

CHANGING CONCEPTS OF GRAMMAR SCHOOL TEACHER AUTHORITY IN SWEDEN

1927-1965

Schools are institutions to which are assigned a great deal of responsibility for the upbringing of the young generation. Part of that responsibility is to ensure that they become good citizens. The students shall, under the teacher's supervision, acquire the knowledge and skills needed for their adult life. The teacher's duty also includes caring for the moral education of the students. Teachers are thus important links in the reproduction of culture. In this respect, however, they do not have an easy task because there is hardly any consensus on what kind of knowledge, skills, and moral qualifications that are desirable. Another complication is the fact that the teacher shares with other adults the responsibility for the upbringing of the youth. Parents are important opponents or allies of teachers, as are other professional groups also involved in cultural reproduction.

The process of upbringing going on inside the school walls is inevitably marked by the power relations between the teacher and the students. In this respect, the teacher is usually, but not always, the more powerful part. An important aspect of the power of the teacher is related to his or her authority. However, authority is not given once and for all but must continuously be established and reestablished. The nature of discipline, however, is a contested issue. Some philosophers of education have, for instance, advocated anti-authoritarian

pedagogies with more democratic relations between teachers and students. Researchers, on their part, have called attention to the employment of new discipline techniques. Still media reports have been consistently critical of a lack of school discipline.

This paper treats issues of teacher authority in a historical perspective. The focus is on grammar school teachers in Sweden between 1927 and 1965. The Swedish grammar school was run by the state, and provided an academic education for students from the age of eleven to twenty years. The final exam, studentexamen, was required for university studies. Before 1927 grammar schools were open only for boys, and they were also socially very exclusive. The school reform of 1927, however, enabled girls to attend these schools, and the aim was also to broaden the social recruitment. As a result, during the period between 1927 and 1965 the number of grammar school students tripled, and the proportion of working class students increased. These and other economical, political, and ideological changes of society affected the teachers' authority and their relations with students.

What, then, was the teacher's authority made up of? How was it upheld, and how did it change over time? As a point of departure Max Weber's three ideal types, bureaucratic, traditional, and charismatic authority, will be used as analytical tools. However, these concepts are theoretical constructs which were developed within a specific

historical context, and one cannot assume that they can be automatically applied to the period of this particular investigation. Therefore the concepts professional authority and maternal authority will be introduced later on. Furthermore, one may ask whose historical reality was included in Weber's concepts, and its relation to Swedish grammar school teachers of the time. In the concluding section of this paper these issues will be discussed as will the issue of teachers' authority at present times, which, according to postmodern philosophers, have witnessed the end of modernity.

The main source of information for this investigation consists of articles on discipline matters published in a teacher journal, *Tidning för Sveriges läroverk*, (TFSL) between 1927 and 1965. I have also used various regulations for grammar schools, staff records of a few grammar schools, reports on national teacher meetings, and written school memories.

Bases of teacher authority

To begin with, let me draw a picture of the 19th-century grammar school teacher. To a certain extent he (and he was male) was the archetype of a civil servant, "the incarnation of the idea of the state", to quote an ex-student remembering his head master. In reality, however, the grammar school profession was composed of a heterogenous crowd of senior masters, assistant masters, teachers in art, physical education and music, and also various temporarily employed teachers. According to

memoirs of ex-students a lot of eccentrics, even crazy persons, belonged to the profession. However, in local communities they were generally respected and their status was relatively high.

The grammar school teacher could rely on the authority of the State and state regulations prescribing the relation between teachers and students in matters of discipline. In the Grammar School Act, for example, there was a multitude of decrees and prohibitions to which the students had to conform, and there were also local stipulations for students' behaviour. Furthermore there were decrees prescribing how order should be upheld, which punishment should be employed, and who had the right to impose and execute it. These impersonal rules were, in Max Weber's terms, a very solid foundation of bureaucratic authority.

The image of the severe but tender father was also apparent in the Grammar School Act. The authority exercised by the father over his child is similar to the civil servant's authority in that it is related to position rather than person. But its foundation is different, because it is not based on impersonal rules but on a personal relationship, and it is upheld by tradition and implicit rules rather than public decrees and prescriptions. Weber designated this form traditional authority, but he also stated that patriarchal authority belonged to this category. I will use the latter term as an indication of its gendered nature. However, when women in 1918, after much debate and hard struggles, got access to positions as grammar school teachers, they could also, at least in principle, enjoy patriarchal authority.

These two types of authority were thus connected to the teacher's position, but still it happened that order collapsed. In school memories there are many examples of teachers who, when entering the classroom, were immediately exposed to the larks and obstructions of the students. But there were also charismatic teachers who never needed to raise their voices to overpower or create order within the student collective.

The authority of the teacher thus contained elements of all three ideal types identified by Weber, but a fourth one must be added, professional authority, based on expert knowledge and competence. The grammar school teacher with a prolonged university training background was the self-evident expert of his subject, and the respect that was bestowed on him must be regarded also in the light of this fact.

Dissolving bureaucratic authority

Bureaucratic authority was ultimately based on state decrees regulating the relation between teachers and students. For rules to be obeyed, however, it is necessary that they are supported by the public opinion and regarded as reasonable. Before World War II, this was not a much debated issue in the columns of TSFL, which probably indicates that the

bureaucratic authority of the teacher was not questioned. Yet, in the 1940s and henceforth it became a frequent topic.

An overall criticism against the disciplinary forms of school was that they were old fashioned and out of date. According to a journalist it was "the duty of every teacher to adapt to the Modern Age and to provide himself with the authority that modern times demand." This criticism was also supported by some teachers. In a discussion held in the Stockholm Society of Grammar School Teachers in 1948 it was pointed out that "all prescriptions for absolute silence, absolute obedience, and absolute attention harmonize with the orthodoxy of the 11th century."

Through the centuries, students have always questioned the order of school even if the protests usually have been ineffectual, and have caused the rebels trouble. In the 1950s, however, the students' possibilities to give force to their protests increased considerably. As an antidote against totalitarian ideologies which had caused the world so much pain during the World War II, the school was now expected to foster democratic citizens, and the students were encouraged to establish self-governed associations. As such, the students began to regard themselves as political subjects having the right to speak, and their voices were considerably amplified when in 1954 they established a national union, Sveriges elevers centralorganisation (SECO). According to SECO, most of the prohibitions surrounding the students' leisure time infringed their integrity and privacy. For example,

prohibitions against parties in public places without the headmaster's consent violated constitutional rights of freedom of assembly.

The legitimacy of a rule-based system depends also on the possibilities of controlling the obedience of the rules. But in practice it was impossible to supervise every student during leisure time. Therefore sanctions hit students randomly; some students got away with breaking the rules, while others were caught and punished. According to representatives of SECO, such injustices and absurdities could not be justified. Some teachers, on the other hand, defended existing rules even if they were difficult to supervise: "... that punishments sometimes would be unfair cannot be helped. An occasionally occurring coincidence could be considerably useful." But there were also teachers who wanted many prohibitions to be abolished so that they themselves were excused from the duty to act like the police. It all ended in a victory for the students in 1959 as the National Board of Education recommended the schools to refrain from issuing detailed prescriptions for students' leisure time.

The rule system was undermined also by the lack of public consensus. After World War II, in the spirit of democracy, pluralism in opinions and standards became an ideal to a larger extent. Therefore any norm system prescribed by school could always be questioned on other grounds of values, and TFSL paid much attention to this problem. No longer was it possible to "act and teach as if there were any correct opinions".

The nation was in an overall state of norm disintegration, and not least confused were the teachers themselves: "Many teachers' philosophical standpoint has turned them into moral relativists. Others are only ethically disoriented like so many others nowadays."

There was still another weak point in the rule system on which the teacher's authority was based; the principle that fair punishments must be equally imposed for faults of similar kind. In this respect practice differed, not only among different schools but also among different teachers at the same school. The teachers were aware of this problem, and staff meetings were held to create joint guidelines for how to treat late arrivals etc. The confusion concerning the marks for conduct and order was reflected also in TFSL. Which faults would render a lower conduct mark, and which would result into a lower order mark? And what was the logic of punishing a badly behaving student with a "B" in conduct which, according to state instructions, meant "good behaviour"? This debate ended with the abolishment of conduct marks from the leaving certificate.

Impersonal bureaucratic rules may be seen as a guarantee for the rights of the individual. As a man of integrity, the civil servant was expected to conscientiously find out all the facts of the case and make his judgements irrespectively of the persons involved. According to the teacher staff at Härnösand grammar school, this was precisely how faulting students were treated:

Every student is of course entitled to have his individual case examined and judged, when faults like cheating are revealed, but it is nevertheless necessary that the staff's judgement be uniform. This is an absolute condition to prevent the students from feeling that the staff responds differently from one case to another.

In this respect, the teachers were supported by the Deputy Assistant of the National Board of Education. He stated that the handling of accusations against students was similar to the procedure practised in courts. Everyone was innocent until proven guilty, and the burden of proof lay on the accusing party. But there were also teachers who doubted that justice was always done. A head master, for example, pointed out to the participants of a national teacher meeting the absurdity that teachers who were involved in controversies with students usually acted both as prosecutors and judges.

All these examples are indications that the bureaucratic authority of the teacher was rocked to its foundations. The fairness of the rules, and the reasonableness of measures and sanctions employed for the upholding of order were questioned. In the following section we will see that also the patriarchal authority of the teacher was undermined.

Patriarchal authority

The teacher shall always keep in mind that he, in relation to his students, is in loco parentis when executing his calling of great responsibility.

This paragraph of the Grammar School Act of 1928 contains the very essence of the patriarchal authority of the teacher. But on whose conditions did the teacher act as a parent? According to the Act the parents and the teachers should cooperate to bring the child up. This presupposed that they shared views on the purpose and means of children's upbringing. The National Board of Education touched upon this problem in its guidelines for grammar school education, but did not give any directions for how to act if consensus could not be achieved. There were many complaints in TFSL about parents' lacking sympathy for the demands for order and discipline in school. Later on the problem could also be the reverse as parents stuck to authoritarian principles of upbringing when teachers no longer "adhered to military drill and straight standards of behaviour." But no matter how the problems were defined, it was usually perceived that it was the parents, not the teachers, who needed to change their views:

Those parents who understand that, for their child's own good, there must be an agreement, try to adjust to the rule system of the school --- parents have only minimal possibilities to influence school.

One condition for the patriarchal element of teacher authority was thus that parents recognized the right of the school to dictate standards

for their children's behaviour. Inevitably, those standards bore the mark of a certain culture's definitions of what a good behaviour means, definitions which in school were elevated to general principles.

Thereby the school exercised symbolic violence against groups with other systems of norms. In the 19th century the grammar school students constituted a socially rather homogenous group, which may be one explanation of the fact that serious cultural clashes between teachers and parents seldom happened. But during the period from 1927 to 1965, when the social recruitment was broadened, the records of staff meetings contain many references to unsuitable parents. This was how a professor in education, Torsten Husén, defined the problem at a national teacher meeting in 1954:

Because of the transformation of a patriarchal society to, in the broad sense of the word, a democratic society we are now facing a discipline crisis. The development in the economical, social, and political fields has been fast, but the norm system has not kept up with the pace. This is especially true for upbringing: the confusion surrounding the aims of education bear witness to that. In this respect there are also differences between home and school. Previously students came from the same background, and the patterns of upbringing were more homogenous. Now the students' background is much more varied, but still they are all expected to adjust to the same norms - - -.

Consequently, much more symbolic violence was needed to suppress norms deviating from the standards of school, a fact that made a speaker at

the same teacher meeting question if it was at all reasonable that school should "set the standards for the whole nation ---- One can hardly prescribe a norm which all social classes shall obey." According to other teachers, however, school should do precisely this:

All measures taken by the school in order to foster the students will be more or less ineffective, if they are not sanctioned by the public opinion and the parents. Therefore it is exceedingly important that parents are made to understand the imperative duty of the school, for the students' own good as well as for the interest of the school, to demand obedience of rules, whether written or not ----- It cannot be helped that parents and students may perceive of this as a violation.

Another characteristic feature of patriarchal authority was expressed in the Grammar School Act of 1928 as follows:

The student shall venerate the teachers of the school and accept their prescriptions, rebukes and punishments compliantly.

Thus a teacher had the right to demand respect from the students. This paragraph implicitly presupposed that the teacher as an upright civil servant used his bureaucratic authority only in order to administer justified punishments and reprimands. But even if this was not the case, the student should defer to the teacher's judgement all the same.

In this respect, patriarchal authority was a complement to bureaucratic authority. However, the vast number of students who were warned for being obstinate and recalcitrant were very concrete tokens that this did not always work. And neither did the public opinion always take side of the teachers against the students:

We teachers are often faced with lack of sympathy for the duties that have been imposed on us, like teaching and fostering. Knowledge, firmness, and personal style are values and ideals that are not very much esteemed always and everywhere in society.

The logic of patriarchal authority demands the student to hold the teacher in high regard. However, the way of showing respect is culturally specific and it also changes over time. The relations between the young and the older generation certainly changed during this period, and some teachers had difficulties accepting this, because they interpreted these changes not only as a lack of rudimentary manners, but also as indications of the general societal disintegration of standards. This episode is one example:

The other day I was walking through the corridor where a group of boys were sitting. The boys greeted me by nodding their heads with their caps on and without raising to their feet! - - - Of course, I turned straight back; I gave them a reprimand and forced them to greet me in a

proper way.

According to this teacher, some of his colleagues did not bother to correct such manners, but in the 1960s the teachers in Härnösand were still trying to hold on to such conventions. There the following statement was added to the local rules for student behaviour:

Every student shall endeavour to acquire a good personal style and attitude, courtesy and correct behaviour. The proper thing for a correct behaviour is to greet the teachers of the school politely.

The patriarchal authority may also be regarded in relation to what was previously named as master power. In the 19th century the Master had the right to administer corporal punishment to the members of the household, just like grammar school teachers to the students. However, this right was abolished in the Grammar School Act of 1928, but the prohibition against corporal punishment was not completely supported by the teachers. Now and then arguments like "a blackguard understands nothing but the rod" appeared in TFSL. Under the headline "The teachers have become outlawed" a very upset Senior Master told about a teacher that had been sentenced to pay a fine for having beaten a provocative student. Another writer defended a colleague who had refused to apologise to the parents for giving their son a 'rightly-deserved' box on the ear:

Honoured be such a man of principles. Why would he humiliate himself in

front of a malicious auditorium, risking his prestige and authority as teacher, educator, and superior?

As late as in 1959 it was argued in the TFSL editorial that the prohibition against corporal punishment should not be misinterpreted: sometimes the purpose was only to restore order. The fact that the intervention would leave bruises should not be taken as a proof that physical punishment had been executed, was intended or that too much force had been used.

Teacher violence was thus occurring but we do not know how frequently. But it was an indication of some teachers' difficulties with striking the balance between gentleness and strictness. Physical violence was the last resort for a teacher to claim his authority. The purpose was to frighten the students into obedience. However, we will now see how the main emphasis moved from severeness to mildness, and from strict principles of justice to consideration for the circumstances of the individual student.

Professional authority redefined

A grammar school teacher usually had a long university training in his subject of teaching, and therefore it is likely that his professional authority was to a great extent attached to this subject. But in the 1930s and 1940s the ideas of John Dewey and progressive education spread to Sweden and met with sympathy among some grammar school

teachers. According to progressive ideals of teaching and learning students are expected to search for knowledge themselves, while it is the teachers duty to arrange the environment for optimal learning. Consequently, the professional teacher is not any longer defined as a subject expert knowing all the answers but one who is capable of showing the student the way to the answers. In this perspective, knowledge of cognitive and development psychology became as important as knowledge of school subjects. In TFSL both progressive and traditional pedagogical ideals were advocated even if most of the writers defended the latter, as for example in this quote from the

early 1930s:

For a long time, and not least in high quarters, indulgence and bad results of knowledge have been regarded as a much more insignificant demerit for a teacher than ferventness and serious demands for knowledge. ---- These unsound pedagogical tendencies must be fought!

John Dewey's "pedagogical fetishes have led to a misjudgement of teacher competence --- There is nothing to replace good teaching with the teacher at the centre talking in such a way that the students are carried away." However, another characteristic of progressivism which it shares with other theories of education, resounded more loudly in TFSL; the one concerning the foundations of discipline. Basil Bernstein's concept of visible and invisible pedagogy illustrates the

point well. In visible pedagogy, rules and norms are explicitly told, with a clear dividing line between what is forbidden and allowed. All the rules governing grammar school students' behaviour were manifestations of this pedagogy. However, as these rules began to be questioned, another argument, more in line with an invisible pedagogy, became more frequent:

--- If you want to bring a human being up, the aim can only be reached by love. If you only rely on principles, you will turn blind to real upbringing; the result will only be compulsion and drill.

Discipline problems should therefore not be regarded as matters of conflicts between teachers and students. The teacher had to make the students to want the same thing as himself. This, in turn, presupposed that the authoritarian relations between teachers and students became more egalitarian, based on confidence rather than fear:

For the sake of education of the character, the teacher has to establish contact with his students. They must be able to talk about personal matters, for example fear, inferiority complex, conflicts with other people, sexual problems, dishonesty etc.

The teacher quoted above expressed another principle of invisible pedagogy: the teacher must get access to the student's feelings and thoughts in order to establish the "inner police". Actually, this principle has a long history in Sweden since it was already prominent

in the grammar school discourse at the end of the 19th century.

However, visible pedagogy dominated the explicit and detailed rules of grammar school acts, and also in practice. But the debate in the 1940s about the reasonableness of these rules indicates that the foundation of visible pedagogy was now seriously questioned.

One consequence was that new meanings of teacher professionalism emerged. The teacher would encourage his or her students to feel free and spontaneous; instead of speaking ironically of a student's faults and mistakes he (sic) would take him to a café to sort the problem out; he would help a blushing and stammering girl by telling her about his own uneasiness; he would not feel hurt by students reproaching him; he would not rebuke, but instead talk to a misbehaving student. In the words of Bruce Curtis, the aim was to hide "the hand of educational power".

Invisible pedagogy has its scientific basis in various psychodynamic theories of learning and development, but another scientific discourse also had an remarkable effect in TFSL; namely the one regarding deviant behaviour of students not as moral defects but as consequences of unfavourable social conditions. The implications of this for the treatment of disciplinary cases were considerable:

Demands of an abstract justice must not be prior to considerations of what is best for the student. Thefts are usually punished severely, but they are mostly caused by a broken family life. Thefts are by no means

tokens of criminal dispositions; they are sometimes only indications of misery and despair, of existential and societal alienation or strong inferiority complex. Irremediable damage may be made by treating the failing person as a villain. On the contrary, understanding and kindness may help him (sic) to restore his mental health.

Thus, the teacher had to combine understanding of social psychology and empathical capacity in order to find out underlying causes of unruly students' behaviour. Perhaps sullen and negative attitudes were due to lacking opportunities to get an outlet for needs of activity?

Discipline problems might be due to mass reactions of the class, and therefore studies in group and mass psychology ought to be part of teacher training. And the student risking his behavioural mark just before his final exam by drinking liqueur at the principal hotel of the town, would have to undergo a mental examination.

However, one consequence of the tendency to regard discipline problems as having environmental or/and psychological causes was that the teachers had to take a line on other professional groups, for example social welfare officers, psychologists, doctors, and school nurses, whose professional status are more explicitly based on sciences like psychiatry or psychology. Furthermore public authorities like child welfare committees became involved in discipline cases. These groups were regarded as complements to the teachers, and it seems to me, that

teachers were glad to accept their help, but occasionally with certain reservations. According to the teachers in Härnösand the child welfare committee should not have an unwarranted influence over discipline matters; the teacher staff should also act according to its own convictions and traditions.

Hence, causes of discipline problems were to a larger extent likely to be found outside the walls of the school, like urbanization, increasing juvenile delinquency, and gainfully employed mothers, and the alleged disintegration of the family. But during the whole period of this investigation many teachers were critical of these tendencies. Of course one had to take the conditions of individual students into consideration, but only within certain limits:

To explain a discipline case only with psychological theories is to psychologise and not to foster. On the other hand, upbringing without psychological understanding of the case in question is to act more or less blindly.

Some teachers were also sceptical about the messages of anti-authoritarian pedagogical theories. Consideration must not degenerate into coddling: "Surely, there are fragile children demanding a very careful treatment. However, Swedish youth of today usually does not show any signs of nervousness, and does not suffer from an inferiority complex." This opinion was stated in the early 1930s, but similar opinions were also expressed twenty years later: "Actually, I

believe more strongly in immediately telling the student 'Let go of it!' instead of emphasizing for the student X the importance of not incessantly kicking student Y on his leg." Another writer was critical of those who argued that punishment should be abolished because it would arouse less pleasant associations; surely, such was the aim of punishment! Voices were raised in warning against educational researchers for turning school into a playground for researchers' trial and error. It was important to:

keep the course for our odyssey in the archipelago of pedagogics between the slavish discipline of Scylla and Caribis' pampering pedagogics. This course shall lead to an upbringing of the youth to style and dignity, self discipline and moral responsibility, solidarity and social spirit.

The debate about freedom versus constraint, strict and equal rules for

all students versus consideration for offenders' individual circumstances, was an indication that the professional authority of the teacher could no longer be founded only on expert knowledge of school subjects. At the same time the bureaucratic authority was undermined as explicit rules and prohibitions began to be questioned. Therefore the field opened up to invisible pedagogy based on psychological theories of cognition and personal development. When teachers failed to implant the "inner police" in the students, explanations were sought in various

sociological or psychological theories of deviant behaviour. As a consequence, professional authority came to rest on three legs; expert knowledge of school subjects, knowledge of psychology, and personal qualities like capability of empathy.

Authority and maternity

The changing meanings of authority in teacher discourse were related to changes in social recruitment to grammar school and anti-authoritarian currents which partly were reactions against totalitarian ideologies so widespread before and during World War II. At the same time, the discourse of invisible pedagogy gained ground among grammar school teachers, according to which the teacher must establish a trustful relationship with his or her students, and also get access to the student's inner feelings. According to Bernstein, this pedagogy has the potential to cause a very profound socialisation compared to visible pedagogy; it is much easier to defend oneself by open protests or by apparent submission against authority based on explicit rules.

Invisible pedagogy, on the other hand, does not show overtly the face of power and therefore it is much more difficult to defend oneself against it: power is spinning its threads underneath the skin of the student. However, this pedagogy also demands much of the teacher. He or she must view every student "not only as an object of teaching but also as a human being in the making".

To establish trust is also a time consuming task and in this respect, the subject teacher system was not very functional, although most of the responsibility was put on the form master. It should also be noted that all the time there were voices defending the justification of rules, a strict control of the observance of the rules, and sanction against those who broke the rules. Therefore it is likely that invisible pedagogy first and foremost existed as a normative discourse without any greater impact on pedagogical practice. But all the same it was to a large extent elevated to an ideal and consequently the teachers became more vulnerable in their struggles for the hegemony of the classroom. Obviously, in some quarters the authority of teachers was totally collapsing. Teachers ended up in hospitals with gastric ulcers, social officers for teachers were demanded, and it was claimed that even teachers would be in the need of therapy.

In this context the analysis of invisible pedagogy carried out by Valerie Walkerdine is relevant. She argues, as Bernstein does, that invisible pedagogy was established above all at the lower parts of the school system. But while Bernstein regards it as symbolic violence directed towards the child, Walkerdine argues that it also hit the teacher who, at the lower levels of school, usually is a woman. A consequence of recent tendencies to psychologize pupils' behaviour is that the teacher has to accept even very insulting behaviours as being quite normal for this stage of the child's development. A female teacher may for example have difficulties defending herself against

sexual harassment of small boys, the argument being that it is normal for boys of that age to use filthy words! Maternal feelings and empathy as ideals for women teachers have also a long history. According to Carolyne Steedman these ideals emerged in the 19th century in England. Hanne Rimme Nielsen has pointed to the same tendencies in Denmark at the turn of the 19th century. Kate Rousmaniere shows how American female teachers blamed themselves for not being capable of handling the students by means of gentle methods. Invisible pedagogy is thus more or less based on characteristics that are traditionally explicitly assigned to women. In this respect it is a contrast to patriarchal authority, but what was the significance of this fact for grammar school?

As stated above, after 1918 women academics were entitled to hold positions as senior masters and masters at grammar school, and after the reform of 1927 the same was true also for women trained at teacher colleges for girls' school. In the 1930s this brought about vigorous protests from male grammar school teachers because at that time the prospects of having a permanent teacher position were bad. And what was worse, if women superseded men in grammar school, every new impulse or idea brought into the school by new recruitment would, during the next ten years, be supplied by women. What sort of impulses would be expected were suggested in the following quote:

After that the most important qualification for getting a teacher position has turned out to be a woman, a lot of well-meaning ladies are trotting around in our grammar schools, wearing more or less thick veils between their theories and the much more robust reality of boys, understanding only a few things, but forgiving everything.

According to this writer, women were, because of their sex, not capable to bring up boys - it would take a father figure with patriarchal authority to make a man of a boy. In the 1950s, however, the opposite was sometimes claimed: the unsuitable teacher was often a man.

According to psychological theories of different personality types it was stated that:

The subvital teacher is usually a man, much too concerned with his prestige, and therefore hypersensitive for those breaches of discipline that are directed towards his authority. If he belongs also to the temperamental type, he would flare up all too easily, letting his unbalanced judgement express itself by much too severe punishments.

It seems as if the ideal of male firmness began to give way to female patient treatment of the students, at the same time as women began to enter the profession. As an alternative to patriarchal authority based on male gender power, a maternal authority emerged. This authority was based on more equal relations between upbringer and child, and therefore it was also to a larger extent an open question of who would exercise symbolic violence against whom. It was not always the teacher

that got the better out of the students.

Charismatic authority

According to the Oxford dictionary the meaning of the word charisma is "power to inspire devotion and enthusiasm", a power that may be regarded as divine. This meaning is well in accordance with Weber's definition of charismatic authority, but Weber more specifically states that:

Genuine charismatic domination ---- knows of no abstract legal codes and statutes and of no formal way of adjudication, - - - - Charismatic domination means a rejection of all ties to any external order in favour of the exclusive glorification of the genuine mentality of the prophet and hero. Hence, its attitude is revolutionary and transvalues everything: it makes a sovereign break with all traditional or rational norms.

In its pure form, charismatic authority is foreign to every-day routine. It is thus sharply opposed to both bureaucratic and patriarchal authority which are forms of every-day routine control of actions. These two latter types of authority were therefore well suited for schooling, since the aim of discipline in school was ultimately to establish and maintain daily routines. For a teacher, however,

charismatic authority seems to be a self-contradiction. But the characteristics of some teachers may still be interpreted in the framework of charismatic authority.

Being the foundation of school order and discipline, daily routines in school also made one day very like the other, and students' protests against school order were sometimes reactions against the monotony always accompanying routines. Therefore, students appreciated activities which constituted breaks in the daily work. Teachers standing out from the rest might for this very reason enjoy respect:

"An odd and strange teacher makes you escape the monotony of schooling."

Some examples of teachers of whom ex-students have happy memories may illustrate this phenomenon: In Landskrona grammar school the lessons of a teacher in Swedish sometimes turned into improvised theatrical performances with students playing active parts. In Hälsingborg the following episode took place in a lesson in Biology:

Ludde was certainly a richly coloured personality with bizarre humour and eventful descriptive power. Once we were going to carry out a dissection of a porpoise, but the stink was unendurable. Facing the threat of the ultimate collapse of the lesson, he excused himself and left the classroom. After a quarter of an hour he returned to the blood-bath with a package of cloth-pegs which he distributed in complete silence. After that he adapted a peg into his nose, enjoying the sight of all his students eagerly acting with their noses blocked

up.

School memories tell of eccentric teachers who were respected for, rather than in spite of, their peculiarities. They were often described as originals with very special personal habits, odd manners and opinions, very much in contradictions to standards for normal behaviour. For example, a teacher who resisted the monotony, inherent also in teacher work, by reading and marking students' essays at the very last minute, during the lesson in the classroom and with the student-author standing at his side, met with sympathy. Other teachers standing out from the rest were those combining professional authority, e. g., expert knowledge, with the capacity to captivate students' attention, and sometimes also to break students' ingrained world views. One example of this is the teacher who started his morning prayer in the assembly-hall calling out: "Is God able to pull a bald person's hair?"

To conclude, although grammar school teachers were not charismatic leaders in Weber's full sense of the word, it is adequate to talk of a quasi charismatic authority; there were charismatic elements in some teachers' personalities, like power to inspire enthusiasm, and for that reason they were also respected. Teachers who were regarded as "quite a character" often belonged to that category. But there were also eccentric teachers who were ridiculed rather than respected, or feared

rather than held in high esteem.

This section is based on written school memories from the whole period of investigation, but stories of eccentric teachers are more frequent for the first half of this period. Actually, according to some ex-students, the (quasi) charismatic teacher seemed to be a species on the point of extinction in the early 1960s:

I remember a cavalcade of teachers from this period. - - - They were excellent school men, each one in his own way, but they would have made themselves impossible in the discoloured art of teaching typical for the comprehensive school. They all were personalities.

Teacher authority and discourses of modernity: Summary and critical reflections

Webers three ideal types of authority have constituted my theoretical point of departure. To all appearances, the bureaucratic authority of the teachers was not a much questioned issue before World War II, but thereafter many articles in TFSL dealt with the legitimacy of the norm system for the students' behaviour codified in the Grammar School Act and various local regulations. Most of the teachers/writers tried their best to argue logically for the reasonableness of existing rules. The teachers were thereby pictured as upright civil servants of justness. But on the other hand there were also teachers questioning both the existing system of norms and the teachers' willingness and capability

to handle discipline matters impartially.

The patriarchal authority of the teachers has mainly been analysed in relation to the paragraph in the Grammar School Act which stated that the teacher, when performing his duty, was in loco parentis. Therefore teachers could draw on the respect that was traditionally bestowed on parents. However, this presupposed that parents did not openly question neither the purpose of upbringing defined by the school nor the methods used by the teachers to deal with disobedient students. As the body of students became more heterogenous, the chances for conflicts between the norms of home and school also increased. Consequently, a larger amount of symbolic violence was necessary for upholding standards for students' behaviour. Many teachers actually claimed that this was precisely both their right and duty but according to other teachers this would no longer be possible in a pluralistic society.

To begin with, the professional authority was firmly based on the teacher's expert knowledge of school subjects. However, in the 1940s the ideas of progressivism emerged in the teachers' discourse, thus challenging this basis. The ideal of the teacher who, knowing all the answers, also told the students these answers by lecturing lesson after lesson, was challenged by pedagogical theories of learning which emphasised the student as the active part of the learning process. These theories can be regarded as representatives of an invisible

pedagogy, and so can the debate of freedom versus coercion that started at the same time. The purpose of discipline was no longer to seek an apparent submission to, but an internalization of, norms and standards. In order to establish the inner police into the pupils minds, the teacher had to create an atmosphere of trustfulness in relation to the students. The severe patriarch was contrasted against the gently empathical mother; the contours of a maternal authority were to be seen.

Yet another discourse, also in accordance with invisible pedagogy, became manifest: the one stating that punishments do not cure a sinner. Moral deficiencies did not cause students to obstruct and break the rules of the school; the explanations were rather to be found in psychiatric abnormalities or in the miserable social conditions of the students' family. Therefore school doctors, psychiatric experts and social welfare committees were consulted to examine, judge and suggest suitable measures for the misbehaving student. The aim was to scrutinize the whole soul of the student and the family conditions. A discourse of normality was thus established, and students were judged against abstract and scientific criteria.

For a teacher, the notion of charismatic authority is something of a contradiction in terms, because it is antithetical to daily routines. It is however possible to speak of a quasi-charismatic authority: there were teachers whose personalities, even strange ones, were respected for their capacity to inspire the students or to break the

monotony of daily work in school.

The above analysis carried out in a Weberian perspective must, however, be qualified. Weber's concepts are not only abstract theoretical constructions but also products of a very specific historical context. As such they are inevitably marked by the social relations constituting this very context. First of all, it must be noted that they are ideal types, constructed by overemphasising and singling out certain characteristics of social phenomena. Therefore they do not necessarily correspond to anything real. But according to Weber, this is the very reason why ideal types may tell us something very important of the social phenomenon in question. I have no problem accepting this line of argument.

The critique delivered by feminists and postmodern philosophers must however be taken more seriously. From their point of view, Weber's theoretical constructions exemplify master narratives of modernity in that he attempts to explain historical processes by using a few key word, like "bureaucratization" and "rationalization". Such attempts are futile because social changes cannot be explained by using simple formulas. Weber himself would not have disagreed with that, at least as far as his ideal types of authority are concerned: he pointed out that "the idea that the whole concrete historical reality can be exhausted in this conceptual scheme is as far from the author's thought as anything could be". However, we are still left with the question of whether, by using his concepts, reality is simplified to the point of

distortion. For this particular investigation, however, the point of departure was a multitude of empirical data, (e.g., of various statements of teachers), and I did not a priori take it for granted that Weber's analytical tools would be applicable to them. For example, it was necessary to extend his conceptual scheme by introducing the notions of professional and maternal authority. Thus I believe that I have not forced the data to fit into the categories used.

Yet, another problem has to be addressed. The feminist and/or postmodern critique of master narratives of modernity states that they also are oppressing because what is not included in these simplified stories is implicitly defined as non-important or even non-existent.

Thereby the marginalization of the Others is executed. Weber is a good (or rather bad) case in point; there was no place for women in his theories, as he focused on social processes and activities in which women were not involved. Moreover, what has been regarded as the very essence of modernity, for example the struggle against bigotry, fanaticism and oppression by the church, is nothing but myths.

Modernity revolves around the quest for modelling, ordering and regulating the world in accordance to general principles, laws, rules and norms, thereby destroying local traditions. Here intellectuals have played an active role because their expert knowledge was needed in order to run schools, factories, prisons, hospitals etc.

Obviously, bureaucratic and/or professional authority have been crucial for the legitimation of the ambitions to control and model societies.

In this perspective these authority types may be regarded as manifestations of the self-recognition of modernity. But let us take this postmodernist deconstruction one step further. A goodly number of bureaucracies and institutions, for example schools, were established in the 19th century. They were, literally speaking, man made, (e. g., made by middle class men). Weber's definition of bureaucratic authority was certainly in line with the self-recognition of those men, and no doubt a powerful discourse of bureaucracy existed, crucial for the construction of social reality. That the basis for the teachers' bureaucratic authority was gradually undermined, may thus be due to the fact that it was challenged by other (not less) modern discourses like progressivism or psychiatric theories of normality.

How, then, may these discursive shifts be understood? Actually, one important element of the modern project is its critical potential; no other authority besides human reason is acknowledged. To begin with, one particular reason was dominant, e.g., this which was the characteristic of bureaucracies. But even with regard to internal bureaucratic criteria, many regulations on which the bureaucratic authority of the teachers was based, were not very reasonable. Other types of reason started to manifest themselves. Certainly, they were only variations of the same theme in that they also aimed at control and order. But figurately speaking, also the yet not fully articulated voices of the Others resounded in the teachers' discourse.

It is also important to note that the discourse of teacher authority was not gender neutral. Both patriarchal and bureaucratic authority are manifestations of different forms of masculinity. The first corresponds to the harsh, although loving and protecting father. The second corresponds to the rational, impersonal, non-emotional and logically competent leader, the very ideal type of the bourgeois man. That precisely these ideals were to leave their mark on institutions like schools, illustrates that often class and gender power are inseparable, reinforcing each other. An authoritative woman became per definition a contradiction in terms, as the male grammar school teachers used Weberian types of authority in their attempts to prevent women from applying for teacher positions. However, in reality there were several women teachers who were highly respected by the students:

With all due deference to the gentlemen, the one who really struck terror into us was actually a woman. When Else Holmgren came tripping into the classroom, well, maybe even a while before, the class was completely silent. Sometimes I have asked myself ---- what is it that make a class respect the teacher? Else Holmgren did not look menacing, a tall and thin, almost fragile woman. But woe was the student daring to breathing a word or the one who had not done his homework! Then you had better to keep out of her way! But she was a good teacher, yes, she certainly was!

Postmodernity, it is argued, puts an end to many things that we have

taken for granted; it proclaims the end of history, truth, morality, or in short, of everything in the way of authorities. In this perspective, the discourse I have analysed might well have represented the beginning of the ultimate end of teachers' authority. It is also symptomatic that many educational researchers are no longer interested in teachers' authority as a source of power; instead they focus on the technologies of power which operate at the micro level, e. g., in all the pedagogical practises where teachers and students participate.

However, such micro-politics nevertheless establish standards of behaviour. Thus, we do not get rid of questions about whose norms and standards should be valid, and on what grounds they should be considered legitimate. The issue of authority is quite simply an eternal companion of schooling and pedagogics, or as Jennifer Gore argues:

---invoking standards appears to be common feature of pedagogy.

Education is naming, communicating, and upholding norms - norms of behaviour, of attitudes, of knowledge.

Neither is teacher power necessarily evil: some form of order is necessary for regulating the relations between all the persons staying in school. If, in the spirit of Lyotard, each oppressed person were granted entire liberty to disobey, the result would certainly be a

disorder which would also be deemed to be oppressive. Whose laws and morals should then be valid? Is it, as for example Paul Heelas argues, possible to draw on Emile Durkheims notion of an abstract ethic of humanity? According to Heelas, principles of human rights, for example, are still powerful instruments for social justice, and education is especially important for the transmission of the humanist tradition, constituting a compromise between freedom and authority. However as, for example, the outcomes of the Human Rights Education Project in Australia indicates, Heelas may underestimate the difficulties involved in creating a national consensus on the practical application of the ethic of humanity in schools.

These difficulties, however, do not necessarily prove the truth of claims for "the end of morality". If each oppressed person were granted entire liberty to disobey, the result would certainly be a disorder which would also be deemed to be oppressive. According to, for example, Thomas Luckman it is likely that traditional moral-meanings have lost their social structural base, but still notions of good and bad are relevant in the face-to-face interactions between people. Zygmund Bauman makes a similar point: The basis of moral principles may be found only "in the moral impulses, skills and competences of men and women, living with, and above all, for each other." Thus, in his view, the foundations of future moral communities have recoiled to the moral capacity of the self.

What would, from such points of view, the consequences be for teachers'

authority? If the national state no longer provides support for certain moral guidelines, then the point of departure may be taken in local and particular conditions. In a single school or a class, for example, it might be possible to agree on what rules should be employed, and to create order out of the pluralism of all multiple opinions represented by teachers, students and parents. In this context, the role of the teacher would be similar to the one that Bauman ascribes to intellectuals of the postmodern era; they no longer have political or cultural authority to establish or uphold standards of truth, goodness and beauty. Instead they emphasise the plurality of cultural standards and their rootedness in local cultures and traditions. They now adopt an interpretative role in order to facilitate communication between diverse traditions and to give 'voice' to those who would otherwise be numb. The professional authority of the teacher would thus also include interpretative competencies.

The decentralisation of the Swedish school system, allocating more initiatives to local communities, may provide opportunities to create small-scale consensus on discipline matters. Furthermore, an explicit aim of current Swedish school policy is "More power to students and parents". On the other hand, the local cannot be isolated from its wider context. As Jane Kenway argues, local politics are often overdetermined by the power relationships which exist beyond the moment and the specific locality. Furthermore, decentralization is only

one of many forces at work, aiming at a profound restructuring of the educational system. Some of the keywords used by Kenway to describe these processes may also be crucial for questions concerning teachers' authority: globally shifting centres of production and power, the relationship between political alliances, state formations, disciplinary technologies. For example, one consequence of the ongoing marketization of schooling could be that teachers' authority would become managerial and entrepreneurial rather than interpretative. As John Smyth puts it:

There is also the view that we need more generic management skills, in order to whip schools into shape. That is to say, we don't need more qualified, experienced and dedicated educators -- just business managers who are able to get the "line management" function right, in larger and larger depersonalised training factories of the future.

If teachers are authorized according to the ideology of the market only, the 21st century will be facing another grand narrative, as oppressive and marginalising as ever the bureaucratic authority, the hallmark of the 19th century.

Cf e.g. Roger Slee, *Changing Theories and Practices of Discipline*, London, The Falmer Press, 1995.

Those who did not plan to go to a university could take a lower exam, realexamen.

At the end of the 19th century about 80 per cent of the students were middle class boys. Cf. Ulla Johansson & Christina Florin, 'Where the

glorius laurels grow....' Swedish grammar schools as a means of social mobility and social reproduction. *History of Education*, 1993, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 147-162.

Cf. Max Weber, *On Charisma and institution Building*, Selected paper, Chicago, The Chicago University Press, 1968, pp. 46-54.

Christina Florin & Ulla Johansson, 'Där de härliga lagrarna gro...'
Kultur, klass och kön i de svenska läroverken 1850-1914, Stockholm, Tiden, 1993, p. 145.

Weber, *On Charisma*, pp. 66-70.

From Max Weber, *Essays in Sociology*, London, Routledge, 1993, p. 296.

However, the notion of charismatic authority is not immediately applicable to teachers. Cf. pp. ???

This concept has been introduced by the Swedish political scientist Svante Beckman.

Quoted in *TFSL*, 1952, no. 20, p 26.

TFSL, 1948, no. 7, p 88.

Cf Robert Adams, *Protests by students. Empowerment, schooling and the state*, Basingstock, The Falmer Press, 1991.

Tore Gjötterberg, *TFSL*, 1956, no 28, p. 753.

Cf records of staff meetings (RSM) at Högre allmänna läroverket för flickor å Södermalm (a grammar school for girls in Stockholm) 22 Oct. 1947.

Gustaf Lindberg, *TFSL*, 1955, no. 3, p. 64.

Martin J:son Marte, *TFSL*, 1949, no. 17, p. 212.

Cf. e.g. RSM at Högre allmänna läroverket för flickor å Södermalm 2 March, 1942.

Weber, On Charisma, pp. 69-70.

RSM of Härnösand grammar school, 21 Dec., 1942.

Sigurd Åstrand (1946), Berättelse från det allmänna svenska
läroverksläarmötet, p. 228.

Stadga för Sveriges läroverk 1928, §131.

Aftontidningen, quoted in TFSL, 1948, no. 4, p. 42.

Aftontidningen. Cf. also TFSL, 1949, no. 6, p. 77ff; Åstrand, p. 220.

Pierre Bourdieu & Jeean-Claude Paasseron, *Reproduction in Education,
Society, and Culture*, London & Beverly Hills, Sage Pub., 1977, pp.
3-68.

Florin & Johansson, 'Där de härliga lagrarna gro...'

Torsten Husén, 31:a svenska läraremötet i Lund 1954, p. 87, Lund, 1954

Härnström, TFSL, 1954, p. 108.

Editorial, TFSL, 1960, no. 35, p. 1207f.

Stadga för Sveriges läroverk, 1928, § 50, mom. 1.

Cf stadga för Sveriges läroverk, § 131, mom. 2: "In his upbringing work
the teacher shall always be guided by conscientiousness and honesty
---."

Thorbjörn Eliasson, 31:a svenska läroverksläarmötet i Lund 1954, p.
17,

TFSL, 1955, no. 31, p.770. Also the teachers in Härnösand complained
over the students' way of greeting their teachers and over their bad
manners in general. Cf RSM of Högre allmänna läroverket i Härnösand, 19
Jan. 1933.

RSM of Härnösand, 16 Oct 1961.

For elementary school corporal punishment was not prohibited until 30 years later.

Birger Löfgren, TSFL, 1946, no. 2, p. 29f.

YFSL, 1944, no. 3, p. 34f.

Editorial, TFSL, 1959, no. 9, p. 211.

In this respect Swedish grammar school teachers were not exceptional.

Corporal punishment was officially sanctioned as late as in the 1980s in Victoria, New South Wales, Western Australia, South Australia, and Queensland, and neither was the rod spared in American or New Zealand schools. Cf e g Roger Slee (ed.), *Discipline in Australian Public*

Education. Changing Policy and Practice, Hawthorn, Victoria, Australian Council for educational research, 1992, p. 18, 46-48, 56, 75, 79, 114;

Irwin A. Hyman & James H. Wise, (eds.), *Corporal Punishment in American Education: Readings in History, Practice, and Alternatives*,

Philadelphia, Temple University Press, 1979; Joseph A. Mercuro, *Caning: Educational Ritual*, Sydney, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975.

Rudolv Körner, TFSL, 1931, no. 19, p. 247f.

Folke Leander, quoted in TFSL, 1949, no. 2, p. 29f.

Basil Bernstein, *Class, Codes, and Control. Vol. 3. Towards a Theory of Educational Transmission*, London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975.

Pontus Pehrson, *27:e Svenska läroverkslärmötet i Stockholm 1938*, Stockholm, 1938, p. 147.

Olof Helander, TFSL, 1943, no. 1, p. 8f.

Bruce Curtis

See e.g. editorial, TFSL, 1945, no. 13, p. 217ff.

Karl Thunell, TFSL, 1937, no. 5, p. 88f.

Sigurd Åstrand, 28:e svenska läroverkslärmötet i Stockholm 1946,
Stockholm. 1946, p. 212f.

The National Board of Education, referred to in YFSL, 1951, no. 12, p.
257.

Greta Wendin, TFSL, 1955, no. 4, p. 336; Birgith Rodhe, 1954, 31:a
svenska läroverkslärmötet i Lund 1954, p. 121.

RSM of Härnösand grammar school, 10 May, 1950.

RSM of Härnösand grammar school, 9 March, 1935.

Svante Bohman, TFSL, 1954, no. 3, p. 60f.

Simon Erlandson, TFSL, 1933, no. 17, p. 251. See also TFSL, 1952, no.
18, p. 294.

Greta Wendin, TFSL, 1954, no. 36, p. 802.

Karl Lamm, TFSL, 1946, no. 3, p. 46f.

Bengt Holmberg, TFSL, 1957, no. 8, p. 184f.

TFSL, 1947, no. 17, p. 244.

Valerie Walkerdine, *Schoolgirl Fictions*, London & New York, Verso,
19??, pp. 3-9.

Hanne Rimme-Nielsen, ??? in Kate Rousmeanier et. al. (eds.),
Discipline, Moral Regulation, and Schooling: a Social History, New
York, Garland Pub., 1997.

Kate Rousmanniere, in *Discipline, Moral Regulation and Schooling*, 1997.

TFSL, 1927, no. 25, p. 375.

Olov Andersson, TFSL, 1934, p. 98.

Tore Gjötterberg, TFSL, 1957, no. 3, p. 95f.

Weber, On Charisma, p. 24.

Weber, p. 51-52.

Of course, there might have been exceptional teachers, like the one in the movie 'Dead poets' society', to whom the Weberian concept could be fully applied.

Sveriges studenter, Kristianstads läroverk, p. 190.

Sveriges studenter, Landskrona högre allmänna läroverk, p. 135.

Sveriges studenter, Hälsingborg högre allmänna läroverk, p.117.

Sveriges studenter, Gävles högre allmänna läroverk, p. 142.

Sveriges studenter, Linköpings högre allmänna läroverk, p. 86.

I have found many examples of this in records of staff meetings.

Linda Nicholson, 'Introduction', in Linda Nicholson (ed.),

Feminism/Postmodernism, New York & London, Routledge, 1990, pp. 1-4;

Dorothy Smith, 'Sociology from Women's experience: A Reaffirmation',

Sociological Theory, 1992, vol. 10.

Jean-Francois Lyotard, The Postmodern Conditions: A Report on

Knowledge, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1984, p.

xxiii-xxv.

Weber, On Charisma, p. 47.

Cf. Beverly Thiele, 'Vanishing acts in social and political thought:

tricks of the trade', in C. Pateman & E. Gross (eds.). Feminist

challenges: Social and Political Theory, Sydney, Allen & Unwin, 1986,

p. 31.

Cf Zygmund Bauman, Intimations of Postmodernity, New York, Routledge,

1992.

It is something of an irony that Weber himself would have been willing to agree with this critique; he foresaw a very pessimistic and dull future for societies governed by bureaucratic principles. Cf Max Weber, 'Bureaucrasy', in *Economy and Society*, Vol. 3, p. 987.

Weber himself firmly placed this particular type of rationality within the context of Western civilization, and hence regarded it as culturally specific. Therefore it might be possible to interpret his work within a minimalist instead of universalistic framework. Cf. e.g. a critical review of recent attempts to reinterpret Weber's writings, in Mitchell Dean, *Critical and Effective Histories*.

Foucault's *Methods and Historical Sociology*, London, Routledge, 1994, pp. 75-95.

Actually, there were many attempts to defend existing rules by referring to an abstract human rationality.

Cf Jill Blackmoore, *Making Educational history: A Feminist Perspective*, Geelong, Deakin University Press, 1992, p. 35ff.

Sveriges studenter, Kristianstads läroverk, s 187. Observera att det finns en teckning av henne som jag kan använda i Brisbane vid presentationen.

"The-end-of-everything"- standpoint constitutes a severe challenge to any intellectual endeavour aiming at a better understanding of social reality. It may also aim a blow to any political project, concerned with issues of social justice. Therefore it is no wonder that there are conflicting opinions on the relevance of this standpoint among social scientists. Cf e.g., Paul Heelas, Scott Lash, & Paul Morris (eds.) *Detraditionalization. Critical Reflections on Authority and Identity*,

Oxford, Blackwell Publisher, 1996; Kathleen Lennon & Margaret Whitford (eds.), *Knowing the difference. Feminist Perspectives in Epistemology*, London, Routledge, 1994. Steven Seidman, *Contested Knowledge. Social Theory in the Postmodern Era*, Oxford, Blackwell Publisher, 1994.

Cf e.g. Jennifer M. Gore, 'On the continuity of Power Relations in Pedagogy', *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, Vol. 5, no. 2, 1995, pp. 165-188.

Gore, 'On the Continuity', p. 172.

Paul Heelas, 'On things not being Worse, and the Ethic of Humanity', in Hellas, et. al (eds.) *Detraditionalization*, pp. 200-222. See also Mark S. Cladis, 'Education, Virtue and Democracy in the Work of Emile Durkheim*', *Journal of Moral Education*, 1995, Vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 37-52.

Heelas, 'On things not being Worse', p. 216-217. See also Les Burwood, 'How Should Schools Respond to the Plurality of Values in a Multi-cultural Society? *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 1996, Vol. 30, No.3, pp. 415-427.

Cf Colin Henry, 'If the Current Situation of Human Rights Education is Hopeless, Shouldn't We Take the Next Step?' (Paper presented at the International Seminar on Human Rights Education, University of York, York, England, June 7-9, 1996.).

Thomas Luckman, 'The Privatization of Religion and Morality', in *Detraditionalization*, p. 78-79.

Zygmund Buman, 'Morality in the Age of Contingency', in *Detraditionalization*, p. 58.

This approach to issues of discipline and order is similar to the Whole-of-School approach which was put into practice in a few schools in South Australia in the late 1980s. Staff, students and parents were involved in discussions about assumptions and expectations related to behaviour. It proved to be possible for staff and families to agree when the focus was on the child in the school context: "Parents and teachers want children to be safe, happy and able to learn". Cf Wendy Johnson, 'From good school practices to effective policies*', in *Discipline in Australian Public Education*, p. 8.

Cf Bauman, *The Intimation of Postmodernity*, p. 18.

Jane Kenway, 'Taking Stock of Gender Reform Policies for Australian Schools: past, present and future', *British Educational Research Journal*, 1997, Vol. 23, no. 3, p. 341.

Kenway, *Ibid.*

John Smyth, *Schooling for Democracy in Economic Rationalist Times*, Adelaide, The Flinders University of South Australia, School of Education, 1993, p. 4.