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ABSTRACT

This research is a detailed analysis of code theory and the various ways it can be utilized to gain a deeper understanding of how culture is reproduced in a state capitalist society, like Canada, especially through the institution of education. It explores the phenomena of why elementary school children learn differently through a process called recontextualization. Code theory is developed in light of several sociological perspectives in education, and argues that both the diminished autonomy of teacher’s work and the intersection of students’ lived experiences have a profound effect on unequal educational experiences.

The thesis further establishes how symbolic control is encoded in the physical and ideological levels of society, as well as in other institutional settings in Canadian society. Of special concern is the critical examination of pedagogical discourse and how it creates and enforces state control, particularly within Ontario’s educational system.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction: Statement of Problem

The ways in which human beings learn are both dynamic and culturally relevant. In this thesis, the term 'culture' will be used to describe the process in which human beings learn. Culture is not a collection of things, whether tangible or abstract. Rather, it is an adaptive process that accumulates partial solutions to frequently encountered problems; culture is the ways people come to think and act in order to make sense and meaning within the habitus in which they live. From birth, the unimpaired biological components are in place to begin the process of learning. However, the ways in which people learn differ immensely from culture to culture, and from within a formally structured educational experience. For instance, such differences are evident within our own Canadian educational system at the elementary level. There are several questions to be raised concerning teacher autonomy and effectiveness, as well as the process of learning itself whereby learning is particular and specific to each and every child. Not only do regional differences exist, but inequalities within school districts and within the scope of inner-city schools themselves are evident. In order to address the unequal experiences these young students face, we must ask: Why do people within an institutional education system learn differently?

There are several academic disciplines that attempt to explain this reality, including those of sociology, feminism, linguistics, psychology, resistance theories and critical theories of education. All of these considerations and theoretical bases converge within the classroom, at times creating conflict and contradiction through
inherent opposition. For example, while pedagogic discourse might suggest that effective teaching techniques must take into consideration individual differences and account for them through one-on-one instruction, the official administrative and economic concerns in most state-capitalist countries like Canada usually dictate that there be twenty to thirty children in any given classroom, thus limiting such effectiveness. Similar contradictions and paradoxes occur frequently; the intersection of these diverse areas of discourse may produce teachers who were at one time aware of what needs to be done in order to teach their classrooms effectively, and at the same time rendered incapable of fulfilling those needs through restraints based on time, money, and documentary practices. In this sense, I refer to state-capitalism as a regime in which states are strong and through which, state agencies like schools, are seen to adopt a market-driven approach.

Teachers need to exercise a form of pedagogic code production that takes into account all of these theoretical aspects if they are to achieve a teaching approach that is both critical and effective in terms of serving the various needs represented by different pupils. The concentration of this chapter will be to describe these diverse critical approaches to learning that have been used to explain the phenomena of why children learn differently. The problematic is to seek out the dilemmas inherent within the institutional and ideological composition of the state-capitalist educational experience in Canada, in order to produce codes aligned with the concepts of diversity and free thinking. A classroom designed in form and content to produce diversity and free thinking is a classroom that is attuned to the fact that every
child learns differently.

The differing theoretical circles that I will identify all critically view the capitalist education system as simply an institution designed to reproduce a culture that maintains unequal relations. To begin, Henry Giroux (1997) espouses the idea in which he outlines the relationship between pedagogic practice, student psychology, socio-cultural structures and the politics of emancipation. He writes:

It is essential that the radical educator understand how student experience is both constructed and engaged, because it is through such experiences that students produce accounts of who they are and constitute themselves as particular individuals. Student experience is the stuff of culture, agency and self-production and must play a definitive role in any emancipatory curriculum. It is therefore imperative that radical educators learn how to understand, legitimate, and interrogate such experience. This means not only understanding the social and cultural forms through which students learn to define themselves, but also learning how to critically engage such experiences in a way that refuses to disconfirm them or render them illegitimate (1997:110).

This argument specifies that curriculum needs to be designed in opposition to the ideology of state capitalism which sets up a hierarchy based on class differentiation and standardization. Notwithstanding the unintended effects, conscient realities are indeed complex, but this system can be interpreted as a way of supporting and maintaining these unequal relations, especially at the earliest ages of education where schooling transmits and reinforces those ideologies that reflect the prevailing values and ethos of a male-dominated, hierarchical, middle-class social structure (McLaren, 1998:206). In order to transcend the cycle of pedagogic code production that serves the interests of the dominant
classes by sacrificing those of the socially subordinate, teachers need to be aware of the central ideas of code theory as well as the ideas that illuminate the social, psychological and linguistic reasons for the differences in the ways children learn.

Basil Bernstein (1996) identifies a pedagogic concept that is derived from the convergence of disciplines as diverse as linguistics, psychology, anthropology and sociology. The knowledge concept is that of competence, and it is acquired not through teaching but through social and cognitive interaction. He explains:

The concept refers to procedures for engaging with, and constructing the world. Competences are intrinsically creative and tacitly acquired in informal interactions. They are practical accomplishments. The acquisition of these procedures are beyond the reach of power relations and their differential unequal positionings, although the form the realizations may take are clearly not beyond power relations. From this point of view the procedures which constitute a given competence may be regarded as social: the negotiation of social order as a practice, cognitive structuring, language acquisition and new cultural assemblies on the basis of old (Bernstein, 1996:55).

The concept of competence as a form of knowledge that cannot be taught but is found in everyone signifies an understanding of the student as a subject that is socially determined, and therefore, necessarily different in terms of learning. All students operate within their respective milieu, and their competence is going to be applied in different ways. By understanding competence as a shared and inherent attribute, a pedagogic code can be constructed that takes this into account. By recognizing the direct relationship between competence theory and concepts like universal democracy, universal grammar, and emancipatory politics, Bernstein is able to
identify the goals of what he calls the "recontextualization" of teaching codes and practices (1996:56-57). This concept will later be explained in detail and will prove central to the argument of this thesis.

However, in sum, students share competence that is universal and inherent. Nevertheless, the idea of competence is not a totalizing concept. Instead, it is based on the idea that although students will all learn differently, a basic faculty exists that allows them to interact with the world and construct their own reality. It is this very capacity that determines the diverse variety of learning and language conditions that exist between students. In order to engage with this procedure productively, the teacher has to align pedagogic practice according to codes that are democratic and non-authoritarian.

Part of this process requires an understanding of why students learn differently in terms of psychology and society. Peter McLaren's (1998) resistance theory notes that while all students share certain intellectual capacities, to some it is deemed more culturally appropriate to apply them in one way while to others it might be culturally appropriate to apply them in exactly the opposite way. Here, students learn differently because of "secondary effects" that are independent from cognitive ability. These effects are both social and cultural, and contribute to the decision-making process that individuals must undergo in their interactions with society and construction of reality. These secondary effects are related to the differences in students' cultural capital and the social practices lived out within various cultural fields of experience. For example, working-class students
operate with different "decision-fields" (such as with the family, workplace and peer culture) that involve specific class, gender, and race relations (McLaren, 1998:210). According to this theory, students learn differently because they come from differing socio-cultural backgrounds. The educational system fails some because it is structured in such a way so as to maintain the unequal relationships of power that are in place in all capitalistic societies. McLaren continues:

Understanding school failure as the secondary effect of cultural capital and class and gender specific social practice runs directly counter to the prevailing neo-conservative social logic, which attributes school failure to individual deficiencies on the part of a lazy, apathetic, and intellectually inferior underclass of students or to uncaring or selfish parents (1998:210-211).

Schools fail students, students do not fail schools. The dominant class legitimizes itself by constructing subordinate culture as inferior, whereas students may simply be choosing to not fit into this type of moulding. Instead of taking into account the reality that students all come from different social and cultural experience, schools instead are used to reinforce the unequal codes that prevail.

A linguistic theory, put forth by Noam Chomsky (1998), identifies the first and secondary levels of effects on learning and language. He contends that all humans have the same capacity to learn; that there is an inherent and biological competence in all individuals. This capacity is then applied in the realm of experience to create expression. Human action, he says, can be understood only on the assumption that first order capacities and families of dispositions to behave involve the use of cognitive
structures that express systems of unconscious knowledge, belief, expectation, evaluation, judgement, and the like (1998:24). Chomsky acknowledges that we all share an innate faculty for grammar, and that all human languages are structured according to a system that is derived from this biological base, what he calls a 'universal grammar':

Let us define 'universal grammar'... as the system of principles, conditions, and rules that are elements or properties of all human languages not merely by accident but by necessity; of course, I mean biological, not logical necessity. Thus, universal grammar can be taken as expressing 'the essence of human language' (1998:29).

Chomsky thus establishes the linguistic capacity as "an innate property of the human mind" (1998:34). This has been coined 'the innateness theory', which is an explanation for the concept of competence in language and education. All humans are endowed with a certain biological reality that requires us to communicate. When this concept intersects with sociological and pedagogic discourse, as identified by Bernstein (1996:55), it is extended to provide an understanding of the role of language generation and cognition in education. Here, every mind creates a system of cognition using the biological reality with which it is faced. As such, by understanding this process, pedagogic practice aligned with shared capacities for understanding can be constructed. This is the application of Chomsky's theory by Bernstein.

The reason that differences in learning between children are apparent is because teachers do not concentrate on the shared aspects of their students' educational process. Certain forms of knowledge are objectified and made legitimate, while others are rendered illegitimate in discourse. Instead of concentrating on
the fact that everyone has an individual experience that is no more or less authentic than any other, schools favour certain forms of experience and socialization as important. Essentially, the first-level effects of shared biological language and cognition capacities are undermined by secondary effects such as society, class, gender and race. These are the variables that are manipulated to create power inequalities. The individual’s experience as a thinking, feeling subject are rendered subordinate to the interests of those who benefit from the promotion of the dominant ideology.

Within a feminist sociology of knowledge, Dorothy Smith (1990) discusses how certain forms of knowledge are objectified and used to support the ruling powers, while others are treated as insignificant. She posits that the established ideological practices separate the locally known and experienced from the objectified version of society. Objectified forms of knowledge, integral to the organization of ruling, claims authority as socially accomplished effects or products, independent of their making (Smith, 1990:61). Here, the codes that are generated in schools are not aligned with the actual cognitive experience of individuals. As such, a revised pedagogy would account for differences between individuals and concentrate upon first-hand life experience as the primary form of knowledge:

Knowledge can be investigated as the ongoing coordinated practices of actual people. This means addressing ideas, concepts, beliefs, and so forth as expressions of actual social practices, as things that are spoken, written, heard, or read in definite local historical contexts (Smith, 1990:62).

The codes produced by teachers must involve the actual experience
of the learners so that their experiences are not rendered subordinate to objectified forms of language and knowledges that are constructed to preserve the unequal relations that are in place.

Outside of the institutionalized ideology of capitalism, learning is not restricted to the classroom but instead extends to every form of experience. It is through this process that accepted structures can be challenged: "Texts read in contexts outside and uncontrolled by a given jurisdiction of reading and controlled schemata of interpretation will not necessarily construct the same virtual reality" (Smith, 1990:96). Effective critical pedagogy needs to recognize that these realities, while not sanctioned by those in possession of power, are more relevant than any objectified learning offered to students.

Pierre Bourdieu and Jean-Claude Passeron (1994) identify the way that obscure academic discourse contributes to the reinforcement of class inequalities within state capitalist societies. They observe that objectified language serves to exclude those who are not familiar with the codes, and that this marginalizes individuals whose social and cultural background is incongruous with the language that is being used within the classroom:

Outside school, working-class children have no access to cultural works, so the teaching of culture always anticipates an experience of culture which is missing. The divorce between the language of the family and the language of school only serves to reinforce the feeling that what teachers say has nothing to do with daily life because [it is] spoken in a language which makes it unreal (1994:9).

This is not a democratic system of education, rather it involves
the imposition of linguistic structures upon every student. These effects may not necessarily be conscient, voluntary impositions by teachers, but unintended effects. Pupils who are able to appropriate it for themselves are accepted, and those who do not are excluded and alienated by their refusal to work according to codes with which they are not familiar. Bourdieu and Passeron continue this discussion:

The world of the classroom, where 'polished' language is used, contrasts with the world of the family.... This rift extends across all dimensions of life, from central areas of interest to the very words in which these are discussed; and it can be lived only with a sense of dualism or in a state of resigned submission to being excluded (1994:9-10).

This exclusion, when examined according to the unequal socio-economic relations that are in place, is an active form of race, gender and class discrimination.

In order to oppose such forms of oppression, the classroom must generate a critical pedagogy that produces codes and a language aligned with subjective experience rather than with dominant structures. This is the pluralistic, multicultural classroom that holds no single experience as primary over another. Critical pedagogy involves a discussion of experience, and how that experience is relevant to the structures of power which are present. Giroux develops this position further:

An anti-racist pedagogy must do more than reconceptualize the political and pedagogical struggle over race, ethnicity, and difference as merely part of the language of critique, it must also retrieve and reconstruct possibilities for a progressive vision that makes schooling for democracy and critical citizenship an unrealized yet possible reality (1991:226).

This is the goal of radical critical pedagogy, and it provides an
outline for the recontextualization of the classroom into an emancipatory environment.

So there are several theories each attempting to explain why children learn differently within the Canadian classroom; to resolve the struggle between teacher and student; and to alter the form and language within our schools in order to create an equitable educational experience for all members of society. Basil Bernstein's code theory of education is based on the selection of theories of learning from the field of the production of pedagogic discourse for the implementation in the classroom. For Bernstein, the contradictions and conflicts that arise between modes of teaching and learning are based upon the opposition between official controls and teacher autonomy. He explains that today, the determining factor for choosing discourse is in fact appropriated and depends more and more upon the dominant ideology in the official recontextualizing field, and upon the relative autonomy of the pedagogic recontextualizing field. An examination of this conflict will prove central to the discussion to follow.
CHAPTER TWO

Recontextualizing the Problem

Structuralism is a theoretical approach that explores large scale patterns of social organization within society. In state capitalist societies, a typical way of structuring social relations around specific needs is to introduce the idea of modern institutions; two well-known examples are the positional family and the educational system. Basil Bernstein has contributed a structuralist approach to schooling in an attempt to link the interrelations of curriculum and pedagogy to the larger social structures of class relations. In this chapter, I will begin by utilizing Bernstein's structural sociology of code theory to link the activities within the classroom to the ‘moral order’ of society. It will then be necessary to detail the intricacies of how recontextualizing the production of pedagogic discourse has changed classroom discourse. Specifically, Bernstein asserts that a shift from traditional, visible pedagogy to that of cooperative, invisible pedagogy is in direct relation to a parallel shift from mechanical solidarity to organic solidarity at the larger societal level.

Durkheim and Structuralism

Bernstein’s research into code theory is rooted in the works of Emile Durkheim, where ‘structures’ can be understood as the underlying systems of relationships that make possible the significance of cultural phenomena (Atkinson, 1985:85). In essence, Bernstein’s work outlines the basis for profound changes in the organizational and sentimental order of the contemporary school.
It is an attempt to link the inter-processes of the classroom to that of the larger societal structures by raising crucial questions about the relationships among the social division of labour, the family and the school. Atkinson (1985:21) describes Bernstein’s approach to schooling as representing "an embryonic anthropology of schools as agencies of reproduction". Within this approach, the concern lies in changing the moral order of schools as institutions and as transmitters of systems of meaning, value and instrumentality.

Following Durkheim, Bernstein identifies two organically linked behavioural complexes that the school transmits to the student termed the 'instrumental order' and the 'expressive order'. The former is simply the body of facts, procedures and practices needed to acquire specific skills; this transmission is intended to divide pupils according to differences in ability. The expressive order, on the other hand, is a body of ideas, conduct and behaviours shared by everyone, independent of individual characteristics. In other words, the instrumental order divides (based on ability) and the expressive order unifies (based on shared ideals). By promoting shared school values, the expressive order is the principal mechanism of social consensus that allows the school to be a genuine moral collectivity.

This concept is derived from Durkheim’s 'moral order', where the notion of morality refers to whatever creates a sense of solidarity and integration of individuals within a community. Here, the expressive order is directed toward social integration but is founded upon the universality of ideas, as well as on what is considered to be proper conduct in school. The instrumental
order, however, divides the collectivity into specializing skills. Together, the two types are major mechanisms of internalization, which in turn reproduces control by and loyalty to the social order; which is not, however, fixed and definitive.

Bernstein draws from the difference that Durkheim revealed between mechanical and organic solidarity and this difference is fundamental to understanding both their views on the division of labour, and its corresponding effect on our social institutions and individual persons. The distinction Durkheim has made is based upon a model of social complexity and differentiation. With mechanical solidarity, a society is characterized by a high degree of uniformity and consensus whereby values and sentiments are shared and followed (Atkinson, 1985:24). Conversely, organic solidarity is the outcome of diversity. It is clear that Durkheim's principles of solidarity characterize whole societies, yet for Bernstein, the distinction between mechanical and organic solidarity does not refer to such clear-cut boundaries of differences (such as with 'simple' or 'complex' societies), but to different principles of differentiation. It is a matter of differing principles within the same society, or at the various micro-social orders; like school institutions.

The core of Bernstein's argument is that contemporary schools of the 1960's were in a process of change, from social arrangements founded upon premises of mechanical solidarity, to those associated with organic solidarity where students are integrated by the school in a very different fashion. Organic solidarity and curriculum developments weaken the boundaries that insulate teachers into departments, and school knowledge into disciplines. With this
newer organic-type of learning, social control in the school is much more personalized and individualized since teachers and students confront one another as non-authoritative individuals, not as interchangeable members of different social categories.

In sum, a social arrangement displaying mechanical solidarity is segmented, where members are arranged in relatively insulated, self-contained classrooms. Here, the mechanisms of control are couched in terms of shared values and group loyalties. Organic solidarity, however, is manifested through an increasingly individualized mode (but the expressive order is not absent) and a weakening of the insulation or boundaries that formerly defined structural segments. I will now unfold the use of Bernstein's code as an analytic tool to connect how the instrumental and expressive orders of the classroom are ultimately affected by the shift in social solidarity.

Code Theory

According to Bernstein, the relationship basic to cultural reproduction is essentially the pedagogic relationship between teacher and student because this relation consists of transmitters and receivers of cultural knowledge. Therefore, the primary emphasis of his analysis is on how the rules of pedagogic practice define this relationship, and how these interactional processes reflect social class assumptions about all the players: the child, the teacher, the role of the family, and the process of learning (Sadovnik, 1995:12). This suggests that the processes of the pedagogical encounter are directly linked to the principles of order and power relations. In other words, a shift in educational
knowledge is induced by the same shift at the moral and sentimental order of society.

Durkheim and Marcel Mauss write that in order to create meaning, people categorize events and facts about their world into "kinds" and "species" (1963:4). People classify knowledges by arranging them into groups that are distant and distinct from each other. This means that the messages we receive are categorized in order to make meaning; what we learn is socially constructed, thus culturally determined. Durkheim was concerned with how such knowledge is placed into independent cultural terms, with what people consider to be "sacred" or "profane" (1947:37-8). There are no congruencies from culture to culture of what sorts of matter fall into either category. What should be made clear is that the sacred is a domain of knowledge separated from the surrounding context of the profane everyday experience. Here, code is really created by society; its purpose is to link everyday knowledge to that which is taught in the classroom.

Bernstein exerts that educational knowledge becomes a major regulator of the structure of experience, whereby:

Formal educational knowledge can be realized through three message systems: curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation. Curriculum defines what counts as valid knowledge, pedagogy defines what counts as a valid transmission of knowledge, and evaluation defines what counts as a valid realization of this knowledge on the part of the taught (1971:203).

Code can be understood as the collection of key principles that govern production, transmission, and reproduction of systems of messages that underlie curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation. It regulates the selection and combination of cultural elements (of what is considered to be sacred or profane) into permitted
arrangements. The structuration of school knowledge relates such cultural forms to the division of labour, in order to give access to different modes of understanding and meaning (Atkinson, 1985:132).

It is important to stress here that Bernstein is interested in the principles of Durkheim's differentiation within the classroom. Such differences will have very real consequences for the social placement of individuals because a change in the instrumental and expressive orders within the classroom coincide with a shift in social arrangements. Thus, code is applied to the message systems curriculum and pedagogy in order to uncover the regulatory principles that control the selection of curricular and linguistic elements.

Classification and Framing

Bernstein's attempt to connect classroom interactions to the broader moral order of society centres on a model of pedagogic practice. Within the structured Canadian educational system, there are two types of codes that dominate the socialization processes and transmission of knowledge within the school setting. Basically, 'collection codes' portray lecture-style formats, while 'integrated codes' come in many forms that resemble cooperative, informal classroom organization. Before delving into these two types of codes, it is necessary to first explain how a code can be identified through the notion of 'classification' and 'framing'.

The transmission of knowledge within the classroom always depends on curriculum and pedagogy, which are identified by the degree of boundary between each notion. Classification refers to
the strength or weakness of the boundary within curriculum, and framing refers to the strength or weakness of the boundary in the pedagogical relationship. For instance, if classification represents the degree of boundary within curriculum, then a lecture-style classroom displays a very strong boundary since students are isolated from each subject matter that they examine. The lecture-style format thus represents a closed type of curriculum because there are distinct boundaries of time between subjects. In contrast, a cooperative-style classroom exhibits an open system as there is less boundary between subjects. Instead, subject matter are blended together by both teacher and taught so the classification is very weak.

Just as classification refers to the strength/weakness in the boundary between curricula, framing refers to the degree of boundary within the pedagogical encounter. In the lecture classroom, the framing is very strong because there is an extremely limited range of options as to what is taught. Here, the teacher has complete control as to what information is covered and how it is presented, thus representing a closed pedagogy. Conversely, a cooperative-style classroom usually negotiates how class-time is to be utilized, so the pedagogical relationship has very weak frames; it is an open relationship. Framing then, simply refers to the degree of control teacher and student have over the selection, organization, pacing and timing of the knowledge transmitted and received in the pedagogical relationship.

The Collection and Integrated Codes

Bernstein is concerned with the formal ordering of the message
systems curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation, and their systematic relationships. Together, curriculum and pedagogy form two types of educational codes; the collection code and the integrated code. The collection code is identified by strong classification and strong framing, and it is a closed system of learning. The integrated code is identified by weak classification and weak framing so that it is an open learning relationship between teacher and taught.

The collection code is characteristic of the lecture-style classroom. Each subject is taught by an individual teacher for an allotted amount of time. Once the lesson is complete, the students move on to another, visibly different subject for another set amount of time. Both the classification and framing is thus very strong, since students are well-insulated from each subject matter and have very little control as to how or what they are taught.

The integrated code reflects cooperative-style classrooms, where the classification and framing are very weak. Now, integrated codes are present in many forms, but generally, both curriculum and pedagogy (as well as evaluation) lie in an open relation to one another. For example, a few distinct disciplines/subjects may be combined into one presentation so that curriculum is decided by both teacher and students; and the pedagogy turns more to a facilitating role. More than one teacher may also be present in order to facilitate the students thoughts/ideas, and the classroom may also be arranged in groups so that ideas can be shared and discussed.

With the collection code, the learner chooses several distinct subjects in order to satisfy some criteria of evaluation
With integrated codes, the contents do not go their separate ways but stand in an open relation to each other, and the transmission of knowledge is negotiated by both teacher and taught. In either case, it is the code that is the cultural context in which curriculum is created by society, and how it is reproduced or transmitted through pedagogy. This is how the moral order of society is connected to what gets taught in the classroom. Knowledge that is assumed to be sacred or profane by society is reproduced by how and what is taught within the school. Bernstein states that the form a code takes depends on social principles that regulate the classification and framing of knowledge made public in educational institutions (1971:203). Thus, code theory establishes a single system, a single language in which macro-structural and micro-interactive aspects are connected and demonstrates the moulding of the latter by the former (Rodriguez-Illera, 1995:201). The classification and framing of the code are tightly tied together, just as curriculum and pedagogy are in order to create these codes.

Bernstein (1971) describes the shift from mechanical to organic solidarity as a transition between the old middle class to the new middle class. The old middle class was characteristic of mechanical solidarity, where culture (thus knowledge as to what is considered to be sacred or profane) is reproduced by the school in the form of the collection code. With the rise of the new middle class in the 1960's, the moral order of society saw a shift toward organic solidarity, which is a form of cohesion based upon specialization and interdependence. Bernstein links this shift in society to the interactive procedures of the school, which is a
major institution of reproducing culture. Organic solidarity within the school is transmitted by integrated codes, as they too promote diversity of ideas and an open-learning context with their weakened classification and relaxed frames. For these reasons, a cooperative pedagogy is impossible with time-divided, distinct curricula represented by the traditional collection codes.

Visible and Invisible Pedagogy

The old middle class was domesticated through strong classification and framing that reproduced the positional family. In this type of family, control is vested in the positions themselves. It is explicit, in the sense that control is manifest in the formal status of parent and child; realized through shared public norms. Likewise, the collection code is characteristic in schools wherein control relies upon the positional statuses of teacher and taught (Atkinson, 1985:150). Here, control within the family and classroom is not only continuous, but is visible by way of power and status.

The collection code is a visible type of pedagogy. As discussed earlier, there is little room for negotiation on the part of the student, and this is made known in the authoritative positions of the teacher and student. Visible pedagogy displays an explicit hierarchy and sequencing rules, as well as specific criteria of assessment. Here, learning is structured so that the student learns from the surface structure of categoric symbols to the deep structure of ideas.

The new middle class of the 1960’s is a result of the shift to organic solidarity. Eichler (1988) provides an accurate
description of how families have changed in disposition, which is identified by a change in property arrangements. The decline of the family as a property-regulating institution is a result of the rise of jobs as the most important forms of property. Eichler characterizes the 'new family' as "increasing [in] fluidity, detachability and interchangeability of family relationships" (1988:129). In this sort of family, the ranking of family membership is blurred, or invisible to what the public norms once commanded.

Within the realm of pedagogy a similar shift occurred, represented by the integrated code. There is no formal status of teacher to student. The timing and pacing, as well as what is to be learned, are negotiated between the informal relationship of the teacher and students. The pedagogy is thus invisible because the boundary between curricula and the boundary in the pedagogical relationship are to be relaxed (weakened), so that an informal verbal exploration of learning is undertaken between teacher and taught. This is a bottom-up, deep-structured learning arrangement.

The ideologies of education are essentially the ideologies of class. Once a shift in the latter can be recognized, then a corresponding shift in types of learning will be induced. Bernstein (1975:120) argues that invisible pedagogy is an interrupter system, both in relation to the family and in its relation to other levels of the educational hierarchy. This means that integrated codes interrupt the cultural reproduction that collection codes once transmitted. I have mentioned that the open context of invisible pedagogy cannot be accomplished in the traditional closed (or visible) setting. For these reasons,
invisible pedagogy is indeed an 'interrupter system' because it transforms what were privatized social structures of the old middle class (expressed through visible pedagogy), into a personalized social structure and cultural contexts. Nevertheless, it must be clear that control is much less overt with invisible pedagogy, but it is not absent. Control is a matter of negotiation and influence rather than power and status; and it is at this point where a return shift toward mechanical relations is induced by the state as it regains control of pedagogical discourse within the classroom.

**The Performance and Competence Models of Pedagogic Practice**

Code theory states that teachers transmit meaning to their students in ways that are socially significant outside of the classroom; and also recognizes that teachers' work processes are indelibly linked with all other social and economic processes. Bernstein identifies two contrasting modes of pedagogic practice describing how this is so; that of 'performance' and that of 'competence'.

Bernstein describes the performance model of pedagogic practice as:

Placing the emphasis upon a specific output of the acquirer, upon a particular text the acquirer is expected to construct, and upon the specialized skills necessary to the production of this specific output, text, or product (1996:58).

The competence model, on the other hand, is based on developing inherent strengths rather than imposing external procedures, measurements and controls:

According to competence theories there is an in-built procedural democracy, an in-built creativity, an in-built virtuous self-regulation. And if it is
not in-built, the procedures arise out of, and contribute to social practice with a creative potential (1996:56).

Within the competence model, discursive categories such as space and time are weakly classified and are open for negotiation and fluctuation, such as with invisible pedagogy. With the performance model, these considerations are strongly regulated and classified as with visible pedagogy.

Similarly, evaluation within the competence model is based on 'presences', concerned with what is there rather than what is not. Evaluation within the performance model is based on 'absences'; what is missing or divergent from that which is designated acceptable (Bernstein, 1996:59). Control in the competence model is implicit, internal and personal to the student; while the performance model is based on explicit external control within the strong classification inherent to the system.

Now, the pedagogic text within the competence model is based on what the student/acquirer offers at the present moment; while the pedagogic text in performance models is clearly defined and any divergence from these settings is deemed counter-productive. In terms of autonomy, there is a great deal more freedom to exercise personal initiative as an educator and to react in ways that are elastic and adaptable within the competence mode than there is within the performance mode. In terms of the economic bottom line, competence models cost more because teachers need to be better trained, and to devote hidden time costs to their tasks. Conversely, the performance model is based strongly on economic considerations and is more susceptible to being controlled by them than the competence model, which holds therapeutic considerations
in priority (Bernstein, 1996:63, 69).

Recontextualization

So far in this chapter, I have attempted to lay the groundwork for Bernstein's code theory and how curriculum and pedagogy are ultimately affected by the larger social orders of society. An idea central to code theory is that of change. Changes in the discourse of teaching are enabled by changes in the codes that construct teaching practices. When components of classroom codes are adjusted (such as classification and framing), a general realignment of discourse and practice takes place. Bernstein elaborates:

As classification and framing change in values, from strong to weak, then there are changes in organizational practices, changes in discursive practices, changes in transmission practices, changes in psychic defences, ... changes in the concepts of the knowledge itself, and changes in the forms of expected pedagogic consciousness (1996:29-30).

Teaching is an avenue of cultural reproduction transmitted through codes; where power relations, control issues, and class consciousness are produced and reinforced through pedagogic structure and practice. The idea of change, presented by Bernstein, is one that acknowledges the encoding process taking place in order to inform the transmission of codes that challenge and oppose pedagogic discourse based on competence and performance models. For this reason, his methodological framework is suitable to those who wish to provide an alternative critique of existing pedagogic practices.

The reformulation of pedagogic discourse is what Bernstein
calls 'recontextualization'. The process of challenging current codes and offering new ones as the discursive basis for pedagogic practice is one that is focused on recontextualizing the problem. Bernstein (1996:42) states that recontextualizing rules regulate the formation of pedagogic discourse. This pedagogic discourse is a single text that is created out of the embedding of 'instructional' discourse within 'regulative' discourse. This is a power relationship that sees the distribution of skills and knowledge controlled by a normative moral social order:

We shall call the discourse which creates specialized skills and their relationship to each other 'instructional discourse', and the moral discourse which creates order, relations and identity 'regulative discourse'. The instructional discourse is embedded in the regulative discourse, and the regulative discourse is the dominant discourse (Bernstein, 1996:46).

Pedagogic discourse then, is the embedding of the 'instructional' within the dominant 'regulative', in order to create a single text. In this way, pedagogic discourse is presented as a 'principle' rather than a discourse since it involves the appropriation and re-ordering of other discourses to create one text.

This creation of a single text out of multiple discourses, both instructional and regulative, is the essence of recontextualization. The principle of pedagogic discourse is outlined effectively by Bernstein:

Pedagogic discourse is a recontextualizing principle. Pedagogic discourse is constructed by a recontextualizing principle which selectively appropriates, relocates, refocuses and relates other discourses to constitute its own order. In this sense, pedagogic discourse can never be identified with any of the discourses it has recontextualized (1996:47).

Knowledge of the fact that pedagogic discourse is formed out of
this process of recontextualization allows for the manipulation of the principle by those who are in positions of pedagogic code transmission. An understanding of the principle of recontextualization offers educators the opportunity to construct recontextualizing fields that are based on competence models. A deep understanding of the principle of recontextualization also provides insight into how dominant codes are appropriated and imposed in the classroom by regulative bodies.

The struggle between these fields of recontextualization is the struggle over what is presented in the classroom as well as how it is presented. It is also a conflict over power and autonomy between educators and those who regulate them. This tension is central in terms of recontextualizing the problem, in that it constitutes the opposition between those who teach and those who do not teach but want their ideology reinforced through the transmission of codes within the classroom.

Bernstein's distinction between an 'official recontextualizing field' (ORF) and a 'pedagogic recontextualizing field' (PRF) is one that is crucial in understanding the problems that are in place and the challenges faced by those who wish to overcome them:

The recontextualizing field has a crucial function in creating the fundamental autonomy of education. We can distinguish between an Official Recontextualizing Field (ORF) created and dominated by the state and its selected agencies and ministries, and a Pedagogic Recontextualizing Field (PRF). The latter consists of pedagogues in schools and colleges, departments of education, specialized journals, and private research foundations. If the PRF can have an effect on pedagogic discourse independently of the ORF, then there is both some autonomy and struggle over pedagogic discourse and its practices. But if there is only the ORF, then there is no autonomy. Today, the state is trying to weaken the PRF through its ORF, and thus attempting
to reduce relative autonomy over the construction of pedagogic discourse and over its social contexts (Bernstein, 1996:48).

Recontextualizing rules follow from distributive rules, which regulate the relations between power, social groups, forms of consciousness and practice. Pedagogic discourse (the 'principle of recontextualization') arises out of the embedding of the institutional discourse within the regulative discourse (Bernstein, 1996:46). There is a direct and apparent conflict between teacher autonomy and the consuming powers of the social order. This conflict establishes recontextualization as a necessity, and then renders it nearly impossible in the face of official regulative obstacles.

Teachers know what needs to be done in their classrooms. Every learner is different and every learning context requires a suitable reaction and adaptation by the educator. For example, a teacher quickly realizes when any individual child in the class is in need for more attention. The teacher attempts to respond through pedagogic recontextualizing within the PRF by anticipating the need for special attention and forming curriculum and practice that accounts for it (perhaps extending extra time during the summer). They are then faced at the beginning of the year with a classroom that is huge in number, as assigned by those at the school board who are faced with budget cuts imposed by the government. In turn, they are forced to adhere to curricula that are standardized rather than engineered in reaction to the specific learning context that is in place. We need to take into account that some teachers are part of the process of standardization of curricula as they are invited (in Ontario) to work at the ministry;
in a way to democratize the process. I will address this issue in chapters five and six. Nevertheless, this is an example of the domination of the ORF, and of the contradiction, tension and struggle that arises between the ORF and the PRF. Bernstein locates this struggle as one based on ideology:

Both fields may well have a range of ideological pedagogic positions which struggle for control of the field. And these positions in the Official and Pedagogic Recontextualizing Fields may well be opposed to each other. Thus the relative independence of the latter from the former is a matter of some importance (1996:118).

The independence of the PRF from the ORF is important, yet it is also rare. The following will outline the recontextualizing fields and their dynamics in order to provide an understanding of how the principle of recontextualization is both an agent of change and a principle that makes change especially difficult.

To reiterate, recontextualization is the production of pedagogic discourse. The struggle between the PRF and the ORF is essentially one that concerns changes in values and their codes; it is a struggle over degrees of classification and framing, and a conflict between competence and performance models of pedagogic discourse and practice. Bernstein (1996:67) identifies a general shift that took place in the 1960's from performance to competence modes (or a shift from mechanical to organic solidarity) and now a return shift back to performance (mechanical) modes. The decision of which discourse is appropriated depends more and more today upon the dominant ideology in the official recontextualizing field and the relative autonomy of the pedagogic recontextualizing field. Presently, the fact that competence modes arise out of official control is apparent. Bernstein outlines the different modalities
that exist within the competence and performance models:

The divisions within, the opposition between competence and performance models created three competence modes: liberal/progressive, populist, and radical; and three performance modes: singulars (specialist), regional, and generic. Competence modes are considered here as therapeutic (but 'empowering' by their sponsors) although the goals of each mode are different, whereas performance modes, at least regionalized and generic, serve economic goals and are considered here as instrumental (1996:67).

In this way, the existing competence modes are aligned with the idea of the therapeutic, and the performance modes are aligned with economic considerations, particularly with state ideologies.

It is evident that the distinction that exists in the contemporary Canadian educational context between the ORF and the PRF is one that is also split according to similar distinctions. The PRF seeks through teacher autonomy and the application of competence models to construct a pedagogic discourse that creates identities to challenge and oppose traditional consciousness and symbolic control. The ORF, meanwhile, seeks to regulate pedagogic code transmission in a way that adheres to the present structures of capitalist ideologies of competitive economy through performance models. Bernstein writes:

All competence modes, despite oppositions, share a preoccupation with the development (liberal/progressive), the recognition (populist), and change (radical) of consciousness. Performance models and especially their change are more directly linked to the economy although they clearly have symbolic control functions (1996:68).

The fact that teachers are instructed to react and adapt to learning environments in ways that recognize their relative autonomy, and are then told that their ideas cannot be implemented due to economic (or policy) constraints in the budget and mandate,
is a simplified example of the links between the ORF with performance modes and the PRF with competence modes. The former is concerned with economics and reinforcing the structures of competitive capitalism through the transmission of codes engineered for that purpose; the latter is concerned with challenging this system through the construction of identities that are therapeutic and introjected (based on what is present) rather than economic and projected (based on what is absent).

Recontextualization within the PRF and the ORF and in terms of competence and performance modes has, as mentioned, undergone a shift and reverse shift over the past fifty years. The dominant mode that was in place before the first shift (that of the old middle class) was the performance model, which was based on the structure of the school system:

Thus the dominance of performance modes in the PRF was linked to the organization and discursive structure of primary and secondary education. Performance modes focus upon something that the acquirer does not possess, upon an absence, and as a consequence place the emphasis upon the text to be acquired and so upon the transmitter (Bernstein, 1996:71).

The weakening of classification that took place in the 1960’s meant that the PRF was not controlled by the ORF, and the response in terms of the PRF’s construction of discourse was a move towards competence models:

In the PRF, with the weakening of the performance positions, previously subordinate, competence positions became dominant and new competence positions appeared. From the point of view of competence positions, performance modes were based on the concept of deficit, whereas competence modes were considered to be based on the concept of empowerment. Thus from this perspective, different from ‘therapeutic’ as identified earlier, the liberal progressive mode was the basis for cognitive
empowerment, the populist mode was the basis of cultural empowerment, and the radical mode the basis for political empowerment (Bernstein, 1996:71).

This was allowed to take place because the ORF was not exercising regulative control over the PRF. The ideologies of the ORF and the PRF were aligned with one another through a shared belief in the power of recontextualization to create change; and as a result, the PRF was able to function with autonomy.

After this initial shift, we can see a move to institutionalize competence modes within a system that had previously been based on the concepts of performance models. The move to institutionalize performance models and their modes was made possible at primary and secondary levels by the general weakening of classifications between levels, and "By the introduction of new agents under conditions of autonomy of the PRF and ideological rapport between that field and the ORF: a unique set of conditions" (Bernstein, 1996:72). This set of circumstances was decidedly favourable to those working to recontextualize from within the PRF; yet it did not last. What has ensued demonstrates the regulative power of the ORF to recontextualize pedagogic discourse according to performance models through the imposition of the dominant ideology concerning what gets taught in classrooms and how it gets taught.

In the 1970's, power and autonomy were taken away from the PRF through centralization and state intervention of school management and teacher training. What resulted was a re-emergence of the performance models, as the classroom was once again recontextualized this time by the ORF. Bernstein (1996:72) states that, "The shift to performance models and their modes was
initiated by the ORF which now more directly regulated pedagogic practices, contents and research". The state plays a central role in the construction of the ORF, and its influence was made apparent as the competence models were replaced by performance models. That which had recontextualized education had been in turn recontextualized itself.

The PRF had been awarded the autonomy it needed to exercise and implement its therapeutic models for education, and then that power was taken away and centralized. Bureaucracy replaced autonomy, and the result has been the generation of standardized curriculum and uniform competitive standards dictated by the state as reinforcement of the ideology that is dominant in state capitalist societies today. The process of recontextualization that has taken place to reverse the movement that occurred in the 1970’s is effectively described by Bernstein as a power struggle:

Thus the state, through greater centralizations and new forms of decentralization, has shifted pedagogic models and modes, management structures, and cultures of all educational institutions and sponsored generic modes. The reproduction of state-recognized and rewarded forms is facilitated by the change in positions of dominance in the recontextualizing fields (ORF and PRF), the introduction of new discourse and, of crucial importance, the dominance of new actors with new motivations (1996:75).

These motivations are economic, and the imposition of economic concerns within the field of production of pedagogic discourse is what characterizes the reverse shift that has occurred from competence modes back to performance modes.

The school has become a location for economic competition over resources, and this competition is gauged according to performance. Schools that demonstrate the closest adherence to this mode are
those that are deemed successful. From this point of view, although pedagogic discourses are differently focused, the management focus of all institutions at all levels is similar. Economic goals are at the fore, while emancipatory concerns become irrelevant. The management structure has become the device for creating an entrepreneurial competitive culture. The performance mode now dominates pedagogic discourse because those in control of the ORF have, again, taken away the autonomy of the PRF and shifted that power to centralized managers. As such, the recontextualization that has occurred is one that has witnessed the re-emergence of the ORF as primary, and the imposition of performance models as the dominant form of pedagogic discourse and practice.

What needs to occur now is yet another phase of recontextualization. Teachers know what it takes to teach a classroom successfully in terms of enhancing students competence. They are, however, placed in conditions that do not allow them to exercise any autonomy without repercussions in terms of the students' performance according to generic, standardized models. The construction of identities based on therapeutic, internal considerations is replaced with identities constructed according to instrumental concerns; based on economics through the imposition of structures and the transmission of codes that are aligned with these considerations. The problem inherent in teaching today is that teachers want to recontextualize and revolutionize the discourse and practice of teaching so as to address the problem that children learn differently. However, their domain of the pedagogic recontextualizing field is rendered subordinate to the
concerns of the official pedagogic field at every turn.
CHAPTER THREE

Cultural Reproduction: Code as an Analytical Tool

The next direction this thesis will take is to explain why code theory is relevant when attempting to understand the intricate composition of our society. Quite simply, what impact does the notion of recontextualization have in trying to describe and explain the institutional workings of symbolic state control within state-capitalist societies and its subsequent domination of discourses? It should be clear that the institutional make-up of the Canadian education system is intended to create a stratified class system (where children at young ages are taught in very different ways), but what is important here is to look at the purpose or motives behind this phenomenon. In this chapter, I will disclose the importance of how discourse analysis leads to a better understanding of how certain forms of knowledge become legitimate, thus influencing the way people speak and act within our society. It is here that we can begin to locate what forms of knowledge production are valued, and reveal how culture is unequally reproduced. I will then proceed to show how code theory and recontextualization can be utilized by examining a few theoretical frameworks that have very much aided me to develop ways of critically understanding the world.

There is much testing to be done with the notion of recontextualization. When speaking of education and why children learn differently in the school, we must realize the notion that the classroom is a conduit where pedagogical discourse enables the dissemination of the state’s values and objectives; not only in the way some knowledges are deemed acceptable, but also in limiting the
autonomy of teachers' work processes. We will find that the educational experience is therefore not confined to the classroom, but must include all other aspects of lived experience through the family, the community and other forums where discourse take place. We must concern ourselves with all areas in which dominant culture is diffused throughout society.

I do not intend to change the focus of this thesis, but I may have decided to write this next portion from many different angles, so I have chosen to create a 'sociological imagination' in order to describe a brief description of how I think cultural reproduction theory is integral when investigating the production of discourse.

My theoretical framework, as introduced in chapter two, is categorized as belonging to 'cultural reproduction theory', where discourse analysis is an important analogical tool. To begin, I must disclose what I consider the definition of the term 'discourse' and to what it refers. Discourse definitely includes ideology, but it is more of an umbrella under which various ideologies loosely linger. Discourse involves the values and rules that govern how one must speak and act while interacting with somebody else, and are resistant to internal criticisms. In this respect, it resembles Durkheim's explanation of the 'moral order' where certain societies deem certain things to be 'sacred' or 'profane' (these, of course, change with each society). One must be located outside of a certain discourse in order to examine it because the subject is always positioned within a particular discourse. That is, one cannot be objective because in order to critique a discourse, one must be in another discourse. Discourses always have a competitive relationship to each other; they relate
to people in a given situation and intersect so that some discourses will be marginalized, while others will dominate. They are also tied to the distribution of power and social hierarchies where control over social discourses relates to control of power in society. In sum, the difference between ideology and discourse is that discourses embody ideologies.

The science of discourse must consider the conditions for the establishment of communication because the anticipated conditions of reception are part of the conditions of production. What I mean is, production is governed by the structure of the market; whereby authority is symbolic and reminds us that we are in the presence of a discourse that merits our belief and obedience. The specific effect of authority, then, can be uncovered where the listener grants the discourse sufficient legitimacy to listen even if they do not understand it (as is often the case within the officialdom of a lecture, sermon or political speech). It may be symbolized by the language itself where the speaker’s nature consists precisely of his/her eloquence. Ways of speaking and acting are worked at, and serves to produce or maintain a faith in language so that it must contribute to its own credibility.

A ritualized language, as witnessed in the speaker’s eloquence and dress, can only function so long as the social conditions for the production of the legitimate transmitters and receivers are secured. What code theory contributes to the study of linguistics is that it accounts for the conditions of the establishment, and the symbolic social context in which it is established, particularly the structure of the group within which it takes place. Furthermore, because there are multiple lived-social
phenomena that are deeply encoded, we must also account for the symbolic power relations within the group concerned; which means that some people are not even in a position to speak or must win their audience (such as with various minority or marginalized groups who are, in fact, the majority). The hidden conditions are decisive in understanding what can and cannot be said within a group.

Discourse is a symbolic asset that can receive different values depending on the market in which it is offered. Within capitalist relations, the social conditions are based on the production and reproduction of producers and consumers. It simply depends on the symbolic power relations prevailing at a given moment so that long-term processes can occur according to such logistics. It can be seen that many diverse cultures have been brought into contact over the past few centuries, each of which possesses its own unique systems of organization and ways of understanding the earth. Human beings have learned to adapt to so many diverse, or what may seem to some as inhospitable, environments. Whether they be high altitude mountainous regions, the barren permafrost areas of the arctic, or the swamplands throughout the tropics, societies have prospered in many unique ways. Each culture displays its own ways of organizing itself, and I would add, usually in environmentally-friendly ways.

Western colonialism made diverse cultural contact inevitable in recent history as active pursuits of new lands and goods increased dramatically. However, these endeavours were accomplished with imperialist conquering tactics and a superiority complex that nullified and ignored the voices of many host
cultures. There are multiple examples that are only now being told of how such contacts occurred and how western cultures displayed their pious attitude. The concept of private ownership is a purely western notion where profit is the central driving motive behind the culture’s ideology; it creates and disseminates such a dominant discourse among its members. There are countless instances worldwide where Western contact clashed with the host culture; for example, by the late nineteenth century, European missionaries made their journeys to many lands and proceeded to build chapels with picket fences constructed around them. The common discourse among the missionaries was that of ‘private’ and ‘sacred’, which ought to be universal, although the native people in the area could not so easily comprehend that their once ancestral lands were now privatized lands. To be frank, the concept of private ownership was as foreign a concept to these people as the new religion and language itself. I can only imagine if these people also thought the sky above the newly established plots of land were also privately owned.

The intent here is not to seek out blame or enter into an idealist mindset condemning the West, but to examine how the present workings of the increasingly globalized market operates in an attempt to step outside of the dominant discourse and to better understand it. In the first chapter, I addressed the problem of why children in our educational system learn differently from particular critical perspectives. Each of those positions agree that language is indeed one of the key components in how ‘culture’ is defined. Language is unique to any culture because it breeds an understanding of its localized world. To take away such an
integral element from a given culture is to undermine and appropriate that culture. This is what the newest form of 'imperialism' means; and what is at stake is the loss of cultural meaning and ways of understanding the world.

It is evident that capitalist relations have spread rapidly as the world becomes more globalized by means of this dominant discourse. I am arguing that each host culture has not only lost much cultural identity, but does not understand the concepts of the encroaching culture, nor its notions of what is to be sacred and profane (such as with private ownership). The new form of imperialistic force has become ideological, concerned with economic pursuits. What is at stake is the loss of language, or voices, from these now marginalized people, as well as environmental degradation since many indigenous knowledges promote a harmonious existence with nature rather than economic gain.

The social world is a system of symbolic exchanges and social action is an expression of communication. Here, language is made for communicating, thus it is made for understanding and deciphering (Bourdieu, 1977:646). As mentioned, discourse always owes its most important characteristics to the productive relations within which it is produced. In this sense, the symbolic sign has no real existence outside a concrete mode of linguistic production. Language is not only an instrument of communication or knowledge, but also an instrument of power. A person speaks not only to be understood but also to be believed, obeyed and respected; so that listening is believing.

Questions of power and inequality within the present state capitalist system boil down to how human beings socially organize
themselves. This process is not passive or naturally-occurring, it is rather a work in progress and intended to create a stratified hierarchical system based on class. The institutions that a society creates are conduits for disseminating a discourse based on the dominant ideology; thus 'culture' becomes a commodity to be produced and more effectively reproduced, negating certain alternative discourses while promoting economically-orientated ones.

Now the question must be asked: How do certain discourses become dominant? This is where code theory is crucial in identifying where and when the shifts in power occur in this society. I am specifically interested in the educational system, however, pedagogical discourse is not merely confined to what gets done in the classroom. Rather, pedagogical discourse simply occurs in the relationships between people. It is evident in the relationship between doctor and patient, employer and employee, among peer groups and within communities. It is also the dominant discourse spoken in much of the entertainment industry, and the media. Discourse involves values and rules that govern how people speak and act, and in turn, people create discourses. If you work in an office, for example, you will know the differences between proper and improper behaviour, mannerisms and language to be used when interacting with either a colleague or interviewing for a better position. There is much symbolic interaction involved, where one (or many) may also introduce new 'behaviours' or ways of being that will become the "norm". There are certain ways of speaking and acting that socialize people to 'be successful' as a prosperous businessperson, and these behaviours are learned through
symbolism and a common discourse, a discourse that does not critically question the present power arrangements.

I have had many influences at various levels in sociology and cultural studies that have helped me to critically examine how human beings organize themselves. Particularly, the 'materialist' or 'neo-Marxist' positions have been very intriguing; whether inquiring into the social-feminist views of the family, or the historical materialist interpretation of the rise of capitalism itself from a feudal society to that of the state's corporate relations. Thus far, I have discussed a version as to why changing pedagogical discourse is necessary so that more effective learning from multiple discourses can be pursued. In recent years, my attention has become focused on the educational system itself so that I can contribute to changing such pedagogical discourse (these implications will be discussed later on). For the rest of this chapter, I will describe how code theory and recontextualization can now be used to interpret some of the 'classic' works on education that I have favoured in the past. I have chosen three theoretical examples where code theory can be an effective analogical tool for revisiting such works or add to our understanding of them. The first two examples are focused on education, while the third is a study conducted on the inner-workings of a social-work office, which will be helpful to show that pedagogical discourse is not only confined to the classroom.

**Economic Reproduction Theory**

This theory examines the relationship between education and the state, and the economy with social class. It argues that what
is learned in the school is the social placement of individuals; 'lower-class' schools produce a labour force while private or affluent professional schools produce managerial-type positions. The emphasis is placed on power and control by the state and how it is exercised through ideology. Here, ideology is the key analytical concept, just as discourse is in cultural reproduction or postmodernist theories. The purpose of education is twofold: First, it serves the interests of the state by promoting capital accumulation, which in turn leads to the creation of an infrastructure to provide public services and a setting of law and order that enables business to function. Secondly, it legitimizes capitalist order where the legal system constitutes an image of a just and moral society. Obviously, the state must feel pressures generated by the working class, therefore, it must make concessions so that capitalist methods seem legitimate.

Education is crucial in reproducing capitalist relations because it reproduces the labour force as well as the relations of production. The logic here is that if the state does not produce people who will submit to the system then a revolution may occur. The school acts as an agent in reproducing skills for the labour force, and disseminates the dominant ideology of the relations of production. I use the term 'ideology' to encompass a set of ideas that legitimizes the current system. In this case, the dominant ideology describes how society works (claiming to be meritocratic); it states a clear understanding that this value system is just, and that economic competition is healthy. This type of ideology appears to mystify the actual relationships by not raising inherent problems such as class inequality.
Louis Althusser (1971) suggests that both the reproduction of labour power and the relations of production are necessary in order for a mass of people, who are ideologically conditioned, to be exploited. The 'repressive state apparatus', which includes the government, army and the judicial system, maintains order and quells other interpretations of its motives; while the 'ideological state apparatus' embodies politics of nationalism, the media, religion and education to persuade people to fit into the system (rather than inflicting the use of force) (1971:139,136). Here, the school is a key factor in accomplishing this objective. Certain elite-class schooling trains people to manipulate ideology, and to become agents of exploitation. Aside from certain techniques and knowledge located in the school, students also learn 'proper' behaviour that is respectful to the system of exploitation. Although this position can be critiqued in that it views students as passive beings, it nevertheless regards the school as turning out a grove of students that fit into the economic system, thus creating a hierarchy within the school itself (mirroring that of social class) where each social class level has a function enabling the system to work. This tactic is most powerful when ideology is taken for granted so that rituals will not be questioned and the system can thus be stabilized.

Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis (1976) develop economic reproduction theory further, arguing that the economy is the driving force behind the entire institutional make-up of the state capitalist society. Now, there is definitely a need to consider many other complexities so as not to use the economy to explain-away everything, but economic determinism is quite incompatible
with the notion of free choice, and the authors also view the institute of education as nothing more than an efficient tool used to fit people into the capitalist hierarchy. Here, the economy is characterized by rights vested in property rather than people. Another way of looking at this concept is to see how the system reproduces class relations based on mechanical solidarity, which is why the need to emancipate pedagogical discourse was identified during the initial shift towards the pedagogic recontextualizing field. Jean Anyon (1980) found empirical evidence from many diverse elementary schools across the United States that displays extremely low expectations in 'working class' schools, where there is limited decision-making by the pupils. There is a form of 'rope knowledge' where knowledge is presented in the pedagogical encounter as a set of facts to be memorized (Anyon, 1980:76). The pedagogy here is closed, or visible in the authoritative nature of teacher and taught, and the classification and framing are very strong.

Bowles and Gintis do not find fault with this type of outcome in the school, but with the order of capitalist society itself (1976:88). Here, egalitarian change cannot be accomplished unless the entire capitalist system is changed by means of revolt. This position also demonstrates that what gets taught in the classroom may not be in the teachers’ control, a concern that was grappled with during the 1960’s when the pedagogical recontextualizing field gained control over the integrated code from the official recontextualizing field. Bowles and Gintis discuss the origins of mass public education and conclude that the demands of the economy influenced the school as an institution. This concept is termed
the 'correspondence principle', indicating a correspondence between social relations of education and social relations of production (1976:131). According to this principle, schools resemble factories in that they prepare students for the disciplines of the workplace and develop the necessary attitudes. Again, the outcome is the production of relations based on principles of mechanical solidarity, as the school transmits both expressive and instrumental orders to the students.

There have been several discussions that observe the contexts imposed upon contemporary education during the early emancipating movements of the 1960's (and early 1970's). Bowles and Gintis contend:

The educational system, perhaps more than any other contemporary social institution, has become a laboratory in which competing solutions to the problems of personal liberation and social equality are tested and the arena in which social struggles are fought out. The school system is a monument to the capacity of the advanced corporate economy to accommodate and deflect thrusts away from its foundations. Yet at the same time, the educational system mirrors the growing contradictions of the larger society, most dramatically in the disappointing results of reform efforts (1976:5).

As discussed previously, Bernstein identifies a shift from economic-based performance modes to therapy-based competence modes (and a consequent return shift to performance modes). It was also detailed how this was a movement that saw power and control shift from the official recontextualizing field (ORF) to the pedagogic recontextualizing field (PRF) and back again to the ORF (1996:67). In light of this interpretation, reform efforts were made in which the pedagogic emphasis was placed on ideas of development, recognition and change; yet these ideas were abandoned for the
bottom line of profit and loss. Schools that were formed in alignment with an egalitarian ideal, with the initial shift to integrated codes, were restructured to become reproducers of the cultural and economic systems that dominate state capitalist societies. The recontextualizing field becomes one controlled by teachers if the school system bases its structures on egalitarian ideologies (when the PRF provides the system of symbolic control), and may witness a pedagogical relationship based on weak classification and relaxed frames. At the time, it was liberal, and offered an alternative method based on developing competence in students.

The reform movements outlined by Bernstein, as well as Bowles and Gintis, reflect these developments towards egalitarianism in education. The latter outline the demise of that system:

...It is clear to many that the liberal school-reform balloon has burst. The social scientists and reformers who provided the intellectual impetus and rationale for compensatory education, for school integration, for the open classroom,...are in retreat. In political as much as in intellectual circles, the current mood is one of retrenchment (Bowles and Gintis, 1976:6).

This process has been underway for more than twenty years. The development initiated through the PRF has been thoroughly negated, an event identified by Bowles and Gintis as the 'great American dream freeze' (1976:10). It must be noted that in Bernstein's earlier work on code theory, he recognized a paradox with the shift towards integrated codes, stating that they may in fact begin a newly constituted form of mechanical solidarity. It is apparent that the collection code segregates knowledge into specializing domains where an array of diverse ideologies can be available
within each classroom. The covert structure here is that of organic solidarity, and as the educational life of a student continues, s/he receives this 'array' until finally choosing an allegiance to a specializing discipline. Bernstein then proposed it was possible that the overt structure of organic solidarity within the integrated codes unintentionally creates mechanical solidarity through its less specialized outputs; and, he contended that it will do this to the extent that its ideology is explicit, elaborated and closed, and to the extent that it is implicitly transmitted through its low insulations (1971:225).

Nevertheless, the integration that took place in schools observed by Bowles and Gintis involves the reproduction of the dominant ideology geared towards the unequal structures of capitalism. Students are placed in a situation where they are forced to compete with other students for perhaps the favour of a teacher, who is placed in a hierarchical power position also reflective of the workplace. Put differently, schools do not produce equality or develop inherent, shared qualities; instead, they produce workers and managers:

The structure of the educational experience is admirably suited to nurturing attitudes and behaviour consonant with participation in the labour force. Particularly dramatic is the statistically verifiable congruence between the personality traits conducive to proper work performance on the job and those which are rewarded with high grades in the classroom (Bowles and Gintis, 1976:9).

Reform did not catch on because it was not aligned with the dominant interests of the economy and the state. The therapeutic symbolic control provided by the PRF and its competence modes has been wrested from educators and placed into the hands of those in
bureaucracy, whose interests are vested in the economic structures that curriculum now reflects through its control by the ORF and its performance modes.

The existing norms constructed by the state and the nature of performance-based models are not those that are necessarily fulfilled within the pedagogical practice. Teachers know their roles are to develop and recognize qualities or deficiencies, and to alter their approach in order to meet the educational demands that are required in any given classroom context. Within the ORF, state interests are controlled through funding, and the decree that a set curriculum be instructed, quite often to far larger classrooms than any teacher can effectively handle. Egalitarian and competence-based modes are not aligned with the material reality in which the education system is rooted. Although official mandates from progressive-thinking educators dismiss such claims as inauthentic, Bowles and Gintis maintain that economic structures dictate teaching practices:

The economy is a formally totalitarian system in which the actions of the vast majority (workers) are controlled by a small minority (owners and managers). Yet this totalitarian system is embedded in a formally democratic political system which promotes the norms, if not the practice, of equality, justice and reciprocity (1976:54).

Education becomes part of the production process, and it is a form of indoctrination or social integration that tries to reconcile the contradictions inherent within the system through structures that mirror, encode, and legitimize this system.

A numbing experience overtakes the practice of performance modes, and replaces cognitive development located within the PRF and its competence modes. The ORF declares a system that is
meritocratic, and that education is a way to transcend class and economic distinctions. However, other indications suggest that as constructed social institutions, schools function within the ideology of capitalism to reproduce class, race and gender distinctions through the structures that have been imposed upon it. Bowles and Gintis question this institutional setting:

"...The roots of inequality...are to be found in the class structure and the system of sexual and racial power relationships. The school system is then but one of several institutions which serve to perpetuate the structure of privilege. But education is relatively powerless to correct economic inequality....If, as we argue here, inequality has its origins in the structure of the capitalist economy, educational reform will be a powerful force for equalization only to the extent that it can alter those aspects of the economic system which provide the institutional basis of inequality (1976:86)."

The materialist perspective espoused by the authors is evident as it comes to its theoretical conclusion: a call for educational revolution would see education re-appropriated as a tool to undermine the present structures of the capitalist economy, rather than support them. Instead of focusing on individual competition, Bowles and Gintis suggest an overall pedagogic restructuring that attempts to reconcile the interests of the individual with those of the community. The contradiction between the individual and community is mediated by many formal and informal institutions, such as the family, peer groups, churches, the justice system and so on. One of the most effective institutions in carrying out such contradictions is indeed the school, and so, a radical form of recontextualization is needed to redress the dominant/subordinate relationships in our society and replace them with ones based on shared emancipatory potential.
Hegemonic Reproduction Theory

Traditional Marxist theory initially provided a useful analytic tool for the discipline of cultural studies by deducing economic and political power to an economic model of base/superstructure. However, cultural forms are much more complex than what this model imposes. Raymond Williams (1977:108) argues that the discipline of sociology cannot just insert Marx's economic model into cultural studies, because what is essentially required is the restoration of the whole social material process; specifically, cultural production as social and material.

By comparing Marx's notion of ideology to hegemony, we can see that ideology is left somewhat incomplete. We therefore need a working definition. Hegemony is not only a conscious system of ideas and beliefs, but the whole lived social process as practically organized by dominant meanings and values (Williams, 1977:109). Ideology includes the formal meanings, values and beliefs that a dominant class develops; but it does not equate these with consciousness. Hegemony includes relations of domination and subordination as a saturation of the whole process of living. It not only includes economic and political activity, but the whole process of lived experience to the most extreme degree, all of which are shaped perceptions of the world. It is like the fusing of classes together, from one discourse to another.

Forms of domination and subordination correspond much more closely to normal processes of social organization and control. If the pressures and limits of a given form of domination are experienced, hence internalized, then the question of class rule according to the base/superstructure model is transformed.
Williams (1977:111) argues that the base/superstructure model places cultural activity in the superstructure; yet they are among the basic processes of the formation itself, related to a much wider reality than the abstractions of ‘social’ or ‘economic’ experience.

A lived hegemony is always a process. It is a realized complex of experiences, relationships, and activities with specific and changing pressures and limits. It can never be singular because its internal structures are highly complex. In other words, hegemony does not passively exist as a form of domination, for it must be continuously renewed, recreated, defended and modified. At any time, forms of oppositional politics and cultures exist, so a ‘static’ hegemony (like a dominant ideology) can ignore and isolate such opposition (Williams, 1977:113). If these oppositions are significant to a hegemonic function, they can control, transform or incorporate them.

Pedagogy is central to the notion of hegemony because it is located in all cultural settings and occurs between vast amounts of relationships. Michel Foucault (1977) describes curriculum as firmly related to ideology, and knowledge to power. Power includes the ability to pressure and justify a population in order to minimize rebellion (by controlling what people know). Here, the circulation of knowledge distribution is how power is held so that there is a great need to re-write history from different perspectives and redefine the ‘facts’. In order to produce a truly hegemonic curriculum, it is crucial to align every eclectic cultural group involved so that the dominant group’s bias can be stricken. I am reminded of the many history books written about
North America: In nearly all that I have sought, history begins in 1492. There are many mythologies and oral traditions passed on through the many First Nations people over thousands of years, but none of them are deemed relevant by the opinions of those who interpret their own versions of history and present them in the curriculum as factual. The point is, education, particularly through pedagogy, is a major site where different groups (all with differing ideologies) attempt to define and get their ideas into the curriculum.

Within our educational system, it is the textbook that defines elite culture. Textbooks are selections that most students simply take for granted. Michael Apple (1986:82) posits that texts are very pivotal in many pedagogical encounters, since teachers rely on them and they dominate what people learn. Texts are often viewed as 'authoritative', and discourage too many questions as the texts are presented as facts that are official. Apple explains that textuality takes away some of the discretion from teachers through the proletarianization of teaching (1986:34). Here, teachers relinquish control in favour of educational packages organized by the state. Apple (1986:36) also notes that as a result, teacher workloads becomes highly intensified, resembling that of a factory worker, so that they become rushed with their work. With biases built into texts, it is really an issue of cultural politics where certain groups are supported while others are not.

Ideas of the state and of social distinctions (such as race, gender, class, disabilities and languages) are ongoing processes that can be applied to understanding the classroom as an active part of the state apparatus and the structures that are maintained
through everyday activity. Apple describes the role the school plays as a state apparatus that is strongly related to the core problems of accumulation and legitimization faced by the state, and a mode of production in general (1982:29). Apple sees hegemony as another process that people undertake everyday through their daily activities such as learning and teaching:

Hegemony isn't an already accomplished social fact, but a process in which dominant groups and classes manage to win the active consensus over who they rule (1982:29).

Schools, like any governed institution, are agents of the state, and are also a part of the state as an active process.

Bernstein (1996) states that recontextualization according to the ORF is a process that lends to this active participation, legitimization, and reproduction of the codes governing society in which the dominant mode of production is industrial capitalism. Specifically, he writes:

The specialized recontextualizing field produces and reproduces imaginary concepts of work and life which abstract such experiences from the power relations of their lived conditions and negate the possibilities of understanding and criticism (Bernstein, 1996:73).

In light of hegemonic reproduction theory, hegemony continues as a process because institutions like the school are able to subsume it and gain consensus through suitable management processes as these management structures become the device for creating an entrepreneurial competitive culture. In the last example to be discussed in this chapter we shall find that this phenomenon occurs in other institutional settings.

Still, curriculum is formed out of ideology, and what is deemed as acceptable 'knowledge' is related to power and the
political economy. Apple elaborates:

Schools are organized not only to teach the 'knowledge that, how, and to' required by our society, but are organized as well in such a way that they ultimately assist in the production of the technical/administrative knowledge required among the other things to expand markets, control production, labour, and people, engage in the basic and applied research needed by industry, and create widespread 'artificial' needs among the population (1982:22).

In this way, it is clear that curriculum is thus shaped according to a very narrow set of rules and standards that stratify both knowledge and skills, and actively reproduce the dynamic processes of hegemony. Furthermore, the kinds of knowledge considered most legitimate in school, and which act as a complex filter to stratify entire groups of students, were connected to the specific needs of our kind of social formation (Apple:1982:22). Again, curriculum is directly related to the ideology represented by the dominant mode of production, and knowledge is equated with power as the property of an elite, who have patterned it over many years to suit their own intentions.

We can begin to see how curriculum plays an active role in legitimizing the hegemonic processes that we undergo as members of a capitalist society. It is a form of cultural reproduction that persuades people, or curbs their experiences, to accept the conditions in which they find themselves. It is often extremely difficult for people to 'step outside' of the surrounding dominant discourse that bombards them through so many of their daily experiences. These conditions are in place because the vast majority have been persuaded into accepting them so that an active consensus is formed.
Since the concepts of 'hegemony' are so extensive, hegemony draws on many other theories. Apple borrows from economic reproduction theory to outline the relationship between the production of hegemony and school curriculum:

Not only does education allocate individuals to a relatively fixed set of positions in society, an allocation of positions determined by economic and political forces, but the process of education itself, the formal and hidden curriculum, socializes people to accept as legitimate the limited roles they ultimately fill in society (1979:32).

Elsewhere, Apple cites the work of Bernstein in which he outlines the relationship between pedagogic consciousness formation and ideology:

Other similarly orientated scholars take a comparable stance in examining the effect schools may have on the formation of consciousness of individuals. Thus, for instance, Basil Bernstein has argued that, to a significant extent, 'through education the individuals mental structures (categories of thought, language and behaviour) are formed, and that these mental structures derive from the social division of labour' (Apple, 1979:32).

In this way, the stratification that takes place, in terms of economic and social distinction, is also actively carried out in the classroom where certain forms of knowledge are held as more important than others and the distribution of that knowledge is not as important as its mere manufacturing.

This creates an unequal condition in which students become stratified according to their economic class before they are even at a level where they contribute to the economy. Apple makes this clear:

Thus, certain levels of achievement on the part of the 'minority' group students, children of the poor and so on, can be tolerated. It is less consequential to the economy than is the generation of the knowledge itself. Once again, production of a
particular 'commodity' (here high status knowledge) is of more concern than the distribution of that particular commodity (1979:37).

This is an active process of hegemony construction in which both the relationship of the curriculum to the dominant ideology, and the relationship of knowledge to power, create a form of cultural reproduction that is based on stratification. Therefore, the cultural content, whether it be legitimate or high status knowledge, is used as a device or filter for economic stratification. It is thus established that the relationship between the curriculum, pedagogy, and forms of evaluation in schools, and the structures of inequality in the larger society, is an active process that allows for the acceptance and legitimization of unequal structures on an everyday basis. A key part of this process is the way control is implicitly exerted through the ORF and performance-based models. It is also the dominant ideology of competitive capitalism that underscores all of these aspects, and as such the state is just another process that is informed by this system. Once more, Apple specifies:

Instead of examining the role of our dominant mode of economic organization in producing unemployment, instead of looking at how our economic arrangements 'naturally' generate such inequalities, our attention is diverted from the economy to government (1986:17).

Thus far, I have suggested that the state and its institutions are not separable, and that they share the qualities of being manufactured in relation to the dominant mode of production so that it might be acted out and encoded in our everyday lives.

There are powers that depend upon the manufacturing of culture for their legitimization. For example, economic power is tied to these specialized and stratified systems, and as such they are
formed out of the interests of the elite. These interests are based on the ideology of capitalism, and the culture being constructed adheres to its forms by creating an environment that revolves around presences and absences, surplus and shortage; and where a dominant discourse evolves. The recontextualizing fields (in particular the ORF) reflect these interests in the designation of curriculum and evaluation practices; where the dominance of performance modes over competence modes is a result of the active participation of the school within the overall economy.

The Inner-Workings of A Social Work Agency

I now wish to utilize a study conducted by Roxana Ng, called Immigrant Women, Class and the State (1996), to show how control is exercised in another institutional setting outside of the school. The study demonstrates the theory of state racism as an inherent characteristic of social institutions. It illustrates how codes are transmitted and reinforced through agencies that are community-based and state-funded (hence, state-controlled). Ng's work approaches the idea of the state as a process that is undertaken by people in their everyday activities.

The empirical research begins as Ng spent a year volunteering at a private organization that helps immigrant women find suitable skilled labour. The backgrounds of these women are Spanish, Italian, West Indian and Chinese; and, it is often the language barrier which makes it difficult for them to locate such work. This private organization turned into an institutional agency of control by projecting immigrant women into a category of minimum-wage workers. Ng studies this process of transformation towards
control as the social work agency involved applied for state funding because it could no longer sustain itself with volunteers alone.

There are two parts to Ng’s theory. Primarily, the author examines how class is socially constructed; it does not just happen, rather it is a process or a construct. Ng looks at what people do to produce this, in particular producing a ‘gender-ethnic class’ of immigrant women as minimum-wage workers. Secondly, the inquiry proposes that the state is not merely a set of structures, but a process carried out by the community agency. Ng questions how the agency becomes a control measure of the state.

The initial observations are that the people involved are miserable, as tensions run high and counsellors lay blame on each other, and get deeply upset. What began as a volunteer advocacy group sponsoring immigrant women, has turned into an agency set up as a ‘government outreach program’ aimed to aid community groups and help individuals. However, many criteria had to be met in order for it to be legally incorporated, so it became a branch of Employment Immigration Canada (EIC). It is now set up as an ‘Incorporated’ (Inc.) entity that requires a new mandate to account for its funding. As a volunteer advocacy centre, the old mandate was to serve immigrant women with their employment-related needs through individual counselling. The newly incorporated mandate shows a noticeable difference that government funding creates, as it states, "To improve, in measurable terms, the employment and employability of immigrant women..." (Ng, 1996:36). Funding now brings quantifiable accountability to the service. To be ‘accountable’, a hierarchy is needed, so a staff and membership
Ng describes how the state gains control through job-placement measures. A project officer is hired to supervise bookkeeping, and the entire staff must now go through this person for everything, as well as provide monthly financial reports to him/her. As a result, the staff must fill out a large amount of forms, taking vast amounts of time away from counselling (notwithstanding the time needed just for translations). These voluminous forms create the same pressures as that of a boss leaning on employees and telling them what to do; so the counsellors begin to stick clients into categories just to get them out of their way. Furthermore, 'ethnicity' has become a factor because if a client does not belong to one of the four groups stated in the mandate, they no longer qualify.

Counsellors choose this sort of work so they can help people, but they now find that the bureaucratic forms really get in the way of their performance as counsellors. The agency measures success by the number of jobs found for as many clients as they possibly can, so counsellors often obtain minimum-wage, low-skilled work for their clients, which is what their clients were doing in the first place. They counsel their clients to take such jobs and socialize them to fit in, conditioning them for what the employer wants by telling them to be punctual, clean and the like. The choices are limited because the counsellors are evaluated by this quantified measurement of job-placement. Here, the advocacy role is abandoned as there is a measure on how many jobs can be found, regardless of how appropriate they are to the workers' skill sets, and counsellors negotiate with employers to hire their clients. A
displacement of priorities is evident here, and it is funding that becomes the control mechanism since quotas must be met at the expense of sincere counselling.

The process began with counsellors becoming outraged with the employer’s exploitation of their clients, but they gradually become more apologetic as they reason that at least work is being provided; perhaps blame should be shifted onto the clients’ unwillingness to work. They then blatantly discriminate among their ethnic clientele for job placements (which is illegal) and counsel them into taking those jobs. Counsellors either begin quitting, or they shove clients into unwanted placements in order to meet their quotas.

The board (who were volunteers to begin with) are responsible for the agency’s financial status, and the staff become more and more upset and want to be unionized to protect themselves from arbitrary firing. Policy-making also veers from weekly meetings designed to discuss clients and care, to funding concerns whereby counsellors’ heavy work-loads do not allow for much emotional support. The morale is destroyed by low funding. It breaks down disorganized counsel work, the work load never stops, and counsellors begin to resent their clients.

Ng’s analysis shows how the state uses ordinary people to act as its control mechanism. People are contracted out while control is vested in the bureaucratic forms so it appears that the agency itself is in control, not the state. This affects class stratification, where ‘class’ is not an indicator, but a process (the outcome of policy and what people do) where a gender-ethnic class is created. Here, the state is not some monolithic
structure, but a work process of what people do. The volunteers become agents of the state through the process of documentation; and counsellors now side with the views of the employers.

The employment centre is funded by the state, and as such the agency that was supposed to be working to help immigrant women is also an agent of the state, and, a part of the state itself in its everyday activities. Immigrant women are treated like commodities in the Canadian labour market; they are resources whose work can be exploited by owners for profit. The interests of the government and the interests of these corporate owners are the same, hence, the agency became a feeder to the structures of exploitation that were in place, as Ng explains:

As a result of its funding arrangement, the employment agency now entered into a sub-contractual relationship with the state. The funding protocol was such that the agency had to produce a 'product' for the state in return for funding (1996:14)

Code theory and recontextualization is clearly applicable in this situation as Bernstein identifies a structure common to all institutions that is geared towards producing a culture and an ideology based on industrial hierarchy. Bernstein writes:

From this point of view, although pedagogic discourses are differently focused, the management focus of all institutions at all levels is similar. The management structure has become the device for creating an entrepreneurial competitive culture. The latter is responsible for criteria informing senior administrative appointments and the engaging or hiring of specialized staff to promote the effectiveness of this culture (1996:75).

One of these forms of specialized staff is the minimum-wage-earning immigrant woman worker, who is enlisted to fill the bottom of the industrial hierarchy. The institution that is the employment
agency is thus based on a management structure that produces people as a product or commodity to be exploited by technology and the economy.

The agency transmits a code that has been formulated by the state and has appropriated it through demands justified by funding. This code is one that constructs class and economic relations in ways that result in products like the 'gender ethnic class' to which the women described by Ng are designated. Bernstein elaborates on this transmission of codes as a means of realizing preferred meanings through contextualization:

Different distributions of power and principles of control differentially shape interactional practices according to different classification and framing values and thus give rise to different orientations of meanings, forms of realizations, and so 'texts' (1996:194).

The 'text' produced by the agency is the 'product' or 'commodity' of the minimum-wage immigrant women. This is created out of the power structures in place within the employment agency as it functions also as an agency of the state.

In this way, the agency is the state in its everyday guise; and the agency is class relations in that it directly works towards reproducing the structures that are in place. Ng looks at her subjects in terms of their role in producing and reproducing the dominant codes that are accepted and maintained through such institutions. Ng's overview of the structures of the agency and its relations to class-production illustrates the link between code theory and her study:

...We see how the interview process served to select and articulate, as well as socialize, immigrant women into a labour process stratified by gender and ethnicity. The counsellor's work in this selecting
and matching process, meanwhile, was part of how a segregated labour force was organized and maintained on an ongoing basis. In examining the counselling process of the agency, we glimpse how class rule is accomplished in a liberal democratic state: not merely through coercive mechanisms, but also through its elaborate funding apparatus which penetrates into grassroots organizations and movements (Ng, 1996:69).

The relationship between Ng's study and the overall study of recontextualization is evident as we observe that codes are produced and transmitted through practice, and that these are not objective categories, but in fact are dynamic processes that are always changing. It is significant to note that Ng's conception of the state is similar to that of hegemonic reproduction theory, in that each of them does not abstract government as a separate entity, but incorporates it as a process that we all undergo on a daily basis.

Ng comments on the significance of her study in terms of understanding how institutions and the people who function within them are actually producing and reinforcing distinctions such as class, race and gender in their everyday lives. Ng explains:

We begin to see how class is reproduced as a practical everyday matter: as people look for jobs and as people go about their daily routine of doing their work. Class is not simply a set of categories based on some objective indicators; it is a dynamic process produced and reproduced through human activities on a daily basis (1996:69).

Action and interaction are texts that have been produced through processes that are based on the organization and distribution of power and control. Ng's idea that the state, class, and other social categories are ongoing processes, is illuminated by Bernstein's ideas of power and control constructing the social reality of which everyone is a functioning, interacting part.
Control establishes legitimate communications, and power always operates on the relationships between categories. Thus, power forms relations between, and controls relations within given forms of interaction (Bernstein, 1996:19). The dynamic forces of power and control that we call the state are in fact linguistic and organizational influences that are appropriated to serve the interests of corporations, as effectively illustrated in each of these examples.
CHAPTER FOUR

Recontextualization and the Social Organization of Teacher’s Work: A Case Study

To further the understanding of how code theory interprets the active roles people play in carrying out the interests of the state, I have chosen to analyze a case study of a doctoral thesis that sought to understand the ways in which pedagogic practice is linked to class reproduction. The thesis put forth by Ann Manicom, (1988), Constituting Class Relations: The Social Organization of Teacher’s Work, illustrates the reproduction of class relations through the on-going interactions of teacher’s work processes and family labour processes. Manicom discusses and compares the teaching experiences in school catchment areas in Halifax, Nova Scotia, that are strongly differentiated by social class. Her findings indicate that the intersection of the family and the school that takes place in the classroom results both in the social organization of teacher’s work (or recontextualization of that work), and the social organization of the students in terms of their social class positioning. I will describe Manicom’s work in unison with the explanations offered by code theory so that a deeper understanding of both theoretical frameworks can be achieved.

Dorothy Smith outlines the process that constructs our everyday experiences in accordance to, and in support of, dominant social powers:

The everyday world is the fundamental grounding of a mode of knowing developed in a ruling apparatus, integrally part of that ruling apparatus, which is formed of the relations among management, state, professions and the looser intersections of the intellentsia (1981:2).
The everyday world of the teacher and the elementary school student is formed out of such relations while simultaneously serving to reproduce, reinforce and maintain them. Essentially, this is the thesis central to Manicom's study. Smith (1981:22) identifies students' class positionings as the, "actual and immediate organization of an experienced world in a manner which articulates it to an extended organization of social relationships", which are both produced and reproduced in the classroom.

Manicom identifies many of the contradictions that arose in the previous chapter, such as the conflict between performance-based modes and the emancipatory, therapeutic goals carried out through competence-based modes. Hence, the focus of this chapter is to understand these contradictions, oppositions and conflicts in terms of their position within code theory. What will be demonstrated is that when teachers attempt to implement competence-based practices, they are faced with many contradictory impediments. For example, if teachers try to help a child by enrolling the services of social workers, the teachers usually suffer in terms of their effectiveness in that the time allocated to dealing with the social worker inhibits them from completing the set curriculum, which is entrusted to them by the school board to complete. This is the inherent problem facing inner-city schools. Attention needs to be paid in areas that are not directly aligned with the set curriculum; yet any such attention that does not fall within these confines results ultimately in shortcomings, since the teacher is unable to teach according to the established requirements outlined by the official curriculum. As such, this becomes a conflict between the recognized need to adapt competence
models and the control imposed by the structures of performance models.

The struggle that is identified in Manicom's work is essentially one between a teacher's desire to overcome this cycle of social organization through empowering education, and the formation of work processes that render this desire unattainable; it is the inability of teachers to transcend the cycle of social and class reproduction. This is not due to any lack of desire to transcend the trappings of class and dominant ideology on the part of the teachers; rather, the problem is based on the conflicts between their autonomous desires to make a difference in the conditions of the lives of the children with whom they work every day, and the work processes that are determined by the intersection of the school board's mandates and their own experience within the classroom.

The conflict is one that has arisen out of a teacher's need to implement competence-based pedagogic practices and the teacher's requirement to fulfil expectations strongly laid out in the curriculum that is imposed upon them and their classrooms. As mentioned, this is a conflict between code theory's official recontextualizing field and the pedagogic recontextualizing field. Bernstein is effectively describing the situation outlined by Manicom when he states that the shifts that have occurred through recontextualization undergo a process that denotes the contradiction between teacher's apparent autonomy and the control exercised by official school boards; or the initial shift from performance modes to competence modes and the reverse shift from competence to performance modes (1996:67). It is interesting to
note Ng's hypothesis here, in the sense that people might be a vehicle for state control. This shift and return is directly reflected by the words of the teachers interviewed by Manicom. Her analysis demonstrates that while teachers in their classrooms recognize and act on the need to adapt practices based on competence, they are rendered unable to do so once the official recontextualization field imposes the constraints of performance modes upon them.

Teachers find that the performance mode does not allow them to fulfil the ideals that they possess as concerned educators; in turn, they adapt by implementing modes that are aligned with the model of competence. Once this is attempted, contradictions arise, which re-situate pedagogic practice within the performance model. A historical example of this can be found in Manicom's identification of the contradiction and conflict that arises in the teaching practice of reading to children. In the 1960's, developmental psychologists determined that there were "individual differences" among children in terms of cognition. Parental involvement had an effect here, but most were consequently stigmatized as 'problem families'. While teachers may have tried to account for these differences by attempting one-on-one instruction, the intersection of their work with administrative and economic concerns rendered this impossible. The result was standardized group learning in which the children were categorized according to 'ability'. Manicom writes:

In these developments, one can see how the pragmatics of everyday and administrative life intertwine with discourse. Clearly, the concept of individual differences might lead to pedagogical practices of one-to-one instruction. But there is
also an administrative concern to maintain reasonable student-teacher ratios (about 25 children per teacher). How can these ratios be maintained while still providing for "individual" differences? Administrative relevances and discourse practices interact; in this instance, the solution is grouping as a central feature of instruction in elementary schools. Grouping thus is the practical solution to the problem of working with a psychological discourse which proclaims individual differences, using a technology which consists of a set of standardized Readers, within institutional arrangements of one teacher with 25-30 children of the same age for one school year (1988:225-226).

This example is relevant to the overall everyday experiences of teachers in their classrooms as expressed in the interviews conducted by Manicom. Teachers know when a need must be met in their students. When they try and implement effective strategies in order to meet those needs, they are confronted with realities based on economics and administration. Hence, their autonomy in relation to their own pedagogic recontextualization field is undermined by the controls imposed upon them by the official recontextualization field. The result is that they are essentially handcuffed to one pedagogic mode because their teaching work processes are constructed out of the many intersections identified by Manicom.

Manicom’s research is concerned with the attempts by teachers to adapt to the conditions they face in an inner-city school while striving to transcend class reproduction through the empowerment of education. The study indicates that when teachers do make an attempt to adapt or take advantage of the elasticity of their positions through the implementation of competence-based pedagogic practice, they are quickly recontextualized through demands of time, administration, and a standardized curriculum. These and
other conflicts identified in Manicom’s research interviews and analysis can thus be interpreted in terms of code theory. I find the result to be an enriched understanding of the problems faced by teachers who wish to transcend the reproduction of oppressive social class structures that arise in their classrooms. This understanding is crucial to any proposed solution to the issue of class relations being maintained and reinforced within the discourse of the classroom.

Bernstein offers a methodology that allows us to understand pedagogic code production and reproduction in terms of its relation to power structures. He provides a model for pedagogic discourse that sees instruction firmly fixated in dominant regulations to create a single discourse, a single recontextualizing principle:

I will define pedagogic discourse as a rule which embeds two discourses: a discourse of skills of various kinds and their relations to each other, and a discourse of social order. Pedagogic discourse embeds rules which create skills of one kind or another and rules regulating their relationship with one another, and rules which create social order (Bernstein, 1996:46).

Instructional discourse then, is embedded within the dominant regulative discourse to create a single pedagogic discourse, which constitutes the recontextualizing principle. The moral order of regulation is actually seen here as primary to the secondary function of transmitting information and developing skills through teacher instruction.

The regulative discourse is the dominant discourse, therefore, it situates the instructional in a way that is aligned with the moral codes that are being transmitted. In our modern capitalist society, this means that the capitalist ethic informs everything
that is presented as factual. It also informs our decisions as to what skills are to be valued and which are not. This is recontextualization, as it is the production of fields within which teaching practices are organized according to the power structures that are in place, or institutionalized.

This analysis has particular relevance to Manicom's study as we attempt to understand the experiences of the teachers interviewed, in terms of the power relations that are in place in Halifax, Nova Scotia. What is essential to my study is an understanding of the relationship between the ORF and the PRF, and how their respective recontextualizing fields clash. It is a question of teacher autonomy versus official control. The codes that are transmitted as a result of this conflict find that the latter, regulative discourse, stands in the way of instructional discourse. At this point, it is necessary to review some of the contents outlined in the second chapter since the conflict between the ORF and the PRF is a succinct statement of the reality presented through Manicom's research. Again, Bernstein (1996:48) asserts that the PRF consists of pedagogues in schools, specialized educational journals and private research foundations; but, if it can have an effect on pedagogic discourse independent of the ORF, then there is both some autonomy and struggle over pedagogic discourse and its practices. If there is only the ORF, however, then there is no autonomy. In recent practices, the state is attempting to weaken the PRF through its ORF, and it is the management structure that has become the device for creating an entrepreneurial competitive culture (Bernstein, 1996:75).

In an attempt to identify and transcend the structural
boundaries that have limited teacher autonomy in Halifax, we must remember that the specialized recontextualizing field reproduces imaginary concepts of work and life that abstract experiences from the power relations of lived conditions, and negate the possibilities of understanding and criticizing them (Bernstein, 1996:73). It is therefore important to try and reconnect these areas of pedagogic discourse in the hopes of providing such an understanding and criticism towards the role of official regulation in stifling teacher autonomy in the inner-city schools of Halifax.

Manicom’s work effectively illustrates the conflicts that are identified in the study of pedagogic code construction, as she does not allow for any division between school, home and work. The author sees these factors intersecting, and forming an everyday process that is the relations within capitalism. Class is not some separate entity, it is formed out of the intersection of all areas of life and is constructed as an active practice of everyday life. It is these class relations that form the teacher’s work processes, and as such the ‘instructional’ of teacher’s work is certainly embedded in the regulative moral and economic system that is in place. Consequently, the implementation of competence modes is regularly rendered impossible by the imposition of performance modes. The reasons for this are primarily economic, hence, the economic reality of teaching informs and constructs the economic class reality of students. Bernstein describes the advent of the Reagan-Thatcher era and its politics as having established this contemporary context, which is directly illustrated by the Halifax-area teachers interviewed by Manicom:
At all levels of the educational system a combination of the decentralization in respect of local institutions and their management, and centralization with regard to their monitoring and funding, changed the culture of educational institutions, their internal management structures, criteria for staff appointments and especially promotions and their pedagogic practices (Bernstein, 1996:72).

Curricula became set, and teacher autonomy was reduced significantly. The experiences of the teachers interviewed and Manicom's own observations reflect these conditions and demonstrate their consequences in terms of class reproduction.

Teachers try to structure their work processes around the needs of their students. If a student is falling behind in reading, for example, then the teacher would like to pay more attention to the special needs of the child; this includes delivering information in a way that one child might find more relevant than another. But what occurs when this autonomy and attention is exercised is that the entire classroom falls behind because the teacher has taken the time out of the required curriculum to pay attention to another student. This proves central to Manicom's findings:

The interest in this thesis is to discover some of the practices through which this 'falling behind' occurs, processes and practices which mean that a teacher structures her work processes in ways which reduce the time she allocates to the 'real' work of schools: progression through the mandated curriculum materials (1988:84).

Manicom seeks to understand the ways that pedagogic practice is linked to class reproduction; yet to a large extent, teachers are unable to transcend class structures because their own teaching structures are informed by them. Manicom explains:

My interest is in the relation of teachers’ work to
the production of class differences in children’s achievement; my argument is that some of this can be understood by prising apart the structuring of the work processes and examining the shifts in time allocation in the work processes, shifts which draw teachers away from ‘mandated curriculum work’ for all the students in the class, and produce a cumulative ‘falling behind’ (1988:87).

The mandate for standardized curriculum is to equalize what children were going to learn, but is really the product of a centralized institution that constitutes the ORF and its influence on teaching discourse. The ORF is the school board and the state institutions that fund it; and it is here that designations are laid out in terms of what should and should not be taught, as well as at what pace the skills and information ought to be transmitted. We can locate here the codes that are constructed in the contemporary recontextualizing field, as the PRF now deals with trying to keep up with the standards that have been set. As such, the current PRF is embedded in the ORF in the same way that instruction is fixated within the dominant discourse of regulation. In each case, the former is constructed out of the latter, and official power regulations are primary to the actual practice of teaching.

An example that is cited and examined by Manicom is the ‘Basal Reading Series’, which is a pre-ordained program for literacy instruction that operates according to a strict time-line. The Basal Reader does not take into consideration differences between teaching contexts or student life. The readers are used as a kind of barometer for classroom performance, and teachers gauge their progress according to the time-line that is established, as it is described:
If a teacher uses the books at the standard pace, she will 'get through' the Reader series for her particular grade level. The Basal Readers thus define the proper amount of work for the grade, and become the implicit measure of adequacy of the pace of one's work (Manicom, 1988: 199-200).

The readers are thus based on a performance mode that is established and measured by the school board. It is a normative device that is a documentary source of the divisions that exist along class lines. The books are designed to present children and teachers with reading skills that are based on acquiring reading as if it were a race instead of an important, nurtured skill. If children are not acquainted with the subjects, or worse, if the language being presented is not the language that they encounter on a daily basis, then they are not normal and they fall behind. Is it not the job of education to teach language skills that are absent from children's lives rather than to judge them upon what they are already missing? Manicom describes the manuals that accompany the reading series, which are designed to allow teachers to determine who in their classroom is viable and who is not:

The suggestions in the Manual for 'getting ready to read' provide for teachers a normative account of the typical background knowledge that needs to be given. Here we can see two processes structured through the textual materials. First, if the children do not 'have the background' (or World Knowledge), they are defined as deficient; the 'deficiency' is socially constructed, in part through the active texts, through the Teacher's Manual and the Readers themselves. The texts (the documents) provide the teacher with a particular naming of children's knowledges (1988: 203).

This is quite evidently a performance mode of pedagogic practice, as it is based on the acquisition of things that are not present instead of the enhancement of what is present. From the point of view of competence positions, performance modes are based on the
concept of deficit, whereas competence modes are considered to be based on conceptions of empowerment (Bernstein, 1996:71).

The ORF has imposed these forms of knowledge and has legitimized them, without taking into account differences in contexts or students and their unique cultural experiences outside of the school. Bernstein (1996:72) reminds us that the shift to performance models and their modes was initiated by the ORF, which now more directly regulated pedagogic practices, contents and research. The Basal Readers are a perfect documentary example of how the ORF has recontextualized pedagogic practice in a way that is aligned with performance modes.

The PRF sees teachers acting and reacting to the conditions within which the ORF has embedded them. Yet, as Manicom and those whom she interviews directly observe, these pedagogic recontextualizing attempts take away from the performance of the dictated curriculum. One teacher reveals she is well aware that one particular student in her classroom needs extra help with the reader series, and that the individual attention she gives him is exactly what he needs. However, she also finds that the time spent with him takes away from the time she is told to spend on fulfilling the tight demands of the preordained curriculum, as she illustrates:

I really have four Reading groups. I have one, back in September he just didn't fit in with anybody, but I still have to give him some of my time... So I agreed that three days a week I would work with him at lunch time, from 1:00 to 1:20 (Manicom, 1988:144).

This takes away from time the teacher is told should be spent on other things, whereby, "School scheduling is an administrative matter, articulated to provincial regulations" (Manicom, 1988:156).
Indeed, almost everything the teachers do is structured according to official regulative efforts. These are the actual production of discourse that is the ORF, and it is here that teachers, their curriculum, and their pedagogic practices are constructed. This is made clear as Manicom outlines the influence of the ORF in the province of Nova Scotia upon the teaching of Mathematics in schools:

This is an example of how administrative social courses of action (work processes spatially and temporally beyond the specific school) structure teachers' work in early elementary grades. In the mid-1970's, the Provincial Department of Education hired a dynamic curriculum consultant for Mathematics (its first). Her work...has meant that over the past ten years there has been considerable Mathematics inservicing, provisioning of materials, and the removal of Mathematics workbooks from the Primary programme. These have produced a Mathematics programme which has re-structured parts of the classroom work process, particularly in the use of time (Manicom, 1988:151).

Teachers were given greater demands, but not more time in which to achieve them. The central administration established, similar to the Basal Readers, a set curriculum against which all students would be evaluated according to their performance of the set studies.

The teachers, however, find that their autonomy is reduced as they are forced to spend more and more time doing what they are mandated to do instead of what they hold as priority. As one teacher comments, the improvement of curriculum usually depends upon greater demands upon teaching time:

It's a terrific programme...you can't help but see that that's the route that should be taken anyway, in order to develop the more complicated concepts; but in terms of the teacher, it's more work (Manicom, 1988:151).
The teaching work process is structured in a way that does not allow for teacher autonomy; it does not even account for anything out of the 'ordinary' that may arise. Manicom effectively relates the recontextualizing of pedagogic practice to constraints placed upon teachers in terms of time and space by the ORF:

You see here the structuring of the teaching work process in its intersection with two overall courses of action: first, curricular (there must be French, and for a certain number of minutes taught by a French teacher, and this can be linked historically to the provision of funding for French after the Federal Bilingualism and Biculturalism Report of the late 1960’s); the second, administrative problems of space allocations (and behind this the increasing school enrolments in some schools, the demands of school space as some schools are closed, the pressures on schools in expanding residential areas where there is limited financing for new school construction). The teaching work process must coordinate with, is structured in the conjunction of, such broad social courses of action (1988:160-161).

I described earlier that most teachers know what it takes to effectively teach a classroom, and this does not always fall within the boundaries of curriculum. But their job is now so structured, and their autonomy so reduced, that they are unable to give the attention that is needed because of conditions that appear to be unrelated to the classroom. These conditions, however, are the realities of capitalist relations that seek to understand everything in terms of the quantitative: of the bottom line of profit and loss. In this sense, teachers’ work is structured to be efficient, not effective; as such the teacher has been reduced to a device for the reproduction of conditions that they would like to transcend as educators, such as class oppression and elitism.

The teachers in Manicom’s research express a desire to implement a form of what was described previously as 'therapeutic
control'; based on the development, recognition and change of consciousness through symbolic means. This form of pedagogic control is associated with competence modes and is based on 'similar-to' relations rather than exclusive distinctions. However, the control these teachers presently find in the recontextualization of their jobs is orchestrated by the ORF, which is induced through economic control and the performance modes that are associated with it.

Consequently, children in lower catchment areas are not afforded the benefits of knowledge discovered from their own experiences, and they lack the dominant cultural capital. In this sort of pedagogical encounter, there is no similar-to focus, and children are excluded and alienated from the classroom they inhabit due to rigidly structured curriculum and time constraints. The children of lower class backgrounds are situated at an early age as the "Other", and this designation remains with them as they find themselves streamlined along with all the other children from similar economic backgrounds into courses designed not to transcend, but to reinforce the conditions under which they have lived. It is a pre-ordained future, as they become socialized to fit into the jobs that operate within the same discourses that their school experiences wrought. It is in the schools where the transmission of codes that are reproductive of unequal class relations are instilled. At the conclusion of Manicom's thesis, she describes her findings:

But there is a future too, an interest in the transgenerational continuity of class relations. Class relations are processes of subordination. In schooling, in secondary school, for example, we can see evidence of this process of subordination in the
higher drop-out rates of inner-city children. We can see it too in the way they are streamed into vocational tracts. In elementary schools, where the school catchment areas are class differentiated, we can see the 'evidence' of subordination in lower literacy levels and more placements in special classes for children from low income families. These things are processes which constitute futures (1988:313).

The teachers' work processes intersect with, while simultaneously being formed out of, the larger social reality. This in turn reinforces the validity of this social reality for the students. The larger social reality is based on competition, and as such the performance mode is deemed valid. It is also considered normal for children from lower class backgrounds to perform worse than children from higher class backgrounds. All this demonstrates is that class is indeed a process: it is worked at by, and diffused through, discourse; and, it is a social construct developing out of the active everyday intersections of people's daily lives. The school is a major arena where such social organization can be institutionalized, thus controlled.

These teachers demonstrate that social class is certainly an ongoing process, constructed to reinforce such placements through the competitive designation of some forms of knowledge as valid and others as not. The teachers in lower class catchment areas all expressed disappointment in the fact that the learning was not aligned with the social reality that intersected with these students lives. For this reason, extra time and attention had to be given to help these children catch up; such actions contributes to a lower quality of education for everyone in the classroom. Standardized curriculum creates boundaries that do not encompass the experience or the reality of children who are not members of
the middle class dominant discourse. Thus, gaps are created that translate into continued exclusion, sometimes for the entire group of students situated in a lower class catchment area. Again, Manicom elaborates:

Thus the analysis has to be framed in terms of the conjunction of the work processes of many families. A different work process is produced in a classroom where there are many children with 'gaps', in contrast to the classroom where there are 'gaps' only in the occasional child (the notion of 'gaps' is, of course, a social construction). It is one thing to have to teach extra skills to one or two children. It is quite another if you have a whole class, or the majority of a class, to deal with (1988:185-186).

In this way, the entire classroom can be affected by the imposition of a set curriculum based on performance modes of official recontextualization; for, the empirical evidence reveals the disparity in 'gaps' among children from different social class backgrounds.

The classroom is a highly regulated environment today. Both the structure of lessons and their contents are strictly imposed upon teachers and students; and teacher autonomy appears to be at an all-time low. Knowledge has been categorized according to the demands of the elite and privileged, and as such the codes that are transmitted do not have direct relevance to the underprivileged student. The time and attention it takes to bring a student up to 'par' with these standards takes away the time that is allotted for other functions. When this involves an entire classroom, then the time involved is simply too much, due to space and money constraints imposed by the school boards and those who fund them.

Social class, therefore, cannot be viewed as a separate, set entity. It is a process that is derived, as Manicom effectively
proves, through the intersection of various social areas including the school, home, work and such. Performance modes designated by the ORF are designed to evaluate people according to the deficiencies that they demonstrate through their work. Hence, it is exclusionary by nature, and hegemony-enforcing in its results. Yet it is rarely challenged, as it functions within a mode of production that requires teaching to be regulated according to the bottom line of efficiency, profit and loss. Bernstein’s work comments on the recontextualization process that is identified by Manicom:

Classics provided privileged access to the administrative levels of the Civil Service. The specialized sciences provided the basis for material technologies. However, despite these external linkages singulars are like a coin with two faces, so that only one face can be seen at any one time. The sacred face sets them apart, legitimizes their otherness, and creates dedicated identities with no reference other than to their calling. The profane face indicates their external linkage and internal power struggles. Organizationally and politically, singulars develop strong boundary maintenance (1996:68).

The recontextualization that is inadvertently outlined by Manicom is one that sees specialized knowledge maintained according to strict boundaries that are established and imposed by the ORF. As such, Manicom has illustrated directly the ideas that have been put forward through code theory in terms of pedagogic discourse’s direct relation to official control.

It is apparent that code theory and the concepts of recontextualization have significant relevance to the case study conducted by Manicom on the subject of elementary school teachers in Halifax, Nova Scotia. Bernstein’s theory is based on the idea that pedagogic practice supports and maintains greater social
structures, while Manicom has demonstrated that this is indeed true. By analyzing the latter in light of the thought of the former, an in-depth understanding of both theorists' ideas can be achieved. By examining the specific everyday experiences expressed by the teachers in their interviews with Manicom in terms of their relevance to competence and performance modes, their structural significance can also be understood more effectively.
CHAPTER FIVE

Formulating Coded Discourse

I have been arguing the importance of experience in any learning development because it is through experience that people create meaning and understand themselves and situate their place in the world. It is therefore crucial to understand the structures that have been created by the state, such as educational mandates or the judicial system, and the implicit, tacit symbolic meanings they manifest. Whose interests are being served in the promotion of such structures, and how do people come to abide and accept these rules? The influential or dominant discourse in our society can be stirred up in various ways, and it is based on the accumulation of wealth and consumerism, as well as the idea of health. It is evident that these capitalist relations are rapidly spreading, and it is these influences that must be identified to find how they are encoded. In this chapter, I will examine how society is indeed coded to serve the interests of the state, followed by a discussion of how code can re-interpret the goals and objectives of the education system in Ontario.

The views of the state, or the functionalist method, imply that the global village is inevitable; that society is ‘progressive’ and that it is human nature that has led to an imminent development of a globalized economy. This is a poor explanation of how the world is presently situated. To begin, every individual needs to discover his/her own personality, and since human beings are social by nature, these developments are shaped by the culture in which they are raised through interactions with others. There is no ‘true self’ in which one muddles through
society. The key to understanding why any such global phenomenon occurs is to analyze and make explicit how people organize themselves as whole societies. The way a society is organized creates the situations to which we, as members, must respond. Personality is not inherent, rather, human beings are engaged in a lifetime of acquiring knowledge so that personalities are learned through each and every lived experience, beginning at birth.

Political and social decisions of the state are worked at and coded so that covert general processes are enabled to serve the interests of the state through hidden agendas, such as with state policy and institutional mandates and special interests. Unlike concurrent or marginalized discourses, a common, dominant discourse communicates what you ought to believe (such as broad beliefs like the American Dream) and disseminates the rules and conduct whereby laws become the greatest method of social control. Laws change on a daily basis; they bend with society so as to maintain and uphold these symbolic structures.

Code is found at all levels of social life, from relations between individuals to relations among nation states. Modern and nationalistic states code every aspect of our life. The entire notion of 'nationalism' is in fact manipulated to create a false sense of identity. This is clear historically, and it is also in other discourses. For instance, recent studies show that around 1850, under the discourse of conjunction between Irish, Celts and Anglo’s, a category of 'white' immersed. Over time, who is 'white' varied to include North, and then Southern European groups. The extreme example of this 'culture is race' division was that both Nazi Germany and apartheid South Africa considered Japanese as
'whites', whereas Chinese, Koreans and so on were 'coloured' or Asian. People share a sentiment of sovereignty within a territory, whereby negotiation through diplomacy is the means to resolve disputes between and within nations. War is the institution created as the way of conducting political strife between nations whenever nationalism fails to settle such differences. As a result, if a nation prepares for war it will inevitably beget war. In effect, a 'war culture' is thus created and accepted. One only needs to observe the statues and monuments honouring war heroes over the past century, or even be cognizant of the national holidays in remembrance of past wartimes that exist in Canada and many other nations to see this.

A population becomes convinced that a war is just, that there is a common enemy who must be defeated; but how are these opinions of war informed on either side? When the Berlin wall crumbled, did people in the west immediately stop loathing those from Russia and all of a sudden accept them into their own countries? Nationalism binds people together to support the wishes of their country's foreign policies through symbolism and ideology, and in capitalist countries, the economy is of special concern. What we are witnessing now is the expansion of capitalist relations where there are laws supporting capitalist modes of production and enforce them upon other host nations as a newer form of imperialism.

At a much more localized level, everyday experiences are channelled by even more discreet symbolism; where social positioning is accomplished through coding. For example, we can look at the architectural vocabulary that is the political landscape of the modern city; rich and poor areas may be in very
close proximity to one another, yet very divided. It is often easy to stumble into many poor neighbourhoods, but richer areas are commonly much more difficult to access, although they may be located mere blocks away from a poor district. Unless people know their way around, the hidden structure or planned design of the city makes it very difficult for those unfamiliar to find their way into rich neighbourhoods of an inner-city, as vital roads are designed to go around, over, or under these neighbourhoods.

We can also unearth the competitive nature of the downtown core of a city where large corporate buildings compete for attention. This is evident in the sheer height of many of these buildings, but also in some architectural designs. For instance, the Royal Bank has become the wealthiest bank in Canada and its head office is located in downtown Toronto, Ontario, where some of the tallest buildings in the world are built. The Royal Bank building is newer than most of the structures in that area, so rather than compete with height, it is a large, solid square with a huge atrium in the middle. What makes this structure unique is that it is all gold and mostly glass; it glistens with light and simply wreaks of wealth upon sight. Architecturally speaking, it is nicer than something made of all concrete, but the design is a very ardent-looking configuration that represents great wealth and power. There are codified changes that take place in other forms of the landscape, where the proportions are embodied in who and where you are. Political monuments or even the location of universities reveal a physical hierarchy and forms of secularized power. These too are often situated in the downtown area, but you are routed around them as they signify powerful meanings of
importance and stability. One must physically move around them almost as if to be awe-struck.

Another way symbolic control can be understood is through the appropriation of discourse where an extreme example would be the loss of an entire cultural language. Previously, I discussed some of the changes that occurred during the 1960’s, such as with the shift from the old middle class to the new middle class, where the blurring of family-members’ roles ensued. There were many other social upheavals and transformations underway such as the demands for equal rights for groups such as women and the black community, as well as a call to end class oppression and promote freedom of self-expression. A common discourse arose linking many of these movements, and it was reflected in the form of emancipatory and revolutionary rock music of the time. Popular music had not yet become a large-scale industry generating huge profits as it does now; however, much of this same music written in the context of escaping existing state practices and corporate control is now being bought to sell marketable commodities such as airline tickets, shoes, tampons or mutual funds. The discourse identified in those songs have ultimately been reversed or appropriated in order to serve the interests of consumerism, which is partly what those movements sought to repel. For example, much of Bob Dylan’s folk music and poetry were written to bring about awareness of how/what he perceived to be societal controls. He wrote ‘Subterranean Homesick Blues’ describing how people ought to act in society:

...Don’t steal, don’t lift, twenty years of schoolin’ and they put you on the day shift; Look out kid they keep it all hid, better jump down the manhole, light
yourself a candle; don’t wear sandals try to avoid scandals, don’t wanna be a bum, you better chew gum; the pump don’t work ‘cause the vandals took the handles (Dylan, 1965).

This song was used in the 1990’s to sell automobiles. Another example of how past liberating songs become appropriated for commercial interests can be found in Buffalo Springfield’s ‘For What It’s Worth’:

...There’s battle lines being drawn, nobody’s right if everybody’s wrong. Young people speaking their minds, getting so much resistance from behind, I think it’s time we stop, hey, what’s that sound, everybody look what’s going down (Stephen Stills, 1967).

Some thirty-years later, we hear this same anthem used to sell life insurance. Many of these songs are no longer owned by the original artists, and the ones that sold-out have essentially succumbed to the domineering effects of a discourse that promotes self-accumulation. Past buzz-words of peace and love are replaced by overtones of business and commodity-consumption. These are merely a few examples of how society is encoded, but I would now like to return the focus on education.

The Aims of the Ontario Education System

We can begin to see just how coded our society really is and how dominant discourses curb people’s experiences, yet my central focus is concerned with pedagogical codes in education and their implications as to why children learn differently. In order to create any sort of meaning, people categorize events and facts about the world into kinds and species so that what we learn is socially constructed, and thus culturally determined. Humans categorize messages in order to make meaning, and classify
knowledge by arranging them into groups that are distant and distinct from each other.

In chapter three I discussed the effect of symbolic meaning that is evident in our society as a means of creating and controlling experience. In this sense, code is really created and re-created by society; its purpose is to link everyday knowledge to that which is taught in the classroom. They (code) are the key principles that govern production, transmission and reproduction of systems of messages that underlie curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation. Code regulates the selection and combination of cultural elements into permitted arrangements. Furthermore, the structuration of school knowledge relates such cultural forms to the division of labour in order to give access to different modes of understanding and meaning.

Within the mandate of the Ontario education system, code can be applied to the message systems curriculum and pedagogy in order to uncover the regulatory principles that control the selection of curricular and linguistic elements. The Ontario government advertizes a standardized mandate that is very effective because it does not resemble any code. For example, within the Education Quality and Accountability Office (EQAO, 2000), under the heading "Daily Plan", teachers are instructed to:

Tell them [the students] that in answering multiple-choice questions, all they have to do is use their pencil to fill in a small circle beside the right answer. You should demonstrate by showing them the format of a multiple-choice question....Share with the students tips for answering multiple-choice questions and tell them you will leave the tips posted on a chart for the class to refer to when answering the questions (EQAO, 2000:12).

These are certainly very clear directions, but what knowledge are
the students learning? Perhaps there is a hidden agenda here to justify the continuation of cut-backs intended to keep lower-class schools subdued (effectively keeping those children in a lower social class through coding of valid knowledge). As a result, social class reproduction appears to be non-discriminatory, although the effects show much difference. Here, a discourse is incited telling the population what the social policy is by naming what the government wants accomplished, such as labelling children with decisive markers like 'excellence' or 'failure'. To me, this is the latest process of privatization and a coded way of stratifying society.

It appears as though standardized reading curricula and their strict schedules are not being fulfilled; could this be a result of decreased teacher autonomy and performance models? Such methods are breeding poor performance, and their mandates have been forsaken because time and curriculum are much too strictly set in this era of cut-backs, larger classrooms and teacher dissatisfaction. In fact, more than four thousand Ontario teachers resigned in the past year. Now, a large proportion of this estimation are retiree's, but in my own experiences while talking with my peers, all teachers, much of the discourse from many young teachers is that they want to get out. The attitudes of many of these peers are striking. They are frustrated and exhausted, and want to move on to another profession while they are young enough to pursue other careers.

The (EQAO) in Ontario is easily accessible on the Internet. The EQAO literature reflects the reality of official code construction as they provide the types of assessments similar to
the one just administered to the grade tens. It is especially significant that the EQAO is designed to monitor and evaluate not only children, but the system as a whole. It administers performance-based tests that are being applied to performance-based recontextualizations with no real objectivity as it takes for granted that the system is going to operate according to only one pre-set code.

The government wants to implement a system that is based on maintaining the structures that are in place although these structures themselves are based on producing students that are trained and indoctrinated into the social and economic codes that dominate; such as with the 'political correct' components that we see in the curriculum. The EQAO (November, 2000) reads that communicating the plan provides clarity and demonstrates a commitment to create the climate for successful implementation. From a sociolinguistic standpoint of code production, this has several hidden meanings. It appears that the Ontario government is attempting to be open to new ideas, and that it wants to create a discourse between parents, teachers, and the official institutions; but, is it merely trying to entrench its system as accepted realities? This new curriculum is an attempt to create conditions that will lead to the implementation of its 'plans' as smoothly as possible. These plans are based on standardized testing, which effectively treats children like a measurable or quantifiable commodity.

It is evident to me that the government is attempting to create a homogenous educational community so that there is no dissent and no change, and where group loyalties are shared.
Statements like, "Our objective in communicating these plans are to promote synergy, share exemplary practices, and improve the achievement of all of our students" (EQAO, November, 7, 2000) is in effect telling us that the Ontario government has decided to let us know what they it has in fact been planning for years, because it now feels it is time to impose its structures upon society in such a way that has real symbolic relevance, and which has a definite label. There is certainly a 'don't say we didn't warn you' overtone here. It is a way to say standardization is a process that has been underway for some time, and here is the next step. The government calls it 'improvement planning' so that the population will not argue against it, but according to whose criteria is this 'improvement'? Is it improvement in teaching practices and conditions, or is it the enhancement of teacher autonomy? It is quite the opposite. The mandate states an 'improvement' because this is a word with positive connotations, but the improvement is more along the lines of improving the conditions that allow for the further control of the classroom by the state.

Let us look at these improvements in light of the present domineering discourse. There are systems of assessment in reading, writing and mathematics for grade three and six. The EQAO has asked that the results of their assessments be used to create school action plans to further monitor students' performance. The performance model seems to be taken to the limit so that eventually the system will not need teachers at all, only people who can monitor progress according to a strict set of guidelines. I have at least three close friends all of whom obtained various Bachelor
of Arts degrees and have acquired high-school teaching jobs without any training whatsoever. Teaching used to be an honourable profession, but now teachers are not even enabled to evaluate their students for themselves, as teachers themselves are being evaluated as much as the students. The discourse is to find work in the 'real world' that fits the moulding of a stratified class society, and this is why children learn differently: the emphasis is on moulding students to fit into a cookie-cutter society rather than on nurturing skills that enable them to think for themselves.

Globalized Code Production in Education

Performance is now being gauged at both the national and international level. The era of globalization is upon us, and the codes constructed to support capitalist relations are permeating every level of society. Universal standards are based on performance in areas that contribute to further globalization, such as with Information Technology. It is very significant that the developments taking place are being extended into the international arena. The 'International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement' seems to be something along the lines of a World Bank for education. For example, entire countries are gauged according to their performance in relation to other countries, and those who are substandard will have to compete to keep up with the others. The first measurement is based on achievement in computers, so my initial reaction is to ponder how all the poor countries, or even the lower-class schools where computers are not afforded, will fare. These schools will undoubtedly perform poorly in testing, and it has nothing to do
with competence or aptitude; it is merely a matter of resources. Those who have the least amount of time and resources will do the worst on these tests. Information technology and computers are the subjects to be tested, and it follows that those with no or very little access will be more likely to fail.

While researching the Ontario memorandum on the Internet, I came across a new program called ‘SchoolNet’, which is a Canadian Government initiative designed to create standardized search engines, databases and information technology resources for all Canadian schools. There is also a monthly on-line newsletter that has been deemed ‘a school newspaper for all of Canada’. It is heralded as a great achievement; students from all over the country are going to have the information technology skills necessary to make it in tomorrow’s information and knowledge-based economies. Upon closer inspection of this multi-million dollar initiative (one of the few to survive in education at the federal level), I found that there was a great deal of corporate sponsorship. Communications, computer, and other technology-based companies have all contributed the money necessary for this project. Nobody can predict what children will finally do, or become; but I am suggesting that one of the explanations behind corporate sponsorship in schools is that it will create a system where the children are trained at a very young age for the workplace, and these companies can spend the money now to avoid the time and money on training people in the future. I found this to be an extremely graphic example of code construction whereby the schools are now being recontextualized to serve corporate interests. Now, we live in a complex world with many competing code constructions, but
corporate interests are powerfully supported, and these processes are not hidden or covert. The costs are justified by the cooperation with these corporations, and the discourse is that they are providing the necessary skills for tomorrow’s work-force. Is it any wonder that subjects that do not fit the corporate mould, such as music or physical education, have been the first to be dropped from most Canadian curricula?

The existing economy is not just about capitalism, it is about global capitalism maintained by multinational corporations. This is the dominant ideology that is being supported today in schools, and the codes seem to be changing towards that direction. There is no central state on the global level, only corporations and global police forces such as the IMF and World Bank. As such, the schools are serving those interests as they promote Information Technology skills alongside the standards of reading and writing. For example, the EQAO mandate brags that Ontario is participating in the Program for International Student Assessment sponsored by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). This is a clear message that the formation of a global economy is being perpetuated by official involvement in education, but what does international economics have to do with elementary school classrooms?

Here is an example of how a dominant discourse can at times be overwhelming. Recently a picture in one of the national newspapers grabbed my attention showing a group of school children demonstrating on the street with placards. Initially, I thought they may be seeking better conditions, more funding or smaller classrooms. However, these were young students from affluent
private schools in Toronto, Ontario, who were actually demonstrating in favour of the processes of globalization that demonstrators in Seattle, Oregon and other G7 summit sites were protesting against (representing alternative discourses). These children had set up an organization that is aligned with the mandate of the OECD. How were these children’s opinions formed? Were they aware of the reality for which they were protesting in favour; or did they not realize they were supporting realities such as child labour and the exploitation of Third-World markets? Obviously, at such a young age, they organized themselves within their classrooms at school. Here, private schools make it possible for these children from Toronto’s economic elite to be isolated from the rest of the province’s children thus creating an intellectual environment that supports and reinforces the systems that allowed for their parent(s) to profit from creating debts in small, poor countries.

A sub-category within the EQAO is the Education Quality Indicators Program (EQUIP) that also reveals some very interesting indicators among its list of significant educational markers, such as ‘socio-economic status’ of students, ‘student mobility’, and ‘intra-board financial indicators’ that are all areas of concern for school quality. These indicators allow for the schools to be stratified with standard devices for measurement that are designed to rate one aspect against another, and as such all standards are created so that stratification can be justified and perpetuated. The most significant section is the rating schedule for the ‘Teaching and Learning Environment’. Teachers are effectively graded on how closely they can adhere to the set curriculum, and
any divergence is viewed as a weakness on the scale. Measurements include 'time distribution of selected subjects', the 'use of selected methods or strategies of instruction', 'use of selected assessment materials and methods', 'use of computers in selected subjects' and even 'availability at home for school work' as well as 'teacher professional development, planning and collaboration'. All these indicators are based on time allotment, evaluation, rigidly constructed curricula and other such standards. Perhaps this is partly why anybody with a Bachelor of Arts degree can fit the moulding of this 'ideal-type' of teacher in the Weberian sense (1992:71).

The question as to whether students have access to computers at home is clearly an economic distinction, but the fact that it is taken into consideration to measure teaching effectiveness means that those who are disadvantaged economically are now officially seen as being ineffective learners. It is also an indicator that standardization is taking place on a global level, and those in power (at the corporate, global scale) are to be the ones determining what is and what is not important to learn (much like how Information Technology is more valued than music). The list of countries that took part in the Third Annual Mathematics and Science Study is basically a list of the most privileged countries in the world. It is one thing to believe you are fortunate to be a citizen of a richer country, but it is quite another to discover at whose expense this is so. Countries such as Nigeria or Brazil are two of the many countries missing, although both their resources are rigorously extracted for export by the domineering economic powers with very little reciprocity in return. What is
being accomplished? Now, the daily organization of activities, or the learning in schools is complex and diversified from one school to another, but these developments resemble something similar to the G7 in education; the construction of an educational elite where the standards of the global economy will be established and supported, while the children from the excluded countries can sit in their work-houses and learn how to avoid getting their hands caught in the machinery.

In the grade three and six newsletter published by the EQAO (Volume 5: pp.2), we find another significant indicator between rich and poor schools. The 1999-2000 assessments for these grades permitted students to use manipulatives to complete mathematics tasks and included questions that required the use of specific mathematics manipulatives. These manipulatives are physical resources that cost money (in fact, one of the manipulatives is money!). The advice that the Assessment Board gives to schools that cannot afford to have a manipulative for every child tells them that it is important that manipulatives be available to students while they are completing the assessment. A number of curriculum expectations require the use of these manipulatives to demonstrate student learning. If a classroom does not have enough materials to share among all students, teachers may wish to pool resources from other primary and junior classrooms for the duration of the assessment period. The fact that this final instruction is included demonstrates that the resource conditions between classrooms are going to be different. If a classroom has none of these resources and has to borrow them, then what do students do the other days of the year? Some classrooms obviously have access
to these for every student, and some obviously do not. Furthermore, it is clearly stated that these tools are going to provide one of the central assessments of the students. However, if students at one school have a manipulative in their desks every day, and students at another school get to use one only when the test is given, it is evident that the former students will perform much better than the latter.

This type of assessment reflects advantages or disadvantages, depending on the school. Imagine a teacher having to round up supplies from other classrooms in order to be sure there are enough for the one assessment day. What about the other days? It seems that these unequal resource conditions could easily be interpreted as a way that class codes are transmitted through systems and structures of education. People come to accept these unequal realities as the way it is rather than revolt against inequality. Why else would they make something that is so obviously unequal be a key indicator of assessment? It is also significant that money is one of the tools used to measure how well a student performs in mathematics.

To think that these standard accountability measurements actually dictate that a child in grade three be comfortable with money is excessive, but it is a graphic illustration of the processes that are underway. These symbols are evidently becoming more and more concrete, showing the symbolic encoding of capitalism at its very worst. The codes that are being transmitted to students are becoming more aligned with nationalism, economic realities and social class stratification since the ORF gained more control over the PRF.
CHAPTER SIX

Conclusion and Future Work

We can see that pedagogical discourses are found in various social relationships throughout society, and how some discourses are re-created to become dominant, supporting existing power structures. If the regulative discourse is to change in favour of alternative emancipatory ones, then it is necessary to locate where and how symbolic control manifests itself in actual settings. I have argued that the phenomenon that children learn differently is a result of the intersection of so many cultural factors that inhibit or curb the possibilities of eclectic ideas and experiences. Culture is produced and reproduced in our society, and it is the pedagogical discourses at various levels that allow for this to occur. A stratified, class society is worked at through the process of coding in order to serve the interests of the state and the economic elite. Chomsky (1998:14) describes how all children possess the same capacity to learn, so it is this worked-at structuration of experience that inhibits alternative instructional discourses to develop equal educational opportunities.

To demonstrate the processes that are involved in code theory and in the idea that locations such as class, race and gender inequalities are reproduced through official pedagogic recontextualizations, I would like to discuss the most recent developments in our society by citing the educational system that is in place in Ontario to observe where it is headed. The intersection of apparently unrelated fields into the official pedagogic code constitutes the discourse and pedagogical practices
in the shared sphere of the political, economic and social. What follows then, is a cross-section of the structure.

In order to secure votes, the government of Ontario has proclaimed a 'tough love' approach to young offenders, and this is fuelled by a common discourse; the media's construction of the epidemic of youth crime is a typical example of this discourse. Tales of youth crimes undoubtedly sell newspapers, and politicians take advantage of reactionary news stories in order to obtain support by professing a hard-line stance on juvenile delinquency. Maude Barlow and Heather-Jane Robertson (1994) contend that if there is one subject which 'experts' agree, it is that prevention and early intervention when children are at risk is the most effective strategy available to us. Children's cognitive powers are greatest in the first years of their lives, and patterns of emotional and physical health are established at that time so that once established, negative patterns are difficult to reverse; whereas a nurtured, strong mind and body have great resilience (Barlow, 1994:250). However, in Canada, policies are geared more towards profit than therapeutic rehabilitations, as Barlow explains:

We have strange priorities. It costs taxpayers nearly $70,000 to keep one young offender in secure custody for one year. There are few young offenders whose lives would not have been put on a different course if a fraction of this money had been invested in prevention; yet the public outcry is centred not on early intervention, but on tough measures for young offenders. We champion harsher criminal-code amendments for those who abuse children, but in many jurisdictions, young children can wait more than two years before they are professionally assessed -let alone treated- for emotional problems (1994:250).

Privatized 'boot-camps' such as "Project Turnaround" in Barrie,
Ontario, have been established, and these institutions are run for profit. Those who own them have competed for lucrative government contracts, and these private interests present a business plan that outlines the savings they can make in comparison to government-run institutions. Furthermore, Project Turnaround is not a Canadian-run institute, but owned and operated by American interests, and is currently operating at full capacity. This shows us that profit is of central importance to the state, not the people who are in them for rehabilitation.

At the other end of this same spectrum, the provincial government cuts spending on schools in Ontario. Once school programs are reduced, extra-curricular activities get sacrificed and ultimately schools are closed. In a document released by the Council of Ministers of Education, Canada, 1996, the Ontario government reports reduced funding to school boards and this trend should continue. The report states:

Transfer payments to school boards have been reduced by $400M or 9 per cent for the 1996-97 school year. ...Accordingly, the General Legislative Grant allocation will be $4,044M, as compared to $4,444M for 1995-96 (Council of Ministers of Education, Canada, 1996:21).

As a result of lesser funding, classroom sizes increase dramatically and performance models of pedagogic practice are the only option made available within the dominance of the ORF. As we know, the embedding of instructional discourse within regulative discourse means that power structures are primary to real educational development in schools. According to Ronald Samuda (1995), children of privilege are often rewarded with high marks through their alignment with the favoured forms of pedagogized
cultural knowledge, whereas students from minority groups suffering economic and political oppression find that these codes are carried over into the classroom. Samuda explains:

In the same way that exposure of certain Europeans to a variety of languages predisposes them to learn several languages with facility, so the sociocultural environment and the home prepare the child in a special way to succeed at school....Many minority youngsters with relatively low scores function well in their familiar cultural setting, the fact remains that achievement in the school will be measured in terms of majority norms (1995:300).

If there is such an increase in youth crime, maybe these conditions of negligence begin a path towards juvenile delinquency where worst cases, and head-line news, are perpetuated. This hypothesis certainly requires empirical evidence to back it up, yet we find that the newer institutionalized boot-camps, with totalitarian-type structures of military discipline that focus on strict punishment rather than valuable therapy, become the location of ORF pedagogy. Children are literally sold by the government to these for-profit learning institutions, where they are indoctrinated into the structures of authority through legitimized methods that may otherwise be considered child abuse.

These are dire conditions indeed, but if those are the types of rehabilitations that are accepted, then it must be terribly difficult for teachers who seek to transcend the unequal codes produced in our society through educational empowerment. Yet there is some hope, and it comes from the PRF. This field has the ability to oppose the ORF and its structures of inequality. Let us revisit a single description from Bernstein’s code theory that is of utmost importance to the present study:

We can distinguish between an official recontextual-
izing field (ORF) created and dominated by the state and its selected agents and ministries, and a pedagogic recontextualizing field (PRF). The latter consists of pedagogues in schools and colleges, and departments of education, specialized journals, private research foundations. If the PRF can have an effect on pedagogic discourse independently of the ORF, then there is both some autonomy and struggle over pedagogic discourse and its practices. But if there is only the ORF, then there is no autonomy. Today, the state is attempting to weaken the PRF through its ORF, and thus attempting to reduce relative autonomy over the construction of pedagogic discourse and over its social context (1995:48).

This thesis has been designed as an expression of the PRF to build upon this struggle and contribute to the tension that must exist between the PRF and the ORF. I feel that the explanations are in alignment with the various strikes and work-to-rule policies that have been undertaken by other practising members of the PRF, although not overtly realized in this sense. Nevertheless, these are not mere labour disputes, but are protests aimed at the systems of negligence that are imposed upon the school boards by the state.

Striking and unhappy teachers endure what Manicom effectively describes as the intersection of economic, social and political conditions in the classroom. This is what constitutes the teachers' work processes, and as such they desire the autonomy to deal with the conditions with which they are faced. But the ORF effectively renders them powerless against these structures through systemized and rigidly structured official curriculum. Large classroom sizes caused by funding cuts demand that time be used to maximum efficiency; so economics, rather than therapeutic considerations, are maintained as primary. The result is that the PRF is reduced to almost figure-head status, and the representative managers of the bosses of education are asked to carry out the
dirty work that is demanded by the ORF. Clearly, no one is happy except the politicians who treat society as if it were any for-profit corporation. The school system is thus a metaphoric factory designed to manufacture individuals who might prove valuable commodities within the existing political economy. This is the dominant mode of production known as multinational industrial state-capitalism.

Consider the process of specialization that is represented by the performance modes of pedagogic practice that are imposed upon students today. There are several critical positions regarding whose interests the schools operate under, such as the economic determinist view, that argues when graduating from secondary school, students are expected to choose an educational field of interest that will prepare them for the future in the job market. Other views, such as the postmodern perspective, claim that this is too narrow since people themselves are in a position to make up their own minds and control their own actions to resist preordained societal roles. James Scheurich (1997) points out that we must look at the power of resistance, whereby those with less power in society are not simply trapped within the totalization of an asymmetrical power relation; for "The less powerful find innumerable, creative, even powerful ways to resist inequality" (Scheurich, 1997:71).

The processes of opposition that have recently been undertaken need to be extended and continued, and the best way for this to be realized is through a heightened awareness on the part of educators in terms of their autonomy and power within the system of education: to allow for alternative, instructional discourses to
evolve. The ultimate advantages of competence-based fields of discourse need to be understood, and the central role that the PRF plays in limiting the power of the ORF. Teachers know the processes and conditions that limit their ability to enact positive change in the lives of their students; yet sometimes it takes research outside of the profession, those who may have a 'fresh look' and different perspective, to provide a better understanding of alternative styles of pedagogy to counter the powers of the ORF. What code theory offers us is a methodology through which we can understand our roles within the construction of codes.

In order to disseminate a therapeutic discourse, perhaps Bernstein and others should be central texts for present-day teachers college; for, the Bachelor of Education program offers a unique condition in which future educators function in the role of their students' experiences. Those who teach teachers are playing a key role in constructing the perspective that will be found within the classroom. Many teachers (including a large number of those interviewed by Manicom) state that their careers constitute a rapid process of disillusionment and shattered ideals. These teachers need to be aware (or re-socialized into) the conditions that they are entering and the real challenges they are undertaking. In a system where dominant, regulative discourses are held as primary over instructional discourse, a thorough understanding of their role and their power as educators must be achieved. While this might scare off potential teachers, those who are up to the challenge will enter the classroom with a full awareness of the struggle in which they are involved, and slowly pedagogic discourse at all levels may change.
This awareness leads to empowerment. By knowing and understanding how the system that is in place operates in reproducing class structures, teachers will know what they are up against. There is a need to educate educators in a way that is aligned with the interests of the PRF and its powers of resistance in the face of official pedagogic recontextualization. This comes from within the PRF itself, as it is the education of educators.

Teachers will then be afforded the know-how to try and exercise autonomy whenever they can. Although some teachers are fully aware of such problematics, others will be able to approach standardized curriculum critically, and realize when certain codes need to be challenged. Furthermore, teachers may develop an understanding of the need to think about what they are doing, and act and react to changes rather than exercising the norms that are presented and then complaining about it later when it is too late.

Bernstein writes about the relationship between official rules and pedagogic discourse, noting that they can be understood as a site of contention or as a site of compliance by educators:

In the case of the formulation of pedagogic practice, rules refer to the set of controls which are considered to give this practice its communicative form and context. The rules become resources for appropriation in the construction of specific pedagogic practices/communications and contexts. They also become sources of challenge and defense. How the rules are realized as resources is a function of classification and framing produced by the power and control relations of these groups dominating the specific realizations (Bernstein, 1996:192).

The symbolic codes of control under which the teachers function are transmitted to students only if they are reproduced.

As educators, there is no doubt a need to develop codes that
are aligned with competence modes. While it has been discussed in chapter two that the previous liberal movement has been stifled, it must be renewed. The alternative and student schools in Toronto, Ontario need to be empirically researched and examined for their effectiveness. It is here that work is being actively undertaken to challenge the existing structures. These schools concentrate on the inherent abilities of all students rather than on distinguishing them from one another according to their performance in standardized curriculum. The students are encouraged to come up with their own topics of interest, and these are explored for their overall relevance to the students’ situation rather than compartmentalized within a discipline and according to performance systems of evaluation. The teachers here are producers of authentic codes rather than reproducers of official ideology. Indeed, these schools cost more to run, but that is more likely due to the fact that they are not mass-produced, homogenous institutions. They are the opposite of boot-camp, and they have demonstrated an ability to empower people that is not found in schools aligned with the status-quo.

Conversely, privatized schools to a large extent expunge the PRF in favour of the ORF that is controlled by those who run them. These, like boot-camps, are operated for profit; but unlike boot-camps they are regularly designed to serve the children of the economic elite. As such, their hidden structures are in conformity with the dominant ideology of capitalist society. It is no coincidence that these children are given the uniforms of patriarchy and elitism. The boys are told that they must wear suits, while the girls are given kilts that distinguish them as
objects based on gender status. Nice clothes cost money, but the real cost cannot be quantified by numbers. There is a strong code here as the clothes themselves are symbols of control and emblems of the unequal conditions that exist, and which they will continue to uphold, in our political economy.

What is also found at these schools is a system of hierarchy that distinguishes some students as dominant over others. Older boys are given governance over younger students, and authority is dispersed according to performance correspondent to certain categories. Those who conform in these microcosms are rewarded with power; those who do not have the threat of expulsion looming overhead. It is not uncommon to find that a large percentage of the teachers in private schools are themselves products of the schools in which they teach, or from private schools with similar structures.

Bernstein provides us with the paradoxes that are inherent to the pedagogic device and its potential symbols of control. These need to be cited in order to understand the possibilities for challenge and change. The official pedagogic device tries to control what is accepted as 'knowledge', thus becoming the dominant discourse. This means that a distinction is being created between the knowable and the unknowable. As mentioned, by setting up rules, alternatives that do not fall within those parameters are also determined. It is the distinction between the sacred and profane that allows us to explore these alternatives. Bernstein explains:

Although the device is there to control the unthink-able, in the process of controlling the unthinkable it makes the possibility of the unthinkable
available. Therefore, internal to the device is its own paradox: it cannot control what it has been set up to control (1996:52).

The other paradox is an external one. By setting up a hierarchy, targets are provided, and since there is an ORF, the PRF will always exist and challenge it. Because control is enforced, opposition is unavoidable:

...The distribution of power which speaks through the device creates potential sites of challenge and opposition. The device creates in its realizations an arena of struggle between different groups for the appropriation of the device, because whoever appropriates the device has the power to regulate consciousness. Whoever appropriates the device, appropriates a crucial site for symbolic control. The device itself creates an arena of struggle for those who are to appropriate it (Bernstein, 1996:52).

This struck me in the same way that Marx and Engels ideas on the paradoxes and contradictions inherent in capitalism did. If the system is allowed to run its course, the inequalities that are produced will eventually create conditions in which there is no choice but to instigate a worker’s revolution.

Perhaps then, there is a need for a teacher’s revolution, and there is evidence that this is already underway. We see daily the effects of the ORF, and we are witnessing large-scale protests against its structures more and more. Work-to-rule campaigns and strikes are increasing in numbers, and parents are even demonstrating solidarity with the teachers’ cause. The next election in Ontario (it always seems to be the next election) will be the forum through which these problems can be addressed. It is getting to the point where the accumulation of conditions is becoming unbearable, and things may be on the verge of breaking. What needs to be established is an understanding of code theory so
that these actions can be understood as demonstrations of the fundamental paradoxes that are being illustrated.

Bernstein asserts that there is an inherent grammar to the educational field of discourse that is in place, and that this grammar on the one hand is bent on control, but on the other hand indirectly encourages opposition:

I have tried to expose the intrinsic grammar of the device, and to expose what might be called the hidden voice of the pedagogic discourse. I have suggested that the grammar of the device regulates what it processes; a grammar whose realization codes order and position and yet contains the potential for their own transformation (1996:52)

Although cultural change is extremely slow-moving, there is hope for educators and students alike, as the device that regulates their school-work processes leaves itself open for criticism and contradiction.

I have demonstrated that locations such as class, race and gender are not fixed constructions or separate entities, but are in fact processes that we all take part in everyday. We still have a role in determining our own situations. Self-determination is the essence of competence-based forms of education, and it is also the only way that the PRF can be rescued from the structural constraints set up by the ORF. It is important that teachers work towards enhancing their autonomy so that this, rather than the ability to conform to spoon-fed ideologies and curriculum developments, will be the measurement of a good teacher.

The ultimate value of code theory, therefore, is its demonstration that control can be determined over the codes, and in the long run, the consciousness that emerge in schools. By knowing how codes of inequality are constructed and transmitted, we can
begin to construct and transmit codes that defy official ideology and the status-quo. As mentioned, no one knows more than teachers what it takes to get through to students; so who better than they to instill concepts such as equality and inherent worth in students? Only then, will all children be afforded equal opportunities based on merit, and the only difference in learning will not be based on class or race or gender, but on aptitude.
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