

Reading Bernstein, Researching Bernstein

Johan Muller, Brian Davies
and Ana Morais

 **RoutledgeFalmer**
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2004
by RoutledgeFalmer
11 New Fetter Lane, London EC4P 4EE

Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada
by RoutledgeFalmer
29 West 35th Street, New York, NY 10001

This edition published in the Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2004.

RoutledgeFalmer is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group

© 2004 Johan Muller, Brian Davies and Ana Morais for selection and editorial matter, and individual chapters, the contributors.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

A catalog record for this book has been requested

ISBN 0-203-46187-8 Master e-book ISBN

ISBN 0-203-47150-4 (Adobe eReader Format)

ISBN 0-415-33982-0 (Print Edition)

15 The wrong kind of knower

Education, expansion and the epistemic device

Karl Maton

Introduction

This chapter has two principal purposes, one substantive, the other theoretical. Substantively, it explores the question of how systems of education respond when facing rapid expansion. The most significant change undergone by education systems worldwide over the past century has been meteoric expansion, yet this remains one of their least studied aspects. In this chapter I specifically examine the hitherto often neglected role played by perceptions of the new learner that expansion is expected to bring into or retain within education. Moments of anticipated rapid expansion raise issues of what is to be done with these new students – they pose questions of who should be taught what, when, where and how. Analysis of such moments enables insight into the differential distribution, recontextualization and evaluation of forms of educational knowledge. By problematizing these issues, debates over new students also bring to the surface the tacit belief systems of educational fields and so afford heightened insight into the transformation, reproduction and change of education. To this end I examine a specific example of such a moment: the ‘new student’ debate prefacing the rapid expansion of English higher education during the early 1960s. Actors responsible for overseeing expansion focused debate on new, working-class students expected to enter universities in large numbers and their perceived needs legitimated radical changes undertaken within higher education, including the creation of new universities characterized by innovative pedagogic and disciplinary practices.

The second purpose is to illustrate and extend the concepts of legitimation code and epistemic device. These build on Basil Bernstein’s conceptual framework and were originally developed to explore the generative principles of knowledge structures and their intellectual fields. Here I extend the application of these concepts beyond the question of knowledge production. Specifically, I analyse the new student debate in terms of struggles for control of the epistemic device. The chapter comprises three main interrelated parts. First, I explain the conceptual framework. Second, I analyse the structuring principles of: English higher education prior to this debate; the new student as constructed within the language of legitimation of actors overseeing

expansion; and their related plans for the ‘new’ universities. These are shown to exhibit knower code, knowledge code and knower code legitimation, respectively. Lastly, I analyse how the new student debate worked to maintain the hierarchical relations of power and control in the field of English higher education in the face of anticipated change. In short, by constructing new students as the wrong kind of knower and, in the form of the new universities, revalorizing the field’s existing legitimation code, the managers of expansion maintained their control over the epistemic device and, thus, a key underlying structuring principle of the field.

Conceptual framework: codes and devices

This chapter forms part of a cumulative and ongoing project to develop a dynamic and epistemological sociology of knowledge. The aim is to provide an empirically applicable conceptual framework that enables the study of both social relations and intrinsic structures of knowledge (what Bernstein referred to as ‘relations to’ and ‘relations within’), as well as their interactions and dynamics of change, for all forms of knowledge. This chapter uses and illustrates one dimension of this developing conceptual framework: legitimation codes and the epistemic device.

These concepts emerged primarily from developing the ideas of Basil Bernstein in directions immanent to his cumulative theory. Bernstein (1999) outlined the trajectory of his work as a movement from the analysis of the pedagogic transmission and acquisition of existing knowledge within educational contexts, through a theory of the construction of the pedagogic discourse being transmitted and acquired, to the study of the knowledge subject to such pedagogic transformation. The first of these was famously conceptualized in terms of educational knowledge codes (Bernstein 1975). These concepts also enabled empirical research of the workings of the ‘pedagogic device’, which Bernstein developed to account for the construction of pedagogic discourse. He postulated the pedagogic device as the means whereby actors are able to regulate the principles and social bases of the distribution, recontextualization and evaluation of pedagogic discourse (Bernstein 1990: 165–218). In the course of ongoing struggles within pedagogic fields, actors strive to control the pedagogic device in order to be able to shape the form taken by pedagogic discourse and so further their own interests. Having conceptualized the structure and generative principles of *pedagogic* discourse, Bernstein turned his attention to the intellectual fields from which knowledge is recontextualized to become pedagogic discourse (Bernstein 1999, 2000). With the concepts of ‘knowledge structures’ and ‘grammars’, Bernstein provided the means of systematically describing differences between fields of knowledge production in terms of their organizing principles. What remained was a means of accounting for the *construction* of new knowledge, i.e. a means of conceptualizing the underlying generative principles giving rise to these knowledge structures and grammars.

This formed a key starting point for Moore and Maton (2001), where these generative principles were conceptualized in terms of an ‘epistemic device’. The epistemic device was postulated as the means whereby intellectual fields are maintained, reproduced, transformed and changed. Whoever controls the epistemic device possesses the means to set the structure and grammar of the field in their own favour. Through illustrative analyses of mathematics and literary criticism as fields of knowledge production, we showed how different ‘settings’ of the epistemic device generate different knowledge structures and grammars and so shape intellectual fields. Such empirical study was enabled by the concepts of legitimation codes which had been developed through analysis of the language of legitimation (claims for knowledge, status and resources) of actors in intellectual fields (Maton 2000a, b). Applying Bernstein’s concepts of educational knowledge codes and knowledge structures to an analysis of British cultural studies I found these characterized it as both weak classification and framing *and* strong classification and framing, respectively. I argued that this *prima facie* contradiction was resolved by distinguishing between the *epistemic relation* and the *social relation* of knowledge. These relations refer to two empirically co-existing but analytically distinguishable dimensions of knowledge and practice, namely that knowledge claims are *by somebody* and *about something*. In this study I defined these as follows. The epistemic relation (ER) refers to the relation between knowledge and its proclaimed object of study; the social relation (SR) is between knowledge and its author, the subject making the claim to knowledge. Each relation may be strongly or weakly classified and framed. Thus a language of legitimation may be conceptualized in terms of the strength of classification and framing it announces for what may be claimed knowledge of and how (ER), and for who may claim knowledge (SR). These strengths together give the legitimation code or specific ‘setting’ of the epistemic device. Varying the relative strengths of SR and ER generates four potential legitimation codes of which two were identified as predominant within extant intellectual fields: the knowledge code emphasizing mastery of specialized procedures (ER+, SR-); and the knower code emphasizing social attributes of the subject (ER-, SR+).¹ In more general terms, the knowledge code is predicated upon the rule ‘What matters is what you know’, and the knower code is predicated upon the rule ‘What matters is who you are’.

In short, legitimation code augments Bernstein’s concepts of strong/weak grammar to analyse the underlying principles generating knowledge structures; and the epistemic device analyses the means whereby these codes are established, maintained, transformed and changed in the course of struggles within intellectual fields. The epistemic device was, however, intended to *complement* rather than replace the pedagogic device. Just as Bernstein’s theory shows the pedagogical nature of social relations well beyond the classroom, we argued that the epistemological nature of social relations is similarly universal and ubiquitous. Analyses of knowledge *production* had

highlighted a new issue necessitating conceptual development because epistemological issues are muted and secondary to pedagogic concerns in arenas of recontextualization and reproduction. None the less, *both* devices form the basis of all three arenas.² Knowledge production, recontextualization and reproduction are all both pedagogic and epistemological. Thus, though the concepts were developed through studies of knowledge production, they were intended to illuminate educational knowledge and practice more generally. This forms the starting point for two related papers where I analyse continuity and change within higher education. In Maton (2004) I shall focus on changes within its symbolic field or disciplinary map; in this chapter I analyse its social field – institutional map and pedagogic practices.

The ‘new student’ debate

In the early 1960s English higher education was on the cusp of dramatic expansion.³ An unprecedented governmental inquiry was being published (Robbins Report 1963), sixteen institutions were chartered as universities and student numbers doubled (Layard *et al.* 1969). Studies of such changes often focus on state reports or student experiences – the view from above and below. The relatively high autonomy enjoyed by higher education, however, highlights the significance of the view from *within* the field; as a major study of academics during this period declared, ‘the university teachers themselves are the managers of expansion’ (Halsey and Trow 1971: 26). Among these actors it was not expansion per se but questions of *who* should have access to *what* and *where* that focused debate. A spectre was haunting English universities: the ‘new student’. This student was defined as the first of (usually) his family to enter university and typically of working-class origin. Such students were portrayed as a major challenge for higher education, bringing ‘their own problems for which the universities have to find the appropriate answers’ (Fulton 1966: 26). Moreover, they were directly associated with dramatic institutional change. Huge financial government investment was ploughed into the creation of eight brand new, fully chartered universities during the early 1960s. These ‘new’ universities were heralded as radical, progressive and initiating ‘a sort of revolution within a revolution . . . the redrawing of the map of knowledge itself’ (Hall 1965: 117). Crucially, they were explicitly legitimated by their planners as the solution to the new student problem. The model of this student was thus central to the form taken by expansion.

This new student debate among the ‘managers of expansion’ is my focus here. Drawing primarily upon the public contributions of actors responsible for shaping these institutional changes, I analyse their representation of the new student and plans for the new universities in terms of the legitimation code each represents.⁴ I then discuss how these constructed problems and solutions contributed to continuity and change within higher education.

I begin with a brief outline of the field of institutional positions prior to this debate and into which the problematic new student would arrive.

In the immediate post-war period the social field of English higher education was represented by participants as a polarized and hierarchically arranged field of institutional positions. The poles of this field were represented by two ideal types that comprised competing visions of higher education: a higher status 'English university' ideal and a lower status technological model. The English ideal represented a realization of the ruler by which universities were measured; the grouping of institutions into university types and ranking in status by participants depended on approximation to this ideal (Halsey 1961). This model comprised an assortment of empirical characteristics based on an idealized version of mid-nineteenth-century Oxford and Cambridge (Halsey and Trow 1971). One of the key threads running through these characteristics was the significance they accorded the university as a social context for cultivating knowers. A stress on 'academic freedom' and 'institutional autonomy' underscored the necessity for individual academics and universities to be protected from external political and economic interests, keeping the locus of allegiance, identity and practices *within* the strongly bounded institution. Similarly, liberal humanist ideas of 'knowledge for its own sake' were deemed essential and notions of vocational relevance viewed as anathema to university education. Rather than training students to attain a mastery of specialized procedures, education was defined as the inculcation of students into a way of life through cultivating specialized sensibilities. Universities should produce 'university men' (typically men) who identified themselves with their alma mater and were cultured knowers rather than technocrats. This vision portrayed an organic community of teachers and taught 'co-operating with leisurely confidence in the task of preserving and transmitting a cultured way of life' (Halsey 1961: 55). According to the ideal, students should be hand-picked on the basis of the fit between their habitus and the institution's established life and character rather than their educational qualifications. It thereby trumpeted the virtue of the amateur generalist with a breadth of culture and denigrated specialization to specific disciplines. The institutional character was further emphasized through the weight given to the longevity and tradition of universities: the older the institution, the higher its status.

One key thread throughout this ideal was an emphasis on the social context of privileged knowers at the expense of possession of specialized procedures. Analysing the principles underlying this empirical ruler in terms of legitimation code, one can describe higher status institutional positions as representing strong classification and framing of the social relation and weak classification and framing of the epistemic relation: a knower code. In contrast, the technological model of the university, which lower status institutions were viewed as resembling, was of a newer, non-residential institution offering training in specialized technical competencies to anyone with sufficient educational qualifications; this ideal announced that what

mattered was what you knew, not who you were – a knowledge code. In short, the prevailing conception of university education within English higher education was that of cultivating knowers rather than training knowledge specialists.

The new student

For the managers of expansion the new student was at odds with this established university ideal:

Concealed behind so many more of our university entrants now is the struggle between the home or the sub-culture and the life that you are trying to make him lead and the values that you are trying to give him.
(James, in Hall 1961: 155)

According to this conception new students presented problems on two fronts, equating to social and epistemic relations: they brought dispositions that would disadvantage them within universities; and they believed that what mattered in education was specialist knowledge.

The wrong kind of knower

The cultural background of new students was, Vice-Chancellors argued, likely to have profound consequences for their ability to succeed. The conventional single-subject honours degree course at university derived:

from a time when it was reasonable to suppose that students entered the university after liberal education, and, in most cases, from cultivated or bookish homes.

(Thistlethwaite 1966: 58)

Disciplinary specialization was predicated on cultural breadth that, in turn, assumed a certain social class of knower. In contrast, new students were said to come from ‘homes with no tradition of culture or learning’ (Sloman 1963: 11) where ‘there are not a great many good books read, there is very little good music, there is above all not a great deal of very intelligent conversation’ (James, in Hall 1961: 155). Their only *legitimate* cultural capital thereby derived from school education, which was portrayed as a narrow, scholastic background leaving new students vulnerable to *over*-specialization at university. Moreover, lacking the social ease which comes from sustained interaction with ‘high’ culture, they would struggle to fit into university life; new students had the ‘technical but not normally the cultural background necessary for an easy transition to university style study’ (*The Times Educational Supplement* 1964, quoted in Jobling 1972: 326). This prejudiced their chances of success within the traditional intimacy of collegiate life where

ease and integration were paramount. New students therefore brought not different forms of cultural capital and dispositions to the university but rather suffered from a cultural deficit that no amount of further schooling or educational achievement could dispel – they were the wrong kind of knower.

Knowledge specialists

New students were also portrayed by managers of expansion as bringing a conception of university education that dispensed with time-honoured traditions. New students were, in short, pragmatic, utilitarian and careerist, seeking higher education not in and for itself but for the social advancement it endows. The founding Vice-Chancellor of York University, for example, described:

your very ordinary person who is going to do technology, for example, who really does not like learning at all . . . he does not like reading; he may quite like Science, but he is on the whole envisaging the university as the place from which the best jobs in electrical engineering are to be obtained.

(James, in Hall 1961: 154)

Under this barbarous gaze extrinsic function would displace intrinsic form as the focal measure of status. This, many participants feared, would produce pressure for vocational courses, transforming university education from the civilizing of well-rounded amateurs into the training of technical experts. A common conception was that new students ‘seek a degree course to earn a living rather than college residence to complete their induction into a style of life’ (Halsey 1961: 56). Their arrival would thereby herald a shift whereby specialists would replace generalists, depth would usurp breadth, and imparting knowledge would supplant cultivating the knower as the basis of achievement within the field. This would also see disciplines usurp universities as the central focus of higher education. While past students were said to owe their position, identity and allegiance to their membership of a university, scholastically minded new students would, it was alleged, focus on their knowledge of a discipline. One would no longer consider oneself an ‘Oxonian’ but rather a geographer or engineer – what you knew would be what mattered.

The managers of expansion portrayed new students as unlikely to integrate into university education. They were both culturally impoverished and liable to further compromise their education as well-rounded human beings. Conceptually, their imminent arrival within universities would elevate a new ruler of consciousness, relation and identity, one which emphasized the discipline over the institution, what one knows over who one is, and thus the epistemic relation over the social relation: knowledge code legitimation.

The new universities

A question often asked by senior figures within English higher education was how this mismatch between new students and university education could be bridged. Their conclusion was that they needed to provide 'in the atmosphere of the institutions in which the students live and work, influences that in some measure compensate for inequalities of home background' (Robbins Report 1963: 7). An oft-repeated argument held that this required new educational thinking:

New institutions starting without traditions with which the innovator must come to terms might well be more favourably situated for such experimentation than established universities.

(UGC 1964: 74)

To this end eight campus or 'new' universities were explicitly planned and created for the perceived needs of new students. Here I focus on two effects of these plans, which are the ways in which they attempted to: weaken the epistemic relation by downplaying the significance of specialized disciplinary knowledge; and strengthen the social relation by inculcating a sense of membership of an institutional knower group among new students.

Discouraging knowledge specialization

According to the influential Robbins Report a key aim of higher education 'should be to produce not mere specialists but rather cultivated men and women' (1963: 6). For planners of new universities this aim necessitated new forms of curriculum 'to give the student a more liberal education . . . broad enough for them to emerge as educated human beings' (Thistlethwaite 1966: 58). This need for breadth rather than depth was the basis for a restructuring of the disciplinary map. Planners adopted multi-disciplinary Schools of Study that brought together cognate fields within which students would typically study a common foundation course before multi-subject Honours degrees. The aim was to minimize the student's contact with disciplinary boundaries: 'In all our schemes of study we stand by the principles of integration' (Sloman 1963: 41). Accordingly, requirements for applicants' qualification to match their chosen subject areas were relaxed, pedagogy emphasized the mastery of 'ways of knowing' rather than 'states of knowledge', and examinations were minimized. Moreover, a curricular bias against applied science and technology aimed to keep students insulated from the vocational demands of the economic world. However, specialization into a discipline was to be delayed rather than dispensed with, 'to broaden the base without blunting the point of the pyramid' (Thistlethwaite 1966: 60). New universities often embraced a fourth year or taught a Master's course for students wishing to pursue an academic career. However, only once they had resocialized into

becoming the right kind of knower could new students be granted access to disciplinary specialization.

Socializing knowers

This issue of resocialization was central to the design of the new universities. In a number of ways they resembled what Erving Goffman termed ‘total institutions’. First, new students were removed from their originating social contexts and kept apart from outside influences. New universities were located near historic cathedral towns rather than in cities, separated from these towns on dedicated ‘greenfield’ sites, as far as possible residential and designed as ‘university towns’ that provided for the whole life of students. Second, students were said to need ‘continuous education . . . positive guidance, which is both intellectual and cultural’ (James, in Hall 1961: 155–6). Accordingly, campus layouts integrated learning and living areas within adapted forms of the ‘Oxbridge’ collegiate system and pedagogic practices were adopted that maximized interaction between staff and students, such as small-group tutorials and coursework assessment. Such intimate social and pedagogical relations were legitimated by planners as opening up more of the new student to surveillance and discipline and engendering familiarity, interest and social ease (Thistlethwaite 1966). Both also served to encourage institutional loyalty and affiliation. New universities attempted to ‘show the student what it is to be a university man’ (Fulton, in Mackenzie 1961: 151), and to shape them in such a way that it ‘would be apparent in the university man’s conduct and conversation for the rest of his life’ (Lindsay, in Gallie 1960: 66). The collegiate-tutorial system emphasized the institution as a socializing space extending beyond transmission of knowledge in the lecture hall. Similarly, architects of new universities explicitly aimed to help inculcate students’ commitment to ‘university values’ (Casson 1962). These were, moreover, the time-honoured traditions of the English university ideal. New universities imitated features of the ‘Oxbridge’ model, revived and re-enlivened in the image and financial exigencies of the 1960s precisely to enable new students to ‘enjoy the same intense and immediate undergraduate experience’ as at the ancient universities (Thistlethwaite 1966: 68).

In summary, managers of expansion hoped to overcome the mismatch between new students and the established university ideal by resocializing them into the right kind of knower. Institutional and curricular plans for the new universities attempted to move the locus of influence over the identity and allegiance of new students away from the specialized knowledge of disciplines (ER-) and towards the institution as a social space (SR+), to make new students into members of an institutionally based knower group; in short, they embodied knower code legitimation.

Controlling the epistemic device

The new student was a mythical figure. New students were not about to flood universities; the social class composition of the student population was neither undergoing nor about to experience great change (Layard *et al.* 1969). When new students did enter higher education they tended not to choose new universities, opting instead for such institutions as technical colleges (Couper 1965). Moreover, actual new students resembled little the portrait painted by the managers of expansion. Working-class students represented a survivor population already well socialized into the legitimate educational habitus (Halsey *et al.* 1980). In short, the ‘new student’ constructed by the managers of expansion did not exist. This raises the question of what the debate was really about and its role within educational expansion.

Its public face was of pastoral concern for the educational success of new students within universities. Although often expressed in what today appears unsympathetic language, participants legitimated their stances as helping new students. While not doubting their sincerity, I argue that the debate may also be understood as one realization of struggles for control of the epistemic device. The characteristics attributed to new students can be rewritten as realizations of a knowledge code. Returning to the discussion of English higher education prior to the debate shows this ‘setting’ of the device to be that already underlying lower status institutions and against which higher status universities defined themselves. The new student embodied an opposing legitimation code to that dominating the field – the threat of the profane entering the sacred. The anticipated entry of large numbers of new students would thus alter the field’s status hierarchy – a change in ownership of the epistemic device.

However, the new student was a myth, occasioning a moral panic; the true source of this threat lay elsewhere, in a more diffuse perception of loss of control by actors within the field. During this period many ‘managers of expansion’ voiced concern that ‘the Idea of a University . . . is frequently the subject of ridicule’ (Mackerness 1960: 14), and claimed that economic and political changes were pressuring universities to move towards the technological model. The new student was, I would argue, the embodiment of these pressures. Space precludes extensive discussion here, but one example is how students are selected within the two university ideals. Policy makers argued that the growing tide of potential university applicants (generated *inter alia* by demographic trends) *should* be accommodated, a belief codified by the Robbins Report’s ‘guiding principle’ that higher education should be available to everyone qualified to attend (1963: 8). From sponsored mobility, where elite status is bestowed upon hand-picked apprentices by established élites, expansion would thus encourage moves towards contest mobility, where status is earned by the candidates’ own efforts in open competition (Turner 1971). This represents a move from knower code to knowledge code, changing the social role and position of intellectuals and elevating the

technological university model. One finds this threat echoed in the portrayal of new students as culturally impoverished despite being highly qualified. In the new student such threats to ownership of the epistemic device from beyond higher education were refracted and embodied within a specific, manageable set of educational problems.

New universities: continuity through change

The solution to these problems was the new universities. This answer may be understood, I argue, as helping to maintain the existing hierarchy and underlying structuring principles of English higher education. I shall focus here on three illustrative ways in which this change to the institutional map enabled continuity.

First, it was taken for granted that new students should change to fit universities and not vice versa. The new universities were designed as specially built total institutions where the habituses of new students could be reconfigured in the image of the English university ideal. The form they took was legitimated as enabling new students to adapt successfully to *established* university life and, though couched in educational terms, this meant resocialization. As descriptions of their problematic cultural backgrounds made clear, it was not ‘new’ students per se who concerned the managers of expansion but rather *working-class* students. Similarly, the solution was not to augment their knowledge but to change their attitudes, perceptions, dispositions, i.e. their habitus. The new student was simply the wrong kind of knower and the price of entry to university education was to become the right kind of knower. New students faced the choice of resocialization within higher status universities or (as many actually chose) relegation to lower status, knowledge code institutions.

Second, though innovative, new universities were not as new as portrayed. They were neither revolutionary nor a continuation of the status quo. They shared the knower code legitimation of the established English university ideal but for a new kind of knower, thus representing a *variation* of this ideal. Summarizing a conference on the new student, one commentator asked whether the universities could ‘by some devious method, salvage the concept of “education” from the pressures of a merit-minded society. . . . Can they educate by stealth?’ (Hall 1961: 13). The answer was, as one founding Vice-Chancellor put it, that ‘traditional ends will have to be sought by new means’ (Sloman 1963: 12).

Lastly, the creation of wholly new institutions changed the surface structure of the field of higher education while maintaining its underlying hierarchies. University planners argued that new students had specific needs requiring new institutions; the intention was to insulate higher status universities from this polluting category by channelling them into specially designed sites. Sir Charles Morris, highly placed in university governance, claimed that ‘the main problem’ was ‘how to get the right students to go to the right

universities', those which would best suit their 'needs and interests' (1961: 359). The creation of the new universities transformed the shape of higher education, adding a cluster of new positions to the field, but retained the basis for organizing positions within the field, among them the dominance of the knower code. By legitimating this restructuring, the myth of the new student helped the managers of expansion to retain control of the epistemic device.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have explored one aspect of how educational systems work to maintain their hierarchical relations of power and control in the face of anticipated expansion. Specifically, I highlighted the significance of the image generated within educational debates of the learner expected to be brought into or kept within education by expansion. Using the concepts of legitimation code and epistemic device I analysed the way actors responsible for managing expansion legitimated their actions through the construction of this image. When facing rapid expansion, for things to stay as they are, something has to change and something has to be found to legitimate that change. In the example discussed here the 'new student' provided the educational rationale for avowedly radical changes within English higher education. New students were portrayed as embodying a knowledge code that would jeopardize their educational success and which required knower code institutions to remedy. The threat of a new social class of student entering a knower-based field was neutralized through resocializing institutions designed to produce the right kind of knower for the field. Although in reality the new student was a myth, the debate legitimated change which helped maintain the field's underlying structuring principles.

I would suggest that this is a paradigmatic episode within education under conditions of expansion, one example of a recurrent 'expansion/accommodation' problem (Hickox and Moore 1995). Raising the school-leaving age, for example, has typically prompted debates where forms of institution, curriculum and pedagogy are advanced as meeting the proclaimed needs of pupils who would otherwise have left education. Such models usually portray new students as not simply lacking in knowledge but as the wrong kind of knower. Within English higher education, for example, the 1960s portrait of the working-class student echoes that of the middle classes in the late nineteenth century (Lowe 1987). Moreover, despite recurrent expansions of higher education, institutional hierarchies have remained remarkably consistent (Tight 1996); as Bernstein was fond of stating, *Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose*.

Finally, I have also illustrated the application of the concepts of legitimation code and epistemic device beyond their genesis in the analysis of knowledge production. As emphasized earlier, this is not intended to replace analysis of the pedagogic device. Rather, these concepts sensitize us to issues

of the basis of claims to knowledge, status and resources, enable us to identify what is a change, what is a variation, what is the same, and (in this case) show that despite good intentions our hopes and fears for new students and educational expansion may be inextricably linked with our hopes and fears for ourselves.

Notes

- 1 +/- refers to strong/weak classification *and* framing. Note that legitimation codes are not ideal types but generating principles whose empirical realizations are dependent on the enabling context.
- 2 I shall discuss relations between the two devices and elaborate the overarching symbolic device of which they are two key components in future publications.
- 3 The Scottish system was sufficiently different to merit its own analysis and no 'new' universities were situated in Wales.
- 4 The corpus comprises published discourse of senior figures within higher education during the early 1960s, including conference reports, mission statements and interviews. For identifying quotes used here, founding Vice-Chancellors of new universities were: Fulton (Sussex, chartered 1961); Lindsay (Keele, 1962); Thistlethwaite (UEA, 1963); James (York, 1963); Sloman (Essex, 1964); Carter (Lancaster, 1964); Templeman (Kent, 1965); Butterworth (Warwick, 1965).

References

- Bernstein, B. (1975) *Class, Codes and Control, Volume III: Towards a Theory of Educational Transmissions*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Bernstein, B. (1990) *Class, Codes and Control, Volume IV: The Structuring of Pedagogic Discourse*, London: Routledge.
- Bernstein, B. (1999) 'Vertical and horizontal discourse: an essay', *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 20 (2): 157–73.
- Bernstein, B. (2000) *Class, Codes and Control, Volume V: Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity*, Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Casson, S.H. (1962) 'Bricks and mortar-boards', *The Twentieth Century*, 172 (1014): 91–102.
- Couper, M. (1965) 'Why some prefer CATs', *New Society*, V (123): 12–13.
- Fulton, J.S. (1966) 'The University of Sussex', in M.G. Ross (ed.) *New Universities in the Modern World*, London: Macmillan.
- Gallie, W.B. (1960) *A New University: A.D. Lindsay and the Keele Experiment*, London: Chatto & Windus.
- Hall, S. (1961) 'The new student', *Universities Quarterly*, 15 (2): 152–63.
- Hall, S. (1965) 'Changing patterns of study in the universities', *Universities Quarterly*, 19 (2): 115–61.
- Halsey, A.H. (1961) 'University expansion and the collegiate ideal', *Universities Quarterly*, 16: 55–8.
- Halsey, A.H. and Trow, M. (1971) *The British Academics*, Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.
- Halsey, A.H., Heath, A.F. and Ridge, J.M. (1980) *Origins and Destinations*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hickox, M. and Moore, R. (1995) 'Liberal-humanist education: the vocationalist challenge', *Curriculum Studies*, 3 (1): 45–59.

- Jobling, R.G. (1972) 'The new universities', in H.J. Butcher and E. Rudd (eds) *Contemporary Problems in Higher Education*, London: McGraw Hill.
- Layard, R., King, J. and Moser, C. (1969) *The Impact of Robbins*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Lowe, R. (1987) 'Structural change in English higher education, 1870–1920', in D.K. Muller, F. Ringer and B. Simon (eds) *The Rise of the Modern Educational System*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mackenzie, N. (1961) 'Starting a new university', *Universities Quarterly*, 15 (2): 139–51.
- Mackerness, E.D. (1960) 'Ignorant armies', *The Universities Review*, 33 (1): 14–17.
- Maton, K. (2000a) 'Recovering pedagogic discourse: a Bernsteinian approach to the sociology of educational knowledge', *Linguistics and Education*, 11 (1): 79–98.
- Maton, K. (2000b) 'Languages of legitimation: the structuring significance for intellectual fields of strategic knowledge claims', *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 21 (2): 147–67.
- Maton, K. (2004) 'Exploring knowledge structures: languages, literacies and the epistemic device', paper presented at Third International Basil Bernstein Symposium, Cambridge University, July.
- Moore, R. and Maton, K. (2001) 'Founding the sociology of knowledge: Basil Bernstein, intellectual fields and the epistemic device', in A. Morais, I. Neves, B. Davies and H. Daniels (eds) *Towards a Sociology of Pedagogy: The Contribution of Basil Bernstein to Research*, New York: Peter Lang.
- Morris, C.R. (1961) 'Postscript', *Universities Quarterly*, 15 (4): 359–60.
- Peters, R.S. (1965) 'Education as initiation', in R.D. Archambault (ed.) *Philosophical Analysis and Education*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Robbins Report (1963) *Higher Education*, London: HMSO.
- Slooman, A. (1963) *A University in the Making*, London: BBC.
- Thistlethwaite, F. (1966) 'The University of East Anglia', in M.G. Ross (ed.) *New Universities in the Modern World*, London: Macmillan.
- Tight, M. (1996) 'University typologies re-examined', *Higher Education Review*, 29 (1): 57–77.
- Turner, R.H. (1971) 'Sponsored and contest mobility and the school system', in E. Hopper (ed.) *Readings in the Theory of Educational Systems*, London: Hutchinson.
- UGC (1964) *University Development 1957–1962*, London: HMSO.