



LUND UNIVERSITY

Framed School

Frame Factors, Frames and the Dynamics of Social Interaction in School

Persson, Anders

Published in:
Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research

DOI:
[10.1080/00313831.2014.932305](https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2014.932305)

2015

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Persson, A. (2015). Framed School: Frame Factors, Frames and the Dynamics of Social Interaction in School. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 59(5), 499-514. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2014.932305>

Total number of authors:
1

General rights

Unless other specific re-use rights are stated the following general rights apply:
Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Read more about Creative commons licenses: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

LUND UNIVERSITY

PO Box 117
221 00 Lund
+46 46-222 00 00

This article was downloaded by: [Lund University Libraries]

On: 18 July 2014, At: 03:07

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/csje20>

Framed School – Frame Factors, Frames and the Dynamics of Social Interaction in School

Anders Persson^a

^a Lund University

Published online: 14 Jul 2014.

To cite this article: Anders Persson (2014): Framed School – Frame Factors, Frames and the Dynamics of Social Interaction in School, Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, DOI: [10.1080/00313831.2014.932305](https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2014.932305)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2014.932305>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

Framed School – Frame Factors, Frames and the Dynamics of Social Interaction in School

Anders Persson
Lund University

This paper aims to show how the Goffman frame perspective can be used in an analysis of school and education and how it can be combined, in such analysis, with the frame factor perspective. The latter emphasizes factors that are determined outside the teaching process, while the former stresses how actors organize their experiences and define shared situations. In this light, an analysis of framing of and in Swedish compulsory school, based on governing documents, is carried out. Since the frame factors are contradictory, different possibilities to frame school in the Goffmanian sense present themselves to the school actors. In spite of frame factors, school can be framed in different and inconstant ways, for example, as an institution, an organization, a movement, or a seminar. Such nuance shifts show different dynamics of social interaction in school and can be used to understand variations between and within schools.

Keywords: framing, frame factors, nuance shifts, school as institution, school as organization/movement, school as seminar

Introduction

Is it possible to think school without some kind of frame? Perhaps. Illich (1973) tried in his book *Deschooling society*, a fundamental critique of schooling on the theme “schools are based upon the ... spurious hypothesis that learning is the result of curricular teaching” (p. 64), but yet was forced to imagine an alternative institutional frame (named “convivial institutions” [p. 58]) that intended to frame learning for a better future. Confronted, moreover, with Anderssons (1999) book *Blow up school*,¹ one might say, or sigh: “Sure, but what are we going to do with the pieces?”, suggesting that schools necessarily have to be kept together by a new frame. To *think* school without frames seems, at least partly, to work, but to *do* school without frames is a far more difficult matter.

School as a phenomenon is associated with frames of an obvious nature, such as: curricula, goals decided by politicians, groups of pupils, time, economic and personal resources, school houses, classrooms, and the very organization of activities in school. Such frames are mirrored in many different perspectives on school and education, for example the frame

Anders Persson, Department of Sociology and Department of Educational Sciences Lund University.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Anders Persson, Lund University, Department of Educational sciences, Box 882, 25108 Helsingborg, SWEDEN. E-mail: anders.persson@soc.lu.se

¹The Swedish title of the book means simply “Burst the school” and the ambiguity of the translated title “Blow up school”, meaning both to burst and to enlarge school, is only in English. All translations from Swedish to English is by the author unless otherwise noted.

factor perspective that was developed by Swedish educational researchers Urban Dahllöf and Ulf P. Lundgren. This perspective will be presented below. But there are also other frame perspectives, among which the frame perspective of Erving Goffman will be presented in what follows.

This paper² aims to show how the Goffman frame perspective can be used in an analysis of school and education and how it can be combined, in such analysis, with the frame factor perspective. In the light of the two mentioned perspectives, an analysis of framing of and in Swedish compulsory school is carried out, focusing on tensions between different frame factors and of nuance shifts of frames. The paper concludes by showing that these two frame perspectives can benefit from each other if combined in an analysis of different dynamics of social interaction in school and also be used to analyze, explain, and understand variations between and in schools in different aspects of schooling.

Two Frame Perspectives

Frame perspectives emphasize various restrictions upon individual and collective social actors—restrictions that also can be used to manage actors. Also, frame perspectives are often used to contextualize action and, to a certain degree, explain why actors behave as they do. In school and in educational research, the frame concept is often used to show restrictions upon the school and the individual actors. Usually the frames apply to different resources: time, the group of pupils, the teachers' competence, space, organization, rules, curricula, and different steering documents such as laws and ordinances, and will, in what follows, be illustrated by the frame factor perspective. As that perspective is well-known and often used by both researchers and practitioners in the educational field, according to Broady (1999) "... a standard reference among educational researchers in several countries" (p. 114), which also through the very term frame factor "... has become part of the everyday language of Swedish teachers", it will not be presented as thoroughly as the Goffman frame perspective. Goffman developed this frame perspective in the research field of social interaction and used it to understand how individuals construct definitions of shared social situations by organizing their experiences and by reading the other interactants in the situation.

The Frame Factor Perspective of Dahllöf and Lundgren

Since the 1960s, a frame factor perspective has gradually developed inside Swedish educational research. After reading several works by Swedish educational researchers Urban Dahllöf and Ulf P. Lundgren—the two researchers that have invested great intellectual energy in developing the perspective³—one is inclined to agree with Dahllöf (1999) when he writes about the circuitous ways of the frame factor perspective that often "... in contrast to the straight normative lines in the handbooks, characterize the real expedition of the

²A former version of this paper (in Swedish) has been discussed in the educational research seminar at Lund University and also commented on by Assistant Professor Glen Helmstad, Lund University. A former English version was presented at the NERA conference in Reykjavik in 2013. I wish to express gratitude for all comments, also those whose influence is not immediately seen in the text. I also wish to thank my friend Wade Nelson, Emeritus Professor, Minnesota, USA, for proofreading and commenting on the paper.

³Many others have also contributed, according to Lundgren (1984).

researchers moving from one result in one area to a new approach in another, but related field” (p. 6).

The development of the frame factor perspective starts with Dahllöf’s (1967a) re-analysis of educational researcher Nils-Erik Svensson’s (1962) thesis, which “... indicated that one shouldn’t fear any decreasing knowledge standard” (as cited in Lundgren, 1984, p. 69) as a consequence of the new nine-year compulsory school that in the 1960s was gradually replacing the old school in Sweden. The Dahllöf re-analysis focused on intervening variables between teaching and knowledge in pupils, in both the old and new school; more precisely, the composition of the pupil’s group, the time spent on teaching, and the actual lack of proper, individualized teaching media in the new school. These intervening variables were later to be called frame factors. One might also describe this as an analytical model where the relation between input and output, or stimulus and response, has been replaced by a model that Dahllöf (1999) describes as the relation between “frames-process-result” (p. 9). Lundgren (1984) shows that this is a changeover from how to why, from “... the question about how results of educational activities are supposed to be measured, to the scientifically more interesting question about why different results are achieved” (p. 70). In a later work, Dahllöf (1971) tried to adopt a general view of several of the frame factors that influence educational activities and, consequently, can contribute to the explanation of them. Dahllöf analyzes how “grouping” and “time for school and homework” influence the pupil’s results and in which other variables need to be kept constant in order to see the unmediated relation between the frame factors in question and learning results of the pupils. Later, Dahllöf (1999) described this as if “... the lid of the black educational process box was open” (p. 16).

The early frame factor perspective is contextualizing the teaching situation by bringing its closer context to the fore, that is, physical factors, time, organizational, and curricular restrictions upon the actors involved. Consequently, the frame factor perspective in the Dahllöf version was a scientific contribution to curriculum construction and educational planning inside educational policy. In 1967, it was a new feature “... that empirical investigations were systematically utilized in questions regarding goals in educational policies, while they formerly in educational science mainly had been treated as theoretical problems” (Dahllöf, 1967b, p. 13). The later development of the frame factor perspective maintains the empirical emphasis but also contextualizes the teaching process in a broader way, inspired by educational sociology and easily connected to several other theories in the 1960s and 1970s that analyzed school in the light of societal structures, systems, cultures, codes, and other factors that were supposed to limit the possible development of the school. Lundgren (1972; 1981) shows this in his analytical and empirical development of the frame factor perspective by connecting to the framing theory of Basil Bernstein, in which frame “... refers to the form of the context in which knowledge is transmitted and received” (Bernstein 1971, p. 50) and to teachers and pupils degree of control over “... the knowledge transmitted and received in the pedagogical relationship” (1973, p. 231; see also Bernstein & Lundgren 1983). The frame factor perspective can, in that context, be taken as “... a theory on how different restricting factors make possible or impossible a certain teaching frame and consequently points out the freedom of action inside the frame” (Callewaert & Lundgren, 1976, p. 79) or as factors “... that are limiting the actual teaching process over which teachers and students have no control” (Lundgren, 1979, p. 233). Lundgren has, in different contexts, tried to make clear in detail what such restrictions mean, for example by distinguishing between constitutional, organizational, and physical frames (Lundgren, 1981, p. 93).

By broadening the frame factor perspective, Lundgren (1981) also criticizes educational research that rests on the view that “... teaching leads to the learning of the stated goals”, a critique that clears the way for both an educational sociological perspective on the relation between education and society and, at the same time, for an empirically oriented research that is based on “... data concerning the educational process as it exists in reality” (p. 33).⁴ Against that background, Lundgren (1981) gives a more precise definition of frame factors: “... those factors which are determined outside the teaching process” and hence “outside the control of teachers and students” (p. 36).

Goffman's Frame Perspective

The Canadian-American sociologist Erving Goffman (1922–1982) elaborated on the cognitive frame concept of William James.⁵ I use the word cognitive in a fairly loose way as something that has to do with thinking and knowledge. James (1948) describe frames, accordingly, as an “image in the mind”—surrounded by a “fringe”, that we maybe can call a frame of reference—and with every such image goes:

... the sense of its relations, near and remote, the dying echo of whence it came to us, the dawning sense of whither it is to lead. The significance, the value, of the image is all in this halo or penumbra that surrounds and escorts it—or rather that is fused into one with it and has become bone of its bone and flesh of its flesh; leaving it, it is true, an image of the same thing it was before, but making it an image of that thing newly taken and freshly understood. (p. 165f.)

Edward de Bono (2008), a contemporary researcher but first and foremost a developer of methods of creative thinking, has visualized frames in a similar way and describes them as language codes that can be used as aspects in a conscious way when handling information.

In transitions between frames, whether conscious, as in the case of de Bono, or as the result of mistakes, the frames become visible. Bateson (2000) illustrates this in a famous article from 1955 referring to observations of monkeys that were playing a make-believe fight. There, Bateson starts to develop a more communicative frame concept. To be able to take part in such a make-believe fight, the monkeys also have to be able to meta-communicate the frame and show that “this is play” and by that make a distinction between play and a serious and dangerous fight (p. 179). To play-fight, which both monkeys, human beings, and some other animals are capable of doing, is, from a communicative point of view, rather complicated as the involved parties must be able to communicate that “These actions, in which we now engage, do not denote what would be denoted by those actions which these actions denote” or differently, more concretely, expressed: “The playful nip denotes the bite, but it does not denote what would be denoted by the bite” (p. 180). Play,

⁴This development of the frame factor perspective not only involve a broadened contextualization of the educational process, but also the study of new objects in connection to frame factors. For example Lundgren (1981) studies classroom language as a language-game and a frame factor.

⁵The following section on Goffman's frame perspective is based on chapter 10 in my book *Ritualisering och sårbarhet* [Ritualization and vulnerability] (Persson 2012a). A summary of the book in English is available in the *Erving Goffman Archives* at The University of Nevada, Las Vegas (Persson 2012b).

or rather that something is played, is a frame defined as a context inside which both communication and action is given a special meaning. According to Bateson, play implies that one can tell the difference between “mood-signs” and “simulated mood-signs”. The bite in the serious monkey-fight would be an example of the former, while the played fight belongs to the latter category. This distinction is also important in other contexts, for example at the theatre, in role-play, and in threats, fraud, and betrayal.

Turning now to Goffman’s (1974) framing perspective, he keeps the Batesonian cognitive and communicative frame concept, seeing frame as a cognitive code that can be meta-communicated, but also goes beyond it by connecting frame to social interaction or, to be precise, to the definition of the situation, to interaction between individuals, and to individuals acting in situations. Goffman anchors the frame concept to social interaction. This is his contribution to the evolution from the cognitive over the communicative to his own social interactive framing perspective. He defines frame as a definition of the situation that “... are built up in accordance with principles of organization which govern events—at least social ones—and our subjective involvement in them” (p. 10f.). Frame refers to: (1) the individual’s knowledge (more exactly to her or his former experiences and her or his immediate gathering of social information through scanning of others in close proximity), (2) social interaction (where definition of situations shared with others are essential), and (3) the social dynamics of the situation (that are created by social interaction in a given context).

Frame analysis is the title of Goffman’s 600-page book, published in 1974, where this form of analysis is described as an examination of “the organization of experience”, with the above-mentioned definition of frame as the point of departure.⁶ According to Smith (2006) the essence of frame analysis is three frameworks: primary frameworks and two transformations of them that Goffman calls *keys* and *fabrications*. Primary frameworks are like cosmologies of which individuals often are fully or partly unaware. These frameworks “disappear into the smooth flow of activity”, Goffman (1974, p. 39) writes, because what works doesn’t demand an immediate explanation and therefore resembles what Bourdieu (1977) called *doxa*, meaning the self-evident in the natural and social world, so self-evident that it is not even an object of either orthodoxy or heterodoxy.

Goffman split the primary frameworks into two categories: natural and social. His example of natural frameworks is the weather as it is represented in a weather report, to a great degree ruled by natural phenomena (e.g., high and low pressure) and to a lesser degree by, for example, definitions of what is considered to be good and bad weather.⁷ Social frameworks have, on the other hand, to do with that part of reality that is ruled by will. These frameworks help us understand such phenomenon where individuals are actors guided by, for example, good taste, economy, and discretion. Goffman (1974, p. 22) calls this behavior “guided doings”.

⁶*Frame analysis* is one of the most cited works in social science according to Scheff (2006) and Goffman is considered to be one of the most important American social scientists of the twentieth century by Fine and Manning (2003) and many others—but far from everyone.

⁷This might have been a better example when Goffman used it 40 years ago, but maybe not today because of the subjective tone in today’s weather reports as in this one from Swedish Television (from memory): “On the west coast it’s going to be sunny and for the season pretty hot and, therefore, some nice days ahead.” Today’s weather reports—especially oral ones—seem to be developed inside a frame that mixes scientific facts, forecasts based on interpretations, and the inspiration of hope.

Primary frameworks can be transformed to two secondary frameworks: fabrications and keys. Fabrications are asymmetrical as at least one of the interacting individuals, for example someone who is being the object of a practical joke or a con game, is unaware of or refuses to acknowledge the fabrication. Keys are, on the other hand, symmetrical transformations of a primary framework that all involved actors are, or are supposed to be, aware of. Key means here both a key that unlocks something and a nuance, tone, and style that keeps different parts together as a whole.

Since it is hard to tell the difference between keying and fabrication in a given situation (it is an empirical question), and as it is the changing of the frame that is the central feature of both keying and fabrication, I will not differentiate between the two forms in what follows. Instead, I will call changes that take place in both fabrications and keys *nuance shifts*. When something serious becomes play, or when play becomes competition, or when actions become rituals, then we have cases of nuance shifts. This kind of shift means that something is being transformed, transcribed, or transposed or, even with a single word, recoded from something to something else in spite of the fact that what is being done looks the same before and after the shift. Goffman (1974) describes such nuance shifts as “... the set of conventions by which a given activity, one already meaningful in terms of some primary framework, is transformed into something patterned on this activity but seen by the participants to be something quite else” (p. 43f.). Framing is, consequently, something that, on the one hand, is firm in the sense that several individuals share the definition of a phenomenon or a situation and, on the other hand, something that, in spite of this, can change suddenly and fast. The openness for the variability of knowledge, interactions, definitions, and situations is the very point of Goffman’s framing theory. This changeableness also illustrates the vulnerability of social reality. Individuals that share one and the same situation can define it differently and, if they are to interact, they therefore need to define or frame the situation in roughly the same way. This frame tends to guide the interacting individuals and in that way determines the dynamics of the social interaction inside the situation. In what follows, this idea will be illustrated by, firstly, different ways of framing the school and, secondly, different nuance shifts of these frames.

The Frame Factor and Frame Perspectives

There are considerable differences between the frame factor perspective and the Goffmanian frame perspective but, in spite of their dissimilarities, it is possible to combine them when analyzing the school. The frame factor perspective refers to factors in- and outside school that the actors in school seem to have limited possibilities to influence, factors that, so to say, exist “outside the individual”. Frames, for Goffman (1974), on the other hand, are “something that an individual actor can take into his mind” (p. 13) and they exist “inside the individual” as experiences that the individual organizes when interacting with others. The experiences are externalized in social interaction through social definitions that guide action. The frame factors are used when studying how different factors, among them some that are characterized of a relatively high level of inertia, influence the teaching process. Frames in the Goffman perspective are, on the other hand, characterized by simultaneous inertia and inconstancy. The frame perspective hasn’t been used so much in educational research, but as its central feature is the experiences of individuals and the organizing of experiences when interacting with others, it has an analytical potential that may not, at first, reveal itself.

One of the most stereotyped but, nonetheless, true expressions in the school discourse is the saying that everyone has school experiences and that these experiences, in principal, work as if they were frame factors. The school experiences make possible and restrict the school actors' ways of doing school, but not necessarily in the form school will get if moulded in the form prescribed in the governing documents. Rather, it may well be that school will be shaped in a nuance-shifted form. That process will be illustrated in the following pages.

By using frame factors, one is probably better able to see and, maybe, to understand why political decision makers allocate resources, write curricula and other governing documents, and attempt to reform school the way they do. To see and perhaps better understand why resources are used by actors inside school in ways that are not intended by political decision-makers, why reforms are subject to nuance shifts on the school floor, and how it can be that curricula and governing documents not are realized in intended ways, we probably need Goffman's frame perspective because it links the present actors in school to earlier forms of doing school by focusing on how they organize their experiences of schooling. Below, I will try to illustrate this need by combining the two frame perspectives in an analysis of the Swedish compulsory school.

School Frames Based on Governing Documents

What is school? And what can it be and not be? That depends on how the school is organized, governed and managed, but also on how the school is defined and what is actually being done by the individuals who are active inside the school. The governing documents of the school are often contradictory and can be used as justification for totally different ways of doing school. When framing their school experiences, actors in and close to school (teachers, pupils, headmasters, parents, local politicians) can consciously or unconsciously be supported by varying rules, norms, and ideas that are expressed in curricula and other governing documents. The ways in which actors define school and act inside it can therefore vary a lot. What school is depends, consequently, both on frame factors and frames. In the following pages, I will illustrate this variation through three typological and very different pictures of school based on Swedish official governing documents and then show how the nuances of these pictures can be shifted.

School as Institution: Being (Kept) in School

Sociologically, an institution can be both an establishment with a lasting organization and a repeated course of action.⁸ An institution will be perceived as an institution if it creates actions that are repeated and, when doing so, confirms the basic nature of the institution. Institutions create a certain kind of constancy, and Hughes (1946) emphasized that aspect in his definition of institution: "... the term institution is applied to those features of social life which outlast biological generations or survive drastic changes that might have been expected to bring them to an end" (p. 225).

That does not mean that institutions prevent change, rather, they contribute to change by way of formal and informal regulations on actions. The classic sociologist Émile Durkheim (1982) showed that institutions, whether as establishments or repeated actions, exert a kind of

⁸Institution, as concept and phenomenon, is full of nuances and I cannot do full justice to it here. A summary of some of the research on institutions will be found in Jönsson, Persson, and Sahlin (2011).

social constraint or pressure that restricts the individual's possibility to fully control her/his life. According to Durkheim, one can, for example, choose not to speak the language (an institution) that is operative in a region, but if one wishes to make and stay in contact with people, one must subordinate oneself to the language of the region.

The institution phenomenon draws, consequently, our attention to constancy, to repeated action, and to regulated change. If we now look at the compulsory school as an institution, our attention is drawn to the fact that "everyone" is there or, rather, is forced to be there. Compulsory school attendance results in an almost universal repetition of individual actions: nine years of schooling for everyone. According to the Swedish Education Act (2010), the aim of the compulsory school attendance is to educate all young people and not only to keep them in school. But, given the assumption that authorities respect the integrity and the basic rights and privileges of the individual, the school cannot force the pupils to learn or to be educated. Strictly analytically speaking, compulsory school attendance can only produce a spatial transfer of pupils from the family (or some equivalent) to the school. In other words, compulsory school attendance has to do with pupil supply, through which children and young people become accessible for influence inside school (e.g., teaching, self-studies, and social interaction).

Compulsory school attendance is, today, seen as an imperative and a necessity and is regulated in the Swedish Education Act. In spite of this fact (or, maybe, as a consequence of it) education is seen, exclusively as a positive phenomenon. Nonetheless the Education Act doesn't only appeal to our better selves. If a person of school age does not attend school, the authorities have the right to order the parents, under penalty of an economic fine, to put the child in school (Swedish Education Act (2010), chapter 7, 23§). In relation to pupils in school, authorities have the authority to expel, keep in detention, temporarily transfer, suspend, and confiscate forbidden objects held by pupils (Swedish Education Act (2010), chapter 5, 6§).⁹

The most constant part of the school institution is the fact that school is a place for everyone, a place where all children and youth are forced to be, and a place where they are kept.¹⁰ If we look at school from this point of view only, school is extremely constant, far more constant than teaching and the things that are supposed to be taught and learned in it. But the fact that all children and youth are in school patterns the variability of teaching and learning in a special way. The being of all in school seems to create a special format from the point of view of content, and this format or frame can be described with the words "objectivity and comprehensiveness" and is illustrated by what I call the article of trust in the curriculum of the compulsory school: "All parents should be able to send their children to school, fully confident that their children will not be prejudiced in favour of any particular view" (Curriculum for the compulsory school system, the pre-school class and the leisure-time centre, 2011, p. 10). This sentence, the article of trust, is one of very few that have survived 40 years of curriculum reforms, and for that reason it has something important to say about the Swedish school as an institution and about its teaching format. The article of trust is also

⁹The compulsory school has not only an institutional, but a *total* institutional character and is, in many ways, in accordance with Goffman's definition of a total institution (Goffman 1961a p. 17ff; Persson 2012a ch. 6).

¹⁰During the school year 2006/2007, 100 (around one tenth of a thousandth) of all pupils were absent from the compulsory school during the whole school year (*Rätten till utbildning* 2008).

found in the curricula of 1994 (Läroplan för det obligatoriska skolväsendet, 1994, p. 14) and in the curricula of 1969 and 1980, but while the two from 1994 and 2011 say that “their children will not be prejudiced in favour of any particular view” the two from 1969 and 1980 say “in favour of any particular of mutually struggling views and opinions” (Läroplan för grundskolan, 1969, p. 42, and 1980, p. 19). The dialectical perspective has been rejected in the latter curricula.

When choosing to see school as an institution, I take its constancy as a starting point, exemplified by compulsory school attendance and the article of trust. There are other examples, such as ways of teaching, that have been constant for a long time as well as the very idea that learning should be managed by goals decided by others than the pupils themselves (notwithstanding the possible influence the pupil may have on the way to the goal). Constancy in school is not only an obstacle to change, it may also be seen as a protection against hasty or ill-considered change: “How would school appear if all reforms had been implemented immediately?” (Pierre, 2007, p. 13).

School as an Organization and a Movement: Management by Goals and Social Change

Through the municipalization of Swedish schools, the increase of private schools due to grants given from the municipalities, and increasing possibilities for parents to choose among schools, all of this beginning in the early-1990s, a school-market was created by political forces. Producers in this market are supposed to work as organizations and the consumers are supposed to frame them as such. The idea of school as an organization is thus a frame that can be illustrated fairly well by Weber’s (1983, p. 34ff.) definition of organization. He points out that an organization, among other things, is closed and sometimes regulates admission, that rule-following is supervised inside the organization, that management is essential, and that the organization can be seen as an order that can be maintained (or not). The organization frame takes more or less for granted that an organization is marked off from its surroundings, has goal orientation to which actions can be related and evaluated, is run by management, and that both individuals and organizations act rationally toward goals (Czarniawska-Joerges, 1994; Jacobsson, & Sahlin-Andersson, 1995). Even though schools and human actors inside school do not work this way, they are supposed to do so according to laws, ordinances, and, partly, also curricula.

In the governing documents, school is not only framed as an institution and an organization but also as a kind of social movement, with goals that are loosely connected to social movements in society. As both school as organization and movement are focused on goals they can be seen as goal-directed, collective actors. As a movement, the school is trying to change individuals and society, a fact that is illustrated in the latest curriculum for the Swedish compulsory school:

Education should impart and establish respect for human rights and the fundamental democratic values on which Swedish society is based. Each and everyone working in the school should also encourage respect for the intrinsic value of each person and the environment we all share. The inviolability of human life, individual freedom and integrity, the equal value of all people, equality between women and men, and solidarity with the weak and vulnerable are the values that the school should represent and impart. In accordance with the ethics borne by Christian tradition and Western humanism, this is

achieved by fostering in the individual a sense of justice, generosity of spirit, tolerance and responsibility. (Curriculum for the compulsory school, 2011, p. 9)

Some would probably say that the above-mentioned values are self-evident and embraced by many, consequently there is no need for school to be a movement, while others would claim that several of the values are frequently challenged by the development of and within society and need to be captured over and over again, in school as well as elsewhere.

The concept “social movement” can be defined in different ways. Della Porta and Diani (2006, p. 20ff.) define social movement as a perceivable social process. It consists of mechanisms that enable collective actors to engage in conflicts with opponents, to connect in informal networks and share a collective identity. In the light of this particular definition, school is hardly a movement. On the other hand, the movement character of the school can be seen in Castells’ (2010, p. 72ff.) definition, which has three essential parts: firstly, a movement is a movement by self-definition; secondly, movements need not be revolutionary but can also be conservative or something else, the important thing is that a movement is engaged in social resistance and/or social change; and, thirdly, a movement identifies its enemy and tries to fulfill its societal goal by collective action. The school has at various times come to be defined as a movement in order to either counteract or change conditions and thus has also promoted various political interests, for example: resist class struggle, encourage class cooperation, resist/encourage nationalism, promote reading of good books, level out class differences in education, see to it that society uses the reserve of talent in the population of the country, promote reading, counteract environmental pollution, counteract racism, counteract discrimination, promote sex equality, promote democracy, and more and more. To some extent, then, school is a social movement in the Castell sense. A third way to understand social movements is entered by Eyerman and Jamison (1991), and focuses on the expressive dimension and the cognitive praxis of social movements. New perspectives and new knowledge develop because of the movements’ resistance against other perspectives. Movements also, according to Eyerman and Jamison, represent a space for creative interaction that develops knowledge that, otherwise, might not have been developed. It is not easy to see school as a movement defined in this way, but thanks to the fact that school—despite being average and moderate—sometimes connects to existing movements, such as environmental and anti-racism movements, it increases the number of perspectives available in school to pupils and teachers. In that way, the dialectic character of learning and knowledge also becomes visible.

To conclude, it is hard to understand some of the goals in school governing documents without framing school as a social movement. But school cannot be fully defined as a movement. School, rather, supplements its more narrow knowledge goals with broader ones sometimes inspired by genuine social movements.

School as Seminar: Seeding

There exists immediateness when school is framed as an institution or organization/movement. In the case of the institutional frame, it is a spatial immediateness, meaning that the pupil is supposed to be in place, the fact of which can be, almost immediately, established. Framed as an organization or a movement, the immediacy, rather, has to do with the fulfillment of goals during a stipulated time in school. The assessment and evaluation format is determined by the duration of the pupil’s time in school, hours, days, weeks, semesters, and years. However, school is also supposed to engage in learning where the assessment format

exceeds the school time, illustrated by the words in the Swedish Education Act about “... a lifelong desire for learning” (Ch. 1, 4 §). And this is not the only case where the results of learning cannot be assessed during school time. Other cases are: classical education (*bildung*) and learning—for life, for work-life, for individual development, and for active democratic citizenship.

What does school do when it engages in these hardly assessable learning activities? I think that an appropriate metaphor for this activity is seeding, which, by the way, is the original meaning of the word seminar. School is not only spatial containing of pupils and learning and change managed by goals, but also a kind of seeding. While the first two school activities can be determined rather precisely inside a time frame—compulsory school attendance means that the pupil are to be in place in school now and for nine years in all and learning managed by goals means that school has a detailed conception of what and when something is supposed to be learned—seeds, on the other hand, do not always grow while the pupil is still a pupil. This reality justifies school being engaged in learning activities that, in many cases, cannot be measured during school time. Some of these learning activities do not manifest themselves in the curriculum, for example those activities that Jackson (1968) described as belonging to the “hidden curriculum” (or rather the unwritten one, as it is hardly hidden), those things that are learned through repetition during schooldays: for example patience, to constantly be evaluated, and position in hierarchies. Some of the long-term learning (i.e., seeding), however, has its place in the curriculum, for example: “A sense of exploration, curiosity and desire to learn should form the foundations for school activities.” (Curriculum for the compulsory school, 2011, p. 15). At the same time, the coerciveness of compulsory school attendance and the instrumental character of learning managed by goals risk to reduce exploration, curiosity, and the desire to learn. Further, all seeds do not grow on command. The Education Act (2010) also calls attention to the fact that the soil where the seeds are supposed to grow can have different quality:

All children and pupils should be given the guidance and the stimulation that they need in their learning and personal development so that they can develop as far as possible in the direction of the school goals. Pupils that easily reach the minimum goals should be given guidance and be stimulated to reach farther in their development. (chapter 3, 3 §)

But if a knowledge seed, planted during the school years, starts to grow when the former pupil is 22 or 37 years of age, he or she cannot return to school and ask for guidance and stimulation to reach farther.

Tensions and Nuance Shifts in School

What has become evident is that the tensions in Swedish governing documents for the compulsory school lead to contradictory framing of school activity. The schools are supposed to educate for cooperation and competition, for equality, for environmentalism, and democracy, and at the same time educate the pupils for a life in a world that is not particularly equal, environmentally durable, or democratic. Further, the school is based on spatial coercion at the same time as pupils are supposed to desire to learn, learn out of curiosity at the same time as learning is managed by predefined goals, and be guided by a sense of exploration at the same time as the state prescribes what it is that should be explored and when it is supposed to be done. It is also important to understand that the governing documents are political: they

indicate a political intention concerning the school, not what the school actually is; they are compromises between different forces; and they are documents to which teachers and other actors at the street level in school are supposed to be loyal, a loyalty that often is performed by cascades of words from the governing documents. In these cracks of the frame factors there appear possibilities to frame school in ways that, compared to the words in the governing documents, represent more or less radical recoding or nuance shifts of activities in school. As already mentioned, Goffman (1974) describes such nuance shifts as "... the set of conventions by which a given activity, one already meaningful in terms of some primary frame-work, is transformed into something patterned on this activity but seen by the participants to be something quite else" (p. 43f). In the following, some different nuance shifts of and in school are described.

As a textbook case of a nuance shift concerning the school as an institution, take compulsion in school as a starting point and reframe it as imprisonment. Here we have the pupil that experiences her/himself as detained, who longs to get out and away, and who defines time off as conditional release. We also have the teacher who organizes the activity as if the pupils were prisoners.¹¹ There is an extensive both fictional (cinematic, literary, and musical) and non-fictional documentation of school as an experience of coercion to which I am not able to do full justice here. The Swedish researcher Bengt-Erik Andersson (1999) has, for example, collected a lot of evidence that indicates widespread school fatigue in Swedish schools, a fatigue that, according to the German researcher Thomas Ziehe (2003), was shared by pupils and teachers.

Another nuance shift presents itself in the Swedish Education Act (2010, Ch. 7), where compulsory school attendance is framed as a "right to education", a frame that, most likely, also appeals to some parents and some pupils. Another nuance shift takes being in school itself as its starting point and transforms it to the very meaning of school. Framed that way, school works more like a youth recreation center, a café, or any place where people come to meet (and where learning also takes place). When pupils hang out inside a school framed like that, schoolwork can be defined as a disturbing, but necessary, secondary activity. The teachers become organizers of activities that motivate the pupils for schoolwork. In the words of the Danish researcher Mads Hermansen (2005), the teachers become engaged in "motivation of helplessness", meaning that teachers take it as their responsibility to motivate the pupils to learn. School as a compulsory institution also becomes the subject of a nuance shift when it becomes possible for pupils/parents to choose between a supply of different schools run by municipalities, entrepreneurs, and others. This freedom of choice is, however, not a freedom to choose if you want to go to school at all, rather a choice of the place and, maybe, the way in which compulsory school attendance is fulfilled. Then, freedom of choice becomes at least partly a chimera and possibly a motivational chimera. As a consequence of the possibility to choose, schools market themselves, for example, like this: "In our school all dreams can be fulfilled", but certainly, one must add, not the dream of not having to be in school. The organizing of the choice of schools as markets produces this peculiar address. Deeply contradictory, it says: "We do not need to speak about coercion, choose instead what you in the end are forced to do."

¹¹ As once a prison-teacher I, also, had the opportunity to experience that the prison-school could be framed by the prisoners as freedom from manual labor. That frame actually corresponded to the ancient Greek definition of school: *skhole* = time off from manual labor.

Another textbook case of nuance shifts concerns school framed as an organization and social movement and presents itself when educational objectives become a means of political steering and the goals of individuals are annexed by the state. Another case is when parents, for fear of their children's failure in school, contribute heavily to knowledge becoming a commodity. Under such circumstances, a nuance shift can take place and transform learning to karaoke (a Japanese word meaning "empty orchestra") thus producing mimetic learning that does not, necessarily, have content for the learner but, rather, works like a learning ritual where predetermined content is being reproduced in order for the pupil to become assessable and sortable. Curiosity is sacrificed in favor of a feeling of security.

In the Swedish Education Act (2010) one can read:

The purpose of the education inside school is that children and pupils shall obtain and develop knowledge and values. It shall promote development and learning in all children and pupils and a lifelong desire for learning. The education shall also convey and anchor respect for human rights and the basic democratic values that the Swedish society rest upon. (Ch. 1, 4 §)

It is obvious from these words that the school should not, necessarily, be framed as an organization and that the karaoke type of learning is hardly far from fully supported in the Education act. This act, rather, defines a field where a trial of strength is taking place about how education and learning are to be done. But the Education Act also defines some of the words and concepts that are used in the act and, then, emphasizes the fundamental contradictions of the school. Teaching and education are defined in the following way: "... teaching: such processes that are managed by goals that under the supervision of teachers ... aim at development and learning through obtaining and developing knowledge and values, and education: the activity inside which teaching are conducted within fixed goals" (Education Act, 2010 Ch. 1, 3 §). This attempt to colonize the meaning of teaching is, as far as I know, in conflict with what the Education Act, in other places, says about learning, desire, and curiosity. The above-mentioned definitions of teaching and education very strongly emphasize the connection between teaching and learning, on the one hand, and goals, on the other, and also, unexpressed but as a consequence, accentuate evaluation and follow-up of goal performance. School leaders are thereby given directions that school activity should be goal-oriented and managed by goals. In spite of the fact that some researchers, for example Rombach (1991), hold that it is impossible to manage by goals, we are constantly experiencing new attempts to do just that, for example by connecting teachers wages to goal performance.

Nuance shifts of the school framed as a seminar, where seeding takes place, can, finally, be manifested in resistance against goal-managed, instrumental learning. Learning may then be presented as personal, as full of nuances, as an adventure, as a journey with an indefinite goal, and so on. This can sometimes transform to another nuance shift, namely a kind of knowledge and education elitism that says that teaching should be adapted to the soil where the seeds grow best.

Conclusion: Dynamics of Social Interaction as a Tool of Analysis

The different school frames that are patterned on frame factors (here exemplified with governing documents), described above as institution, organization/movement, and

seminar, and the just-mentioned nuance shifts of the frames, visualize different dynamics of social interaction. By dynamics, I mean interplay and tensions between different forces and actors inside a frame, a room, a situation, or a field. With the words of Goffman (1959, p. 249) it is possible to describe this dynamic as the fundamental dialectic underlying all social interaction. When interacting persons share a situation and frame it in roughly the same way, one might say that a frame is a particular “sense” (Goffman, 1961b, p. 20) that guides the interaction in the given situation. The school framed as an institution and the nuance shifts in connection with it, for example imprisonment, are particular senses that revolve around the pupil’s spatial being in school. School framed as an organization/movement and the connecting nuance shifts constitute, on the other hand, quite different senses revolving around management by goals and change, for example learning transformed to something that resembles karaoke. Finally, school, framed as a seminar and connecting nuance shifts, is an additional sense that focuses more on the learning of the individual, its conditions and long-term, intended, unintended, imaginable, and unimaginable outcomes, for example learning defined as a personal adventure.

The visualization of different dynamics of social interaction in school shows that there is some kind of pattern in the variations that exist between and in schools. That pattern is not a straightforward effect of governing documents and other frame factors, but, rather, a mediated and modified consequence of how individuals in social interaction frame school situations under the influence of frame factors and their own experiences of school. The social segregation of and in schools, for example, creates conditions that enable actors to organize similar school experiences and on those grounds create joint schoolviews that can contribute to the creation of far-reaching variations between schools. Hence, the dynamics of social interaction—becoming visual as different frames and nuance shifts—can be used as a tool of analysis to describe, explain, and understand variations between and in schools in reference to change, resistance to change, inadequate goal performance, relations, conflict, school cultures, cooperation, unwillingness to cooperate, and more.

References

- Andersson, B. E. (1999). *Spräng skolan!* [Blow up school]. Jönköping: Brain Books.
- Bateson, G. (2000 [1955]). A theory of play and fantasy. In G. Bateson (Ed.), *Steps to an ecology of mind* (pp. 177–193). Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Bernstein, B., & Lundgren, U. P. (1983). *Makt, kontroll och pedagogik: studier av den kulturella reproduktionen* [Power, control, and pedagogy: Studies of the cultural reproduction]. Stockholm: Liber Förlag.
- Bernstein, B. (1971). On the classification and framing of educational knowledge. In M. F. D. Young (Ed.), *Knowledge and control: New directions for the sociology of education* (pp. 47–69). London: Collier-Macmillan.
- Bernstein, B. (1973 [1971]). *Class, codes and control. Volume I: Theoretical studies towards a sociology of language*. St Albans, UK: Paladin.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977 [1972]). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Broady, D. (1999). Det svenska hos ramfaktorteori [The particularly Swedish in frame factor theory]. *Pedagogisk forskning i Sverige*, 4(1), 111–121.
- Callewaert, S., & Lundgren, U. P. (1976). Social reproduktion och forskning om undervisning [Social reproduction and research on teaching]. In S. Lundberg, S. Selander, & U. Öhlund (Eds.),

- Jämlikhetsmyt och klassherravälde* [The myth of equality and class domination] (pp. 74–94). Lund: Cavefors.
- Castells, M. (2010). *The information age: Economy, society, and culture* (2nd ed.). *Volume II: The power of identity*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Curriculum for the compulsory school system, the pre-school class and the leisure-time centre 2011*. Stockholm: National Agency for Education.
- Czarniawska-Joerges, B. (1994). Narratives of individual and organizational identities. In S. A. Deetz (Ed.), *Communication yearbook: An annual review* (pp. 193–221). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dahllöf, U. (1967a). *Skoldifferentiering och undervisningsförlopp: komparativa mål- och processanalyser av skolsystem 1* [School differentiation and teaching lapse: Comparative goal- and process-analysis of the school system 1]. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Dahllöf, U. (1967b). *Fem promemorior om målanalys, läroplansrevisioner och pedagogisk forskning* [Five memoranda on goal analysis, revision of curricula and educational research]. Göteborg: Pedagogiska institutionen, Göteborgs universitet.
- Dahllöf, U. (1971). *Ability grouping, content validity and curriculum process analysis*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Dahllöf, U. (1999). Det tidiga ramfaktorteoretiska tänkandet [Early thinking inside frame factor theory]. *Pedagogisk forskning i Sverige*, 4(1), 5–29.
- de Bono, E. (2008). *Six frames for thinking about information*. London: Vermilion.
- Della Porta D., & Diani, M. (2006). *Social movements: An introduction* (2nd ed.). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Durkheim, É. (1982). *The rules of sociological method and selected texts on sociology and its method*. New York: Free Press.
- Eyerman, R., & Jamison, A. (1991). *Social movements. A cognitive approach*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fine, G. A., & Manning, P. (2003). Erving Goffman. In G. Ritzer (Ed.), *The Blackwell companion to major contemporary social theorists*. (Blackwell Reference Online). Oxford: Blackwell. Retrieved June 21, 2014.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Goffman, E. (1961a). *Asylums*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, Doubleday & Co.
- Goffman, E. (1961b). *Encounters: Two studies in the sociology of interaction*. Indianapolis & New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company.
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Hermansen, M. (2005). *Relearning*. Copenhagen: Danish University of Education Press/CBS Press.
- Hughes, E. C. (1946). *Institutions*. In A. M. Lee (Ed.), *New outline of the principles of sociology* (pp. 223–281). New York: Barnes & Noble.
- Illich, I. (1973 [1971]). *Deschooling society*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Jackson, P. W. (1968). *Life in classrooms*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Jacobsson, B., & Sahlin-Andersson, K. (1995). *Skolan och det nya verket: skildringar från styrningens och utvärderingarnas tidevarv* [School and the new department: An account from the age of management and evaluation]. Stockholm: Nerenius & Santérus.
- James, W. (1948 [1892]). *Psychology*. Cleveland, OH: The World Publishing Company.
- Jönsson, L. Eric., Persson, A., & Sahlin, K. (2011). *Institution* [Institution]. Malmö: Liber.
- Lundgren, U. P. (1972). *Frame factors and the teaching process: A contribution to curriculum theory and theory on teaching*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Lundgren, U. P. (1979). *Att organisera omvärlden* [Organizing the surrounding world]. Stockholm: Liber.
- Lundgren, U. P. (1981 [1977]). *Model analysis of pedagogical processes* (2nd ed.). Lund: LiberLäromedel/Gleerup.

- Lundgren, U. P. (1984). 'Ramfaktorteorins' historia [The history of 'frame factor theory']. In D. Broady & U. P. Lundgren, (Eds.), *Tema: Rätten att tala* [Theme: the right to speak] (pp. 69–81). Stockholm: Symposion.
- Läroplan för det obligatoriska skolväsendet* [Curriculum for the compulsory school] (1994). Stockholm: Utbildningsdepartementet.
- Läroplan för grundskolan* [Curriculum for the compulsory school] (1969). Stockholm: Skolöverstyrelsen.
- Läroplan för grundskolan* [Curriculum for the compulsory school] (1980). Stockholm: Skolöverstyrelsen.
- Läroplan för grundskolan, förskoleklassen och fritidshemmet* [Curriculum for the compulsory school system, the pre-school class and the leisure-time centre] (2011). Stockholm: Skolverket.
- Persson, A. (2012a). *Ritualisering och sårbarhet – ansikte mot ansikte med Goffmans perspektiv på social interaktion* [Ritualization and vulnerability: Face-to-face with Goffman's perspective on social interaction]. Malmö: Liber.
- Persson, A. (2012b). Ritualization and vulnerability: Face-to-face with Goffman's perspective on social interaction (contents and summary). In Dmitri Shalin, *The Erving Goffman Archives*. Las Vegas: University of Nevada.
- Pierre, J. (2007). Decentralisering, styrning och värdekonflikter i skolan [Decentralization, steering and value conflicts in school]. In J. Pierre (Ed.), *Skolan som politisk organisation* [School as a political organization] (pp. 9–22). Malmö: Gleerups.
- Rombach, B. (1991). *Det går inte att styra med mål!* [It is not possible to manage by goals!]. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Rätten till utbildning. Om elever som inte går i skolan* [The right to education. On pupils that do not attend school]. (2008). Stockholm: Skolverket.
- Scheff, T. J. (2006). *Goffman unbound: A new paradigm for social science*. Boulder, CO, & London: Paradigm.
- Skollag 2010* [2010] [The Swedish Education Act]. Stockholm: Utbildningsdepartementet.
- Smith, G. (2006). *Erving Goffman*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Weber, M. (1983 [1922]). *Ekonomi och samhälle. Förståendesociologins grunder. Del 1* [Economy and society. Part 1]. Lund: Argos.
- Ziehe, T. (2003 [1982]). *Ny ungdom. Om ovanliga läroprocesser* [New youth. On rare learning processes]. Stockholm: Norstedts.