PROFESSIONAL AUTONOMY VERSUS EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS: THE EXAMPLE OF A SPLIT-SITE COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL

K Shenton
*Cleadon Park Secondary School,
South Tyneside*
and
W F Dennison*
*School of Education,
University of Newcastle upon Tyne*

A clear advantage of case-studies is that they can highlight situations which other investigative techniques overlook In this case the develop ment of a comprehensive school on two sites shows the problems that arise when the experiences traditions and conventions of single site situations are transferred unchanged to a split-site reality In particular when movement between sites is deliberately minimized, the independence of the individual teachers can adversely affect organizational effectiveness

the most serious problems which confront a multi site school, and the great handicaps under which it works all day and every day can be removed only by nothing short of complete rebuilding on one site (5, p 8)

Are these schools on two sites so very much disadvantaged? at least half (of the headteachers and staffs) could think of no advantages to being split rather than being on one site But some heads spoke of units being more manageable when smaller, and pupils finding it easier to settle into secondary education initially in the small 'lower' unit The big disadvantages were felt to be wasted time (moving between sites) as might be expected, and difficult communications between sites But sometimes, when visiting combined schools, we found the actual situations were subjectively assessed (1, pp 90, 92)

What these two conflicting statements indicate is not only the uneven and inadequate distribution of resources which has accompanied the

* Requests for off prints should be sent to W F Dennison School of Education University of Newcastle Upon Tyne, Newcastle Upon Tyne NE1 7RU

comprehensive reorganization of secondary education (so that single schools have been based on two or more separate sites), but the opposed attitudes which can develop regarding the effects of this variation. On the one hand, there are the subjective judgements of teachers that while split-site schools have disadvantages these must be measured against the benefits that this arrangement produces; on the other hand, some headteachers are so convinced of the defects of physical separation that the only solution they can recommend is the complete rebuilding of the schools on one site.

Although split-site schools account for a relatively large proportion of secondary school places* (and until the financial situation allows a substantial secondary school building programme, and the declining school rolls of the 1980s begin to have an effect, this proportion is not likely to drop), consideration of their particular problems and attempted solutions have usually been in the context of broader issues (3). In the same way, while studies of developing comprehensive schools have included split-site arrangements within their surveys, the findings and conclusions which emerge apply to all schools, from which it is impossible to isolate detail about split-site situations(6,8). To a certain extent this apparent reluctance to consider split-site schools as a separate issue in the reorganization of secondary education is perfectly understandable. The main thrust in works considering the motivation of a group of comprehensive schools is to study reorganization as such, and the fact that some schools for practical reasons must be sited on more than one site is only a single facet of the total situation. In addition the intention is that split-site schools should in the main represent a temporary solution to a problem imposed by previous building patterns and the imperfect financial climate which has accompanied reorganization. Yet it is highly likely that, for the forseeable future, up to a third or more of all children will receive their secondary education in a split-site school, while a large number of teachers will spend much of their professional life working in such conditions. Under these circumstances, as our case-study school will show, many problems can arise when traditions, conventions and expectations developed in a single-site organization are transferred to a split-site reality.

With many hundreds of schools involved it would of course be impossible to choose one and argue that it was a typical split-site school. Each has its own characteristics, and the differences that would occur naturally are

* Benn & Simon (1) suggested that about 25% of comprehensive schools were on more than one site but since then, with more local authorities introducing such schools and a reduction in capital building programmes, the percentage will certainly have risen.

emphasized by the organizational and curricular freedom awarded to every school by its local education authority In our case study the most obvious features were a secondary modern school, using premises completed in 1939, gradually being transformed into the secondary school for all of the western sector of a northern industrial town At some stage in the future the intention was to establish the whole school on a new site just over a mile away, and prior to its designation as a ten form entry, 11 18 age range school, science and practical blocks with additional classrooms had been completed and were in use Further developments were halted by restrictions in the school building programme, in addition to which some of the classrooms and the administrative block in the new premises were destroyed by fire As a result, the school began its comprehensive existence with years one to three in the original buildings − including the administra tive centre for the whole school − and years four and above in new premises in which responsibility for day to day management was delegated to a senior teacher

The chief reason for the rigid separation of year groups was to avoid movement of pupils between sites Experience in the secondary modern school before reorganization had shown that regular pupil and staff commuting had given rise to registration difficulties which sometimes led to truancy problems The lower school therefore was under the day to day responsibility of a head of lower school supported by a tutor for each of years one to three, each tutor having an opposite sex assistant These teachers virtually never taught in the upper school and the intention was that their constant availability should give a sense of stability to the younger children In addition, without a base in the upper school, the headteacher and his deputy were located in the lower school, although they were regular visitors to the other premises Meanwhile, in the upper school premises, the member of staff responsible was assisted by a year four and a year five tutor, each of whom had an assistant, and a sixth form tutor Other key members of the organization sited here were the head of careers, the member of staff responsible for time tabling and nearly all heads of depart ment As staff movement between premises had also been minimized, these personnel did very little, and often, no teaching in the lower school With teaching organized on a departmental basis, and staff throughout the school under the guidance of the appropriate head of department, it was found necessary shortly after reorganization to appoint 'mini' heads of department who were responsible for teaching and stock control in the lower school Usually by age and experience (and often academically), these 'mini' heads of department were less well qualified, but higher in rank, than the second person in the department who was based in the upper

school to help in the teaching of the senior and more examination-orientated pupils.

The intention in focussing on this single school is to analyze the administrative mechanisms which were adopted during its establishment and development as a comprehensive school. In particular the re-negotiation and applicability of these mechanisms, largely based on previous single-site experience, in terms of the unique peculiarities of this one situation are studied in four clearly defined areas: (i) the administration of the school, particularly its system of internal communication; (ii) teaching and the organization of the curriculum; (iii) social and pastoral organization; (iv) the use of teacher resources.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE SCHOOL

As the organization of the comprehensive school began to evolve, a number of administrative problems became apparent. They were attributable to two main factors. A physical one — the location of the administrative centre in the lower school (a decision made necessary by a fire, but which by the use of 'makeshift' arrangements could have been altered), and an organizational one — the separation of the school into two separate units. It is doubtful whether, for example, the motivational difficulties which can occur with decentralization were fully appreciated. Certainly the possibility of the two separate units encouraging the formation of and a loyalty to sub-goals only partially parallel with those of the whole school was never considered, nor was the likely extent of non-programmed decision-making in a situation of delegation (9). Yet these are crucial issues in the organization of an effective institution. If the two parts of the school were to be allowed a separateness (because of the division of buildings, age-ranges and to a large extent staff), then obviously each had to be able to develop as an organic whole but, much more importantly, each had to clearly understand the contribution it had to make to the achievement of the aims and objectives of the bigger organic whole, the total school. It proved all too easy for staff as individuals or groups, and most vitally as members of the junior or senior school staff, to choose their own goals, and the manner of their pursuit, in accordance with the norms and conventions developing in the building in which they worked. Staff saw themselves as teachers of years one to three, or as recipients of fourteen-year olds who had to be made ready in two years for external examinations and often regarded happenings in the other part of the school in the same way as they would traditionally view events in other schools receiving or supplying their pupils.

The difficulties associated with delegation of responsibility arose in the first place because the headteacher and his deputy, located in the lower school, spent a high proportion of their time in those premises The deputy headteacher attempted to spend as much time as possible in the upper school but found himself regularly detained in the lower school — his administrative base   Related difficulties, such as heads of department spending httle time in the lower school, did exist, but those were to a certain extent overcome by the creation of mini heads of department However, in the upper school, in the absence of a clear devolution of duties to those permanently in this building (except for day to day and mainly minor administration matters to a senior teacher), important decisions tended to be deferred until the headteacher or his deputy appeared Often, by then, the problem had ceased to be urgent As a result, many important matters of principle and policy were left unresolved and the 'ad hoc' decision became the norm, if it were capable of producing a palliative effect In general, meetings were not called because of the obvious problems, if items concerning the whole school were included, of getting the relevant people in the same building at the right time, and when meetings were arranged, much of the time was used in resolving general policy before particular matters could be discussed   In this way, the organizational framework began to consist of unilateral solutions to specific problems rather than properly considered means of aiding the achievement of aims and objectives Therefore a teacher, particularly in the upper school, could find himself making an attempt to deal with a problem, without being sure that his solution would meet with official approval, or even that his decision would be allowed to stand

The separateness of the two parts also created particular problems for the communications system of the school   Apart from the inevitable 'us' and 'them' feeling between two relatively closed communities, so that staff working in the 'wrong' part of the school reported feeling like strangers in the other staffroom of their own school, there were the obvious difficulties of communicating within the school pastoral system, when year tutors and their assistants never taught and rarely had to visit the other part of the school   Therefore the fourth year tutor, for example, would have had no contact, pastorally or academically, with the children that he was expected to tutor   In the same way, heads of department had not taught the children who had chosen their subjects before their arrival in the senior school   To many staff and pupils, the transfer at 14+ from junior to senior premises was almost as total as the change three years previously on entry to secondary school   While meetings were regularly held on pastoral matters and within academic departments, these tended to

concentrate on issues relating to one or other of the premises, and communication on such matters which did exist between lower and upper school tended to be based on telephone conversations, written notes and chance occurrences when a member of staff happened to meet someone while visiting the other premises.

Within each section of the school, communication patterns evolved in different ways. In the lower school the majority of aids to information communication developed with the pastoral system. The year tutors were the most senior members of staff, they met frequently, and soon formed a close co-operative system by which information could be collected or disseminated on its way from headteacher or deputy to form tutors (almost all teachers based in the lower school fell into this category), or vice versa. However in the upper school, where almost all the status positions were held by heads of department, the channels of communication were less clearly defined. The head of the upper school was also a subject head and therefore was unwilling to call heads of departments together for a meeting with the ease of the head of lower school in assembling lower school year tutors. As well as this role conflict difficulty, the heads of department were a much more heterogeneous body than the year tutors, used to competing, for example, with one another for resources. Also with many more senior staff in the upper school there was a pronounced democratic and participatory atmosphere, with a tendency to proceed by consensus, whereas in the lower school communication was altogether quicker and more authoritarian, taking place through the levels of the hierarchy.

Therefore the separateness of the two parts of the school, and the differences in emphasis that evolved, were further highlighted by the independence and the nature of the two communication systems. While it would be expected that the lower school would be more concerned with pastoral matters and the upper school with curriculum matters, it is significant that soon after reorganization it was found necessary to establish lower school mini-heads of department meetings and an upper school pastoral committee. To a large extent this stemmed from some awareness of the problem created by differences between the roles staff were fulfilling in the 'task' system of the school and the roles they thought they ought to be adopting in terms of their attitudes towards the development of the whole institution. This of course is long-term as compared to the immediate administrative problems which frustrated the effectiveness of the school. Examples of such problems were the difficulties of the deputy headteacher in organizing external examinations in premises in which he was not usually

located, the allocation of staff to cover for absent teachers and the production of the timetable, both with the minimization of staff commuting as the main objective, the most efficient means of using secretarial, clerical and technical assistance and the non-disruption of the other part of the school during a major activity   These problems arose solely because of the split site, individually, they were of limited importance, but the viability of the solutions on a day to day basis largely determined the effectiveness of the administrative function, as perceived by staff, pupils and casual observers

TEACHING AND THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CURRICULUM

The outstanding difference between the two premises was in their physical condition   The lower school, completed in 1939, was conventional for that time and had been little changed   The square shaped classrooms, with display boards on front and back walls, had brick and plaster walls which allowed each member of staff to design the interior decorations of his own teaching room   Even to the light bulbs and many of the original desks, the environment was entirely traditional and created a warm and friendly atmosphere, with an air of solidarity and continuity   In contrast, the new buildings of the upper school, had a cold and unwelcoming appearance   The walls, consisting of plastic covered sheets, could not support display materials, so that the mounting of illustrative materials, pupils'work and so on, as in the lower school, was impossible   As a result, it was very difficult to create a specific atmosphere in each room and large areas of wall space remained as white plastic-coated sheeting   There were many other differences   In the upper school, rooms were of various shapes and sizes, working surfaces were movable tables, fluorescent lighting was used, and wall windows — a number of rooms only had roof lighting — faced away from the school, not in towards it, as in the lower school   The result was that at 14+ the children found themselves moving abruptly from a children's school to a teachers' school, or so they thought, and to a situation which placed the burden of creating interest directly on the teacher and the textbook   Therefore, a high proportion of the upper school's lessons were textbook orientated, dispite the availability of audio visual aids and, while a change in emphasis must occur with the increasing demands of external examinations on the curriculum, the speed of this change — powerfully reinforced by the conventions of the upper school staff whom they were meeting for the first time — was striking as the children moved from third to fourth year   Clearly, both the mechanism and the environment of transfer did not allow for a smooth and gradual progression from the existing teaching methods of the lower school to those to be used in the upper school (2)

However, in the lower school many staff welcomed the separation from the senior school for a number of reasons. The general view was that it helped to prolong the primary school atmosphere of the early years of secondary education — although obviously this was difficult in a unit of 750 children — and enabled the pupils to achieve a better grounding in basic skills. The division also limited the downward pressure of public examinations, although very few staff were prepared to allow themselves to become general subject teachers. All were subject orientated, believing this to be necessary in terms of their own career prospects. Against these advantages — subjectively appraised — must be set the disadvantages of separateness. In the first place, it was decided that choices about option subjects and external examinations could not be left until the children entered the upper school. In the lower school, children spent the first two years in broad ability bands but during the third year preliminary decisions were taken, with the guidance and encouragement of lower school staff who would have little influence on the outcomes in the upper school, which would largely determine courses of study for individuals up to age sixteen. Yet members of staff who were to participate in this education had little direct contact and limited influence either with the previous teaching or the choice mechanisms; besides,the whole process took place within an unsatisfactory communication system between the two parts of the school. At the lower end of the academic scale the separateness created similar problems. On entry to the lower school, dull and retarded pupils* were placed in one of two classes and extracted for remedial reading. Recommendations for this extraction were made by form and year tutors, so that after three years of general education, during the whole of which he received additional assistance in reading, a pupil joined the upper school, where, because of financial limitations, there was no remedial provision. Therefore, the main effect of these arrangements was to create in the upper school a group of children for whom there were inadequate facilities and whose confidence often had been reduced by the movement to new premises.

More generally, the disadvantage of the two sites was shown by difficulties with curriculum development projects and subject integration. The mini-head of mathematics in the lower school, for example, was an enthusiastic supporter of modern mathematics. With the help of his colleagues, he introduced a successful lower school course using the Schools Mathematics Project material. Significantly, none of the lower school mathematics staff taught in the upper school and quickly two distinct

* The word 'dull' refers to children with limited potentialities and simple needs: the needs of 'retarded' pupils are more varied and complex.

courses developed — 'modern' in the lower school and 'traditional' in the upper school The difference in aims and practice was so clear that the head of mathematics felt compelled to introduce a bridging course in the fourth year — when the children first joined him — to consolidate the rules of computation, which he thought were lacking, before the children could start on examination courses The integration of the sciences produced a similar type of problem The upper school was based on three separate science departments, while the lower school introduced integrated science courses * Thus, children found themselves leaving premises in which an integrated science philosophy prevailed and moving to an environment in which biology, physics and chemistry were viewed as separate subjects

Obviously, differences in curriculum organization and teaching method as children grow older are to be expected and positively sought in all schools However, the change in this case from lower to upper school, and the swiftness with which it occurred for every child, introduced by the differences in buildings but exacerbated by the separation of staff and the ineffectiveness of communications, produced a substantial discontinuity in curriculum Given the circumstances, it had to exist, but a primary aim of the school should have been to limit this discontinuity, not accentuate it

SOCIAL AND PASTORAL ORGANIZATION

The paradox of stability and unity for the pupils, because they remained on one site, creating, for the same reason, two groups of staff, with confused perceptions and loyalties towards the school as a whole, was always apparent, even when it was decided to separate the two parts of the school The intention was that the two smaller and more coherent systems, with their relative autonomy, would each sustain social interaction, extra-curricular activities, facilities for individual pupil attention and opportunities for participation (a prefect system, for example) sufficient to promote a viable educational unit Therefore the social and pastoral system was entirely decentralized to the two sets of premises, on the assumption that it would be more flexible and more able to discover and correct problems than if it were based on the whole school Of course the concept of the lower school as a cohesive unit, even on a single site, has been advocated for many years, whether for diagnostic purposes or to allow for the changing needs of secondary school children as they grow older (10)

*The 'Science for the Seventies' scheme was used in the first two years of school and the Schools Council Integrated Science Project (SCISP) in the third year

However, in the emerging situation the framework of the pastoral system proved to have substantial defects. Designed to promote the understanding of pupils' problems there could be little continuity in the service offered to the individual child during a school career. A child changed form and year tutor every year, and although records were passed on, the official version was held in the only available office accommodation which was the lower school. The construction and maintenance of good pupil-tutor relationships was made even more difficult by the third to fourth year change of premises. Staff found themselves trying to construct relationships with children who in the main they had rarely met and never taught, while the children themselves were coming to terms with another organization in new buildings. In many cases, transfer took place when the child was going through some adolescent crisis, in which social and psychological pressures were likely to be of more significance than attainment in school subjects. For some, the combination of previous and current experiences was sufficient to cause total alienation from the school system. As a result, workable relationships between tutor and pupil were the exception rather than the rule during the two years of compulsory education in the upper school and it was generally acknowledged that form periods were more useful for administrative purposes than for genuine tutorial work. Another adverse effect of site autonomy was the restriction in opportunities for helping children and parents in critical decision-making situations. The careers department, for example, located in the upper school, exerted little influence on choices in the lower school. Yet it was at this stage that children decided initially about option subjects and examination levels (CSE and GCE), and therefore in some part determined subsequent career patterns. Largely as a result of this and the related separation of upper school subject teachers from previous teaching, there was in one year a total of 164 changes in option choices out of a total of 1,290 choices (0.74 per pupil) within one month of children moving to the upper school, and 186 out of 1,554 in the subsequent year (0.72 per pupil). The organizational effects of these changes were considerable, involving some rewriting of part of the time-table to cater for the emergence of new groups and the disappearance of others. The extent of these variations in pupil choice, although demonstrating flexibility, did nothing to sustain pupil and parent confidence in the effectiveness of the school guidance system.

A further drawback to the unity of the pastoral system was the relative inaccessibility of the headteacher and deputy to both pupils and staff as a result of the split-site arrangements. Year tutors, for example, assumed responsibility for helping new staff to socialize into the particular character-

istics of the part of the school to which they were assigned Particularly
in the upper school, problems were discussed with other teachers rather
than seeking an interview by telephone with senior staff or taking a chance
on a meeting on a visit to the 'wrong' premises Year tutors therefore
became advisers to form tutors and although a general pattern was
established — first year tutors settling the children into secondary education,
second and third year tutors consolidating this work and establishing good
discipline, while in fourth and fifth year the emphasis was on guidance
and relationships with the outside world — diversity of practice became
inevitable and inconsistencies developed as year tutors exercised their
initiative and judgement

Therefore, both in continuity of experience and uniformity of practice,
the guidance and pastoral systems of the school were considerably
disadvantaged by the split site premises and the measures adopted to cope
with these arrangements Several aspects of what was to occur had already
been anticipated when it was decided to organize the schools into two
separate communities — the discontinuity between third and fourth year
pastoral systems and the difficulty of establishing relationships with
children joining the new premises being the most obvious — but the
intention was that these drawbacks would be more than compensated for by
the gains of smaller and more manageable units In practice, this did not
happen and those benefits which did accrue fell far short of compensating
even for those drawbacks discussed prior to reorganization There were
also many more the restrictions in sporting and extra-curricular activities
as a result of their separate organization in the two buildings and the
impossibility of maintaining useful developments across the boundary,
the problem of deploying staff, employed in the main on a teaching subject
basis, in the provision of a stable, pastoral system, while minimizing staff
commuting between buildings*, and the readjustment difficulties of
children who had been urged as third years to take a leadership role in the
lower school and then moved into the upper school as the youngest pupils
The net result was that the school had a social and pastoral organization
which was both ineffective and inadequate

THE USE OF TEACHER RESOURCES

The policy of restricting staff and pupils to one building had a consider-
able effect on the relative disposition of teacher resources (cf 8) The

*As will be seen in the next section this minimization of staff commuting was achieved

average staffing ratio (pupils per full-time equivalent teacher) was 18.4 for the whole school, but this was raised to 21.2 in the lower school, and reduced to 16.0 in the upper school, as a result of the majority of heads of department (with most non-teaching time) being located in the upper school. However, the average class size, ignoring the sixth-form, was almost identical (25.7 in the lower and 25.5 in the upper school) because while a typical teacher based in the lower school was time-tabled to teach for 80% of the week, the equivalent figure in the upper school was 63%. Therefore, while the minimization of staff movement had been successfully achieved (less than one in five of staff was involved in teaching in the 'wrong' building and the length of time in this teaching was under 2% of all teaching), the clear disadvantages of this policy had to be recognized. In the first place there was the very fact of the separateness of the staff of the two premises from one another. Apart from the headteacher and his deputy, less than 20% of the staff had time-tabling reasons to travel between lower and upper school, and even for this minority of staff the number of lessons taught in the 'wrong' premises was minimal. Organizationally, this limitation was a remarkable achievement, but it effectively created two independent groups of teachers. Well aware of each other's existence, the closed communities easily began to suspect that the other was more privileged. The upper school staff, for example, envied the lower school staff because of the younger and less difficult children they were thought to be dealing with; further, lower school staff were perceived as failing to provide adequately for the transfer of pupils to the upper school and for preliminary preparation for external examination work. The junior school staff, for their part, knew of the lighter teaching loads in the upper school and the far greater proportion of promoted posts. Therefore, while the average grade of teacher was only 2.0 in the lower school, it was as high as 4.0 in the upper school*, and with allowances for the number of heads of department working with senior classes it still appeared to many lower school teachers that career prospects were superior in the upper school. Twice as many graded posts, for example, were awarded for academic responsibilities as for pastoral duties, and even with the mini-heads of department arrangement, the general view was of senior, academically orientated staff in the upper school, with junior staff in the lower school, either accepting the pastoral bias of responsibilities in their work or striving to be promoted on the academic side to the upper school. In fact, staff movements to new positions in the other part of the school were rare, largely as a result of the development of expertise and experience in one building thought not to be the most appropriate for the other.

*At the time, grades of teaching posts ran from 1, an unpromoted post, to 5 for the most senior staff below deputy headteacher level.

In other words, while the reorganization of the school h id clearly demanded new skills of the staff as a whole, the split site reality and the organizational arrangements devised to cope with it, had limited the range of experience and expertise which individual teachers could develop (7)   Apart from the obvious frustrations in terms of personal fulfilment and job satisfaction, these limitations were seen as a threat to career advancement by many staff, and reduced the attractiveness of advertised posts to external candidates   In addition, staff as individuals and as members of their particular staffroom community, found it difficult to contribute to the school as a whole, because they were by geographical and organizational circumstances deliberately excluded from opportunities of viewing the organization as a single whole   By having two clearly designated groups, each with a real and independent existence and each with an assumed set of intentions, developed with little reference to the other, the opportunities for them to interlock into a cohesive organization with a unity of purpose were substantially limited (4)   It was this which was the unsatisfactory feature of the staff deployment pattern   The higher proportion of promoted posts in the upper school was after all in line with the 'age weightings' of pupils used to calculate the total number of promoted posts available in the school   Had there been entirely separate junior and senior schools, the distribution of such posts would not have been so very much different from that which actually existed*   Also in both parts of the school there was no evidence that the more able children received more of their teaching from promoted post holders, below the compulsory leaving age   Therefore, within each age range, teaching resources were more or less evenly distributed, both in terms of the social composition of forms and subject coverage, while the differences between age groups could be defended using externally applied criteria   However, what the upper school advantages in promoted posts and free time did accentuate was the differences in organization and attitudes between the two premises and the resultant lack of corporate staff responsibility towards the school as a whole

CONCLUSION

The value of case material in the study of organizations is either as an example to others considering a similar situation or as a mechanism for highlighting issues which are overlooked by other investigative techniques   In the case which we have described it would have been highly unusual if

---

*The number of promoted posts in a school depends on its points total   For this, each child under fourteen years of age counts two points rising to eight points for a seventeen year old

the traditions, conventions and expectations developed for single-site premises had not been transposed into the particular circumstances of our school. After all, single-site schools are the more numerous, they give rise to the majority of experiences and, while there are many split-site situations, they are generally regarded as temporary solutions to a buildings problem and, therefore, something which is abnormal. Yet it is this transposition of patterns of behaviour and thought to which staff have become accustomed which focusses attention on the fundamental issue raised by this study — the viability of the ideal of professional autonomy in relation to the effectiveness of the institution. The measures chosen by this school to deal with its split-site situation were extreme, as compared with those described for other schools (1, 6). This was largely based on past experience, but the division into two separate units raises several questions about the nature and value of the gains which are supposed to occur as a result of granting the individual teacher maximum freedom to fulfil his role in the way which he thinks most appropriate. It is difficult to reconcile, for example, the discontinuity between third and fourth year pastoral systems, the differences in attitudes between lower and upper school staff, the various tutorial practices and the discrepancies in curriculum development, with the efficient pursuit of school objectives or the effective education of the individual child. The extremity of the solution adopted by the school obviously exaggerated a number of issues, but had they occurred in two separate schools (the alternative arrangements the local education authority might have introduced) they would have been quite acceptable. For teacher freedom arises from institutional freedom*, and although both have advantages — subjectively appraised — in terms of diversity of practice and motivational factors, what our example shows very clearly is that these must be set alongside the discontinuities in individual and institutional practice which autonomy encourages and it cannot always be assumed that the communication system and the quality of leadership which accepted conventions and previous experiences allows to develop in any institution will necessarily favour autonomy.

*No attempt is made by any local education authority or central government agency to determine the curricular arrangements of individual schools.

REFERENCES

1   BENN C and SIMON B *Half way there Report on the British comprehen sive school reform* London McGraw Hill, 1970

2   CASTALDI B *Creative planning of educational facilities* London Rand McNally 1968

3   HALSALL E *The comprehensive school Guidelines for the reorganization of secondary education* (rev ed) London Pergamon 1975

4   LIKERT R *New patterns of management* New York McGraw Hill, 1961

5   LONDON JOINT FOUR ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS *Report of the Working Party on Multisite Schools* London Joint Four Association of Teachers, 1972

6   MONKS T G (Ed) *Comprehensive education in action* Slough Bucks NFER Publishing Co 1970

7   RICHARDSON E *Authority and organization in the secondary school* London Macmillan 1975

8   ROSS J M and others *A critical appraisal of comprehensive education* Slough Bucks NFER Publishing Co 1972

9   SIMON H A *Administrative behavior A study of decision making processes in administrative organizations* New York Macmillan 1965

10   SMITH J E *Inside the comprehensive school* London National Association of Schoolmasters 1958