The Problem of Recontextualisation/意味と関係の編み直しの問題

Paul Dowling

Institute of Education, University of London

In October 1982 The Education Secretary, Sir Keith Joseph, insisted on a change of name for the UK Social Science Research Council (SSRC) if it was to continue in operation. The SSRC became the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC), pointedly dropping the word 'science', which Joseph believed did not properly apply to the 'social sciences' (Halsey, 2004; p. 137). This, of course, did nothing to inhibit the scientific aspirations of social, and particularly educational researchers, many of whom continue to work within what is widely taken to be scientific method.[1] This approach generally presumes the existence of causal structures that are accessible to our enquiries via the separation of experimental and control variables. Thus educational research includes a very substantial body of experimental work, randomised controlled trials (RCTs) and, where these are not viable, surveys. Even qualitative educational research often seems to regard this approach as an ideal, exhibiting inappropriate concern for representativeness in sampling strategies and pre-determined structure in data collection, and underplaying the labour of analysis, not infrequently failing to advance beyond empirical categories. In other words, educational research seems all too often to fail to recognise that qualitative research at its best entails an honest and transparent transaction between researcher and empirical setting in an interpretive context. Qualitative research does or should not seek to discover in any absolute sense what it presumes was there prior to its endeavours, but rather to construct something that certainly was not. Its interpretations should suggest new ways of making sense of the world and, in doing so, provide inspiration for the interrogation of existing practice and possibilities for its future; essentially, they do not *tell* us anything! At their best, educational researchers are artists or perhaps engineers and not technicians, putting to their audiences only the simple suggestion, suppose you look at it like this, leaving the reader to draw their conclusions in respect of their own context. What motivates the comportment of this kind of researcher is the problem that has been bothering me for a quarter of a century: the problem of recontextualisation.

意味と関係の編み直しの問題

Suppose you look at it like this.

Linguistic translation is a very obvious kind of recontextualisation. It entails, of course, not simply the replacement of one signifier with another, leaving the signified unaffected. Rather the meanings and connections of a sign within one linguistic system are re-woven into another. This is the sense of the formulation of 'recontextualisation' in Japanese by 佐藤学 (Sato Manabu), of 東京大学 (Tokyo University),『意味と関係の編み直し』 (*imi to kankei*

[1] It is, of course, not entirely clear that science is always science in these terms. See, for example, Collins & Pinch (1998), Knorr Cetina (1999), Latour & Woolgar (1979), Turnbull (2000).

no aminaoshi), that is used in the title of this paper.[2] 鳶島修治 (Tobishima Shuji) uses 再文脈化 (*saibunmyakoka*), which perhaps is a more obvious term, having the meaning, the re-doing of context—recontextualisation—but, focusing more on the signifier than the specific signified, it lacks the sense of transformation that is crucial to the way in which I want to use the term here and to its use by Basil Bernstein, whom 鳶島修治 cites[3] and who was the original inspiration for my own, now very different use. English connotations have to be developed; in Japanese, they can often be expressed by the characters that one chooses, without further elaboration; Japanese 漢字 (*kanji*—Chinese characters) often seem so much more sententious.

There is a sense, of course, in which every action entails 意味と関係の編み直し, because all contexts are unique and non-repeatable. It may be relaxing, from time to time, to play the *flaneur* in such anarchy, but, sooner or later, we should go to work and build some structure (though not so much that we are immobilised by it). I shall return, briefly, to the problem of translation. Let's start with the word used for the very rough equivalent of a professional football club in 相撲 (*sumo*) in Japanese, the word is 部屋 (*heya*, which is also the word for 'room'). The equivalence with the football club is very approximate, there being quite fundamental differences, not least that the 力士 (*rikishi*, wrestlers) are expected to remain with their 部屋, where they live and train, throughout their whole careers. The conventional translation into English of the word 部屋 is 'stable', the back translation of which (using the translator on my Macintosh computer) is 馬小屋 (*umagoya*), which is the word for a small house where a horse is kept. In English, the word stable can mean that, but it can also mean a larger establishment housing racehorses and, indeed, an organisation providing the same background or training for its members or a group trained by the same person or management (from the dictionary on my Macintosh computer). In Japanese, racehorses would be housed in a 厩舎 (*kyuusha*), which my computer translates not as simply 'stable', but 'racing stable'. I have attempted to summarise these meanings in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Stable translations

馬小屋	厩舎	部屋
room for a horse	accommodation for racehorses	training establishment for humans
stable		

Essentially, the single noun, stable, in English covers three terms in Japanese. There are, however, two further wrinkles. Whilst a particular 相撲部屋 (*sumobeya* or *sumo* 'stable') would be officially described and would self-identify as a 部屋—for example, 佐渡ヶ嶽部屋 (*sadagotakebeya*)—it is unlikely that any organisation or establishment managing or training human beings would describe itself as a 'stable', though this is occasionally done, informally, by a commentator; again, my computer dictionary gives these examples, 'the player comes from the same stable as Agassi' and 'the agent looked after a big stable of European golfers'. Furthermore, the term 部屋 is used in the sense indicated in Figure 1 only in respect of 相撲 and not, for example, for tennis or golf training establishments or organisations, which, in English, could be pointed at using the word 'stable'. I suggest, then, that the overall impact of the 意味と関係の編み直し of 部屋 as 'stable' entails a dehumanising, in the English

[2] See http://ja.wikipedia.org/wiki/佐藤学.
[3] See www.sed.tohoku.ac.jp/library/nenpo/contents/58-1/58-1-04.pdf.

context, of Japanese 力士 and, by extension, a diminishing of Japanese culture because of the dominant association of the term stable with animals.

By contrast with the will, in English, to translate that is apparent in the use of the term stable rather than retaining the use of 部屋, realised in *romaji* as *heya*, Japanese generally renders foreign words as カタカナ (*katakana*)[4] rather than as 漢字 (*kanji*)[5] translations. Thus the computer that I am using is パソコン (*pasokon*, from personal computer, despite the fact that it is actually a Macintosh and not a PC) and, in July in Yokohama, I have a クーラー (*kuuraa*, from cooler) to keep me comfortable. What is crucial, here, is that the work of Japanese 意味と関係の編み直し here focuses on the signifier, whilst the work of the English translation attends to the signified. The effect of the former action is to filter out connotations other than—by the use of カタカナ rather than 漢字—that of the mildly exotic; the effect of translation is to install new connotations from the translating culture. Japanese カタカナの意味と関係の編み直し imports resources from foreign cultures, but then makes them its own, whilst still marking them as foreign; the English translation objectifies and so transforms foreign cultural elements. Both moves effect cultural transformations—a transformation or recontextualisation of practice—and, in doing so, sustain a social opposition—an opposition between sets of relations between individuals and groups, in this case, between Japanese speaking and English speaking societies, constituted here as respective alliances: the action of recontextualisation/意味と関係の編み直し has a social not simply a cultural base and both are established and sustained by action. To put this another way, the sociocultural chronotope is constituted by strategic, autopoietic (self-making) action directed at the formation, maintenance and destabilising of alliances and oppositions, the visibility of which (in terms of regularities of practice) is emergent upon the totality of such action, which always involves 意味と関係の編み直し in one form or another.

Interaction and pedagogy

The problem of recontextualisation, then, is not limited to movement between languages, but to any action that views one practice from the perspective of another. I want to explore some of the implications of this problem and, alongside this, to introduce some conceptual apparatus in the form of relational schemas from my organisational language, social activity method (SAM, see Dowling 2009a). The first schema, in Figure 2, presents a modality of strategies of social interaction.

Figure 2: Modes of social interaction

	Target of Discursive Action	
Alliance	Closure	Openness
Similars	*equilibration*	*exchange of narratives*
Disimilars	*hegemony*	*pastiche*

(From Dowling, 2009a)

[4] A phonetic Japanese script commonly used to transliterate foreign words.

[5] The Chinese characters used in Japanese writing along with the two *kana* phonetic alphabets—*hiragana* (used for inflections and words not having familiar *kanji* versions) and *katakana*—and *romaji*, the phonetic transliteration of Japanese words into the Roman alphabet.

Exactly what constitutes an alliance is given by decisions about the level and unit of analysis at which one wishes to operate. In the previous section, I was considering linguistically delimited societies as alliances; here I need to drill down a little. Let's take the *alliance* that is to be established by a supervisor of doctoral students and one of her/his students. In the early stages of the research, the supervisor is likely to constitute the alliance as one of *disimilars* in the sense that the supervisor has expertise that the student is to acquire and the student has predispositions (not all of them, one hopes) that they probably need to lose. The supervisor is, to the extent that this description is appropriate and to the extent that they act in ways that are consistent with it, constructing a *hegemonic* mode of interaction, because the target is one of *closure*, which is to say, the supervisor's practice is to prevail. Certainly following successful completion of the doctorate, the now former supervisor should, at least in some respects, be thinking of the alliance as one between similars, so that discursive closure is now to be achieved through the more liberal mode of *equilibration*; neither former supervisor nor former student has the necessary upper hand, closure is realised through legitimate argumentation. Certainly, this is how I interact with my former students and I generally feel that I am the principal beneficiary of such equilibration.

Not all interactants, however, privilege closure or consensus. The kind of engagement in which participants produce a series of utterances that are internally coherent but only loosely connected, or not connected at all, may result from a consensus on the form of the interaction as an *exchange of narratives*. Empirically, we might expect to observe this mode in settings involving the telling of stories or jokes, perhaps, or even academic papers presented at a seminar or conference at which participants seem to eschew engagement or interrogation: participants seem to agree that they are all playing the same game (an alliance of similars), but none move to close the discourse, to render the sequence of narratives accountable to a single discourse. Under such circumstances, any move to do so is likely to be experienced as disruptive.

In sociological terms, hegemony and equilibration may be directed at the stabilising or destabilising of a practice. This description recruits a fourth meaning of the word stable, this time as an adjective: established and unlikely to change and, I want to say, *disciplined*. The strategy, exchange of narratives, may be directed at the maintenance of a harmonious community. Clearly, the introduction of closure strategies in the form of argument (equilibration) or a hegemonic move, entailing the claim that the alliance is plural rather than singular, is likely to be resisted and/or the community may disintegrate (see Dowling, 2009a, p. 46, for a brief example).

The fourth mode of interactive strategy involves the construction of the alliance as plural, as in the hegemonic mode, but without the target of discursive closure; the participants in the alliance are to retain their respective integrities. At one level, this aptly describes the (idealised) mode of interaction between Edo period Japan and the Dutch inhabitants of Dejima Island.[6] Here, the *pastiche* was judicially and militarily sustained and the content of interaction policed and, at least in intent, limited to trade and necessary linguistic exchange.

---

[6] See Mitchell (2010) for a thoroughly researched and thoroughly engaging historical fiction centring on Dejima in 1799. See also Sofia Coppola's film, *Lost in Translation*—an expression also recruited in Mitchell's subtitle—in which Charlotte (Scarlett Johansson) and Bob (Bill Murray) interact in *pastiche* mode, the former fascinated by and drawn into Japanese culture, the latter repelled by it. The productivity of the interaction is, perhaps, found only in the final, whispered message, unheard by the audience, passed between them, the kiss of (noisier) billiard balls in the instant of the collision that sends one returning as quickly as it had arrived and leaves the other static in its new (however temporary) home.

In more prosaic terms, this is also one of the modes—the other being equilibration—that I favour in interactions with my own former and, indeed, current doctoral students: we each, I hope, learn from and are transformed by the interaction, but without the one overwhelming the other.

The subject of hegemonic interaction is deploying a strategy that seeks to retain the principles of evaluation of performances relating to the interaction; I refer to this kind of strategy in general as *pedagogic*. Alternatively, an action may be constituted in such a way as to delegate to its audience the principles of such evaluation; I call this *exchange* mode and this kind of strategy is generally consistent with the exchange of narratives and pastiche modes of interaction strategy. Action directed at the transmission of a practice must, at least in some respects, be pedagogic, but pedagogic action may also be described as modal as is illustrated in Figure 3.

Figure 3: Modes of pedagogic action

	Transmitter Focus	
Mediation	Competence	Performance
Unmediated	*delegating*	*apprenticing*
Mediated	*teaching*	*instructing*

(From Dowling, 2010)

The kind of *apprenticeship* that perhaps we tend to associate with doctoral study—in the UK, at least—involves a pedagogic relationship between what we might refer to as a producer of knowledge in the relevant field and a would-be producer; this is a direct and *unmediated* transaction in contrast with the situation in high school, where the teacher of mathematics, say, is not usually a producer of mathematical knowledge; *teaching* is *mediated*. Apprenticeship takes place in the field of production; teaching—as defined here—in the field of reproduction, to make use of Basil Bernstein's (1990) distinction (see also Dowling, 1991). A second difference between these two modes of pedagogic action is that, whilst apprenticing action must emphasise *performance*, teaching is concerned with *competence*. In apprenticeship as characterised by Japanese folkcraft pottery, for example, the transmitter of the craft is not satisfied with the apprentice's work until their performance meets the required standard (see Singleton, 1989); similarly, the doctoral thesis—the *viva voce* examination notwithstanding—must ultimately stand on its own merits. The schoolteacher, by contrast, generally regards particular performances as ephemera and is concerned instead with the levels of competence that they do or do not evidence; I shall return to teaching shortly.

The kind of 'apprenticeship' that is, interestingly exhibited in the mediaeval scriptorium is of a different kind from that in the pottery, it seems (Cohen-Mushlin (2008); see the discussion in Dowling, 2010). In the scriptorium, the master scribe is of necessity bound to accept less than perfect performances because of the prohibitive costs in time and raw materials that would be involved in re-doing unsatisfactory work. The emphasis seems to shift more to the production and indeed continued reproduction of a community of competent scribes. The novice members of the community will inevitably contribute flawed and unsophisticated sections of script to a codex that will have been co-produced by a number of scribes of varying levels of competence and will include exemplar text, produced by a master, as well as the far less accomplished attempts of beginners; no standard level of performance

is achievable. Successful management in more contemporary institutions may also tend to follow this model, especially in the context of succession planning. Work that is *delegated* cannot be held up constantly to scrutiny without undermining the development of the delegate.

Finally, *instruction* denotes the mode of mediated pedagogic action that is directed at the achievement of satisfactory performance, but that does not evidence interest in the fostering of competence. One might cite many examples of instruction: giving directions to a tourist; producing instruction sheets for the consumer construction of 'flatpack' furniture or the use of fire escape routes in hotels; 'teaching to the test' in schooling. In each of these cases, the transmitter may be understood to mediate a practice rather than being involved in its production and, at least in the manner in which I am interpreting them, is primarily concerned with one-off performances so that more general competences are not at issue. It is often claimed that the emphasis on testing and on league tables and so forth, such as has been escalating in schooling in the UK over the past twenty years or more (see Dowling & Noss, 1990), ultimately leads to a shift in pedagogic modes from what I am calling teaching to instruction, to 'teaching to the test'. This is as may be. However, my immediate concern, here, is with that which logically and empirically precedes this transition, the teaching mode itself, and its very particular nature.

Pedagogy and disciplinarity

Whatever the nature of the relationship between the fields of production and reproduction—Bernstein (1990) inserts a field of recontextualisation between them—their differentiation establishes a new position in the division of labour, that of the mediator—the teacher, the writer of instruction manuals, and so forth. There is clearly potential here for the development of this position as a specialism and this potential is more likely to be realised where the differentiation between producer and mediator is substantial. In the case of mathematics, for example, the producer of academic mathematics is historically differentiated from the contemporary school mathematics teacher in the sense that few if any school mathematics topics feature in university mathematics and have not done so for more than a century (see, Dowling, 2009b, 1998; Ernest 2006). Such dislocation of producer and mediator—which is often characterised differently, but is similarly substantial in other areas—has enabled the fostering of mathematics and other school subjects is disciplines in a curriculum as *collection*, this latter term is borrowed from Bernstein's (1977, 2000) distinction between collection and integrated curriculum codes, but my use of it strongly resonates with this definition from Krzysztof Pomian, who was talking about a different context altogether, a collection is …

> … a set of natural or artificial objects, kept temporarily or permanently out of the economic circuit, afforded special protection in enclosed places adapted specifically for that purpose and put on display. (Pomian, K. 1990; p. 9)

What establishes and maintains the school curriculum as a collection and the subjects within it as collections of topics, themes and activities and so forth, what effectively dislocates them from the 'economic circuit' by affording them special protection in purpose-built enclosed places behind the school gates yet makes them available for public admiration, is what I shall refer to as *disciplinarity*.

The term disciplinarity gathers together strategies that institutionalise teaching, not just as a mode of pedagogic action, but as a field of production in its own right. If we consider the field of practical teaching—schooling—as, at least initially or in principle, a field of reproduction, then in western and western-influenced systems, a theoretical field has developed via the objectification of the practical field. Ironically, perhaps, a field of academic production—educational studies—has arisen on the back of a field of academic reproduction—schooling—from which it is substantially detached to the point of standing in opposition to it. The binary field of schooling and educational studies is rendered more complex by the involvement of the state in the regulation of syllabuses and (in some systems) textbooks, in its control over the principles of distribution of teacher education between the school and the academy, and in its institutions of quality control. Further, in the UK, successive governments have, since the advent of mass schooling in the mid-eighteenth century, involved themselves in the metadiscourse on schooling that constructs its rationale. For some time, now—at least since the 'Great Debate' of the 1970s—a prominent feature of the metadiscourse has been the discourse of skills, which is to say, that schooling is primarily concerned with the transmission of skills that are apparently required in the general economy.

For my purposes here (though see also Dowling, 2010), the primary outcomes of disciplinarity are, firstly, the institutionalisation of the school curriculum as a collection of subjects that stand substantially in opposition to one another. It may be thought, say, that mathematics and physics are appropriately construed as interdependent or at least interrelated subjects, but there would seem to be little if any cross-referencing between them, as is illustrated by, for example, the Swedish school syllabuses, which present these two subjects separately, rather than subsuming physics under science (Swedish National Agency for Education, 2008). These syllabuses are augmented by textbooks. Secondly, disciplinarity achieves, at least in school mathematics, a particular, hegemonic relationship between the mathematical and the non-mathematical. My analysis of the most popular junior high school mathematics textbook scheme in the UK in the 1980s (and textbooks have not changed much in this respect since then) revealed that the content of school mathematics could be described as a combination of a non-arbitrary and relatively systematic mathematical content, generally expressed in formal mathematical language, on the one hand, and a collection of apparently arbitrary non-mathematical settings rendered, commonly, in everyday language (see Dowling, 1998). I referred to the former as the *esoteric domain* of school mathematics and to the latter as the *public domain*.[7] The relation between these domains can be described as follows. The non-arbitrary, esoteric domain can be said to construct the principles of recognition and realisation not only of mathematical action *per se*, but of a *gaze* that is cast (by, for example, the mathematics teacher or textbook or school test author) beyond the mathematics classroom at non-mathematical activities. Such activities are *fetched* into the classroom and, in the process, recontextualised by the mathematical principles of the esoteric domain. By way of an example, one PISA[8] assessment item shows a graph of the speed of a racing car against distance travelled around the track and invites candidates to select the appropriate plan of the

---

[7] In fact, the analysis constituted a relational space from the cross-product of the variables, *expression* (signifiers) and *content* (signifieds), each scaled as strong (I^+) and weak (I^-) mathematical *institutionalisation*. The esoteric domain comprised curricular content that is described as I^+I^+ and the public domain as I^-I^-, respectively, strongly/weakly mathematically institutionalised expression signifying strongly/weakly mathematically institutionalised content. This scheme generated two other, hybrid domains, the *descriptive domain* (I^+I^-)—the domain of mathematical modelling—and the *expressive domain* (I^-I^+)—the domain of pedagogic metaphors (Dowling, 1998; see also Dowling 2009a, 2010).

[8] PISA, Programme for International Student Assessment.

track from five offered (OECD, 2008). As far as I can see, there are no circumstances in which this might constitute an authentic problem within the context of motor racing—If the track has been built, then its shape is known and if it hasn't been built, then the speed of a car on a lap of it can hardly be determined. Rather, the mathematical gaze has been cast into the world, a non-mathematical setting has arrested the gaze, which has fetched it into the classroom, recontextualising it as a public domain setting that is now consistent with esoteric domain principles.[9]

In fact, the racetrack problem is quite interesting for one inclined to be interested in school mathematics and might quite reasonably be described as a potentially 'authentic' task in the sense used by Henry Widdowson (1979, see also 高瀬貴美子 (Takase Kimiko), 2008) in the context of foreign language learning. That is to say, *mutatis mutandis*, that the problem may well stimulate genuine involvement on the part of the student—be an authentic problem for them—in a task that has mathematical learning potential. The racetrack problem is, however, 'authentic' in the context of school mathematics and not in the context of motor racing.[10] What this suggests is that, whilst the racetrack task has been fetched from outside of mathematics and so recontextualised (in this case, out of almost all recognition, when viewed from the perspective of motor racing), it may be—removed from the test—potentially effective at *pulling* the student into esoteric domain mathematics. This is certainly a key function of the public domain in mathematics texts directed at high 'ability' students. Not all mathematics tasks are like this.

Eric Gutstein (2002) reports on a mathematics lesson in which he and his class compared data on traffic stops by police in Illinois by ethnic group of driver with figures produced by a random number generator.[11] Gutstein and his class concluded that police seemed to be acting in a racist way, as one of his students put it:

> I learned that police are probably really being racial because there should be Latino people between a range of 1-5 percent, and no, their range is 21 percent Latino people and also I learned that mathematics is useful for many things in life, math is not just something you do, it's something you should use in life. (Gutstein, 2002; no page numbers)

Again, a non-mathematical setting has been fetched into the classroom and recontextualised as a mathematical problem, which has then been solved. This time, however, the solution has subsequently been *pushed* back into the non-mathematical setting in the form of the conclusion, 'the police are probably being racial'. The student has also learned that this fetch/push strategy is generally beneficial, mathematics is 'something you should use in life.' The OECD—in a publication in which it presents sample PISA test items, including the one cited above—refers to this process as 'mathematisation', which involves:

- Starting with a problem in reality.
- Organising it according to mathematical concepts and identifying the relevant mathematics.
- Gradually trimming away the reality to transform the real-world problem into a mathematical problem that faithfully represents the situation.
- Solving the mathematical problem.
- Making sense of the mathematical solution in terms of the real situation.

---

[9] In fact, the formulation of the PISA problem is more appropriately coded as *descriptive domain* (see note 7). The analysis has been simplified here in order to clarify the general argument.

[10] Of course, we should bear in mind that the racetrack problem is intended to be a summative assessment task and not a learning activity, but the potential is there, nevertheless.

[11] See Dowling (2010) for a more extended discussion of Gutstein's lesson.

(OECD, 2008; p. 99)

This, of course, is entirely consistent with the skills discourse in presenting mathematics, in this case, as primarily, or at least partially, for something other than itself. The difficulty is that, far from faithfully representing the 'real' situation, fetching always entails recontextualisation. This is not a reversible process, which is to say, fetch and push strategies do not annul the recontextualising impact, because both are directed from the esoteric domain of the fetching/pushing activity, in this case, school mathematics. This is illustrated very well by Gutstein's lesson, which recontextualises police traffic stops as ideally random. They are not. Random stopping is illegal in the US, being a breach of Fourth Amendment rights: police have to be able to demonstrate probable cause for their suspicion that an offence has been committed and only if they are able to do this are they entitled to stop a vehicle or make a search and so forth.[12] Furthermore, it is not clear that police officers are generally able to determine ethnicity in advance of making a stop. A more likely explanation for the disproportionate number of Latinos stopped might be their overrepresentation in lower socioeconomic status groups that, in turn, might mean that, for financial reasons, they are more likely than, shall we say, white middle class professionals, to be driving old and poorly maintained vehicles exhibiting visible and possibly illegal defects. It is also of interest that one Illinois police department uses Gutstein's strategy to demonstrate that their traffic stops are in proportion to the demographics of their community in terms of ethnicity and gender, thus demonstrating that they are 'engaging in bias free traffic enforcement' (Carpenter, 2004; p. 66).

There is a difference between the Gutstein lesson and the police department analysis, however. Whilst the fetching activity in the former is school mathematics, in the latter case it is police department management. The department is required or has decided to publish statistics on its practices and has fetched statistical methods from social research. The resulting analysis will then be used to publicise their lack of bias, although there is no more evidence of this than there is of racism in the Gutstein study. The analysis would presumably inform departmental management in an interrogative way where *prima facie* evidence of a problem is revealed. Thus the police department will recognise that stops are not random and so would not, we might imagine, self-identify as racist should the figures turn out to resemble Gutstein's. Rather, one would hope that further investigation would ensue. Thus, in the terms of Figure 2, whilst Gutstein's push strategy is hegemonic, the police departments fetching of statistical methods is potentially more like pastiche; social research and statistical methods are not challenged by the strategy, but the department potentially learns from them and, in any event, remains in control of its own activity.

To return, briefly, to the 相撲 example discussed earlier, we can describe the English translation of 部屋 as stable as a fetch strategy that recontextualises by dehumanising Japan's traditional sport through connotation with animals. Now, whilst the translation is not exactly pushed into the Japanese context, there is a degree of permeability in this direction because English is taught as a second language in Japanese schools (whereas Japanese is rarely taught in UK schools) and is spoken by a non-negligible number of Japanese. The Japanese カタカナの意味と関係の編み直し of sports popular in the UK, however—サッカー (*sakkaa*, soccer), ラグビー (*rugubii*, rugby), クリケット (*kuriketto*, cricket)—

[12] Decker *et al* (2004) do argue that US courts have been very liberal in respect of what might count as probable cause. However, the principle that there must be a reason for a traffic stop does undermine the assumption in the mathematics lesson that the stops are intended to be random; they are not.

phonetically adjusts their signifiers, but otherwise seems to respect their integrity. In any event, relatively few native English speakers speak Japanese and many of those who do have difficulty with カタカナ, establishing an effective dislocation between the two languages in this respect. That Japanese can also be written using *romaji* facilitates phonetic adjustment by English speakers, thus, again in 相撲, recently disgraced 大関 (*oozeki*, second highest rank in *sumo*), 琴光喜, becomes *Kotomitsuki*, in *romaji*, allowing English commentators to render it Kotomitsooki, where 'oo' is as in shoot and stressed rather than whispered; and current 大関, 琴欧洲, is, in *romaji*, *Kotooshu*, in which the 'oo' is pronounced by the BBC as, again, in shoot rather than o-o. Incidentally, at the Beijing Olympic Games, the Japanese cycling event, 競輪, *keirin* in *romaji*, was pronounced kee-er-rin, by the English broadcaster commentating on it, even though the more accurate, kayrin is perfectly doable within the English phonetic space. Again, the Japanese カタカナの意味と関係の編み直し looks like pastiche, whilst the English phonetic adjustments, whilst also focusing on the signifier only, are more hegemonic, not least because of their accessibility within a global language and via BBC World News. It is significant that broadcasting is a mediated form of pedagogic action, generally more appropriately understood as instruction rather than teaching, but, insofar as it may be considered to be an organ of transmission of linguistic competence, it may be interpreted as teaching in this respect.

The institutionalising of teaching, as a mediated mode of pedagogic action that focuses on the transmission of competence, opens up a space for actions of disciplinarity that constitute distinct regions of practice as esoteric domains. A good deal of action is contained within particular esoteric domains of school subjects, such as mathematics, and within particular linguistic communities. However, the gaze cast from the perspective of such an esoteric domain into other practices/languages fetches elements from these other practices/languages effecting a recontextualisation/意味と関係の編み直し. In general, we can say that the fetch aspect is consistent with pastiche interaction and is not hegemonic other than in its association with a pull action in attracting new participants. Danger lies, however, in the push aspect of recontextualisation/意味と関係の編み直し, which generally does constitute a hegemonic move into another field of practice. Supposing that we look at the situation of schooling like this, what are the implications?

Disciplinarity and authority in the curriculum

As I have pointed out, my analysis of UK school mathematics textbooks (see Dowling, 1998) suggested that what I am now calling the fetch/pull strategy seems to be common in the curriculum that is directed at students attributed with high 'ability'. This strategy effects a move from the esoteric to the public domain and back to the esoteric, drawing students in via a recontextualisation of what they already know (the public domain, constructed by the fetch strategy) to what they do not know (the pull to the esoteric). Once inside the esoteric domain, its gaze—the principles of the gaze that constituted the fetch strategy and hence of mathematical modelling—could be made explicit. Students classified as low 'ability', by contrast, were generally confined—insofar as the textbook defined their curriculum—to the public domain, which, itself, was essentially a collection of recontextualised domestic settings (shopping and so forth) the textbooks thus presenting them with only a push strategy that presented them with recontextualised versions of what they already knew. A further finding of the analysis—established on the basis of the particular connotations of the settings of tasks in the respective texts and on the formats of the 'ability' differentiated textbook

sereis—was that a key principle of recognition of 'ability' was socioeconomic class. Thus the school mathematics curriculum served, firstly, as a device that translated socioeconomic class into ability and, secondly, to distribute the esoteric domain and the principles of its gaze (whereby the public domain is constructed) to high 'ability'/socioeconomic class students and the public domain to low 'ability'/socioeconomic class students. I concluded, then, that only the former category of students was provided with a career in mathematics, whilst the latter was trapped in the mythical world of the public domain, excluded from—the opposite of being pulled into—the esoteric domain.

I have now revisited this conclusion (Dowling, 2010). I have already mentioned the historical separation of the school mathematics curriculum from that of the university and from other school disciplines. Another way of putting this is that the esoteric domain of school mathematics is, to a substantial extent, a self-referential practice, that is, mathematics is a member of a collection of school subject esoteric domains that are dislocated from each other, from their nominal correlates in Higher Education and, via recontextualisation, from other practices more generally. I am not claiming here that there are no articulations between school esoteric domains and other practices, simply that such articulations as are established are primarily in the fetch, pull or push modes, there being no clear continuity between them just as there is no clear continuity between English and 日本語 (*nihongo*, Japanese). Each community of practice (to borrow from Lave & Wenger (1991), each linguistic community establishes its own perspective so that analogues between them must be constructed as metaphors; as my examples are intended to illustrate, fetch is an import—the crafting of a metaphor—push entails its export to another practice. We might say, then, that pedagogic reproduction of any practice in any mode of pedagogic action is always the reproduction of the arcane, the more so the greater the effect of disciplinarity on the institutionalisation of the practice. Revisiting school mathematics, it would appear that both the high 'ability'/socioeconomic class students—who are invited into the esoteric domains—and the low 'ability'/socioeconomic class students—who are to be restricted to the public domains—are to be pulled into practices that will cease to have value as embodied knowledges or skills at the point of graduation. Those directed to the esoteric domains, of course, will have the opportunity to acquire symbolic capital that can be 'exchanged' in the schooling and/or economic markets (Dowling, 2009a, 2010; Bourdieu, 1991).[13]

Where disciplinarity is weak, of course, and curriculum and student stand in a form of relationship that does not insist on discursive closure—primarily, pastiche interaction—there is clearly more opportunity for fetch strategies to be deployed by the students. There is nothing new, here; this is precisely the liberal pedagogy advocated by Jean Piaget (1995) and others. There are two important points to be made about this, however. Firstly, if there is any value to be placed on a legacy of cultural production—and to deny such value is to advocate cultural anarchy, which, of course, must be contingent upon social anarchy—then any cultural selection must be established on the basis of disciplinarity and the institutionalisation of that which is to be valued. So, if we want to continue to make use of air travel, then probably best not to liberalise the schooling of pilots or air traffic controllers; in order to maintain 相撲 as a spectator sport, then there has to be some institutionalisation of both performative and interpretive action and both, it would seem, are intricately woven in to a broader cultural heritage, a heritage that is sometimes ignored or misunderstood by foreign commentators who have not had the opportunity of appropriate schooling as 力士 or as 観客

[13] Athough it is not clear that the value of this symbolic capital is quite what it was before the new massification of the university; see below.

(*kankyaku*—spectators). The second point is that the direction that schooling—at least, elementary and secondary schooling—is taking is clearly towards more extensive disciplinarity and not towards the liberal curriculum. This is primarily the result of increasing involvement of governments in schooling through the establishing of official curriculum, limitations on the approval of textbooks, national testing and school inspections, and participation in international assessment initiatives such as TIMSS and PISA.

In the previous paragraph I have referred to two strategies that relate to pedagogic *authority*. From these two, I want to generate a schema that presents a modality of authority strategy. State involvement in secondary schooling, as I have described it, involves a regulation of disciplinary content. This is a *bureaucratic* strategy that imposes on schooling *practice*, but not on the deliverer of this practice—the teacher. Furthermore, these bureaucratic strategies impact only on that part of schooling practice that relates to content and do not seem to touch specifically teaching skills that are thereby presumed to be embodied in the teacher. There is an extent, then, to which the bureaucratic strategies here constitute teachers as interchangeable with respect to content—because this is prescribed for them—but not in respect of their generic teaching abilities.[14] In respect of the latter, teachers are able to claim what I refer to as either *traditional* authority—whereby a regulated practice is embodied in a skilled practitioner—or *charismatic* authority, whereby expertise—the practice—is as defined by the practitioner and may be unique to them. These three strategies locate authority either in the practice (bureaucratic) or the practitioner (charismatic) or both (traditional). The *liberal* pedagogy of Piaget and others hands authority over to the audience of the practice, in the case of teaching, to the learner; this is an *exchange* strategy, whilst the other three are *pedagogic*. The authority schema is presented in Figure 4.

Figure 4: Authority Strategies[15]

	Practice	
Practitioner	Open	Closed
Closed	*charismatic*	*traditional*
Open	*liberal*	*bureaucratic*

(Adapted from Dowling, 2009a)

The strategies relating to schooling as I have described them, then, bureaucratise the content and, in general, the ordering and sequencing of the curriculum, constituting strong disciplinarity in these respects, but, by and large, leave the teacher to claim traditional or charismatic authority in respect of teaching skills.

The situation in the university is somewhat different. One factor that is impacting on it is the very substantial increase in the participation rate in Higher Education, which in the UK in 1960 was about 5% (Chowdry *et al*, 2010; Figure 2, p. 5). Currently, the rate for women between the ages of 18-30 in Higher Education in the UK is 49% and for men 38%—an

[14] Although inspection does cover teaching skills, these do not seem to be prescribed in the same way as the curriculum is. The situation is somewhat different in elementary schooling, where the State does provide instruction in respect of learning theory and teaching strategy in the area of early reading, see http://nationalstrategies.standards.dcsf.gov.uk/node/84453.

[15] The terms bureaucratic, traditional and charismatic are borrowed from Max Weber's (1964) ideal typology of leadership, though their use here differs from Weber.

average rate of 43% (BIS, 2009). In effect, this dramatic increase over a period of fifty years has transformed the university—at least at undergraduate level and possibly beyond—from an elite academy into a mass schooling institution. We might suppose that a curriculum that is appropriate for the education of an elite is probably not going to be seen as appropriate for the education of getting on for fifty percent of the population. We might suppose, also, that the State will take a greater interest in Higher Education as it becomes less of a minority and more of a mainstream activity. Whilst this massification makes the university look more like the school, nevertheless a crucial difference remains: whilst the pedagogic mode in schooling is predominantly teaching, pedagogy in the university is, at least in principle, unmediated in the terms of Figure 3. This is because academics are producers as well as reproducers of knowledge in their field of specialism. This being the case, developments in knowledge production, which is to say research, are likely to impact on knowledge reproduction, so that we should look at both in any consideration of academic pedagogy. What we see in both areas is the privileging of a bureaucratic discourse of accountancy that seems to be pushing regions of the university in the opposite direction to that of developments in the school, which is to say, in the direction of antidisciplinarity.

A crucial move in respect of research is the increasing demand that it be productive outside of the context of its original elaboration. Perhaps most significantly in the UK, this demand is realised in the inclusion in the Research Excellence Framework (REF) of a measure of the 'impact' of research beyond the university.[16] The REF will not run until 2013-14, but the current intentions are expressed as follows:

> Our aim is to identify and reward the impact that excellent research carried out within UK higher education is already achieving, and to encourage the sector to build on this to achieve the full potential impact across a broad range of research activity in the future.
>
> We embrace a wide definition of impact, including benefits to the economy, society, culture, public policy and services, health, the environment, international development and quality of life.
>
> (HEFC, 2010; p. 3)

The excellence of research is, within the areas of social and humanities studies, likely to continue to be measured by peer review though, of necessity, the panels that are constructed to read submissions will cover a wide range in terms of specialism. Holding universities accountable in respect of impact and quality are both bureaucratising strategies. The latter constitutes a strategy of disciplinarity that is broadly consistent with other peer review practices in the reviewing of submissions to journals and conferences and in the assessment of proposals for research funding. To the extent that the outcomes of peer review are unpredictable, however, they are weak strategies. Certainly, research by Soh-young Chung (2009, see also Dowling & Chung, 2009) and by Jaamiah Galant (in progress) present descriptions of literary studies (Chung) and medicine and educational studies (Galant) as far less coherent disciplines than one might suppose; both studies lend support to the proposition that disciplinarity in university research is limited.[17] Peer review of quality is a bureaucratising strategy to the extent that it operates on the practice only; the item under

[16] The REF is the latest version of the national exercise to assess university research for the purposes of funding distribution between departments and institutions.

[17] As, of course, does Lyotard's 'report on knowledge' (1984).

review has to stand on its own merits.[18] This is also the case with the assessment of impact and, furthermore, both are concerned with the content of the research. However, whilst peer review holds research accountable within the context of its production, the assessment of impact seems to be approaching the research from outside of this context. Without specific examples—which are not yet available—we cannot determine whether this strategy will be responding to push (from the research context to its public domain) or fetch (from outside the research context) strategies; addressing this issue would seem to be crucial in respect of the question of validity. However, since the measures will be based on institutional reports, it seems inevitable that public domain text will be the principal resource.

Fetch strategies operating on the public domains of research often tend to limit action to headline results. This extract from the UK Government skills strategy is an example:

> A one percentage point increase in the proportion of employees trained is associated with an increase in productivity of 0.6 percentage points (…)—which in turn is worth around £6 billion a year to the UK economy. (BIS, 2009; p. 4)

The footnote reference cut from this extract signals research by Dearden *et al* (2005) and, indeed, this work does identify this association between training and productivity as its main finding. What is not mentioned in the government document is that the Dearden research focused the econometric part of their analysis exclusively on the production sector as there are, apparently, no 'robust measures' of service sector productivity available. Dearden *et al* do point out that the production sector did contribute 'about 50% of private sector net output in 1986' (p. 12); this does, however, leave out of the analysis about half of the *private* sector output (in 1986) or, it would seem, about three-quarters of the total UK economy in 2010[19]. Further, the main question on training on the instrument used to generate one of their datasets (the UK Labour Force Survey) was 'over the 4 weeks ending Sunday … have you taken part in any education or training connected with your job, or a job that you might be able to do in the future?' (p. 12), which, of course, leaves it to the respondent to determine what might constitute 'education or training connected with [their] job.' The presentation in the government document of the headline finding as fact leaves these and other methodological issues unquestioned as are the assumptions behind the economic and statistical models used to generate this finding. None of this is a criticism of the research, which properly provides access to its own inevitable limitations.[20] I does, however, illustrate the impact of this kind of recontextualisation.

Both peer review of quality and impact assessment are, then, bureaucratising strategies, the former—by virtue of its internal nature—imposing on the esoteric domains of research, the latter on the public domains. Both entail a detaching of expertise, esoteric bureaucratising of the researcher, public bureaucratising of the institution more generally. By having a regulatory impact on practice, they both weaken the facility of researchers and institutions to claim traditional authority in respect of research.

---

[18] The situation may be somewhat different in the case of the assessment of research funding bids, where a reviewer will not only consider the proposal, but also the track record of the proposer. This constitutes an interrogation of the bid as a claim to traditional authority.

[19] BBC News, 25th July 2010, http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-10737352.

[20] Though the authors might be chided for their use of the 1986 figure and its limitation to the private sector that, perhaps, has the effect of giving the impression that their study covered half rather than a quarter of the economy as a whole.

Bureaucratic strategies imposing on university pedagogy tend to operate differently. A battery of external and internal quality assurance (QA), accounting and governance strategies concentrate more on the *form* of accounting than on the *content*. For example, Higher Education institutions in the UK are required to undergo quality audits in respect of their teaching and awards. The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) lists the following aims for institutional audits:

> The aims […] are to meet the public interest in knowing that universities and colleges […] have:
> - effective means of ensuring that the awards and qualifications in HE are of an academic standard at least consistent with those referred to in The framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland (FHEQ) and are, where relevant, exercising their powers as degree awarding bodies in a proper manner
> - effective means of providing learning opportunities of a quality that enables students, whether on taught or research programmes, to achieve those HE awards and qualifications
> - effective means of enhancing the quality of their educational provision, particularly by building on information gained through monitoring, internal and external reviews, and feedback from stakeholders.
>
> (QAA, 2009; p. 2)[21]

The document referred to in the first aim specifies the standards for different levels of qualification. This, for example, is from the specification for a graduate at Honours (H) level:

> An Honours graduate will have developed an understanding of a complex body of knowledge, some of it at the current boundaries of an academic discipline. Through this, the graduate will have developed analytical techniques and problem-solving skills that can be applied in many types of employment. The graduate will be able to evaluate evidence, arguments and assumptions, to reach sound judgements, and to communicate effectively.
> (QAA, 2001; no page nos)

This is from the Masters (M) level specification:

> Much of the study undertaken at Masters level will have been at, or informed by, the forefront of an academic or professional discipline. Students will have shown originality in the application of knowledge, and they will understand how the boundaries of knowledge are advanced through research. They will be able to deal with complex issues both systematically and creatively, and they will show originality in tackling and solving problems.
> (QAA, 2001; no page nos)

Whilst for Doctoral (D) level:

> Doctorates are awarded for the creation and interpretation of knowledge, which extends the forefront of a discipline, usually through original research. Holders of doctorates will be able to conceptualise, design and implement projects for the generation of significant new knowledge and/or understanding.
> (QAA, 2001; no page nos)

In moving between H and M levels, the cline seems, broadly, to go from 'some' to 'much' content at the forefront of knowledge and from simply 'academic' to 'academic or professional' disciplines, and from making 'sound judgements' to originality in applying knowledge. Between M and D levels, the shift is, essentially, from deploying (albeit

[21] This document relates to England and Northern Ireland only; separate documents are produced for Scotland and Wales.

creatively) existing knowledge to producing new knowledge. The development in terms of the descriptors is clear, but it is to apply to all areas of study; there is nothing that relates to discipline-specific contents, nor, indeed, can there be. The second and third of the QAA aims quoted above are, respectively, to ensure that students have appropriate learning opportunities and that the institution has effective monitoring and quality enhancement procedures. Again, both are intended to operate generically only on the form of accountability and not on the content of the curriculum.

Bureaucratising strategies internal to institutions also operate primarily on the form of accounting of pedagogy. These include the production of codes of practice, the processes relating to the validation and review of programmes and modules, the requirement that the description of modules be produced in terms of learning outcomes, bringing into line with other institutions the credit value of modules and so forth. It's not that these strategies have no impact on curricular content—clearly the use of specialist reviewers and external examiners does—but the bureaucratising strategies themselves construct the spaces within which disciplines must speak. Indeed, these spaces are increasingly delimited to the point of disciplinary decimation in some areas and this is most apparent in the ubiquity of modularisation below doctoral level. The impact is likely to be anti-disciplinary rather than disciplinary, especially where the construction of modules is intended to be targeted at a not necessarily academic market. Further, modules are often not developmental with respect to each other. This is commonly the case on masters programmes, for example. In the UK, currently, a masters degree in educational studies consists of 180 credits, commonly achieved by the successful completion of four taught modules of 30 credits each—about 30 hours of contact time and commonly examined by coursework, such as a 5,000 word essay—plus the submission of a 60 credit, supervised dissertation. It is unclear how far such a programme can proceed towards the 'forefront of an academic or professional discipline', a boundary line that, in any event, is always going to be very difficult, to define if, indeed, it is meaningful in these terms at all.

By and large, then, bureaucratising strategies that operate on research are concentrated on its content, whereas those operating on pedagogy focus on form. This differentiation gives rise to the schema for the modality of bureaucratising strategies that is presented in Figure 5.

Figure 5: Bureaucratising Strategies

	Content Focus	
Form Focus	Closed	Open
Closed	*curricular*	*accounting*
Open	*domain*	*liberal*

The curricular bureaucratising strategy is that which is prevalent in schooling up to the university. This strategy is, empirically, one of strong disciplinarity. Esoteric *domain* bureaucratising is also a strategy of disciplinarity, but its strength depends upon the coherence of the field, which, at least in social and humanities research, tends to be weak. Public *domain* disciplinarity is a strategy of anti-disciplinarity because it holds a practice accountable in terms of its public domain. Accounting bureaucracy is almost certainly going to be a strategy of anti-disciplinarity, because its discourses are, essentially, the discourses of accounting rather than academic discourses and must encourage institutions to present

themselves in terms of units rather that the contents of those units. Like liberal authority, the liberal bureaucratising is oxymoronic and signifies the absence of its term.

In the final section of this paper before its brief conclusion I shall report on some preliminary work from a study that is being carried out by Kanako Kusanagi of the Institute of Education, University of London. This, I hope, will illustrate the more general sociological potential of SAM and, in particular, the schemas that have been introduced above.

Studying Abroad

Kusanagi's research is an ethnographic/participant observer study of the implementation of the Japanese professional development scheme, 授業研究 (*jugyoo-kenkyuu*, see 稲垣忠彦、佐藤学 (Inagaki & Sato), 1996) in an Indonesian junior high school. In general terms, 授業研究 involves a set of procedures that is intended to facilitate reflective practice on the part of teachers. The procedures include the introduction of open classes in which teachers observe and subsequently discuss a lesson prepared and presented by a colleague. The pedagogic principles underpinning 授業研究 are constructivist and influenced by and broadly in-line with Donald Schön's (1983, 1987) concept of the reflective practitioner, which, in turn, is influenced by Piaget's and Goodman's constructivism (Kinsella, 2006) and Goodman's and Dewey's pragmatism. Essentially, the theory predicts that the 授業研究 procedures provide the non-authoritative, disruptive basis for productive reflection and the concomitant development of pedagogic competencies, both at the individual level and at the level of the school institution as a learning community. This articulation of procedures and pedagogic theory may be said to constitute the *esoteric domain* of 授業研究. The two components of the esoteric domain are consistent in that the procedures exclude any imposition of authority in respect of the specification of pedagogic strategies that individual teachers or the school as a whole might be expected to acquire; *bureaucratic authority* is thus potentially imposed in respect of *form*, but not *content* and we can describe the authority strategy associated with the implementation of 授業研究 procedures as an *accounting bureaucracy*. The pedagogic strategy that we should associate with 授業研究 is *delegation*, because it takes place in the context of the production—in this case, perhaps more appropriately the elaboration—of pedagogic practice, so is *unmediated*, and the emphasis on the development of a learning community signals a focus in *competence*. The pedagogic theory proposes an absence of authority at the level of *interaction*, which is therefore to be constituted as an *exchange of narratives* or, to the extent that participants understand themselves to be participating in dissimilar discourses, *pastiche*.

The constructivist theory also predicts *equilibration* in terms of intra-individual interaction. In Piaget's epistemology, equilibration is motivated by the autoregulative nature of the individual and, by extension, of society (see Piaget, 1995). However, it can be inhibited at both levels by the imposition of authority. Piaget imagines the possibility of a *liberal* context for both individual and social development. As I have announced above, SAM's starting position is that, at all levels of analysis, the sociocultural is constituted by strategic autopoietic action relating to the formation, maintenance and destabilising of alliances and opposition and that the visibility of alliances and oppositions if emergent upon the totality of such action. The use of the term emergence entails that alliances and oppositions are not the directly intentional outcomes of any particular action or subset of the totality of actions. Put in what is probably more familiar sociological language, the

sociocultural configuration is constituted by power, which is to say, by the imposition of authority. Piaget's modernist liberalism is, therefore, rejected by this position: a society without authority is an extinct society. *Equilibration*, then, is not being conceived as a natural propensity of the individual or community as autoregulative entities.[22] Rather, *equilibration* must be motivated.[23]

The SAM approach proposes that the 授業研究 programme's effectiveness (if indeed it is effective) in Japan is not explained by the kind of *liberal* pedagogic theory that contributes to the *esoteric domain* of 授業研究. Rather, that 授業研究 has developed organically within Japan entails that there is a degree, at least, of consistency between the fact—rather than the necessity—of its stimulation of *equilibration*, on the one hand, and the sociocultural conditions of its implementation. For example, one might suppose that Japanese elementary school and junior high school teachers are held to account in respect of their display of *traditional authority* as skilled in *teaching*, as defined by Figure 4. This accountability motivates the *equilibration* that is a necessary condition for the effectiveness of 授業研究.

The situation in the Indonesian school, however, is very different. Kusanagi's study has revealed that teachers are subordinated to the *curricular bureaucracy* of the State in terms of curriculum *form* and *content*, but not pedagogy; teacher identity is invested in their status as civil servants rather than as professional educators. Teachers are required to present the formal curriculum to students and students are responsible for its acquisition. Indeed, there seems to be a prevalent view amongst teachers that *competence* is innate in students, so that the teacher's role in *teaching* is minimal. There is also a strong motive for shifting the *pedagogic strategy* from *teaching* to *instruction*, because teachers are also held to account, again via *curricular bureaucracy*, for the *performance* of their students in official assessments. In general, then, there would seem to be no basis in the Indonesian school for the motivation of *equilibration* in terms of the development of pedagogic skills; this would seem to be in contrast with the Japanese situation. In addition, the accountability of teachers to each other is also constructed *bureaucratically* within a strong hierarchy. In respect of interaction on official matters, this will always be *hegemonic*, with the senior participant dominant. This contradicts the non-authoritative basis of the 授業研究 procedures, again constituting the Indonesian context as very different from the Japanese one where, at least until fairly recently, management structures have been fairly flat.[24]

The Indonesian teachers' relations with each other outside of their *bureaucratic* responsibilities might be described, using Tönnies' term, as gemeinschaft in contrast with the gesellschaft of the official school institution. Interpersonal relations and social activities seem to dominate over *bureaucratic* interests, so that, for example, lessons might be curtailed or cancelled so that the teachers can attend a wedding.

Looking at 授業研究 as a top-down innovation in the Indonesian context, as compared with an organic evolution in Japan, it would appear that the innovators, looking from the

---

[22] For further discussion on the problematic nature of equilibrium conceived in this way see Dowling, 1998.

[23] Indeed, even if *equilibration* was to be naturally motivated, it would seem that it can also be naturally inhibited by the imposition of authority, so that we are not compelled to reject the *liberal* ideal in order to challenge the presumption of *equilibration* as an inevitable process irrespective of context.

[24] None of this is to claim that 授業研究 is easy for Japanese teachers. Indeed, the limited, anecdotal evidence that I have suggests that its interrogative procedures can be quite traumatic. Nonetheless, the same evidence does indicate the possibility of *equilibration* in the Japanese context in contrast with its lack of appearance in the Indonesian school. Japanese schools are, however, now becoming increasingly hierarchical in terms of management structure and it is an open question as to what impact this will have on 授業研究.

perspective of the *esoteric domain* of 授業研究, have recognised Indonesian schooling as another site of implementation, *fetching* aspects of it that can be rendered equivalent to the Japanese setting, so constituting the Indonesian school as a *public domain* setting. This represents the *push* of the 授業研究 *bureaucratic authority* onto the Indonesian setting via the imposition of a set of procedures and a pedagogic theory that presumes that this will be effective. However, the conditions for the *pull* into the *esoteric domain* of 授業研究 are not in place, because the sociocultural conditions of the Indonesian school are very different from those that have produced 授業研究. Kusanagi found that the Indonesian teachers accepted the new procedures as an addition to their *bureaucratic* responsibilities and dutifully prepared lessons involving group work and other pedagogic approaches for their open classes. However, neither these approaches nor any outcomes from discussion transferred to the normal classes, there being no motivation for *equilibration*. The open classes and the routine classes stood alongside each other as either *narrative exchange* or as *pastiche* within the school curriculum. These interactive strategies may, of course, also stimulate individual development, but only where this is motivated and it is not in the Indionesian context. We might even describe development within the school along Piagetian (1980) lines. If the introduction of 授業研究 constituted a disruption to the school curricular schema, then the response of the school was a form of *equilibration* that generated specialised forms of lesson, the 授業研究 mode and the routine mode; unfortunately, from the point of view of the innovators, there was no motivation for the re-globalisation of the curriculum.

The problem of recontextualisation

Kusanagi's research illustrates, I hope, SAM's potential use-value by making use of its language in describing the apparent failure of an educational innovation as it moves between contexts. It also illustrates precisely the problem of recontextualisation that is the project being addressed in this paper and it is a happy coincidence (or perhaps no coincidence at all) that the 佐藤学, whose translation of recontextualisation—意味と関係の編み直し—I have borrowed in this paper, is the same 佐藤学 who has been so influential in the development and promotion of 授業研究. Essentially, *liberal* educational initiatives must fail precisely because, by definition, they ignore the transformative impact of moving between contexts that exhibit different social relations and—though arguably to a lesser degree—different patterns of cultural practice. The same problem is associated with translation or transliteration between different linguistic communities or processes such as mathematisation that entail moves between different disciplinary communities. The value of SAM lies in its facility to describe sociocultural contexts in a consistent manner precisely so as to reveal continuities and discontinuities between them and, at least potentially, to indicate where attention needs to be paid to the innovation, to the context of reception or both. It would seem that, for 授業研究 to be effective in facilitating the development of pedagogic practice in the Indonesian school, teaching as a professional activity must be encouraged to shift from *bureaucratic* to *traditional* mode. Only in this way will teachers be accountable as practitioners in terms of their embodiment of pedagogic skills, so motivating *equilibration* where these are challenged via the 授業研究 procedures. It might also help if the contexts of teacher-student interactions were extended to include more social activity and, perhaps, pastoral care, expanding the school gemeinschaft to incorporate the students and their families. The emphasis on holding schooling accountable primarily for student *performances* is consistent with trends in State surveillance more generally. This situation is likely to encourage (and, indeed, in many

places has encouraged) a shift from *teaching* to *instruction*. Although it seems unlikely to happen, a reversal of this trend, to establish accountability on the basis of student/school *competence* would also seem to be a move in the right direction.

In order to be consistent with my own method, I have to understand its language as a context-specific *esoteric domain*. SAM is constructed and legitimated within a fairly loosely institutionalised region of social and educational research. Nevertheless, this academic location constitutes it as other than the contexts that have been brought under its gaze in this paper; it is not any of the contexts that establish translations or transliterations between Japanese and English, it is not school mathematics or traffic policing, or higher education policy or curriculum construction, and it is not 授業研究 either as a policy or as a practice, nor is it schooling in Japan or Indonesia. In particular, Kusanagi's analysis of 授業研究 practices have proceeded as a *fetch* strategy, constituting *public domain* descriptions that are other than the settings that they seem to represent. They do not represent, they construct. This is the nature of interpretive social research and Keith Joseph was right, it is not science, but is proud to stand apart from a practice that would *push* its theories and its findings into our public spaces in order to *teach* or *instruct* us—if indeed this is characteristic of science (and perhaps it is not). In this mode, there is no intention to *hegemonise*, nor should there be where *interaction* is between *disimilars*, given the problem of recontextualisation/意味と関係の編み直しの問題. The authority claim being made in presenting this paper is, insofar as it is consistent with institutionalised sociology, *traditional*; insofar as it moves beyond the already institutionalised, the claim is *charismatic*. There is, however, no presumption of a motive to *equilibrate* on the part of the audience. The mode of *interaction* between author and audience is, I hope, a *pastiche* of discourses: suppose you look at it like this …

References

Bernstein, B. (1977). *Class, Codes and Control: towards a theory of educational transmissions*. London: RKP.

Bernstein, B. (1990). *Class, Codes and Control Volume IV: The structuring of pedagogic discourse*. London: RKP.

Bernstein, B. (2000). *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.

BIS (2009). Skills for Growth: The national skills strategy. BIS. Available at www.bis.gov.uk/assets/biscore/corporate/docs/s/09-1467-skills-strategy-command-paper.pdf

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge, Polity Press.

Carpenter, G. (2004). *Wilmette Police Department 2004 Annual Report: Traffic stop data collection and analysis*. Wilmette: Wilmette Police Department. Available at www.wilmette.com/police/report/TrafficStopAnalysis.pdf

Chowdry, H., C. Crawford, et al. (2010). Widening Participation in Higher Education: Analysis using linked administrative data, Institute for Fiscal Studies/Economic and Social Research Council. Available at www.ifs.org.uk/wps/wp1004.pdf

Chung, S-y. (2009). 'The Crafting of Crisis: a sociological analysis of the "cultural studies paradigm shift" in literary studies. PhD thesis, Institute of Education, University of London.

Collins, H. & Pinch, T. (1998). *The Golem: What you should know about science*. Second Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dearden, L., H. Reed, et al. (2005). The Impact of Training on Productivity and Wages: Evidence from British Panel Data, Centre for Economic Performance Publications Unit. Available at www.ifs.org.uk/wps/wp0516.pdf

Decker, J.F., Kopacz, C. & Toto, C. (2004). 'Curbing Aggressive Police Tactics During Routine Traffic Stops in Illinois'. *Loyola University Chicago Law Journal*. 36. pp. 819-892.

Dowling, P. C. (1991). 'The Contextualising of Mathematics: towards a theoretical map.' In M. Harris (Ed). *Schools, Mathematics and Work*. London, Falmer Press.

Dowling, P.C. (1998). *The Sociology of Mathematics Education: Mathematical Myths/Pedagogic Texts*. London: Falmer.

Dowling, P.C. (2009a). *Sociology as Method: departures from the forensics of culture, text and knowledge*. Rotterdam: Sense.

Dowling, P.C. (2009b).『哲学の道』. In B. Sriraman & S. Goodchild (Eds). *Relatively and Philosophically E^{a}rnest*. IAP.

Dowling, P.C. 'Abandoning Mathematics and Hard Labour in Schools: A *New Sociology of Education* and Curriculum Reform.' Plenary presentation at Madif7, Stockholm University, Stockholm, 27th January 2010 (and proceedings, in press). Available at homepage.mac.com/paulcdowling/ioe/stockholm2010/Abandoning%20Mathematics%20and%20Hard%20Labour%20in%20Schools.pdf

Dowling, P.C. & Chung, S-y. (2009). 'Knowers Ark/A Ship of Fools?' In P.C. Dowling. (2009). *Sociology as Method: departures from the forensics of culture, text and knowledge*. Rotterdam: Sense.

Dowling, P. C. and R. Noss, Eds. (1990). *Mathematics versus the National Curriculum*. London, Falmer Press.

Ernest, P. (2006). 'A Semiotic Perspective of Mathematical Activity: The case of number.' *Educational Studies in Mathematics* **61**: 67-101.

Gutstein, E. (2002). Math, SATs, and Racial Profiling. *Rethinking Schools Online*. 16(4) (no page numbers). www.rethinkingschools.org/archive/16_04/Math164.shtml

Halsey, A. H. (2004). *A History of Sociology in Britain: Science, Literature, and Society*. Oxford, OUP.

HEFC (2010). 'Annex A Initial decisions on the Research Excellence Framework.' From www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/circlets/2010/cl04_10/cl04_10a.pdf.

稲垣忠彦、佐藤学 (1996).『授業研究入門（こどもと教育)』岩波書店

Kinsella, E. A. (2006). 'Constructivist underpinnings in Donald Schön's theory of reflective practice: echoes of Nelson Goodman.' *Reflective Practice* **7**(3): 277-286.

Knorr Cetina, K. (1999). *Epistemic Cultures: How the sciences make knowledge*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Latour, B. & S. Woolgar (1979). *Laboratory Life: The social construction of scientific facts*. Beverly Hills, Sage.

Lave, J. and E. Wenger (1991). *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge, CUP.

Lyotard, J.-F. (1984). *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Mitchell, D. (2010). *The Thousand Autumns of Jacob de Zoet*. Sceptre.

OECD. (2008). *Taking the Test: Sample questions from OECD's PISA assessments*. Paris: OECD

Piaget, J. (1980). Opening the Debate. In M. Piattelli-Palmarini (Ed.). *Language and*

Learning: the debate between Jean Piaget and Noam Chomsky. London, RKP.
Piaget, J. (1995). *Sociological Studies*. London, RKP.
Pomian, K. (1990). *Collectors and Curiosities: Paris and Venice, 1500-1800*. Cambridge: Polity.
QAA (2001). The framework for higher education qualifications in England, Wales and Northern Ireland—January 2001. Available at /www.qaa.ac.uk/academicinfrastructure/fheq/ewni/default.asp
QAA (2009). Handbook for Institutional Audit: England and Northern Ireland. Available at www.qaa.ac.uk/reviews/institutionalAudit/handbook2009/InstitutionalAuditHandbook2009.pdf
Schön, D. (1983). *The Reflective Practitioner: how professionals think in action*. Basic Books.
Schön, D. (1987). *Educating the Reflective Practitioner*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
Singleton, J. (1989). 'Japanese Folkcraft Pottery Apprenticeship: cultural patterns of an educational institution.' In M. Coy (Ed.). *Apprenticeship: from theory to method and back again*.
Swedish National Agency for Education. (2008). *Compulsory School Syllabuses. Revised 2008*. Stockholm: Fritzes.
高瀬貴美子(2008)「コミュニカテイブランゲイジティチング(CLT)とコミュニケーションテクノロジー」村田久美子、原田哲男編著『コミュニケーション能力育成再考：ヘンリー・ウィドウソンと日本の応用言語学・言語教育　シリーズ言語学と言語教育11』第５章、ひつじ書房
Turnbull, D. (2000). *Masons, Tricksters and Cartographers: Comparative studies in the sociology of scientific and indigenous knowledge*. London: Routledge.
Weber, M. (1964). *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. New York, The Free Press.
Widdowson, H. G. (1979). *Explorations in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.