

---

early-view..  
citable, but seeking feedback  
please send to...  
to [bill@hihoiho.com](mailto:bill@hihoiho.com)  
or go to  
<http://cloudworks.ac.uk/cloud/view/6374>

## **place, space and social justice in education** enclaves, systems and voice

Bill Law  
*The* Career-leaning CAFE  
[www.hihoiho.com](http://www.hihoiho.com)

---

*Geography impacts life chances. But opportunities in any place can be expanded. And how we create that space feeds into our hopes for social justice. All of this is extensively documented by Danny Dorling (2010). This monograph examines in particular how people voice justifiable claims on respect, freedom, confidence, and – therefore – on their stake in society.*

*Following Dorling, it argues that such needs are situated: each place, with its culture, nurtures a different sense of ‘who I am’ – differently voiced. The monograph examines the case that education is for enlarging that space – bringing students to ‘a new place in the making’. There are issues: notably concerning how learning is transferred from one place to another, how different places differently frame realities, and how the structure and dynamics of each place is layered and contradictory.*

*The focus for the monograph is how help in dealing with that complexity can be convincingly framed. Help is expressed here as healing, care and learning. It suggests that the idea of social enclave is useful for framing the structure and dynamics of place, space and social justice, because the experience of help varies from enclave to enclave. The monograph tracks the philosophical, political and professional terms in which any enclave can be understood. It looks for cultures of belief, value and expectation concerning what is going on and what can be done about it.*

*Moving from useful conceptualisation to appropriate programme development, the monograph shows how the complexity in structure and dynamics can usefully be set out in terms of systems thinking. And it sees that thinking not just as a tool for programme development, but also for professional and organisational reform.*

*The argument develops a place-rooted basis for enlarging the space for social justice. It proposes ‘usefulness’ as a more appropriate base-line concept than ‘effectiveness’. It tracks how enlargement requires images of exploration rather than competition. And it concludes by proposing the terms in which students can learn to voice where they are, who they are, and where they’re headed. That means constructing their own exploratory narratives, and realising their own configuration of the terms in which they voice the version of place, space and justice they seek.*

#### **key words**

careers / connected / culture / enclaves / ethnography /  
experience / expertise / narrative / professionalism / reform /  
research / situated / social mobility / systems / voice

---

---

## contents

	page
<b>issues for place, space and social justice</b>	<b>1</b>
learning for living	1
situated learning	2
in markets, in niches, in enclaves	2
<b>space and place as enclave</b>	<b>3</b>
to belong and not to belong	3
a stake in society	4
<b>systems for usefulness</b>	<b>5</b>
confusion is to be expected	5
inconvenient questions	6
interrogating a system	6
finding place – enlarging space	8
a new place in the making	8
<b>locating interests – framing reform</b>	<b>9</b>
post-code realities	9
locations and interests	10
repertoires for action	10
re-locating research	11
place, space and race	11
finding a narrative	12
<b>references</b>	<b>13</b>

---

## issues for place, space and social justice

Much of what is voiced as identity is located – a person inhabits a mappable place, and the features of that space are reflected in that person's being. Let's say that a conversation about 'who I am' is likely to set how a person experiences 'respect', 'freedom' and 'confidence' – and, so, of that person's grasp on a stake in society. If argument here holds, what people say they believe, value and expect about any of that will be voiced differently in different locations. We would find that how people voice respect, freedom and confidence is situated – different place, different voice, different culture, different sense of 'who I am'... different outcome.

Writers take the idea seriously. From William Shakespeare through Charles Dickens to Hanif Kureishi characters are understood in terms of what they take to be in their place, – and not their place. And that place is scaleable: it may be spoken of grandly of as sceptered isle, affectionately as Rochester, or sharply as a street in Bromley. A British Library exhibition tracks such writing 'from wastelands to wonderland' (Morrison, 2012; Salwak, 2012; Mellor, 2012). Birthplace, upbringing, setting and location are key elements in all such narratives.

In a sane society nobody would be in a better position than educators to work on examining how place, culture and voice play out in people's lives. There is no shortage of thinking: a detailed review of the literature (Leander, Phillips and Taylor, 2010) shows theories of learning to be set in narratives of 'where-and-when'. The authors argue that education can and must take account of the geographies and mobilities of that experience. The consequences would be radical, pushing boundaries from where convention expects learning to happen, to where it actually happens. They illustrate how much there is to turn over: the connections between affect, engagement and learning; how learning is expanded, contracted and shaped by perspectives; and the ways in which schooling does or does not fit to experience – all of these need critical attention. It would transform the classroom, no longer a container, but a node in a network of discovery. These authors see all of this as an issue for access to opportunity – with education as 'a new place in the making'.

This monograph pursues that aim in those terms. It starts from a fundamental question for social justice...

### *who gets to do what in our society?*

Educators commonly see work-life as a personal choice, calling for a matching of person to opportunity. Dominant thinking is, then, based on the economics that informs the opportunity and the psychology that diagnoses the person. The literature of history, geography, narrative and culture can occupy no more than a background position in such a limited scenario. Education therefore has a great deal of unmapped space for the realisation of social justice.

There are demanding issues. They concern the uses of learning, the features of any situation, and the complexities of groups.

**learning for living:** Learning which is to have any influence on who-does-what cannot be contained in a classroom, it must be useful in a life. So-called 'academic' learning, for use in bounded assessment settings, is not the model. Learning for living means using what is found in one location in an entirely other location.

The evidence on getting that kind of transfer is not good. What is learned in one place is not readily recalled in another. Memory has an event horizon – just walking out through the school gates can discard it (Radvansky and colleagues, 2011).

Thomas Mackey and Trudi Jacobson (2010) are more hopeful about the transferability of evaluating sources and incorporating them into developing action. These are processes – knowing what to do with information, rather than just finding things out. The authors'

observation of students shows how such learning how to adapt and engage can, itself, be learned and transferred from one situation to another – it is a meta-cognitive ability.

There are also indications of how transfer can be improved (Meadows, 1993; Maclure and Davies, 1991). The evidence is that it is more likely where the learning is given markers signalling the locations where it can be used.

Those markers are needed to remind people of their lives, so that their lives remind them of their learning. Useful markers can be found in role thinking. A life-role positions a person in a location, with other people, and taking on a task. Transfer of learning can be made explicit, therefore, with that three-fold set of markers (Law, 2006): asking, in using that learning...

*where might you be?  
who might you be with?  
what might you be taking on?*

Wherever in school or community the learning is gathered, such reminders suggest explicit scenarios that can be rehearsed and adapted. They are place-related – learned here, used somewhere else.

**situated learning:** What sort of ideas can be attached to locations? Do different places develop different voices, expressing different cultures, and leading to different senses of 'who I am'? Among those who say they might is situationist-philosopher Guy Debord. He opens up a distinctive way of thinking about locations, offering insights into the way contemporary urban areas fragment. Debord characterises the Parisienne landscape as comprising both 'hard' physical constructions and 'soft' ambiances. Each is located in time-and-place, but each is characterised by the thoughts and feelings associated with that location.

Such locations are '*dérives*'. They may be small, locating as few as four-or-five people – a *dérive* of more than nine-or-ten tends to fragment. The average life is short – sometimes no more than a day. Although each has its architectural, geographical and economic realities, each is defined in terms of how people see it – those thoughts and feelings expressing the distinctiveness and independence of each.

Derives are psycho-geographical locations and can be mapped; but none corresponds with any *arrondissement*. They manifest both the formal and informal, they may be transient or they may linger, they embrace some ideas and reject others. Their populations and visitors see them in terms of what they say about the inhabitants. The French think of them as holding together shared insights, poetry and intuitions.

But there are harder-edged parallels – including those expressed in the language of ecological niches and microclimates. And we need not assume that Gallic delicacy is necessary to the location of thoughts and feelings. If expressive of shared insight, why not of shared impulse? If of poetic romanticism, why not of demanding rap? If of insightful intuition, why not of urgent instinct? In all cases that culture can be familiar and comfortable – even playful. But that 'culture' can also be written with a capital 'K'.

**in markets, in niches, in enclaves:** The argument here is that a location makes room for a voice that reflects a culture, out of which emerges a sense of 'who-I-am'. That will be different in different locations. But are those different voices best interpreted as belonging to an economic market? or to a biological niche? or to an ethnographic enclave? Economist Robert Frank (2011) opens the door to the issue by examining how behaviour varies, not just between groups, but within them. No location is unanimously populated. Not everybody in the mix see work the same way. Drawing on a darwinist reading of behaviour, the author shows how the inhabitants of any space include competitors, risk-takers, the damaged, the fulfilled... and helpers. The helping agenda may well be a minority interest.

Frank's account resonates with career management. He poses issues about whether any society needs so many people in financial services, about what causes extremes of high and low wages, and why the pursuit of commercial success is so frequently futile. He is not seeking to undermine conventional economic thinking, but – by drawing on evolutionary thinking – to signpost how it can become more effective.

The argument does, however, play out contrary to conventional careers-work thinking. Frank shows how the individual competitiveness of some may benefit the individual by penalising the group – energy is uselessly expended, which leads to escalated efforts, which become wasteful of group resources. The evolutionary origins of the thinking point to parallels for such behaviour in animal life. In all cases an individual may undermine the survival of the group in its location.

Groups do not evolve. But evolution selects individual behaviour in the interests of group survival – sometimes at increased risk to the individual. Both natural and sexual selection feature in that process. It is adaptive to the environment that the group inhabits.

The analysis reframes career-management dynamics. It is too simple to see work-life as uniformly responsive to market opportunities. There is a more useful understanding in the biological mix of individuals adapting to their niche through their responses to each other. But, most usefully, Frank signposts some of the features of work-life that understand career as an adaptive response in a social enclave.

## space and place as enclave

Place-and-space is infused with 'as-if' metaphors for social membership. We have found social membership described as if it were a 'role', a 'market', and a 'niche'. The term 'enclave' is inclusive of all three: it can express the positioning implied by role, the negotiation implied by market, and the distinctiveness implied by niche. And 'enclave' has a robust provenance in the literature of social membership.

**to belong and not to belong:** Policy commentator Alessandra Buonfino (2007) is aware that there is more than one way of setting out that membership. She appeals for a more inclusive frame of reference for examining the possibilities. Her search calls on Mary Douglas's (1966) visualisation of how people locate themselves in social space. Mary Douglas finds four broadly discriminated attitudes, each with a version of its own distinctive range of social perspectives. They are sketched in table one.

table one  
*belonging or not*

<b>isolates</b>	who are detached from society – risk averse – outside conventional frames – not belonging – maybe unable to afford membership – voiceless
<b>positioners</b>	who are believers in tradition, order and social class – respectful of élites as guides to success – seeing failure as the result of non-compliance
<b>individualist</b>	who are entrepreneurial, innovative and adaptive – and, so, competitive and confident – and rootless, so that everything is negotiable
<b>enclaved</b>	who are located with like-minded – where beliefs and values are shared – and, so, separated from outsiders – sometimes defending 'us' from 'them'

Allestrandra Buonfino sees social enclaves as a contemporary trend in relating to others. The way in which enclaves protect the agreements and comforts of like-mindedness seems to exclude what Frank sees as the risks of complex group membership. Knowing and being known by one's familiars simplifies the task of agreeing what is going on, and what we shall do about it.

Mary Douglas could not have known how the internet would accelerate the formation of enclaves. On-line life has assembled itself around enclaves – its links are increasingly formed by the dynamics of 'I like' and 'like me' (Law, 2012a). It can feel like a cushion against risk – whether on-line, on-the-street or on-the-make. Like *dérives*, enclaves are each a refuge from others. Like markets, enclaves can be seen as customers – and maybe as competitors. Like niches, they attract the attention of predators.

**a stake in society:** The internet came too late for Mary Douglas; but she takes account of the dynamics of change. She sees enclaves as becoming important in fractured societies – where both congenial families and demanding hierarchies are weakened. People then look for others they can trust – concerning what is worth believing, worth having and worth doing. She also sees all of such allegiances as capable of sponsoring both protection and aggression.

The relationship between enclave, family and learning is notable. It is nicely illustrated by Irish poet and novelist Colm Tóibin. He writes of his extended family, and the way its memories infuse his own. He recounts how the grown-ups speak of their memories, so that the children take possession of them. He appeals to a compatriot for that sense of personal ownership of group learning in shared space.

Conor Cruise O'Brien writes...

*there is for all of us a twilight zone of time  
stretching back for a generation or two before we were born  
which never quite belongs to the rest of history*

What has been group-shared becomes individually-experienced as if it were personally remembered. It is a gift more likely to be received in a distinct community – a cultural enclave.

Mary Douglas characterises the formation of enclaves as a way of gaining recognition, finding affirmation and claiming a stake in a community. Such a characterisation could also stand as a characterisation of career. What people do about enclaves has parallels with what they do about career. Work-life is a form of social membership.

But what Kevin Leander, Robert Frank and Guy Debors each suggest is that different social memberships will shape how Colm Tóibin's, or any other enclave, brings recognition, affirmation and membership to its people. In enclaves people are bound together not, as conventional career thinking assumes, because they have similar psychological profiles. It is because they share learning from shared memories of shared experience.

Each enclave will do that differently. Table two (following page) sets out some imagined examples. Each articulates a different sense of having a stake in a society, and each calls up its own more-or-less distinct way of seeing work-life.

table two  
**place and space as enclave**

---

<b>social circle</b>	may be local or cosmopolitan – people comfortably and informally approach each other – feeling that they belong – making valued contacts – keeping each other in view
<b>association</b>	usually a religious or other cultural membership – favouring a distinctive activity – offering advantages not available to others – with procedures and requirements for joining, leaving and exclusion
<b>on-line location</b>	formed by following and seeking followers – by sharing preferences and aspirations – visitors appear because they identify with the inhabitants – or are spying – or preparing to exploit
<b>neighbourhood</b>	people nurture, oversee and protect their space – or, where it is damaged or disowned, they may neglect or defile it – inhabitants approach and avoid each other on the basis of congeniality
<b>community</b>	people are there because it is what they can afford – it may be economically-similar but can be culturally-diverse – there is an awareness of the way in which post-code affords opportunity
<b>territory</b>	people feel a need to defend the space – which involves making alliances and demanding allegiance – there may be no-go areas – pushing out those seen as invaders – occupying as if besieged

---

There is much here for Robert Frank's helping agencies to take on board. Each has its version of risk – needing healing, care and learning. But, for those purposes, what can be recognised as real and useful in one setting might well be seen as alien and irrelevant in another. And, if learning is to be for living, what is real and what is alien frames the life into which learning must be transferred.

## **systems for usefulness**

Any opening of place and expansion of space for the realisation of social justice requires a framework for thinking which can accommodate that complexity and make it useful.

**confusion is to be expected:** Liz Richardson (2011, 2012) illustrates the point. She reports on local and central interests in public-service projects established to offer the sort of care, learning and healing that Frank seeks to position. Her report is in two stages; she can therefore – over time – usefully set out not only the structure of connections but the dynamic of change.

The interim report shows people relating to the small-scale and informal activities which local beneficiaries can recognise as useful. The author relates them to an overarching framework, being canvassed by government as the 'Big Society'. But she finds few people in a position to take on 'big' commitments. The final report shows local practitioners unhappy with national policy, which is seen to be irrelevant to neighbourhood needs. And, although voluntary and community organisations are ready to take on some of the work of struggling public-service agencies, those local agencies are reluctant to let go.

The resulting plea is for an openly reflective process which mediates between neighbourhood and local and central interests in public services. However, what policy

has been calling 'the big society', is more usefully characterised by Antonio Gramsci as 'civil society' (Simon, 1991). Gramsci's civil society is built by families, associations and alliances which are driven neither by commercial nor by political imperatives. However, Liz Richardson does not re-frame her plea for an open reflective process in such terms.

**inconvenient questions:** Neither does John Seddon (2008). He recognises the need and acknowledges its complexity; but he looks to system thinking for the framework. He favours it because it is rooted, not in political or theoretical constructs, but in the location where the work is done.

His focus is on social care as a public service – which he has extensively canvassed for accounts of experience. But, like Gramsci, he sees such work as standing outside market thinking. Seddon is critical of the way in which the market metaphor manoeuvres public-sector performance into requiring indicators which are believed to inform 'choice'. Resonating with some of Frank's observations, Seddon claims that his canvassing illustrates how the consequences of that imposition are simplistic, over-controlling, and wasteful.

Seddon's questions have been characterised as exposing an 'inconvenient truth'. And his writing is polemical; but it deserves attention precisely because the issues it raises are not derived from abstractions, but from immediate and observable obstructions to the delivery of a service. He claims that his work is a reminder of why people wanted to do care work in the first place.

The systems thinking he proposes is an adaptation of a manufacturing fault-finding process. It probes for needed action by asking a progressively more tightly-focused series of 'why' question. A test of the method would be the extent to which such interrogation reveals anything useful.

**interrogating a system:** Ethnography can provide the data. It is a source for our understanding of the culture of beliefs, values and expectations and how they are voiced differently in different locations. Notable for the purposes of careers work are ethnographers Paul Willis (1997, 2001), Howard Williamson (2004) and Geoff Bright (N G Bright, 2011). Contrary to conventional careers-work thinking they find that, though psychologically different, the young men in their studies are bound together by shared experience. That experience shapes a shared narrative, which belongs to their time and place.

Williamson follows-up his sample after more than twenty years. He tracks how work-life has interacted with all aspects of their lives. That means that it is possible to transpose versions of John Seddon's five questions into that over-time experience. The thought experiment (Law, 2009b) is to suppose that somebody asked such questions about how those young men's experience has unfolded over those years. The resulting dialogue is in table three (following page). It is constructed *post-hoc*, and can be no more than illustrative of the possible uses of system thinking for careers-work purposes.

A notable feature of Williamson's report is the extent to which the men still feel able to speak for each other. Table three suggests how that feeds into the conversation.

As lads these men might have occupied what the earlier table two calls 'a territory'. They are defensive, though not aggressively so. There are alliances and allegiances, although not so much demanded as volunteered. They may not feel besieged, though they certainly feel not understood.

table three  
**questioning ethnography**

**1. why do smart kids sideline school, settle for routine work, turn to crime, and resort to drugs?**

*'I think I knew when I was younger that I was heading that way - I knew I was going to spend some time in prison – given what I was doing it was bound to happen sooner or later – wasn't it?'*

*'Ted'*

**2. why do they find that so predictable?**

*'I knew I was going to do an apprenticeship but I did not know whether that was what I wanted to be doing – because I'd not experience of anything – you know, I might have liked to be a social worker or a solicitor – I just don't know'*

*'Shaun'*

**3. why are they so short of ideas?**

*'I knew somebody somewhere was having it - I assumed it must be in London, or New York or America, or whatever – but I didn't have the background, the contacts, the things you needed to be part of it'*

*'Jerry'*

**4. why do they have that sense of separation?**

*'I lost my job because I just couldn't be bothered working – I found that thieving with these boys was much more fun – you didn't have to get up in the morning and it was more um... lucrative'*

*'Spaceman'*

**5. why are they so ready to run that risk?**

*'Danny has been good to me over the years – same as Ted, when I needed them – that is what it is about really - you make them kind of friends only once in your life – you do things together when you are younger – and so, when you are older, you know everything about each other'*

*'Vic'*

These are not instinctive knee-jerk responses, they are reflective accounts which construct a five-scene story about what held them back all those years ago...

*we didn't expect to find anything better – because we didn't know what else there might be – and that's because we had no connections or contacts – so we justified ourselves in other ways – they were ways that made sense of our lives – the bottom-line is that the risk mattered less than holding on to the trust of the people we knew best*

Like all stories worth telling, it is one of other people and inner life – these thoughts-and-feelings are both culturally acquired and embedded in identity (Bourdieu, 1991). They signpost a world which – seen from any other place – appears chaotic, incomprehensible... maybe mad or inexcusable. The 2011 UK riots illustrate the extent of that kind of reciprocated confusion (Law, 2011a). But, for all that, these men appear to be voicing what seem to them to be uncassailable truths.

System thinking frames a process of interrogation which can reflect place and space in terms which suggest bases for action. It locates place, but it also suggests where in that place there is the possibility of enlarging space.

**finding place – enlarging space:** When we talk about the importance of voice we might usefully ask what place it speaks for. Seddon hears a voice which speaks for the way things are and how that influences what people do. This is close to how Donella Meadows (2009) defines systems thinking. It sets out a structural and dynamic complexity which can be mapped and interrogated. It entails looking for a linking pattern among what might otherwise be mistaken as random and disconnected elements. There is plenty of scope for such interpretations in Liz Richardson's public-service networks, among Williamson's wayward lads, and at the 2011 riots. They all allow for unscrutinised explanations to thrash about – randomly.

In system thinking the scrutiny seeks function – it looks for purpose. But purposes are hierarchical – the first answer to any question may be too general to be useful. The simulated interrogation of Williamson's young men moves answer-by-answer towards what is most basic and therefore most influential. The most significant answer speaks of the most encompassing factor. And, in systems thinking, that has the greatest leverage on enlarging the space for justice.

As Richardson's work illustrates, a system can be set out for an individual, or a relationship, or a neighbourhood, or a local authority, or a state – there are systems within systems. Each is comprised of elements, such as experience: and of connections, such as transfer: and of functions, such as meaning. But, as all the foregoing accounts illustrate, each system is more than the agglomeration of fragmented parts, it has integrating structure and dynamics. Being able to map a system is to model how things are working. It is, in that sense, a learning device – both a description of what does happen, and a way of seeing what can happen.

In system thinking, where complex realities are engaged the thinking becomes varied, subtle and extensive. That complexity can be set down in tabular form as 'input', 'process' and 'outcome'. Input is what feeds into the system – such as students' experience. Process is what goes on – in, say, how meanings are reshaped. Outcome is what people carry away – for example as new connections for future use.

And so systems thinking can map what Kevin Leander calls 'a new space in the making'. The bigger the space, the more room there is for expansion. It makes Liz Richardson's complexity both a bad-news problem and good-news resource.

**a new place in the making:** In education the 'new place in the making' is a learning programme. It can be examined as a system: 'what goes into the programme?', 'what goes on in the programme?', and 'what comes out from it?'. Table four (following page) is a system-based representation of a learning programme.

We can reasonably expect education professionals to use that throughput first to set out the experience of students' learning – row one in table four. But rows 2 and 3 show how the throughput can also be useful to teachers and others.

The table is located among people of a cosmopolitan social circle where occupants are comfortably in touch with valued contacts. Do they and their children need their perspectives expanded? Alert educators would notice if students were getting trapped by such an upbringing. The table suggest some such possibilities in one place. It may seem more obvious that the start-in-life place occupied by Howard Williamson's lads could usefully have been expanded.

To know whether the more comfortable enclave can trap its own would need at least five of Seddon's questions. Table four is no more than a sketch, suggesting how the answers could be systematically framed. Educators with any understanding of their students would work in more detail.

There is a question about who those educators might be. It is by no mean obvious that it should be a career specialists, rather than – say – a dramatist who is into conflict resolution, a geographer into economic trends, a biologist into the survival of the

biosphere, or a mathematician into probability – or all five. This would not be conventional careers education. Which is in no position to do more than show people how to come out with a stronger grip on what they came in with. That's not system thinking, it's not making space, and it's not education.

table four  
**systematic programme development**

	<b>input... what goes in?</b>	<b>process... what goes on?</b>	<b>outcome... what comes out?</b>
<b>1: among students...</b>	home and travel experience social circle range of friends experience of work	imagining their own exclusion mapping exploration of other possibilities	wider horizons excitement possible change-of-mind sense of new beginning memorable learning transferability
<b>2: by educators...</b>	knowledge of students openness sensitivity	winning interest questioning assumptions building trust	increased credibility expanded expertise
<b>3: in the enclave</b>	personal biographies knowledge of employees and service personnel willingness to meet students ability to deal with questioning	meeting new people connecting with the un- connected	wider awareness greater inclusivity interest in other people's children

## locating interests – framing reform

Although an educator's focus, in table four, would first be the top-row learning outcomes for students, what comes out of this – in all three rows – can be made the basis for changes in the whole system. Outcomes can become feedback – to reshape what is invested as input and what is designed as process. It is learning from the system for the system – the system can be used to change the system. An enquiry into the correlates of professional independence (Law, 2005) produces a measurement of high-to-low 'system orientation'. It detects, respectively, greater and lesser protection of the existing system. The study describes the many bases on which reform is resisted. In contemporary conditions we can expect the cost-effectiveness of 'what goes in' and 'what goes on' to be prominent. In system terms 'what comes out' for system reform is referred to as outputs rather than outcomes.

**post-code realities:** Liz Richardson encountered the breadth of interests, stretched between the local and the national. These polarities date from the birth of the welfare state – Bevanite centralism versus Morrisonian localism. They are place-related: a centrist commitment pursues a universal entitlement. It is voiced as a rejection of the post-code lottery. But a localist commitment is to post-code realities. A recent aspiration has been for 'double devolution' – not just inward to local authorities, but outward to

local communities. Evidence of usefulness is stronger among the more locally focussed (Lodge and Muir, 2011).

**locations and interests:** Helping – that is caring, healing and learning – can be shaped for a sceptered isle and for a Balham back-street. Two recent historical studies enquire into the interests that can be harboured in those central and local places. The studies are of the influence of national politics on local agencies.

One of the studies is a nuanced account of popular support for a totalitarian regime (Erickson, 2012). It highlights the role of both education and church in managing that influence. The author documents their lack of independence from centrist power. A parallel account (Peel, 2011) comes closer to UK concerns. It is a comparison of social work in different countries. It illustrates how people needing care can be seen as irresponsible and blameworthy, or as victims of external conditions and deserving. Professionals lean towards a blame position where policy seeks to minimise the external causes of personal and social damage.

These are extremes cases of high system orientation, seeking their cue from established interests. Their relevance to contemporary Britain may seem remote. But they illustrate the widely-entertained belief that professionals can behave less than professionally (Law, 2011b). And even a remote probability of a disastrous consequence represents a risk worth examining. In both cases the historian's plea is for the voice of the dispossessed to be heard. They restate the local-central issue in terms of whose interest a profession acts. System thinking suggests that a repeated – and assertive – 'why' interrogation can show what resources and processes are being invested in which systems, to bring about what outputs – and in whose interests.

**repertoires for action:** The language of 'blame', 'victim', and 'interests' is feeling-laden. That emotional infusion of professional and political behaviour would come as no surprise to David Hume. And the hegemonic capture of its language would come as no surprise to Antonio Gramsci.

None of it comes as a surprise to Jonathan Haidt (2012). He collates evidence for the influence of sentiment, intuition and emotion on policy. Like Frank, Haidt draws on evolutionary psychology to explain why political behaviour assembles around such feelings as empathy, concern and anger. It is a political repertoire; but some politics draws on a more diffuse repertoire – not just of sentiments, intuitions and emotions but also of concerns for loyalty, authority and sanctity.

You would be able to recognise the more diffuse range of moral tastes by the way in which it claims its adherence to the group, by its tenacity in asserting its position, and by its belief in the righteousness of its cause. Winning allegiance to these conservative causes can mean that the poor will deny their own interests in favour of any group which seems to share that morality.

The other, more tightly-focused, liberal agenda has fewer interests to satisfy and therefore can entertain wider sympathies. Being unhampered by considerations of loyalty, authority and sanctity, it can also argue against its own interests, and not exclusively in support of people it regards as deserving. Even the well-heeled will do that; indeed, it is more likely to be found among the northern rich of the western hemisphere.

It means that voices informed by the one repertoire are incomprehensible to the other. Jonathan Haidt is arguing that politics is informed by mutual incomprehension. Arthur Sullivan seems to have had a point...

*That every boy and every gal  
That's born into the world alive  
Is either a little Liberal  
Or else a little Conservative!*

The analysis has place-and-space correlates: Haidt implies that the inhabitants of a defended territory may well be less liberal than the inhabitants of a well-connected social circle. But not necessarily. And Haidt's analysis is well-enough documented to suggest a research agenda on the place-space-social-justice effects of social enclaves.

**re-locating research:** Programme effectiveness is not the same as programme usefulness. Effectiveness assumes that we know what the outcome should be; usefulness shows what people actually do with the programme. To understand this in the context of enclaves is to wonder how valuable large-sample statistics can be. There are methodological issues for all such all research – relating to how researchers frame enquiry, and to how respondents shape what they say. Either may be influenced by expectations set up by dominant and pervasive voices concerning what outcomes of successful careers work are expected.

In response to such issues, Sue Clegg (2005) advocates a research method, 'critical realism', with place-and-space resonance. It uses evidence as a tool for exploration, and not as a routinised determinant of findings. The thinking inserts into an early stage of the research process an informed understanding of what might be going on. That understanding must be based on directly-observed experience. Before anybody concludes whether a resource or strategy is useful, somebody needs to visualise the lives it must serve. The basis for criticality is that informed account of those lives: where they are situated, how things are in that setting, and what its people are in a position to recognise as real. That is an enclave. As Gramsci, Franks and Haidt all argue, without that situated understanding, ready-made arbitrary and dominant assumptions will take over.

What serves the interests of some lives can deny the interests of others. The findings of a single study addressed to usefulness can therefore suggest contradictory recommendations. So, only when we know whose interests frame the research and whose interests the research must inform, can we have a basis for engaging with the findings. Parading findings is a secondary output of that process.

In system-thinking terms a dominant concern with the effectiveness of education is tested by the way it front-loads into productivity, competitiveness and employability. In Haidt's terms it means that commercial success is part of loyalty to the nation. And so the outputs of education become the inputs of economy. But, as Haidt shows such a diffused allegiance leads to a narrowing of sympathies. And, as he further argues, the prospects of a mutually comprehending debate are not good. The consequences for place, space and social justice are challenging. They need a good story.

**place, space and race:** The metaphor for conventional careers work is as if managing a career is about getting ahead, like a competitive winner in a race. The etymology of 'career' supports the imagery: in its origins 'career' is cognate with 'racecourse'. The racing imagery fits well to a commercially competitive agenda. And it is muscular careers-work branding: a career coach (!) will help you to achieve the goal (!) you wish to pursue (!). It's a good story.

But 'career' is also cognate with 'carriage', as if career management were a journey. That imagery is less compelling: a career guide (?) signposts an exploration (?) which might take you to somewhere you've never heard of (?) one day (?). But, in place-and-space terms the journeying image is the more open: any journey can be interrupted by a race, but no race can be interrupted by a journey. The idea of journeying can enfold the idea of race – ascribing to it some deeper meaning and more-far-reaching purpose than winning a race (Law and Stanbury, 2009).

The implications for programme management are challenging. Do we ask the children of a comfortable social circle, or of a run-down territory, what race they want to enter? And make that the basis of all we do? Or do we take their first answer to be the starting-point of a journey leading who-knows-where-or-when? The answer may not be obvious: a journey does not exclude a race; and its exploratory tone resonates with the ready-for-

anything flexibility that informed opinion says is what both commerce and society now need (Andrzej Klesyk (2012).

**finding a narrative:** A journey is a narrative – passing from how things were, through how things are, towards how things could be. Meaning and purpose are important elements in narrative – searching for what these events are about and why anybody should care (Law, 2012). Students and clients can be enabled in the construction of each their own story. Not all professional educators and careers advisers can do that for other people. But every person can learn to do it for her or himself - perhaps along the lines in table five.

Voicing a claim on respect, freedom and confidence – is claiming a fair stake in society.

table five

### ***place, space and social justice – a story***

*how do you tell your story? – about when things go well – and not so well – people need to hear how you learn from both – especially people important to you – and people you want to want you*

*getting money, passing exams and winning respect is part of it – and you need to say what you do about that – some of it is about where you've come from – a lot of it is about what you've learned – people are also interested in where you're headed*

*some of where you come from you'll hold onto – some you'll let go – that's because the end of a story is never like the beginning – nothing is fixed unless you let it be fixed*

*your story features more than one person – you – the people you know – the people you can get to know – they won't all see things as you do – but being able to say how they see things helps you to be clear about how you see things*

*you don't need everybody to agree with you – you just need them to listen – so be interesting and special in saying who you are – some will not want it – but you might as well find out who they are now – so you can concentrate on the people who do want you because they've taken the trouble to understand you*

*people who care about you need your story – as do people you care about – or will ever care for – or will one day depend on how you work things out*

*do it now – and you'll be able to do it for all of your life – do it for yourself – because you don't need other people to do it for you*

*that's the situation – live and learn or live and don't learn – and tell it for yourself – not faked – or invented*

*it's your journey from how things were – to how things are – to how you mean things to be – you tell it*

## references

- Pierre **Bourdieu** (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power*. London: Polity Press
- Alessandra **Buonfino** (2007). *Belonging in Contemporary Britain*. Wetherby: The Commission on Integration and Cohesion – Communities and Local Government Publications <http://www.hihohiho.com/information/cafBuonfino.pdf>
- N G **Bright** (2011). "'Off the model": resistant spaces, school disaffection and "aspiration" in a former coal-mining community'. *Children's Geographies*, 9 (1) pp.63ff
- Sue **Clegg** (2005). 'Evidence-based practice in educational research – a critical-realist critique of systematic review'. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 26 (3)
- Guy **Debord** (1967). *The Society of the Spectacle*. Fairford, GLO
- Danny **Dorling** (2010). *Injustice – Why Social Inequality Persists*. Bristol: The University of Bristol Policy Press
- Mary **Douglas** (1966). *Purity and Danger – An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. London: Routledge Classics
- Robert **Ericksen** (2012). *Complicity in the Holocaust – Churches and Universities in Nazi Germany*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Robert **Frank** (2011). *The Darwin Economy – Liberty, Competition, and the Common Good*. Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University Press.
- Jonathan **Haidt** (2012). *The Righteous Mind – Why Good People are Divided by Politics and Religion*. London: Allen Lane
- Andrzej **Klesyk** (2012). *Strategic Agility Rather than Dreaming about Advantages*. <http://www.en.think-europe.com/wydarzenia/andrzej-klesyk-strategiczna-zwinnosc-zamiast-marzen-o-przewadze/wszystkie-strony>
- Bill **Law** (2005). *Helping Personal Advisers Working With Systems*. <http://www.hihohiho.com/memory/cafsocnts.html>
- Bill **Law** (2006). *LiRRiC: Life-Role Relevance in Curriculum for Effective and Useful Learning*. <http://www.hihohiho.com/www.hihohiho.com/underpinning/cafqca.pdf>
- Bill **Law** (2009a). *Community Interaction and its Importance for Contemporary Careers Work*. <http://www.hihohiho.com/memory/cafciit.pdf>
- Bill **Law** (2009b). *Reforming Leadership*. <http://www.hihohiho.com/magazine/features/cafleader.html>
- Bill **Law** (2011a). *Riots 2011 – Unspoken Quotes and Thresholds of Help* <http://cloudworks.ac.uk/cloud/view/5681>
- Bill **Law** (2011b). *Ten Propositions in Search of a Profession*. <http://www.hihohiho.com/magazine/features/cafprofessionalism.pdf>.
- Bill **Law** (2012). *Three-Scene Storyboarding – Learning for Living*. <http://www.hihohiho.com/storyboarding/sbL4L.pdf>

Bill **Law** and David Stanbury (2009). *Images, Ideas, Realities and the Uses of Career Metaphors*. <http://www.hihohiho.com/magazine/mkngtwork/cafimages.pdf>

Kevin M. **Leander**, Nathan C. Phillips and Katherine Headrick Taylor (2010). 'The changing social spaces of learning: mapping new mobilities'. *Review of Research in Education* 34. pp. 329ff <http://rre.sagepub.com/content/34/1/329>

Guy **Lodge** and Rick Muir (2011). 'Localism under labour'. In Patrick Diamond and Michael Kenny (eds.) *Reassessing New Labour*. London: Wiley Blackwell. pp. 96ff

Thomas **Mackey** and Trudi Jacobson (2010). 'Reframing information literacy as a meta-literacy'. *College and Research Journal* <http://infolitlib20.blogspot.com/2010/03/reframing-information-literacy-as.html>

Stuart **Maclure** and Peter Davies (1991). *Learning to Think Thinking to Learn*. London: Pergamon

Donella **Meadows** (2009). *Thinking in Systems*. London: Earthscan

Sara **Meadows** (1993). *The Child as Thinker – The Development and Acquisition of Cognition in Childhood*. London: Routledge.

Leo **Mellor** (2012). 'Picture this'. *Times Higher Education*, 10 May pp. 48f

Blake **Morrison** (2012). 'Dream country'. *The Guardian Review* 5th May pp. 2f

Mark **Peel** (2011). *Miss Cutler and the Case of the Resurrected Horse : Social Work and the Story of Poverty in America, Australia, and Britain*. London: Forthway Books

Gabriel **Radvansky**, Sabine Krawietz, and Andrea Tamplinthe (2011). 'Walking through doorways causes forgetting – further explorations. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 64 (8), pp 1632ff

Liz **Richardson** (2011). *Working in Neighbourhoods in Bradford – an Interim Summary of Findings from the JRF*. London: Joseph Rowntree Foundation

Liz **Richardson** (2012). *Working in Neighbourhoods, Active Citizenship and Localism – Lessons For Policy-Makers and Practitioners*. London: Joseph Rowntree Foundation

Dale **Salwak** (2012). 'Windows on their worlds'. *Times Higher Education*, 10 May pp.45ff

John **Seddon** (2008). *Systems Thinking in the Public Sector – the Failure of the Reform regime... and a Manifesto for a Better Way*. London: Triarchy Press. <http://triarchypress.com/pages/book5.htm>

Roger **Simon** (1991). *Gramsci's Political Thought*. London: Lawrence and Wishart

Colm **Tóibin** (2012). *New Ways to Kill Your Mother*. New York: Viking

Howard **Williamson** (2004). *The Milltown Boys Revisited*. Oxford: Berg

Paul **Willis** (1977). *Learning to Labour*. Farnborough: Saxon House, 1977 – 'Joey' reprinted (2001) <http://www.hihohiho.com/magazine/reallives/cafjoey.html>.