Abstract

Critics of education in advanced capitalist societies have assailed schools as being reproducers of the existing patterns of social inequality. A fundamental concept in understanding this reproductive role of education lies in Gramsci's notion of 'hegemony'. On the other hand, the 'interpretative' perspective on schooling, drawing heavily from phenomenology, sees the possibility of educational and broader social change through the transcendence and redefinition of the realities of day-to-day school life. In this view, through community participation in schools, teachers, students, and parents can develop new 'realities' which concomitantly alter consciousness and generate counter-hegemonic momentum.

Don Dawson*

Educational Hegemony and the Phenomenology of Community Participation

That the expansion of education in modern liberal democracies has not lead to widespread social mobility or egalitarian societies is clear.[1] On the other hand, it is also clear that many neo-Marxist critiques of capitalist schooling, in their use of overly mechanistic and deterministic models of social reproduction, have denied the schools any contributing role in social change. To avoid this analytical shortcoming, in this paper we shall treat economic and cultural reproduction in schools as part of what Antonio Gramsci refers to as 'dominant hegemony'. An analysis of hegemony places its emphasis upon the influence of ideology and culture upon consciousness, and posits that the relationship between the socio-economic superstructure and education is not causal, but continuously dialectical.

In this view, contrary to many neo-Marxist interpretations, the dynamics of schooling and educational change can be considered as significant factors in the explanation of broader social change. Consequently, we believe that phenomenological interpretations of curriculum, pedagogy, evaluation, as well as teacher-student and school-community relations are necessary elements in such an analytical framework. The perspective we shall be arguing for, then, (1) stresses the importance of the role of education in supporting and maintaining the dominant hegemony, and (2) utilizes a phenomenological assessment of the active role played by individuals and communities in interpreting and constructing school realities.

Hence, it is our contention that community participation in schools can, from this interpretive stance, be regarded as a mechanism through which students, teachers, and parents, in their day-to-day interaction, can develop new modes of consciousness and perhaps a 'counter-hegemonic' world view. Once this occurs, the school may become an originator of cultural and economic change in society.

In the next section we will first examine the role of schooling in social reproduction and introduce the concept of educational hegemony. The remaining sections attempt to reconcile an analysis of hegemony in education with a phenomenological interpretation of community participation in schools.

---

*Department of Sociology, University of Ottawa.

Social Reproduction and Educational Hegemony

Traditionally the role of schooling in Western democracies has been seen to be that of a meritocratic institution offering opportunities for social mobility through training and the acquisition of specialized knowledge. In this view social mobility is often synonymous with occupational mobility. As one climbs the occupational hierarchy one simultaneously moves up other hierarchies (e.g., class, status, etc.). Although some "incongruence" can occur in one's positions in each of these hierarchies, for the most part an individual has similar hierarchial positions in all societal spheres.

Some functionalist theorists of social stratification have argued that the hierarchical nature and structural inequality of industrialized nations are inevitable.[2] In this argument the talented will be upwardly mobile as they assume 'more functionally important' occupational roles. The less talented offspring of those presently in the important 'talent-scarce' occupations will be inter-generationally downwardly mobile as others more talented and skilled take their place.

Society is thus seen as 'meritocratic' in that individuals achieve an occupational level based upon their skills, talents, and knowledge. An extreme version of this view is expressed in Shultz's Human Capital Theory which postulates that education is more than merely a consumable, it is also an investment in human capital (i.e., knowledge and skills).[3] In this theory individuals benefit from education because their investment in the acquisition of knowledge and skill has given them ownership of economically valuable capacities. Thus, talented and highly motivated children from lower class backgrounds will be upwardly mobile, while untalented or lazy children of privileged parents will find it difficult to avoid downward mobility.

It is evident however, that much social mobility is of a relatively short-range kind and so does not necessarily involve sharp social changes. The 'distance' one has moved in the process of being mobile may be very small; social mobility may involve status change but not class change; mobility may be horizontal within an occupation and not involve even status change; and downwardly mobile families tend to be upwardly mobile in the next generation.[4] All in all, that there is little social mobility of consequence in industrial societies is indicated by the fairly high degree of social continuity in the reward position of family units through the generations.[5] So, despite the enormous expansion of education in North America, it has not been demonstrated that there has been commensurate increased working class individual upward mobility, nor has expanded schooling made dramatic contributions to the more general features of social mobility.

Whatever lower class upward mobility and upper class downward mobility that can be attributed to schooling is restricted to individual mobility which contributes little to erasing the structured inequalities that exist in capitalist systems. Thus, mobility is not equality. This basic distinction is of fundamental importance to our discussion; the type of individual mobility we have described can be seen as 'personal opportunism' which is not necessarily concomitant with widespread lower class upward mobility that would result in the more egalitarian social order predicted by Horace Mann when he pronounced education as the "great equalizer".

Hopper posits that the school must "reject" candidates who are "not sufficiently talented" to benefit from higher learning.[6] In this process of selection the school must systematically "warm-up" those students who will receive further and more specialized training, and "cool-down" those who are to be sent directly into the lower levels of the occupational hierarchy. In performing these warming up and cooling down functions, the school, contrary to the liberal ideal of maximizing achievement for all, must artificially restrict (in the process of cooling down) educational attainment of some individuals while developing (in the process of warming up) the full potential of others. As

the school systematically cools down substantial numbers of students in preparing them to accept low levels of educational attainment and the accompanying low socio-economic status, it effectively blocks upward mobility for many and ensures a continuing underclass of 'non-achievers' and 'failures'.[7] In his discussion of the patterns of mobility and non-mobility in industrial societies Hopper presages the critical theses of cultural and economic reproduction — whereas schooling has often been viewed as offering opportunities for individual mobility, the reproduction theorists stress the role of education in maintaining the structured inequality of capitalist society.

Bowles and Gintis do not see the schools as producing social mobility or equality, but interpret the education system in the capitalist economy as a key element in the reproduction of the social division of labour. They posit that schooling in capitalist societies serves to perpetuate existing social, political, and economic conditions. The school does this as a consequence of a straight forward correspondence principle: "For the past century at least, schooling has contributed to the reproduction of the social relations of production largely through the correspondence between school and class structure."[8]

In capitalist society the social relations of production, which reflect the hierarchical division of labour and rigid patterns of dominance and subordinacy (according to the ownership of the means of production), are reproduced as the schools socialize pupils. In this view, schooling performs an essential intergrative function through its production of a stratified labour force for the capitalist enterprise. Hence, the main function of education is the socialization of an adequate labour force into a hierarchically-controlled and class-stratified social system.

To accomplish this integration of youth into the economic system the social relationships of the school — between administrators, teachers, students, and their work — replicate the hierarchical, alienated, and fragmented division of labour of the work place. Values, beliefs and behaviours are seen to be transformed and reproduced, bringing the individual in line with the needs of the capitalist social order and the wage-labour system.

In Bowles and Gintis and other neo-Marxist interpretations of social reproduction the educational system does not promote working class social mobility in any form, but rather is structured in order to reproduce the social relations of production towards the end of teaching working class individuals to be 'properly subordinate' and to sufficiently fragment their class consciousness so as to preclude any collective action.

Thus working class schools, as well as the schools of ethnic, racial, and other minorities, emphasize behavioral control and rule-following, coercive authority structures, and provide minimal chance for successful advancement. The school roles then 'mirror' the characteristics of inferior job situations. Conversely, schools of the capitalist classes (in well-to-do suburbs, etc.) tend to stress participation, indirect supervision, and internalized standards of control.

Therefore, the schools treat students of different social class origins differently and thus reinforce the social division of labour. The educational meritocracy is rejected as a 'facade' which is used to cover up the reality of an educational system geared toward the reproduction of economic relations. Economic reproduction is class-reproduction — the social relations engendered by the economic division of labour of the capitalist mode of production are reproduced, and social classes are thus reproduced. Working class students are socialized into working class roles, and collectively are not given an opportunity for social mobility. That some minimal mobility is allowed as a 'safety-valve' to help maintain stability is not seen to negate the economic reproduction thesis.

Pierre Bourdieu has popularized the notion of *cultural* reproduction.[9] He is not concerned with the reproduction of the durkheimian notion of culture as a 'consensus on values', but rather is referring

to reproduction of the culture of the dominant classes of society. The key concept in Bourdieu's analysis is the notion of "cultural capital". This cultural capital consists of literature, science, religion, art, language, and all symbolic systems falling within the widest interpretation of the term, and is comparable to economic capital in that it is transmitted by inheritance and is 'invested' in order to be cultivated.

Linguistic and cultural 'competence' are aspects of cultural capital that facilitate academic achievement for individuals. Simply put, Bourdieu's thesis states that the educational system discriminates in favour of those who are the inheritors of cultural capital; the upper classes.

Whatever means are used to specify the amount of inherited cultural capital it is apparent that social elites are generally well endowed in this regard be they highly educated or not:

> The culture of the elite is so near to that of the school that children from the lower middle class (and *a fortiori* from the agricultural and industrial working class) can only acquire with great effort something which is *given* to the children of the cultivated classes — style, taste, wit — in short, those attitudes and aptitudes which seem natural in members of the cultivated classes and this regard be they highly educated or not: The culture of the elite is so near to that of the school that children from the lower middle class (and *a fortiori* from the agricultural and industrial working class) can only acqper classes who have 'scholarly culture' as their maternal culture. Bourdieu is proposing that schooling's reproduction of the structure of the distribution of cultural capital along class lines is a vicious circle wherein cultural capital builds upon cultural capital. High levels of education are nothing more than the accumulation of the effects of the training begun in the upper class family, and the later academic apprenticeships which themselves presuppose this previous training.

Accompanying the working class student's poverty of cultural capital is a working class "ethos" which works to shape attitudes towards educational institutions. The working class ethos leads to 'self-elimination' because within this ethos the student's 'subjective hopes' are very low for scholastic achievement in that his 'objective chances' are minimal.

The reproduction of social hierarchies is legitimized by the school in that it converts the existing social hierarchy into an academic hierarchy, and conceals this reproduction beneath a cloak of an ostensibly meritocratic and democratic selection process. The educational system thus gives its *de facto* sanction to initial cultural inequalities despite external appearances of equality and universality. Hence, although formally equitable, the school selection procedure as envisioned by Bourdieu both perpetuates and legitimizes social inequalities as it reproduces the hierarchical distribution of cultural capital along class lines.

Finally, while the proportionately small number of students who are able to overcome their lower class origins supply apparent justification to the educational selection process and lend credence to the belief that the school is truly a meritocratic institution, their resultant individual mobility is not indicative of some contribution by the school to a broader pattern of upward mobility. For example, Christopher Jencks has shown that schooling has had very little impact in improving the socio-economic status of lower class students.[11]

As we have seen, both the economic and cultural reproduction theses respectively do not view the school as a meritocratic mechanism promoting broad social mobility. Both in fact postulate that the schools reproduce the existing hierarchy of social inequality.

We propose that although Bourdieu acknowledges "that the holders of economic power have more chances than those who are deprived of it also to possess cultural capital," his treatment of cultural reproduction is made to appear too distinct a process from that of economic reproduction.[12] On the other hand, the economic reproduction thesis, because of its reliance on the correspondence principle, tends to treat schools as 'black boxes' and misses the dynamics of cultural capital and its reproduction.

Moreover, the economic reproduction thesis holds that social inequality is embedded in the capitalist economy and that schooling is simply an aspect of the reproduction of the capitalist division of labour. An almost perfect 'fit' is suggested between the productive system and the educational system. Education is then seen as a dependent variable determined by the primacy of the capitalist mode of production. Therefore, schools are powerless to alter the hierarchical order of social inequality in capitalist society as they neither cause inequality nor relieve it. Obviously, such a model of school and society implies that significant social change must necessarily precede educational changes. When viewed from this perspective community participation in the process of schooling cannot possibly contribute in any way to social change. To change society the capitalist economic system itself must first be changed.

For its part, Bourdieu's cultural reproduction thesis also denies the possibility of educational change (through community participation or otherwise) resulting in broader social change. The cultural reproduction thesis holds that within the process of schooling inherited cultural capital begets academic cultural capital in an incestuous, self-contained system from which there is no apparent release.

The mechanistic determinism of both the economic and cultural reproduction theses deny the significance of human action in the day-to-day activity of school life. Yet the relationship between base and superstructure — economics, culture and consciousness — is not mechanically deterministic, but is dialectical and mediated by human action. As such the function and structure of schools are not passive reflections nor mere products of economic forces, neither are they inevitable consequences of cultural reproduction.

We propose that one must first examine the nexus of relationships between culture and economy in order to understand the interpenetration of cultural and economic reproduction. To accomplish a combined economic and cultural analysis which also recognizes the role of human action and consciousness we make use of the concept of 'hegemony' as developed by the Italian Marxist Gramsci.[13] The traditional use of the term emphasized political and economic domination of the working class by the capitalist class, while Gramsci stressed the role of consciousness, culture, and ideology in the maintenance of unequal social and economic systems. Hegemony can be defined, then, as "the central, effective and dominant system of meanings and values, which are not merely abstract but are organized and *lived*."[14] Thus class domination is exercised through a seemingly 'popular' consensus which is continuously generated by the effects of the media, the law, cultural traditions, education, etc.

In advanced capitalist nations these institutions perpetuate beliefs, values, norms, and behaviors on a mass scale to sustain the existing social order and capitalist Weltanschauung. While in this sense hegemony takes on a more cultural meaning, if we do not neglect its basis in politico-economic domination, hegemony can serve as a means to understand how cultural *and* economic relations are developed and reproduced. Thus we conceptualize hegemony as a ubiquitous day-to-day 'reproductive force which acts in the interest of those who control cultural capital as well as economic capital. Consequently, in any analysis of the role of schooling in society, researchers and educators must regard the daily activities of the school as aspects of social reproduction. That is to say, we must investigate that part of the dominant hegemony that is realized through the educational system. Furthermore, we must recognize that this 'educational hegemony' effects the consciousness and behaviors of students, teachers and all those involved in the everyday activities of the schools.

In summation, then, through the reproductive force of the dominant hegemony, schooling serves to reproduce concomitantly the cultural as well as the economic relations of capitalist societies, and thus prevents or severely limits the social mobility which might lead to a more egalitarian society.

We believe that this concept of educational hegemony is more inclusive and has more explanatory power than do the cultural or economic reproduction theses alone or in combination, in that it takes into account the consciousness and actions of human actors.

A Phenomenological Perspective on Community Participation

In this section of our discussion we will first briefly outline what can be meant by the terms 'community' and 'participation' in the notion of community participation in education. The view that community participation in schooling is a major strategy in educational and social change will be analyzed from two theoretical perspectives — the phenomenological 'interpretative' approach and the hegemonic thesis. We shall argue that in order to appreciate community participation in education as a strategy for social change one must adopt a synthetic view incorporating the phenomenological aspects of the interpretative approach within the framework of an analysis of educational hegemony.

The 'local community', in that its nexus of relationships is fundamentally organic rather than contractual, is a conservative ideal which stands in counterposition to the 'liberal-rational-universalistic' society of developed capitalist nations.[15] This liberal mass society, an aggregate of atomistic individuals sharing only their common citizenship, has only reluctantly endured the existence of parochial local communities or neighbourhoods. Yet it is evident that such societies are not populated solely with modern independent-rationalistic individuals; they are also made up of different quasi-organic ethnic, religious, racial, linguistic, and socio-economic 'communities'. Loyalties are often split between the wider national scene and the local community in which membership is maintained. Typically a person can be part of an ethnic or neighbourhood community and still identify with the state as an individual, thereby keeping a unique cultural identity and self-image within the larger atomistic society.

Whatever definition one accepts for the term 'community' we will, for our purposes, consider any generally representative collectivity of a school's parents and other members of the surrounding neighbourhood a community group. This partially 'associational' (i.e., with the school) and 'spatial' (i.e., in the local neighbourhood) definition is necessitated by the large array of neighbourhood groups which have come under the conceptual umbrella of 'community'.[16]

Though nearly all school boards are now elected assemblies, the franchise itself is not community participation per se, but individual participation. Traditionally community participation has been through Home and School Associations or the P.T.A. These groups are usually dominated by the principal and his staff, and the degree of 'effective' community participation is a reflection of the social, political, and economic influence the community members can bring to bear informally. Moreover, the mere existence of these kinds of organizations "has often pre-empted or precluded the formation of other public groups with a direct policy role."[17]

Beyond that mentioned above there are essentially three categories of community participation in schooling: service, student instruction, and decision-making. Participation at the first two levels of activities — service and student instruction — does not constitute any fundamental change in the actual control of the affairs of the school. The use of parents as teacher aides, as resources in instruction, and in the strengthening of parent associations or other groups in advisory or consultative capacities does not give the community a voice in school decisions as does the third level of participation.

In response to the protagonists' call for greater community participation in school decision-making, the concept of the 'community school' has emerged. Yet even here, in the area of policy formation the community is likely to participate only in a consultative or advisory capacity within

most existing community schools.[18] The community generally has no authority to make decisions and often is forced to defer to professional expertise. The concept of 'community control' of schools implies community participation at the third level, that of decision-making. Community control has been conceived of in two distinct modes. First, as a representative parent-community council with the power to set school policy and to make personnel, budget and curriculum decisions at the individual school level. In the second mode, "community control means self-determining power of elected school boards over budget, personnel, and curriculum" within a very small region or locality.[19] These 'neighbourhood boards' would autonomously control a few local schools (e.g., a secondary school and its feeder primary schools). Though this kind of "decentralization-community control" has been proposed as an attempt to increase local community participation while retaining the basic existing framework of public education, the prospect of a system of small autonomous neighbourhood boards does not appear to be a realistic possibility in this country and others. As a result the most frequent type of community participation in Canadian education has occurred in 'parent-community councils' associated with single 'community schools'.[20] These councils generally do not control decision-making processes in the school but share in decisions co-operatively.

Most of the demand for increased community participation in school, including community control, has arisen out of the failure of many school systems to produce social mobility and ultimately to equalize levels of educational outcomes across community lines. Consequently, some local communities have lost confidence in the schools' ability to properly educate their children, and this has led these communities to question the legitimacy of professional control of education. Socio-economically homogeneous neighbourhoods, minority ethnic groups, and increasingly native communities in Canada are alienated from schools which suggest that their culture is a basic cause of their children's continuing pattern of failure.[21] In response, lower class and minority community groups feel that their children can do better in schools which *they run in their own way*.[22] This can include changes in curriculum, teaching strategies, and techniques of evaluation.

In short, protagonists of community particiption in schooling see it as a means of improving educational achievement, increasing social mobility, and ultimately creating a more egalitarian society.[23] It is not obvious, however, that equality of educational outcomes will result from community participation, or, more fundamentally, that equality of educational outcomes will lead to equality of social outcomes. Moreover, Entwistle may be correct in asserting that some community control practices are "a retreat into localism" which serve to reaffirm social class, ethnic, or regional divisions.[24]. Nevertheless, we assume in this paper that working class and minority community participation in the process of schooling is directed towards greater social mobility and equality.

Much of what has recently been described as 'interpretative' sociology of education has derived its methodological and theoretical emphasis from phenomenology. This research, despite differences in particular approaches, is concerned with microsociological analyses of the internal workings of schools and thus is well suited to the study of community participation. The construction and interpretation by individual 'actors' of the day-to-day reality they subjectively experience is regarded as paramount. Some of these theorists have stressed a 'possibilitarian' position which sees educational and broader social change as being possible if students, teachers and parents can transcend the "experienced realities of everyday life."[25] In this focus the dominant concern in the study of education becomes the phenomenology of the curriculum, pedagogy, evaluation, and teacher-student interaction.

M.F.D. Young and his associates have argued that what is important about the school is that "what counts as knowledge" in the curriculum is socially determined. There are a number of critical implications for community participation stemming from this interpretation. Those taken for

granted and generally unquestioned aspects of academic curricula are seen as problematic in that they are but cultural choices which accord with the values and beliefs of the dominant ideological hegemony. Consequently, for example, a different set of cultural choices by participants in the educational enterprise might result in alternate definitions of 'success' and 'failure' in the schools.

Hence, assertive efforts by teachers, parents and community members to overcome the dominant hegemony reflected in curricular knowledge could lead to "the development of conceptions of curriculum development that might really transform educational experience."[26] Moreover, in this model education is viewed as 'determining'. People's quotidian lives are the elements that make up social structure and, as such, social structures can only be sustained in a particular form if people act in a manner which gives it that form. Evidently, then, the people who make up society can change it. In this view, the curriculum in particular and education in general, as powerful socializing influences on the young, can be seen as possible mechanisms for broader social change.

Obviously, within this phenomenological emphasis of the 'interpretative' approach community participation in the process of schooling can, indeed, be seen as a major strategy for educational and social change. Instead of being *controlled through* the curriculum, working class and minority groups could take *control of* the curriculum and thereby create a counter-hegemony, enriching and emancipating the educational experiences of their children. Even if formal control is denied the community, any participatory role it plays will profoundly affect the so-called 'hidden curriculum' and the general school 'ethos'.

A Conceptual Reconciliation of Phenomenology and Hegemony

A major weakness in the interpretative approach is that it is concerned with the 'how' of the social world but not the 'why'. Phenomenology itself does not provide an adequate analytical framework for understanding why things such as the stratification and labelling of children go on, or why certain social and cultural meanings and not others are distributed through the schools. For example, why are age specific, single grade classes which are batch processed in a locked promotion sequence the norm in elementary schooling rather than multi-age, multi-grade classes where individuals proceed from one level to the next as they are capable? Why is punctuality, rule following, and formal evaluation stressed in secondary schools over and above personal development and creativity? To be able to answer these and other questions of 'why', the actors and their activities must be situated within the broader framework of society. There is a need, therefore, to interpret phenomenologically-based micro-research within a macro-approach.

Arguing from a Marxist position, Sarup states that there are macro-social forces which have an independent reality of which actors may not be aware.[27] These forces influence thoughts and actions, and can produce consequences which the actors did not intend. It is not surprising, then, that a number of proponents of the 'interpretative' approach realize the necessity of looking beyond the phenomenology of the curriculum or classroom and to accomodate the effects of other institutions and structures in their analyses. For example, Nell Keddie in her study of what counts as classroom knowledge, warns that "the origins of these categories are likely to be outside the school and within the structure of the society itself in its wider distribution of power."[28] That is, the appropriate content and relative esteem of school subjects as well as the reception that students' common-sense knowledge receives in the classroom are largely determined by social realities beyond the school's walls.

Some neo-Marxist critiques of purely phenomenological approaches focus upon their neglect of the social structure of the capitalist system and the power of the dominant hegemony to constrain human actors *irrespective of their definition of reality*.[29] The constraints of the material factors of

life cannot be 'thought away'. As Whitty cautions, some phenomenologically inspired correctives aimed at contemporary education are "dangerously over-optimistic" and have "exaggerated the power of a theory of multiple accounts" to subvert conventional education, knowledge and notions of reality.[30] Thus, the major limitation of the phenomenologically inspired interpretative approach is that, in explaining the day-to-day micro processes of schooling, it tends to ignore the impact of the macro structural features of the capitalist economy, cultural characteristics, and the role of the dominant hegemony.

We suggest, then, a synthesis or reconciliation of hegemonic and phenomenological interpretations. This synthesis, we believe, would develop a dialectical approach to the study of the relations between culture, economy, and education. Popular 'consensus' on shared cultural understandings and mass acquiescence to existing social and economic structures are created and maintained on a day-to-day basis through the dominant hegemony. Yet simultaneously individual actors and communities of actors construct and develop particularized world-views and consciousness. It is the resolution of the influence of the dominant hegemony with the individual actor's interpretation and construction of his reality which ultimately shapes society. The ubiquity of larger social movements is recognized, but the individual human is also seen as an active participant in history.

The reconciliation that we are proposing suggests that revolutionary changes in the nature of economic relations and social structures can find their genesis in the realm of consciousness; in the development of a counter-hegemony. According to this perspective, once the lower classes and the socially 'disadvantaged' generally reinterpret and reconstruct their own views of educational and social realities, this new consciousness will lead ultimately to a reconfiguration of schooling and society. The processes inherent to this approach are not merely of the 'social reconstruction' variety as espoused by symbolic interactionists, but are dialectical in that they are consciously generated in the negation of the prevailing hegemony.

Now, with respect to community participation in schools, the type of micro-political, face-to-face action it implies can be seen as contributing not only to educational change but social change as well. The redefinition of power within the school, the questioning of what counts as school knowledge, and a reassessment of curriculum content by parent-community councils can lead to altered consciousness in opposition to the dominant hegemony both in the school and in the community. Within this reconciled analytical approach, using a phenomenological interpretation within an analysis of hegemony, community participation in schools and the possible emergence of counter-hegemonic consciousness can be seen as, perhaps, incipient 'revolutionary praxis' that once gaining momentum, may be difficult to arrest.

The explanatory and prescriptive implications of this approach for education in general and community participation in schools in particular are many. Initially, as an explanatory devise, our reconciliation of hegemonic analysis and phenomenological interpretation leads to a model of schooling which emphasizes not procedures and outcomes as products of the educative enterprise, but the relationships between learners, teachers, and curricula as aspects of the larger social order. As such, the daily activities of students and teachers as they relate to each other and the forms of knowledge presented in the classroom are to be interpreted as providing form and substance to the ubiquitous cultural and economic imperatives of society.

The prescriptive or programatic consequences for schooling of our reconciled view find ready expression in the community participation movement. If local communities are excluded from the processes of schooling, the dominant hegemony is allowed free rein to suppress opposing visions of learning, teaching and knowledge, and to perpetuate the status quo. Conversely, community participation in schools, if it is motivated by a desire to change and improve the educational

experiences of the learners, must actively challenge not only the hegemony of the school, but in doing so it must also challenge the overarching societal hegemony. For example, in pushing for personalized progress reports in opposition to a fixed grade scale which effectively ranks students on a competitive basis, or in arguing for the decompartmentalization of knowledge from strictly bounded subject areas, a community group is concurrently countering the dominant organizational and evaluative principles of society. If the community becomes aware of, or is made aware of, these broader implications of its narrow school-focussed actions, it can transcend hegemony in other aspects of social life — that is, in the family, in the workplace, etc.

Of course, the nascent 'synthetic' interpretation introduced here needs extensive elaboration. Nevertheless, while other explanations of community participation proliferate, we believe that any approach which addresses the phenomenology of micro school processes in conjunction with a broader analysis of educational hegemony is worth pursuing. Also, from this interpretive stance, we hold that community participation in schooling can be seen as having great potential for generating the impetus for substantial change in the day-to-day activities of the school and ultimately in general social life.

Notes

[1] A good critical review of the supporting studies is found in Christopher J. Hurn, *The Limits and Possibilities of Schooling* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1978).

[2] See, for example, Kingsley Davis and Wilbert E. Moore, "Some Principles of Stratification", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 10, April, 1945, pp. 242-249.

[3] Theodore W. Shultz, "Investment in Human Capital", *American Economic Review*, Vol. 2, No. 1, 1961, pp. 1-17.

[4] Earl Hopper, *Readings in the Theory of Educational Systems*, (London: Hutchinson, 1971).

[5] In Canada see John Porter, *The Vertical Mosaic* (Toronto: U. of Toronto Press, 1965), in the U.S.A. see Peter Blau & Otis Dudley Duncan, *The American Occupational Structure* (N.Y.: Wiley, 1967), and in Britain see A.H. Halsey, *Educational and Social Mobility in Britain Since World War II* (Paris: O.E.C.D., 1974).

[6] Hopper, *op. cit.*

[7] For a convincing refutation of the 'education produces more equality' argument, see also Lester Thorow, "Education and Economic Equality", in *The Public Interest*, 28, 1972.

[8] Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis, *Schooling in Capitalist America* (New York: Basic Books, 1977), p. 130.

[9] Pierre Bourdieu, "Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction", in J. Karabel and A.H. Halsey (eds.), *Power and Ideology in Education* (New York: Oxford Press, 1977).

[10] Pierre Bourdieu, "The School as a Conservative Force: Scholastic and Cultural Inequalities", in John Eggleston (ed.) *Contemporary Research in the Sociology of Education* (London: Methuen, 1974), p. 39.

[11] Christopher Jencks et al, *Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America* (New York: Harper, 1973).

[12] Bourdieu, "Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction", *op. cit.*, p. 507.

[13] Antonio Gramsci, *Prison Notebooks* (New York: International Publishers, 1971).

[14] Raymond Williams, "Base and Superstructure in Marxist Cultural Theory", in R. Dale et. al. (eds.), *Schooling and Capitalism* (London: R.K.P., 1976), p. 205, emphasis added.

[15] Leonard J. Fein, *The Ecology of the Public Schools* (New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1971).

[16] For example, G.A. Hillery lists no less than ninety-four separate sociological usages of the term 'community' in "Definition of Community: Areas of Agreement", *Rural Sociology*, 20, 1965.

[17] Mario Fantini et. al., *Community Control and the Urban School* (New York: Praeger, 1970), p. 74.

[18] For Canadian examples see G. Eastabrook et al, *Community Schools Survey in Ontario* (Toronto: O.I.S.E., 1977) and *Community Education Project: Report of the Alberta Inter-Departmental Community School Committee* (Edmonton: The Committee, 1976).

[19] Maurice Berube, "Community Control: Key to Educational Achievement", *Social Policy*, Vol. 1, No. 2, 1970, p. 42.

[20] J. Stevens, "Community Schools", *Education Canada*, 14 (4), 1974.

[21] For an example of native 'community control' efforts in Canada, see Solomon Sanderson, *A Model for Community Education: Local Control at James Smith Reserve* (Saskatoon: University of Saskatchewan, 1975).

[22] C.H. Moore and R.E. Johnston, "School Decentralization, Community Control, and the Politics of Public Education", *Urban Affairs Quarterly*, Vol. 6, No. 4, 1971.

[23] See George Martel, *The Politics of the Canadian Public School* (Toronto: Lewis & Samuel, 1974).

[24] Harold Entwistle, *Class, Culture and Education* (London: Methuen, 1978), p. 69.

[25] M.F.D. Young and G. Whitty, *Society, State and Schooling* (Ringomer, England: Falmer, 1977), p. 31.

[26] M.F.D. Young and G. Whittey, *Explorations in the Politics of School Knowledge* (Nofferton, England: Studies in Education, 1976), p. 198.

[27] Madan Sarup, *Marxism and Education* (London: R.K.P., 1978).

[28] Nell Keddie, "Classroom Knowledge" in M.F.D. Young, *Knowledge and Control* (London: Collier-Macmillan, 1971), p. 156.

[29] See, for example, Michael W. Apple, *Ideology and Curriculum*, (London: R.K.P., 1979).

[30] Young and Whitty, *Society, State and Schooling*, *op. cit.*, pp. 34-35.