



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

This thesis has been submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree (e.g. PhD, MPhil, DClinPsychol) at the University of Edinburgh. Please note the following terms and conditions of use:

- This work is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, which are retained by the thesis author, unless otherwise stated.
- A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge.
- This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author.
- The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author.
- When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given.



The House Camphill Built:
Identity, Self and Other

Miriam Snellgrove

PhD in Sociology
University of Edinburgh
2013

Declaration

In accordance with University regulations, I hereby declare that:

1. This thesis has been composed solely by myself
2. This thesis is entirely my own work
3. This thesis has not been submitted in part or whole for any other degree or personal qualification.

Miriam Snellgrove

Abstract

This thesis concerns the process of everyday identity formation within Camphill settings. Specifically the research investigates the ways that Camphill places construct their identity around notions of deviance, repetitive practice, material spaces and the social self. Using a broad ethnographic methodology the thesis examines the ways that making, verifying and ascribing such identity claims occur and in what situations and contexts. The research further contributes to debates around the particular ways that social research constructs an understanding of the social world and argues that knowledge of normative rules and social practices are crucial skills that determine our ability to function within society. Chapter One reviews the genesis of Camphill as residential settings for children and adults with disabilities. Discussions around the textual representations of Camphills' seventy year history are critiqued. The three fieldsites and the particular challenges present in undertaking multi-sited and ethically challenging research are discussed. Chapter Two discusses the practical, epistemological and conceptual lens through which the research is devised. Further the process of 'doing' ethnography shapes the researcher's identity as much as deviance, repetitive practice and the social self are implicated within Camphill's identity work. The discussion argues for socially positioned ethnographies that reflect the multiple and competing social worlds of researcher, text and other. Chapter Three examines the particular ways that deviant identity is lived and experienced. It suggests that deviance is an important part of socialisation as it constructs social norms and rules, even if those norms are largely imagined. A key point is that non-conformity is person specific and engaged in differently across the fieldsites. Chapter Four examines the role materiality plays in the formation of Camphill identity work. It suggests that engagement with material things is done as part of wider ongoing socialisation processes. Chapter Five argues that Camphills' highly structured everyday life is a crucial means for wider group and individual socialisation, with the expectation that such knowledge enables successful participation within society. The conclusion considers Camphill identity work and theorises its connections to collective experiences and structural processes.

Acknowledgements

Writing a thesis is sometimes compared to giving birth. Long, messy, painful but eventually fruitful. It is worse. Writing this thesis has been more exhausting and draining than any labour I lived through (and I did overblown drama and medicalised intervention in labour well). Where the birth of the thesis analogy holds true is in the essential presence of parents, friends and professionals that surround the labouring mother/writer and give repetitive encouragement. At each stage of my academic labour I was supported by some exceptional and wonderful people.

To the ESRC, the fairy godmother of my thesis, my thanks for the resources to undertake this research for four years and not live in a starving garret with mice and holey jumpers for company.

Of equal importance are the people of Camphill Blair Drummond, Camphill Community Corbenic and Ochil Tower School who accepted me quickly, trusted me with their stories and demanded very little in return. Any mistakes or misrepresentations herein are all my own.

Hugo Gorringe and Liz Stanley suffered with me for four plus years and lived to see the finished result. Thanks for all your patience, timely guidance and superior writing tips (even when seriously ill or miles away in India). I give you leave to make a voodoo doll of me.

My sincerest thanks to Amanda Coffey and Angus Bancroft for a friendly, constructive and helpful viva, I could not have asked for better examiners.

For corridor conversations, natters over cooling cups of tea and sartorial elegance I thank Michael Rosie and Andrea Salter.

To the men who plied me with mosque curry, walks in the Meadows, cupcakes, CV advice and often difficult but exhilarating conversations my thanks go to: Fraser Stewart, Eric Chen, Sam Friedman, Antonio Malfense Fierro and Paul Anderson.

The 6.12 Club a bastion of exclusivity and laughter. For the many illuminating conversations on motherhood, pornography, pubic hair and hinkypucks I must thank: Ruth Lewis, Amy Chandler, Kanykey Jailobaeva and Lucy Bull. Special mention to Club Chief High Priestess Heather Blenkinsop whose refusal to engage in academic

spectral wank alongside her extensive bibliography was a constant inspiration. Long Live the Club!

The Peet B&B run by the lovely and much missed Jennifer Peet was my home away from home. When she moved across the pond, the Milyaev family (Sveta, Nestor and Yegor) stepped into the breach and provided me with caviar, borscht and friendship.

For keeping me sane with gin and tonics, cinema nights, transport sharing, songs and sisterly advice I thank Emma Snellgrove, Annie Kus and Miriam Puccianti.

Finally to Berry who endured three labours with me, two children and one thesis. Beside this woman stands a great man. Thank you.

M. L. Snellgrove, December 2012

For my Parents
Neil and Margaret Snellgrove
'The light doth shine
for all to see.'

Table of Contents

Declaration.....	3
Abstract.....	4
Acknowledgements.....	5
Table of Contents.....	8
Camphill on the Map.....	10
Introduction – Entering Camphill	
<i>A Beginning</i>	12
Chapter One – Reading Camphill	
Introduction.....	27
The Cult of Personality.....	29
Camphill Blair Drummond.....	36
Camphill Community Corbenic.....	41
Ochil Tower School.....	45
Multi-Sited Ethnography.....	49
Ethical Considerations.....	51
The Disclosed Self.....	56
Conclusion.....	59
Chapter Two – Writing Camphill.	
Introduction.....	61
Aims and Theoretical Underpinnings.....	62
Exploring Ethnography.....	67
Participant Observation.....	75
Fieldwork and Fieldnotes.....	77
Researching the Familiar.....	82
The Continuous Field.....	85
Writing Motherhood.....	89

Conclusion.....	95
 Chapter Three – Defining Camphill	
Introduction.....	97
The Deviant Camphill.....	98
The Pillars of Camphill.....	116
The Other Pillars.....	124
Conclusion.....	130
 Chapter Four – Identifying Camphill	
Introduction.....	133
Camphill Images.....	135
Attention to Detail.....	142
Camphill Meals.....	151
Conclusion.....	163
 Chapter Five – Becoming Camphill	
Introduction.....	165
Being and Becoming.....	167
Troubled Histories.....	172
Significant Others.....	181
The Social Self.....	189
Conclusion.....	195
 Conclusion – Leaving Camphill	
An Ending.....	198
 References.....	 212



Camphill on the Map

Camphill in the United Kingdom and Ireland



Camphill in Scotland



Camphill in Central Scotland





Introduction

Entering Camphill

A Beginning

Being asked to explain your research is not unusual. The request is voiced by polite dinner guests, baffled family members, lecturers and fellow students. It was and still is a question to be dreaded, for it can't be answered properly without becoming entangled in explanatory blunders. Even now when I have some conclusions to offer and am quite clear in my head about what my position is, I still fluff the question. My favoured, rather reductionist explanation over the past four plus years has been the following: 'I am researching Camphill. Camphill is the name given to a variety of residential schools and homes for children and adults with additional support needs.' Additional support needs sometimes gets changed to 'physical and behavioural disabilities,' or 'people who are labelled as needing residential care.' Sometimes I get lucky (or unlucky) and my questioner has vaguely heard of Camphill, in the form of 'but isn't it like some kind of religious cult/group/movement?' 'It has a particular philosophical ethos and is Christian based, yes', is my usual answer.

All of these answers provide a particular kind of representation of Camphill, one that does not really make Camphill any clearer or easier to understand. I have often wished that I could say 'I am researching the Nuer people of Sudan' (Evans-Pritchard, 1940). Location, context and social group are defined and initially easy to grasp. 'I am researching people in Camphill places of Central Scotland' does not quite have the same ring. Part of the problem is the acceptance and fetishisation of the exotic other. Sudan and Nuer are exotic from a Westocentric perspective, central Scotland is not. That central Scotland has its own exotic tribe called Camphillers who are relatively unknown is not so much interesting as puzzling. In today's immediate news world, how can we know about floods, referendums and mass

¹ The Camphill Logo and font. I discuss this in more detail in Chapter Four.

protests in other parts of the world and not what is right next door to us? It implies not just ignorance on behalf of the questioner, but also a desire on the part of Camphillers to remain unknown and removed from mainstream central Scotland life. Ergo cult, sect, weird religious group etc.

I have had my own difficulties beyond that of immediately explaining my research to strangers: I have been researching something very familiar and close to home. I grew up in a Camphill Community in Northern Ireland on the shores of the Belfast Lough. I spent the first twenty years of my life roaming the extensive acres of farm land, woods and beach. I learned all the daily rituals and took part wholeheartedly. I joined in the seasonal plays, first in more junior roles, gradually moving up the hierarchy to more pivotal and important roles. I knew all the songs that were sung and when and how they should be sung. When I was older still I worked in the garden picking fruit, ran the laundry over the summer and eventually ended my Camphill career as a class helper, sometimes teacher, before I left for other, newer pastures. During the time I lived there it was my home completely and utterly. I felt contained, safe, with a bone deep sense of belonging. My world was centred on my parents, sister and a house full of other people who had funny physical quirks and idiosyncrasies. I knew how to wind them up and also could spot quicker than the co-workers assigned to their care when they were upset and were about to get aggressive. My world had clear boundaries and I was not interested in the Troubles beyond the limits of the community. A bomb scare at the swimming pool or ice rink, the army with tanks patrolling the streets, were not as real as harvesting at Michaelmas, boundary walks on Palm Sunday or lighting the Christmas tree. The outside world had little to offer that was more interesting than what was going on at home. It was an insular existence to some degree, but my childhood memories are for the most part happy.

However, such a presentation does not acknowledge the other realities present alongside the rich cultural and festive life of my childhood and teen years and I became more aware of the responsibilities that my parents carried. New frown lines appearing on father's face and my mother became ill for months when she was never normally so and usually carried on regardless. A sister who hated sharing my parents

with people who seemed to be more important than her and her struggles at school. Not to mention the gossip mill of the community. Vicious and unforgiving rumours and scandals. Backstabbing and infighting. Paperwork that seemed to grow all by itself. More forms to fill in, more meetings to attend where nothing was ever decided. When decisions were made there was always someone who took umbrage thus adding to the perpetual gossip mill (Gluckman, 1963; Elias and Scotson, 1994).

I pieced this together from what I overheard and saw. I noticed that on holidays my parents returned to their normal laughing selves. They would talk about coming back with concern and tired voices. The frown lines and hunched shoulders would return within hours of arriving home. But it was and still is one of the most beautiful places in the world. When I see photos of the houses I lived in, lawns I played on, woods I hid in, the farm with cows I petted, the wild bales of straw where dens were made and kisses exchanged, it is easy to paint memories and pictures of a glorious untroubled natural past, free from the messiness and complexities of human encounters.

This thesis is not about my attempts at memory recall. It is not about reliving a past through anecdotes and the vagaries of reimagined encounters. It is about Camphill in the 21st Century, and how Camphill is lived now and understood. For although Camphill is young in many ways (only seventy years old), it has changed beyond what the founders could ever have imagined when they began Camphill during World War Two. It is about how some things vanish and others endure in the process of change, and why certain things stand the test of time better than others. It is about Camphill identity and how this is made, taken apart and remade. That I grew up in a Camphill and through my parents am still, even now, attached to another Camphill also plays a part, though not, I would argue, the definitive or even most interesting part. One of my informants told me I was like a thread: when I was there I was part of the tapestry, when I left the traces remained but the weavers moved on (Fieldnotes, 2 April). I think this analogy is a good one to describe my role and insignificance in Camphill. Lives are not static, nor are people unmoving blocks of marble, they live, breathe, create and change. People in Camphill are no different.

Life in Camphill is a reflection of wider social processes. Some of those processes are increasing regulation, increased self monitoring and surveillance as evidenced through the production of documents, declining public adherence to organised religion and questions about identity: personal, national, global. How these processes are understood and played out within Camphill settings reveals much about how people in Camphill (aka Camphillers), construct an identity of what it means to be a Camphill and how that identity is constructed through everyday activities and conversations. Equally Camphill identity work reveals much about the importance of repetitive social practice and how understanding norms and rules of society is vital work in the development of the social self, all staples of the Sociological canon.

When I began my fieldwork I did not really have a set of research questions, but instead had plenty of assumptions about what I would find when I entered my various fieldwork sites. I was then constantly surprised and confronted by the levels of difference I encountered and would greet the smallest similarities with a surprising amount of relief (Hume & Mulcock, 2004; Fadzillah, 2004). This was something I had not anticipated. I had saturated myself with the literature on the problems the native ethnographer faces (Jackson, 1987; Hayano, 2001; Ellis, 2000; Reed-Danahay, 1997; Coffey, 1999; Davies, 1999; Oriola & Haggerty, 2012), yet the degree of hard-wired certainty I had about Camphill and by extension Camphill identity was something I only became aware of when I entered Camphill Blair Drummond, where my assumptions about Camphill-ness were decisively challenged.

I had undertaken a pilot study during my Masters year at the school my parents currently worked at, so though I had encountered other familial issues that impinged on the research then (Snellgrove, 2008), I was still researching people whose outlook and views on Camphill had ultimately shaped my own understanding of what Camphill was and wasn't. I had also had a very illuminating discussion with Ludwig, a long standing golden oldie of Camphill who told me that Ochil Tower (the school I was at) was definitely a Camphill, but Camphill Blair Drummond just down the road wasn't (Fieldnotes 16th May). I was internally somewhat panicked by the certainty of this statement, as I was then already negotiating access to Camphill Blair

Drummond. ‘If Camphill Blair Drummond is not a Camphill, maybe I shouldn’t go and do fieldwork there’ I remember thinking. Such was Ludwig’s status as someone close to the beginnings of Camphill (the founders all having since died) that I felt wary of challenging his statements or indeed demanding an explanation about Blair Drummond’s apparent deviance. In the end, I went to Blair Drummond without his approval, where my fieldwork was the catalyst for challenging all my previous ideas about what a Camphill was and how it was granted legitimacy by other Camphills.

At the end of my year long fieldwork, when I was battling with my data, I visited my godmother in a Camphill in the Irish Republic and encountered exactly the same attitude from other ‘significant’ Camphill people. My research was ‘interesting’ but when I said I had done fieldwork at Blair Drummond the immediate reaction was ‘but that’s not a Camphill’ (Research Notebooks III, 2010). At that point though, I was more amused and even more certain that the theories I had developed about what constitutes a Camphill were relevant and accurate. My mother, however, took instant umbrage to this statement and loudly declared that ‘well some people would say Ochil Tower is not a Camphill as we hold services on a Friday instead of a Sunday.’ Instead of this declared move from the ‘traditional’ norm being greeted with raised eyebrows and tutting (something I think she was expecting), the response was ‘well I am very impressed that you are still doing services at all.’ I was jubilant. What mattered was not that things had changed; indeed the subsequent conversation was all about the changing work and employment patterns found in UK and Irish Camphills, but that Ochil Tower could throw the baby out with the bathwater. In short, they could change what they liked but as the joint co-ordinators (of which my parents were part) had spent the last thirty plus years in Camphill they *knew* Camphill history, in fact were a part of Camphill history – so any changes they made would be seen as in the ‘spirit’ of Camphill. The changes may not meet with universal approval by other Camphills, but Ochil Tower would never seriously be considered outwith the Camphill fold. Blair Drummond with its new management and changing staff did not know this history, did not know the founders, did not know the oral history of Camphill that only ‘time in the trenches’ could legitimise. They did not have some elder who could recall Camphills early days living on the

premises to whom such questions about identity could be instantly resolved through that person's very presence. Such a person would have literally broken bread with the founders, and so would be legitimacy personified.

A Camphill place with any of the following I concluded would always be a Camphill. If it had:

- A retired Camphill co-worker/s who had worked with Karl König² et al living on site and/or symbolically attached to the place it was a Camphill.
- Senior staff who knew stories about the founders that are not found within the published Camphill canon and could knowingly and convincingly perform these stories to other Camphillers (using Camphill-speak), it was a Camphill.
- Long term co-workers who are familiar with the published history, might also have been taught by the founders, can relate and document the changes that have occurred over Camphill's seventy year history and/or disregard Camphill identity questions as they are 'too busy doing real work', such a place is a Camphill.
- Most importantly residents, children and/or adults³, without whom there would not be any Camphill at all and who are often overlooked concerning identity narratives.

It may be a Camphill internally riven with conflict and disagreement, or battling with external regulators and social services, it could also be run almost completely by employed people, but it was a Camphill nonetheless.

The exploration of these specific points and how they are played out in everyday encounters within my various fieldwork sites is the aim of the following chapters. Crucially, these sort of identity questions are certainly verbalised in discussions but the defining area of identity formation comes through the everyday activities and aesthetic constructions, in short repetitive practice. Daily rituals like morning

² The founder of Camphill

³ The various labels given the physically and emotionally impaired people who live in Camphill

assembly, the lighting of candles, graces at meals, songs at certain times of the year, particular pictures hanging in halls, the decoration of public spaces and the celebration of festivals are, I argue, the social and material glue that expresses Camphillness. These practices also have the added bonus of reaffirming to other Camphills that they are a Camphill. However, there is disagreement among my informants regarding their significance. For some, the rituals and festivals are crucial ways of marking Camphill as different (in a good way) from other care homes (certain people in Camphill Blair Drummond argued this for example). For others, they are only important if they are not dead (Staal, 1979) but instead 'living' rituals that are imbued with meaning and hold relevance to the people in the place and as such their daily necessity is often questioned (some people in Ochil Tower School said this). For yet others, they are done simply because it is requested by residents that they be done (as claimed by staff in Camphill Community Corbenic). As a result, establishing the significance or not of daily rituals and festivals is complicated when ascribing significance to the maintenance of a Camphill identity. Such activities are the easily visible markers of difference when initially entering a Camphill place, but I will be arguing that the different ways that each Camphill place engages with the importance of these markers of difference reveal how firmly entrenched they are within the Camphill framework. A place like Ochil Tower can question the rituals as meaningless and discuss whether they want to continue them, because the people running Ochil Tower are long time Camphillers and their belonging to Camphill is beyond doubt. But others, like Blair Drummond, do not have that luxury and hold the daily rituals and festivals up as markers of their difference to other care facilities whilst also trying to use them to demonstrate their belonging to Camphill (which for certain Camphillers is not enough).

It is therefore clear that whilst the everyday is of crucial importance to understanding Camphill identity formation, biography and the interpreted history of Camphill also play a significant part. However the links between these investigations has not been a clear and straightforward one. My connection to Camphill, as previously mentioned has been a difficult one to conceptualise and write about and this I would argue, was also due to my ongoing ambivalence about academia as self defined and

institutionally constructed. This was largely brought about by an academic career that started in Sociology and Religious Studies, moved to Social Anthropology and then returned for my thesis to Sociology. Such movement between disciplines, whilst exposing me to a multiplicity of viewpoints and contrasting conceptual lenses with which to view the social world, increasingly made my own attempts at knowledge claims fraught and problematic. I perceived boundaries between and across disciplines which manifested itself most directly in the use of specific authors who, I was told, had to come from within Sociology and not to continually ‘borrow’ academics from other disciplines. My thesis was based in Sociology and therefore I needed to state my allegiance, unequivocally to a specific discipline. Like Gordon (2008: 25) argued, I increasingly saw such academic representations as fictions “which separate[d] literature (story/fiction) and social science (fact)... [despite the border being] not quite as secure as institutional mandates presume”. This segregation between imagined worlds, social worlds and disciplinary worlds was one I experienced in a variety of ways, and so my journey to be an ‘academic’ moved and shifted over the four years of thesis writing, changing how I conceptualised and understood what a thesis should be and how I was to construct and write it. Such concerns, I came to realise, are typical of doctoral work (Li & Seale, 2008; Oriola & Haggerty, 2012). At the time however, the need to be able to clearly state what *sociological* contribution my own research made to knowledge demanded that my interests in “experienced and observable social events” (Sztompka, 2008: 25) also “reveal understandings of larger social structures and forms” (Crow & Pope, 2008: 598; Mills, 1959). I felt therefore, for much of my research that I had been caught within a plethora of disciplinary worlds and contrasting opinions, which sought to position my engagement with Camphill and my engagement with academia in very particular ways. Much of this academic angst came through my attempts to bring together clashing and contrasting theoretical viewpoints. It did not seem practically possible to marry particular, contested, hierarchical, gendered and raced discourses, to name a few, (Cerulo, 1997; Butler, 2004, 2006; Wetherell, 2009; hooks, 2000; Haraway, 1991; Hill Collins, 2000, Foucault, 1975), with my own cross-disciplinary history and swithering⁴ academic concerns. This was also made harder by the

⁴ Scots word for agitation, hesitation, perplexity

recognition that within my fieldwork settings constructing essentialist and arguably reductionist criteria of belonging and identity provided clarity and clear boundaries and this was something all my informants actively engaged in and thought desirable. For many within Camphill, much of the identity formation work was aimed at solidifying an essentialist doctrine and doing away with the messy and fragmentary nature of identity posited by many postmodernist scholars, even if the explanations given were multiple and contradictory. At basis, Camphill identity means sustaining strong collective and social practices, all done I shall suggest through knowledge of Camphill's history, longevity within Camphill and the successful performance of particular rituals, festivals, the daily work with pupils/residents and so on to other self-identified Camphillers. The need for a clear unproblematic identity is also done to maintain the successful and healthy functioning of Camphill as a place of education and training for children and adults with a variety of emotional and behavioural disabilities. As I shall demonstrate, a fragmented, porous identity is not conducive to 'good' care work and social education and training. With fieldsites that placed repetitious work and everyday structure as crucial elements of their daily identity work, seeing my own life and those of my informants as constructed fictions did not, I feel, adequately capture the tensions between fieldwork realities and academic theorising. This did not mean that my fieldsites could not be theorised or analytically engaged with, but rather than my own ambivalence about what conceptual lens to apply to my data made my time within academia fraught and often painful.

As a result I spent a considerable amount of time and energy trying to find an appropriate sociological identity that would help me "extract the distinct figure of a discipline from the messy ground of everyday life" (Prior, 1994: 521), an identity moreover that would help me smooth away my intellectual anxieties and disciplinary clashes. After countless attempts to shoe-horn myself and my data into neat boxes which had handy labels like 'symbolic interactionist', 'materialities scholar', 'classical sociologist' (this seemingly demanded a return to Hegelian thought and a read of Plato's republic), 'feminism and gender', 'community studies' and so on, it became glaringly obvious that I was in a bit of a muddle. I couldn't answer questions

about my research which didn't cause panic and I was unable to state what type of sociology I did and to which sociologists I owed allegiance. Even claims to academic promiscuity were quashed as I only ever mentioned a handful of people and then only bits and pieces of studies that I thought interesting. Maybe I could banish the idea of whole pictures and images, and instead work with the reality of flawed research, fuzzy fields and an academic self that was not completely determined nor totally free (Crang & Cook, 2007; Nadai & Maeder, 2005, 2009; Visweswaran, 1994; Murphy, 2008; Muir, 2004; Hayano, 2001; Ellis, 2004; Denzin, 1997)? If I did that, I could legitimately argue that "research is personal, emotional, sensitive, should be reflective and is situated in existing cultural and structural contexts" (Coffey, 1999: 12).

By adopting such a proactive and critically reflexive approach that demanded I look at what I am doing rather than focus on what I wasn't achieving or doing, it became clear that I used ethnography (my chosen method) in particular ways and that I analysed my data through a lens that focused on the everyday as a site of important social activity. This needs to be explored further. The everyday, as I have already suggested, is very important within Camphill settings and instead of trying to theorise and explain particular sections of everyday Camphill life through one particular lens, I see the everyday as an umbrella under which my desire to pick and choose academics to explain and explore issues and challenges that arise in fieldwork, can take shape. In this way my own identity questions about Camphill and myself as a 'sociologist', take place under the roof of the everyday. Such questions and challenges happen in everyday encounters and, whether trivial or profound, or simply mundane and taken for granted, shape how I construct and build an understanding of social as well as academic norms. The everyday as Sztompka (2008: 31-35) argues is the place where all of Sociology's main concerns (whether this is class, gender, power, social inequality, modernisation, identity, nationalism, race etc) play out "in the episodes of everyday life." Dismissing the central importance of the everyday Crow and Pope (2008: 600) suggest, means that we "have little hope of understanding wider structures and the bigger picture." As Berger and Luckmann (1967) have stated, social reality is constructed through the

course of our daily lives and in our relationships with others, whilst Garfinkel (1991) has suggested that people have a vested interest in maintaining social order because of the benefits it provides them, which is why we follow rules, with the tacit assumption that we could always choose to do otherwise. Furthermore, as I was aware in my own life and also that of my informants, understanding the everyday came about primarily through interaction and repetitive performance and this is where Goffman's (1959, 1963, 1965) ideas about how people learn to establish a common definition of the situation and perform collective roles gained importance.

As a result of placing the everyday as the roof under which a whole host of other people and perspectives could shelter, I found I had unwittingly developed a particular kind of sociological identity all along. The self in everyday life is clearly embedded in the social world and related to "cultural norms, values and interaction" (Scott, 2009: 31). My own academic self, the selves constructed and lived by Camphillers, the challenge of Camphill identity work and my own academic identity work, to name a few, were all played out and seen in the everyday. The everyday as a result was the space where the challenges inherent in undertaking ethnographic research and living Camphill lives could be taken apart, remade and recreated. In this way the uneasy boundary between fiction and fact (Gordon, 2008) could be blurred and my own constructions of knowledge (multiple and contested as it is and was) could be highlighted (I discuss this more in Chapter Two). Suffice it to say here that, by adopting the everyday as my particular sociological label, I am able to produce the kinds of writing about the social world that recognises the contribution of others as well as my own contribution to the production of that world. As Coffey (1999: 161) writes:

Our research commitment is not only to the field setting, our informants, the academic discipline and academic scholarship. We should also have and enforce a commitment to ourselves ... we owe it to ourselves to undertake fieldwork that is ethical in our own terms; is reflective of and sensitive to our needs and emotions; aims at personal development as well as scholarly reward.

As a result, my journey through Camphill, though long, has not been as challenging and thought provoking as my journey towards a sociological identity that enabled me a degree of freedom in the tools I used and the approaches I adopted, whilst also providing the necessary clarity and overview that social research requires if it is not to be solely a navel gazing exercise (Ellis, 2004). The everyday enables an intimate yet simultaneously wider reaching sociology to take place as this thesis will make clear.

This introduction has briefly laid out the main concerns and interests of my thesis. Earlier I noted my familiarity with the subject area of Camphill and how this shaped my perception and understanding of what a Camphill is. I did so in a relatively informal manner, my aim being to give the reader a glimpse of how I viewed Camphill through the particular rose-tinted lens of retrospective memory construction. Even now, after four years of dissecting and deconstructing Camphill and my own representations of it, I occasionally sink back into this rather romantic rhetorical style of writing. Being aware of certain 'field-blindness' is an ongoing and unremitting process (Fox, 2004: 8). Personal reflections aside, I laid out the main criteria for Camphill identity formation alongside my own simultaneous academic journey to create and embody a particular kind of sociological self and the ways that my own identity questions meshed with those asked and lived by many of my informants. Such identity work, as I will demonstrate throughout the thesis, is never finished but is ongoing and is subject to change over time and place. I will now outline how these points will be elaborated in further chapters.

In Chapter One, I discuss my three research sites: Camphill Blair Drummond, Camphill Community Corbenic and Ochil Tower School. I present my reasons for a multi-sited ethnography, alongside providing an historical overview of the development of each site and how each site is variously portrayed within Camphill produced literature, their websites, discussions with informants and my own fieldnotes. This gives the reader a clear impression of the differing views and ideas about Camphill and its identity. I discuss the oral history and folklore of Camphill

and the significance status stories have on the shaping of a perceived legitimate Camphill identity. I also discuss the recent plethora of Camphill produced literature which positions and shapes an understanding of what Camphill is in a particular way. What is important is that what is written and what is actually lived are often very different things, as my research shows. I further explore the various ethical considerations that are in place when doing research with people labelled vulnerable and in care. All three of my research sites requested individual anonymity for staff, pupils and residents, but wanted their places named. Such negotiations between researcher and informants open up questions about navigating risk to all involved (Rustin, 2010). Further, much of the ongoing complex ethical dilemmas (Crang & Cook, 2007) involved can contradict a funding body's requirements (Stanley & Wise, 2010). I have deliberately combined the ethical and access discussion with my site descriptions, as both sections deal with the context-specific nature of research and question how much can be known and in what ways it can be known within particular (restrictive) frameworks.

Chapter Two presents my methodology. I begin with a more macro overview of my research design, my particular aims and underpinnings alongside a theoretical deconstruction of the challenge of 'doing ethnography.' This feeds into a discussion concerned with my main method – participant observation and the pitfalls and problems alongside the positive reasons for employing such a method. I then move on to my actual experiences and struggles 'to know' whilst undertaking the research. In particular, I discuss the problematics of researching family and friends, and how knowing and being known by informants impinges upon the research enterprise in particular and often unforeseen ways. I discuss how I tried to deal with this through my fieldnote writing and subsequent reflections on the fieldnote writing process. Critically deconstructing my fieldnotes became a key part of my data analysis, not only in terms of my assumptions about Camphill, but also in subsequently seeing key themes and ideas emerge from the fieldnotes that in the field I had not been so aware of. I also discuss the use of other types of data (photographs and diaries) as further opportunities for data analysis where there is the possibility for multiple representations to be explored and analysed.

Chapters Three, Four and Five are substantively-focused chapters where I explore the various themes and issues that relate to the construction and formation of a Camphill identity. In Chapter Three I present various challenges facing Camphill in the 21st Century with the increasing managerialism and the employment of people changing the perception of what Camphill is, if not actually changing the daily structure. I discuss how perceptions of difference do not actually have much basis in empirical reality. This then leads into a discussion regarding the 'deviant' Camphill and why it is identified and self identifies as outwith the Camphill fold. From the questions regarding a deviant Camphill identity I then move onto some of the 'pillars of Camphill' both written and orally expressed views by my informants as to what is and what constitutes a Camphill. Such angst and questions about a Camphill identity are often absent from the concerns of many of the residents living within Camphill. I discuss them as an almost forgotten pillar in the building of a Camphill identity. Furthermore residents see Camphill as their 'homes' and do not engage in debates about Camphill deviance because such debates are not important in their daily lives. The discussion about the socially constructed nature of Camphill identity leads onto Chapter Four where I explore the material spaces and aesthetics of my three fieldwork sites. Here I show how much of a Camphill identity is visible in the houses, halls and walls of the places but this is never used to explain or even construct a legitimate Camphill identity. However there are certain rituals, and material activities that are given a significant amount of attention and these events and decorative arrangements, I argue, are viewed as possibilities to train and socialise residents and staff into a particular way of being. I conclude by showing how the material and social are linked to the everyday working and reworking of a Camphill identity. In Chapter Five I extend the ideas about the socialising of residents to explore the ways that social rules and norms are seen as concrete social facts within Camphill settings. I also discuss that the ability to be a competent social self is an ongoing process and the structural and cultural life of the Camphill place plays a crucial role in this learning. The ability to read, internalise and then manage a variety of social situations are necessary skills in order for the children and adults to be a home in the world. I suggest that this kind of social work with pupils and

residents is another layer to the identity formation and construction of Camphill within the 21st Century.

The conclusion encapsulates the four themes I have explored in the previous chapters. Namely it deals with how identity is spoken about, written about, evidenced in material spaces and finally how it is lived. These four things constantly rework and rewrite what Camphill is and how it is presented. This leads to my suggestion that Camphill identity is both complicated and clear. It is fragmented, contested and changing, yet at the same time structured, bounded and rigidly controlled. I then suggest that understanding Camphill identity in particular is concerned with the task of becoming a competent social self in a complicated and difficult social world.



Chapter One

Reading Camphill



Introduction

In 1939 Karl König and a group of other Austrian-Jewish émigrés fled Austria to Scotland and there started a community for children with additional support needs: in time this extended across four continents and one hundred schools and residential facilities (Bock, 1990:36-56). Based on the principles outlined by König, Camphill was established to create and maintain an environment where the economic, social and spiritual aspects of lives within the community complemented each other. The ideals of the founders were to help those who had been “rejected and misunderstood by society, to care for the land, to celebrate the Christian festivals and to live together in a truly communal manner without salaries or other remuneration for their work” (de Ris Allen, 1990:11), guided by the Anthroposophical philosophy of Rudolf Steiner (1861-1925). It was not a job as much as a way of life, with an ideal of equality and unified decision-making practices (Seden, 2003:111; Bock, 2004).

In 2012 in Scotland, twelve communities are part of the worldwide Camphill Movement (<http://www.camphillscotland.org.uk/>). The majority are residential training facilities for adults, with one retirement home and two residential schools. Aberdeen, where Camphill began, has the largest concentration in Scotland, with Perthshire home to three and Dumfries to one centre. Academic research on Camphill is in its infancy (Bloor et al 1988; Cushing, 2008; Brenner-Krohn, 2009;

Smith, 2011), though Camphill-based writers and writings have flourished recently (Bock, 2004; Surkamp, 2007; Luxford, 2003; Plant, 2006, Jackson, 2006, 2011), covering founding member biographies, discussions about ‘curative education’⁵, challenges to Camphill in the twenty-first century, alongside questions regarding Camphill’s contemporary role and relevance. Camphill has a seventy year history and distinctive language, philosophies and ‘alternative’ outlook and at times these practices seem umbilically linked to the very word Camphill, which transcends the specific sites as a global Movement, yet simultaneously is embedded within the locations called Camphill. The implication is that one Camphill place represents the whole, a sort of community of communities. Exploring this oscillation between key ideas of a communally-determined history and how such a history is lived, re-imagined and constructed in the present (Stanley, 2008; Anderson, 1991; Plummer 2001; Hobsbawm and Ranger 2002; King, 2000; Halbwachs, 1992), is the aim of this thesis, alongside exploring the challenge and social reality of being a Camphill in the twenty-first century and the different identity-claims such a name imposes on the people working and living in Camphill-labelled places.

This chapter does a number of things. It starts with a discussion around the key figure behind Camphill’s inception, Karl König, as well as a brief discussion mentioning some of the other significant people in Camphill’s history. Significant people are, I argue, an important part of how Camphill constructs an identity. As I will demonstrate in later chapters the role of significant others is crucial to grasping the ways in which Camphill life is experienced and lived. My discussion within this chapter is not a complete or definitive reading of the ‘big’ people in Camphill’s history, but in order to understand much of what I observed in my three fieldsites some kind of knowledge of its past and ‘people’ history, even if this is contested and problematic, is necessary (Stanley 2008; Wolf, 1992; Plummer 2001; Smith, 1999; Tamboukou, 2008). By performing this type of people-knowledge publicly, people actively recognise and reconstruct its significance for the particular identity claims they are making. Furthermore, much of this narrative is embodied by particular

⁵ Curative education explained as ‘healing education’ and based on Steiner’s philosophy where body, soul and spirit are brought together in a ‘holistic’ manner through special therapies, medicine, art, crafts etc. For a more detailed discussion, see Jackson, 2006 & Smith, 2009.

people around what I term ‘the cult of personality’. To ‘know’ stories about these particular individuals is on one level to ‘know’ the, or rather a, history of Camphill. Presenting knowledgeable selves is an important element of identity work and runs explicitly and implicitly throughout this thesis. The chapter moves on to discuss my three fieldsites, their written beginnings and how they are structured on managerial lines as well as offering a snapshot of the daily life within them. This moves onto a discussion about multi-sited ethnography and the reasons behind my choice of these three fieldsites. Finally I end the chapter exploring how my ethical choices and how ethics, access and anonymity impinge on the research premise in particular ways. Further, such constraints shape what can be known and how Camphill life can be presented and constructed. This chapter acts as a descriptive gateway into my research, where some themes such as identity work and the social self, which I explore in later chapters are here, brought to the fore and highlighted.

The Cult of Personality

To write authoritatively about Camphill is a challenging task. It requires sifting through published and unpublished documents and negotiating the vast realms of memory of existing Camphillers in order to locate Camphill and its practice in the twenty-first century seventy years after its inception. Despite such variety in sources and the many people who have passed through the many different Camphill places worldwide, there are some people who are granted greater status and significance than others. These are the people who have books dedicated to them, courses named after them and portraits displayed in Halls and homes. This is a form of ‘institutional display’ (Goffman, 1961: 98) that reminds the insider of Camphill’s beginnings (and to which they are indebted). To an outsider, what hangs so prominently on the staircase is simply a black and white photo of a serious looking man, often one where the man is embracing a Down syndrome child (see start of chapter). The man is Karl König.

There is folklore attached to The Founder and a certain amount of reverence and awe. At the 2012 New Lanark Camphill conference, I was presenting a paper on aspects of my research to a mixed audience of co-workers and residents. I showed a

slide of the afore-mentioned photo and asked the audience if they recognised it? An immediate storm of voices responded with ‘that’s Karl König’ and ‘I knew the boy (whom König is embracing) when I was in Delrow’⁶. When I had finished presenting, various residents and co-workers came up to me to tell me about the ‘cheeky boy’ and where that picture hung in their particular Camphill places and yet other stories about König (Research Notebooks: V, 2012). Trickling down through the Camphill grapevine, I heard that his study is still maintained just the way he liked it. By this I am given to understand that bookshelves line the walls, a small table with a cloth, fresh flowers in a vase and a candle are all regularly maintained. I have no idea with whom this originates or even if it is ‘true’. When I was doing my fieldwork at Camphill Blair Drummond, I met someone (a child of early Camphillers, ergo someone ‘significant’) who told me that amongst the ‘staff children’⁷ there was a competition around who could bring König the first snowdrops of the year, and apparently the parents took this just as seriously as their children (Fieldnotes, 6 March). I have an image of earnest-looking men and women wrapped up in their homemade woollens walking heads bent peering under bare bushes and being lashed by cold winds and Aberdeen snow when trying to spot the first fragile cluster of snowdrops and then rushing to tell their children, ‘There under the birch tree, snowdrops.’ Tremblingly handing over the wilting blooms, perhaps a pat on the head and the glory of being The One To Pick The First Snowdrops!

I recently attended a Camphill conference where Camphill practice was being discussed vis a vis ‘excellence,’ with one male participant in particular being incensed by the ‘interference’ of social workers and external regulators who thought they ‘could dictate how we live our lives.’ This is a kind of rant that asks for taxpayers money to run ‘his’ Camphill but dislikes the checks and balances that come with such a handout. This man I discovered in the tea break had said ‘fuck you’ to König – to the titillated shock of all present on the occasion. ‘Well König was a bit of a dictator’ someone else murmured. ‘A dictator escaping a dictator?’ I asked. ‘Perhaps a little yes, a benign dictator’ a bespectacled man agreed. ‘He used to go

⁶ A Camphill place for adults with disabilities and special needs in England.

⁷ The name applied to children of the staff who run and organise the various Camphill places. It was always staff children not staff’s children.

mad if a book was out of place or put back in the wrong order' (Research Notebooks: III, 2010). I thought to myself that these people had been reading Bock (2004: 50), where such outbursts are described as 'König was sometimes difficult to approach.' Other written descriptions of König emphasise his 'disproportionally large head' (Müller-Wiedemann, 1990: 15) a literal statement as by all accounts he was small with a very big head and also that he 'struggled with loneliness and melancholia all his life' (Selg, 2008: 13) and often wrote in his diary that he 'did not belong' and 'experienced himself as a stranger amongst people' (König, 1954 in Selg, 2008: 13). This is not perhaps surprising, given that he was surrounded by people who regarded what he said as gospel, with his every word and written edict being used to build and develop more and yet more Camphill places.

Such accounts are informal oral stories that are handed out as precious knowledge at conferences and in conversation with older Camphillers. They cannot be verified, but they endure. They concern the 'human-ness' of the mighty founder, someone who could be sworn at and given flowers to. They never concern his academic achievements, or that he was a doctor. Nor do they concern his upbringing in a middle class Jewish Viennese family, or his meeting with significant Anthroposophical figures of the day and the apparently profound impact which Ita Wegman's clinic⁸ had on his life. Stories like this are in the 'official' biography by Müller-Wiedemann, (1990) and other accounts collected by Bock (2004). What the informal stories entertain is the possibility of similarity. By this I mean that everyone can struggle with loneliness and be cranky and out of sorts but still be admired, their opinion still count and the first flowers of the year be given as a symbol of that. The re-telling of encounters with König serves also to unite the tellers in a bond of shared identity that strengthens a process of common meaning (Cohen, 1985: 50); whether these stories are 'true' or not is irrelevant, what is important is the "meaning they hold for those who tell them" (Nadel-Klein, 1991:509). The persistence of such stories told at conferences, at my fieldwork sites, and also at home by my parents

⁸ Ita Wegman was a doctor who ran an alternative therapeutic clinic in Arlesheim, Switzerland where she applied Steiner's anthroposophy to medicine and healing. She was, reportedly, an important figure in König's life as her clinic was inspiration for much of the cultural life he would later develop in Camphill. For a longer discussion see Müller-Wiedemann, 1990.

form a history that presents itself simply as the ‘way things are done.’ Each new generation can hear the stories about snowdrops, swearing and other tales that I have not heard; and through this repetition a form of self-evident ‘legitimation’ occurs (Jenkins, 1983: 70; Jenkins, 2008: 164; Norrick, 1997; Smith, 1999, Hobsbawm and Ranger, 2002) bound up in the array of associated roles that König had as founder and leader (Merton, 1957: 369).

The status invested in the stories of König also extends to the group of people who joined him when he fled Austria for Scotland. This is not the place to explore the many different personal biographies and histories of those who joined and left Camphill in the early years.⁹ Suffice it to say that many of the founders had children, and some of those children still live and work (or are retired) in various Camphill places around the world. Others have become Steiner Waldorf School teachers, while little is known about others. What is important is that today, the people who lived and worked in Camphill from the 1940s to the 1990s are *categorised* in particular ways by the dominant collective Camphill rhetoric and specific Camphill practices. What I am suggesting here is that certain people have been “lumped together in the eyes of others, but aren’t aware or fully aware, of the content and implications of that categorisation” (Jenkins, 2008: 108). For example, I was treated many times throughout my fieldwork and afterwards to particular presentations of a UK Camphill history that pinpointed a ‘moment of change’ as occurring in the 1990s with the advent of increased care reports, external regulation and care inspections of Camphill places (Research Notebooks: IV, 2011). Prior to that, Camphill places performed their own internal inspections, with the suggestion being that the increased load of external documentation made maintaining specific König-determined practices difficult if not practically impossible to continue. By the early 2000s, many Camphill places had employed managers and more employed staff. Working in Camphill was increasingly seen as work, and the ideal of ‘living’ Camphill was diminishing. In 2009 and again in 2012, when I attended the worldwide New Lanark Camphill conference, I talked with more managers and employed staff than I did with live-in co-workers. As a result, the current generation

⁹ For detail on the founders and post-founding generation see Bock (2004) and Surkamp (2007)

of golden oldies in Camphill (people in their late forties and mid fifties who came to Camphill in the seventies and early eighties) were bemoaning a present where young people do not want to stay in Camphill, and romanticising a past that was unified, spiritual and conscious of the lineage of König et al (Fieldnotes, 8 April 2009).

Interestingly, since I began my research on Camphill back in 2008, a whole plethora of literature on Camphill has sprung up. The majority is written by people within Camphill and published by Floris Books Edinburgh, arguably the largest publisher of Camphill literature in the world. The literature can be broadly divided into two camps. The first group, not surprisingly, is engaged with the writing of biographies of the founding and post founding generation (Müller-Wiedemann, 1990; Bock, 2004; Surkamp, 2007; Selg, 2008). These biographies are written in flowing and lyrical prose and conceal the early difficulties of starting Camphill behind phrases like ‘this was my task’ and often ‘such is the challenge of the twentieth century.’ The everyday issues and idiosyncratic behaviour I noted earlier is often absent from such accounts, yet close readings reveal that building a life together during the second world war was often fraught and painful (Müller-Wiedemann, 1990). That said, the enduring romance of the past survives quite simply because the past can be retold in ways that serves the writer’s purpose (Young, 1993).

The focus on biography has extended to the relatively recent opening of the Karl König archive in Aberdeen, the same building that houses König’s study. Within the archive the collected letters and writings of König are assembled into yearly and sometimes twice yearly publications, again by Floris Books. At present there are twelve published volumes of the writings of König, from Camphill thoughts and diary fragments (König, 2008), to his own biographical writing on people such as Helen Keller, Sigmund Freud and Charles Darwin (König, 2011). König wrote mostly in German so various translators are involved in this ongoing project. Equally difficult for the compilers is the fact that König requested his diaries to be burnt upon his death. This request was duly carried out by Anke Weihs (a co-founder of Camphill and discussed later in this chapter) and so much of König’s writings are lost. Anke’s decision to burn the diaries is hotly contested as being ‘true to König’s

wishes' and a 'great loss for us all' (Research Notebooks: II, 2009). The publishing of König's diaries and past lectures is currently the most prolific area of writing related to Camphill, however these publications are descriptive and offer very little by way of analytical commentary on the writings within.

The second group engaged with writing about Camphill are largely concerned with the contemporary issues facing Camphill. The writers are mostly from within Camphill settings, or affiliated to Camphill, and are often running the degree course in Social Pedagogy at Aberdeen University. A variety of Camphill places fund this degree course completely with no external financial aid from either the University or the Scottish Government.¹⁰ These writers engage with the challenges that doing 'good' practical work with children and adults with a variety of disabilities entails (Jackson, 2006, 2011). Such literature calls on particular notions of self and being and the various ways the child/adult can be socialised into a 'whole' awareness of themselves (Moraine, Hansen & Harrison, 2006; Henderson, 2006; Tanser, 2006; Ehlen, 2006). I discuss the ideas raised in this literature and how it was practically employed in my fieldsites in Chapter Five, and suffice it to say here that some of the authors are aware of the mytho-romantic status of the König stories and try to present more pragmatic readings of Camphill's early history (Costa, 2011; Brennan-Krohn, 2009). Their aim is to destabilise the rhetoric that presents Camphill's beginnings as seamless and unified and today's Camphills as fragmented and disintegrating. As Hobsbawm and Ranger (2002) suggest, such inventions assume continuity with the past that is somehow fixed and immutable instead of an active process of everyday practical activity that continually creates and re-creates ideas of the past in the present (Goffman, 1959, 1961; Scott, 2009; 2010).

¹⁰ I.e. the Camphill places that send their co-workers on this course pay the usual UK and overseas fees to the University of Aberdeen. In return they get access to University resources (library, lecture halls and rooms, a degree certified by the University) but the lecturers all stem from within Camphill and do not draw salaries from the University. At the time of writing, entrance to the BA in Social Pedagogy has been halted (though already registered students degrees have been guaranteed) whilst the University holds an internal audit on course content and decides whether to continue their 'support' of a degree programme that has drawn considerable media interest and academic contention (Gray, 2012; Colquhoun, 2012).

Extending the critiques of the early presentation of Camphill are yet other writers who document the particular issues and challenges facing Camphill in the twenty-first century. Like the mytho-romantic stories of König et al, much of the formation and organisational structure of the early Camphill places no longer exists in its originally envisaged state. These authors discuss the ways that Camphill identity has changed and how to re-establish and recreate what is termed ‘a sense for community’ (Luxford, 2003). Plant (2006, 2011) goes further and suggests that communities go through a forty year halcyon period and then are faced with the major challenges of change and upheaval. Camphill is currently in the phase of upheaval and bureaucratisation. Plant’s suggestion is either people work with Camphill as it is now or pack their bags and leave to start a new venture somewhere else. Those who remain must recognise that the changes Camphill is currently facing are no different from countless other community and social living experiments. I discuss the conceptual difficulties of the term community in more detail in Chapter Two, however the authors presented here, are primarily engaged in an ongoing debate with other Camphill places that follows the line of both reassurance – change is inevitable and happens everywhere – and criticism – the past is not the halcyon place you think it was, stop trying to create it as such. What follows then, are practical as well as ideological suggestions for how people within the UK Camphill Movement can be better equipped to deal with various internal and external challenges without resorting to identity crisis (Skinner & Baron, 2011; Smith, 2011). Understanding what Camphill faces internally combined with the ability to present Camphill more successfully to ‘external people’ resulted in the Camphill Research Group being founded in 2009. Internal research was not enthusiastically followed up, but the ability to present what Camphill does, why it does it and how good it is at it, has been of greater interest to many more people beyond the confines of the UK Camphill places (Plant, 2012: 4). The ‘it’ of Camphill is a significant part of this thesis and is particularly addressed in Chapters Three, Four and Five.

The various writers discussed here, whether they focus on biography or the issues of Camphill now, all seek to construct a particular identity of what Camphill is. At basis the assumption and often vocalised expression in the books is that Camphill is

special, unique and wonderful. Whatever difficulties and challenges there are within specific Camphill places, the overarching agreement between all the various authors is the love they have for Camphill. The following encapsulates this perspective:

What would life be like if we didn't have Camphill? What would it be like for so many families, who rely on Camphill and others like it? It would be like switching off the light on a life. Every child and every young adult, whatever their circumstances, is entitled to the fullness of life, to know what their fullness is, to have it revealed to them and to be part of that revelation.

(Mary McAleese, President of Ireland. January 2010, in Jackson, 2011: 8).

I am not interested in challenging such glowing statements. What I am primarily concerned with are the ways in which Camphill life is lived, experienced and understood away from the constructed histories and troubled presents as discussed above. That is not to say that my own writing is not equally constructed, it is, but my perspective attempts to unpack how such constructions (my own included) shape not only how I write and read Camphill but also the ways such constructions define how Camphill is seen and most importantly lived. What follows is a brief exploration of my fieldsites, as a 'sort of' history compiled by me detailing the structural and organisational make-up of Camphill Blair Drummond, Camphill Community Corbenic and Ochil Tower School.

Camphill Blair Drummond

Camphill Blair Drummond became a Camphill in 1975. Until then it was a privately owned castle with extensive grounds. The family sold much of the land around the castle to developers, who turned the land into the Blair Drummond Safari Park. The castle overlooks the Safari Park and can be reached by a long winding drive through parkland dotted with mature trees. Though within close driving distance of Stirling town, it feels very removed from the outside world. This feeling of isolation was commented on by many people during my time there. 'I feel like I have entered a beautiful peaceful bubble when I am here,' one respondent said. Also that the pace of

life was slower and people were less aware of world events that occurred ‘outside’ (Fieldnotes, 14 March).

Within books that deal with the development of Camphill, Blair Drummond is mentioned briefly as part of the expansion of Camphill during the sixties and seventies. Blair Drummond was originally started as a training college for people between the ages of eighteen and twenty-one (de Ris Allen, 1990). It was therefore a sort of transition place between school and the eventual moving on to one of the Camphill ‘Village Communities.’ At the extended time I was there during 2009, the idea of Blair Drummond as a transition place was no longer relevant. Many of the ‘residents’¹¹ were in their thirties and forties with the oldest resident in his sixties; this was a man who had been in Blair Drummond since its Camphill beginnings.

The main and original house is a large castle sitting on a jutting promontory. The castle has been divided into three houses (Tourmaline, Juniper, and Orion) while the middle floor of the castle houses the Textile workshop, a large Library where Morning Assemblies are held each day and a newly renovated Meeting Room. The corridor to these rooms is long and wide with eighteen foot high paintings on the walls done by David Newbatt (a well-known Camphill painter). The Library is a large high ceilinged room with a grand piano in one corner, bookshelves lining the walls, floor to ceiling south-facing windows, one a painted glass window. Chairs are usually in an oblong circle round a small table with a vase and flowers on it (Fieldnotes, Feb-March 2009). The Craft, Pottery and Bakery workshops are in the basement of the castle proper. The Basketry, Garden, Woodwork, Estate and Sensory workshops occur in buildings a short three minute walk from the castle, where two other Houses for residents also stand. Blair Drummond, as previously mentioned, is surrounded by the Safari Park on one side and land owned by previous owners of Blair Drummond on the other. As a result, though surrounded by nature, the grounds are small and the boundary walk a ten minute stroll. In winter when the Safari Park is closed, and in the Summer after six in the evening, residents and co-workers often walk through the Safari Park, past llamas, the lions and the elephant enclosure and

¹¹ Label given to people with ‘challenging behaviour and behavioural disabilities.’

‘do’ a sort of circular walk that then takes them back up the drive to the castle. Co-workers often said to me that it reminded them of ‘Hogwarts’¹² when they approached it (Fieldnotes, 17 March).

Blair Drummond has an operational structure that is headed up by a ‘Director of Operations’ who works with a group of people labeled ‘residential care managers,’ ‘day services managers,’ ‘administrative and finance managers.’ Underneath this group are the ‘House coordinators’ and ‘Workshop leaders.’ The former see to the running of the houses, the latter are responsible for their particular workshops. Helping with this are twenty+ young volunteer ‘co-workers’ largely from Germany and Eastern Europe. Certain residents have a one-to-one support worker who accompanies them throughout the day, from getting up in the morning, through going to workshops till bedtime. These are usually the residents labeled as ‘challenging’ (Fieldnotes, Feb – April 2009).

The majority of residents come to Blair Drummond from other care centres and are recommend through a complex negotiation between parents, local councils, social workers, educational psychologists etc and the admissions team at Blair Drummond (Research Notebooks III, 2010). There are also Camphill transfers, that is, people who come to Blair Drummond from other Camphill places. Though coming from other Camphill places the admission policy is the same complex one. However, the people transferred are previously familiar with particular rituals, festivals and songs while the other new incoming residents are not. This is an important difference as such knowledge shapes the implementation of certain rituals, festivals and even the singing of songs. These residents embody a particular form of Camphill identity, something I discuss in more detail in Chapter Three.

On its website, Blair Drummond’s presentation of its history is thus:

Blair Drummond, founded over 30 years ago by the Austrian, Anke Weihs, is part of the international Camphill movement for social renewal through

¹² The name of the school in the Harry Potter books created by author J.K.Rowling

community living. In over 100 Camphill schools, training centres and villages worldwide, children adolescents and adults in need of special care live and work together. Based on the work of Rudolph Steiner, life at Camphill centres is shared on an extended family basis, building communities that uphold in each individual a sense of integrity, dignity and worth. Camphill Blair Drummond is a member of Camphill Scotland and of the Association of Camphill Communities (<http://www.camphillblairdrummond.org.uk/about-us/the-camphill-movement>).

When I read the above extract, some aspects are immediately striking. First mentioned is Anke Weihs. Anke Weihs was one of the ‘builders of Camphill,’ part of the group that fled Austria at the start of World War Two and was given refuge in Scotland and there created the first Camphill School. Mentioning Anke is to say publicly ‘we were founded by those who created Camphill.’ It is a statement of legitimacy. To visitors, parents, social workers etc unversed in Camphill history it simply means that an Austrian started Blair Drummond. However, to those who ‘know,’ it is a claim back to the beginnings of Camphill. But, and here is the rub, Anke was not Austrian but an Australian who moved to Austria (Sanders, 2004: 86-95) and married another founding father, Thomas Weihs. Such a statement therefore shows a lack of awareness of the key founders and their lives. It is in fact a glaring statement of error as pointed out by one sharp-eyed golden oldie (Research Notebooks I, 2009). It adds to the anomalous position that Blair Drummond holds within UK and Irish Camphill places, rather than aiding it in appearing within the fold. It may seem trivial, but such a mistake can be used to illustrate Blair Drummond’s deviant status as a rogue Camphill, something again that I explore in greater detail in Chapter Three.

The brief presentation of purpose then states that Blair Drummond caters for people ‘in need of special care.’ This sounds lovely but is definitionally vague, I would argue intentionally so. It does not read well to list all the different medically diagnosed syndromes and disabilities housed within Blair Drummond. ‘Special needs’ in contrast is the umbrella under which all such labelling can sit with ease. It

includes everyone and excludes no-one. ‘Aren’t we all in need of special care’ is an oft repeated phrase I heard throughout my fieldwork (Fieldnotes, 21 March). The implication is that the benefits of ‘living and working’ in Blair Drummond extend beyond such narrow definition of ‘carer and cared for.’

From special needs, the anonymous author then carries on to list in rather etymologically-vague terms such phrases as ‘social renewal’, ‘building communities,’ ‘integrity,’ ‘dignity,’ and ‘worth.’ But defined by whom and meaning precisely what? It sounds worthy and noble, and the very vagueness of the words used adds to the presentation of a place with an ethos. And this is an ethos, moreover, that is not written and dictated by contemporary fads and regulations, but one that has a history, hence the mention of Rudolf Steiner. Again this is a nod to people who ‘know’ who Steiner is. Briefly, he is the philosophical guide behind the building of Camphill and the inspiration for much of the articulation of Camphill’s spiritual and social formation,¹³ as understood and implemented by Karl König et al. Even for those who don’t know about Steiner, the presence of this name implies that this person has some kind of legitimate weight, furthering the impression that every detail of life within Camphill places is thought through and not subject to changeable policy whims.

Finally, at the end of the online manifesto, there is a further presentation of membership to a wider network of places. Blair Drummond is part of Camphill Scotland and the Association of Camphill Communities. These claims of belonging signal a seamless and uncontested presentation of unity. As Jenkins (2008: 141) suggests,

... Individuals select, from the available possibilities, and not necessarily self-consciously, collective identifications with which to identify themselves (and to identify themselves with). In the process, they contribute to the production and reproduction of the collectivities with which they are

¹³ I use spiritual and social formation unexplained here. However König using Steiner had very clear ideas about what spirituality and social formation was. For further discussion see Müller-Wiedemann, 1990.

identifying, evoking and constructing intra-group similarities and inter-group differences.

Through this brief discussion of the place and online identity of Blair Drummond, certain factors are worth highlighting. Blair Drummond, quibbles aside, has an impeccable Camphill beginning and is situated in a large rambling castle. This is the type of building that the early founders often sought out and bought to start new Camphill places, but today constitutes a practical nightmare for the more movement impaired residents (Fieldnotes, 27 March). Change in relation to the practical site of Blair Drummond is currently ongoing (Fieldnotes, 25 February, 2011), alongside change in how it perceives and is perceived by other Camphill places (Fieldnotes 2009). Blair Drummond is in many ways the deviant Camphill around which other Camphill norms are established (Becker, 1963; Jenkins, 2008). The reasons for this are not immediately obvious or indeed logical, and I discuss this further and in greater detail in Chapter Three.

Camphill Community Corbenic

To reach Corbenic, I usually drove through the Sma Glen. This Glen is a ‘must-see’ on the Scottish Highland tourist trail and there were often buses lumbering along the hairpin bends with eager faces pressed to the window taking pictures of the bleak and rocky mountains. I find it very beautiful. The drive lasted about 40 to 45 minutes and on a good (no traffic at all) day thirty minutes. Corbenic is fairly isolated, though I write this knowing that isolation is a relative term. People in Corbenic would tell me that Perth was only thirty minutes away and a good local pub ‘just down the road’. So my experience of isolation was linked more to the relatively untouched landscape and the fact that Corbenic was often completely cut off during heavy snowfall. Dedicated staff would trudge their way through the snow so as to make sure community life could continue (Fieldnotes, 5 May).

Corbenic, like Blair Drummond, was founded by Thomas and Anke Weihs. Their pictures hang in The Library alongside König and Steiner as a visible explicit link to the past. Some of the residents have been at Corbenic since it started in 1978 and can

point out the rooms where Anke slept, a living symbol of continuity and belonging (Cohen, 1982, 1986). The main building is an old converted hunting lodge that ranges over three floors. These three floors are divided into three Houses – Mullach, Lindisfarne and Turach, similar to Blair Drummond being three Houses within one building. Mullach, the smallest of the houses, was probably formerly servant quarters with its narrow hallways, bendy bathrooms, where you have to duck to enter the room and has smaller bedrooms. Lindisfarne, on the floor below, has large airy sitting and dining rooms and bigger rooms for residents and co-workers and was the Lodge proper one could assume. Turach, on the ground floor, has a low ceilinged kitchen, dining, sitting room all in the one space. Its windows mostly look out onto the rhododendron bushes and the main drive curling down the steep hill. The other Main Rooms on the ground floor are the Library and the Hall. The Library is where meetings take place and the Hall is for the collective Monday morning Assembly, Birthday parties and Festivals that bring the whole of Corbenic together. The Lodge is perched on the top of a slag heap and is slowly and inexorably, according to some sources, sliding down the hill. Being so perched above the Glen means that the water pressure is almost non-existent and when it failed completely one summer, the residents and co-workers drove the fifty minutes to Ochil Tower School to have showers and use the loo (Fieldnotes, 23 May).

Since its (quasi) humble beginnings as a Lodge House, two other Houses, workshops and farm buildings have been built on the 46 acres that Corbenic owns. The central area where all the buildings are collected is relatively small, and the land beyond extensive and barely touched. I went on numerous ‘short’ boundary walks where the physical boundary of Corbenic would be pointed out to me and much of the land is wild and uncultivated. All the land was intended, so it was suggested, to create an active and self-sufficient farm. But Corbenic’s residents are ageing and many of them are unable to walk the boundary of the place as this requires climbing stiles and wading through marshy bog land and navigating tractor-driven pot-holes. As a result, the Farm is small and focused on the rearing of a small range of livestock such as pigs, chickens, ducks, a couple of horses and little else. The land is apparently not suitable for crops so it remains wild. The Farm is also no longer the primary

workshop. Corbenic now has a Garden workshop (the growing of vegetables primarily), Estate workshop (maintaining the grounds and drive-way), Bakery, Craft, Woodwork, Candle-making in the winter months, Laundry, a small Pottery and Cooking where one resident will cook lunch with a staff member for a particular House. The outdoor workshops such as Garden, Estate and Farm often require a level of physical competence and strength which is increasingly not possible for many of the movement-impaired and older residents. As a result, young and healthy co-workers are set jobs such as re-surfacing the drive whilst residents look on or occasionally manage a few shovels of digging before retiring exhausted (Fieldnotes, May 2009). Other workshops such as Craft and Bakery are activities much more geared to the physical capability of the residents, where the kneading of bread and the making of felt dolls can be individually tailored for the resident in question. Living in one of the five houses and attending workshops throughout the week makes the bare bones of the everyday life in Corbenic. Weekends are given over to walks in nearby Birnam and Dunkeld, or trips to Perth and the cinema. On Sundays residents and co-workers attend the Service at Dunkeld Cathedral or on 'special' days such as Whitsun have their own Service in the Hall (Fieldnotes 31 May).

Corbenic is overseen by a female manager. Prior to Corbenic she worked at Blair Drummond as a house co-ordinator. She has been working in Corbenic for over ten years now. Similar to Blair Drummond, Corbenic has administrative and finance managers, workshop leaders, house coordinators, one-to-one support, and young volunteer co-workers also coming primarily from Germany and Holland. They also have a 'befriending'¹⁴ programme in place where interested volunteers can come from 'outside' Corbenic and are attached to a specific resident who they then take for trips to coffee shops, cinema etc.

In email correspondence with the manager one day, I asked her to detail how residents came to Corbenic. This is what she wrote:

¹⁴ Blair Drummond also has a befriender's scheme.

How do residents come to Corbenic? There are two possibilities, either the parents are very active and look for a place for their son/daughter, or the Care Manager/Social Worker is the one who looks for a suitable place. Most of our residents come from other Camphill Communities, but not all, some come from other homes, hospitals or living in the community projects. The resident, together with parents and/or care manager usually comes for a visit to look around in the houses and workshops. We have a chat and I give the resident a small booklet about Corbenic. The parents/care manager also receives a written outline of our admissions procedure and some general info about the community.

If they like what they see and read, the resident could come for a day to experience life in the workshop and house. After that visit we offer a two week trial visit. This is beneficial for all parties as we can see if someone feels at home here and the resident can decide if they would like to live here. Also at this stage we try and set the fee level for this resident. After the two week trial we have a meeting with all people who have been involved with this resident, a report is written (house, workshop, social, weekends etc) and a recommendation. The care manager then will negotiate the fee level with the local authority and once that has been agreed, we hope that we have a space for the person to move into; otherwise they have to go on the waiting list (personal email, 5 August).

As can be seen from the above extract, much emphasis is placed on the resident 'choosing' to live in Corbenic, a sort of 'elective belonging' (Savage 2008) Also, the majority of Corbenic's residents come from other Camphill places. This is significant as the resident brings with him/her much that they have learned and been socialised into. As I go on to suggest in later chapters, this is how much of the day to day activities are carried on, such as songs, graces and festivals etc. Residents are both worked on and work on the maintenance of Camphill's everyday identity. The process of being socialized into Camphill's social and cultural life I discuss in detail in Chapter Five, but what is important to note here is that they are not passive bodies

to be worked on (Foucault, 1976) but are active participants in the construction of their Camphill identity.

Ochil Tower School

Ochil Tower School was my first and also my last fieldwork site. I undertook research for my Master's dissertation there and then returned eighteen months later for my final round of data collection. Ochil Tower was not only my geographically closest fieldsite: it was also close to me personally because my parents live and work there and a close friend was and is working there as a Housemother. I discuss the continuous and familiar nature of my fieldwork in Chapter Two, but suffice it to say here that Ochil Tower embodied what Nadai and Maeder (2005) describe as a 'fuzzy field' where the boundaries of being 'in' and 'out' of the field are continually challenged, crossed and often do not seem to exist.

Ochil Tower is within walking distance of my home. It is in the centre of a growing rural town in Perthshire. The entrance to the school is directly opposite an old Tudor tearoom and optometrist. The local Co-Op is two minutes walk away, with banks and pubs also surrounding the boundary of the school. The entrance to the school is noticeable to the passer-by due to the overgrown fir trees and shrubs that line the entrance. It is not gated and has no streetlights illuminating the driveway, so at night the experience is of passing a looming hole of darkness. This lack of light is entirely deliberate: 'It puts kids off from coming down the drive and 'loitering' on the premises,' I was told (Fieldnotes, 27 September). The experience people have on entering Ochil Tower is often one of surprise at the peace and tranquillity of the place despite it being 'right in the middle of a busy town' (Fieldnotes, 4 March). The school with its seven houses and various outbuildings inhabits a couple of acres of land and has open views to the Ochils. Like Blair Drummond and Corbenic, the original building was an old, fairly small castle which today houses one of the largest Houses and the school's office.

Ochil Tower was a small residential school founded in 1966 before it became part of the Camphill Community Movement in 1972. Facing closure in 1972, the School

was bought and the existing pupils were transferred to the care of an experienced couple with a lengthy Camphill background who worked with the founding members in Aberdeen and other Camphill centres further afield (Laura & Ludwig, Fieldnotes, 12 May, 20 May 2008). It became part of the then-expanding Camphill Movement largely through this couple's dedication to Anthroposophy and the application of the social forms of community life as laid down by König. The couple continued their work with vulnerable children with additional support needs for many years, expanding the School as need arose, notably commissioning the building of a custom designed Hall and Schoolrooms in 1978/9 (de Ris Allen, 1990:72). When retirement loomed, the School again faced immanent closure as no suitable replacement could be found to take on the full responsibility that running such a School entailed. The Camphill network came to rescue in the form of another couple with extensive Camphill experience in working with children with challenging behaviour (Shirley, Fieldnotes 13 May 2008). They were joined a few years later by another equally practically-experienced couple and these four 'joint co-ordinators'¹⁵ are today responsible for the overall management of the School, including pupil admission, administration, health and safety, accountancy, HMIe¹⁶ and Care Commission inspection preparation etc, as well as being active practitioners in their respective House communities and as class teachers. The School's website states the following as a mission statement:

The Camphill Movement, which was founded in 1940, works to create Communities in which vulnerable children and adults, many with additional support needs, can live, learn and work with others in healthy social relationships based on mutual care and respect.

Camphill is inspired by Christian ideals as articulated by Rudolf Steiner and is based on the acceptance of the spiritual uniqueness of each human being, regardless of disability or religious or racial background (<http://www.ochiltowerschool.org.uk/Curative/curative.htm>).

¹⁵ ↔ Denotes terms used by informants

¹⁶ Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Education

This is expanded to cover a variety of aims and objectives that include a 'holistic, educationally rich' environment that is supported by working together with parents and other childcare professionals, alongside 'recognising, healing and enriching' the personal life of each child. The School has been recognised by the Scottish Government to have the capability to cater for children with 'moderate to severe learning disabilities'. This is a medical scale (Simonoff, 2005) whereby a child's emotional, intellectual and physical capabilities are measured and the appropriate care and education facilities provided. Children who come under the category 'moderate to severe' exhibit behaviour that can in its most extreme form be a danger to the surrounding public, and involve little or no understanding of normative social rules and the behaviour that accompanies such an understanding, as well as often having intensive physical care needs that demand one-on-one attention and exhibiting a variety of complex behavioural needs with often reduced verbal communication and occasionally severe self-injurious behaviour (Allington-Smith, 2006). In connection to the aforementioned difficulties, a child can also display a variety of syndromes and disorders, such as Autism Spectrum Disorder, Asperger's Syndrome, Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), Down's syndrome, foetal alcohol syndrome and other drug-related dependencies that affected normal foetal and emotional development (Simonoff, 2005; Fieldnotes, 13 June). The above list is by no means definitive but it provides a general overview of the kind of child that comes to the School, exhibiting one or many of the behaviour and congenital-related difficulties described above.

At present the School has a pupil roll of thirty-eight pupils (day and boarding) with about forty-two live-in 'co-workers' and three 'staff children' (Fieldnotes, 18 November). It also has an employed cook who cooks the lunches for the whole school, which are eaten in the separate houses. There is also an administrative secretary, three maintenance and garden men, an employed teacher, teaching assistants and a language therapist. Much of the school's financial and administrative decisions are made by the four joint co-ordinators. They have very few traditionally employed staff, with the majority working on a voluntary basis (coming from Germany mostly) with their board and pocket money given on a weekly basis. The

longer term co-workers are not paid annual salaries but instead have access to money as they need and see fit (Fieldnotes, 17 December). Decisions about the School are made at a communal weekly/fortnightly meeting with the other 'Core Group' Members, co-workers who have made a long-term commitment to working and living at the School (Fieldnotes, 22 January). The School is heavily reliant on young volunteer workers, who come predominantly from central Europe as a social 'gap' year before their University studies. Though the young co-worker turnover is relatively high, many co-workers choose to stay on as there is now the opportunity to undertake a long-distance degree course at Aberdeen University in Social Pedagogy, which is directly linked to working in a Camphill community.

Each new pupil (day and residential) and new co-worker is assigned to a particular House when they arrive, where they will spend their time outwith the traditional School day. The School has five Houses, run by a set of 'Houseparents' who are responsible for the pupils in their care and for providing support and supervision for the young co-workers caring for respective pupils. The day begins at roughly 7am with co-workers getting children up and preparing breakfast, which is eaten together. This is followed by general clear-up afterwards and walking pupils to their classrooms. The School day begins at 9am and finishes at 3:30pm with a break for lunch which is eaten in the Houses (Fieldnotes Oct-Dec 2009). All the co-workers working in the School are either teachers or 'class helpers,' aside from those designated Houseparents who are busy with the domestic details that 'running a house' involves and also other administrative responsibilities. After School, various activities such as swimming are organised and undertaken in the Houses with supper usually starting at 6pm (Fieldnotes, October–December 2009). Once the children have gone to bed, between 8pm and 9pm, co-workers either have some free time or have 'housekeeping' responsibilities till 11pm. This daily routine is repeated Monday to Friday, when the weekly borders go home. The remaining pupils do a variety of social activities within their 'house community' over the weekend, with the return on Sunday evening of the weekly borders. The day pupils arrive on Monday in time for School Assembly and the week commences again (Fieldnotes 27 October).

Having presented a sort of history and the organisational layout of my three fieldwork sites, I now move on to discuss the reasons behind my choice of using multi-sited ethnography. I discuss this from a practical and theoretical perspective that does not see the fieldsite as bounded and static and also questions how knowledge is constructed and presented (Falzon, 2009:13).

Multi-Sited Ethnography

The idea that ‘doing’ ethnography at a single site can accurately capture the lives and people there has over the last twenty plus years been challenged (Clifford, 1997; Marcus, 1998; Hastrup & Hervik, 1994). Instead ideas about a range of ‘cultural landscapes’ (Appadurai, 1990; 1996), ‘shifting locations’ (Gupta & Ferguson, 1997) and ‘nonplaces’ (Auge, 1995) have gained credence. As part of this, Clifford (1997) has suggested, there is a difference between multi-sited ethnography and multi-locale ethnography, with the former dealing with the many locations of culture, and the later involving field study in many locations and presupposing that a bounded definition of culture and difference between sites which is problematic. As a result, Nadai and Maeder (2009: 234) suggest that ‘the field’ should be viewed as a place without clear boundaries with “respect to many dimensions”, a helpful approach given that my research is not neatly bound and constrained. On one level, my fieldsites are clearly specified places (twelve Camphills in Scotland, one hundred worldwide) and so finding the field in this sense was not a problem. My choice of three was therefore based less on the ephemeral and boundary-less character of fieldsites (Muir, 2004) and more on practical choices and theoretical interest.

Having said that I am aware that the issues of multi-sited ethnography are far more complex and diverse, dealing with different conceptual understandings of multi-locale, and multi-country to name a few, alongside charges of a lack of depth and paucity of ‘thick description’ (Geertz, 1973)¹⁷. It is not the province of this thesis to deal with all of these issues, but suffice it to say that I have used multi-sited as a means of displaying the different and often contesting notions of Camphill-ness that my informants expressed. By using more than one site, I have also supported a

¹⁷ See Falzon, 2009 for a good discussion on the problematics of multi-sited ethnography.

‘fracturing’ of “authority over one setting or group of subjects ... [dissipated] by a constant allusion to other settings and subjects” (Teaiwa, 2004: 230). In this way, the perspective of the researcher’s voice is highlighted, alongside understandings of space and time (Marcus, 1994; 1995), as I discovered throughout the research at my three different sites.

When I undertook my Master’s research in 2008 at Ochil Tower, I chose this site somewhat out of convenience, it being close to where I live. However it quickly became clear that this was an excellent choice on other intellectual grounds. My familiarity with Camphill sensitised me to how much social science literature constructed ideas about legitimate knowledge practices in which my familiarity was a ‘problem’ (Strathearn, 1986; Powdermaker, 1967; Delamont et al, 2010). At the same time, much of what I read indicated that my fieldwork struggles had more to do with the method of participant observation and less to do with this familiarity (Kurotani, 2004; Teaiwa, 2004; Crang & Cook, 2007). Consequently I began to see that this could be an interesting area for exploring how the use of my ‘social self’ (Hume & Mulcock, 2004) moved across a number of boundaries and was constructed in particular ways in different locations, opening up for exploration the different layers of knowledge claims and positionality. As a substantive area, my thesis research was engaged with just such debate vis a vis Camphill’s identity, so my own identity matters meshed with this.

In addition, I wanted to move beyond a specific case study so as to widen out my area of analysis, and I thought that researching two Camphills might lock me into binary comparisons of similarity and difference rather than enable me to raise the messy ongoing nature of social life (Leonard, 2009; Falzon, 2009). As a result, the inclusion of a third site would shift, I concluded, my sociological ‘gaze’ away from the comparative and dichotomous. The choice of Blair Drummond and Corbenic occurred because they were close to Ochil Tower, had the same landowner (Camphill Central Scotland Trust), and also had links through residents and pupils often moving from one to the other. In this way they were linked beyond simply sharing the name Camphill. This was my position when I decided on my three sites. When I started my

research at Blair Drummond, ideas about deviant Camphills and indeed what exactly constitutes a Camphill (something I had been unaware of) became of crucial importance in understanding how ideas about Camphill identity are made and remade. A single site would have presented a world of everyday ritual and mundanity, while three have enabled more far-reaching issues regarding Camphill identity to be explored and teased out. Having three fieldsites has illustrated not only the situated nature of identity constructions, but also that identifying with some kind of Camphillness is of considerable importance for those who articulate it and also those who ‘do’ Camphill identity work every day. Part of this identity work is in dealing with the legal and ethical requirements of working with vulnerable children and adults. I discuss the conflict this can cause many people in Chapter Five, but here I am going to explore the issues and challenges that I faced whilst doing research and how certain types of knowledge are deemed appropriate and inappropriate depending on the ethical legislation and particular social situations. Ethics discussions are a key place where identity work as a cyclical process between the researcher self and the informant other are often mutually affecting spheres of reality (Hastrup, 1993: 48).

Ethical Considerations

Undertaking any form of research within a social environment requires careful thought and due consideration to the ethics involved, from gaining access to approaching participants, recording data, to publications and the impact this might have on the informants’ lives in the future (Crang & Cook, 2007:27, Schepers-Hughes, 2001). As Bulmer (2003) articulates, being ethical “limits the choices we can make in the pursuit of truth ... respect for human dignity is better, even if, in the extreme case, the respect for human dignity leaves one ignorant of human nature” (Bulmer, 2003:45). In taking Bulmer’s statement seriously, I as the researcher had to carefully assess whether my Camphill informants might resent or suffer badly from my particular representations, deconstructions and dissemination of their lives, roles and rituals. A variety of academics have posited a number of suggestions that would enable the researcher to be more sensitive vis a vis the power dynamics in his/her work (Marcus, 1995; Taussig, 1992; Abu-Lughod, 1990; Stanley & Wise, 2010). For example Strathern (1989) posits that studies should focus more on ‘our own cultures’

and cease to take them as some “universal benchmark and problematise their values” (Crang & Cook, 2007:28). This is not as unproblematic as it initially appears, particularly when the culture or people under scrutiny hold a minority viewpoint and life ethos within the wider normative ‘society’, thereby demanding greater ethical and methodological sensitivity in the application of such an ethical ideal. Attempting to ‘problematise values’ of informants can run contrary to their own sensitivity regarding certain texts, people and spaces. For example when I asked an informant whether it would be possible to read their Service holders book (a Christian staff led service), I was emphatically told ‘no, that is sacred.’ When I raised it with another member of staff he became quite self-consciously embarrassed and asked me whether I was ‘ethically allowed’ to ask him this (Fieldnotes, 9 May), as a result what is inside the book remains a mystery to me. What these responses told me, was that I had crossed an invisible boundary and must carefully negotiate my respondents’ own ethical code connected to the sacred protected nature of their texts if I wanted to further understand the importance and relevance informants placed on this event in their lives.

This politics and ethics of knowledge are further interconnected with the Ethics demanded by the researcher’s funding body. The ESRC, which funds my own research, demands at a minimum the following ethical considerations:

- honesty to research staff and subjects about the purpose, methods and intended and possible uses of the research,
- confidentiality of information supplied by research subjects and anonymity of respondents, and
- Independence and impartiality of researchers to the subject of the research (ESRC postgraduate guidelines, 2004, 2005 in Crang and Cook, 2007: 29).

At the simplest level, such guidelines appear sensible and well intentioned, however they are also based on somewhat questionable definitional terms, such as ‘independence,’ ‘impartiality’ and ‘honesty’ of the researcher – as etymologically understood and enforced by whom? Also a literal understanding of ‘confidentiality of

information supplied by research subjects' could mean that the researcher has adopted a confessional authority and is not at liberty to discuss, write or publish *anything* that informants reveal. Furthermore, 'honesty' can become difficult to unproblematically apply when the research paradigms change rapidly through a sudden revelation in the field (Benford & Snow, 2006). As Crang and Cook state, "yesterday's honesty can often be tomorrow's apparent lies" (Crang and Cook, 2007: 30).

In addition, confidentiality of the informants might be very difficult to maintain when the informants declare a wish to be publicly named and insist on full disclosure (Bulmer, 2003:50). In such instances the ethics of University institutions and funding bodies can clash spectacularly with the empirical realities and wishes of informants unversed in these ethical procedures (Rustin, 2010, Hammersley, 2010, Reed, 2010). This was clearly demonstrated at all of my three research sites. The mind game that is confidentiality and anonymity first raised its Janus shaped head during my Master's Research at Ochil Tower School. As I was 'known' through my parents work in the School, staff I spoke to thought my desire to fully discuss and receive informed consent was rather nonsensical. 'Oh I'm sure we all don't have a problem with you' I was airily informed after I had insisted on speaking at a senior staff meeting to outline my fieldwork trajectory. I was already trusted by informants and my ethics discussion with them appeared a strange anomaly that they humoured me with. Prior knowledge of my character seemed to equal an *innate* ethical disposition for my informants.

My own apparently ethical character was further challenged by the desire expressed by management and staff of my three research sites that I name the Camphill places and even the Houses. This goes directly against the afore-mentioned ESRC guideline to anonymise and protect informants against negative repercussions of the research. This was particularly difficult as my informants were keen to advertise that research had not only been done at their places but the attendant possibility of publication was felt to be a 'good' thing. Anonymity in this instance would undermine that other highly vaunted ESRC desire for widespread research dissemination. These tensions

between a theoretically sound idea of anonymity can then come into direct conflict with practice on the ground (Rustin, 2010). As a result, the daily ethical decisions determined *outwith* a research funding application are “messy, ongoing, impure, continually updated ... [and] develop over time and through experience” (Crang & Cook, 2007:32).

In this situation I decided to honour the expressed wishes of my research participants to name the places, and as the reader will be aware, have done so throughout this chapter and also the thesis. Blair Drummond, Corbenic and Ochil Tower School are the real names of the places and can be found just as I have described. I have also honoured the wish to name the Houses. I did this also because the House names given are distinctive and also present a particular kind of Camphill identity. This was obvious at all sites but in Blair Drummond there was the added twist that the house names reflected the geographical position of the Houses. Within the main building there were three houses. The House under the roof was called Orion, after the star constellation. The middle house, Juniper after the Juniper tree and finally at the bottom, Tourmaline, the semi-precious stone found in the earth. The geographical location of the Houses plays into the name and this in turn reflects a particular Camphill identity that Houses be named after either natural things, like trees, stones, stars or Saints (Halder, 2006; Fieldnotes, 2009).

However, I have anonymised and given all my research participants pseudonyms. In this instance, though my informants (should they read this) might recognise themselves (Scheper-Hughes, 2001), it does provide a degree of protection and invisibility for all concerned. This was also particularly pertinent as I was doing my research amongst people labelled ‘vulnerable’ and in ‘need of care.’ In this instance I was subject not only to outside care regulations regarding the protection of such labelled people but also the places themselves were clear that their care responsibilities demanded the anonymity of pupils and residents. However changing a name does not disguise certain mannerisms and quirks of behaviour that could be traced back to the particular pupil or resident. As a result my fieldnotes contain little or no mention of physical characteristics and behaviours which often make the

distinction, when reading fieldnote extracts, between staff and resident difficult to ascertain. This is deliberate and challenges assumptions about the competent presentation of self and visual signifiers of difference (this is explored more in Chapter Four). However anonymising residents was problematic particularly at Corbenic where a few of the residents would say: ‘and you will write that I (says name) think that, won’t you Miriam?’ (Fieldnotes, 18 May). I duly noted it down, thus my original fieldnotes contain the names and my thesis has them changed. It was interesting to note that those residents who took an interest in the research wanted to be named, whereas it was often staff and young co-workers who would say: ‘watch what you are saying, there is a researcher present, she is going to write all that down!’ At such points the line between an ethical self and ethically dubious researcher (Milgram, 1974; Humphreys, 1970) shifted according to person and place. Though some residents wished to be named, the added challenge here is whether the person had full knowledge of what their types of self-disclosure could mean (Cocks, 2006; Gray & Denicolo, 1998). Verbal expressions of discontent and dissatisfaction when placed in the hands of other powerful individuals could be used in such a way that my public naming be seen as a reckless disregard for the resident’s privacy. Equally not exposing such things could be seen as me silencing a group of people who have few opportunities for such public self expression. It is these constant negotiations that make ethical decisions in the field ‘messy and impure’ (Cragg & Cook, 2007:32).

There was also the added challenge of doing research with non-verbal participants. Methodologically, dealing with non-verbal informants raises particular issues for the researcher (Wright, 2008; Stalker, 1998; Cocks, 2006) from developing alternative models of consent and participation (Cushing, 2008) to overarching questions about the validity of such research and whose interests are actually being served (Gray & Denicolo, 1998). As the previous section has demonstrated, consent to name the places and houses was done by senior staff and not in consultation with residents and pupils. Equally the fact that I have anonymised all participants, in some instances against their expressed wish to be mentioned. In this situation, because I was using participant observation it enabled me time to build up rapport through lengthier visits

alongside the development of “tacit communication” between researcher and informant and a willingness to work with people’s silences as much as with their words (Cushing, 2008:16; Caranfa, 2004). At all three research sites, communication with non-verbal pupils and residents was done mostly through makaton – a sign language of gestures that encompasses whole sentences rather than specific letters as standard sign language does. For example, moving the index finger up and down on the chest tells the observer ‘I need to go to the toilet.’ I learned some makaton whilst doing my fieldwork, but was never wonderfully proficient. Also it varied how much makaton was built into the daily structure of the places. At some houses in Blair Drummond, the graces uttered before meals were also accompanied by makaton gestures (Fieldnotes, 20 February; 17 March). In Ochil Tower the classes all had the makaton signs laminated and attached with velcro to boards so that pupils could take one to show what they wanted to do, but were also used by staff to communicate a forthcoming event or activity, such as wheelbarrow work (Fieldnotes, October – December 2009). Makaton was always used alongside verbal speech, as well as other gestures of interaction and understanding and was a perfect way to observe, as well as be part of, the many different types of “power relationships ... [exposing] what is being said, what is not being said, who is speaking, who is not speaking” (Dresch, 2000:15).

The Disclosed Self

Being an ethically porous self, able to read what type of ethics were suitable and appropriate in a given situation, also shaped access to my fieldsites. All three fieldsites demanded a Disclosure Scotland check. This is standard when it comes to any type of educational setting, but particularly where ‘vulnerable’ children are concerned. At Blair Drummond and Ochil Tower my Disclosure form stated I was a researcher but at Corbenic I was a ‘volunteer co-worker.’ These three police checks took between six and eight weeks to be processed and as a result I had to wait for the clearance given by the form to commence my fieldwork. I also had to write a letter to parents outlining my research agenda before I could start research at Blair Drummond. Both Blair Drummond and Corbenic also required meetings with senior management and staff where I outlined what I would be doing and they in turn

expressed what they hoped my research would achieve and their hopes for it (see Chapter Three). I was also told that ‘they would never read my thesis, but a feedback session would be appreciated’. As a result in 2011, I organised two research dissemination sessions at Blair Drummond and Corbenic. Interestingly the people who attended these session were all senior management, who perhaps unsurprisingly were not ‘convinced’ concerning my discussions about the contested and often challenging nature of identity constructions that their places engaged in (I discuss this more in the Conclusion). Ochil Tower, in large part due to my familiarity I assume, demanded no pre-fieldwork meetings, had no requests about the outcome of my research and met offers to give a research feedback session with only lukewarm interest (Research Notebooks IV, 2011).

Once I had gained access to my sites, I was presented with a variety of things that I could and could not do. As mentioned previously, the application of pseudonyms to people but not to place was one, another was what I could photograph and film. At Blair Drummond and Ochil Tower I could photograph staff, buildings, paintings, houses etc, but I could not photograph any of the residents/pupils. I called this the ‘ethics of emptiness’ so the majority of my visual data from Blair Drummond and Ochil Tower contain no reference to, one could argue, a central pillar of the life there – the pupils and residents. The irony was that in both places co-workers and staff were constantly taking photographs of pupils/residents as ‘evidence.’ Evidence of ‘good practice’, evidence of the variety of activities engaged in, evidence to send home to parents in weekly reports (Fieldnotes, 28 February, 29 March, 12 November, 16 December). As a reader you are free to visit the websites of both places (as they are clearly named) and see a variety of photographs of residents and pupils engaged in numerous activities all suitably presented for the consumption of the world beyond the Camphill. This reminded me of Goffman’s (1961) work where such presentations are consumed by the visiting public as the nice ‘front’ stage that hides a more complex backstage world from view. The restraint placed on me taking photographs implies a truth and validity to visual materials that written accounts are thought not to have. I can write fieldnotes, but not photograph certain people. This meant that when staff were amenable they would appear in my pictures and short

films, as I got increasingly fed up of taking empty photographs of places that were normally filled with people, especially as I had hoped to use my visual data as a means to capture the vivid visual lives my informants led (Teaiwa, 2004: 216). This denial to photograph pupils/residents did not extend to me as researcher. During my time at all my sites, I was inevitably caught in several photographs. Two that I know of ended up on one of the websites complete with captions reading: ‘enjoying a chat in the sun’ and later in the year ‘braving the snow.’

Corbenic in contrast did not engage in this ethics of emptiness, and so I have folders and folders of visual materials filled with people. The reason given was that everyone there was an adult and it was not for the management to say who could and could not be photographed. The polite thing to do would be to ask whether the particular individual minded if I took a picture, was the suggestion (Fieldnotes, April – June 2009). This is what I did, and many residents particularly liked to see the picture afterwards, which having a digital camera enabled. Some would laugh and others, if they disliked the picture, would ask for it to be deleted, which I duly did. There were also some residents who would either tell me ‘now is not the time for taking a picture’ or vigorously intimate their disapproval through head and hand shaking. Such requests were often preceding events such as Whitsun Sunday service (a special occasion), or cleaning (not interesting enough for pictures) (Fieldnotes, 30 May, 13 June).

My involvement in the daily life of my fieldsites meant that I was often asked to do such simple things as help wash up, dry up, cut vegetables for lunch (even cook on occasion), sing seasonal songs at festivals and mealtimes as well as participate in the activity of whatever workshop/class I was part of. At Blair Drummond and Corbenic this meant sanding wood, felting dolls, baking bread, fixing fences and gravelling roads, when part of the Farm, Craft, Bakery and Estate Workshops to name a few. The work in Ochil Tower was the education of pupils which meant that I was sometimes asked to help a pupil with reading, accompany a pupil to the toilet and do other cleaning and education led activities whether in class or in the houses. The tasks appear simple and relatively straightforward, where they are ethically

interesting is due to the fact that I was party to the ongoing education and socialisation of the children and adults with all the attendant risks and challenges that involves. For example, being asked to supervise a pupil sweeping or hoovering the floor often caused me to move from the passive role of watcher to pointing out where dirt had been overlooked. I very clearly knew that this was ‘matter out of place’ (Douglas, 2002) and tried to teach that awareness to the pupils (Fieldnotes 12 November). Furthermore in situations where I was scratched, pushed or my hair pulled, caused me to attempt to point out that violence was not an acceptable way to behave (Fieldnote, 17 March, 28 May, 10 November). I discuss the management of ‘violent behaviour’ more in Chapter Five. Suffice it to say here that being consistently ethical, as determined and defined by my funding body, was challenging and difficult (Stanley & Wise, 2010; Reed, 2010).

Despite the problematics of consistent ethical practise, the multi-faceted and contradictory elements at play, ethical issues cannot be ignored. “The best counsel for the social researcher is to be constantly ethically aware” (Bulmer, 2003:56), of the funding/institutions ethical guidelines, alongside an embodied approach of ‘best practise’ in connection with their particular research field. In this way the research produced is not compromised unnecessarily by illicit covert operations and grubby ethical standards (Milgram, 1974; Humphreys, 1970).

Conclusion

In this chapter I have commented on the beginnings of Camphill around the cult of personality and discussed how this is played out in material and linguistic ways in my fieldwork sites. I showed how particular writings, largely produced by Camphill co-workers, engaged in biographical presentations or in ideological debates about the ‘best’ way to address the challenges and issues Camphill faces. The concerns of the writers and the presentation of Camphill extended to my own discussion of my particular fieldsites and the different ways they construct themselves on webpages, letters to me, within Camphill literature and further how I compiled these presentations. The reasons for choosing three fieldsites was strongly linked to the desire not to be locked into binary debates and equally that three fieldsites enabled

the variety of constructions about what Camphill is and how it is lived to be more fully teased out. Further, understanding the complex and multifaceted nature of Camphill identity work is made starkly evident through my ethical considerations. Ethics highlights what types of things I could document and equally what I couldn't. This shows that my documentation of Camphill life is subject to particular hierarchies of control over what is considered ethically safe and ethically dubious conduct, learning these rules is important to become seen as a 'good' and trustworthy researcher. The reading of Camphill that I have presented here shows that complexity and differing viewpoints are evident. However differing viewpoints aside, the story of Camphill that I will tell over the coming pages is one of ongoing identity work that has at its heart the task of becoming social.

In the following chapters I explore my particular theoretical concepts and methodological choices. This brings the key focus of this thesis to light which is the different ways that identity is constructed within Camphill settings. The use of the material environment is one, the learning of social skills another and the deviant other another element of Camphill identity work. Blair Drummond in particular positions and is positioned as deviant. However both Ochil Tower and Corbenic engage in identity questions and issues in particular ways. Such labelling practices reveal much about what is seen as absent from those places, but also what is assumed to be needed (Gordon, 2008). It is through deviance that norms are established (Durkheim, 1952; Becker, 1963; Goffman, 1963), and whilst the founders shaped the ideological and structural basis of Camphill, the mundane everyday, deviant other and repetitive practice are the new shapers of identity formation and praxis within Camphill today.



Chapter Two

Writing Camphill



Introduction

This chapter provides a critical description and analysis of my research methods and practice. It begins by discussing ethnography as a methodology more broadly, before narrowing down to the more specific mechanics of participant observation. It explores an issue that is inextricably bound up in how I research Camphill, which is how I am seen and equally how I see and write about myself and others. I am researching the familiar, both as a subject and also as ‘home’: Camphill family and friends. I explore the struggle of researching something so close to home from a position of familiarity but also from a gendered position through an analysis of my fieldnotes. The recording and writing of social events, people and places is never without problems and is of course subject to particular representational practices on my part. The use of fieldnotes, the critical deconstruction of them and the various voices that are presented, omitted and silenced in them are also explored.

Throughout my fieldwork I took innumerable photos as well as short films, where much of what is seen to constitute a Camphill identity is clearly evidenced in the land, and the way in which houses within Camphill are built, decorated, and socially organised. Seeing this in the form of pictures reveals something more about Camphill identity than can be gained from lengthy fieldnotes. The above photograph encapsulates the fuzzy and blurred nature of my fieldwork. It is one of the few that was taken with me actually in it, and although I hate being photographed, I

recognised that taking photos of everyone else and then refusing to allow the person who wanted to take one of me would be churlish, and ethically problematic at best. Aside from that, the photo captures much of how I did my fieldwork, by being as active and engaged in whatever social process was happening (in this case rag rug weaving) where my presence became a simple part of the everyday life of the various Camphill places I was researching. However my non-presence is disrupted through the taking of the photograph: I am no longer ‘Miriam the person engaged in craft activities’, but the ‘researcher’ who needs to be photographed. A continuous ebb and flow existed between the various roles ascribed to me and my own challenges in dealing with this. The process of doing this research was a long and in many ways a painful one, and continues with the writing of this thesis. Throughout the chapter I reflect on the changing nature of my research design and practice, particularly the ways that I construct knowledge but am also constructed into certain ways of being. This is not just regarding my familiarity with Camphill but also how knowledge is produced in academia and the forms it is supposed to take (Li & Seale, 2008), and the many different paths I have taken to acquire the requisite sociological identity. I also explore how such positionings construct ways of how to be in the social world (Oriola & Haggerty, 2012).

Aims and Theoretical Underpinnings

This research was designed after some pilot research I undertook during my MSc by Research, carried out at Ochil Tower School. At that point I was particularly interested in exploring notions of community and how community is lived. This was because many of the Camphill places have community attached not only to the name of the place, such as Camphill Community Corbenic, but also state that they live ‘in community’ (Fieldnotes, 12 August 2008). Community as both a concept and place therefore needed to be unpacked. Interestingly the results of this research led me to discard the term community, which is notoriously slippery and difficult to define (Neal & Walters, 2008; Alleyne, 2002: 608; Amit & Rapport, 2002: 13) and instead focus on how my informants explained community to me. Community therefore was broken into three key elements: living and working together, shared aims and ideals and ‘more to it than that.’ (Snellgrove, 2008: 23-27). These three things run

throughout this thesis in a variety of ways. In Chapter Three I discuss how living and working together is held up as a key Camphill ideal alongside shared aims and ideals (left suitably vague for a variety of reasons). In Chapter Five ‘more to it than that’ is explored through the daily work of educating and training people to become social. This, I argue, is what ties all Camphill places together more strongly and concretely than nebulous definitions of community or indeed identity (but more on that later). I also discarded community as it was rarely raised by informants as an explanatory device regarding Camphill. Within my Master’s work the afore-mentioned examples were offered when I asked my informants to explain what community meant to them. Much like debates around the more esoteric aspects of Camphill literature and past practice, (see Chapters Three and Five), community was not much used within my fieldsites and so I decided to focus much more on how the people construct and define their Camphill identity: what they think Camphill is and the many different ways that is explained and lived.

My PhD work has looked at the subtle ways that a Camphill identity is built, shaped and enacted, most directly observable in what people say, do and how they shape the spaces around them. How and by whom is Camphill constructed? Relatedly how and in what ways is everyday life performed and maintained? These questions act as my primary focus and from these a whole host of other interpretive questions arise. How are discourses concerning Camphill identity presented, internalised and re-performed within my fieldwork sites (Foucault, 1969; Goffman, 1959, 1965, 1961)? Who employs these discourses and how? Linking to that, how is the space and place (Bender, 1998) arranged and what daily practices are employed to further communal aims and educational environments (Caranfa, 2004)?

These questions concerning a Camphill identity and how Camphillers¹⁸ construct such an identity within their everyday lives has continued to resonate and raise many questions both at my fieldwork sites and subsequently when analysing my data. Though many of these questions, which I first raised in my Master’s dissertation,

¹⁸ I use this term to refer to all people who live and work in Camphill. Therefore someone can be a Camphiller when living or working (or both) within their particular Camphill and not be a Camphiller when they leave. I am not a Camphiller as I do not work or reside in a Camphill.

were relevant, what I had not anticipated was quite how important perceptions of exclusion and deviance within the Camphill Movement would be understood and played out in one of my fieldwork sites in particular. This is the transformative power of fieldwork, in that the unexpected can suddenly reveal a key issue that in more a structured context might perhaps not come to light. As a result, I began to rethink some key ideas about how not only a Camphill identity is constructed, but also how and in what ways a Camphill identity can be seen as lacking, by whom and why. Why are performances of adherence to certain cultural codes not enough to silence the critics of the deviant Camphill? What is this ‘something other’ that people refer to when discussing what Camphill is (and isn’t)? I began to realise that answering such questions was only possible by placing my informants and their respective Camphills within their socially situated and socially mediated contexts. This can best be described as an interest in the details of the everyday as a site of identity construction, formation, challenge and continuous remaking. Furthermore, such questions demonstrate an interest in understanding how people learn and become socially successful actors within their chosen context. At basis Camphill places are a perfect microcosm of society and as such are subject to the same rules, norms and hierarchies that people have been subject to since social scientists have attempted to explain and document the social world. Camphill settings I would argue follow these normative socialisation processes but in particular ways and calling on particular notions of the self and other.

In addressing these issues I have been particularly guided by the theoretical ‘toolkit’ concept which Clifford (2003) suggests. Such an approach, Clifford argues, is necessarily ad hoc and not systematic but instead recognises that “investigations can only be carried out step by step on the basis of reflection ... on given situations” (Clifford, 2003: 123). Using the tool-kit approach, I try to engage proactively in Wolf’s (1992) ideas of multi-vocal ethnography. Whether I achieve this is something I reflect on in the conclusion. Further I seek to be theoretically diverse, by which I mean that though I use Goffman’s (1961, 1959) ideas about performance and total institutions as building blocks to analyse my data, as well as Foucault’s (1975) discussion of discipline and surveillance from the perspective of how both I and my

informants regulated our bodily behaviour and discursive practices to the point where they became naturalised habit, I also use a variety of other sources and academic writers and ethnographers whose particular concepts or ideas are helpful and useful in explaining Camphill social life. For example, Becker's (1963) notion of deviance as the product of labelling was particularly helpful in seeing how Camphill places were positioned and position themselves as deviant from an unspecified norm. To understand deviance and its functional role in the development of cohesive social groups, Durkheim must also be included (Durkheim, 1952, 1982). Both Becker and Durkheim are my primary sources for exploring and explaining the role of deviance and its social function, as the following data chapters make clear. Understanding the role of the other is another theme that runs through this thesis. The other as written about in ethnographies (which I discuss below), the disabled other, the physically different other, the anomalous researcher other, the Camphill other and so on. The other plays a significant role in the development of the social identity of person and place.

Ideas about identity also run through this thesis. Identity like community is a slippery and tricky word to pin down precisely and is used and understood in a variety of conceptual and theoretical ways (Wetherell, 2009; Jenkins, 2008; Cerulo, 1997; Gorringer, 2005; MacInnes, 2006; Bonsu & DeBerry-Spence, 2008). Within this thesis I use it in the following ways: identity as performance, identity as repetitive practice and identity as a gateway to exploring the social self. Identity in the performative sense borrows strongly from Goffman and his ideas of how an actor interprets what is required for them to successfully navigate a given social situation. Performance then is linked to impression management and constant negotiation for strategic purposes (Goffman, 1959, 1961, 1963, 1965). Performance here is linked not only to my research sites but also to the performances required by me as the researcher to present a competent sociological identity (Li & Seale, 2008).

However this is only one layer of identity as presented within this thesis. Identity is also linked strongly to everyday life and the practices within them (Scott, 2009; Sztompka, 2008). The everyday is of profound importance to my research. This was

not only about experiencing the passing of the days, but also in witnessing the often overlooked significant minutiae of repeated and often trivial tasks wherein the daily identity of a place and group of people was worked on and experienced. Within Camphill settings I suggest that repetitive practice is one of the most enduring markers of Camphill identity. By this I mean the entire structure of the Camphill places is geared towards daily, weekly and annual repetitive rhythms and practices.

Finally there is identity as a gateway to the social self. Identity is often viewed as something intimate and personal which can be divided into other categories such as gender, race or social class (Bechhofer & McCrone, 2010). Within this thesis I use Jenkins' (2008: 27) ideas about the *processes* of identification, which focuses on what can be seen and less on the internal workings of the mind. Within Camphill contexts the self is taught and becomes socially aware of the norms, rules and regulations that govern everyday life within particular places. The self is socialised into being. Self identity is therefore linked to collective group practices and discussions around who we are and who we are not and who are we to become. The social self relies heavily on the repetitive practices of the Camphill places to come into being, much as the performative element of identity construction facilitates the everyday to be seen. I contend that these three types of identity (performative, repetitive practice and socialised self) shape how everyday life is lived, experienced and constructed within Camphill settings.

From this, it can be seen that my epistemological standpoint is broadly interpretive. I am deeply interested in the many ways that people live and order their lives, but also aware that such an interest and the understanding I gain from observing, talking and participating in people's lives remains only a partial representation of these. I am consequently wary of others (and occasionally myself) when macro level definitive narratives are presented as absolute Truth. The polar opposite of such a worldview is being immersed in endless subjectivity (Strathern, 2006; Hoskins, 1998, Ellis, 2004). Stanley and Wise (1993:166) suggest that the "best alternative is that researchers should present analytic accounts of how and why we think we know what we do

about research situations and the people in them”. Over the coming pages, this is what I aim to do.

Exploring Ethnography

Ethnography is a tricky term. Gone are the days when to speak of ethnography was also to automatically imply participant observation. Though ethnography is often still presented as umbilically linked to this method (Dewalt & Dewalt 2002; Hume & Mulcock, 2004), ethnography as a practice has expanded exponentially. Whilst ethnography has been traditionally associated with cultural and social anthropology, many more ideas and approaches to what constitutes ethnography have developed (Crang & Cook, 2007). As Atkinson et al (2007) suggest, ethnography can cover visual methods like films and photos, documentary sources, interviews, surveys, as well as a variety of narrative and auto-ethnographic approaches. Ethnography can, then, cover a wide range of techniques for exploring and documenting social life. It is the umbrella held over a diverse and often uneasy household of methods and outlooks. As I was engaged in an ethnographic study of familiar people, places and practices I had to grapple continuously with questions of how to write and do ethnography. A brief review of debates surrounding ethnographic research is in order, therefore, before moving onto the specifics of my research.

The publication of Clifford and Marcus’s (1986) edited *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography* challenged existing thought and practice by arguing that the way ethnographers both write and position themselves in the field is powerfully asymmetric. Furthermore it suggested that past and present ethnographic attempts to uncover and disseminate the structural, linguistic and symbolic similarities and differences prevalent throughout cultural encounters often remain unaware of their own “invention not representation of culture” (Clifford, 1986:2). The task of representing the ‘other’ is thus intimately connected to the writing mechanism which scholars use to document social life. How can ‘true’ and ‘accurate’ written representation be possible when knowledge is inherently situated, contested and multivocal? *Writing Culture* exposed the need for scholars to become aware of their own epistemological assumptions regarding their representations of the ‘other’ in

their ethnographies (James, et al 1997:3). This demanded that researchers be more self-critical and reflexive about epistemology and methodology (Clifford & Marcus, 1986; James et al, 1997), amongst other things.

For many ethnographers, this form of ‘epistemological angst’ and ‘crisis of representation’ was seen as monumentally self-indulgent (Sahlins, 1993), the “ultimate argument for armchair anthropology and a recipe for navel gazing” (Jarvie, 1988:428 in James et al 1997:1). This backlash and the subsequent literature it produced convinced the editors of *After Writing Culture* (1997) that the subject matter, method, and medium of the ethnographic encounter had become ‘crystallised uncertainties’ within theorising and practice (James et al, 1997:2). Representation, with its attendant meanings of “interpretation, communication, visualisation, translation and advocacy ... [fundamentally questioned] whose knowledge, what sort of knowledge and what constitutes the social” (James et al, 1997:2/3). An important result was the recognition that when an ethnographer speaks of representing a ‘culture’ or ‘people,’ not only is the ‘other’ selectively mediating and self-representing, but also the ‘ethnographer’ must equally situate themselves as “similarly contextual, mediated and in the end partial” (James et al, 1997:5) as would-be producers of cultural ‘truth’.

Representation in such an approach becomes a ‘negotiated character’ with competing views, claims and dissenting voices; and relatedly ethnography is re-understood as an elastic concept that can manifest itself in the traditional approach, but can also include visual images and artefacts, and be a form of liaison between informant and researcher as mutual constructors of meaning and interpretation of the everyday world (James et al 1997; Kondo 1995; MacClancy, 1997; Myers 1994; Turner, 1990). As a result, the researcher self and the informant other come to inhabit a relational environment, with the ethnographer attempting to overcome her personal biases through critical self-reflexivity (Okely, 1992:4). For Okely, the writing of self into ethnography is relevant “only in so far as it relates to the [research] enterprise” (Okely, 1992:1), which entails fieldwork theorising as inseparable from fieldwork experience. Hastrup extends this by arguing that the ethnographer is not merely a

writer of culture but also an author, with fieldwork situated between autobiography and anthropology and “connecting an important personal experience with a general field of knowledge” (Hastrup, 1992:117). For Hastrup, personal experience is not to be conflated with ethnographic ‘annotative soul-searching’ (Geertz, 1988:97; Cohen, 1992:230) or a single ‘representation of experience’ (Riessman, 1993:8). Rather it is a challenge to the single-minded narrowness of Master Narratives and it exposes the “multi-vocal ... essentially inexhaustive” (Hastrup, 1992:129) nature of ethnography and ethnographic representation.

In contrast to the views espoused by Hastrup (1992) and Okley (1992), others argue that the dilemmas of representation raised by Clifford and Marcus (1986) make the premise of an ‘authentically’ positivistic ethnography unrealistic and unobtainable (Rapport, 1997; Dwyer, 1982). As a result, the notion of ‘autoethnography’ has gained credence with many of the former subjects of Western ethnographers who speak and write about their own culture and experience, rather than being spoken and written about by others (Raheb, 2004; Shukrallah et al, 2002). This has extended the writing of self into ethnography into a growing genre of autobiographical ethnography in which researchers write about their own personal experiences as part of their ethnographic work (Rapport, 1997; Gorkin & Othman, 1996; Mansour, 2002; Ellis, 2004; Delamont, 2009; Murphy, 2008). Often these forms of writing are directly linked to advocacy of and solidarity with threatened, marginal and oppressed people and have an inherently political agenda (Atkinson & Delamont, 2006), but can also include first-person testimony of an event and culture which is seen to have epistemological privilege. As a result, some academics have argued that writing is only ever a partial account of the multiple and varied realities that position producers in their social context (Mahon, 2000), and consequently that “the reflexive representation of the ethnographer [as] simultaneously narrator and narrated in his or her textual representations” (Atkinson & Delamont, 2006: xli-xlii) removes the old hierarchy of power and knowledge between the researcher and researched.

This has led to an interest in what is termed narrative ethnography. However, narrative ethnography is as much subject to different and competing interpretations

from scholars across and within disciplines as are other forms of ethnographic representation and writing. Broadly speaking, an increasing number of authors suggest that narrative ethnography can be understood as a wide-ranging concept that covers all forms of spoken, written and visual performative social encounters in which social organisations, and individual and collective identities are constituted (Atkinson & Delamont, 2006; Stanley 1992, 2008; Lieblich et al, 1998; Josselson et al, 1993; Ferber, 2000; Ewick & Silbey, 1995; Elliott, 2005). In turn, narrative research has developed into a ubiquitous methodology and epistemological standpoint throughout the social sciences (Elliott, 2005; Ferber, 2000; Lieblich et al, 1998; Plummer, 2001; Maines, 2006; Josselson, 1993). Narrative, like ethnography, cannot be understood within a ‘single orthodoxy’ (Atkinson & Delamont, 2006: xx) but is rather viewed as an umbrella term including “life history, biography, autobiography, testimonial, memory, folk tale, urban legend or spoken performance” (Atkinson & Delamont, 2006: xii). From a narrative perspective, the social world does not come neatly packaged as a ‘narrative;’ it is only through human constructions of meaning and reality that narratives take shape and become situated spoken ‘truth’ (Ferber, 2000:342; Ewick & Silbey, 1995; Maines, 2006; Stanley, 2008). By extension, reality, life and truth, Widdershoven (1993) suggests, cannot exist independently of the meaning attached to interpretation and the stories told about it. At basis, life “does not merely anticipate stories, its meaning is essentially dependent on stories ... life and story are only meaningful through mutual interaction” (Widdershoven, 1993:4). In addition, the possibility of capturing time within a particular cultural encounter is only possible through a narrative encounter (Bruner, 2006:100; Maines, 2006:121), something crucially important for understanding and interpreting identities and everyday lives.

Using narrative ethnographically involves combining methodological and epistemological standpoints, importantly regarding the ways that researchers should go about collecting, analysing and ultimately presenting their data. Issues of representation and authenticity, alongside concerns about ‘giving voice’ to the marginalised within ethnographic enquiry, have gained increasing credence amongst social researchers and are more intimately experienced and embodied within specific

fieldwork observance and locations (Abu-Lughod, 1993; Kondo, 1995). For Elliott (2005), narrative research has an interest in ‘empowering’ informants and enabling *them* to determine the most important themes in the area of research, whilst simultaneously acknowledging that these experiences are temporally located and change over time. Simultaneously scholarly attention to these ‘sites of resistance’ tries to avoid perpetuating images of politically marginalised people as passive victims and instead presents them as active agents (Scott, 1986; Guttman 1993; Mitchell, 1990). By situating their analyses ethnographically, these researchers mediate between “extremes of romantic resistance and devastating domination” (Myers, 1994:681; Abu-Lughod, 1990) and reveal the complex negotiations that occur within these sites of production.

Lieblich et al (1998), Rosenthal (1993) and Ferber (2000) investigate narrative itself as their research object. Their concern is with how narrative is used both linguistically and semantically, and furthermore how language “is a constitutive force, creating a particular view of reality,” assuming a distance between the researcher and the researched that enables the differing views of reality invoked to be scrutinised (Richardson, 1991:174). In this way narrative itself is seen as potentially complicit in “constructing and sustaining the very patterns of silencing and oppression that some narrative scholars seek to reveal through the use of narrative method” (Ferber, 2000:344). From this perspective, the very basis of meaning is open with no guarantee of a political liberatory agenda, thus potentially allowing hegemonic social control in “instructing about what is expected and warning about the consequences of nonconformity” (Ewick & Silbey, 1995:217).

However, Atkinson & Delamont suggest that narratives have a “moral force, and may accomplish social status and professional authority” (Atkinson & Delamont, 2006: xxvi) whilst simultaneously producing conventions about who can tell, listen and respond to stories, how the narrative can be presented and the legitimacy of particular ways of writing it down. Thus the empowerment and advocacy of narratives may, firstly, impose advocacy where it is not wanted and, secondly, undermine the dominance of respected authority figures. For Jean-Klein (2002,

2001), activist narrative ethnographers must contend with the possibility that their forms and ways of documenting the lives of oppressed groups and their cultural struggles may be viewed by the group itself as another form of exogamous patronising intervention. Also the ethnographic practice of documenting political ‘resistance’ may be seen and used by research informants to ‘tell the world’ of their struggle, placing responsibility for its reception outwith the situated context onto the shoulders of the researcher, whether the ethnographer seeks this position or not (Jean-Klein, 2002: 55-56). Ethnographic representation, then, comes with its attendant political expectations and repercussions that the researcher must negotiate both within and outwith the fieldwork situation (Okely, 1997).

Aware of the representational and hierarchical pitfalls facing the narrative ethnographer, Rapport (1997) presents thirty-one different voices from the Israeli town of Mitzpe Ramon at a point when people were attempting to make this new town home, thereby rejecting the single authoritative voice of the ethnographer and enabling the reader to interpret the randomly placed ‘multivocality’ of the text in a multitude of ways. By presenting his narrative ethnography in this way, Rapport wanted to demonstrate the “fundamental perversity and unpredictability of human conduct” (Manning, 1995:250 in James et al 1997:9) and insist that no “theory or episteme or narrative that the social commentator might import would cover all the ‘facts’ that are alive and being exchanged in a social milieu” (Rapport, 1997:183). However, for some readers Rapport’s position could still be seen as a continuum of the ‘legacy of positivism’ (Okley, 1992) within the social sciences, wherein multivocality and the ‘monograph of dialogue’ (Dwyer, 1982) is treated as the more *accurate* representation of the experiences on the ground. This is a position, according to Hastrup, that ‘completely misses the point,’ because sequentially presented dialogues do not supply the ‘interlocution’ between the researcher and present and absent ‘objectified persons’ (Hastrup, 1992:126).

Reflecting the understanding of narrative ethnography as a site of struggle, Cohen suggests that by taking representational relativism to such a degree, we call into question the “scholarly integrity of the entire ethnographic record ... [and demand]

that ethnographic and interpretative documents [cannot] stand independently of their authors' ... convictions" (Cohen, 1992:223). Thus the site of ethnographic discourse and practice retains the potential for conflict and contention, particularly where narrative and ethnography are perceived as interwoven concepts (Rapport, 1992; Dwyer, 1982) which shift necessarily according to the particular scholar's viewpoint.

The ethnographic studies discussed thus far struggle and engage with the problems of representation and use of narrative in a variety of often contested ways. Questions about *how* to represent without suppressing or falsely constructing informants' voices and culture remain of central concern to many researchers and theorists (Abu-Lughod, 1993; Said, 2004). Does this then render the centrality of participant observation obsolete and disprove Josephides' comment that, "only the field encounter, creative, transformative, and authoritative, can offer legitimacy to ethnographic representation" (Josephides, 1997:32), if representing the 'other' is no longer necessary?

For Okely, such a position automatically assumes that the fieldwork experience is somehow separable from theory, where "the enterprise of inquiry is discontinuous from its results" (Okely, 1992:3). Representation and meaning may be understood as arising from fluid, dynamic and contextually-situated shifting processes, but it is these lived experiences and embodied knowledges that ethnographers "have not fully theorised" (Okely, 1992:3; Hastrup, 1992; Cohen, 1992). Therefore the informant and ethnographer engage in a dialectical process of communicative engagement in the field, with the subsequent production by the ethnographer of a document/artefact that purports to explain/theorise instances of that particular culture, with this document/artefact then re-interpreted and re-evaluated by subsequent readers who are in "dialogue with the text, resulting in a fusion of horizons" (Widdershoven, 1993:2; Gadamer, 2004; Elliott, 2005). These 'fused' realities and interpretations then potentially feed back into the culture under analysis, thus creating a mutually-affecting cyclical process (of informant/culture – ethnographer theorising – production of artefact/text – engagement of reader – alternative meanings impacting

informants' culture), with the multitude of representational realities becoming an encyclopaedia of meaning.

By viewing fieldwork and its implications within this wider spectrum of perpetually influencing multivocal representation, the ethnographer can more freely engage in analysis of texts (visual, oral, material, written) produced by other social actors without necessarily having been at the direct site of production. As a result, ethnographic practice moves away from the dichotomy of superiority between fieldwork practitioners and textual ethnographers to a plurality of experience, representation and theorising. The fusion of competing realities between written texts (fieldnotes) and being in the field are issues that I engage with throughout this thesis. Such debates about ethnographic representation and the ethnographic self reveal the challenges present in conducting good fieldwork. As Coffey (1999: 158) suggests,

We do not come to a setting without an identity, constructed and shaped by complex social processes. We bring to a setting disciplinary knowledge and theoretical frameworks. We also bring a self which is, among other things, gendered, sexual, occupational, generational – located in time and space. This does not imply an uncritical celebration of the self. It does imply a self-conscious and self-critical approach to fieldwork.

As a result this thesis seeks to explore not only the various ways the self (identity and other) is understood and located within Camphill contexts, but equally the ways that I, as the researcher am located and constructed. Being aware of the many different and contrasting viewpoints regarding ethnographic writing and representation is therefore crucial to undertaking such a task. Method in this sense is not just what is done, but also the ways that knowledge about social life is situated, presented and lived. Ethnographies as I have shown can include a plethora of perspectives and different writing and presentation techniques. Within this ethnography I have chosen to use a variety of methods for my data collection which include participant observation, observation, informal conversational interviews and the collection of documents such as photographs, leaflets, reports as well as the usual journals, books

and web-sites. I then use these sources to construct a particular view of Camphill that says something meaningful about the various ways that the self is made manifest through wider social processes. I explore my researcher self in greater detail over the coming pages, particularly in relation to participant observation and the challenges of researching the familiar.

Participant Observation

I have chosen participant observation in its broadest sense as my primary method because it ‘entails the extended involvement in the social life of those he or she studies’ (Bryman, 2004:291) and provides the most data-rich method for enabling exploration of the minutiae of everyday Camphill life (Denzin, 1997). Participant observation involves spending time in the social environment of people and observing their behaviour in a more natural manner, away from the socially manufactured arenas of the structured interview or social survey. Participant observation is also an excellent means for “developing intersubjective understandings between researcher and researched” (Crang & Cook, 2007:37) and in exposing the increasingly blurred nature of the boundaries between academic researchers and informants. Participant observation is a rather schizophrenic method. On the one hand, the researcher is to be fully involved with the people and the lives they are living: but on the other hand, she must remain coolly and dispassionately detached so as to better observe what is going on. The seesawing from detached observer to involved participator can be quite extreme and make the researcher undertaking this feel alarmed or panic stricken. Where does the observer begin and the participator end? When should one be in the role of social scientist, and when is one simply a person involved in the mundane activity of washing up or making bread? Fox (2004) describes participant observation as rather like the child’s game where you pat your head and rub your tummy at the same time.

Despite the difficulties and challenges inherent in participant observation, it remains a potentially rewarding methodology for social research: “By drawing attention to the particular skills it demands of us and the personal tests that it subjects us to, we are able to advertise its intricacies and its rigor” (Hume & Mulcock, 2004: xvii).

Participant observation not only reveals the minutiae of everyday life, but this is mainly done by researchers using their 'social selves' as their primary research tool (Powdermaker, 1967; Stacey, 1988; Krieger, 1985; Hume & Mulcock, 2004). Practically this means that you are both interviewer and interviewee, silent observer, active participator, knowing when to be part of social life and when to be still (Jean-Klein & Riles, 2005). The boundaries between private and fieldwork selves is an ongoing process and can be confrontational. An internal conflict between personal values and maintaining a relativist position as a researcher tends to characterise the experience of participant observation. The extent and intensity of such personal conflict varies according to the researcher's own strengths and limitations, the topic under investigation and the research site. Hume & Mulcock suggest that awareness of such internal conflicts can give rise to 'unexpected insights' into the social world being studied and is the basis of the 'epistemology of ethnographic knowledge' (Hume and Mulcock, 2004: xviii).

One of the key requirements of participant observation is the ability to build relationships with those being studied, often referred to as developing 'rapport.' In order to gather information about the beliefs, practices and values of others, the skill to relate to people on a one-to-one basis is essential. This demands a high level of interpersonal skill from the researcher (Okely, 1992; Turner, 2000). Participant observation can thus be described as an intensely humanistic methodology centred around the messy, complicated and emotionally demanding interaction between people, of which the researcher is part (Hume & Mulcock, 2004: xxiv). As a result, fear, self-doubt and feelings of failure can haunt the researcher throughout the research process. Robinson (2004) argues that feelings of exhaustion, shame and voyeurism during fieldwork often equals very good fieldwork. The personal compromises that can be demanded of researchers in the field, alongside the desire to 'fit in' and combined with external ethical criteria, make participant observation hard work. Feeling morally uncomfortable therefore can often reveal much about how other people position themselves socially, whilst also revealing the normative assumptions of the researcher (Kelly, 2004). Furthermore, feeling at home in the world is predicated on certain understandings of people, place and space and their

slippery interconnections (Birkhead, 2004; Jackson, 1995). Recognising that everyday life is full of awkward moments, misunderstandings, pain, boredom and laughter, participant observation and its practitioners are concerned to reveal this. Over the coming pages I demonstrate the particular challenges and issues that confronted me whilst doing participant observation. Like many others, I have found that the textbook definitions of fieldwork methods and how they should be conducted are very different from the reality of fieldwork as I lived it. My experience is that the intrinsic disjunctures and conflicts in social life are mirrored in fieldwork. This was particularly relevant as my research 'field' was often fuzzy and difficult to confine. Equally I was positioned in various ways by my informants and various gendered and familial responsibilities also impinged on the research agenda, as well as the challenges of writing and constructing fieldnotes.

Fieldwork and Fieldnotes

Within this thesis, I use my fieldnotes as both documents of social life observed, and also as partial and problematic representations which I critically analyse as the textual ethnographic element of my research methodology. I also use my diary, research notebooks, leaflets, reports, photographs and other materials that I have collected over the four plus years of data collection. I include these different approaches because my informants in Camphill did not live their lives solely or primarily through the medium of text. Their lives were visually experienced, materially and verbally constructed and elements were shaped by text. I think it is therefore important to collect and try to produce knowledge in as many of the same ways as we encounter it (Smith, 1999). However, I came to this realisation and desire only later on in my fieldwork. Though I struggled to explain the distinctiveness of Camphill buildings and the ways the houses were decorated, (Miller, 2008; Dant, 2008; Buchli, 2002), I did not immediately question why I still clung to the pen and paper that was proving ineffective and cumbersome when photo and film would provide more vivid depictions of such social spaces and moments. That said, I do not take the photographs and other documents solely at face value and as unproblematic representations (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007: 138), being aware that they capture only partial moments and are thus as subject to differing interpretations as the

fieldnote. However, I agree with Stanley & Wise (2006: 4) that they do provide some evidence around which the reader can judge the interpretations made by the researcher, holding the researcher accountable for the claims made in their writing. By presenting the data (photographs, fieldnotes, diary extracts), conflicts and gaps within or between the data will be apparent and must be defended, as demonstrated throughout this thesis. Where I have analysed a photograph of an event, or discussed the photo in terms of its links to wider debates about Camphill's material identity, I have included a copy for the reader to see (see Chapter Four in particular). In this way I am demonstrating the ongoing development of ethnographies and the challenges prevalent in ethnographic writing and representation.

When I first started fieldwork in 2008 as part of my Master's research, I carried a notebook with me and was continually jotting things down seconds after they occurred, feeling this was the 'accurate' way to do participant observation (Emerson et al, 2001; Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007). I tried initially to distinguish between 'data', 'fieldnote records' and 'diaries' (Sanjek, 1990), however this distinction demanded that certain observations were seen as more objective and concerned with valid knowledge claims. Why should my diary be completely separate from 'data' for instance? Wasn't social life about complexities and contradictions and shouldn't my fieldwork reflect that? In the end separating the diaries and fieldnote writing was decided by the negative reactions I got from my informants when they would see my notebook in my hand. People would begin to freely speak and then when they saw me scribbling down their comments they became more reserved and reticent. It introduced an element of awkwardness to the encounters and in some cases killed the conversation almost before it began, as with one informant who said 'are you going to rush over to that corner and write down everything I've just said?' When I responded with a hesitant yes, he walked off (Fieldnotes, 12th May). As a result I adopted Fielding's (2003) suggestion of a variety of note-taking styles, from the more verbatim transcriptions to internal memory notes written up either at home or in my car. This meant that there was often a time-lag between what and when I wrote, and how long for. I was very much aware that my fieldnotes entries were often minimal and contained

Little or no overall coherence or consistence; [the fieldnote] typically contains bits and pieces of incidents, beginnings and ends of narratives, accounts of chance meetings and rare occurrences and details of wide and unconnected matters (Emerson et al, 2007: 353).

This suggests that the fieldnote itself, much like fieldwork is subject to the same fractures and disjunctures as the social life they purport to selectively represent. In my case the writing of fieldnotes was a lengthy process that usually occurred at the end of the day of fieldwork. Once I was back home, I would set my laptop up on the kitchen table and proceed to construct the day I had just experienced, writing times of arrival and departure at the fieldsite, bits and pieces of conversations and the format of events and daily practices and rituals. As I was writing on a computer, this also meant I could insert a suddenly remembered fragment of conversation or an event that I had omitted in the chronology of the day at a later point. I was aided in my writing by the very structured nature of life at all of my three sites. There were regular tea breaks and meal times throughout the day. This meant that I could place myself at 11:15, having tea-break etc. It also helped that I quickly grasped the order and format of the days and so my passive participation in the fieldsite, quickly changed to more active involvement and more targeted conversations about Camphill life and the various challenges and issues my informants would raise. In general though I favoured an approach that aimed at making my presence as normal and unremarked on as possible and tried to integrate myself into the everyday life of the places, making bread, singing songs etc. The purpose of spending considerable time and effort in seemingly mundane activities that do not directly address the research, or at least do not appear to at the time, were an invaluable way for me to build rapport especially with the non-verbal pupils and residents, for as Delamont (2009: 60) points out, “access is a *process* not an event, and must always be treated as a precarious accomplishment and not a stable state.”

All of this made me aware that fieldwork and fieldnote writing are challenging activities and as such construct multiple lived and written social realities. My

fieldnotes were often what Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007: 163-4) call ‘analytic notes.’ This was where I documented potential future areas of analysis into the writing of the fieldnote. For me, the fieldnotes themselves are the beginnings of analysis in their own right, as I have already edited, in my own mind, what to write and what to omit, because “the fact that we choose to write down a particular piece of information implicates it in the beginning of analysis. Our fieldnotes are the first ordering of ‘what we know’” (Wolf, 1992: 91).

However ‘what I know’ is subject as much to how I write about the situation as well as how I organise the vast amounts of data I collected. When I first started my fieldnote writing I initially thought I would have one file called ‘Blair Drummond fieldnotes’, another ‘Corbenic fieldnotes’ and another ‘Ochil Tower fieldnotes,’ but after my first week when I had written 17,000 words I realised that this was silly. I would never be able to navigate such a large file. So each week I created a new file and labelled them after the house where I was staying for meals. So for example I wrote ‘Week Six – Tourmaline’ as the file name. This also helped position and orient myself in connection to my data (Sanjek, 1990, 1996; Wellin & Fine, 2001; Van Maanen, 1988, 2010). On average I wrote about 13,000 words a week while at Blair Drummond. By the time I was in my sixth week, however, my word count became considerably less as I had in a way reached ‘theoretical saturation’ and was often simply recording similar things over and over again, such as meals, Assemblies and tea-breaks. I therefore moved onto more ‘targeted/specific notes’ (Cragg & Cook, 2007: 56; Van Maanen, 2010). But this shift of fieldnote compiling from the general to the specific was not as straightforward as this implies. Rather I realised that I often missed ‘obvious’ things, jumped to complex decisions too early, with the resulting self-conscious vacillation between ‘comprehensive and targeted’ note-taking (Cragg and Cook, 2007:56), as the extract below demonstrates:

Arrive 9:28am. Get another farewell from Naomi. Walk to Farm. Feed ducks and chickens. Tom collects eggs. Clean out coops. Monty leaves for doctor’s appointment with son. Clean out BBQ with Katja et al, this is next to where the craft workshop is doing wet felting. Observe. Stop for tea break. Wash up

dishes and BBQ racks with kettle of boiled hot water and no washing up gloves. Hands pickled afterwards.

Check if I can come to Lindisfarne for lunch. Discuss ‘grain of the day’ with Lena. Horace thinks that I will hate the lunch as it is composed of leftovers.

1pm Lunch. Horace’s potato and lentil dish which isn’t half bad. Very quiet. Tom says grace. Skye snuffs the candle. Help clear up. No pre wash. Leave and toddle up the stairs to Mullach. I am plied with food for a second lunch of roast chicken. Eat a small helping. Get Steiner lecture from Rose and read it at the lunch table. Juliana asks me to correct her English on a report.

Leave. Meet Horace on the stairs and tell him his lunch wasn’t that bad. He disbelieves me. Sit in car and eat a Wispa. Chat to Simon. Walk around the Estate.

3pm Go to Farm. Given job of screwing in the connections for the electric pig fence. Turned into a glorious sunny day. Do this till tea break of biscuits. Collect eggs. Give eggs to visitors of Gareth’s. Finish trimming and screwing in connectors. Monty brings the pigs to put in their new enclosure. Chat to Monty post workshop end. Wander up to Keeper’s Cottage and Lochran. Chat to Ruth petting the horses. Walk with her to Keeper’s Cottage.

6:15 Study Group. Read the Steiner lecture, paragraph by paragraph. Stop to discuss it. Mentions Dalits as a spiritual choice. William mentions ‘economic oppression.’ Discussion about situated subjectivity (William and I) ‘there is no absolute truth’ – and overarching objectivity ‘truth’ (Ruth, John). John points out that the argument saying there are multiple truths is in and of itself a truth claim. My methods of fieldnote writing are discussed. Leave and have further chats with John before meeting Sara and Sofia who didn’t come. Chat briefly about ‘truth’ and they are relieved that they didn’t have to engage in something so heavy at the end of their work day.

Leave 8:15. (Fieldnotes, 25th June)

As can be seen, the early part of the day is documented in short sentences which mean more to me as the person who has lived the experience than to the reader, who a) does not know who all these people are, and b) can not really follow the order of

events with such abrupt logical steps. I also mention certain things like ‘grain of the day’ without covering just what exactly the conversation with Lena was about. However, once I reach the Study Group, slightly more detail is given as regards the discussion of the particular Steiner lecture the people were analysing. Though the fieldnote is an example of extreme descriptive brevity, what it does for me its reader is act as a sort of mnemonic gateway to thinking about the past (Young, 1993; Stier & Landres, 2006). I ‘see’ the field where I was erecting a pig fence, smell the wet wool from the felting undertaken by the Craft workshop. Standing under the pine trees with John, last year’s pine-cones about our feet, I remember details as he and I debated between one truth and many truths. All of my fieldnotes, whether detailed to the point of banality or very brief, can transport me back to those particular days in the field with remembrance adding another layer to the written representation of people and place. Such re-constructions of the past are not without problem, but they are however inextricably tied up with the research process. My fieldnotes were written *after* the event, my memories are subject to the vagaries of time and the moment of when and how I choose to recollect them, and the photos I took are also partial representations (Rose, 2001, 2011; Hall, 1997; Crang & Cook, 2007; Banks, 2001). Each of these three things reveals something of the field, but their significance and meaning beyond such a moment is left to me the writer to construct, as “we cannot separate fieldwork, and our consequent texts, from the memories that shape them” (Coffey, 1999: 128) and the particular ways that they provide meaning to our experiences.

Researching the Familiar

Strictly speaking I can be labelled as ‘researching the familiar’, given that my topic of study is Camphill and not only did I grow up in a Camphill but also undertook fieldwork at a Camphill school where my parents and friends, and people who have known me for many years, live and work. The issues and problems of researching the familiar or ‘ethnography at home’ (Jackson, 1987; Hayano, 2001; Ellis, 2001; Reed-Danahay, 1997; Oriola & Haggerty, 2012) are present throughout my research and as Coffey (1999: 46) found, awareness of this shapes and defines my epistemological stance, researcher position and ethnographic self. Such deconstruction of “why [I]

understand what [I] understand within the contingent, intersubjective, time/spaces of [my] field work” (Crick, 1992 in Crang & Cook, 2007:45) is part of the participant observation approach and not necessarily different simply because I am ‘known’ to some degree by my informants. Teaiwa (2004: 216) uses the idea of ‘homework’ as a critique of the centrality of fieldwork, and recognition of the process of ‘learning and unlearning’ that takes place throughout the research encounter, and it is a particularly useful idea for me. It is certainly true that the blurring between academic researcher and accepted insider occurred throughout all three of my research sites in particular ways, although this was often done as a way of positioning me as belonging or not belonging within Camphill.

My birth, my parents’ continued work within a Camphill school, and now my own research on Camphill, meant that I was often positioned as a sort of ‘expert’. Younger volunteer co-workers would often ask me what my childhood had been like in Camphill and if the sort of practices and events that they experienced in their Camphill were similar to ones that I had experienced as a child. Such conversations about my history occurred primarily during the everyday activities of washing up dishes, baking bread, or other such practical activities. I never initiated these conversations and as time wore on and my ‘life story’ was passed around, I got asked about my Camphill background much less. It was only when I returned to analysing my fieldnotes that I noticed what a dominant theme my background had been for many of my informants. I realised that my background was discussed and used in particular ways by particular people. For example, my account that Camphill life, as I remembered it, was not always golden and rosy was often greeted with dismay. A glowing account of halcyon days where everyone was happy and life was harmonious would have been preferred. It meant that because I had a history, and that history was unquestioned and legitimate, then the very things that were disliked were actually part of the baggage of living and working together in a Camphill (Fieldnotes, 14th March). So while what I said was often accorded authority and legitimacy, however much I often tried to disable such notions, such moments also provided clear insight into how notions of an ‘authentic’ Camphill were constructed and how my history was appropriated to aid such a construction.

The challenges of familiarity when I was undertaking research at Ochil Tower School where my parents worked were somewhat different. Here my attempts to be ‘Miriam the researcher’ were often overridden and I would be viewed and placed in many different roles. For example, on attending the end of week Friday service, I always set out to be as unobtrusive as possible. However on one occasion, the minute I walked into the Hall, Liesl a teacher, asked me to help her in the preparation. Attempting to slip away after the Service, Maria asked if I wanted to socialise with her that evening and whilst Maria was talking to me Shirley commented in passing us that my ‘cheeky face’ in the Service reminded her of when I was a child flooding her bathroom (Fieldnotes, 27 May). So here I was: a remembered child, a friend, a helper and a researcher, juxtaposed and competing identities in one body and at one moment. How was I to maintain a sense of emotional and social detachment from my informants in order to overcome the ‘hazards of intimate familiarity’ (Hayano, 2001:81)? Such ambiguities about my Camphill-ness happened time and again throughout the research and the longer I remained in the field, the more I began to realise that the ‘hazards of intimate familiarity’ were as much a bonus as a burden (Oriola & Haggerty, 2012: 546). As Kondo (1990) writes, the multiple subjectivities that researchers inhabit between their ‘home’ and ‘fieldwork’ sites can be viewed as a form of situated knowledge that overrides notions of objective truths and whole pictures. Instead I came to view the many ways I was positioned and came to position myself and my informants as a key part of gaining an understanding of how people in Camphill actively constructed notions of identity, belonging and exclusion. To practically do this, I adopted a ‘sponge like’ approach where I hung around and tried to absorb as much information as was possible. I rarely had to target people for information as I was a participating target for many people, and my presence was used to present and perform their understandings of what Camphill was, how they viewed it and further how they understood who I was in the field. In this way my ethnographic fieldwork and the texts that came out of it “are concerned with the studying of lives and experiences” (Coffey, 1999: 154) and the multiple ways the self is constructed.

The Continuous Field

My first lengthy fieldwork stint began at Camphill Blair Drummond at the end of January 2009. I had somewhat arbitrarily decided that I would be there for two months. This was done for a number of reasons. At my PhD progression board meeting, concern had been expressed about my familiarity with Camphill and it was suggested that instead of the lengthy immersion in the field traditionally part of participant observation fieldwork, I should undertake shorter periods of research with periodic returns to academia to gain the required ‘distance.’ This suggested process I adhered to, though I am still ambivalent about how helpful such moments of distance were to the research project as whole. Instead of the critical reflection of fieldwork and fieldnotes, I spent my time in the academy negotiating access to the next Camphill I wished to research at; and because this required filling out Disclosure Scotland forms, waiting for these to be processed, as well as meetings with the management to approve my study, this time away from the field was more practically rather than philosophically spent. In hindsight the decision to break up the fieldwork, though well meant, did not achieve its original intention. However, time to think and let revelations in the field slowly marinate was very useful and beneficial both to the writing of this thesis and in the constructing of academic arguments.

On my first return to academia, I asked my supervisors where the ‘field’ began and ended. This question was sparked because I continued to hear things about Blair Drummond from my parents, and also had other informal encounters with Blair Drummond staff and residents when shopping in Stirling or at the cinema. Such moments I felt at the time added to the data I had already collected and further demonstrated to me the unruly nature of fieldwork, which refused to be confined by my arbitrary time constraints. I and my informants continued to exist beyond the limits of fieldwork. They had become important to me and I was known to them. However, one supervisor suggested that I regard only the fieldwork gathered during my ‘officially’ sanctioned time at the sites as relevant. Whilst I saw the practical reasoning behind this (the real concern that my data collection would never end), I felt that this denied the recognition of the continuous nature of the fieldwork encounter. Initially I tried to develop a conceptual terminology that recognised the

different nature of the ‘in the field’ encounters to the ‘post field encounters.’ My rather naive aim was to avoid existential questions about where one ‘field’ experience began and ended. With that aim in mind I used the phrase ‘front line research’ to refer to the time when I was specifically placed at Blair Drummond, Corbenic or Ochil Tower and explicitly ‘engaged in research’. This term is not without problems, but I thought that it captured my immediate and sustained engagement within the specific sites in a way that chance encounters and conversations do not. However it became increasingly clear that such linguistic and experiential separation was and is problematic. For starters it implies that one experience and time period has greater currency and the other is lesser, more partial and therefore not contributing to ‘real’ knowledge. As I have already made clear, my familiarity with Camphill exposed me to people who ‘knew’ me; and whilst this may have been occasionally problematic in the field, the major bonus of my familiarity was crucial and often serendipitous meetings, conferences and internal memos that were passed to me by family, friends and research informants which I would otherwise not have been aware of. Such repeat encounters furnished me with over four years of data wherein it became clear that my own research interests in Camphill identity were and continue to be a widespread and ongoing issue raised in a variety of ways across UK Camphill places.¹⁹

All of this led me to the understanding that the ‘field’ could not be so easily demarcated between my initial idea of ‘front line research’ and ‘post field encounters,’ but was rather a ‘fuzzy field’ (Nadai & Maeder, 2005) as the following example demonstrates. Whilst at Blair Drummond I became acquainted with the music therapist, David, who came to Blair Drummond a couple of times a week and undertook music therapy with a select few of the residents. This took different forms, including playing the piano and the resident listening, to playing instruments and composition between David and the resident. Thus it was that at the end of February 2009 a new song was handed around Morning Assembly. It was entitled ‘The Snowdrop Song’ and had been composed by David and a resident called Paul. The

¹⁹ See ‘The Essentials of Camphill’ Conference April 2011 in Thornbury. The recent 2012 publication on ‘Discovering Camphill’ and other 2011 and 2012 meetings by the Camphill Research Group on defining and disseminating research on Camphill principles and practices.

majority of the people present could not read music so the song was played through three times on the piano with us singing haltingly along. The song was sung again a few Morning Assemblies later in the week. During my time there it was sung all in all about five times. Then March arrived with its multitude of daffodils and a new composition was sung at Morning Assembly. When I left I asked David if I could possibly have ‘The Snowdrop Song’; he gave me a folder full of the songs sung seasonally at Blair Drummond. I was delighted. At Blair Drummond my song repertoire had expanded to include more spring songs (of which the Snowdrop Song) was a part) but also a new Michaelmas song.

The year passed and I went to Corbenic for more fieldwork, learning yet more songs and singing old songs that I knew. I had my required fieldwork break over the summer months and prepared to go to Ochil Tower in the autumn of 2009. Simultaneously, I was part of a small choir at Ochil Tower and the woman, Martha, who runs it is a good friend. She too has spent much of her life within the Camphill ‘fold’ and was tasked with teaching the new co-workers the Michaelmas songs. She and I agreed that twenty-odd years of singing ‘Unconquered Hero of the Skies’ and ‘Let me of God a Fighter be’ induced certain song inertia. Did I know any new Michaelmas songs? I did: The Blair Drummond Michaelmas song. I should add that the Michaelmas song came from the ‘Waldorf Song Book,’ a book that Ochil Tower had many copies of, yet this song remained unknown. So it was that a new Michaelmas song was sung on 29 September 2009 in the Three King’s Hall at Ochil Tower School. It was sung again in 2010. The young co-workers like it. It has simple harmonies and is accompanied by energetic guitar playing from Martha. At home I sang the song to my children when they went to bed (at the seasonally appropriate time of course) as well as other songs that I photocopied from the Camphill Song book. The Snowdrop song was also sung. The following year Martha told me that she had been asked by my mother if she could teach their co-workers who attended the choir, a February song. So out came the Snowdrop Song.

I do not know if the co-workers went back and taught it to my parents, but what this example demonstrates is the continuous nature of fieldwork across its locations and

my presence in it. As a result, new songs are sung in Ochil Tower composed by Blair Drummond residents. The cycle continues: pupils from Ochil Tower often transfer to Blair Drummond and bring with them the songs they have learned at Ochil Tower. In this way particular songs retain their hold on the seasonal Camphill canon and are trotted out each year to form part of the cultural landscape of Camphill. This in turn forms an aspect of Camphill's everyday identity. If I allowed only my data gathered from 'front line research' situations to count, then this aspect of linkage between Camphill places would not have become clear and, equally the repetitious nature of song recitals and the part it plays in everyday life in Camphill would not have been seen to play out in such a way. My 'homework' meant that my presence in the field had ramifications beyond my 'front line research'. This impacted practice most noticeably in Ochil Tower School, though I would argue that, if the songs had not resonated clearly with the time of year and festivals planned, they would not have been taken up in the ways that they were. This brings me to another point: In this example Blair Drummond, often identified and self-identified as the Camphill deviant, is the one providing Camphill appropriate songs for the consumption of Ochil Tower run by ye olde established Camphillers. However, as I discuss in a later chapter, the use of song and the material construction of place, whilst adhering to a Camphillian idea of aesthetics and ritualised format, was never quite enough to silence the more vociferous critics regarding a Camphill identity. Such things as songs, Morning Assemblies and Festivals went only so far in the shaping of a Camphill identity, and for some people a greater significance was placed on history and lineage. This is something I have briefly demonstrated in relation to how my own history was constructed and leads back to my earlier discussion around identity as linked to a social self and the 'something more' that Camphill is. Further that ethnographic friendships in the field "experience and sharpen our abilities for critical reflection... Moreover [such relationships] firmly establish fieldwork as relational, emotional, and a process of personal negotiation" (Coffey, 1999: 47). My friendship with Martha and the use of songs, shows the ways that the gathering of data meshes with the reciprocal ties of friendship. It is clear that in researching, conducting and writing the lives of others we are also writing ourselves (Coffey, 1999:47). The continuing nature of identity work is discussed in the following section.

Writing Motherhood

Walk over to the Transition workshop. Quiet here, only Daniel dozing in a chair in the sun. Tara (the workshop leader) gets her guitar out and together we chat and sing our way through the Camphill song book. I mention that many of the Camphill festivals are actually German in origin. She knows this and always wonders why they can't celebrate festivals that are more Celtic inspired like Beltane and St. Patrick's instead of Three Kings Day and St. John's? However she remarks that it always comes down to who will do the work organising the event? It is always the same few people who 'take it on'. 12:30 arrives and I'm just about to head off for the workshop leaders' lunch when Martha from the office breathlessly runs up to me and informs me that my son is in hospital. Ask her to make my apologies to the workshop leaders and leave.

Write up today's fieldnotes in Stirling hospital after a cross-council trip between different hospitals. B. tired and wants to go home. Dominic has finally fallen asleep on the ward (Fieldnotes, 26th March).

I have placed the above fieldnote here for a number of reasons. On one level it links back to the previous discussion of song within the daily life of a Camphill place, and on another level it reveals more of the challenges facing me in the field that are not just linked to doing research 'at home'. It is also very detailed, bearing in mind Geertz's (1973) behest towards 'thick description' in the writing and production of ethnographies. Here I am in my fieldworker role, gathering reciprocal information, my sole focus being completion of my day of fieldwork. However, this is interrupted by the news that my son is sick and in hospital. My fieldworker role is subsumed to that of Mother. My son needs me and I must leave to go to him ASAP. The running and out of breath secretary suggests that my first responsibility is to my son and the fact that he is ill. I do leave, but not before I send my apologies to the workshop leaders that I will not be able to attend their lunch. When I asked Martha to pass on

my apologies, she rushed out ‘yes, yes’ and if she could have chivvied me to my car faster she would have done. When I returned to Blair Drummond a few days later, because my son was housebound for a while, people would come up to me and ask me how my son was and was it really ok for me to be here? Thus for a while I was identified as Miriam the mother, not Miriam the researcher. On my part, when I was writing up my fieldnotes in a depressing children’s ward, all I could really think about was that I would miss a day in the field and all the interesting events and conversations I was losing out on. It would be this paradox, the writing of social life whilst also living a very messy form of social life that quite literally could demand my undivided attention in the form of a sick child or after school activities, having other people’s children over, school meetings, transport sharing, dental appointments. The general make-up of a family with highly regulated and regimented lives could, when disrupted, massively impact on and change my engagement with ‘the field.’

The biggest challenge that impacted on my PhD was juggling writing and motherhood. The challenges of writing and motherhood have been commented on by numerous authors (Mann, 2012; Nelson, 2009; Jackson, 1992; Cowan, Lam, & Stonehouse, 2008; Hanauer, 2002). The endless juggling of demands from children, partners, parents and the resented and yet continually re-performed gendered roles that shape how motherhood and particularly ‘good’ motherhood is played out in the day to day (Oakley, 1984) are all involved. And then sitting down, or trying to grab the few precious minutes to document these challenges, show points where it seems to be a permanent choice between the ‘art’ of writing and the responsibility of motherhood (Cowan et al, 2008: xix). As Virginia Woolf so memorably phrased it, “a woman must have money and a room of her own if she is to write” (Woolf, 1928: 3). I was fortunate in that I had a room (shared office space) and money (ESRC funding) to make this possible. Where I differ from Woolf, is in the presence of two active and unruly boys. As Rodin suggests, the ability to write well and often demands a “blank state of mind, a sense of unlimited time and freedom”, not always possible with the constant demands of children (Rodin, 2008: 218). Shea is even blunter about the juggling act of mothering and writing, commenting, “I can be a

writer who does not write, but I can't be mother who does not mother ... Not writing causes me less guilt than not parenting well. Something has to give, and in my case it is usually the writing" (Shea, 2008: 123). This is seen most clearly in how and what ways writing occurs, Sarah writes that she is often "effectively silenced by motherhood" (Sarah, 2008: 47) and that what is written is often fragmentary and incomplete. This I understand, as I would often use my diary (daily planner) as an aide-memoire throughout my fieldwork and the subsequent period of writing the thesis. It facilitates memory recall when presented with a few words scribbled beside, for example, a calendar date like 25 November 2009. I depended on my written words to provide a memory that held more than one life, not just the one I was leading at one moment (Shanahan, 2008:165), as the following excerpt shows:

25 Wednesday Soc Sem 11-1

MT Mike Savage – Constructing the modern nation

Cubs 6:30 Innes Bday in Class

Swim 4:30 Noon Singing Hall for

Play

Lunch Elmtree

26 Thursday Dom off sick

MT

AT

Juice break Elmtree & Supper

Advent wreath making Sycamore/Elmtree

Singing – settling Alice

Here is the combination of my three worlds, as it were, academic, fieldwork and home. I have noted the sociology seminar (soc sem), though I didn't go as I was on fieldwork. The MT and AT in the margins is my shorthand for morning school transport (MT) and afternoon school transport (AT). On 26 November, I obviously had other things planned for I have scribbled it out and over the top simply written

‘Dom off sick.’ As I had done two transports on the Thursday, on Friday I did none. This was often the arrangement with Lara: if one week one of us did more than our allotted five, the other would make it up later when they could.

These two days in terms of fieldwork data were unbelievably rich ones. On Wednesday there was a birthday in class, followed by singing in the Hall with the entire school. There was early preparation for the forthcoming Christmas pageant, then lunch in Elmtree. My children had swimming and cubs in the afternoon and with that – in terms of noted entries Wednesday was over.

Due to Dominic developing a fever on the Wednesday night, I spent the next day at home. However, B. agreed to come early so I could be part of the Advent wreath-making that evening in Elmtree. This had caused some consternation from my parents as they had expected me to join them in Sycamore. B went with the children, but it was not them they wanted. They wanted me to sing whilst my Father made the Advent wreath (a circular form covered with evergreen branches, decorated with red ribbons and carrying four candles to mark the four weeks till Christmas). Me not being there meant he had to make the wreath and ‘carry the singing.’ It was very ‘selfish’ of me and what did I mean that Elmtree’s ‘need was greater.’

Their need was greater. Martha was the only one in her house who knew the Advent songs. Her two young co-workers, fresh from school in Germany, made the wreaths but were too shy to join in the singing. In the end it was Martha on the piano and I who tried to sing whilst the wreaths were being made. At one point Alice decided she had enough and went out on the swing in the garden. In order to check that she was fine (it being dark outside), Martha left the sliding doors to the garden open. I remember trying to sing ‘O come, o come Emmanuel’, Martha on the piano, Steve on the floor surrounded by bits of branches trying to attach them with wire to the frame, Joy in the kitchen preparing supper with Benjamin, Alice’s voice calling over the music ‘you see me Martha? You see me Martha?’ and the wind from the open door causing the fire to gutter.

Martha and I laughed about it the next day. The following year when wreath-making approached again, she recalled what a shambles the whole thing had nearly been: ‘Honestly Miriam if it hadn’t been for you, the whole thing would have been a disaster.’ The singing was the glue that held the event together and made it special, and without the singing it would have been simply people making a wreath. Singing Advent and Christmas songs grounded the event in a cultural and yearly moment, and Martha and I resolutely singing in the face of group disintegration gave it an identity beyond the repetitious mundane. Martha and I had both made Advent wreaths like this as children, so we tried to replicate the formality and tradition of past events in the present one, to recreate the re-imagined identity of the past in the present (Hobsbawm & Ranger, 2002; Anderson, 1991; Fitzgerald & Robertson, 2006). It was certainly marked, but by humour more than anything else. So that was Thursday afternoon, completed by supper in Elmtree and then observing Alice getting ready for bed and Martha singing her songs on the guitar once Alice lay in bed.

Here not only are my different roles of mother, researcher, daughter shown, but also the various ways that my fieldwork data was gathered and recorded. Even now, almost three years after the original data collection I will still refer to my diaries and research notebooks to remember an event, date or time that something occurred. I agree with Coffey (1999: 127) that “ethnography is an act of memory ... [that is] uniquely biographical and collective,” where we draw on cultural meanings and shared language to provide a framework for these types of recollections. Furthermore that being an ethnographer involves “learning how to do fieldwork, learning how to write, figuring out who you are as a person/fieldworker/writer, and knowing how, where, and when these all connect” (Cunliffe, 2010: 231).

In recognising the multiple roles and challenges prevalent in data collection alongside the partial nature of fieldwork and fieldnote construction, I am suggesting that my thesis is what Haraway (1988) calls a ‘situated ethnography.’ A situated ethnography recognises the often competing claims that other people have on me and equally how this shapes what I can research, how I record it and how much time I

have to do it in. I have come to see these constraints as opportunities for not only seeing how my own biography impacts on the data gathered, but also how acceptance of such a ‘warts and all’ approach is actually the time when “method is *invented* out of the muddiness of field experience” (Robinson, 2004: 165). I used to be incredibly anxious about my fieldwork, fieldnotes and all methodological elements of my research. I recognise that much of that anxiety was a fear of failing as a potential academic researcher, although as Visweswaran (1994: 100) writes,

A failed account, I argue, occasions new kinds of positionings. Yet a ‘failed’ account resting on claims to totalising explanation ... gives way to partial accounts, which in turn ‘fail’ for new reasons ... If the response to a partial account is inevitably the demand for a fuller one, to refuse such a desire is immediately to jeopardise one’s status as an ethnographer.

I often struggled with feelings of failure throughout my research. My visits to my research sites were often cut short by sick children. Most of my colleagues who used participant observation did the ‘traditional’ year to eighteen months in the field. My periods of fieldwork, followed by breaks, and then another period of fieldwork did not conform to this ‘norm.’ The data I gathered extended beyond such timeframes to over four years of unruly, often fragmented data collection. Like Hammersley & Atkinson (2007: 28) my goal is “the production of knowledge” about social life in Camphill, specifically how the daily constructions of Camphill identity are made and remade. Equally that ethnography goes beyond data collection to become a “process of creating and representing knowledge that is based on the ethnographer’s own experiences” (Pink, 2007: 22). That my own identity is part of that construction means that I am speaking from the place I am really located, not just a physical space but a subject position that accounts for the ways that gender, power and (imagined) history play out in my and my informants’ lives (Teaiwa, 2004: 230). As a result, including the researcher’s experience in the field does not in itself provide any analysis of the actions of the researched, but it does introduce a reflexive dimension to the account, and as Atkinson (1990: 180) states, “the fully mature ethnography

requires a reflexive awareness of its own writing, the possibilities and limits of its own language, and a principled explorations of its own modes of representation.”

Conclusion

Within this chapter I have explored the particular choices I have made in the collecting of data, presentation of that data and the ways that fieldwork and fieldnotes are interlinked and challenging processes. I have shown how ethnographies have changed and developed over time with the aim and intention to be more inclusive and aware of the representational pitfalls prevalent in documenting other groups and their social life. This was further evidenced by the variety of data collection tools I used, from notebooks, diaries and photographs alongside the ubiquitous fieldnote that helped me try and present both the fullness of everyday life within my fieldsites as well as the necessarily blurred and messy nature of practical fieldwork decisions. In particular the ways in which reading, re-reading and making sense of the data enables “pictures, theories and ideas to emerge and develop” (Coffey, 1999: 139). I demonstrated that my betwixt and between position as academic researcher as well as familiar position within Camphill shapes how I construct the social world and equally how I am constructed by it.

All of this returns me to my theoretical points about the situated nature of identity work. It should be clear that the performance of data collection and the successful performance of being an ethnographic researcher shapes my own understandings of self (Coffey, 1999:35). Throughout this research project I have learned to present my data as knowledge in particularly structured ways (as the following chapters will demonstrate), which ties me into certain norms and expectations that govern academic research (Becker, 2007). Writing is a repetitive process of editing and re-writing, much like the repetitive daily work engaged in by my research participants, and this too is something that I have had to learn and become adept in. Suffice to say that undertaking this kind of ethnographic project has led me to a new appreciation for the variety of forms of identity work that I, and the people in Camphill are proactively engaged in within social contexts and ethnographic moments. Chapters Three and Four deal with the issues of deviant identity and Camphill materiality

within my fieldwork settings, whilst Chapter Five explores how and in what ways pupils, residents and co-workers become and develop a social self. Through these three chapters I explore the different ways that the deviant other, performative identity, repetitive practice and the social self constantly rework and rewrite what Camphill is and how this is presented.



Chapter Three

Defining Camphill



Introduction

In this chapter I explore how people in my three research sites constructed their particular Camphill place as somehow ‘not’ a Camphill. Blair Drummond in particular was defined and defined itself as a deviant Camphill. However, both Ochil Tower and Corbenic to some extent also had moments in which doubts were expressed about their Camphill legitimacy and identity. This questioning of their identity took place in often unlooked for moments of conversation throughout the day, also sometimes when people were prompted by me to discuss more fully what they thought Camphill was about. In all the examples I came across, my informants were very clear about why their particular place was not a Camphill and could even list the things that it did *not* do that made it a deviant Camphill. Often this was expressed in a way which placed it in a binary situation of either definitely belonging to Camphill or certainly not. Identity in this context was not fluid and fragmentary: a place either was or it was not a Camphill. As a result, what was said and what was actually lived were often two rather different things. For some of my informants, there seemed to be an ideal that could be found somewhere else, some other Camphill place which was more a Camphill. It was a case of “whose definition of the situation and of the individual counts” (Jenkins, 2008: 97).

What I will explore over the coming pages is this dichotomous perception of Camphill identity as articulated through the verbally expressed sense of deviance and questioning by *certain* staff members regarding their particular Camphill's identity. In particular, I explore the distinction between living and working in Camphill and how employment is often held as evidencing a deviant Camphill activity despite its widespread use among UK Camphills. I also look at the written 'pillars' of Camphill as expressed in the writings of Karl König, the founder of Camphill, and how these are also used to identify examples of not being a Camphill, as none of my three research sites engage with the 'pillars' as these were originally expressed. What becomes clear is that Camphill and Camphill identity is more than either of the discussed issues. Camphill identity also strongly resides in everyday practices and rituals, as well as in the residents/pupils, an aspect of life that is rarely used as an explanation of Camphill identity, but is I would propose the most enduring Camphill legacy (see Chapter Four), alongside the favoured Camphill image of the burning candle as the picture used as an epigraph at the beginning of the chapter demonstrates. As Wolf (1992: 123) suggests, while I am not speaking for Camphill people, I am nonetheless the one who is creating a particular kind of represented construction of Camphill everyday life and identity questions, which despite or because of my situated interpretations provide an insight into the challenges and importance which many of my informants associated with constructing a legitimately perceived Camphill identity.

The Deviant Camphill

When I began my preliminary access meetings with the management of Camphill Blair Drummond, a clearly expressed hope was that my research would be able to furnish the staff of Blair Drummond with the definitive answer to what Camphill was. At the time I was somewhat stumped and taken aback. I thought this rather odd because the answer seemed self-evident, and I was baffled by the need that senior staff had for specific and concrete answers. I thought then, 'what kind of a Camphill place is this if they don't know what Camphill is?' I was naive and guilty of the same snap judgements that other people in Camphill had made about Blair Drummond's Camphill identity. During my time at Blair Drummond, its deviant status within the

wider Camphill Movement was often mentioned. Eventually I asked Jack, who had worked at Blair Drummond for over ten years, why he thought it was not a Camphill: ‘We were told we weren’t one’, he said. ‘A meeting was called shortly after all the old style Camphill people left Blair Drummond and it was being managed by us, employed people.’ (Fieldnotes, 14 March). A certain long-standing Camphill member informed the assembled Blair Drummond staff that they were not a Camphill. What Jack mostly remembered from this meeting was being yelled at for an hour about their deviant status. When this person had calmed down enough, he was asked to define more clearly what Camphill was and how Blair Drummond could move away from their stigmatised identity (Goffman, 1963). The answers given, according to Jack, were fudged and woolly. It seemed that the very fact of them asking what a Camphill was simply served to confirm the views of the man concerned; since if they didn’t know, then they *obviously* couldn’t be a Camphill. Either you have it (the elusive ‘it’) or you don’t, was the response (Fieldnotes, 14 March).

Blair Drummond’s ambivalent status within the wider Camphill network became increasingly obvious to me before, during and long after my fieldwork had ended. The first intimations I had of its deviant status was during my Master’s fieldwork at Ochil Tower School when an elderly Camphill man, full of stories about the founding members of Camphill, was categorically clear that Blair Drummond was not in any way a Camphill. I should ignore them, was his advice, and not have anything to do with them. When I undertook my fieldwork at Corbenic, I was also told this by various staff members and one in particular, who lucidly and colourfully explained that, although ‘employed people would rave about how amazing Blair Drummond was, it was already crumbling. The centre was gone and all that was left were the external practices and rituals that had no deeper meaning.’ (Fieldnotes, 26 May). Also as noted earlier on, on a visit to my Godmother in the Irish Republic, in a small and rural Camphill, the son of one of the founding fathers of Camphill quickly and unhesitatingly informed me that ‘Blair Drummond was not a Camphill’ when I had told him that it had been one of my three research sites.

All of this could have led me to feel like I had failed, not only in my choice of field sites, but also in ignoring the expertise of older and more experienced Camphill people. I had been told it was not a Camphill before I approached them, whilst I was doing fieldwork at Blair Drummond, and somewhat repetitiously afterwards. The stigma of Blair Drummond's deviant status was apparently long lasting. I know now that when I mention my research to older Camphill people, those who are more polite will ask with a certain grimace and twisting of their lips 'and how did you find Blair Drummond?' The question almost begs me to shrug, look a little uncomfortable and say 'well, as you know, it was very nice but not really a Camphill.' At which point the questioner will pat my hand comfortingly and say 'ach ja, it was to be expected when a place is run by employed people.'

It might be thought that the answer is simple, that it turns on employment and to be a Camphill means not employing people. And so this is why Blair Drummond is the black sheep within the fold of Camphill because it is run by an employed manager, employed workshop leaders and house co-ordinators, employed relief and one to one staff. While it also has a large contingent of young voluntary workers mostly from Germany and Eastern Europe, Blair Drummond is for all intents and purposes run by employed people.

The reader might wonder how else residential care homes look after the children and adults in their care, if not by employing people? To answer requires recourse to the beginnings and genesis of Camphill. Camphill's beginnings (like most beginnings) are not clear and straightforward. Who decides what was the beginning? I have read numerous books that trace the beginning of Camphill to esoteric angels, the Archangel Michael most strongly; and to people such as Kasper Hauser, Zinzendorf, Comenius, Rudolf Steiner and Ita Wegman, to name a few. Such people are significant and important, but knowledge of them would not add much to an understanding of present-day Camphill identity. Such people's biographies throw long shadows that can be felt in the present, but in particular ways, and as used by particular people. Mostly they are talked about by an older generation of Camphillers

and as such were rarely mentioned at all throughout my fieldwork²⁰ (Fieldnotes, 12 - 15 May). I have already provided an introduction to Camphill in Chapter One, so here I shall briefly recap.

In 1939, having been refused asylum in France and other European countries, Karl König, his wife and children, were given political refuge status first in England, before moving to Aberdeen, Scotland. They were later joined by other people who had been part of the Viennese study group who read anthroposophy with Karl König in Vienna, Austria (Müller-Wiedemann, 1990). This group came to be known as the ‘Founders of Camphill.’ It involved two doctors, a priest, a dancer, and other women for homemaking, or Housemothers as they later became known (Bock, 2004). Early Camphill was a very gendered environment. It could be argued this was due in large part to the men being interned on the Isle of Wight as possible ‘alien agitators,’ leaving the women behind to run the large run-down manse, manage the children labelled by the local Authorities as ‘difficult, challenging and handicapped’ and take care of finances and generally manage early life there (Bock, 2004; Smith, 2009). Then the men returned and roles became more fixed, along paths determined by the founder and leader Karl König. Within a few years of the Camphill manse being gifted to the group, other locations around Aberdeen had been found, money fundraised, benefactors generously contributed (Aberdeen still has the largest concentration of Camphill places within the UK), and perhaps most significantly Karl König wrote ‘The Pillars of Camphill’ (König, 1960), a small pamphlet that tried to set out the spiritual, economic and social ideals which would govern the work and life within Camphill. It was to be seen as a calling, a vocation, with no salaries or other financial rewards. In practice this meant that traditional wages would not be paid to staff, called co-workers, but instead ‘trust’ money would be available to those who needed it with little or no internal or external regulation regarding its use. The rewards were to be in the work and creating ‘islands of healing’ (Fieldnotes, 7 June,

²⁰ On one memorable occasion the story of Kasper Hauser was told to an enthusiastic audience of staff and residents at the New Lanark Conference, April 2009. What was striking about the telling was the almost constant interruptions offered by long-standing Camphill residents who corrected the speaker’s story whenever they felt he was presenting something different to their own remembered version of Kasper Hauser’s life (Fieldnotes, 12- 15 May). This shows the significance that the Kasper Hauser story carries within Camphill life; the pre-emptive knowledge of the story by the residents demonstrates how often this story has been told to them.

2008). From these humble and very idealistic beginnings, Camphill has spread across the globe, although the majority of Camphill places are in the UK and Eire, followed by Europe, the USA and Africa. India has only a single centre run by a German couple and South America and South East Asia have so far managed to resist a Camphill presence.

What is important here is the early financial structure of Camphill, where wages, and by extension employing people, was not something desired or looked for. That is not to say that Camphill places (in all their variety) have never employed staff. They have, but initially only for very specific roles, such as administration (a secretary, accountant etc) or for maintenance (painters/decorators and joiners for example), as was the case when I was a child. This has expanded in recent years to include a whole host of other employed roles, such as night waking staff, relief care workers and, increasingly, managers of particular Camphill places (Fieldnotes, 2009). Therefore to suggest that employment is the reason for Blair Drummond's deviant status is too simple, for all Camphill places employ people in some guise or other at the present moment. The majority of Camphill places are split between an employed (live out) and not employed (live in) staff ratio. At my three fieldwork sites the ratio was as follows.

Blair Drummond has about twenty six staff living out and coming in to work as house co-ordinators, managers, workshop leaders, one to one staff etc, and there are roughly 24 live in co-workers, the previously mentioned volunteers from Germany²¹ and Eastern Europe. The volunteers typically stay for six months to a year and are given monthly pocket money. They get one and a half days off per week. Holidays must be requested and are allocated on a first come first served basis, and employed staff are given preference over volunteers for their holidays (Fieldnotes, 11 February).

²¹ The German male co-workers usually came to do their civil service. Germany's civil service was stopped by the Summer of 2011. This has resulted in a considerably smaller group of male co-workers applying to come to Camphill. German females still come for a year (Fieldnotes, 16 June).

At Camphill Community Corbenic, the live in/live out ratio is more complicated. They have the ubiquitous volunteer co-workers from Germany, Eastern Europe etc, who lived on site and also received monthly pocket money with a similar arrangement to Blair Drummond regarding days off and holidays. Also some of the more senior workshop and house co-ordinators who are employed live-in too. As a house co-ordinator, they would not sleep in the same house they were responsible for but in a different building, to ensure, I was told, the opportunity to have a break from one's work. The manager of Corbenic also lives on site in a small cottage without any residents. The remaining employed staff (workshop leaders, house co-ordinators, relief staff etc) travel in from the surrounding area and leave at the end of their designated working hours (Fieldnotes, 18 May).

Ochil Tower School, in contrast to both Blair Drummond and Corbenic, runs at present along the 'old fashioned' style of earlier Camphills. By this I mean that the four joint co-ordinators and the 'Core Group' of long term staff all live by the 'trust' money principle and so do not receive a fixed salary or indeed have a written and formalised contract. They also live-in. There is also a mixture of employed and live-in staff, with some employed staff living in and others coming in for their working day (teacher, school cook and secretary, classroom assistants). All the Houseparents (as they are called) live in, the majority on trust money. Like Corbenic and Blair Drummond, Ochil Tower also has about ten volunteer live-in co-workers from Germany, occasionally Brazil²² who also receive monthly pocket money, every second weekend off, with one day off every other weekend. Holidays at the school are not prescribed because all the pupils return home during the school holidays, which means that all staff have about thirteen weeks of holiday a year (Fieldnotes, 4 November).

As is clear from across my three fieldwork sites, people are employed for a variety of roles and often with differing contract agreements and pay scales. Since completing my fieldwork at the end of 2009, I have attended a variety of Camphill run conferences and become aware that *all* Camphill places within the UK have

²² Recent immigration changes mean that people 'volunteering' from outwith the EU face increasingly difficult and complicated entry requirements.

employed staff working and living on and off site. As I have previously suggested, employing staff is nothing new in Camphill, but what has changed is the ratio of employed staff to live-in staff. In some instances employed staff considerably outweigh the live-in staff, while managers who have little or no knowledge of Camphill but considerable experience in the care industry take over the day-to-day running of a particular Camphill place. It is in such these instances that staff from other Camphill places which do not have employed managers will point the finger and say ‘that is not a Camphill.’

Employment is actually endemic throughout Camphill, so if other places which employ people are not labelled deviant Camphills, then what is it about Blair Drummond’s employment pattern that causes such consternation? The manager who does not have a Camphill background is likely to be part of the perceived problem. Geoffrey was brought in to ‘rescue’ Blair Drummond from financial and social ruin and has proceeded to do what was expected of him, to increase resident numbers (Blair Drummond now has an extensive waiting list) and engage positively with local authorities, amongst other things. I was told in another management meeting I attended that Blair Drummond’s reputation was so damaged prior to Geoffrey’s arrival that the very word ‘Camphill’ was treated with hostile suspicion by social workers and local authorities. ‘Fifteen months ago Blair Drummond was the place of ‘last resort’ for many councils, now we are more likely to be the place of ‘first choice’ (Fieldnotes, 26 March). Improved reputation amongst local authorities notwithstanding, Geoffrey does not have a Camphill background but one in mainstream care. The other people who make up his management team also do not have a Camphill background, though two of them were newly employed at the time of Blair Drummond’s internal explosion when the ‘old Camphillers’ left and one manager after another tried to haul Blair Drummond back from the abyss (Fieldnotes, 17 March). As a result, the face that Blair Drummond presents to the world is successful for local authorities and social workers, but does not work in the eyes of older and more established Camphillers. To paraphrase Goffman (1965), Blair Drummond’s presentation of self is seen as all wrong.

This may seem unfair considering that Corbenic too is run by an employed manager. Yet this manager has a sanctioned history, albeit a relatively short one, within Camphill. Before her appointment at Corbenic over ten years ago, Barbara worked in Blair Drummond when it was run by 'traditional' Camphillers. This was the time during which trust money was the norm, live-in staff were the majority and widespread employment was inconceivable, and Barbara worked there as a Houseparent for a while before leaving to pursue other things. Corbenic's history is similar in many ways to Blair Drummond. Corbenic, like Blair Drummond, had also faced a long period of continued instability over who would manage it effectively. The old Camphill guard were leaving in droves and unable to talk to one another about the issues facing Corbenic without meetings ending in vicious personal attacks, bad feeling and hostility (Fieldnotes, 21 June). In order to survive, Corbenic needed a manager and Barbara rode to the rescue. Like Geoffrey, she increased resident numbers and improved Corbenic's reputation with the local authorities, although the Camphill name was unfavourably viewed at the point she took over.

The idea that the name Camphill carries certain negative aspects, as mentioned in the Corbenic and Blair Drummond examples, was also raised by a number of people at Ochil Tower School. Not having gone through such management turmoil as the other two places, nonetheless senior people at Ochil Tower were well aware of what they deemed 'bad practice' in other Camphills and contrasted this unfavourably with their own 'excellent' practice. 'The thing about being called Camphill,' stated Maria, 'is that it presents a certain image to people, social workers, parents, Local Authorities. Do we really want to have that kind of negative reputation attached to us? Equally people who know us may think Camphill is great and then have high expectations of somewhere else,' she added by way of explanation (Fieldnotes, 14 May).

The dilemma around the name Camphill having at times been a burden in social work fields is known across my fieldwork sites. Being a Camphill has a certain ambivalence attached to it, because it means different things to many different people. It is important to stress this. Camphill for the 'old Camphillers' is one thing, while Camphill in the regulated care world is perceived as something else and not

always positively (Smith, 2009: 162). The success of Blair Drummond, Corbenic and Ochil Tower in managing the world of Social Workers, Local Authorities, Care Commission inspectors, is an important part of their everyday identity. Yet I rarely encountered staff members suggesting that their skill at presenting a successful institutional self to the regulators was an important part of their Camphill identity. It suggests that the care work (despite its crucial financial importance in keeping Camphill places functional) is not deemed as important as the something 'other' that people in Blair Drummond are elusively trying to capture. In other words there must be more to life in Camphill places than merely sites of care (however excellent that may be) and it is this kind of distinction that people in Blair Drummond struggle with as the what that something 'other' is, is not clearly explained. I suggest in Chapter Five that the 'other' aspect of Camphill work is in the particular ways that pupils and residents are socialised into being, which is another element of Camphills' ongoing identity work.

When Barbara took on the manager's role in Corbenic, it was important for her to try to retain some of what she called 'Camphill traits', not least because she said that the residents asked for certain festivals to be done and often told newer staff how and in what ways to do things (Fieldnotes 21 June). Unlike Geoffrey, Barbara has some prior knowledge of Camphill practices, courtesy of her time in Blair Drummond. However, unlike Blair Drummond, Corbenic also has people there who have lived in other Camphill places and who worked in Corbenic when it was run along the 'old' lines. Another bonus in Corbenic's favour was Barbara's clever use of an old Camphiller by the name of John to 'guide' them in the cultural rebuilding of Corbenic. John had literally broken bread with the founding fathers and as a result his Camphill lineage was impeccable. His long-lasting contribution to Corbenic was the gift of carved candlesticks that are used for the Sunday and festive Services. In a frank conversation with me on Whit Sunday 2009, John invoked the tangible presence of his handmade candlesticks on the altar at Corbenic as a visual sign of belonging within 'the Camphill framework' (Fieldnotes, Whitsun 31 May). His candlesticks quite literally imbued Corbenic with Camphill legitimacy. In other

words, Corbenic's presentation of self was and is successful for all parties, including social workers and old Camphillers. Corbenic is not a deviant Camphill.

But yet again this is too simple. If this is a solution, then Blair Drummond's deviance lies in Geoffrey's inability to present a legitimate knowledge and history of Camphill that will please the established Camphill old guard. By that understanding, all that he would need to do is ask for an old Camphiller to make some candlesticks or other resonant object that would tie Blair Drummond to that particular person's unquestioned Camphill identity.

However, Blair Drummond has already tried this. At the time of my fieldwork, a similar legitimate individual was running a training course for the volunteer co-workers in 'An Introduction to Social Therapy,' the 'officially' sanctioned title of the course; at the time referred to by some of the co-workers as 'Friday morning crap.' The purpose of these sessions was to help the young co-workers in their everyday practice and also to introduce them to some of König et al's key therapeutic ideas in working with adults with physical and behavioural disabilities. The woman, Gisela, who ran the course was an ex-Camphill staff child as well as having worked in a variety of other Camphills, most notably Blair Drummond in its earlier incarnation. Her parents had also worked with founding members in Aberdeen, the Mother Ship of Camphill. The first time I met her she announced two things: "'I'm dyslexic so ignore my spelling' and 'I knew Karl König as a child and was terrified of him.' Basically: I'm human just like you and look at my Camphill lineage'" (Fieldnotes, 6 March). Hers was an impressive lineage, but even so it did not stop Blair Drummond from being viewed as a deviant Camphill. Gisela came every Friday to try and impart some of her Camphill knowledge with little success. The co-workers spent most of the session giggling and then roundly abusing the ideas she had presented when they were on one of Blair Drummond's many balconies after lunch (Fieldnotes, 12 March). Despite this irreverence she had her supporters, in particular a young and earnest House co-ordinator to whom she would talk about specific rituals which he would then try to implement in the daily running of the house. When Peter was working, he would gather the residents of the house together round a lit candle and

sit in silence for a couple of minutes before they left for Morning Assembly in the Library. He called this ‘holding’ and trying to develop a ‘holding structure.’ This seems a sort of inverted Goffmanesque approach where the front and the backstage are unified to present a soberly controlled, calm and somehow therapeutically porous self. ‘Holding’ in Camphill speak involves an implicit social control aspect in sociological terms, and is also known as intuitive practice in care language (Fieldnotes, 5 March).

Despite Gisela’s sanctioning presence at Blair Drummond, its stigmatised status continued. Personal biography and knowledge of Camphill and Camphill founders were all invested within the body of Gisela but did not act as effectively as John’s candlesticks had for Corbenic. Identity and by extension belonging, whether this be to Camphill or not, depends upon the “symbolic construction and signification of a mask of similarity which all can wear, an umbrella of solidarity under which all can shelter” (Jenkins, 2008: 134). What this means is that Blair Drummond’s deviance and its difference is distinctive, and people become most aware of their cultural identity when they are at the boundaries (Cohen, 1985: 2-3) and when “something assumed to be fixed, coherent and stable is displaced by the experience of doubt and uncertainty” (Mercer, 1990: 43). Basically, a large part of Blair Drummond’s identity is focused on *not* being seen as a Camphill, both by external people and by people within Blair Drummond, and this “process ... contribute[s] to the production and reproduction of the collectivities with which they are identifying, evoking and constructing intra-group similarities and intra-group differences” (Jenkins, 2008: 141). That is, a significant part of Blair Drummond’s identity is invested in its ongoing and repeatedly constructed status as a deviant Camphill. And by ‘repeatedly reconstructed’ here I mean that the young co-workers, who are often only at Blair Drummond for between six months to a year, very quickly pick up on Blair Drummond’s not Camphill status and repeat their understanding of Blair Drummond’s deviance to others, including me as a researcher, as the following two fieldnote excerpts demonstrate:

I think that today has been all about ‘real’ versus not real Camphill and I ask Sebastian what he thinks Camphill is about. He also suggests that Blair Drummond is not a ‘real’ Camphill but is more a care home, i.e., the staff help to create and build a home for the residents. A real Camphill from what he has heard and seen on induction video programmes is where there is a ‘proper’ Housefather, who acts like the father of the House and it is built more along family lines. He knows someone in Loch Arthur (a Camphill community in Dumfries) who told him that they dance in the moonlight to make the water strong and then spread it on the fields to help the plants grow. They also plant and harvest according to the moon and don’t have TVs. In a nutshell Camphill must have people living and working together. Do biodynamic gardening. Work with anthroposophy and dislike most forms of technology. He has heard a rumour that at one point Blair Drummond was in danger of losing its Camphill status and that was why some things had to change. The black sheep of the Camphill family (Fieldnotes, 23 February).

While Deirdre is making pancakes for Shrove Tuesday, Heather enters the kitchen and starts to slice and butter some buns for her late lunch. She then proceeds with a lengthy monologue about how Blair Drummond is different from other Camphill places, what her understanding of anthroposophy and biodynamic gardening is. It is interesting and I don’t interrupt till she says ‘oh but you probably know all about this.’ I reassure that hearing her examples is far more interesting than what I think. She mentions that someone in Loch Arthur once said that the difference between Blair Drummond and Loch Arthur was that Loch Arthur *lived* and Blair Drummond *worked*. (Fieldnotes, 24 February, my emphasis).

What both of these excerpts demonstrate is the opinion, shared by many other co-workers I spoke to, that Blair Drummond was not a ‘real’ Camphill. What is interesting is that they have varied ideas about what a ‘real’ Camphill place should look like and be, courtesy of induction videos, or from meeting people from other

‘proper’ Camphill places who demonstrate through their discussion that Blair Drummond is not a ‘proper’ Camphill. The list is short but clear:

- Camphill is like a ‘proper’ family – complete with a patriarch ‘Father’
- Camphill has Biodynamic Gardening²³
- Camphill works with anthroposophy²⁴
- Camphill dislikes technology

The references to particular practices such as biodynamic gardening and working with anthroposophy pinpoint the specific areas where Blair Drummond is seen to fall short. The Garden and Estate Workshops are run by people who do not have a biodynamic training. However, it is important to note that in Corbenic, where they do have a bio-dynamic garden, apart from the committed gardener most of the staff who ended up having to make the preparations or plant according to the moon nodes called it ‘witchcraft’ if they were being nice, or were ‘dubious but have learned to keep [their] mouths shut’ (Fieldnotes, 18 June). Internal questions aside, the fact was that Camphill Corbenic had what Blair Drummond does not, with the perceived notion that such practices, whether they be ‘witchcraft’ or not, are important.

Sebastian was not the only person in Blair Drummond who cited ‘working with anthroposophy’ as an important Camphill element. One of the workshop leaders was very keen to read more anthroposophy and often talked to me about starting a reading group on this. He and the Pottery workshop leader were the two people who started their workshops with a reading from Steiner’s ‘Calendar of the Soul’

²³ A type of gardening that has its own calendar for when plants/crops should be planted/sown according to moon cycles and particular days. Everything is organic but more so, as there are also ‘preparations’ a fertiliser for want of a better word that is spread/buried in the ground and over the plants. This preparation is mostly water with a few other ingredients very watered down. Bio-dynamic gardening works on a similar principle to homeopathy that the more diluted a substance the stronger its potency. There are particular trainings for bio-dynamic gardeners and farmers, with wider recognition of the practices prevalent in mainland Europe, particularly Germany. See the publishing house Floris Books, Edinburgh for an extensive bibliography on ‘biodynamics’.

²⁴ A particular kind of esoteric philosophy, also known as Christian Science pioneered by Rudolf Steiner. It had its major heyday in the 1920s and 1930s in the UK (le Carre, 1974) and is most publicly noticeable through the Steiner/Waldorf School system. Karl König et al used a lot of Steiner’s philosophy when creating the genesis and organisation of the early Camphills. For more on this see Müller-Wiedemann, 1990.

(Fieldnotes, 6 March, 12 March, 20 March), for it had been suggested to them by Gisela that this would start the day ‘properly’ and help in the practical work with the residents (Fieldnotes, 9 March). So though some people are trying to practically implement what they see as anthroposophy, and there are Gisela’s rather fraught Friday courses, Blair Drummond is still viewed and views itself as not working enough with the ideals of anthroposophy. Anthroposophy in general, I have found throughout my research, is an area that is often held up as a simple way of embodying a Camphill identity, though as the previous example and this thesis generally demonstrates such identity claims are rarely straightforward. In the minutes from a Scotland wide Camphill Forum, held paradoxically at Blair Drummond, one of the minuted points concerning the ‘Camphill impulse’ was the question about the role of anthroposophy in the building of Camphill values and ‘brotherhood.’ The point being that Camphill places are and have to be more than just ‘excellent’ service care providers and anthroposophy is one area where this apparently can be achieved. (Forum Summary Report, 18 January 2012). The following two fieldnote examples make this point about anthroposophy in the everyday practical work of a Camphill place even starker.

By 3:30 we have finished all the necessary baking which means that between now and 5pm, a long drawn out tea-break ensues, alongside more washing up and cleaning of floors. Naomi tells me that she might soon be leaving Blair Drummond to go to Camphill Cherry Orchard in England as she wants to live in a place that uses anthroposophy in the work with the adults. Some people in Blair Drummond are too dictatorial and due to the wage many people are there for the money and not the residents, she explains. Her parents were anthroposophists in Brazil and her brother also went to a Camphill in England. She tried to get into Newton Dee in Aberdeen to do the degree course but there were no vacancies. (Fieldnotes, 23 February)

After supper accompany Sebastian and Bruce again for a long muddy walk through the woods. On our return there is little to do so I take out my notebook and start writing up. Sebastian has put on Phantom of the Opera for

Peter and Trina. The movie is playing in the sitting room and sitting at the dining room table I can hear it. Baz has an ex- Blair Drummond co-worker extolling the joys of learning ‘proper’ anthroposophy in Germany chatting to him in the office. ‘Everyone lives together and it is so wonderful’ she gushes. (Turns out it is Lehnhof, where there are lots of staff, pregnant women and anthroposophy – which translates as not going to the cinema or watching films, but to plays and walks, seminars and a Housemother who only shouts twice a month) (Fieldnotes, 28 February).

As can be seen from this example, anthroposophy as presented here focuses on a more noticeable cultural life full of plays, walks and seminars. It also shapes practice, if Naomi and the lack of a shouting Housemother are to be believed. Interestingly, as previously mentioned, Blair Drummond when it practised anthroposophy and was run along the old Camphill lines was regarded as the place of ‘last resort’ for the council. In other words Blair Drummond’s Camphill status was not in doubt but the possibility to get residents referred to them through official channels was drying up as they were regarded so negatively. As a result Blair Drummond was in severe financial difficulty resulting in many of the changes so deplored by the younger co-workers. This contradiction between the ideals of anthroposophy and the practical realities of working in the regulated care world are not picked up by the young volunteer co-workers. Working with anthroposophy is held up as the difference between Blair Drummond and other Camphill places and must therefore make that place better. The suggestion being that working with anthroposophy will be much more harmonious and the barriers between paid and volunteer staff, residents and co-workers less problematic.

Anthroposophy, as presented in such comments, also has distinct opinions about technology. The second fieldnote extract suggests doing anthroposophy means not going to the cinema or watching films, in direct contrast to the practices going on at Blair Drummond. This means that anthroposophy holds not only cultural answers but also a clear opinion about the role technology should play in a Camphill’s life. Whilst at Blair Drummond I witnessed a real battle between the staff concerning this.

At the end of a long corridor in the castle proper, a collection of tables and chairs had been arranged. The windows looked out onto the lawn and a ceramic sign hanging from the wall pronounced this place to be ‘the café.’ At morning tea break, the Textile, Pottery and Craft workshops would all meet there and have their morning bun, drinks and chat, residents and staff together. This was the routine for a couple of weeks whilst I was there. Then I observed a very heated debate between the aforementioned workshop leaders and ‘management’, who had apparently decided that the café was to go and in its place there would be a more social corner with sofas and a wall mounted TV. The café group was against this and claimed they had developed a social space ‘for the residents’ while those in favour of the TV corner also claimed it was ‘for the residents’ (Fieldnotes, 30 March). What was then added into the mix by the café group was that ‘It is not Camphill.’ Basically, TVs in houses and the designated sitting rooms are fine but a wall mounted TV in the main corridor to the Library and Meeting rooms puts Blair Drummond’s status even more in jeopardy (Fieldnotes, 3 April). I left before the space issue was resolved, but on returning to Blair Drummond for a research feedback session, I found that the café no longer existed but equally a wall-mounted TV had not taken its place (Fieldnotes, 25 January 2011).

Whilst the supposed shortcomings of Blair Drummond as a Camphill appear to be obvious to Sebastian, Heather, Naomi and other staff and co-workers I spoke to, what they are also demonstrating is a clear conviction that particular practices (biodynamic gardening, anthroposophy, dislike of technology) somehow carry a legitimacy that Blair Drummond lacks. In this way it is as if they are saying, ‘we are not Camphill but that does not mean that we don’t know what is missing’. Through this they construct an identity for Camphill that covers things they do not have and can point to as being the definitive ‘pillars’ of being a Camphill. This was clearly seen with the constant othering that took place, with Loch Arthur being a frequently invoked example of all that was Camphill and which Blair Drummond could never be, a point that was also raised by quite a few people in Corbenic. Loch Arthur was the Holy Grail and both Corbenic and Blair Drummond were not as good a Camphill as Loch Arthur was (Fieldnotes, 3 June). Also the criticisms offered by Loch Arthur

were seen as legitimate and not something to be questioned, particularly concerning the living and working distinction. Sebastian touched on this when he made his comment about Blair Drummond doing ‘care work’ and ‘real’ Camphills having more of a ‘family life’.

This returns to previous points I have made about the distinctions between living and working in Camphill, for Camphill according to Sebastian and Heather is meant to be about *living* and not *working*. This is a clear and indeed stark distinction that is considered to explain why Blair Drummond is not a Camphill. It was also raised at Corbenic when certain staff members would give reasons as to why they were not a proper Camphill: ‘Proper Camphill is old style, family style and not the useless ‘house co-ordinator’ (Fieldnotes, 7 June), although one such ‘useless’ house-coordinator told me that to call herself a ‘Housemother’ would be ridiculous as she was not the residents’ Mother, and was younger than many of the residents (Fieldnotes, 18 May). This perhaps romanticising of a past Camphill built on ‘traditional’ family lines²⁵ was a view I encountered frequently at both Blair Drummond and Corbenic.

However, as already stressed, such a clear distinction between those that live and those that work does not hold *practically* true. All three of my fieldwork sites have a mixture of employed and live-in staff, while of the three only Blair Drummond’s Camphill identity is in doubt. The premise behind such a binary appears to be that those who are employed cannot *live* their work, only those that *live-in* can live their work. This is a distinction that many of the employed people I spoke to rejected, often citing in their defence the very long hours they stayed at their particular Camphill and how committed they were to the particular places that employed them, to the point where their family and friends actually thought they ‘lived’ there (Fieldnotes, 24 March, 16 May & 28 October). It was also challenged very strongly

²⁵ A recent flyer, which fell out of my copy of *The Week* magazine, advertising Botton Village (the largest adult Camphill Community in the world, which resides in a whole valley in Yorkshire), stressed the importance of ‘family.’ Indeed it went so far as to have pictures of various residents engaged in craft and practical work related activities with the slogan reading ‘help us save our family’ and then asking the reader to donate. It appears that the marketing department of Botton Village have decided that the ‘difference’ between Botton and other care centres is that elusive ‘family’ feeling.

by one newly employed co-worker at Ochil Tower School. Jade had an Honours degree in Social Science and at the time of my research was working four days a week, from 7am till 8pm and was paid an annual salary. Some of the volunteer co-workers (fresh from school) challenged her employed status as the 'easy option' citing that the hours she worked were less than theirs and the fact that she was paid more than they were. The comments she received from some of the young men considerably distressed and hurt her: she did not defend her position on the basis of her degree and that she was hardworking and often ended up doing more practical cleaning (that I witnessed) than the male volunteer co-workers in her house. Nonetheless she was still seen by her youthful detractors as having the easy option, which was a view *not* shared by her Housemother or the other longstanding staff/co-workers (Fieldnotes, 9 November). What this example demonstrates is the ease with which some individuals or groups can pinpoint a deficient identity around a distinction such as employed versus live in staff, although this view may not be shared by the majority of people in the particular Camphill place. Such labelling has a particular kind of power which Jade, Heather and Sebastian all experienced and, significantly, did not challenge. In the case of Blair Drummond the idea of working versus living became a strong internalised part of its deviant identity, however problematic and practically immaterial this distinction was (Merton, 1957: 369; Jenkins, 2008: 164).

This returns me to an earlier point, namely that Blair Drummond's identity hinges in large part on its status as 'other' or deviant within the wider Camphill fold. While it is certainly true that during my time there I had countless discussion with co-workers and staff about their problematic status, it was not only Blair Drummond that questioned its identity and its belonging to Camphill. The following section explores how my other two field sites, Ochil Tower School and Camphill Community Corbenic, also struggled with defining their Camphill identity.

The Pillars of Camphill

‘Well are we a Camphill?’ asked Johanna. We are sitting in the kitchen chatting and drinking tea whilst her son wanders in from the sitting-room and dumps bricks on the table between us. I look back rather bemused ‘Well, what a Camphill is and isn’t is rather complicated ...’ I respond rather lamely. ‘Not really,’ she says, ‘I have stuff up in the loft from when I was doing the BA at Aberdeen where it says quite clearly what a Camphill is.’ Curious now I ask what exactly a Camphill has to do to qualify for the label Camphill. ‘As far as I can remember it has to have Bible Evenings – we don’t do that. College Meetings – we also don’t do that. The only thing that we do is Economic Fellowship (trust money), is that enough to be a Camphill?’ I shrug noncommittally. ‘But surely there is more to making a place Camphill then following those three things and what of the places that follow those three things dogmatically but where the practical work with the children and adults is rubbish, full of bad practice?’ She is thinking out loud and concludes with, ‘what we do here is good, is it necessary to have the name Camphill attached? Also there are other places with excellent practice not called Camphill ...’ she trails off (Fieldnotes, 13 May).

This fieldnote excerpt encapsulates my struggle to define Camphill, but more importantly it demonstrates Johanna’s insistence that defining Camphill is straightforward by reference to König’s ‘The Pillars of Camphill.’ However she then takes this textbook definition and sets about prolematising what is written with her own understanding and experiences of Camphill. Johanna here also makes the point that ‘good’ practical work can exist beyond the confines of places named Camphill and that equally for her good practical work is the most important aspect of working in Camphill. Finally she suggests that by following the pillars it is even possible that ‘bad’ practical work might and has been the outcome. As I discussed earlier, both Blair Drummond and Corbenic experienced this first-hand with resultant internal strife, burn out and acrimonious leaving. Also as Geoffrey told me, Blair Drummond had been a place of last resort whilst it continued in the old ways, whereas now with

care being the primary focus they were the place of first choice *for parents and the council*. The idea being presented here is that too zealous a focus on Camphill pillars can detract from the provision of ‘good’ care. Just as Loch Arthur is often cited by staff of Blair Drummond and Corbenic as more Camphill, Blair Drummond, Corbenic and Ochil Tower cite themselves as places of ‘excellent practice’. What this actually entails is very dependent on who one speaks to, but placing the child/adult at the centre of the work is often the most obvious and crucial point made by staff. This means that my three field sites may question their Camphill identity whilst simultaneously doing ‘good care work’. The two it would seem are separate things. Basically, we do good care but other places are better at Camphill seems to be the point here. Such a distinction is interesting particularly in light of the fact that the early ‘pillars’ of Camphill (as I will demonstrate) place care of the disabled child as of profound significance, and these were written long before present-day standards of care or inspection bodies existed. However, the conflation of the name Camphill with the ‘pillars’ of Camphill and ‘bad’ practice is interesting, particularly in connection with the construction of a Camphill identity, deviant or otherwise. It also suggests that being Camphill has to have more than just care of the child/adult and this is something I discuss in greater detail in Chapter Four and Five.

As already mentioned by Johanna, the three ‘pillars’ of Camphill as articulated by König are College Meetings, the Bible Evening and Economic Fellowship. The evidence of the ‘pillars’ in my field-sites varied and were often not immediately and visibly apparent. Ochil Tower School engaged only in economic fellowship, while some houses in Corbenic had Bible evenings, and in Blair Drummond (deviance personified) none of the ‘pillars’ existed as originally determined. However, neither Corbenic nor Ochil Tower are challenged as deviant. That people there internally question its identity is clear, but that others deride their lack of ‘Camphillness’ is not as apparent as it is with Blair Drummond. Having said that, Lizzie told me that when she decided to come to Ochil Tower from another Camphill she was told that it was a ‘good school, but not a proper Camphill’ (Fieldnotes, 22 October), which suggests again that belonging and being a ‘proper’ Camphill is heavily dependent on whom

one is talking to and their particular ideas about what constitutes a ‘real’ Camphill identity.

The fact that Ochil Tower and Corbenic are almost universally accepted as Camphill practitioners despite the lack of cohesive adherence to the ‘pillars’, suggests that other equally important social activities are attached to a Camphill identity. These ‘hidden pillars’ are often unremarked upon, but I would argue that they are just as crucial. It is, for instance, also possible to suggest that as König et al were such central figures in the running and maintenance of Camphill through their active practical involvement, much of a Camphill identity was literally invested in the body of the Leader. This would suggest that the pillars only capture the more formal and philosophical/ideological tenets of Camphill life, but fail to offer guidance on those precepts of Camphill that were established through living and doing rather than written edicts.²⁶ As a result the ‘pillars’ were part of the early articulation of a Camphill identity²⁷ and fail to offer sufficient guidance for the Camphill of the twenty-first century with its specific challenges and issues. However, it is important to be aware of the actual form that these ‘pillars’ took because this is used by people within my three sites to confirm their deviant Camphill identity as well as being used by external Camphill observers.

In his 1960 book on ‘the Camphill Movement,’ König as the founder of Camphill states the following regarding the College Meetings:

For many years we have experienced the great importance of our College Meetings. Every week the staff of a house or of a whole estate meet in order to discuss one of the children under their care. The child’s case history is read, and then the teachers, helpers and nurses give their reports and impressions of the child in question. Many symptoms, signs and features are collected until – usually under the guidance of one of the doctors – the images of the child arises. His habits, achievements, faults and failures are

²⁶ I discuss the idea of embodied Camphill in more detail in Chapter Five.

²⁷ For more discussion on the early beginnings of Camphill, see König, 1960; Müller-Wiedemann, 1990; Selg, 2008 & Bock, 2004.

laid out in such a way that gradually a complete picture of his individuality appears. The fundamental indication that *Rudolf Steiner* gave on the being of man are the compass we follow. If such a College Meeting succeeds, it is the result of the common effort of everyone who takes part in it (König, 1960: 32-33).

Simply put, the College Meetings – which did not take place in adult communities – served to unite the various people who cared for the child, to collate their information, and from there to work out the best approach to educating and healing the child in body, mind and spirit. The approach owes much of its genesis to the work of Rudolf Steiner, who was the inspiration for König and the other founding members who fled the Nazification of Europe to Scotland and there began the formation and structuring of Camphill Communities (Selg, 2008; Müller-Wiedeman, 1990). The development of the College Meetings was therefore as much about the child as about the “appropriate way of studying Anthroposophia” (König, 1960:32) as a common and shared experience within the Camphill Movement and an “ever renewed spiritual event” (König, 1960:32). Etymologically, anthroposophy can be simply understood as the ‘wisdom of man.’ It is also an esoteric philosophy which postulates the existence of a spiritual world that can be understood and grasped through ‘inner work’ by “practising rigorous forms of ethical and cognitive self-discipline, concentration, and meditation; in particular, a person’s moral development must precede the development of spiritual faculties” (McDermott, 2007:7).

The lack of College Meetings at Ochil Tower School raises the interesting question as to whether the educational forms of child development advocated by König are of actual practical relevance to those co-workers living and working in a twenty-first century school and culture. The College Meetings were also seen as the “wellspring of our curative educational work” (König, 1960:33), with curative education as created by König being a distinct form of educational practice to be employed when working with children with additional support needs. Therefore in Ochil Tower many of the young co-workers who enroll in the degree course at Aberdeen are expected to

practically evidence how they are using Curative Education, and more recently Social Pedagogy²⁸ in their daily work with pupils at the School. This is strongly supported by many of the more senior co-workers who act as ‘practice tutors,’ as some have spent decades working with the principles of Curative Education (Fieldnotes 28 November). It was suggested by some co-workers (Fieldnotes 18 May, 29 November) that the College Meetings have been replaced by the many other meetings that occur around the child. In Ochil Tower School, a pupil has twice yearly annual reviews in which a panoply of people gather to discuss the child’s development. Such meetings also take place at Corbenic and Blair Drummond and include parents, carers, educational psychologists, social workers, doctors etc (Fieldnotes, 24 March, 6 June, and 13 December). College meetings it could therefore be suggested have been superseded by a different type of person-centred meeting. In fact basing the legitimation of a Camphill identity on the presence or absence of College Meetings is something I have not witnessed or heard, suggesting that this logic is accepted. It is much more common to hear people making a living/working Camphill distinction, alongside generalized othering that negatively positions a particular person and place and does not provide a space for active resistance to such labelling (Becker, 1963; Goffman, 1961).

The next ‘pillar’ as constructed and written about by König is the Bible Evening. This is a weekly occurrence on a Saturday evening, where each House community meets in preparation for Sunday. The house community members gather round a table upon which is set a lit candle, and a simple supper of bread, salt and juice is eaten. Throughout this people speak about the events of the past week and finish the evening with a reading from the Gospel which will be read the following day at the Sunday Services. Inner preparation for the Bible Evening takes place in the week preceding, by reading the designated chapter from the Gospel; this is so that those who can, share the experiences they had when reading the particular verse. The aim of the Bible Evening is to create a strong bond between the co-workers in the House

²⁸ Curative Education is where the three-fold nature of the development of the child is theoretically and practically studied. By three-fold, I refer to König’s idea that the child/person is composed of body, soul and spirit. For greater discussion on this read König, 1994; König, 2010 and König, 2008 where the social and spiritual development of the child with special needs is discussed. I explore this in more detail in Chapter Five.

and to unite them in common purpose. It is also so that any personal difficulties between co-workers are overcome through this uniting together in “devotion to Christ and to his fellowmen” (König, 1960:37). Through this preparation, the Sunday Services for the children and teenagers are properly prepared events which have become an integral part of the Camphill Movement (König, 1960: 36-37).

This was the aim of the Bible Evening according to König, and the significance of the event was highlighted to me by both Laura and John, early generation Camphillers now retired at Ochil Tower School. After an exhausting week working with extremely challenging children, the Bible Evenings were seen as a breath of fresh air and a new lease of life which made the onset of another working week bearable: ‘Without the Bible Evenings I would not have had the energy to get through the week,’ Laura stated (Fieldnotes 20 May), a view that was repeated by Anthony who had practised Bible Evenings in his previous community before coming to Ochil Tower. Rebecca, however, was much more prosaic and pointed out the ‘ridiculous’ amount of preparation that went into the evening. On Saturdays the entire House had to be cleaned, the special Bible Evening bread made (reminiscent of Jewish challah), ‘Sunday’ clothes cleaned and ironed, the settling of children by the designated time, so that come the Bible Evening meal people are completely exhausted and wanting to fall into bed (Fieldnotes, 16 June). Due perhaps to the school’s fortnightly calendar of pupils returning home and also to a general lack of interest in the practice, Bible Evenings played no part in the School’s weekly structure (Fieldnotes, 30 June). In addition König’s related stipulation that Bible Evenings were a preparation for the following Sunday Services is inapplicable at the School, because they hold the Children and Youth Services on a Friday afternoon before the majority of pupils go home for the weekend (Fieldnotes, 8 February). However, what this makes clear is that although the Bible Evening proper does not happen at the School, the subsequent element of the Service does. Ludwig also claimed he read a lecture by Steiner every day (Fieldnotes, 12 May), but he was the only person I met who stated such devoted intent. At Corbenic, a Steiner reading group existed to read and discuss certain key lectures, I attended one session but it

was not always a regular event due – I was told – to the difficulties of timetabling to ensure everyone was free for a particular evening (Fieldnotes, 25 June).

Regarding Bible Evenings at Corbenic, while I observed certain activities that were geared towards a Bible Evening, I never observed a Bible Evening proper myself, due to the sporadic nature of the event and that not all houses in Corbenic did this. The Bakery still made Bible Evening buns every Friday for the Saturday Bible Evening, though the Baker knew that most houses ate the buns on Friday evenings and did not use them for Bible Evening (Fieldnotes, 8 June). In one House, I saw the printed out Bible reading verses and the little salt dish for sprinkling salt on the broken buns still lying on the table in the sitting room. When I asked about this I was told they had had Bible Evening the previous evening as the residents had asked for it, an often repeated explanation for anything cultural or ritualistic in the daily structure and something I discuss in greater detail in Chapter Four (Fieldnotes, 29 May).

The final ‘pillar’ of the Camphill Movement as presented by König is that of Economic Fellowship, which is linked to Steiner’s ‘Fundamental Social Law’ and termed earlier in this chapter as trust money. The pure aim was that co-workers should not receive salaries for their work but have an allocated amount of shared ‘pocket money’ divided between the respective house communities and the co-workers who lived there. The money itself came from the fees for the children and adults and was paid by Local Authorities from their annual budget. Co-workers did not own the cars present at their specific Camphill place but could use them, often on a rota basis. Equally they did not own the Houses, cutlery, crockery or furnishings that made up the common living areas. In this way, the geographically bounded estate and the name attached to it are the owners of goods and properties that are to be democratically used by the staff. As König (1960: 45-46) puts it:

We try to arrange our lives in accordance with the Fundamental Social Law which Rudolf Steiner phrased in this way: ‘In a society of individuals who are working together, the less the individual claims for himself the fruits of his

own work – that is, the more of these fruits he makes over to his colleagues and the more his own requirements are satisfied not from his own work but from the work of others – the greater will be the wellbeing of that society’ ... Basically, however, it is necessary that every member of a work community is kept fully informed of everything which belongs to the economic field and structure of his environment. Only if this is done will a colleague be able to feel a sense of responsibility for his work, because he will see it as part of a greater whole. He can then participate in the spirit of community ... The single individual may possess whatever he may wish. He might still feel the need to own furniture, books, capital; in so far as he is an individual he may be in need of earthly goods. But as a worker in the Movement he is without any property, without any income, and equal to those who work with him ... We work for the sake of work; we do not expect a return because we gradually learn to understand that the returns are gifts, a donation, an act of goodwill which the others provide for us.

Instituting a community life based on the Fundamental Social Law was a central component of making Anthroposophy a reality in social relationships, but the process of implementing this Law has evolved and changed through its many implantations and manifestations in Camphill centres around the globe (Müller-Wiedemann, 1996: 237). Within Ochil Tower, the only one of my three research sites that still lived by economic fellowship, the principle was followed but understood very differently by the senior co-workers. For Anthony, it was and is of crucial significance that within today’s ‘capitalist and profit driven society’, he does not (and never has) received a wage. Indeed it was the search for a life that adhered to these kind of ‘responsible’ socialist principles which led him to Camphill in the 1970s, and that economic fellowship still exists ‘and works’ in the twenty-first century proves to him that another way of living and working is possible (Fieldnotes, 19 May). In contrast, Shirley argued that the idea that they did not get paid was nonsense, because senior staff had access to funds (and a credit card) that could cover all their material needs and extras (Fieldnotes, 13 May). This attitude was carried further by Sam, who was the only Houseparent paid an annual wage at Ochil Tower. In consultation with the

four joint co-ordinators, he had requested this because it was important for him to pay taxes and engage critically with Government parties and policies (Fieldnotes, 14 May). However, he suggested that if annual salaries became the norm in the School, the connection between salaries and hours worked might become an issue, with people clocking off at set times and not seeing their responsibilities as extending beyond their allocated shift, a view that was echoed by the majority of senior staff at Ochil Tower. This is in fact a subtle way of supporting the living/working binary so often cited as the reason Blair Drummond was not a Camphill and the varying interpretation of the long-term applicability of economic fellowship within Ochil Tower extended to wider more pragmatic concerns connected to succession. Fewer people now choose to live by the principles of economic fellowship, which resulted in the increase in employment as evidenced in Blair Drummond and Corbenic. Since my fieldwork in 2009, I have noticed through my regular repeat visits to Ochil Tower an increase in the amount of employed staff, as the four joint co-ordinators recognise their advancement towards retirement and the need to replace an old and potentially redundant structure with a structure that works in the present day context (Fieldnotes, 19 October).

As I have indicated, the three ‘pillars’ of Camphill are no longer practised in their pure form at any of my three research sites. However, at the same time the absence of these led people within Ochil Tower to question their Camphill identity, much as the living/working binary was presented to and by Blair Drummond staff as an irrefutable indication that they were not a Camphill. What these perspectives have in common is that they are all expressed by staff members either within the specific Camphill or from outwith the Camphill. They are not the opinions of the residents or pupils within the particular Camphill places. They are not the opinion of everyone within my research sites. The following section discusses the views raised by some residents and pupils concerning the identity of their particular Camphill place.

The Other Pillars

The previous sections have explored in detail how staff within my three fieldsites articulated an understanding of Camphill identity and what it was, but most

interestingly regarding how they perceived other places as more Camphill and equally how this meant that their Camphill place might have a contested Camphill identity but could boast of good, even excellent care practice. What has been most noticeable about these presentations is that though excellent care practice was often cited as sometimes coming against the Camphill name, and that certain everyday rituals, festivals and songs were done for the residents, the residents' views on Camphill identity were absent. Often co-workers would bring up discussions about Camphill and would ask for my opinion of what I thought of their particular Camphill, during such activities as washing up after lunch, or working in the garden, or during a meal. At these times, residents and pupils would be present and those who were inclined often gave their opinions. On one memorable occasion at Corbenic, I and another resident were washing up; I was drying the dishes as she passed them to me from the sink. A young volunteer co-worker asked me what the Camphill place was like where I grew up? I had been asked this a lot in Blair Drummond and in various houses throughout my time at Corbenic. I duly responded with various anecdotes and stories. The resident, Sally, listened to my rambling chatter about Camphill when I was a child. When the co-workers questions became persistent, Sally responded with: 'I know what Camphill is, I grew up there as a child. It is my home, now stop talking about it.' The conversation duly stopped; there was nothing that I or the co-worker could possibly add to such a masterly description (Fieldnotes, 11 June).

This, as I previously mentioned, was not the only time during a washing up session that I was asked to explain my background in Camphill. On another occasion, I had somewhat stupidly mentioned that there was a dishwashing song that was apparently sung in some Camphill houses up in Aberdeen. The young co-worker in question could not believe it and begged me to sing it whilst he, I and Janet washed up. I had to disappoint him by telling him I didn't know it. Not so easily dissuaded, he then asked me to sing a Camphill March song. So I sang 'I have heard a Mother bird' and not even two bars into the song Janet joined in and we sang the song together to the end. I was genuinely surprised as she is a very quiet resident who rarely speaks and often has so called 'violent' outbursts. The Housemother who walked in whilst she

and I were singing told me that she would have sung it years ago when Blair Drummond was run along the 'old' ways. It was never sung in the time I was there, but Janet remembered it from all those years ago (Fieldnotes, 6 March).

The use of remembered songs as an enduring Camphill identity was brought to the fore on numerous occasion at Corbenic and Blair Drummond. At Ochil Tower it was less noticeable, but then this was arguably because they were educating young children who later as adults in other Camphill centres would remember the songs then. The following fieldnote examples illustrate the legacy of Ochil Tower teaching songs to pupils that though no longer sung in Blair Drummond were remembered and sung by the resident, Chris, (an ex-pupil of Ochil Tower) tune perfect.

In the Estate workshop today. Don the required overalls and outdoor shoes. Our job today will be to move the trees that Mark cut on Tuesday. Martin and Steve can't get the small tractor started initially and they spend some time fiddling about with jump leads while I stand out in the sun humming 'o lovely spring.' On repeating it, a voice joined in. Look up and see Chris singing along. Word perfect. A direct Ochil Tower legacy.

After the morning break, we move on to pruning the blackcurrant bushes. Chris and I gather all the cuttings into wheelbarrows and do two runs to the 'burn pile.' Chris loudly sings 'o lovely spring' and 'I have heard a mother bird' on the way over. He stops if I join in so I just listen to him singing. (Fieldnotes, 3rd April).

Arrive 9:30 and walk over to woodwork workshop. Apologise for being late to Ken – he shrugs it off. Sets Shaun and I up on the table outside sorting different sized wood bricks into piles. We stand in the sun sanding and sorting. Am humming and he starts asking about what kind of bands I like? Do I like Deep Purple etc? Ask him what Camphill songs he knows and we're off singing 'June lovely June' and others. Leads into a St. John play discussion and between the two of us we talk and sing out way through the

better part of the play. Can tell that we've both been in Camphill for a long time (Fieldnotes, 12 June).

What both these extracts have in common is my own knowledge of Camphill songs and through my singing of them both Chris and Shaun joined in and demonstrated excellent memories for the tune and words of the various songs and even plays. For example, I witnessed the enduring legacy of not only Camphill songs but also how movements that accompanied the song were enacted by a group of residents quite unselfconsciously.

5:45 Return to the St. John's fire. Matthew lights it. Barbara calls people to form a circle round the fire. Cathy starts singing one of the songs from the St John's play 'The Bell Song.' I join the spontaneous choir of twins, Ruth, Struan, Adam, and Gisela, all of whom have lived in Camphill for years. When the 'ringing singing' section of the song begins, all six of them suddenly join hands and start rocking backwards and forwards whilst swinging their arms in time to the music. They are making their own bell, complete with physical chiming. I recognise the movements from having done the play every summer as a child. They are quite literally in that moment the embodiment of Camphill socialisation.

These extracts demonstrate quite clearly that a particular type of Camphill identity is embodied in learned behaviour, most strongly through songs and plays. The examples show that the habit of learning such songs repetitiously over the years and then singing them with particular movements attached presents and performs a Camphill identity that is practical rather than theoretical. It is a performance of belonging and group solidarity (Crow, 2002). As Cohen suggests: "what is actually held in common is not very substantial, being form rather than content" (Cohen, 1985: 20). The form of singing and moving in time to the music. Such identity work appears in specific moments, it is contained within memory and is brought to the fore at certain moments, like at festivals or the singing of songs provoked by the presence of an inquisitive researcher. The fact that songs not sung at Blair Drummond are

remembered long after they have ceased to be sung by existing staff, shows how this type of educational socialisation is internalised as a significant norm and then performed as a public allegiance to those Camphill tropes and traits to researchers (Weber, 1978: 212-241; Jenkins, 2008: 173). The examples show that the residents engage in making a Camphill identity that is not linked to angst-ridden discussions, instead their identity claims reside in the public performance of songs and plays, themselves markers and ways of bringing diverse groups of people into a shared moment and collective space. It is literally inscribed as a bodily memory (Douglas, 1973; Lakoff & Johnson, 1999). The human body in these examples “provide[s] a basic metaphor for symbolising and imagining collective identities” (Jenkins, 2008:143). Such visibly performed signs of Camphill identity also demonstrate that there are specific things that endure despite changing staff and employment structures within different Camphill places. This is not just the residents themselves, but the cultural knowledge of practices, rituals and rules they have learned, internalised and then at certain moments re-perform (Foucault, 1975; Goffman, 1961). Disliking technology, working with anthroposophy, having a biodynamic garden/farm, working with the Pillars of Camphill may be of concern for staff across my fieldsites – the residents concern themselves with other more practically visible activities. It is important to also acknowledge that such moments expresses a different type of Camphill identity that is not reliant on clear verbal articulations of what is and isn't a Camphill. It resides in practice and ritual and as such the residents are the longest serving members of their particular Camphill, beyond the staff and co-workers they quite literally are the embodied connection between the past and the future of Camphill. As Sally bluntly put it: ‘Camphill is my home.’ It is her home in a material sense but also in the symbolic sense that she and other residents like her carry the traditions of Camphill within their bodies and memories.

This was confirmed by staff on a couple of occasions both at Blair Drummond and at Corbenic. The oft repeated ‘we do festivals/morning assemblies for the residents’ were in many ways statements of fact. Some of the staff recalled arriving at Blair Drummond and Corbenic and being made aware by the residents of how to start a meal, finish a meal and throughout the year what particular festive activities they

were supposed to engage in (Fieldnotes, 24 February, 23 May, 6 June). What this demonstrates is though staff are seen to be in charge of the welfare and management of the residents, much of the cultural life of the places was fostered by the residents. The staff then come to also see this as normal and do such activities as a matter of course. This then “contributes massively to the production and reproduction of environments of relatively predictable collective behaviour” (Jenkins, 2008: 154). Such training of staff and co-workers is so endemic that it is often unremarked on, it was only through my asking staff why certain things were done that I would get: ‘well actually when I first came here I thought all the candle lighting and singing really strange but it was the residents that did it and wanted it. So I just did it. Now it seems normal’ (Fieldnotes, 17 March; 22 June).

These accounts concern the identity work portrayed by adults. Ochil Tower is noticeably absent from this discussion, this I would suggest is due to it being a school with the pupils arriving from their home with its own ‘presenting culture’ (Goffman, 1961: 23) and becoming day, weekly and fortnightly boarders. The combination of home and school worlds is one that both staff and pupils have to negotiate. The socialisation process to embody a particular kind of Camphill knowledge like the singing of songs, everyday activities like saying graces and partaking in festivals is built into the school’s daily education. I discuss this in greater detail in Chapters Four and Five, but suffice it to say here that the learning at Ochil Tower is the foundation that is carried through the other Camphill places they may move to. Chris singing remembered Ochil Tower songs is an example of this kind of enduring legacy.

What discussions about identity with residents and pupils have shown is that their Camphill identity is centered on the public performance of past songs and plays. It is also linked to the longevity that many of the older residents have spent in the place. It is their home symbolically and materially. Such longevity results in an embodied knowledge that is then passed onto staff and staff then pass to newer residents. Such a process maintains certain types of Camphill practices. The discussions of staff about what their Camphill place lacked and whether they can ever be a Camphill is

less relevant when the knowledge of what Camphill is lies in the memories and bodies of the residents. It may seem trivial and insignificant that songs, movements and actions are remembered even when they cease to be practised, but what I think such moments show is the enduring nature of a particular kind of Camphill legacy. Employment patterns, changing care regulations, high staff turnover, the use of anthroposophy in care work, the use of technology, König's Camphill pillars – all these concerns that staff express, neglect to notice that a particular kind Camphill identity continues regardless of these issues. The other Camphill pillars go about their daily life and work in the spaces of their *homes*, they are the living embodiment of past traditions carried on in the present and continued as long as they live to the future (Snellgrove, 2012: 6).

Conclusion

What this chapter has explored is that the idea of what Camphill is and notions of Camphill identity change and move according to whom one is speaking, observing and what one is participating in. This chimes with other work on identity that suggests such claims are never static but continually made and remade by particular people and in particular ways (Blenkinsop, 2012). The discussion about Camphill deviance uses practical examples, such as lack of College meeting, biodynamic gardening or a traditional family structure, to contrast with the everyday practices in their own Camphill. What was perhaps surprising is that the actual everyday activities staff and co-workers engaged in were seen as simply 'the way things are done.' Very few of my informants ever mentioned how their everyday structures and activities were a part of the making and remaking of their identity; instead such activities were often explained as being done for the benefit of children and residents (Fieldnotes 2009) and not as an integral part of their Camphill's everyday identity.

In contrast, these everyday activities, rituals and material things were how some of the residents and pupils would perform and articulate what constituted a Camphill identity. Financially all three of my fieldsites and Camphill places in general, rely on the economic income that the children/adults bring to the places. Without the pupils

and residents there would be no financially viable Camphill and the role residents and pupils in the cultural life of the places is crucial.

What these fieldwork examples demonstrate is that regardless of their centrality to the continued existence of Camphill in the twenty-first century, residents' views alongside everyday rules and rituals do not overcome the continued identity questions that currently grip Camphill places in the UK, despite the very real fuzzy boundaries between the worlds of staff, resident/pupils and researcher. The question 'what is a Camphill?' is simple, but life in Camphill places makes the answer to the question largely dependent on whom one is speaking to, their relative positions of importance within the Camphill place itself and how that place is viewed within the wider Scottish and UK Camphill family.

In Chapters Four and Five I continue to explore these issues and suggest that much of the everyday Camphill work is crucially linked to ideas around what constitutes the social. The identity work discussed in this chapter takes place in social spaces and as such has been subject to certain norms and rules about deviance and othering for example. In the subsequent chapters I argue that the material spaces of Camphill alongside the everyday work with pupils/residents are primarily concerned with educating people into becoming socially active and functioning people within not only Camphill's formal cultural life but also within normative social settings. The questioning of what constitutes a Camphill is part of a wider project of becoming social. It is in essence a way to make sense of and understand the social spaces and the people that make the world of Camphill. Camphill at basis is a place where knowing and understanding what Camphill is, is the ability to recognise the social development of the individual. I argue this in Chapter Five and end here by stating that the deviance debates and the debates around embodied Camphill cultural learning happen because of this ongoing socialisation process. Camphill is a small microcosm of society and within society there are always those who are identified as being on the boundary (Durkheim, 1952), whether this is just or right is not the issue, the fact is that such people and groups exist, changing over time and place but ultimately serving an important social function which is to be the deviance against

which the norms are established. If the *raison d'être* of Camphill is the task of teaching people to become social then it follows that the questioning of who and what we are, whether as a group or an individual, is simply a part of the ongoing process of socialisation.



Chapter Four

Identifying Camphill



Introduction

This chapter continues the discussion of Camphill identity, and explores discussions about how identity takes place against a backdrop of a highly structured ritualised everyday life, complete with adherence to seasonal festivals, morning verses, graces at meals, songs and so on. This ritualised life and the significant way in which it constructed everyday Camphill life for staff, residents and pupils was rarely used to explain Camphill identity. Indeed it seemed the everyday activities were simply an unremarked banal and largely taken for granted part of Camphill life (Billig, 1995; Garfinkel, 1991). However, as I suggest, such repetitive practice is a core element of everyday identity work within my three Camphill fieldsites.

This was further evidenced in the way the houses, workshops and other festive events made use of a particular kind of materiality to shape and define those moments and events as a particular kind of Camphill identity which was almost taken for granted. The kind of things I am talking about are signs, headed notepaper, computer fonts (see chapter headings), pictures, door knobs, flowers and candles to name a few, that shape the spaces in houses and Halls in very particular ways. In the previous chapter I looked at how the written Camphill ‘pillars’ and expressed ideas about non-conformity existed alongside residents’ social actions on Camphill and shaped and constructed particular ideas about what a Camphill identity was and was not. Camphill identity was located in the other; in the various ways my fieldsites did

and did not do what was constructed as key signifiers of Camphillness. I continue this theme of a place being and not being a Camphill but in reference to Camphill's materiality. As I will demonstrate, Blair Drummond continues its ambiguous status despite being a place saturated in material identifiers unique to Camphill. Indeed, often reference to material things was dismissed as 'outer forms with no inner meaning' (Fieldnotes, 18th October, 9th May, 24th March). What I wish to suggest here is these 'outer forms' signify belonging to a particular cultural aesthetic, but this is again not enough to silence certain critics within both Blair Drummond and the other research sites.

The use of material things takes broadly two forms. There is the banal use of things such as the previously mentioned headed notepaper, signs, door frames and lampshades, chairs for example. The presence of such things in Blair Drummond was brought up by critics as 'all that remained'. In contrast, there is the 'attention to detail' approach, where considerable time and energy is invested by informants to create seasonal tables and hanging branches, flower arrangements and the appropriate positioning of candles, with the reasoning behind such things articulated as 'it's for the residents/children' and 'if done at all it should be done properly' (Fieldnotes, 16th March, 30th October). The material life of my three research sites was rich and detailed and carried within it the weight of tradition and the shadows of previous weighty Camphillers. In this way the current staff, co-workers and residents living with these things also live with the identity of the past in the present. Dant (1999: 2) suggests that "material culture ties us to others ... in a more concrete way than language use or direct interaction." However, what I observed at my research sites is that the interaction between things and people is a relativised relationship, with some things seen as more important than others (Rowland, 2005). In other words, objects are ideas in tangible form and to explore the ways people use things to solidify boundaries of belonging and 'proper' versus woolly practise is the aim of this chapter.

The use of the material also takes on another form and that is in the presence of food, most dominantly through meals. Food, as I will demonstrate, "is both an essential

and mundane part of everyday life and our familiarity with it can mean that we often pay little attention to the meanings and actions that surround it” (Punch et al, 2009: 1). Within Camphill settings, the study of food offers fascinating insights into the social life of the places and the relationships between staff/co-workers and residents/pupils. Food acts, not only from a functional perspective of nourishment and sustenance, but also on a symbolic level, to demonstrate care and build relationships (Punch et al 2009: 1). Equally food and food practices are a medium whereby hierarchical relationships within the Camphill place can be reaffirmed and solidified. Furthermore the construction of the meal is an importance space within which to learn how to be social. Crucially this chapter explores how Camphill’s material aesthetics shape how life is lived and understood, whether this be through the banal use of objects or the regulation of food consumption and practice. This chapter also adds another layer to the ongoing formation and understanding of what it means to be a Camphill place and how such notions are constructed and lived. Crucially, it demonstrates how Camphill identity is located in repetitive practices in particular social contexts.

Camphill Images

I discussed in Chapter Three how Blair Drummond’s troublesome status was explained through verbal attacks made by other Camphill staff but also articulated by some staff members within Blair Drummond itself. That this view was not shared by long-standing residents, nor was it of interest to many residents, remained publically unacknowledged and not part of the wider rhetoric of non-conformity that Blair Drummond was subject to. Alongside this, Chapter Three pointed out that both Corbenic and Ochil Tower questioned what it meant to be a Camphill place, with the name Camphill often set against ‘excellent care practice’ standards. What I will explore in this chapter is the surprising similarity across my three field sites in their use of banal Camphill identifiers and I will argue that these material things are best understood through a visual lens and not the written word. In this way the reader can engage with the visual aspects, much as the people living and working in the places engage with them. They are seen, and were only commented on when I in a research capacity pointed them out. This is not about representative illustration. It is most

strongly connected with things that tell a story, and it may often concern a story that contradicts a narrative that is coming to be regarded as something of a truth. In Blair Drummond's instance, the material saturation and Camphill legacies that adorn walls, cupboards, halls and ritualised practice tell a different story from the one of readily expressed and self-confirmed difference. As Miller suggests, "if we can learn to listen to these things we have access to an authentic other voice. Yes, also contrived, but in a different way from that of language" (Miller, 2008: 2). What focusing in this way also achieves is levelling the hierarchy of prevalence on the oral views regarding Camphill identity. Such a focus on the materiality of Camphill allows the silences to appear as much as words (Gordon, 2008), but it does not anthropomorphise objects and attribute agency to them (Gell, 1998). Instead it is concerned with how people engage (or don't engage) with these things and how such engagements reveal the contextual and mediated nature of Camphill identity processes. It therefore links back to the kind of identity work that residents and pupils engage in (discussed in Chapter Three), which are often unspoken actions and performed social behaviours. I discuss this kind of identity work over the coming pages.

To reach Blair Drummond I had to drive through approximately half a mile of parkland down a long avenue of mature oak trees. The road twisted and turned and I slowly drove up to the clearly marked entrance where a large sign stated 'Camphill Blair Drummond.' It was written in red and the font was in a style I was familiar with. I call it a Camphill font, but its official name is Sagittar. This was not the first time I had seen it. During my Master's research the same font was used at the entrance to Ochil Tower School, on their headed notepaper and in song books among other uses. When I arrived at Corbenic there too was a sign in the same font, as well as headed notepaper and signs to a workshop also written in this particular style. Blair Drummond, Corbenic, and Ochil Tower all had signs in the front of their Houses again in this font. I am using it throughout my thesis for chapter headings and sub-headings.

The Sagittar font is often used together with the Camphill logo (seen in chapter headings), and serves to present a particular stylistic image to friends, social workers, funding bodies, both in correspondence and when they first arrive at a Camphill place. I noticed it when I first arrived at Blair Drummond and it made me smile. Not so deviant after all, was my initial thought. When I parked my car in front of the castle and buzzed my way to the office, I was let in through the front entrance and whilst climbing the stairs was confronted with a layered painting²⁹ displayed above the oak panelling and covering every available space. When I was walking towards the Library, I passed more of these layered paintings on twelve foot high canvases down the length of the corridor. The effect was a little overwhelming. The pictures were of a knight on a horse meeting a person who seemed to be composed of light. Different stages of the knight's journey were shown. I then entered the Library where more of the layered paintings hung above the bookcases. I quickly discovered that the castle at Blair Drummond was literally infested with these paintings. It was impossible to move for them. One of the houses even had their door panels painted in this style, whilst the walls were also covered in more layered painting stories. The paintings were not new, and with some of the door panels the paint was worn through. Again, I saw these paintings as *confirmation* of Blair Drummond's Camphill identity, having seen many such similar paintings as a child and also in my Master's research at Ochil Tower School (Fieldnotes February – June 2008).

There are three paintings shown in the photographs below. The first is one of the paintings that hangs on the main staircase of Blair Drummond with others along the Gallery and in the Library. The second and third are paintings from Ochil Tower and Corbenic. All were done by distinctive Camphill artists and are in the main areas that guests and those visiting these three places would walk past and see. They act, as what Goffman calls, as an 'institutional display' and reveal much about the 'symbolisation process' involved by making a substantive and significant point about the life and history of the place. This means much "more than a simple contrast

²⁹ 'Layer Painting' is a particular style of painting where one very thin layer of watercolour is painted on the paper/canvas and then left to dry. Then another layer is added in the same or different colours. The result is that trees/sky/people can appear three dimensional with the viewer able to look 'through' the painting.

between display and reality” (Goffman, 1961: 99). In this instance the paintings are done by well-known ‘Camphill’ artists (Herman Gross and David Newbatt), something which ties all three places together in their use of the artists’ work as a legitimating Camphill factor. Indeed in many of the other Camphill places I have visited, the main Halls and reception areas also contain at least one (if not more) paintings by either Newbatt or Gross. These pictures alongside the ubiquitous photos of König, Steiner and other founding members (discussed in Chapter One) suggest not only a tangible link to the past but also a collective link between Camphill places within the UK and possibly across the world. As Gell (1998) argues, where these objects are hung, by whom, and that they continue to stay in these prominent places, reveals a level of intentionality and significance that transcends present-day identity concerns. The use of these Camphill paintings are important for the often silent and unremarked but nonetheless resonant role they play in presenting a particular aesthetic to visitors from the outside world and also to the staff, pupils and residents who live their lives beside and beneath them. This is particularly pertinent as the material spaces and pictures are not *owned* in the traditional sense by the people who live with them. Rather they have often been hung and painted some time in the past and simply carry on being there. The cultural aesthetic of the single artist becomes the cultural aesthetic of an entire building and a recognisable Camphill art form. Such materiality becomes a collective way of visibly identifying Camphill. As Baudrillard (1996: 26) suggests such materiality has “neither an owner, nor a mere user – rather [it is] an active engineer of atmosphere.” This was very true of the hallway in Blair Drummond where the building was literally saturated with material Camphillness. The fact that their materiality was often dismissed shows how people have ceased to recognise the ways the paintings construct their social spaces. The paintings have simply become an internalised norm (Foucault, 1975).



A three piece David Newbatt painting, hanging on Blair Drummond's main stairway.



A David Newbatt painting in Ochil Tower's Main school building.



A Herman Gross painting in Corbenic's Main meeting room.

The wall art of Camphill was not the only material feature which embodies a particular kind of Camphill identity. There are other things in all three of field sites, particularly in the different houses, that further demonstrate a visual and material Camphill identity. There are knobs on the kitchen cupboard doors that I have only ever seen in Camphill houses. Ercol chairs covered in purple wool covers that were a favourite when I was a child in Camphill, alongside lampshades with a distinctive asymmetric design, are again prevalent in the main areas of Blair Drummond and Corbenic, though less so in Ochil Tower (see below).



These banal and other unremarked on things shape the spaces of my three fieldwork sites in particular ways. Whilst staff across the sites would comment unfavourably on the ‘institutional’ and ‘sterile feel’ of other residential care locations, they did not point out that their own places had as much of an ‘institutional feel’ to them, only this was done through pictures, distinctive lamps, odd door knobs and purple wool chairs (Fieldnotes, 18 February, 23 May; 16 November). These materialities, alongside the extensive grounds and large castles/hunting lodges, is the image of Camphill most readily and easily consumed by visiting parents, social workers, care inspectors and other members of the public. Goffman suggests that such a display “whatever its audience, can also convey to inmates that they are connected with what is the best institution of its kind” (Goffman, 1961: 98). This is an important point. Many staff, residents and pupils spoke about their Camphill place being ‘the best,’ whether this was in terms of care or not. These visual and material Camphill things present in the three field sites are what the visitor is going to see as the presentation of self on behalf of Camphill, which makes the lack of comment about the crucial role that this plays in a Camphill identity quite striking. As Rowland (2005) suggests, perhaps some things and objects are seen as having greater significance and are more important than others. This is encapsulated in the following fieldnote extracts and accompanying photograph.

George is sick so the bakery is being run by Tim. He is 21 from East Germany and on his civil service year. He was a banker before he came to Blair Drummond and had done some research on what Camphill was. Yet when he arrived in Blair Drummond there was very little of what he had

expected Camphill to be. He thought there would be more communal events and not switching on a DVD in the evening. Also the lack of live-in staff made it less of a 'real' Camphill. The only thing that he sees as Camphill is the picture in the bakery (see below). It is a layer painting and there are many of them all over the castle. (Fieldnotes, 23 February).



... Spend the hour of rest hour perched on an armchair listening to Paolo wax lyrical about Camphill. First he tells me all about his business in London, the degrees he started in Edinburgh and Stirling, his travels to Brazil etc. Am tired and try not to nod off as he chatters on. Tells me all about how Matthew (who apparently left two Scottish Camphills under a cloud) really worked with anthroposophy. 'How' I ask? 'Just the way he was with the residents' is Paolo's response. He tells me about a trip to Aberdeen and the beautiful new Hall in Newton Dee with its huge and distinctively Camphill shaped window. The 'relics' I see around me in Blair Drummond; 'the pictures, lamps and door knobs are all that is left here'. I look at the dusty lamp and wonder if indeed it is an apt metaphor for Camphill identity in Blair Drummond. Also find it curious that it keeps getting brought up, the lack of it and what people understand 'it' to be. Contrast this with Dwayne and his statement about how rewarding it is to work in Blair Drummond and how Blair Drummond is

better than the Aberdeen Camphills if I want to see how challenging learning disabilities are managed (Fieldnotes, 16 March).

These two fieldnote extracts raise the ongoing issues about Camphill identity discussed in Chapter Three. The lack of anthroposophy, the role of technology in Camphill identity, how employment undermines the ‘family feeling,’ the idea that good care comes at the expense of an unquestioned Camphill identity – all of these are and were continually raised at my time in Blair Drummond and in other ways at Corbenic and Ochil Tower. Those issues aside, what both Paolo and Tim point out is their awareness of the visual materiality around them and how it suggests a Camphill identity that they feel is lacking in Blair Drummond. In order to make this point valid, however, the lampshades, pictures etc have to be undermined. As Rowland (2005) suggests, they are not deemed as important as something else, no matter how prevalent and endemic throughout Blair Drummond and across my field sites such visual materialities are. Though these things are crucial to the public consumption of a Camphill identity, internal identity questions about the role of material things in Camphill are significant in very specific ways. They crop up in particular activities - with considerable energy invested on the part of staff and residents to maintain these particular things as significant and special to Camphill. I discuss this next.

Attention to Detail

If an old Camphiller were asked to describe an object that encapsulates Camphill, the answer would in all probability be a candle. The humble candle adorns book covers, book titles, is symbolic of Camphill striving against all the odds, and its physical presence was prevalent in many of the Houses and Halls throughout my fieldwork encounters. Candles were lit at the start of Morning Assembly and School Assemblies, at Evening Circle, before meals, when putting children to bed, even before meetings (Fieldnotes, 18 May, 24 June, and 6 December). The candle is so endemic and so built into Camphill’s daily life that jokes were made by some of my research informants around describing Camphill as a place of ‘candles and sandals’ (Fieldnotes, 14 March).

During my fieldwork in Ochil Tower in the months leading up to Christmas, candles were simply everywhere. The standard candle sitting in the middle of the supper table was of course always there, but now other candles appeared on Advent wreaths, Advent logs, Advent apples, and in one house candles were placed amongst fir and pine cone branches around the sitting room. This use of the candle culminated in the grand lighting of the Christmas tree midway through the Christmas play, just after the Christ is born. Real candles adorning a sixteen foot high Douglas fir tree were lit by pupils and co-workers, under the amazed and somewhat fearful gaze of family and friends (Fieldnotes, 18 December).

This focus on the use of the candle amounted to an almost obsessive mantra of ‘attention to detail’ or ‘doing things properly’ as articulated by more senior staff. This meant that not only was the candle used repeatedly on a daily basis, but also other things such as a season table, season branches, vases with seasonal flowers, and festive books and cards would be also displayed in the dining rooms, main hallways and sitting rooms of the different houses in the school (see the photographs following).



A Halloween season table and Autumn alcove.



A dining room decorated with an Advent wreath, Advent logs, a seasonal table and dresser and many, many candles.



A classroom in the School, complete with a ceramic Advent candle bowl.



Making seasonal ribbon stars during rest-hour after lunch.

There are many more visual images and materialities from my time at Ochil Tower School where candles alongside other seasonal decorations were maintained by staff, and not just any staff but by the Housemothers. Of the five houses in the school which routinely displayed seasonal tables, four of them were run predominantly by women who engaged in this material labour. The one house that was run by a man had the ubiquitous candle on the dining table but lacked a season table (Fieldnotes, October–December 2009). Why, the reader might ask, are these material things invested with such labour and time? The answers given always referred back to the children: ‘It is done for the benefit of the pupils.’ And: ‘It is important for our pupils to experience the rhythmical passing of the year and that is why we do this,’ or: ‘It provides children with a structure not only to their day but also in the spaces that they live’ (Fieldnotes, 28 October, 12 November, 11 December). As mentioned in earlier chapters this focus on the pupils or residents as an explanation for cultural practice and material activities was engaged in at all of my three field sites. Particularly activities such as Assemblies and Festivals that were deemed by both staff and residents to be important were explained as being done purely for the benefit of those in care. However, what such an explanation obscures is that:

Those with power will attempt to impose particular ways of doing and seeing which serve to disguise the labour process. However those with power, and the strategies they invoke, are not only riven by internal factions and tensions, but are dependent upon some degree of acceptance by those without power and must perforce take on board their reactions, contestations and subversions (Bender, 2002: 142)

The use of objects within Camphill should therefore not be seen as an attempt to fetishise things, but rather reveals the more subtle connections between the hierarchical values and individual lives which are often tangibly exposed in the mundane taken for granted artefacts that litter people’s lives. In this way, the particular material qualities of the object serves to naturalise what is in effect an ongoing struggle between assumed and negotiated social processes and identity constructions (Miller, 1998:9, Jenkins, 2008). As a result, understandings of power

are not some philosophical abstraction but rather concern how materiality contributes to how particular people become 'realised' sometimes at the expense of others (Miller, 2005:19). This realisation of the artefacts and dynamics of power therefore can be traced through the often symbolic uses of objects and also their ritualised uses as collective property (Cohen, 1994). This requires greater clarification. For a person to be 'realised' in my fieldwork examples, required the use of these significantly regarded material things, such as candle lighting and the saying of verses during morning and evening circle/assembly. Not only do these material symbols make attachment to a specific group obvious, they also signal attachment to the place and ethos by directly using and engaging with the normatively ascribed things that make up daily life (for example the seasonal tables, candles and festivals, to name just a few). In so doing, they reinforce the particular hierarchies of the place, but also directly support and create the apparent naturalness of why certain people and things matter more than others. As Bender (2002) points out, this is not a seamless process but rather one full of negotiation and subversion, with the background that of educational school and residential training facilities for children and adults with additional support needs, as the following fieldnote example makes clear.

I had been at Blair Drummond for over four weeks and had attended about twenty Morning Assemblies, where the majority of Blair Drummond staff and residents gather in the Library for the recitation of a verse by Steiner, seasonally appropriate singing and announcements for the week ahead. This format had remained generally the same, though some days there were flowers and a candle on a small table in the middle of the Library. Other days the flowers and candle were absent, and on yet others the candle was present but remained unlit throughout the Assembly (Fieldnotes, 16 February – 16 March). On 17 March, that changed:

People slowly arrive. Heather lights the candle, which sits on a low table in the middle of the room. With the movement of people into the room the candle has gone out. James points this out and that it needs to be lit. Dom lights it. Everyone is assembled and waiting ... I wonder if the 'responsible' person who starts the assembly is missing, but then James stands by the table

with the candle and clearly says 'good morning.' We all respond. He then presents the meetings and appointments that are happening today without the aid of the diary sheet. He then announces that there is to be no rushing out after the verse has been said and that only when the candle has been snuffed will we all exit. Sarah is then asked to read the poem and bidden by James to do so standing. She reads, we then all stand for the 'March song' and Steiner verse. After the 'good morning' a few residents make to move, James calls them back to their seats and then Jeff snuffs the candle. People exit.

James is directly opposite me so I comment in passing on the changed format to Assembly. He tells me that they (workshop and house leaders, managers) decided in a meeting last week that the Assembly needed to be worked on. It had got very woolly and loose and more structure needed to be introduced. It was decided that those who felt they could 'hold' the event would take charge as opposed to leaving it in the hands of the Houses where it was rushed through in an often embarrassed and incoherent manner. Continues on that over the last few years the rhythm of the event had lapsed due to various issues, but when he first came to Blair Drummond it was not like that. They want to bring that back.

Why I ask?

Because the day is so full, he states, rushing from one thing to the next, from breakfast to Assembly, to workshops and then back to the Houses for lunch. Assembly is meant to provide a moment of calm, peace and the possibility for reflection before the day commences properly. He says a more structured Assembly lets the residents know that 'now the day has begun.' It is an opportunity to see the resident in a different light and how much is communicated without language (Fieldnotes, 17 March).

Of course the change implemented that first time did not happen seamlessly. Many people had become used to moving out the door the minute the verse was finished, so that getting people to wait for the snuffing of the candle was initially tricky. Interestingly most people, both staff and residents, did remember and it was only when staff forgot and moved early that the majority of residents also moved. During

my remaining time at Blair Drummond, the staff who ‘held’ the Morning Assembly made a real effort to adhere to the new structure. I left before it had become as normalised and unremarked upon an event as the Monday Morning Assembly at Ochil Tower School, but there was a visible change to how the Assembly was carried and the form it took.

The key thing about these types of events is that they make clear not only the hierarchy of power within the Camphill places, but also how the focus on objects such as candles and verses are used as ways to train people concerning when to stand and sit, when to be silent and when to speak. As James and many other people said throughout my fieldwork, it is done for the adults/pupils because of prevailing ideas about how the self within adults and children is to be fostered, nurtured and socialised into being, and consequently these events are an important part of that socialisation process. In such instances applying Foucauldian (1975) notions of disciplinary power and self-surveillance goes some way to explaining how such moments can appear natural and beyond social construction, but ignores the manifold reasons as to why someone complies in the first place. As Cohen states, denying informants the agency of motivation is patronising and is “dooming [them] to be perpetrators rather than architects of action” (Cohen, 1994:21). As the fieldnote example above shows, a certain group of people at Blair Drummond decided to be the ‘architects of action’ and change an event so that it became more structured for the benefit of residents. What this means is that a candle and its snuffing becomes a pivotal moment around which behaviour can be altered, shaped, internalised and then repeated. I discussed in Chapter Three how such learned behaviour could be seen in the remembered singing of songs and actions that residents engaged in. I suggested there that such actions were a form of Camphill knowledge and identity often overlooked by staff and co-workers, and what this present example demonstrates is how this learning and socialisation takes place. Though initially hierarchically determined, there was general compliance from the rest of the people present. Rebellion from the people below would not have enabled the ‘peace’ moment to take place. Here the relationship between carer and cared for is one of learned mutual cooperation that over time develops a certain naturalness and self

evident attitude of ‘that’s simply the way things are done’ develops. “It has become ... a taken for granted feature of the human world” (Jenkins, 2008: 158).

Such learning usually takes place in the early years of being part of a Camphill, and Blair Drummond and Corbenic through their periods of upheaval sought to reaffirm and re-entrench certain practices as the above example demonstrates. Ochil Tower is where such socialisation took its strongest form, from larger communal events to smaller moments and one-to-one training throughout the day. All of these trained the children to stand and behave in what the staff deemed were socially appropriate ways. For example, I was often told that when the new volunteer co-workers arrived who did not yet know how to stand in the appropriate way at Morning Circle etc, the senior more long-term staff would often illustrate how they should be standing by reference to the children: ‘Susan, can you please stand with you feet together and hands folded.’ Or: ‘Harry we are all going to be quiet for a moment before the candle is snuffed’ (Fieldnotes, 23 November). Such verbal queues and comments on bodily behaviour and mannerisms were speedily picked up by the young co-workers, who then changed their own bodily behaviour and posture to match that of the more experienced co-workers and children. As Goffman points out, “staff ... have objects and products to work upon ... but these objects and products are people” (Goffman, 1961:73).

To return to the candle being a beloved central Camphill icon, more so than the door handles, paintings and chairs for example. This is, I am suggesting because around the use of the candle there exists the social training of both staff and residents into what is deemed the ‘correct’ way to stand and behave among other things. As a result, banal material everyday Camphill is not cited as central to a Camphill identity because it does not offer those opportunities for the social training of adults and children to take place. Standing round a lit candle, singing songs, saying verses pre and post-mealtimes does. This is why certain material things are seen as carrying greater significance, because of the social opportunities they are seen to provide to not only train the individual but also bind them together in group solidarity and cohesion. It is this which makes them so valuable to constructing and maintaining an

overarching identity (Cohen, 1994; Jenkins, 2008:27; Crow, 2002). I discuss the particular socialisation practices and the use of collective events and daily ritual in greater detail in Chapter Five, suffice it to say here that much of the identity work engaged in uses repetitive practice with material things, whether it is a candle or singing grace.

It is important to recognise that this ‘work on people’ is not just passively experienced by residents and pupils, but is a negotiated process complete with moments of instability and moments where the resident can become the ‘architect of action’ as much as the staff member works on the resident. My above examples showed how the staff used their positions of authority to change an event that they felt had become ‘woolly’ and loose,’ which was only possible with the complicity of the majority of people at Morning Assembly. I think it is important to stress that though Camphill provides care and education for people ‘in need of care’ the hierarchies of power are often subtle and mutually affecting. I have already shown how many of the long-standing residents demanded that certain festivals are done and songs sung year in year out. That the staff facilitate this, demonstrates a see-saw relationship of power negotiation rather than a top down or Foucauldian disciplinary surveillance approach to understanding how everyday life is played out within these settings. I explore this in greater detail in the following section where food practices and mealtimes are explored as sites for this repetitive material identity work to take place.

The need to eat and the practices surrounding food preparation and consumption can be understood in a variety of ways. From a physiological perspective, we need to eat to survive. Equally, food and particularly mealtimes can be seen to act as an important social function in binding people together in a cohesive and ordered manner (Douglas, 1972). Furthermore the apparent simplicity of using napkins, lighting candles and uttering graces at mealtimes can be seen to reproduce social order in a highly performative and symbolic sense. Food then is a dynamic medium whereby the complexity of everyday life is crystallised (Scott, 2009: 92). I shall now focus on one element of observed food practices: namely the mealtime as a site of

‘performative regulation,’ and ‘ordered patterns’ where a “more dispersed, intangible authority [is] built into relationships and practices” (Scott, 2010: 219). In this way, mealtimes within Camphill settings can be viewed as a “complex web of relations [where] power, conflict and care can revolve” (Punch et al, 2009: 15).

Camphill Meals

The mealtime in Camphill is arguably another enduring cultural hallmark. Much like the candle, the Camphill paintings and large estates, the meal is often seen as something special to Camphill settings. This, I would argue, is because it is a space where a large group of people come together. Camphill mealtimes are large collective events. Meals embody much of Goffman’s (1961) ideas about the ritualised nature of food production and the public performance of normative social rules. Early films of Camphill spend a lot of time focusing on the meal and in particular the structured nature of the event. As a child I remember documentary film crews setting up their cameras, lights and other filming paraphernalia in the kitchen to film everyone eating lunch. Whilst eating lunch everyone was scrupulously polite and also unusually silent during the meal. However the general format of the meal remained the same³⁰. As Douglas (1972), argues the meal can be thought of as “creating meaningful patterns and distinctions in the course of everyday life ... that it is both an object and an event” (Marshall, 2005:75 in Punch et al 2009: 2). Furthermore, these ‘ordered patterns’ carry some of the meaning of previous meals, such that “each meal is a structured social event which structures others in its own image” (Douglas, 1972: 69).

Within my three fieldwork settings, mealtimes were a key factor in the structuring of the day. There were the three main meals at set times. Breakfast starting between 7:30 and 8:00am. Lunch starting around 12:40 and 1:00pm and Supper starting around 5:30 and 6:00pm. There were also tea-breaks at 11am and 4pm. Sometimes there was even a ‘little’ bed time snack before heading off to bed (Fieldnotes, February – December 2009). The times between food consumption were filled either

³⁰ ‘Candle on a Hill’ are three films made by the BBC to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of Camphill School Aberdeen and other Camphill places for its work with children and adults with ‘special needs,’ Other films are promotional films for the particular Camphill places.

by school or workshop activities (such as Craft, Garden or Bakery); however food was a key marker in separating one time-space from another and was an arguably central focal point in its very taken for granted mundanity.

The meals can therefore be seen as forming activities in particular social spaces in explicitly performed ways and can act as a form of social order and control. Ideas about order and control around food are notably discussed by Elias in *The Civilizing Process* (1994). Here Elias explores how food etiquette was introduced in Western Countries as a means of ‘self-discipline,’ with the aim of producing ‘civilised’ people, which is part of a wider social process concerned with the ‘civilisation’ of people generally (Elias, 1994: 52, 182). Foucault’s ideas of ‘disciplinary surveillance’ are also pertinent in this connection, because the ‘disciplinary modality of power’ permeates and is perpetuated through ‘self-surveillance’ and replication (Foucault, 1977: 170-216).

This can be clearly seen in table manners, where learning and internalising self restraint are prized (Elias, 1994: 98). Knowing how to hold a fork, use a knife correctly, know what liquid is served with what food, are all visible signifiers of ‘good breeding’ and also the public demonstration of being able to “put social norms before ... raw appetites” (Scott, 2009: 98). Fox (2004) demonstrates how these forms of social etiquette continue today within British culture and are strongly linked to class. For example, Fox uses the ‘small/slow is beautiful principle’ to distinguish between different types of social class. To cut up your food and then shovel it into your mouth with only a fork is distinctly working class. Superior social standing is shown by slowly cutting up one piece of food, each time ‘spearing and squashing’ a small amount of food onto the back of the fork. Fruit is not meant to be munched whole at the table (unless you are working class), but rather to be cut into neat segments and each segment slowly eaten as daintily as possible (Fox, 2004: 317). The entire process is time consuming and often makes eating much more difficult. But as Douglas (1972) has suggested, there is a pattern and a principle behind such behaviour, which Fox comments on as follows:

What it all boils down to is not appearing to be greedy, and more specifically, not appearing to give food too high a priority... Letting one's desire for food take priority over making conversation with one's companions involves giving physical pleasure or gratification a higher value than words... Over-eagerness about anything is undignified; over-eagerness about food is disgusting and somehow faintly obscene (Fox, 2004: 318-319)

Observing these codes alongside the more generic rules of saying 'please' and 'thank you' when passing dishes, alongside not talking with your mouth full, or dominating the conversation, are all the markers of a civilised, westocentric context (Scott, 2009: 98). By complying with these rules, the meal as a 'harmonious' social event can unfold allowing 'suitable' interaction to take place. In other words, the meal is a crucial place for socialising people into normative eating codes and developing an awareness of what is deemed appropriate and inappropriate food eating behaviour.

In order to explore some of these points further, I examine some of my fieldnotes and discuss Camphill food practices in connection with some of the ideas discussed above. Readers may be a little confused by all the names mentioned without introduction in the extracts, but this is deliberate and will be explained later.

It is potato and courgette soup today. Arthur lights the candles on the table. Jonathon wheels the food in on the trolley and ladles soup into all the bowls at the table. All four residents are sitting in their napkin designated places. Arthur helps Colin to tuck his napkin into his shirt front. The full soup bowls are passed around then Laura recites grace: 'the bread alone is not our food, what feeds us in the bread is God's eternal word, his Sprit and his Life, Amen.' She finishes and we all say 'May the meal be blessed.' All tuck in. Colin talks to Arthur about a co-worker named Dennis, who somehow turns into 'Dennis the menace'. Andrew reminds Colin to eat. Peter also reminds him to eat saying: 'look at me, look me in the eye and now get on with eating.' Peter has been in Camphill for 21 years. Laura shows me her medal

that she won for taking part in British Heart Foundation's annual race. Walter says little and concentrates on eating...

Once Arthur deems that we have all finished, 'thank you for the meal' is uttered. He barely waits for anyone and it is not really a collective saying. I'm passed the candle snuffer and Peter chats away whilst I snuff the candles. 'Good afternoon' is uttered by a few and then chairs are scraped back and I help clear the dishes onto the trolley (Fieldnotes, 18 May).

What this excerpt demonstrates is a variety of things. Firstly it is not immediately clear who everyone is. There are a lot of names flying about and I have not introduced each person and provided neat biographical boxes for them. What this also means is that it is less clear who is a staff member/co-worker and who are the residents. Colin is perhaps the easiest to label, as he has been given help with putting his napkin on, with the assumption being that most adults can put their own napkin on without aid. Caring activities can then perhaps be understood as someone else providing practical interventions that enable the 'cared for' person to present a socially acceptable appearance. The underlying rule here is that Colin *might* spill soup down his shirt, which would then be a visible signifier broadcasting his inability to follow normative soup eating etiquette, that soup passes from the bowl to the spoon and then mouth, not via a shirt front. So to avoid this possible breach in a presentable self, a napkin is tucked into his shirt. In this way any soup mishaps will hopefully fall on the napkin, which can be removed after the meal, presenting Colin once more as clean and conforming to the norm – in line with what the rest of the people at the table will be presenting. Colin is thus presenting a 'civilised' front (Elias, 1994; Goffman, 1961), both literally and figuratively.

The napkin, as a result, can be seen to act in a variety of ways. It is used to perform an attitude of care, but equally one of infantilising an adult. It states that the adult, Colin, is not competent, less so than the other socially acceptable adult, Arthur, who is in fact a member of staff. Equally however, this can be seen from a purely functional staff perspective, that if Colin did spill soup onto his shirt this would entail changing the shirt at the end of the meal, which equates to more washing and

ultimately more practical, time intensive interventions for Arthur, as compared with the simple expedient of tucking the napkin into Colin's shirt. For Arthur, the napkin is a time saver and a means of making his job easier. Equally it could be suggested that tucking in a napkin is a sign of care and affection for the person, so that they don't display a mucky shirt but can remove their napkin in much the same way that the other staff and residents will do. From the napkin in the ring, to adorning the shirt and finally being placed the washing basket, the napkin functions as an "analogy of the corpus of cultural categories" at play (Douglas, 1972: 79).

There are other points of interest connected to this fieldnote. It may perhaps surprise the reader to know that Peter, he who demanded that Colin 'look him in the eye and get one with eating', far from being an authoritarian long-standing member of staff is in fact a long-standing resident. He has Down's syndrome and early onset dementia. These labels add the twist that, rather than the staff member Arthur being the one who is regulating food behaviour most overtly, this is done by a resident to another resident. An example of Foucauldian self surveillance where the monitored self in turn becomes the monitor and carrier of disciplinary food surveillance (Foucault, 1975: 170-216). This also continues my previous arguments about residents training and socialising not only staff into the life of the Camphill place, but in this instance also another resident. It is in this training of the self that a particular type of Camphill knowledge and identity are performed and maintained. This example shows Peter demonstrating his awareness of normative social soup eating etiquette.

However Peter's monitoring of Colin only occurs *after* Arthur has asked Colin to talk less and eat more. In this way, Peter recognises Arthur's superior authority to be able to legitimately demand that eating rather than talking be done by Colin. The hierarchy of staff Arthur, followed by long-term resident Peter, and finally Colin to whom all this is being addressed, is thereby enacted for all at the table. In this way, the relative positions of Arthur to Peter and Peter to Colin are in seemingly banal ways consolidated. The see-sawing power dynamics engaged in by both Peter and Arthur reflect what Scott (2010: 221) calls 'performative regulation', where people "monitor each other's conduct ... [and where] the disciplinary gaze is not merely

transmitted but reticulated: dispersed and refracted through an agentic network.” What this means is that the kind of ‘mutual surveillance’ that Arthur and Peter are engaged in is a particular way of not only signalling ‘commitment’ to Camphill, but also of performing an obedient and rule-following self to residents as well as staff. This results in an “emergent team impression” of conformity (Goffman, 1959 in Scott, 2010: 221) whereby all of us around the table can sustain a collective belief in the sanctioned etiquette of not talking whilst eating lunch. This makes any form of resistance to such a request seem unnecessary, as well as pointless. The success of such training is the apparent naturalness and normalness of this way of being.

The question which may arise here is: what is particularly Camphill about this? The highly ritualised beginning and end to the meal connect with Goffman’s ideas about an ‘institutional display’ which is addressed to visitors, in this instance the visiting researcher, as well as an internal audience as demonstrated above. As Goffman suggests, the outsider may not know the rules of the institution and this provides is a way for the inmate to “play an important role in the institution’s presentation” (Goffman, 1961: 96). In this instance, Laura performs the grace competently and in a way which tells me that this is ‘symbolically important’ within this Camphill setting (Goffman, 1961: 98) and also that it is an identity marker that sets Camphill apart from other secular residential settings. This is not to say that there is a gap between ‘display and reality,’ but that rather saying grace in combination with the lighting of the candle is yet another form of performative regulation that has turned the rule-breaker into an obedient conformist (Scott 2010: 223). Furthermore the Christian-themed grace at the beginning is followed by the less formal ‘thank you for the meal’ at the end; both act as verbal markers that separate the act of beginning to eat from not eating and hence moving into another space. Equally that the ending of the meal and moving into another space is determined by Arthur, the one with the most authority and power at the table. He decides that everyone has finished eating and so the meal is finished.

Such a clear display of Camphill identity also exists in the use of the candle and graces I discussed earlier in the chapter. Another point to return to is how the use of

these material things sets Camphill apart from other residential care settings. Smith, a Social Work academic, writes that what struck him when he first visited a Camphill place. The candles and graces are the most striking feature for him and in the following extract he ponders why.

When there you quickly pick up a sense of being part of something bigger than yourself. This is evident in the rituals such as holding hands and singing grace before and after meals. Of course rituals like this, as well as affirming a spiritual dimension to the school's philosophy, also play an important symbolic and practical role in marking the beginning and end of mealtimes. We were discussing how we had lost such rituals in most residential facilities. They were considered institutional, possibly even religiously divisive or just too difficult to struggle to maintain. Mealtimes then stop being part of the community life and become potential flashpoints to get over and done with as quickly as possible (Smith, 2011: 150-151).

What the above extract demonstrates is how the visible signs of difference, such as holding hands, candles and graces are imbued with added significance regarding the identity of Camphill, here expressed as a spiritual philosophy. What I would suggest instead is that such practical activities, led by staff, learned by residents and children, then passed on to newer staff members and residents/pupils, are again one of the enduring legacies of Camphill that can withstand change and upheaval because they are what Douglas (1972) calls 'ordered patterns.' Her suggestion that every meal carries something of the past meal, not only in its structure and food content but also in the actions of the people present, is a useful one when considering meals in Camphill. I certainly experienced a degree of similarity across different houses and also different Camphills in the form and content of the meals. The ritual of graces being uttered at the beginnings and a closing phrase were evident across my three fieldwork sites (Fieldnotes, 2009). Equally, the see-sawing power relations between staff and residents, between staff and staff and residents and residents were often performed through food-related discourse. To illustrate the repetitive ordered nature of meals, I will briefly discuss a second fieldnote example.

... Everyone takes their designated seat at the table. Laura says grace again. Catherine asks her to slow down in her recitation, she obediently does. Colin receives a monster plate of food, talks about James Bond and slowly ploughs his way through it. Louise talks about the gardening programme she watched at home yesterday evening. Walter burps repeatedly for a five minute period. Cora and Catherine exchange glances and say nothing. Cora explains to me afterwards that they have adopted a new policy of not saying anything, as commenting only made it worse. Walter eventually stops burping. Peter wants more macaroni but is instructed to eat some salad first. He resists and then eventually capitulates. He has two helpings of salad, loading his plate up with seconds as we are blessing the meal and snuffing the candle. He and Colin are left to finish their lunch whilst we clear away. I help Jonathon with drying whilst Catherine washes the lunch dishes (Fieldnotes 19 May).

Similar to the previous example, Laura is the person who says grace. However, it is Catherine and Cora who are the staff members at this meal and not Arthur. Catherine asking Laura to slow down constitutes a clear statement about who is the authority figure at the table and as such it is obeyed without question. Furthermore the 'performance of competence' displayed at the previous meal is somewhat undermined by this instruction to slow down. Here I am no longer a complete outsider but am becoming perhaps more of an accepted presence at mealtimes and therefore staff are less inclined to present a unifying front *with* the residents and a more top-down assertive one *to* the residents. At least at the beginning of the meal.

Walter's burping has a history that I am not initially aware of, and the glance exchanged by Cora and Catherine is a silent way of communicating their resolve to say nothing. Equally, however, it also demonstrates that whilst they are not commenting they are absolutely aware that it is going on. The explanation I am given afterwards can be understood as Cora wanting to justify why she and Catherine said nothing. Continuous burping is not generally considered socially acceptable

behaviour and Cora seeks to reassure me that, whilst she shares this view, they have failed in civilising Walter through active intervention and so have adopted a non-interference strategy in the hope that lack of comment will encourage Walter to abandon his unacceptable burping. What this also demonstrates is Walter's resistance to staff attempts to 'civilise' him. (Elias, 1994; Fox, 2004: 315). That they dislike his burping at mealtimes is something he is aware of, but it could be argued that this is his way of subverting and undermining the obvious authority of Catherine and Cora. On a speculative note, Laura is Walter's 'love,' as he calls her, and possibly his burping can be seen as retaliation for Catherine asking Laura to slow down in her grace recitation.

Another act of rebellion exists in Peter's second helping of salad. He is denied the macaroni he wants and so instead of taking the one helping of salad suggested, he takes two. Also he takes the second helping whilst the candle is being snuffed, the signal that the mealtime is over. However, Colin is still working his way through his mountain of food and Peter is resolutely eating more salad. In this way, although the staff have performed the actions that normally signal the end of the meal, the evidence of people still eating undermines the finality of the ending ritual. It is clear that performative regulation with its emphasis on mutual surveillance and team impression have here been critically undermined. Peter does not reprimand Colin for still eating but instead joins him; the clear hierarchical control exerted by Catherine at the beginning of the meal has vanished towards the end. Finishing the meal, despite the presence of people still eating, appears to be more important for the staff than having a collective ending of the meal together. In this way Cora and Catherine are similar to Arthur in that they deem the meal is over and it duly is and that some are still eating is not of great importance. Therefore though the rituals act as important beginning signifiers to the meal, they are considerably less important regarding the end. Ending the meal here does mean that everyone has finished but that the collective time is over and those who have finished can get up and leave, as there are other time considerations like washing up and rest hour, which all need to be completed before the afternoon workshops restart.

What this also demonstrates are the spaces available for resistance which residents can carve out for themselves through such things as burping or eating when they should have finished. Staff also enable this resistance to take place and are not deliberately punitive when these acts of rule-breaking occur. As Goffman suggests, the possibility of an institution tolerating such transgressions is a sign of the strength of the “establishment state” (Goffman, 1961: 102). What this apparent flexibility also demonstrates is that the ‘ordered patterns’ are also subject to change when people behave in different ways at mealtimes. However, the *pattern* of the meal is still the same. Much as the change in Morning Assembly demanded compliance and engagement from all who participated, so too does the civilising at mealtimes require that residents are compliant to a degree about normative food eating etiquette. The disruption and difference in behaviour at meals is to be expected and is relatively low level rebellion. The pattern of the meal does stay the same, which again suggests that the power relationships are more complexly negotiated through the afore-mentioned see-sawing process. Further, the different behaviours at mealtimes are a way of negotiating relationships and establishing the flexibility of particular mealtime etiquette and rule following, as the following two examples demonstrate (Punch et al, 2009; Smith, 2009).

Mandy eats a couple of mouthfuls and then before I quite catch what happened is dramatically pulled out of the dining room on her chair by Claire. I ask Laura why? She thinks that Mandy stabbed Claire in the hand with her plastic fork. Mandy looks adorable and completely loveable but is apparently one of the most ‘challenging’ residents, Laura tells me. Mandy rarely attends workshops and spends her day with Claire, her one on one support staff. Mandy sleeps late and will break and smash crockery if she gets her hands on it in a rage. Laura points out to me that all the tables are screwed to the floor, this is because of Mandy. She heaves them over and punches and hits people who get in her way. Apparently one minute she is sunny and happy, the next violent and angry. This entire discussion about Mandy’s behaviour has taken place at the table. Everyone else is eating and has ignored Mandy’s sudden exit from the room. Claire comes back into the room, sits at the table and

finishes her lunch. Mandy will be spending the rest of the afternoon in her room she informs us (Fieldnotes, 1 April).

It is pizza for lunch today. We all sit down at the table and Phil recites grace. The pizza is served out and Mandy starts to eat very quickly. Laura asks her to slow down. After Mandy has had her two helpings of pizza she picks up her cup and throws it across the table. It is empty and hits nobody. Laura picks it up but does not give it back to Mandy. ‘You will not be able to leave the table and go to your room just by throwing your cup’, she tells Mandy. Mandy glares at Laura and promptly gets up off her chair and sits down on the floor. No reaction from the rest of the table. Everyone carries on eating. I am watching Mandy. See her look out of the corner of her eye towards a chair and manage to grab the chair before she does. Mandy spends the remainder of lunch on the floor with all moveable objects out of reach (Fieldnotes, 3 April).

These examples clearly demonstrate a level of resistance to staff authority and normative eating practices in a much more striking way than Walter’s burping. Mandy, who has been identified as having challenging behaviour due to her penchant for overturning furniture and attacking staff, consistently tries to undermine the staff who are there to care for her. Smith’s earlier point about mealtimes often being flashpoints for disruptive behaviour is clearly seen here. Such intransigence, Goffman suggests, is indicative of sustained rejection of the place the individual finds themselves and often “requires sustained orientation to its formal organisation, and hence paradoxically, a deep kind of involvement in the establishment” (Goffman, 1961: 62). The above examples demonstrate Mandy’s knowledge of formal eating practices and how she breaks these to try and get to her room and also the staff’s knowledge of just what Mandy is communicating through this type of behaviour. Carter suggests that staff in such settings have to work carefully to read just what is being said in these instances as this can be a “difficult and sensitive area but also one that divides them on how best to respond” (Carter, 2003: 137). This is clearly seen in the different ways that both Claire and Laura negotiated Mandy’s

disruptive mealtime behaviour. For Claire being physically attacked, albeit with a plastic fork, was reason to remove Mandy from the lunch table and arguably this is what Mandy's aim was all along. So whilst Claire may have felt that she demonstrated her refusal to accept fork stabbing as normal lunch time behaviour to the rest of us gathered at the table, it can also be seen that Mandy achieved her aim of returning to her room, a space that she prefers to be in. The power dynamic between Claire and Mandy in this instance is complex and reveals that the relationships between staff and resident can often overturn simple power/powerlessness binaries and reinforce Becker's (1963) point about whose definition of the situation and the individual counts.

Laura, in contrast to Claire, views Mandy's cup throwing and floor sitting in a different light. Such actions were not reason to give in to what she saw as Mandy's manipulative attempts to get her own way. Indeed in subsequent conversations with Laura, she stressed that much of Mandy's violent and aggressive behaviour were due, in her opinion, to staff letting her get away with it. 'If Mandy had her way she would live in her room and never get out of bed' she stated (Fieldnotes, 3 April). For Laura facilitating Mandy's desire to remain in her room and not be part of the House for meals was a sign of failure in 'helping' Mandy to become a more socially aware and therefore integrated person in the life of the House and Camphill. This is an important point as it raises the contentious issue of whose interests are being best served by the continued application of such mealtime rules. Is it for the benefit of the staff or the residents? The ritualised saying of graces and lighting of candles serve as a clear marker in the temporal time spaces of the day, at the same time as trying to manage, train and even socialise residents into a particular way of being. This point needs to be explored further. What type of person is being worked on here and why? This is not just in connection with mealtime behaviour management or indeed with the changing of a festive event that was perceived as being woolly. What has been hinted at and suggested throughout the thesis to date is that Camphill produces certain types of people. Residents that can sing and remember particular cultural practices, residents who view Camphill as home, staff who work and/or live

Camphill and the things of Camphill that surround such lives and constantly make and remake what Camphill is in contemporary society.

Conclusion

The analysis in this chapter has used Goffman's tools of performative regulation and control alongside a Foucauldian acceptance of disciplinary surveillance and also Elias' civilising process as all part of understanding what is going on within the repetitive thrice daily event of the meal. I have suggested that in Camphill the meal (among other things) is both commonplace and complex. It can provide ways of demonstrating care in small and insignificant ways. Equally however what can be seen as demonstrating care can also be viewed as infantilising adults and a site for the performance of a top-down civilising process. This makes the experience of mealtimes "often complex and ambivalent" (Punch et al, 2009: 16) where residents experience a loss of control and staff overtly display their agency, power and in certain instances powerlessness.

In contrast to this, mealtimes were also a space for sanctioned resistance, where residents undermined the dominant civilising discourse through burping, continued eating and other disruptive behaviours. As a result it became clear that whilst meals were necessarily complex and contested, they also contained ordered patterns in the rituals, timing and repeated structural layout. The materiality so redolent within the buildings and pictures is also present in the mundane taken for granted chair that is not thrown and the cup that is. Rowland's (2005) point about things telling a story that we need to have the eyes to see and the ears to listen with is crucial here. Materiality is not just in the obvious and self-evident Camphill iconography; it is fundamental to the lives lived and worked on in places called Camphill. But these questions about Camphill legitimacy and Camphill identity whether couched in the buildings, or the rituals or the festivals or indeed the opinions of staff and residents all have at their core a single purpose and that is to develop a particular kind of Camphill personhood. The repeated assertion that activities, rituals and festivals were 'for the residents' or 'for the pupils', was an interesting way of speaking for a resident/pupil without having to provide an explanation for the continuance of an

event that had in all probability been forgotten through time and change. After all, as Wharton states, “traditions that have lost their meaning are the hardest to destroy” (Wharton, 1983: 234).

Yet this did not satisfy me as an explanation, for at the same time staff and co-workers were discussing their Camphill and other Camphill places as having good or bad practice in connection to their work with children and adults with disabilities. And whilst it could be argued that good and bad practice does not need to be combined with the continuing presence of daily rituals, songs and practices, I began to see that the two were linked. The presence of Morning Assemblies, Evening Circles and the annual celebration of St. John’s, Whitsun and Christmas were both about entrenched traditions carried on by residents and staff, and also concerned spaces for the residents and pupils to learn ‘social skills.’ That there are, as previously mentioned, specific ways that people (staff and residents, pupils and co-workers) must learn to sit and eat at the table, or stand and sit for Morning Assemblies has been shown, and what I will now demonstrate in the following chapter is that these ‘social skills’ incorporate an outlook that places the needs of the adults and needs of the child ‘at the centre’ of care work at the Camphill places. Further, that the development of these social skills presents a particular kind of Camphill identity about the self, the social development of the self and how this self is to be best cared for and brought into existence.

Thus far my chapters have explored identity as understood through the lens of the non-conforming other, through the performance of rituals and festivals and how the material spaces and environment are used for the socialising of pupils and residents. I have also mentioned that repetitive practice is a continuous and ongoing element of Camphill identity work. The next chapter extends ideas about Camphill identity work to the point where identity is seen as embodied repetitive social practice.



Chapter Five

Becoming Camphill



Introduction

This chapter develops ideas and thoughts that have been hinted at and tacitly suggested in previous chapters. The discussion in Chapters Three and Four around Camphill identity and in what ways different Camphill places are seen as more or less Camphill through their use of material things, seasonal songs, festive tables and Festivals and daily rituals for example; combined with how certain people and the knowledge they have about Camphill and Camphill practice are granted a legitimacy (or not) to speak about Camphill identity, is an important and challenging element of Camphill identity formation in the present day. However discussions around daily identity practice and the materiality of my three field sites has at its basis the fundamental questions of: what kind of social individual is being created and worked on within these Camphill settings?

To solely discuss Camphill identity in terms of non-conformity and materiality is to ignore the everyday care and education work that Ochil Tower, Corbenic and Blair Drummond engage in. The care and education work on residents, pupils, staff and co-workers is not, I would argue, so much a case of top down hierarchical power relationships, but a more reciprocal relationship of mutual development with a particular type of selfhood being the end goal and aim. I have explained in previous chapters that much of the practical and cultural life evident in my three field sites

was presented as being for the benefit of pupils and/or residents. Benefit in what way? How were these daily events (morning circle/assemblies, services, festivals, to name a few) seen as benefiting residents? And why is this so important? Analysing such statements from a Fritz Staal (1979) perspective of the meaninglessness of ritual does not I think fully grasp the complex nature of why certain activities and ways of working *with* residents and pupils year in year out are carried on and maintained. The stress on working with residents and pupils is an important one. The dominant view by all staff and co-workers at my three sites is that they are working *with* residents/pupils; and though this does not overcome the hierarchy between carer and cared for, it emphasizes a linguistic distinction that is obviously important for the staff and co-workers. But this type of semantic discussion around working on or with pupils/residents does not full uncover why and how a particular type of social being is worked and created into existence.

Much of the discussion around working with residents was also phrased as developing ‘social skills.’ These social skills, as previously discussed in Chapter Four, were geared towards the recognition of normative eating practices alongside understandings of how to stand for Morning Circles and Assemblies. However, these social skills have another element and this is the recognition that normative social rules and behaviour of wider society exist and can be tangibly taught and learned. My three fieldsites and the people within them therefore were constantly working to train residents/pupils and often young volunteer co-workers into an awareness and learned acceptance of these rules. This demanded at basis the taken for granted socialness of wider society and how people conform and behave within a variety of social situations (Goffman, 1959, 1963; Garfinkel, 1991; Beck and Wood, 1994). Such knowledge it was suggested would better equip people to live happy, integrated lives. Such an understanding accepts that there are clearly distinct and knowable things that people need to learn and do in order to function within society. As Durkheim suggests, “society is not the mere sum of individuals, but the system formed by their association represents a specific reality which has its own characteristics” (Durkheim, 1982: 129). By extension, then, the characteristics assumed by the majority within my Camphill settings, argues that these social rules

can be known and furthermore, learned. As Durkheim (1952) further posits, the rules are known most strongly when they are repeatedly broken. In this way the majority of daily life within my fieldwork sites exists in working and managing boundary behaviour. The strength and success of the particular Camphill place lies in such work appearing as natural, innate and simply the ways things are done (Jenkins, 2008: 164). It does not appear to require deliberate effort from staff, residents, and co-workers but seems to unfold as normal and unquestioned life within the places. What I will demonstrate throughout this chapter are examples of such boundary behaviour and how this is managed. I already discussed in Chapter Four how burping, eating and chair throwing was handled and discussed, and what this chapter extends is the idea that underlying all such behaviour management strategies is the fundamental principle that learning, accepting and conforming to such socialisation principles has the potential to transform residents and pupils into successful functioning people who can live meaningful and worthwhile lives (König, 1994, 2010; Monteux, 2006; Lanyado, 2003; Cameron and Moss, 2011). To understand how a child is socialised into a culture and society and how this socialisation process continues over the lifecourse into adulthood and beyond requires explanation. Over the following pages, I will explore how this process takes place within my fieldsites, but in particular within Ochil Tower School where this social training is most clearly evident and consistently reaffirmed, with the arguably successful long-lasting effects of such a process evident regarding many of the adults in Blair Drummond and Corbenic today.³¹

Being and Becoming

The public image presented to the wider world by my three fieldsites through web pages, leaflets and handbooks stresses the following: that they offer high quality care, education and training opportunities for a variety of children and adults with emotionally, physical and complex needs in dedicated sites and grounds (see Chapter One). Also that within these settings the *whole* adult and child is *treated* and becomes part of a meaningful home/school life and will experience and be part of

³¹ See Chapters Three and Four for the lineage of such training, evidenced most strongly through the seasonal singing of songs and ritual festive practices, alongside mealtime behaviour monitoring.

many culturally rich events that are part of the everyday life of the Camphill place (Fieldnotes, 2009).

The important points to stress here are the issues of holism and treatment. König in his early writings argued that the disabled child contained a whole pure and untouched soul that was not affected by the outer physical and emotional signs of disability and difference (König, 1952, 1994, 2010; Monteux, 2006: 26). The aim of curative education was to enable that wholeness to come into being, facilitated by the people who worked with the child and the environment the child inhabited. König described this process as ‘becoming truly human’, which was as much about developing the surrounding environment to facilitate this aim as working with the ‘inner life of the child’ Through this work, the whole and complete child could flourish and grow and continue to show ‘wonder and awe’ for the world around them (König, 1994: 87). The idea of an internal world that can be brought to life through the everyday life of my fieldsites as well as this work enabling a wholeness to occur, resonated to stronger and lesser degrees within all three of my fieldsites.

It was, as such, not spoken about using the language present within König’s writings, but people did speak about their work in terms of ‘developing the whole child or adult’ (Fieldnotes, 24 February, 18 May, 8 November). At Ochil Tower School certain people would speak about their work with the children in terms of curative education and more recently social pedagogy (Fieldnotes, 12 November 2009; Research Notebook, V, 2012). In Corbenic and Blair Drummond social therapy alongside other care and social work philosophies were also articulated and occasionally mentioned, again by very specific members of staff, usually in discussion about Camphill’s identity (see Chapter Three). However what was striking about these debates was that although some people would discuss the socialisation of adults and children with reference to the afore-mentioned outlooks, they were also problematised with one informant stressing that ‘the ideas were interesting but left gaps as to how I would practically apply it in my work’ (Fieldnotes 25 February). This division between the theory and practice was raised by numerous people across my fieldsite as *ideas* that had little practical application to

their lives. Indeed there was often a struggle between what ‘important’ named individuals such as Steiner and König wrote about and how this could be implemented into the *work* with and the lives of children and adults (Fieldnotes, 25 February; 16 May; 30th October). The challenges faced between a theoretical ideal, as already mentioned in Chapter One concerning Camphill pillars and the practical reality was further raised during lectures I gave as part of the B.A. in Social Pedagogy at the University of Aberdeen. Many of the issues and challenges students raised were how to *effectively* manage the often challenging behaviour of those in their care but also the difficult and often fraught staff relationships, alongside providing and being provided with good supervision connected to their practice. Over the three years that I have given lectures to third year undergraduates on the course, student interest in Goffman’s theories on total institutions, a critical look at community, alongside others on identity and management to name a few, were superseded by the need for discussion and conversations around supervision and practice. This resulted in the majority of oral presentations and essays centring on the challenges of living and working with a variety of people in intimate and closely monitored situations (Research Notebooks II-IV 2009-2011).

This demonstrates that much of the past discussions around the care, education and well-being of children and adults are mostly of interest to select individuals (Snellgrove, 2008; Brenner-Krohn, 2009) and are of considerably less significance in the daily activities and practices that make up life in contemporary Scottish Camphill places. Where the ideas expressed by König et al are seen in present day social pedagogical writing, is in the continued interest in holism. The idea that the developing child needs to be viewed through a complete and total lens as previously mentioned. The following quote describes this pedagogical aim in flowing prose:

Imagine a thriving garden filled with many flowers and plants, a tranquil place of aroma and colour where everything blossoms and flourishes... And then imagine that, instead of plants, the garden is filled with children, all different and all unique, all rich in potential. What conditions would they need to grow and develop?

In this metaphorical sense, social pedagogy is concerned with the theory and practice of creating a ‘thriving garden for children’ and indeed for all human beings – a fertile environment conducive to their well-being and learning, developing their *inherent* resources and connecting them to their surroundings... social pedagogy has to be more than a set of theories or a set of methods, but must be based on profound philosophical considerations about the *inherent* value of human beings both as individuals and as a collective (Eichsteller & Holthoff, 2011: 33 my emphasis).

The important point for my analysis here are the focus on nature and the idea of inherent characteristics. The focus on nature and inherited traits suggests a determinism that has at its basis notion of truth. If truth is grounded in material biological descriptors, then the art of social pedagogy can fully uncover this through the environment and the skill of the social pedagogue. As Costa and Walter posit “our focus is on understanding and truth rather than explanation and prediction ... [where] we seek to foster a developmental and healing process (Costa & Walter, 2006: 45-47).

It is not the aim of this thesis to deconstruct and evaluate the legitimacy of such knowledge claims, but what I do want to stress here is how an awareness of this type of approach reveals much about what kind of child is worked into being. It suggests a process of development that is continually ongoing and does not end with the onset of adulthood (whenever that is deemed to occur). Also there is the suggestion of an essential self which conceals at the core a whole person, untouched by upbringing, aware of itself and not externally determined (Mauss, 1985:20; Jenkins, 2008:53). The argument here is for a sort of primacy of self or rather a “cloistered essence of selfhood” (Jenkins, 2008:53). Cohen further describes this as “selfhood ‘rest[ing] on the essential privacy of meaning; in what else might it consist?’” (Cohen, 1994: 142). However the view of social pedagogy and echoed by certain Camphill writers (König, 2008, 2009, 2010, Weihs, 1970; Jackson, 2006, 2011) is that a focus on the internal self must also use the external world to bring that internal being into social existence. This is important as it seems to suggest that this self is undersocialised and

the work with children and adults with a variety of learning and behavioural needs is to call this undersocialised self into being through external socialisation. I am aware whilst writing this, that there are many people within and outwith Camphill settings who will argue I have neglected to fully account for the role and importance that the spiritual development of the child plays in its early understandings of self and subsequent external socialisation³². I plead guilty to neglecting the esoteric and spiritual as written about by Steiner and König et al, as the problem with the spirit/etheric/astral bodies/forces debate is that it was not shown or indeed engaged with in a meaningful way by anyone throughout my research. It was written about in certain books but never really discussed, the exceptions being at Blair Drummond where the lack of anthroposophy was held up as a sign of Camphill deviance and in Corbenic where I attended a study group where Steiner's lectures were discussed. However both of these events were not concerned with the practical application of Steiner's thought and works and did not concern the development of the self as discussed here. Furthermore the terms, whilst understandable to particular people, are none the less ontologically and epistemologically problematic. The definition and understanding (much like present day Camphill identity claims) cannot simply be assumed, and therefore as a useful concept with which to understand the self within Camphill was of little practical use.

This is important to stress for, as I will demonstrate over the coming pages, much of the discussion around developing the whole child/adult centred on pragmatic concerns around behaviour management and the fostering of social skills. Also as I have previously mentioned, the fostering of the spirit within a child was not of such paramount importance to the students at the BA in Aberdeen, where how to work in structured and effective ways and live harmonious lives with a variety of different people was an issue of greater importance³³. Furthermore, this thesis has continually demonstrated that much of Camphill identity questions revolve around verbal and

³² See writings by König, 1994, 2010, and Steiner, 1964 and Jackson, 2006 and 2011 for more discussion on this.

³³ I am aware that the majority of content on the BA in Social Pedagogy does indeed look at the spiritual development of the child and students are required to observe and discuss this in their work and essays. However I have not witnessed this engagement within my fieldwork or when I was lecturing, which returns to the previous point that there is often a gap between the theories taught on the course and the practical work the students engage in.

material identity claims concerning the making and remaking of Camphill identity and less on the abstract and esoteric. In sum, I wish to suggest that it is possible to speak of a Camphill 'ethos' as there is a near universal emphasis on particular forms and ways of socialising pupils and residents in these settings.

I shall now consider just how this socialisation process is realised and in what ways the idea of the whole child (into adulthood) is made manifest within my fieldwork settings. This is more than just making a person happy, and also lies in realising the potential of the person and how it can best be brought to the fore (Ryan & Deci, 2001: 143). To that end, the learning of social etiquette alongside ritual and festive practices, combined with the various educational training situations the child/adult finds themselves in, are all in one way or another aimed at the realisation of the person's potential. This realising of potential, I must stress is not solely aimed at the pupils and residents, but is a widespread intention that encompasses the staff, co-workers and other volunteers. The work with the pupils and residents is the way that this realisation process takes tangible shape within the relatively administered round of life within Camphill settings, and it is this particular outlook and daily activity that presents yet another element in the complex identity work which makes up Camphill.

Troubled Histories

In much of the Camphill produced literature and throughout my fieldwork there existed a common type of narrative regarding the pupils and residents who came to Camphill. The narrative consisted of the following: the person had a difficult family situation, which either meant they had experienced sexual and/or violent abuse as very young children, and had then been moved through the care system from foster family to foster family before arriving at Camphill, alongside having a variety of medically diagnosed disabilities. Or the person came from a relatively stable family background but their own behaviour had deteriorated to such an extent that the family were all on the verge of collapse as they were faced with increased violence from their son/daughter, and/or had not slept or been able to work properly for years, despite support and help from local health and care services (Research Notebooks, IV). In all situations, attending mainstream schooling had failed, often through

violent and aggressive outbursts from the child, or else displayed such withdrawn behaviour that trained state school teachers did not have the resources to cope with the child alongside their other classroom and teaching responsibilities. Thus the people who arrived at any of my three research sites were young children and/or adults with a thoroughly documented history of what is termed ‘difficult and challenging behaviour’ (Fieldnotes, 2009; Costa & Walter, 2006; Ruprecht, 2007). I mentioned in Chapter One the types of medical syndromes such as Autism, Down’s syndrome, Asperger’s, Fragile X-Syndrome that also accompanied the children and adults to my research sites. The reason it is important to know this is that when the child arrives at the School they bring with them not only a medical history but also detailed reports written by clinical psychologists, social workers, child support workers, educational psychiatrists – the list goes on, all detailing and explaining the breakdown in the management of the child’s behaviour.

This is crucial, for the child/adult arrives with many labels attached to their person, the chief one being that they cannot participate in what are seen as normal social practices. The stalwart institutions of school, family and normative care systems have not been able to integrate the person successfully into social life and arriving at Ochil Tower School, Blair Drummond and Corbenic is often a place of last resort before the removal of the person into a ‘secure unit’ which is a euphemism for a place with round the clock camera surveillance, often two members of staff to every one inmate and permanently locked and wired doors (Foucault, 1979; Goffman, 1961). A very different total institution to what they have previously experienced.

At this point the remit for Ochil Tower, Blair Drummond and Corbenic is initially to see if they have the skills and ability to manage such socially challenging and disruptive behaviour, as the socialisation process has to date completely broken down. This then is what they set out to do. Initially, as Goffman points out, the person comes with their own ‘presenting culture’ (Goffman, 1961: 24) which can be seen, so I was told, in a variety of ways. Damon when he first arrived at the school had the labels ‘aggressive and violent’ along with a host of others. On his first visit to the school during break time when the majority of pupils are in the playground, he

tried to head butt and kick Stefan (his soon to be permanent teacher) and when this failed dug his fingernails into Stefan's skin and proceeded to scratch whilst still trying to bite and kick. Stefan being considerably taller and stronger than Damon calmly maintained a hold of Damon's hands and held him away from his own body thus reducing the potential for any of his kicking and head butting to actually land on his person. Damon continued unabated in his attempts to attack Stefan. Stefan then began walking the kicking, scratching and shouting Damon from the playground. Apparently it took Damon over forty-five minutes before he calmed down. In relating his experience of Damon afterwards, Stefan said: 'you can tell he has got used to getting away with that type of behaviour, he will soon realise that it doesn't work here' (Fieldnotes, 28 October).

I had similar stories related to me at all three of my fieldsite, though using different examples. 'Ann arrived here and she only ate Sugar Puffs - can you imagine? For years that is all she had eaten and of course her digestive system was in trouble and going to the loo was painful.' Or 'Kevin thought he could shout at anyone if he didn't like the way they looked at him. It was so bad that when he first got here all he did was shouting all day long.' Or 'Reece likes to steal knives from the kitchen, so when he first came here every house had to do a daily knife count because he was so quick and would then use them to threaten other residents and staff that he didn't like' (Fieldnotes, 23 March, 16 May, 25 June).

What these accounts have in common is the 'when X first arrived here' beginning. These are recounted as proof that the presenting culture of these pupils/residents clearly demonstrates boundary behaviour. Further, it indicates that the staff show through these examples their knowledge of what are perceived to be wider social norms governing behaviour. These people have arrived variously labelled as problematic and difficult and such behaviour only further demonstrates that. To function within society demands that pupils and residents come to an understanding that violence, threatening people with knives and eating only one type of cereal is not the normal socially acceptable way to be. Stefan's comment about Damon, 'he will soon realise that it doesn't work like that here,' confirms his intention to teach

Damon that shouting and kicking are not appropriate and more importantly not accepted as appropriate within the School's culture. The implicit assertion is that the child's presenting culture of excessive boundary behaviour will, over time, lead to learned self management, social awareness and control.

I was also made aware of the troubled histories in particular during one session of fieldwork. Many of the troubled histories were not openly or indeed publicly discussed with me because of issues surrounding pupil confidentiality, but points such as the above about particular behaviour were discussed as I was a witness to these situations and staff seemed to feel the need to explain why I should be seeing such potentially socially problematic behaviour. In one class the teacher explained a little bit more about the personal background of his pupils to me. This was prompted because at that time his class consisted only of boys and had only male class helpers, and he had been a little cautious about how my female presence within his classroom might destabilise the situation.

Baltz starts telling me about his pupils. 'Most of the boys here come from very disturbed backgrounds. They have never experienced a good male role model in their lives.' I look at him in surprise and he continues to explain that the men in their lives have been violent and aggressive and so he thinks that his classroom has to be a place where they continually meet good male role models. He doesn't have female class helpers because the best female practitioner he feels, would at one point meet a certain attitude that had nothing to do with her competency but simply that she was a woman and many of the boys see women as victims of a man's violence. He goes on further to state that he does not push the pupils to come to school, if they want to come to school they can. If not they don't need to, it is up to them. But if they come to class there are certain rules that they must follow, for example, no swearing in class. Damon when he first arrived was verbally and violently abusive. Really, I question? He nods 'but now as you see he doesn't swear at all' (Fieldnotes, 27 October).

This excerpt continues the idea that troubled pasts can be seen in the present in the way that the pupils conduct themselves in class and how they also respond to people of different genders. At the time, I was not impressed with Baltz's male-centric reasoning as I had not till then encountered behaviour that would have led me to suppose the male pupils regarded women in a particularly negative light. The majority of Baltz's pupils lived in a house run by a female Housemother with a very competent female co-worker also living there. I was dismissive of his suggestion that his pupils regarded women as victims of male aggression until I had been in his class for a little longer and the novelty factor of having a woman in their class had worn off for the boys. On one occasion Baltz asked me to assist Cromwell with the design and drawing of a plan to build a bridge (something the class were going to be doing over the coming term). I duly agreed.

Cromwell and I get pens and paper out to start to work on the plan. He is very detailed and doesn't really want my help so I sit and observe. Cromwell starts telling me about a recent trip he made to Crail at the weekend and the race track and race cars that were there. He tells me he saw 'loads of really sexy girls there'. He continues, 'they were naked and lying on car bonnets and dancing up and down poles. The guys were cheering and laughing. That's what women are like' he tells me. All women are not like that, I respond. 'Yes, they are.' 'Am I like that, Shirley (his Housemother), Caitlin (female co-worker in his house)?' He starts laughing at how ludicrous that image is. 'See', I say 'all women are not like that.' Later when he has finished his design he goes on the computer and calls me over to see some pictures of half naked woman splayed all over a car bonnet. I glance briefly and walk away (Fieldnotes, 28 October).

On another occasion Cromwell asked me to come to his computer and read over a song he was composing. It turned out to be a violent rap song all about rape and beating 'the stupid ho of a bitch up.' I didn't say anything, just looked him in the eye, he kept smirking and laughing and at lunchtime that day mentioned that I didn't like his rap to one of the male co-workers, again laughing over my attitude. The co-

worker just shrugged it off. Such instances are small and can be seen as insignificant, but for me they demonstrated a keen interest on the part of Cromwell to actively cause annoyance and embarrassment. In both instances I did not feel that I dealt with the situation effectively. I knew that watching women laying over car bonnets, gyrating down poles and writing rap songs are in and of themselves a part of life, however the difference here was that my reactions were being sought out quite consciously by Cromwell, arguably to show that he knew these were things Baltz would not like in his class. But also that he had opportunities to access them and took an active part in the construction of a song that was offensive to women.

How much of this can be put down to Cromwell's troubled history I would not care to speculate but it did make me reconsider Baltz's statements as holding an element of practical truth to them. The male co-worker shrugged off the rap song as 'no big deal' which on one level it wasn't. But I began to see that if I did stay longer in the class I would be faced with many more such instances regarding 'what women are like', small and often apparently trivial things that over time would prove difficult for me to calmly deal with. This I think is what Baltz referred to when he mentioned that a competent female class helper might just be worn down by the destructive and negative attitudes many of his male pupils had towards women. That women did not behave like that in the school didn't outweigh the reality that beyond the school women *did* drape themselves over car bonnets and people who wrote songs in support of domestic violence were not reprimanded but instead given money and fame, social realities Cromwell was fully conversant with.

This is a crucial point. All three of my fieldsites create a world that appears to be bounded, if not in a physical or social geographical sense, then at least in a social behaviour way. The boundaries of all three places are well connected to the outside world with staff moving to and from their places of work, co-workers coming and going, friends and family visiting, alongside the many other official and semi-official people who would arrive for meetings and other events. The use of technology (computers, internet, films, radios etc) in the Houses and classrooms was embraced (to greater and lesser degrees) across all three sites. Regular trips to the cinema

happened on often a weekly basis, alongside other trips to coffee shops, supermarkets and restaurants. The world beyond ebbed and flowed, or as Blenkinsop (2012: 213-214) suggests, seeing movement and flow along a continuum rather than as an internal/external dialectic, is a more useful way to conceptualise life. This was certainly true within Camphill settings. It further allows the point to be made that things can influence life within the school which go beyond the remit of staff to control. Cromwell's viewing of racing car drivers and 'their women' is a case in point. Further, access to the internet and YouTube will enable pupils to witness women (among other things) in ways not in public evidence at the school.

However, though the staff have little possibility, or indeed desire, to decry this movement of people and ideas, there still existed across the three sites a clear code of conduct for pupils and staff. The learning and internalising of this code was seen as a way of managing a world where the ambiguities of female behaviour (to continue with the Cromwell example) can be managed and to a degree understood without this becoming seen as 'all women everywhere behave like that.' Baltz's 'no swearing' was another such element of the code, or not being violent and eating only one type of foodstuff another. All of these things come together and are manifested through the declared principle of healthy eating, respecting and showing tolerance for others as well as the importance of role models. At basis such concepts are used by everyone to help establish the ground rules for how people should operate in a complex world. As a result they are often simple and straightforward but crucially inflexible.

Many people I spoke to would reiterate how certain things are 'just done' and there are no questions. What this means is that of course people do question it, but despite the questioning, the practices will carry on. For example, one co-worker commented that standing with his hands folded, feet together and speaking the Christian themed morning verse 'interfered with his chakras' and was bluntly told that 'if he had an issue with that he could go' (Fieldnotes, 22 May). He did not leave but from then on stood in the required pose for the morning and evening circle. Another time, when the book for the morning verse reading had been mislaid, instead of saying 'oh well

never mind, let's just go in for breakfast,' the co-worker in charge took another book from the shelf and read a paragraph (chosen at random) from it. Once this obligatory reading, standing and 'good morning' had been uttered everyone went in for breakfast (Fieldnotes, 18 April). Nobody made a fuss or even raised an eyebrow, because the important thing was that the moment had occurred with the main ingredients in it, or as Douglas (1972) writes, the 'ordered patterns' to it. This ordered pattern is crucial for the development and management of both co-workers and residents/pupils. In this way much of this behaviour management and control could be called the development of a successful social self. In this the staff are also expected to show a continued observance and awareness within their own work, which the resistance to standing in the appropriate way at Morning circle seeks to overthrow. Rather the recognition of the importance of such moments in helping a person to become a socially successful self is another way of interpreting the importance placed on the daily rituals and annual festivals within Camphill settings. The Camphill world must constantly negotiate with many other worlds, as previously mentioned, but maintaining a clear social code through the use of the festivals and rituals is arguably what makes Camphill unique in the kind of work it does. For example, the 'peace moment', as one parent called it, before going in for meals where everyone gathers in the sitting room, sits with folded hands and are then invited to 'go in for lunch' – would be explained to co-workers as:

You become aware of how busy the day is, rushing from one thing to the next. Being still and calm for even a few seconds in the day allows you to breathe and pause before the next things starts. If you are aware of this, think how important and helpful such a moment is for a child who cannot sit or stand still without constantly moving. For a few seconds of each day they can be still. If you [the co-worker] are still, they too can learn to be still and you will see a different part of that person's character (Shirley, Fieldnotes, 23 May).

In my time at all three sites, I noticed that the people who often talked incessantly, constantly fidgeted and generally couldn't sit still, would in those few second before

going in for meals be able to be still and silent. It seems on one level very trivial, a few seconds of silence three times a day. But the argument I was given is that these moments of silence enable all those present to witness and experience different aspects of people's characters. Incessant talking can give way to silence, movement to stillness. The labels and troubled histories applied to people are temporarily destabilised and overthrown. These moments are opportunities for new ways of seeing and possibly developing new ways of understanding, both for the staff and the resident/pupil.

Again it is important to stress that the reading of person and self at these moment has a very practical basis for all concerned. Senior staff would notice if their younger colleagues were tired, looked grumpy or generally did not 'appear to be ok,' alongside the aforementioned transformative reading of the residents and pupils. The troubled history evident through violent outbursts, gendered attitudes and narrow eating habits can, in these moments, appear transformed. The reading therefore is threefold. One, it facilitated a different and temporary state of being for a troubled pupil and resident to come to the fore. Two, it enabled staff and co-worker behaviour to be read and interpreted. Three, as mentioned in earlier chapters, it was a space for demonstrating to newer pupils and staff how to stand and sit and behave. In a nutshell people would see, read and learn within these clearly spaced and demarcated moments.

This is crucial, for the development of the successful social pupil/resident and indeed development of 'excellent' carer/teacher/etc is predicated on this threefold process. The learning is visual and based on observing the people around you. The observing and reading part of this learning is based on the self knowing what the actions, words and rules mean and the types of behaviour associated with them. Cromwell's knowledge that the women at his school did not drape themselves over cars or endorse domestic violence shows his awareness of the school's code regarding how women will behave. This knowledge he offsets by stating 'all women act like that.' In this way though he may be aware of how one social space, namely his school, understands the actions and behaviour of the people within it, he does not always

conform to this type of knowledge. However Cromwell's knowledge of the different codes of behaviour governing different social spaces and him challenging my perceptions of femaleness shows him working out the ways that people learn and become social. As Rapport and Overing state, this knowledge is transformed into the management and performance of the social world, which in turn leads to a "nourishing of their whole selves ... in short [it] describes the arena in which one learns and largely continues to practise being social" (Rapport & Overing, 2007:75). In order for this social arena and social learning to work, repetition is the order of the day. Hence the fairly regimented and static daily structure of the three Camphill places (school and workshops), designated mealtimes, festivals and 'peace moments' – work and work well because they are not new but continuously reinforced through their daily repetitive application. The troubled history and troubled behaviour, can over time be turned into a successful social self with knowledge of how to manage and control the expectations of different social worlds. In order for this to happen, the skills of observation, repetition and learning are honed and developed through the support and knowledge of significant others. Such social knowledge is not just observed and learned through the structural makeup of the places or collective rituals, but works in a dialectical connection with the individual work of significant people.

Significant Others

A crucial step in the development of the socially managed person involves the presence of significant others. By this I mean key and important people who are assigned to the care, education and training of the various pupils and residents. In Cromwell's case, Baltz was his teacher and Cromwell would spend a considerable portion of his day with Baltz reinforcing what was deemed appropriate and inappropriate behaviour. Furthermore, Baltz was also Cromwell's Housefather which meant that this social learning continued during mealtimes and social spaces in the House. The significant person in the majority of cases was someone who spent a considerable amount of time with the child/adult and was characterised by a long relationship to the Camphill place as much as to the people who live there. In Blair Drummond and Corbenic these people were often the House co-ordinators, workshop

leaders and most significantly the Manager. The yearly volunteer co-workers rarely reached this status level as their time within Camphill was necessarily short and like the children and adults they helped care for, they too had to learn the rules and structures of the place which for other long-serving staff were ingrained and self-evident.

At Corbenic, Barbara, the manager, would often hold a weekly knitting group in her cottage on the ground of Corbenic. This was open to all the residents of Corbenic but the people who faithfully attended were the residents who had lived for decades in Corbenic as well as other Camphill places and all had experienced the change and upheaval of the recent past.³⁴ Some of them had come to Camphill back in the late sixties when they were still children. One had been at Corbenic since its Camphill beginnings. Barbara's knitting group was not so much a place to knit, though they all brought along their knitting unravelled, knotted and with plenty of dropped stitches, but was primarily a space where they asserted a claim to Barbara as a figure of embodied knowledge about them and their Camphill past. Barbara knew their histories, the many different people who had been part of their lives and could respond to their questions clearly and sympathetically. Many of the knitting group had no living relatives, or relatives who came only once a year. Barbara stood in the place of family to many of them and was therefore a very important and significant person for all. Competitiveness between them for her attention to sort out their dropped stitches or to listen to what they were saying was fierce and often uncomplimentary. The days before the intended knitting group meeting would have Neil, Colin and Mary checking that it was still happening with Barbara and also checking that she would have cake and tea for them. If it had to be cancelled, the immediate questions were when it would happen next (Fieldnotes, 25 May).

The long term effects of this knitting group could be seen in situations where the behaviour of a particular resident became problematic. Rebecca would on occasion refuse to move from her chair in the sitting room to the dining room table and when asked repeatedly by the House co-ordinator would mutter angrily under her breath.

³⁴ See Chapter Three for the change in management structures that Corbenic went through.

She would also sometimes be physically inappropriate in collective settings such as Monday Morning Assembly and start swearing or touching her breasts and vagina in an obvious way. The looks and requests to stop from her house co-ordinator would often go ignored but Barbara had to simply state 'Rebecca' for her to stop what she was doing and sit quietly without swearing or touching herself (Fieldnotes, 18 May, 17 June).

Similar situations occurred with other members of the knitting group. In all of the situations, Barbara's authority and request to conform to the socially appropriate way of being was adhered to. Indeed for many co-workers and house co-ordinators this was often deeply frustrating. Their own attempts at normative socialisation practices were often ignored and dismissed but Barbara's presence always had a magic effect. Even to the point that the stated intent of fetching Barbara to 'sort out the situation' sent one resident into hasty obedience and an 'I'm fine, I'm fine' response that negated the need for Barbara's presence (Fieldnotes, 10 June). This is not say that Barbara's presence was always the immediate panacea for the management of difficult behaviour. There were plenty of occasions where her presence did not work its magic, but these were often with residents who had not been at Corbenic for as long or for whom the need to attack the bus far outweighed the socially controlling presence of a such a significant figure.

At Blair Drummond, Geoffrey also attracted a similar amount of social obedience but again with specific people. When he was present at Morning Assembly or walking down the corridor, certain residents who were being unmanageable would visibly change how they were behaving to conform to socially acceptable behaviour (Fieldnotes, 12 February, and 20 March). Like Damon in Baltz's class, all of these examples demonstrate that residents know the social rules and are aware when and how they are breaking them. What is interesting is that they associate the socially acceptable way to behave with specific people. As a result Barbara, Geoffrey and Baltz all embody a certain social way of being. This is not as simple as a recognition of hierarchy as Barbara, Geoffrey and Baltz quite literally carry the particular pupil/adults history with them and are also the people for whom the repetitive

administering of social etiquette and norms is an unquestioned way of being. Their presence for certain residents confirms that way of being and they in turn change their own self into one that is in alignment with these significant people. The significance of such people cannot be underplayed. At the time of writing Barbara has been at Corbenic over twelve years, Geoffrey at Blair Drummond for six and the joint co-ordinators of Ochil Tower School have thirteen and seventeen years between them. Their longevity means that they are, alongside the residents and pupils, the most enduring carriers of Camphill knowledge and social practices. All three sites strongly stress the importance of building and continuously developing a strong relationship with the pupils and residents as well as between staff and co-workers. Of course it is a practical impossibility to develop such strong relationships with every pupil or resident, although time and persistence, as evidenced by Barbara, Geoffrey and Baltz, does help with this. However, I also witnessed situations where the young one year volunteer co-workers were the people to whom older residents would respond. On one occasion a resident who was notorious for always finishing undrunk cups of tea appeared in the basket weaving workshop. Everyone, co-workers, workshop leader and residents made a simultaneous grab for their cups of tea. Debra walked around the workshop looking for an unattended cup, the workshop leader then put her cup down and tried to usher Debra out of the workshop. Quick as a flash Debra ran for the cup, the workshop leader beat her to it and remarked afterwards: 'Is there nobody who can stop Debra's incessant need to finish other people's drink?' There was and whenever Debra visited a House or Workshop attended by Claudia, she would not grab people's cups at all. As Debra's significant other, Claudia, a one year German volunteer, could deter Debra's otherwise cup drinking fetish. With Claudia Debra demonstrated that she knew that drinking other people's tea was not an acceptable way to behave, without Claudia she carried on regardless (Fieldnotes, 23 March).

What all these examples demonstrate is the awareness of residents and pupils about the socially acceptable way to behave in particular social situations. This type of knowledge necessarily changes if the social situation is a Morning gathering, or classroom work or drinking tea, but what they all have in the common is the

underlying assumption that these particular contexts demand context specific behaviour. For some older residents that knowledge is tied up with a senior staff member, for others it is with the person who currently and repetitively shares their everyday life. Either way social norms, and the knowledge of them, are connected to staff members in particular ways. Claudia can stop Debra drinking other people's tea but only if she is there, and once gone the tea drinking rules that Debra has been following are not so ingrained that Debra would follow them regardless. What this often means is that pupils and residents develop relationships with particular people who are able to socialise them into particular ways of being, but the social norms and rules have not become so instinctive that they are followed when their significant person is not around. In these situations residents and pupils associate the following of social norms specifically and often exclusively with a single person and not as a wider and endemic part of social life.

Once the relationship between resident/pupil and staff/co-worker has been established and is seen to be working, for example Claudia's success in halting Debra's incessant tea drinking, the following social steps are attempted. This is where the particular resident/pupil is brought into more consistent contact with the Camphill places' collective events like Morning Assemblies, Festivals and Services. The people who cannot manage these types of situations are usually kept with their significant other in their particular House, sometimes a classroom/workshop, whilst the event is ongoing (Fieldnotes, 28 March, 18 May, 26 November). Behaviour deemed inappropriate is very much event dependant. Therefore running and loud shouting is tolerated during a disco or ceilidh but not during a Service or the 'peace moment' before meals. What these collective events do, apart from the obvious building of social solidarity and cohesion for those involved (Crow, 2002; Jenkins, 2008; Cohen, 1982, 1985), is to demonstrate that there are multiple ways of being in the world and that learning how to read and behave in different social situations is an important life skill to develop. It is also a space where the social norms learned with the significant other are tested. In other words, such collective gatherings are spaces whereby the pupil/resident can demonstrate that they have learned and internalised

the socially appropriate way of being, not solely linked to the physical presence of their significant other.

For example Claire no longer attended Blair Drummond's Morning Assemblies as she always spent the fifteen minutes either shouting or running around the room. The entire purpose of the assembly was then lost due to her non-normative behaviour and other residents would often copy her actions resulting in near anarchy (Fieldnotes, 30 April). A similar situation existed in Corbenic, where David would disrupt their Monday Morning Gatherings by wanting to sit next to Barbara and talk to only Barbara. If anyone else spoke or announcements were made he would get angry and often violent. After one too many outbursts he spent his Monday morning having a leisurely breakfast with his House co-ordinator and no longer attended the Assemblies (Fieldnotes, 7 May). In Ochil Tower Ruth and Damon stopped attending the Friday Services as both of them seemed to find the silence and structurally rigid format unbearable, resulting in verbal and violent outbursts worse than in other social situations (Fieldnotes, 27 October, 12 December).

What is clear is that there is a movement between collective events and the presentation of an acceptable social self. Though certain pupils/residents may not manage particular social occasions, this did not mean that they never would and attempts would be made for the person to take part in another collective event, often when their significant person deemed that they were 'ready' and could 'manage it' (Fieldnotes, 12 March, 15 June, 18 December). This was particularly striking in Ochil Tower where Martha had worked intensively with Ruth for nearly three years and kept trying to include her in events beyond the House and classroom. Ruth was someone who would often get 'stuck,' quite literally she would not move and no amount of persuasion would budge her. In fact persuasion often made it worse and she could remain stuck for hours. This often happened when collective events took place in the School's cultural life, such as a Halloween celebrations, Friday Services (which she no longer attended) and Monday morning school assembly and other occasions when the whole school would be all together. I witnessed it at the annual Advent Garden where the whole school along with family, friends and guests of the

School mark the beginning of Advent through the walking of the Advent garden. This is where a green spiral made of evergreen branches is laid out in the Hall with a lit candle in the centre. Each child is invited to walk to the centre of the spiral carrying an apple with a candle in it, light their apple from the main candle and then place their apple somewhere in the green spiral. Meanwhile the adults and other children watching this sing Christmas and Advent songs. The initially striking thing about the ceremony is that the people enter the hall to almost complete darkness, only the main candle and a few side candles are lit and gradually over the course of the event, the Hall becomes ever lighter through the lighting of more and more candles. When Ruth and Martha walked into the hall, Ruth stopped at the entrance way went rigid and promptly collapsed on the floor where she started screaming at the top of her lungs. It took Baltz and Anthony along with Stefan and Martha to lift Ruth's prostrate yelling form out of the Hall. To manage this the lights had to be temporarily put on but once Ruth was out of the Hall, swiftly switched off again. Martha told me afterwards that she was so embarrassed and had thought something like that would happen. 'I shouldn't have gone to the Hall with her but I hoped she would manage' (Fieldnotes, 3 December).

The important point here was for Ruth to demonstrate her knowledge of the socially acceptable way to behave for the Advent Garden and if she had managed it would have been a further development of her social skills in collective and semi-public settings. As the example shows, Ruth did not manage and furthermore that Martha blamed herself for trying to take her to it. Martha's comment 'I shouldn't have gone to the Hall with her' shows how, as the significant person, she was aware of the potential fallout but hoped that Ruth would 'manage' to present a socially successful self, which Ruth often could. This returns to my main argument about the type of social being worked into existence here. It is not enough that Ruth can eat, drink and sing songs in the House and in her Class. To be a successfully functioning individual in society, a person must be able to manage situations where they encounter a variety of people, especially people who will not know anything about them. It is the tacitly written norm of the Advent garden that people enter in the dark and sit quietly. By breaking this tacit rule, Ruth demonstrates her lack of ability to manage a larger

social gathering with a variety of people, much like Claire and David find it difficult to follow the unwritten social rules of Blair Drummond and Corbenic's Assemblies. In a one on one situation with their significant person, Claire, David, Ruth, Debra and Damon to name a few, are socially skilled people who manage their everyday lives of House, workshop/school. It is when they are expected to read and understand wider social norms and rules that difficulties and tensions arise.

The process of participation in the Camphill cultural events, daily Morning circles, weekly Assemblies and annual Festivals, enables the individual to become part of the wider society of the Camphill place and the rules that it has. Through this repetition certain social norms and codes are learned and internalised with the label of challenging behaviour becoming less applicable and the individual able to be part of a wider social group. The importance of learning to manage not only your own behaviour but also be able to interact within a group is deemed crucial because of the interplay between home and school worlds, Camphill life and the life beyond the geographical confines of the place. What my three fieldsites all share in common is the multiple levels of learning that take place within them. Attending school, or the Basketry or Bakery workshop taught not just the conventional skills of basket weaving, bread making and reading and writing but more important and taken for granted skills: namely the ability to be at home in the world. "We tend to single out experiences which we can handle, with which we are comfortable, with which we can live" (Jackson, 1995: 6); learning to be social and to read the rules and norm of that socialness, which for the majority of people are just there and exist, is the continuous work of Ochil Tower School, Corbenic and Blair Drummond. Life in Camphill places can be perhaps best understood through the lens of an ethnographer arriving in a foreign country to observe and study, to them, a foreign people. The rules and ways of being are as yet unknown and therefore immediately strange and different. Over time the country and people become familiar and the rules and norms obvious and self evident. The ethnographer learns by watching what others do, asking for explanations and often mimicking 'the natives' in order to be accepted. For the pupils/residents and young volunteer co-workers that come to Camphill this process is what they all go through and it is made possible because of key and

significant people who know that rules and norms are social facts with important social functions and where internal and external social surveillance are the desired and continuously looked for outcome (Durkheim, 1982; Foucault, 1975). As Marcus, a workshop leader, once said to me: ‘Everyone wants to think that their Camphill place is unique and special, which in one sense we are, but every Camphill place works with residents and pupils in workshops and schools and in this sense we are all the same’ (Fieldnotes, 2 April). The tacit and unspoken rule of Camphill is in the continuous work of learning to become social. In Camphill those seen as unable to adapt to social norms are encouraged to do so through ritualistic interactions and specific care, which is prompted by the belief in holism and developing a complete social self.

The Social Self

I have demonstrated throughout this chapter that the troubled histories of pupils and residents are understood by staff and co-workers in a variety of ways, in particular the importance of a pupil/resident having a significant person in their daily lives. This significant person does more than just teach the pupil/resident how to behave in a variety of social situations; they are also gatekeepers to social events in the Camphill places and outings beyond the geographical boundary of the particular Camphill site. The skills of the significant person are the cultivated ability to recognise when their particular pupil/resident will ‘manage’ to be part of bigger collective gatherings or solo shopping trips to the cinema and coffee shops. As already seen, the ability to read social situations and present a socially acceptable self is, for certain people, a continuous process of learning and re-learning which is sometimes never fully mastered. The social self of such individuals is umbilically attached to their significant other and as such never develops to a social independence not reliant on the socially sanctioning presence of their significant person (Fieldnotes, 23 February, 20 May, 7 November).

However for others, the internalisation of the social norms and rules of the Camphill place gradually extends beyond the scope of a significant other to incorporate a variety of people and social situations. The daily rituals of Morning and Evening

Circle are proactively engaged in with the pupil/resident standing quietly and singing along. Also the recitation of verses and poems is attempted even by those who are a verbally challenged. The weekly Assemblies are managed well, alongside a generally productive self in class and workshops. The annual festivals are known and enjoyed and though there may be times when the social norms and rules are flouted these are increasingly less and less. Trips to the coffee shop, shopping, going for outings and trips with a befriender,³⁵ are some of the next steps in the ongoing development of the social self.

Though the geographical boundaries of my three fieldsites are clear, the social boundaries are much more fluid and less easily regulated and managed. As previously mentioned, the flow of people in and out of the Camphill places happens continuously, however encouraging pupils and residents to go on trips beyond the physical boundary of the places are carefully monitored and controlled. At Blair Drummond, Corbenic and Ochil Tower such outings were carefully planned and assessed, not just from a Health and Safety perspective, but crucially whether the pupils/residents would ‘manage’ them. Negotiations preceding one trip to Perth to a coffee shop with the Craft workshop resulted in Walter staying behind – his continuous burping and ignoring the workshop leader’s request that he stop meant that she did not take him with the rest of the group (Fieldnotes, 12 May). In Ochil Tower, learning coffee shop etiquette was engaged in on a weekly basis by one House and the Houseparents as the following extract demonstrates:

Walk into Café Kisa with Rowan house. The waitress nods a welcome and the pupils and co-workers take their seats at the longest table in the place. I glance at a menu but most pupils have gone to inspect the cake cabinet with their co-workers. Laura asks Simon if he wants lemonade and ice-cream, he nods an enthusiastic affirmative. Andrew tells Johanna that ‘I’m going to the loo and I want the chocolate cake.’ She nods in confirmation. The waitress comes over and the various orders for coffee, cake, juice and ice-cream are placed. Andrew returns from the loo and sits in his chair; he checks that

³⁵ A local person who volunteers to take an individual resident out for coffee, cinema trips etc. Both Blair Drummond and Corbenic have befriending schemes.

Johanna ordered what he wanted. The food and drinks arrive and are distributed around the table. The waitress seems to know which pupil has what. I ask Johanna after the waitress has gone if they come here a lot? ‘Oh yes,’ she laughs ‘once a week. Moritz [her husband] and I decided that the pupils needed to develop their social skills so we take them to the coffee shop. The first time we arrived Andrew ran out of the emergency exit door which set the alarm off and Simon poured the sugar and milk all over the table. The rest of them were so noisy and could barely sit still.’ She laughs whilst telling the story. ‘If that had been me I would never have come back’, I say. ‘Well it takes time but now look at them now.’ I duly glance around the table; everyone is quietly eating with occasional assistance from the young co-workers – social skills learned (Fieldnotes, 12 November).

The fixed and repetitious structure of Ochil Tower school, combined with the daily rituals, festivals and assemblies, is further developed in the social milieu in one of Auchterarder’s coffee shops. By repeating the experience of weekly coffee shop trips, all the pupils of Rowan house learn the socially acceptable way to behave. As Johanna points out this is part of the development of social skills that the pupils will need to have in order to manage life in the world. Furthermore, as Johanna’s retelling shows, the first trip to the coffee shop was not a social success but by repeating the experience, through the co-workers all demonstrating how one is supposed to behave in that particular setting, the pupils all learn to conform to normative acceptance of coffee shop etiquette. As Bryderup and Frorup state, such situations provide “normal conditions for learning and development, in spite of young people’s individual difficulties ... [this is] closely related to normalisation because it adapts individuals or groups to society’s norms and rules” (Bryderup & Frorup, 2011: 96). The trip to the coffee shop is an example of group socialisation; other situations exist where individuals are given opportunities for their own personal social development. During my time at Ochil Tower some of the more senior pupils who were going to leave the school within the year would go on solo trips to Perth. Hamish did this and returned with nails, screws and some wood in his rucksack that Baltz had asked him to pick up from the hardware store. Other pupils went to the local Library by

themselves and others went shopping in the co-op with a list of things they needed to buy for the supper they were going to cook. All of these trips initially started out with a co-worker walking to the Library, co-op, bus stop and trip to Perth etc, with the pupil, then over time the co-worker's presence was then decreased to shadowing the pupil as they went on their solo trips. This was done so that if there were any difficulties the pupil might run into, the co-worker could then appear and help the pupil to resolve them. Eventually the pupil would go on these trips alone with no shadowing, their own hard-learned social skills providing the medium to get them out of any unforeseen difficulties (Fieldnotes 26 – 31 October). Not all the pupils at Ochil Tower reached this level of social independence, and many, as I have shown, struggled to manage the School's collective events and could only attend coffee shops and the cinema if their significant person was with them and even then 'challenging behaviour' as co-workers called it could and did arise.

Transferring from Ochil Tower School to Blair Drummond was initially challenging and difficult for the pupils as well as for the parents/carers. For some pupils, Blair Drummond would never be an option due to the high level of 'challenging behaviour' that they continued to demonstrate at Ochil Tower, along with the difficulty in securing funding from local councils. For those pupils a move to a more 'secure unit' was often the option. Pupils would also return home if no other option was found for them. But for those who did move to Blair Drummond, adult life presented yet more social challenges. In one sense much of the life would be familiar: daily graces at mealtimes, seasonal songs, festivals, workshops instead of school – all in all a highly structured daily life. Whilst this continuity of form and ritual helped ease the transition, however adult life was much more relaxed and also far less socially regimented. Talking to Geoffrey one day in the corridor, he pointed out an Ochil Tower transfer who he said 'ran all over the castle when he first arrived. He was so used to being closely watched and here it didn't happen. It took him a while to learn that he has to control his own behaviour, not us' (Fieldnotes, 22 March). Whether the adult life is indeed more relaxed, all three places continue their daily work of fostering and encouraging the social self of the individual to be integrated into the life of the place.

Other challenges that Blair Drummond and Corbenic face which Ochil Tower through the legal age of their pupils can more easily bypass, is that of intimate relationships between residents. The social self is more than just the successful presentation and internalisation of society's rules and norms as I have discussed throughout the chapter, and another social norm concerns physical relationships between people. Elsie outlined some of the issues she faced in her House with an adult resident who was in a relationship with a female resident and how that relationship had to be monitored.

Elsie starts to tell me about what she considers the most challenging aspect of her work here. Sean (an older male resident) finds it particularly difficult that co-workers can have relationships with the greatest of ease and yet his relationship with Lana is continually monitored and censored. 'We also have to protect ourselves and so there are policies that can be put in place where the relationship between residents is documented so as to protect us against allegations of neglect. The problem is those policies only sanction 'nice and happy' relationships, anything more complicated is just not allowed.' She pauses and frowns 'another problem is that the policy is gender biased and tends to see women as the victims and men as aggressors, when to be honest, here it is often the women who are more sexually pushy and the men who are reluctant. It is our failing that we don't manage it properly and for many residents considering their age it becomes an increasingly more important aspect of their life here.' She relates how there is reluctance to engage with discussions about a residents' sexuality and need for sexual expression. Even if sexual relations were 'allowed' to happen it would still be heavily monitored and a lengthy paper trail would exist as there is a fine line to walk between obligations of protection in care and the freedom of choice for a resident (Fieldnotes 8 June).

Henderson et al (2011) point out that sexual intimacy between people labelled vulnerable and in residential care settings is the last great taboo which remains un-

resolved as there are so many conflicting and incompatible legal, social and practical issues at stake. As Elsie points out, the obligations of care which often at the most basic level stress that the vulnerable person be protected from all harmful aspects of society and even from themselves if need be, comes into direct conflict with the other equally enshrined legal rights to self determination and choice. As I have shown, the development of the social self is the recognition and understanding of normative rules and through this becoming at home in the world. The prohibition on a physical relationship is directly at odds with the development of the social self. Sean sees how co-workers younger than him have relationships (often with changing partners) throughout the course of the year and compares the unconcern and disinterestedness attached to these kinds of relationships to his long-term relationship with Lana. Such situations highlight in the starkest way the differences between carer and cared for. All other social rules and norms, how to eat nicely, the saying of graces, singing of songs, how to stand and behave in the Services, following the structure of day and year, people follow and perpetuate regardless of age or ability, but a sexual relationship is the area where Sean becomes aware that there is something fundamentally different about him and Lana that excludes him from the same social rules and norms the other young people follow. It is not surprising then that he is angry, especially when the solution to the issue is so fraught with problems for those who are legally there to care for him.

There were other couples in both Corbenic and Blair Drummond who, I observed, would often sit side by side, give each other kisses and hugs and often defend each other noisily and sometimes aggressively if they felt they were being mistreated. However none of these couples had an active sexual relationship, they did not sleep in the same room and though this had been offered to one couple the man expressed ambivalence and so nothing came of it. What is clear is that each couple is dealt with very much on a case by case basis. There is no blanket policy for how the relationship should and could proceed with communication between staff and the couple an ongoing process. This is made more complicated when one partner wants a sexual relationship and the other quite literally withdraws from the possibility (Fieldnotes, 24 March, 10 June). Suffice it to say that sexual relations between

residents is a complex and challenging area that highlights the impossibility of becoming a 'whole' and equal self when the social awkwardness of staff and the legal minefield of policies states otherwise. In other words, Camphill cannot be divorced from the wider world in which it is located. Norms are constructed in and through relationships, as this chapter has shown, and this is as true for institutions as for individuals. The social self, whether evident in public settings beyond the boundaries of the Camphill places or indeed within the places themselves, is never static and finished. It is work that lasts a lifetime, for to be social is to "possess a means by which life can be filled, shaped and reshaped – enjoyed and suffered – in significant ways" (Rapport & Overing, 2007: 296).

Conclusion

At the beginning of this chapter I discussed the kind of social self that was being worked on. I mentioned the theoretical debates from social pedagogy that argued for the whole individual to be recognised and brought into being. For the long-term staff and co-workers of Ochil Tower School, Corbenic and Blair Drummond, theoretical issues around holism were translated in practice to the development of a socially functioning self. As I have explored over the last pages, the work and learning of how to be a social person at ease with the norms and rules of the Camphill place and then wider society is an ongoing process. The crucial point here is 'at ease' with these norms. Social situations change and different ways of being are demanded as the varied cultural life within the three Camphill places demonstrates. As an adult ethnographer brought up within the Camphill fold, these ways of being seemed obvious and often seemed as though innate. I barely noticed that I would be standing hands folded, feet together for morning circle, or sit in silence before meals. I had been taught whilst young and though I was no longer part of the everyday life of a Camphill I responded intuitively to the given social situation and remembered how to behave. Such learning is never lost and is often the most enduring legacy of life within Camphill.

I mentioned in earlier chapters how songs learned by residents when young are carried on when they move to other Camphill places, alongside requests for Festivals

and graces. This was evident at Corbenic and Blair Drummond but what this chapter has extended is the notion that these particular rituals and festive moments demonstrate not just knowledge of Camphill's cultural traditions, but also provide spaces for presenting the socially transformed self. For example, another reading of the performance of plays at end of year School festivals is more than just a cynical "contrast between display and reality" (Goffman, 1961: 99), but is where parents and friends of the pupil can see the contrast between the troubled history of the past and the socially functioning and performing person of the present. For many staff and co-workers, the triumphs of their daily work with the children and adults were often encapsulated in such phrases as 'Philip managed to stand in front of the class and hit the PowerPoint button which showed pictures of the class's woodland project!' or 'David stayed on stage even with his mother watching, he never normally manages that' and so on. The focus on managing social situations that hardly seem worthy of comment, are often hailed as grand breakthroughs in a pupil's/resident's capability. I remember sitting through numerous tea breaks at my fieldsites and feeling a sense of bafflement at the high excitement and repeated discussion that arose out of what seemed to me, nothing out of the ordinary. That it was nothing out of the ordinary was precisely the point. The small and insignificant actions, the ability to be part of a weekly event without a fuss were huge because they demonstrated the pupil/resident was becoming part of ordinary social life. Where before their behaviour occasioned comment, despair and fear, now there was learned social control and group integration.

Much as the medical profession has confidence in their diagnosis of the particular syndromes and symptoms the pupils and residents have, so too are the staff and co-workers secure in their knowledge that the environments they work in, the lives that the children and adults will lead in the Camphill settings, the routines and cultural festivities, are as, if not more powerful than a label of autism for example. The troubled history of one person can often be transformed within these clearly socially bounded spaces. The troubled histories mean something but they do not mean everything, and most importantly they are not seen as a limit to what an individual can achieve. Social success is measured by how little attention is paid by other coffee

shop patrons or the audience at a cinema to the presence of pupils and residents. Travelling solo on a bus shows that the person is one of many, not one of a visibly different minority. Other identifiers can be attached to their person, but not exclusively those of the omnipotent medical and social work profession. Instead the person carries the knowledge of a Camphill education and training inscribed on their bodily attitudes and ability to read a variety of social situations. They also carry the memory of seasonal songs, esoteric poems, imposing buildings filled with art, boundary walks and colourful festivals – they literally embody Camphill. It can be seen here that rather than rendering bodies ‘docile’ (Foucault, 1975: 135-169) as such, Camphill’s disciplinary care renders bodies capable of social interaction and has a more positive and empowering end. Daily monitoring by staff, significant others and – eventually – the self, help the pupils/residents to become social beings. As Shirley memorably phrased it, ‘the purpose of Camphill is in building relationships with each other and most importantly in how we behave towards each other’ (Fieldnotes, 27 October).



Conclusion

Leaving Camphill

An Ending

I began this thesis with no overarching research questions or indeed hypotheses about Camphill. Instead I simply wanted to explore how everyday life in Camphill places was lived. It was only through circumstances in the field that I came to the recognition and subsequent discussion about Camphill identity formation and the particular ways my fieldsites construct the social. That said I also wanted to test out some methodological and theoretical ideas in this thesis. I wanted my ethnography to be inclusive and to take account of multiple ways of viewing and constructing the social world. Along the way I struggled with the primacy of text and felt the need to include more visual cues and signifiers, in the belief that more needs to be done to integrate such approaches into social research. I wanted to show that defining knowledge is subject to particular forms and practices, whether as a written thesis or in everyday fieldsite encounters. I wanted the research to be useful for academics and my Camphill informants. In short I wanted my work to be an embodiment of my academic and personal ideals, much as I saw many of my informants embodying Camphill principles and practice.

It is clear that some of this has been achieved but other aspects I have failed to realise. Yet as Visweswaran (1994: 100) writes, “a failed account ... occasions new kinds of positionings” and it is particularly these ‘new kinds of positionings’ that I want to engage with in this conclusion. The five composing chapters have made a variety of points, some explicit and others more implied. In essence this thesis has engaged with the various ways that people learn and become social. It has been a journey of learning, where I have been as socialised as the co-workers, pupils and residents of Blair Drummond, Corbenic and Ochil Tower School. This process of socialisation has had four important elements. First, the ways in which formal knowledge is produced, organised and presented. By this I mean the way the social

world (and I within that world) have constructed and written this ethnography. Two, that Camphill and academia past and present are reliant on significant people and how they impart an understanding of the social world. Three, being part of the social world demands knowledge of the function of rules and norms, whether this is eating etiquette, the ability to recognise the deviant other, or writing, as Elias (1994) so notably argues. Such knowledge acts as an anchor to the social world. Finally, that questions about identity, self and other demonstrate the performative and repetitive socialisation processes that are strongly tied to social context and an endemic part of being human. I will now explore these four points in greater detail.

Throughout this thesis, my voice, the researcher voice, has been ever present. I wrote in Chapter Two that ethnography had developed to the extent where multivocal representation across the visual, oral, written and material was a reality and that this thesis would add to such a way of working and understanding the social world (Wolf, 1992; Elliott, 2005; Gadamer, 2004; Widdershoven, 1993; Atkinson & Delamont, 2006). With respect to those who argue this, I do not think this is quite how things are. This is partly to do with my own ethnographic failings, and the fact that multivocal and mixed media ethnographies demand a certain presentation of the social world that did not resonate within my own study. For example, my desire to present a social world as vivid and visual as the one that my informants live in everyday, has not come to fruition, I think for good reasons. In Chapter Four I attempted greater visual inclusion of paintings and material objects, yet such photos are in and of themselves an artificial construct. Seeing them imposed within a text is not a replication or even good representation of how people live with objects.

Relatedly it is interesting to note that academics who have spent their careers documenting the importance of the material in people's lives often present their work in plain text books, the front cover often carrying the only photograph (Miller, 2008, 2009; Teaiwa, 2004). Instead they rely on words to create the visual for their audience much as I have done throughout this thesis. Pictures where they are included provide window dressing and do not add significantly to the reader's understanding. Text, within the context of this thesis, therefore reigns supreme. The

ability to present the social world in all its technicolor glory is, at this point in time, not feasible. At least it is not feasible within the structures and confines of what I have done and the way that I have done it. This is the material point. Ethnographies and theses construct social worlds which are subject to particular types of format, content and structure regulations. The writers who argue for greater fluidity in the writing and structuring of academic knowledge are often already established names (Rapport, 1994; Gordon, 2008; Crang & Cook, 2007). Much like the senior co-workers of Ochil Tower School could bypass debates around the identity of Camphill due to their unquestioned status within their particular Camphill world, so more senior academics and ethnographers can more easily call for greater flexibility and imagination in the construction of the presentation of the social world, having already spent the greater part of their career writing articles and book chapters in the accepted and then prevailing fashion. Becker (2007: 181) ran his own 'unscientific experiment' on this topic. He found that peer recognition of his name allowed for simpler, jargon free and clear ideas to be accepted, but the same paper when anonymised was rejected on the grounds that 'it didn't fit the journal's style ... and it was too informal, not sufficiently scholarly and academic.' Thus writing is as much subject to problems and contested ideas about the 'right' way to write without trying to include visual materials into the mix. I don't think that I was wrong to try and make the attempt, but being at the end of the PhD process is very different from being at its beginning, and the aims at the beginning now seem laudable but also far away from the intellectual space I now inhabit.

The purpose of this discussion – writing must have a point – is that methodologically I wanted this thesis to achieve something sociologically imaginative (Mills, 1959). I embraced the idea of contemporary ethnographies as written by Reed-Danahay (1997) and Lincoln and Denzin (2003) where the boundary between self and other, fiction and fact, is so blurred that it cannot possibly be untangled. I still like the idea. However, like my informants who would read the Pillars of Camphill or Social Pedagogy or Curative Education, there was a stark difference between what was written and how things are actually lived and researched. Furthermore, the realities of writing, format, structure, content are much like the social norms and rules the

pupils/residents need to learn in order to function within the world. In order for me to function within sociology (let alone academia) I needed to read, learn and replicate these norms. At basis the norms state a thesis must have an argument and contribute to knowledge. On that front my methodological contribution is small but not entirely insignificant, namely that, although I hold dear the principles of multi-visual and multi-vocal research for providing a space for divergent viewpoints and the potential destabilising of hierarchies of knowledge, I think it is disingenuous to propose that ethnographic writing has evolved to a place where fused realities and multiple subjectivities are the norm. This is particularly true when conducting research in environments that are subject to more stringent ethical guidelines. As a result, ethical constraints can limit the choices to include visual materials in a more socially accountable manner. This was true throughout my research as the ‘ethics of emptiness’ prohibited documenting the variety of social life within Ochil Tower and Blair Drummond, and which in turn constrained how and in what ways the social world can be constructed. In this way my research has demonstrated the constant negotiations that ethnographic fieldwork must contend with that overcame my more purist minded ideals. Whilst I may construct the social world of Camphill in the context of writing, and prey as I am to my reading of academic writing norms, awareness of ethics and the “disciplinary culture of a particular department” (Becher, 1994: 357) is of primary consideration. Like the pupils and residents of my Camphill fieldsites, I too have been shaped and guided in my academic and personal socialisation process by significant others.

In the academic setting my significant others have been my supervisors, along with my doctoral peers as well as other academics. The development of my sociological identity has largely been shaped by these people as well as the afore-mentioned academic context and department (Li & Seale, 2008: 999). However this sociological identity has also developed within the personal space of my home, my friends and my roles as mother, partner, daughter and friend. I discussed the contested and ongoing nature of this identity work in Chapter Two and again in Chapter Five regarding the social development of co-workers, pupils and residents within Camphill settings. Significant others, whether they are supervisors or co-workers, act

as windows to a particular world. For me they demonstrated the ways that I should develop into a successfully functioning academic, writing being one of the most important social skills a future sociologist learns to re-enact and renegotiate. Within Camphill, these significant people repeatedly demonstrate the ways that an individual can learn to become a socially functioning person. Through repetitive and consistent demonstration the pupil/resident becomes aware of how to stand, eat and sit. Such processes continue with other daily activities where integration into the group is done through Morning Circle, Assemblies and Festivals alongside trips to coffee shops, the cinema and riding the bus. Significant others used their social selves as visible tools to teach the art of becoming social. Much as I used my social self to gather data and participate in daily life, so too are the social selves of my informants the primary way for an understanding of the social world to be seen. Such learning, I have argued is evidenced through constant performative and repetitive re-engagement and re-enactment within social contexts.

Despite the many methodological challenges I faced throughout my PhD research, particularly my “preoccupation with the writing of self, and the writing to significant others of the self” (Coffey, 1999: 155), I came to realise that much of my angst could be encapsulated in how I understood the self as a socially mediated, performative and continually learning human endeavour and less about the actual structural writing of ethnographies. I have, as mentioned earlier, written an ethnography in a fairly traditional manner and not embraced the more fictitious, multi-vocal approaches that others have experimented with (Wolf, 1992; Elliott, 2005; Gadamer, 2004; Widdershoven, 1993; Atkinson & Delamont, 2006). In this sense Coffey’s (1999: 156) point that the ‘crisis’ in ethnographic representation “and its textual outcomes may have greater long-term impact on the re-writing of the self than on the (re)writing of ethnographies,” is a valid claim. How I understood the self and indeed how my informants understood the self, hinged on certain particular social norms and rules, within specific social contexts. The fact that I was undertaking an organisational ethnography within familiar settings caused the writing of my ethnography and the writing of selves to be a mutually entangled endeavour. This is an important point. There has been recent interest in some quarters to argue that

ethnographies should seek to be interested in and investigate ‘cultural wholes’ (Watson, 2012:17). This implies a return to the ethnographic writing of the past where one *man’s* view of an entire social group was presented as *the* definitive presentation and which negated the social situatedness of the researcher as irrelevant and of little academic interest. I profoundly disagree with such sentiments and would argue that a continual awareness of how the self of the researcher interacts with the selves of others in the fieldsite and further how these selves are written into being is the most ethically responsible and socially accountable way to undertake ethnographic research. To that end, I would argue that future ethnographic studies must take account of the importance of the self in the constructing and writing of ethnographies. Being aware of how the self is written, lived and experienced enables claims about knowledge making to have a real and critically informed impact on the world and people with whom and for whom such research is undertaken. By doing this, evaluating and critically deconstructing our own responses to the people and situations we find ourselves in, the real possibility to learn “about the values of those around us and the social processes we have become part of during the research process” (Hume & Mulcock, 2004: xxv) comes to fruition.

In Chapter Three I showed how notions of non-conformity, rule-breaking and othering were used to construct a particular type of Camphill identity. Notably, to varying degrees, none of my three fieldsites conformed to earlier writings that characterised Camphill. Equally some people always found elements of their identity that were lacking. This was contrasted to the views of residents and pupils who notably did not engage in such exclusionary rhetoric and instead focused on their lived experiences of Camphillness as linked to particular seasonal songs and festive practices. The performative element of these particular constructions, I argued, shows how notions of deviance and belonging have at basis a social functional role. Namely that these types of debates about what constitutes Camphillness are required as a process of social orienteering. To construct what you are not, equally constructs what you are, hence the move away from past edicts about Camphill pillars and the move towards what my informants termed ‘excellent practice.’ This is not to say that the carefully crafted and composed guidelines about Camphill have no authority and

legitimacy. They obviously do and are referred to in particular ways and in particular moments as I have shown. Rather such written edicts do not sufficiently capture the messy reality of Camphill life as it is lived, practiced and encountered.

It is interesting to note that when I held my research dissemination sessions at Blair Drummond and Corbenic, I discussed the particular ways that non-conformity and othering are played out in their particular Camphill contexts. My presentation was not met with universal approval. One person wanted to know why places that didn't conform to set Camphill criteria were not simply 'kicked out.' Another stated that, 'alright yes, when you were here we had lots of questions about what Camphill was but it is different now we know what we are' (Research Notebooks, IV: 2011). The main point to come out of these sessions was a move away from the conflict narratives of the past and instead a united presentation (to me) that the work with the residents was the most crucial and significant area of identity construction that they were interested in. Such ideas lead into Chapter Four, where I developed the theme of everyday practice as a central and ongoing element in Camphill identity work by exploring the ways materiality was lived with and understood. I examined how certain material tropes and uniquely visual signifiers such as paintings, door knobs, Sagittar font, were not deemed as valuable as other things such as candles, seasonal branches and tables to name a few, even though they were all so embedded in everyday life as to immediately evoke a particular kind of identity, a sort of hidden in plain sight Camphillness. I suggested that this was primarily due to the possibilities for socialisation that the afore-mentioned things provided. Learning the appropriate way to stand around a candle, alongside learning to say grace and eat in a normatively ascribed manner, are all things which are crucial for the ongoing work with the pupil, residents and even co-workers. I argued that such repetitive practices were not only performances of an accepted cultural code of Camphillness, but were fundamentally about teaching people to become functionally and socially resilient.

In Chapter Five these theoretical ideas about socialisation and the social self came to fruition. I interrogated the idea that awareness of rules and norms was not just about successful social performance but was further about developing a competent social

self. Ideas of selfhood as articulated by my informants were often connected to ‘wholeness’ whereby the highly regimented and regulated life of the Camphill places aided the ongoing development of this process. I stressed that this was never a finished process with challenging behaviour and changing participation in this process, often inevitable. Indeed I stressed that, for some pupils and residents, becoming social as normatively seen and ascribed was the work of a lifetime. It is also important to note that much of this repetitive social learning happened in public spaces. Privacy within my Camphill fieldsites is differently understood, as people live their lives under close and continued inspection from external regulators, as well as the internal regulators whether they are staff, residents or pupils. This presents particular challenges especially in relation to intimate physical relationships. Here I touched on the fault lines of Camphill’s social work, as developing normative socialisation skills broke down when physical intimacy was sought. This was where the competing worlds of ethical practice and legal obligations often clashed with the desires of residents. Suffice it to say that this is certainly an area that could be explored and researched in greater detail regarding the types of challenges inherent in managing and facilitating these kinds of relationships. Identity within this thesis has been developed through an understanding of performance and repetitive practice as a gateway to explorations of the social self. At basis social performances, whether they are the daily rituals or festivals *in combination* with the repetitive daily structure of the places, enable an understanding of the social self to develop within these particular social contexts and materially saturated environments.

Alongside this I would also argue that this thesis can be of interest to a much wider audience and is relevant to various strands of academic literature. The challenges of ethnography and familiarity notwithstanding, the conceptual points I have highlighted in my chapters about the significance of the social self, the importance of material spaces, the value of rules, rituals, songs and festivals as markers of everyday identity formation, the role of significant others and the many ways people develop their identity both personal and collective, can equally be seen in other settings. For example in Chapter Five I wrote about the importance of social pedagogical practices which came to fruition in the shaping and learning to be a competent social self. I

think my observations would be relevant and pertinent to other residential and non-residential school settings that use a social pedagogical outlook. It would be particularly interesting to see how much of the ideas about the socialising of self were to translate beyond the Camphill boundaries. The current interest in social pedagogy as an approach within UK settings³⁶ is one that demands sustained critical engagement, particularly where the worlds of care and education meet. In Camphill settings the care responsibilities and socialising educational practices work on a fluctuating continuum with the norms of socialisation often taking precedence over those of more normative educational aims. It has been well documented that educational attainment in residential care settings is always low, with pupils having little formal qualifications and equally little chance of active participation in the workforce once they leave (Jackson, 1988; Lindsay & Foley, 1999; Harker, 2004; Smith, 2009). In the past, pupils within Camphill would often move on to other Camphill adult settings with the need for formal qualifications a moot issue. What was of greater importance was the possibility to bake bread, sing songs and to know the appropriate rules and rituals of their Camphill home. To some extent this is still relevant, however since my fieldwork began in 2009, numerous issues around ageing residents and more challenging pupils have challenged that norm. Within Ochil Tower School there has been an increased drive to provide pupils with some recognisable National Qualifications (Research Notebooks V, 2012). This has changed the nature of the school setting from one that focuses solely on the learning of social skills, to a school that now must document and systemically track pupil progression in literacy and numeracy. This is where the medical diagnoses of autism, cognitive behaviourism etc clash with a government agenda that insists *formal* educational learning is the right of all children and the responsibility of the adults who care for them. Residential settings due to their history of low educational attainment are particularly targeted and as such can no longer use the deterministic labels of the medical profession to justify why a pupil has not achieved basic literacy and numeracy skills. It is no longer enough that a pupil is given a solid grounding in social learning and can read and manage a variety of social situations, they must also be able to demonstrate the more formal skills of reading and writing and where

³⁶ see the degree courses run at Aberdeen University, Robert Gordon University and the Thomas Coram Research Unit, London.

possible be 'mainstreamed' back into 'normal' school settings. Camphill with its dominant focus on strong social learning and a rich cultural life is now facing the challenge of formalised educational paradigms. Such challenges between care and education, formal and social learning, documented and oral practice reveal how the wider field of disability studies and educational practices are played out on one of the most vulnerable groups in society. How Camphill schools will manage these challenges and what changes in practice and outlook occur, is an interesting challenge and certainly a possible area for future research.

Alongside the challenges present within Camphill schools, the adult settings also face increased challenges. I mentioned in Chapter One that Corbenic had over 46 acres of land, initially planned to run a fully functioning farm. This never came to fruition and with an increasingly elderly and fragile population the land has remained wild and uncultivated. The issue of ageing and large Camphill estates has become an increasingly pertinent one. Many of the larger Camphill places in the UK are faced with an elderly population that no longer can run large farms as they were originally intended. Equally the changing nature of government regulations has meant that the physically 'competent' resident of the past no longer comes to Camphill. Adult Camphill settings then face the double challenge of providing care for their elderly residents who have lived all their lives there and the struggle to know how to continue the farm, garden and estate workshops. This is particularly challenging for the Camphill places where the farm produced milk, cheese and other goods that were sold successfully to the wider public. As a result of their ageing adults, important revenue will be lost, whilst increased care costs for movement impaired adults rises (Research Notebooks V, 2012). Such challenges have also raised the issue of care as the primary focus of Camphill's work. For some this was never solely the remit of Camphill and so the vexed issue of the future identity of Camphill, what Camphill will look like ten years from now has grown in importance. This returns me to earlier points made in the thesis about whose definition of what Camphill's purpose is counts the most. For many of the staff who came to Camphill up to the early nineties, Camphill was a spiritual endeavour, a therapeutic community or as Scott (2010, 2011) phrases it a reinventive institution. According to Scott (2011:3) a reinventive

institution should be understood as a new “site of biographical identity work whose purpose may be religious, disciplinary, secret, therapeutic, educational or virtual” and where people *voluntarily* commit themselves for an appreciable period of time in which a process of reinvention, transformation and self-improvement occurs. For many of the co-workers, their particular biographical choices phrase their lives in Camphill from a spiritual angle. The aspect of care and formal education work was never the main aim or purpose. I am aware that this thesis has not taken the spiritual and therapeutic elements of Camphill as *the* defining element of Camphill identity formation. As mentioned in earlier chapters I did this because I was interested in everyday identity formation and how Camphill was lived and understood now. However as I mentioned in Chapter Three, some people within Camphill settings have increasingly voiced their discontent with the lack of spiritual and therapeutic aims and ideals. Indeed one informant told me that the ‘Christianising of the earth’ was Camphill’s primary mission and aim (Research Notebooks V, 2012). In Chapter Three I mentioned how anthroposophy was cited as key pillar for some in the formation of a Camphill identity. I used such points to further illustrate the multiplicity of viewpoints regarding what Camphill was and who had authority to construct a valid identity. Alongside that presentation there is a further angle that could be explored, namely the particular biographies that discuss the spiritual quest that some people undertook throughout their time within Camphill settings. I did not privilege this area as I think that ongoing repetitive social processes of everyday identity formation are a much more useful way to understand Camphill’s identity work. That said, such stories are important and valid and can be linked to wider social moves towards reinventing the self within particular institutional contexts (Scott, 2010, 2011). Silent retreats, ecological retreats and monastic retreats, to name a few, have flourished in recent years. Retreat guides and online agencies promise the opportunity to “relax, explore and practice your spiritual beliefs” (www.thegoodretreatguide.com/). The idea of spirituality as active work and often repetitive practice resonates with much of the everyday lives within Camphill settings. Further the retreats where song is used a key marker in the day, week and year alongside shaping and controlling how and when such practices occur and the bodily mannerisms and behaviours of those who replicate and create such spaces,

also echoes within my own study³⁷. My argument that daily repetitive practice shapes the social self, our understanding of who we are and how we understand the world could be further explored in other spiritual and therapeutic contexts.

Like Camphill settings, therapeutic communities began with a particular ethos and focus and had their heyday in the sixties and seventies (Bloor et al, 1988; Kennard, 1998). Today therapeutic communities have changed and are not as prevalent as they once were (Ward et al, 2003; Lees et al, 2004). They have become specific centres for practice with children with a range of learning and behavioural issues and also as centres for drug rehabilitation. Much of the Camphill focus of living, learning and working together is present within therapeutic communities and I would suggest that the definitional problems of ‘community’ aside, the linkages, similarities and differences between Camphill places and therapeutic communities would be a fruitful and interesting exercise. In particular, my own issues with the term community and how it is to be seen and understood could be explored from within the bounded definition of therapeutic community work. Indeed as I mentioned briefly in Chapter Two, there are some within Camphill settings who have used the term therapeutic community to define what they are, whilst others have used the term ‘intentional communities’ (Plant 2009). The exploration of community, whether therapeutic or other, would enable a more macro level focus to be explored. I have argued for an understanding of the everyday as an umbrella for significant others, the social self and materially saturated environments to be seen as key factors in the development of a social identity, personal and collective, therapeutic community work would enable these concepts to be critically explored and developed.

It is therefore clear that my multi-sited ethnographic study of everyday Camphill identity formation can be extended beyond its porous borders to other avenues of academic interest and concern: whether this is critically engaging with social pedagogy as it is applied to care and educational settings, exploring the macro level challenges residential schools face between duties of care and duties of formalised learning, to using and extending my use of the social self to other reinventive

³⁷ see Pluscarden Abbey Morayshire

institutions or therapeutic communities - this study of three small, regulated and bounded sites which are all encompassed under the global umbrella called Camphill, offers some insights into wider processes of identity construction and socialisation more generally. What my fieldwork suggests is that a text based view of Camphill principles and practice presents life as rigid and set in stone, whereas Camphill as lived practice has never been like this. The Pillars may set guidelines, but they do not determine how social life is lived and experienced. As I have demonstrated, the rules of socialisation and ideas about the social self are of greater importance to understanding the particular ways that Camphill life is constructed, enacted and re-enacted, than following written guidelines and procedures. Grasping the complexity of social life can be more fully understood through the realities of day to day life and the ways that people live it. To manage social life in a changing world, people's social identities and ways of being in the world are not fixed and static but in flux and are continually worked and re-worked into being. Such identities are created through social relations in particular places and through the use of particular forms of material culture. The use of material culture and the social relations that shape such encounters has at basis, I argue, a search for security: whether this is done through questioning if we are a Camphill, moving to 'proper' Camphills or the categorical assertion that 'this is my home' there is comfort in certainty. Though Camphill places change, people come and go, regulations and policies shift and alter – people work to create a life and social identity that manages those changes through a learned understanding of the social self and the material world that is secure and contained and furthermore, endures.

When people ask me now what my thesis is about, I am less defensive and hamstrung about my difficulty in answering. In focusing on three relatively obscure places as a research sites, and three different embodiments of Camphill, I have been able to shine a light on the enduring nature of social practice “revealing the ways in which individual identities are shaped by collective experiences and structural processes” (Coffey, 2001:67). Hence my own identity work has linkages to the ongoing identity work Camphill places engage in and as such has value in terms of documenting the everyday realities of doing research in educational settings,

alongside understanding those realities through shifting theoretical, social and practical perspectives.

I named this conclusion ‘Leaving Camphill,’ but I think it has been evident throughout this thesis that leaving is never really a possibility. Much as my data collection spanned over four years – thirty years if you count my life and continued connection to Camphill – so to is it disingenuous to state that I am leaving Camphill behind. When I finished my fieldwork at Blair Drummond I was presented with a basket of goods from all the respective workshops. A wooden spoon from Woodwork, straw stars from Basketry, ceramic leaves from Pottery and so on. I was meant to have had it presented to me during my final Morning Assembly but that day I arrived only at 9:30 as my son was again at the doctor. Instead Geoffrey gave it to me personally but wanted to stress that it came from the *all* of Blair Drummond and was a ‘small token of how much they had all enjoyed having me there’ (Fieldnotes, 5 April). Likewise my connection to Corbenic and Ochil Tower carries on. Every Christmas I go to Corbenic’s Advent fair and often meet Barbara at concerts and conferences. Ochil Tower is where I return most frequently, where the choir sings for all the festive occasions, and a Pageant that Martha and I wrote back in 2009 has been performed every Christmas for the last three years.

I think it is important to state that, in the same way that many of the long-term residents carry Camphill’s cultural traditions around in their memories and bodies as learned practice, so too do I carry a particular understanding and connection to Camphill that is performed and performative. This thesis has demonstrated the fuzzy nature of my fieldsites and my participation within them, and I would argue that such knowledge is more valuable because of its inherent situatedness. Camphill is many things to many people but I think it is most significantly realised in how people learn to become social and crucially at home in the world.

Fieldwork References

- Snellgrove, M. L. (2008 – 2009) *Fieldwork Photos & Films* Author's own collection, available on request.
- Snellgrove, M. L. (2008 – 2012) *Research Notebooks I-V* Unpublished Original Data, available on request.
- Snellgrove, M. L. (2008, 2009) *Ochil Tower School: Fieldnotes* Unpublished Original Data, available on request.
- Snellgrove, M. L. (2009) *Camphill Blair Drummond: Fieldnotes* Unpublished Original Data, available on request.
- Snellgrove, M. L. (2009) *Camphill Community Corbenic: Fieldnotes* Unpublished Original Data, available on request.
- Survival International (2009 – 2012) *We, the People Diary*. Author's own collection. Available: <http://shop.survivalinternational.org/> Bought 2009-2012.

References

- Abu-Lughod, L. (1990) Can There be a Feminist Ethnography? *Women and Performance* 5 (1): 7-27
- Abu-Lughod, L. (1993) *Writing Women's Worlds: Bedouin Stories*. Berkeley: University of California Press
- Alleyne, B. (2002) An Idea of Community and its Discontents: Towards a More Reflexive Sense of Belonging in Multicultural Britain. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 25(4): 607-27
- Allington, S. (2006) Mental Health of Children with Learning Disabilities. *Advances in Psychiatric Treatment* 12:130-138
- Amit, V. & Rapport, N. (2002) *The Trouble with Community: Anthropological Reflections on Movement, Identity and Collectivity*. London: Pluto Press
- Anderson, B. (1991) *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso
- Appadurai, A. (1990) Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy. *Public Culture* 2 (1): 1-24

- Appadurai, A. (1996) *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press
- Atkinson, P. & Coffey, A. (2001) Analysing Documentary Realities. In: Bryman, A. ed. *Ethnography Vol: III*. London: Sage
- Atkinson, P. & Delamont, S. (2006) Editors' Introduction: Narratives, Lives, Performances. In: Atkinson, P. & Delamont, S. eds. *Narrative Perspectives, Vol. 1*. London: Sage
- Atkinson, P. (1990) *The Ethnographic Imagination: Textual Constructions of Reality*. London: Routledge
- Atkinson, P., Delamont, S., Coffey, A., Lofland, J. & Lofland, L eds. (2007) *Handbook of Ethnography*. London: Sage
- Auge, M. (1995) *Non-Place: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity*. (Trans. Howe, J.) London: Verso
- Bang, J. M. (2010) *A Portrait of Camphill: From Founding Seed to Worldwide Movement*. Edinburgh: Floris Books
- Banks, M. (2001) *Visual Methods in Social Research*. London: Sage
- Baudrillard, J. (1996) *The System of Objects*. London: Verso
- Becher, H. (1994) The Significance of Disciplinary Differences. *Studies in Higher Education*. 19(2): 333-346
- Bechhofer, F. & McCrone, D. (2010) Choosing National Identity. *Sociological Research Online*. 15(3) 3 Available: www.socresonline.org.uk/15/3/3.html
- Beck, R.J. & Wood, D. (1994) *Home Rules*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press
- Becker, H. S. (1963) *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance*. New York: Free Press
- Becker, H. S. (2008) *Writing for Social Scientists: How to Start and Finish Your Thesis, Book or Article*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Beckerleg, S. & Hundt, G. L. (2004) Reflections on Fieldwork Among Kenyan Heroin Users In: Hume, L. & Mulcock, J. eds. *Anthropologists in the Field: Cases in Participant Observation*. New York: Columbia University Press
- Bender, B. (1998) *Stonehenge – Making Space*. Oxford: Berg Publishers

- Bender, B. (2002) Contested Landscapes: Medieval to Present In: Buchli, V. ed. *The Material Culture Reader*. Oxford: Berg
- Benford, R. D. & Snow, D. A. (2006) Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview. In: Scott, J. ed. *Documentary Research Vol: I*. London: Sage
- Berger, P. L. & Luckmann, T. (1967) *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. New York: Doubleday
- Billig, M. (1995) *Banal Nationalism*. London: Sage
- Blenkinsop, H. (2012) *Stories from the Wall: The Making and Remaking of Localism in Rural Northumberland*. PhD Thesis: The University of Edinburgh.
- Bloor, M., McKeganey, M. & Fonkert, D. (1988) *One Foot in Eden: A Sociological Study of the Range of Therapeutic Community Practice*. London: Routledge
- Bock, F. (1990) The History and Development of Camphill. In: Pietzner, C. *A Candle on the Hill*. Edinburgh: Floris Books
- Bock, F. ed. (2004) *The Builders of Camphill*. Edinburgh: Floris Books
- Bonsu, S. K. & DeBerry-Spence, B. (2008) Consuming the Dead: Identity and Community Building Practices in Death Rituals. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*. 37(6): 694-719
- Brennan-Krohn, Z. (2009) *In the Nearness of Our Striving: Camphill Communities Re-Imagining Disability and Society*. Undergraduate Dissertation, Brown University, USA.
- Bruner, J. (2006) Life as Narrative. In: Atkinson, P. & Delamont, S. eds. *Narrative Perspectives, Vol. 1*. London: Sage
- Bryderup, I. M. & Frorup, A. K. (2011) Social Pedagogy as Relational Dialogic Work: Competencies in Modern Society. In: Cameron, C. & Moss, P. eds. *Social Pedagogy and Working with Children and Young People, Where Care and Education Meet*. London and Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers
- Bryman, A. (2004) *Social Research Methods*. Oxford: OUP
- Buchli, V. (2002) Introduction In: Buchli, V. ed. *The Material Culture Reader*. Oxford: Berg Publishers
- Bulmer, M. (2003) The Ethics of Social Research. In: Gilbert, N. ed. *Researching Social Life*. 2nd Edition. London: Sage
- Butler, J. (2004) *Undoing Gender*. New York: Routledge

- Butler, J. (2006) *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge
- Cameron, C. & Moss, P. (2011) Social Pedagogy: Current Understandings and Opportunities. In: Cameron, C. & Moss, P. eds. *Social Pedagogy and Working with Children and Young People, Where Care and Education Meet*. London and Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers
- Camphill Blair Drummond (2012) *The Camphill Movement*. [Online] Available: <http://www.camphillblairdrummond.org.uk/about-us/the-camphill-movement>. [Accessed: Throughout 2009-2012]
- Camphill Central Scotland Homepage. [Online] Available: <http://www.camhillscotland.org.uk/> [Accessed: Throughout 2009-2012]
- Caranfa, A. (2004) Silence as the Foundation of Learning. *Educational Theory*. 54 (2): 211- 230
- Carter, J. (2003) The Meaning of Good Experience. In: Ward, A., Kasinski, K., Pooley, J. & Worthington, A. eds. *Therapeutic Communities for Children and Young People*. London & Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers
- Cerulo, K. (1997) Identity Construction: New Issues, New Directions. *Annual Review of Sociology*. 23: 385-409
- Clifford, J. & Marcus, G. E. (1986) *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press
- Clifford, J. (1997) *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press
- Clifford, J. (2003) On Ethnographic Authority. In: Lincoln, Y. S. & Denzin, N. K. eds. *Turning Points in Qualitative Research: Tying Knots in a Handkerchief*. Oxford: AltaMira Press: 121-137
- Cocks, A. J. (2006) The Ethical Maze. *Childhood*. 13(2): 247-266
- Coffey, A. (1999) *The Ethnographic Self: Fieldwork and the Representation of Identity*. London: Sage
- Coffey, A. (2001) *Education and Social Change*. Buckingham: Open University Press

- Cohen, A. P. (1982) *Belonging: The Experience of Culture*. In: Cohen, A. P. ed. *Belonging: Identity and Social Organisation in British Rural Cultures*. Manchester: Manchester University Press
- Cohen, A. P. (1985) *The Symbolic Construction of Community*. London: Tavistock
- Cohen, A. P. (1986) Of Symbols and Boundaries, or, Does Ertie's Greatcoat Hold the Key? In: Cohen, A. P. ed. *Symbolising Boundaries: Identity and Diversity in British Cultures*. Manchester: Manchester University Press
- Cohen, A. P. (1992) Self-Conscious Anthropology. In: Okely, J. & Callaway, H. eds. *Anthropology and Autobiography*. London: Routledge
- Cohen, A. P. (1994) *Self-Consciousness: An Alternative Anthropology of Identity*. London: Routledge
- Colquhoun, D. (2012) *The University of Aberdeen and its Vice Chancellor, Ian Diamond Step Back from the Brink?* [Online] DC's Improbable Science. Available: <http://www.dcsience.net/?p=5261> [Accessed 19 May 2012]
- Costa, M. & Walter, C. (2006) Care: The Art of Living. In: Jackson, R. ed. *Holistic Special Education: Principles and Practice*. Edinburgh: Floris Books
- Costa, M. (2011) The Power of Organisational Myth: A Case Study. In: Jackson, R. ed. *Discovering Camphill: New Perspectives, Research and Developments*. Edinburgh: Floris Books
- Cowan, S., Lam, F. T., & Stonehouse, C. (2008) Introduction. In: Cowan, S., Lam, F. T., & Stonehouse, C. eds. *Double Lives: Writing and Motherhood*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press
- Crang, M. & Cook, I. (2007) *Doing Ethnographies*. London: Sage
- Crow, G. & Pope, C. (2008) Editorial Forward: Sociology and Everyday Life. *Sociology*. 42(4): 597-600
- Crow, G. (2002) *Social Solidarities: Theories, Identities and Social Change*. Buckingham: Open University Press
- Cunliffe, A.L. (2010) Retelling Tales of the Field: In Search of Organizational Ethnography 20 Years On. *Organizational Research Methods*. 13(2): 224-239
- Cushing, P. (2008) Enriching Research on Developmental Disability. *Anthropology News*. 49: 3-6

- Dant, T. (2008) *Material Culture in the Social World*. Maidenhead: Open University Press
- Davies, C. A. (1999) *Reflexive Ethnography*. London: Routledge
- de Ris Allen, J. (1990) *Living Buildings, An Expression of Fifty Years of Camphill*. Aberdeen: Camphill Architects
- Delamont, S (2009) The Only Honest Thing: Autoethnography, Reflexivity and Small Crises in Fieldwork. *Ethnography and Education*. 4(1): 51-63
- Delamont, S, Atkinson, P & Pugsley, L. (2010) The Concept Smacks of Magic: Fighting Familiarity Today. *Teaching and Teacher Education*. 26 (1): 3-10
- Denzin, N. K. (1997) *Interpretive Ethnography*. London: Sage
- Dewalt, K. M. & Dewalt B. R. (2002) *Participant Observation: A Guide for Fieldworkers*. Oxford: AltaMira Press
- Douglas, M (1972) Deciphering a Meal. *Daedalus*. 101 (1): 61-8
- Douglas, M. (1973) *Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology*. Harmondsworth: Pelican
- Douglas, M. (2002) *Purity and Danger*. London: Routledge
- Dresch, P. (2000). Introduction: Fieldwork and the Passage of Time. In: Dresch, P. & James, W. eds. *Anthropologists in a Wider World: Essays on Field Research*. Oxford: Berghahn Books
- Durkheim, E. (1952) *Suicide: A Study in Sociology*. London: Routledge
- Durkheim, E. (1982) *The Rules of Sociological Method*. London: Macmillan
- Dwyer, K. (1982) *Moroccan Dialogues: Anthropology in Question*. Baltimore & London: John Hopkins University Press
- Ehlen, K. (2006) Play Therapy. In: Jackson, R. ed. *Discovering Camphill: New Perspectives, Research and Developments*. Edinburgh: Floris Books
- Eichsteller, G. & Holthoff, S. (2011) Conceptual Foundations of Social Pedagogy: A Transnational Perspective from Germany. In: Cameron, C. & Moss, P. eds. *Social Pedagogy and Working with Children and Young People, Where Care and Education Meet*. London and Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers
- Elias, N & Scotson, J. L. (1994) *The Established and the Outsiders: A Sociological Enquiry into Community Problems*. London: Sage
- Elias, N (1994) *The Civilizing Process*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing

- Elliott, J. (2005) *Using Narrative in Social Research*. London: Sage
- Ellis, C. (2000) Creating Criteria: An Ethnographic Short Story. *Qualitative Inquiry*. 6 (2): 273-277
- Ellis, C. (2004) *The Ethnographic I: A Methodological Novel about Autoethnography*. Oxford: AltaMira Press
- Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I. & Shaw, L. L. (2007) Participant Observation and Fieldnotes. In: Atkinson, P., Delamont, S., Coffey, A., Lofland, J. & Lofland, L eds. *Handbook of Ethnography*. London: Sage
- Evans-Pritchard, E.E. (1940) *The Nuer*. Oxford: Clarendon Press
- Ewick, P. & Silbey, S (1995) Subversive Stories and Hegemonic Tales: Toward a Sociology of Narrative. *Law and Society Review*. 29: 197-226
- Fadzillah, I. (2004) Going Beyond 'The West' and 'The Rest': Conducting Non-Western, Non-native Ethnography in Northern Thailand. In: Hume, L. & Mulcock, J. eds. *Anthropologists in the Field: Cases in Participant Observation*. New York: Columbia University Press
- Falzon, M.A. ed. (2009) *Multi-Sited Ethnography: Theory Praxis and Locality in Contemporary Research*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Ltd.
- Ferber, A. L. (2000) A Commentary on Aguirre: Taking Narrative Seriously. *Sociological Perspectives*. 43 (2) 341-349
- Fielding, N. (2003) Ethnography. In: Gilbert, N. ed. *Researching Social Life*. 2nd Edition. London: Sage
- Fitzgerald, R. & Robertson, L. (2006) Inhabiting the Place and Non-Places of a Residential Home: A Case Study from New Zealand. *Sites*. 3(1): 48-71
- Forsey, M. (2004) 'He's Not a Spy; He's One of Us: Ethnographic Positioning in a Middle-Class Setting. In: Hume, L. & Mulcock, J. eds. *Anthropologists in the Field: Cases in Participant Observation*. New York: Columbia University Press
- Foucault, M. (1969) *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Routledge
- Foucault, M. (1975) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books
- Fox, K. (2004) *Watching the English*. London: Hodder and Stoughton
- Gadamer, H. G. (2004) *Truth and Method*. London: Continuum
- Garfinkel, H. (1991) *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. London: Polity Press

- Geertz, C. (1973) *Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture*. In: Geertz, C. ed. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books
- Geertz, C. (1988) *Works and Lives. The Anthropologist as Author*. Stanford: Stanford University Press
- Gell, A. (1998) *Art and Agency: An Anthropological Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Gluckman, M. (1963) Gossip and Scandal. *Current Anthropology*. 4(3): 307-316
- Godderis, R. (2006) Dining In: The Symbolic Power of Food in Prison. *The Howard Journal*. 43 (3): 255-267
- Goffman, E. (1959) *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Pelican Books
- Goffman, E. (1961) *Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates*. New York: Penguin Books
- Goffman, E. (1963) *Behavior in Public Places: Notes on the Social Organization of Gatherings*. New York: Free Press
- Goffman, E. (1965) *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. New York: Simon & Schuster
- Gordon, A. (2008) *Ghostly Matters: Haunting and the Sociological Imagination*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press
- Gorkin, M & Othman, R. (2000) *Three Mothers, Three Daughters*. New York: Other Press
- Gorringe, H. (2005) 'You build your house, we'll build ours': The Attractions and Pitfalls of Dalit Identity Politics. *Social Identities*. 11(6): 653-672
- Gray, D. E. & Denicolo, P. (1998) Research in Special Needs Education: Objectivity or Ideology? *British Journal of Special Education*. 25(3): 140-145
- Gray, J. (2012) *Heavenly Beings and Astral Forces: The Real Meaning of Social Pedagogy*. [Online] Available: <http://www.james-gray.org/heavenly-beings-and-astral-forces/> [Accessed 18 May 2012]
- Gupta, A. & Ferguson, J. (1997) Discipline and Practice: 'The Field' as Site, Method and Location in Anthropology. In: Gupta, A & Ferguson, J eds. *Anthropological Location: Boundaries and Grounds of a Field Science*. Berkeley: University of California Press

- Gutmann, M. (1993) Rituals of Resistance: A Critique of the Theory of Everyday Forms of Resistance. *Latin American Perspectives*. 20 (2): 74-96
- Halbwachs, M (1992) *On Collective Memory*. Chicago: Chicago University Press
- Halder, F. (2006) The Natural Environment. In: Jackson, R. ed. *Discovering Camphill: New Perspectives, Research and Developments*. Edinburgh: Floris Books
- Hall, S. (1997) *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. Buckingham: Open University Press
- Hammersley, M. & Atkinson, P. (2007) *Ethnography Principles in Practice*. 3rd Edition, London: Routledge
- Hammersley, M. (2010) Creeping Ethical Regulation and the Strangling of Research. *Sociological Research Online*. 15(4) 16 Available: www.socresonline.org.uk/15/4/16.html
- Hanauer, C. ed. (2002) *The Bitch in the House*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books
- Haraway, D. (1988) Situated Knowledges: The Science in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective. *Feminist Studies*. 14(3): 575-599
- Haraway, D. (1991) *Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. New York: Routledge
- Harker, R. M., Dobel-Ober, D., Berridge, D. & Sinclair, R. (2006) More than the Sum of its Parts? Inter-Professional Working in the Education of Looked after Children *Children and Society* 18: 179-193
- Hastrup, K. & Hervik, P. (1994) *Social Experience and Anthropological Knowledge*. London: Routledge
- Hastrup, K. (1992) Writing Ethnography: State of the Art. In: Okely, J. & Callaway, H. eds. *Anthropology and Autobiography*. London: Routledge
- Hastrup, K. (1993) The Semantics of Biology: Virginity. In: Ardener, S. ed. *Defining Females: The Nature of Women in Society*. Oxford: Berg Publishers
- Hayano, D. M. (2001) Auto-Ethnography: Paradigms, Problems, and Prospects. In: Bryman, A. ed. *Ethnography Vol: IV*. London: Sage
- Henderson, M., Smith, D., Elliott, L., Nixon, C. & Wight, D. (2011) Vulnerable Young People in Alternative Education Settings: Their Sexual Health Needs, Experience and Use of Sex Education and Sexual Health Services. *MRC Social and Public Health Science*. 21

- Henderson, P. (2006) A Community of Learning. In: Jackson, R. ed. *Discovering Camphill: New Perspectives, Research and Developments*. Edinburgh: Floris Books
- Hill Collins, P. (2000) *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness and the Politics of Empowerment*. New York: Routledge
- Hobsbawm, E. & Ranger, T. eds. (2002) *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- hooks, b. (2000) *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center*. London: Pluto Press
- Hoskins, J (1998) *Biographical Objects: How Things Tell the Stories of People's Lives*. New York: Routledge
- Hume, L. & Mulcock, J. (2004) Introduction; Awkward Spaces, Productive Places. In: Hume, L. & Mulcock, J. eds. *Anthropologists in the Field: Cases in Participant Observation*. New York: Columbia University Press
- Humphreys, L. (1970) *Tearoom Trade: Impersonal Sex in Public Places*. London: Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd
- Jackson, A. ed. (1987) *Anthropology at Home*. London: Tavistock Publications Ltd.
- Jackson, J. E. (1990) I Am a Fieldnote: Fieldnotes as a Symbol of Professional Identity. In: Sanjek, R. ed. *Fieldnotes: The Makings of Anthropology*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press
- Jackson, M. (1995) *At Home in the World*. Durham & London: Duke University Press
- Jackson, R. ed. (2006) *Holistic Special Education: Camphill Principles and Practice*. Edinburgh: Floris Books
- Jackson, R. ed. (2011) *Discovering Camphill: New Perspectives, Research and Developments*. Edinburgh: Floris Books
- Jackson, S. (1988) Residential Care and Education *Children and Society* 4: 335-330
- James, A., Hockey, J. & Dawson, A. (1997) Introduction: The Road From Santa Fe. In: James, A., Hockey, J. & Dawson, A. eds. *After Writing Culture*. London: Routledge
- Jean-Klein, I. & Riles, A. (2005) Anthropology and Human Rights Administrations: Expert Observation and Representation After the Fact. *PoLAR*. 28(2): 173-202
- Jean-Klein, I. (2001) Nationalism and Resistance: The Two Faces of Everyday Activism in Palestine During the Intifada. *Cultural Anthropology*. 16 (1): 83-126

- Jean-Klein, I. (2002) Alternative Modernities, or Accountable Modernities? Palestinian Movement[s] and Political Audit Tourism during the First Intifada. *Journal of Mediterranean Studies*. 12 (1): 43-80
- Jenkins, R. (1983) *Lads, Citizens and Ordinary Kids: Working-class Youth Life-Styles in Belfast*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul
- Jenkins, R. (2008) 3rd ed. *Social Identity*. London: Routledge
- Josephides, L. (1997) Representing the Anthropologist's Predicament. In: James, A., Hockey, J. & Dawson, A. eds. *After Writing Culture*. London: Routledge
- Josselson, R. (1993) A Narrative Introduction. In: Josselson, R. & Lieblich, A. eds. *The Narrative Study of Lives Vol. 1*. London: Sage
- Kelly, P. (2004) Awkward Intimacies: Prostitution, Politics and Fieldwork in Urban Mexico. In: Hume, L. & Mulcock, J. eds. *Anthropologists in the Field: Cases in Participant Observation*. New York: Columbia University Press
- Kennard, D. (1998) *An Introduction to Therapeutic Communities*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers
- King, N. (2000) *Memory, Narrative, Identity: Remembering the Self*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press
- Kondo, D. K. (1997) *About Face: Performing Race in Fashion and Theatre*. New York: Routledge
- König, K. (1952) *Superintendent's Report*. Aberdeen: Camphill Rudolf Steiner Schools
- König, K. (1960) *The Camphill Movement*. Botton Village: Camphill Press
- König, K. (1994) *Eternal Childhood*. Botton Village: TWT Publications Ltd.
- König, K. (2008) *The Child with Special Needs*. Edinburgh: Floris Books
- König, K. (2009) *Seeds for Social Renewal: The Camphill Village Conferences*. Edinburgh: Floris Books
- König, K. (2010) *Becoming Human: A Social Task*. Edinburgh: Floris Books
- König, K. (2011) *At the Threshold of the Modern Age: Biographies Around the Year 1861*. Edinburgh: Floris Books
- Krieger, S. (1985) Beyond Subjectivity: The Use of the Self in Social Science. *Qualitative Sociology*. 8(4): 309-324

- Kurotani, S. (2004) Multi-Sited Transnational Ethnography and the Shifting Construction of Fieldwork. In: Hume, L. & Mulcock, J. eds. *Anthropologists in the Field: Cases in Participant Observation*. New York: Columbia University Press
- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1999) *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and Its Challenge to Western Thought*. New York: Basic Books
- Landres, J. S. & Stier, O. B. (2006) Introduction In: Landres, J. S. & Stier, O. B. eds. *Religion, Violence, Memory and Place*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press
- Lanyado, M. (2003) The Roots of Mental Health: Emotional Development and the Caring Environment. In: Ward, A., Kasinski, K., Pooley, J. & Worthington, A. eds. *Therapeutic Communities for Children and Young People*. London & Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers
- LeCarre, J. (1974) *Tinker, Tailor, Soldier, Spy*. London: Bantam Books
- Lees, J., Manning, N., Menzies, D. & Morant, N. eds. (2004) *A Culture of Enquiry: Research Evidence and the Therapeutic Community*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers
- Leonard, K. I. (2009) Changing Places: The Advantages of Multi-Sited Ethnography. In: Falzon, M. A. (2009) ed. *Multi-Sited Ethnography: Theory Praxis and Locality in Contemporary Research*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Ltd
- Li, S. & Seale, C. (2008) Acquiring a Sociological Identity: An Observational Study of a PhD Project. *Sociology*. 42(5): 987-1002
- Lieblich, A., Tuval-Mashiach, R. & Zilber, T. eds. (1998) *Narrative Research: Reading, Analysis and Interpretation*. California: Sage
- Lincoln, Y. S. & Denzin, N. K. eds (2003) *Turning Points in Qualitative Research: Tying Knots in a Handkerchief*. Oxford: AltaMira Press
- Lindsay, M. & Foley, T. (1999) Getting Them Back to School – Touchstones of Good Practice in the Residential Care of Young People *Children and Society* 13: 192-202
- Luxford, M & J. (2003) *A Sense for Community*. The Camphill Foundation in the UK and Ireland and Communities of the Camphill Movement
- MacClancy, J. ed. (1997) *Contesting Art: Art, Politics and Identity in the Modern World*. New York: Berg

- MacInnes, J. (2006) Castells' Catalan Routes: Nationalism and the Sociology of Identity. *British Journal of Sociology*. 57(4): 677-699
- Maines, D. R. (2006) Narrative's Moment and Sociology's Phenomena: Toward a Narrative Sociology. In: Atkinson, P. & Delamont, S. eds. *Narrative Perspectives, Vol. 1*. London: Sage
- Mann, J. (2012) *The Fifties Mystique*. London: Quartet Books
- Mansour, S. (2002) A Week in Jenin: Assessing Mental Health Needs Amid the Ruins. *Journal of Palestine Studies*. 31 (4) 35-43
- Marcus, G. E. (1994) The Modernist Sensibility in Ethnographic Writing and the Cinematic Metaphor of Montage. In: Taylor, L. ed. *Visualising Theory*. New York: Routledge 37-53
- Marcus, G. E. (1995) Ethnography In/Of the World System: The Emergence of Multi-Sited Ethnography. *Annual Review of Anthropology*. 24: 95-117
- Marcus, G. E. (1998) *Ethnography Through Thick and Thin*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press
- Marshall, D. (2005) Food as Ritual, Routine or Convention. *Consumption Markets & Culture*. 8(1): 69-85
- Mauss, M. (1985) A Category of the Human Mind: The Notion of the Person, The Notion of the Self. In: Carrithers, M., Collins, S. & Lukes, S. eds. *The Category of the Person: Anthropology, Philosophy, History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- McDermott, R. A. (2007) *The Essential Steiner*. Great Barrington: Lindisfarne Books
- Mercer, K (1990) Welcome to the Jungle: Identity and Diversity in Post-Modern Politics. In: Rutherford, J. ed. *Identity: Community, Culture and Difference*. London: Lawrence and Wishart
- Merton, R. K. (1957) 2nd ed. *Social Theory and Social Structure*. Glencoe: Free Press
- Milgram, S. (1974) *Obedience to Authority: An Experimental View*. London: Harper Collins
- Miller, D. (1998) Introduction. In: Miller, D. ed. *Material Cultures: Why Some Things Matter*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Miller, D. (2005) Materiality: An Introduction. In: Miller, D. ed. *Materiality*. Durham and London: Duke University Press

- Miller, D. (2008) *The Comfort of Things*. Cambridge: Polity Press
- Miller, D. (2009) *Stuff*. London: Polity Press
- Mills, C. W. (1959) *The Sociological Imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Mitchell, T. (1990) Everyday Metaphors of Power. *Theory and Society*. 19: 545-77
- Monteux, A. (2006) History and Philosophy In: Jackson, R. ed. *Holistic Special Education: Principles and Practice*. Edinburgh: Floris Books
- Moraine, P., Hansen, B. & Harrison, T. (2006) Education. In: Jackson, R. ed. *Discovering Camphill: New Perspectives, Research and Developments*. Edinburgh: Floris Books
- Muir, S. (2004) Not Quite at Home: Field Envy and New Age Ethnographic Disease. In: Hume, L. & Mulcock, J. eds. *Anthropologists in the Field: Cases in Participant Observation*. New York: Columbia University Press
- Müller-Wiedemann, H. (1990) *Karl König A Central-European Biography of the 20th Century*. Botton: Camphill Books, TWT Publications Ltd.
- Murphy, P. D. (2008) The Anthropologist's Son (or Living and Learning the Field). In: Atkinson, P & Delamont, S eds. *Representing Ethnography Vol 4*. London: Sage
- Myers, F. (1994) Visual Media, Cultural Politics and Anthropological Practice: Some Implications of Recent Uses and Video Among Kayapo of Brazil. *Comm. Visual Anthropology Review*. Spring: 8-13
- Nadai, E. & Maeder, C. (2005) Fuzzy Fields: Multi-Sited Ethnography in Sociological Research. *Qualitative Social Research*. 6 (3) [Online Journal] Available at: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/22/47> [Accessed: 17th June 2010]
- Nadai, E. & Maeder, C. (2009) Contours of the Field(s): Multi-Sited Ethnography as a Theory-Driven Research Strategy for Sociology. In: Falzon, M.A. (2009) ed. *Multi-Sited Ethnography: Theory, Praxis and Locality in Contemporary Research*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing Ltd
- Nadel-Klein, J. (1991) Reweaving the Fringe: Localism, Tradition and Representation in British Ethnography. *American Ethnologist*. 18 (3): 500-517
- Neal, S. & Walters, S. (2008) Rural Be/Longing and Rural Social Organisations. *Sociology*. 42(2): 279-297

- Nelson, F. (2009) *In The Other Room: Entering the Culture of Motherhood*. Halifax & Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing
- Norrick, N. R. (1997) Twice-Told Tales: Collaborative Narration of Familiar Stories. *Language in Society*. 26(2): 199-220
- Oakley, A. (1984) *Taking It Like A Woman*. London: Fontana Paperbacks
- Ochil Tower School (2012) *Introduction*. [Online] Available: <http://www.ochiltowerschool.org.uk/Curative/curative.htm> [Accessed: Throughout 2009-2012]
- Okely, J. (1992) Anthropology and Autobiography: Participatory Experience and Embodied Knowledge. In: Okely, J. & Callaway, H. eds. *Anthropology and Autobiography*. London: Routledge
- Okely, J. (1997) Some Political Consequences of Theories of Gypsy Ethnicity: The Place of the Intellectual. In: James, A., Hockey, J. & Dawson, A. eds. *After Writing Culture*. London: Routledge
- Oriola, T. & Haggerty, K. D. (2012) The Ambivalent Insider/Outsider Status of Academic 'Homecomers': Observations on Identity and Field Research in the Nigerian Delta. *Sociology*. 46(3): 540-549
- Pearlman, W. (2003) *Occupied Voices*. New York: Thunder's Mouth Press/Nation Book
- Pink, S. (2007) *Doing Visual Ethnography*. London: Sage
- Plant, A. (2006) *Experiences of Community*. Internal Publication to the Camphill Communities of Scotland
- Plant, A. (2011) The Challenges Facing Camphill: An Internal Perspective. In: Jackson, R. ed. *Discovering Camphill: New Perspectives, Research and Developments*. Edinburgh: Floris Books
- Plant, A. (2012) Research as a Signpost to the Heart: Making Camphill More Accessible to the Wider World. *Camphill Correspondence*. July/August: 3-4.
- Plummer, K. (2001) *Documents of Life 2: An Invitation to Critical Humanism*. London: Sage
- Powdermaker, H. (1967) *Stranger and Friend: The Way of an Anthropologist*. London: Secker & Warburg

- Prior, P. (1994) Response, Revision, Disciplinarity – A Microhistory of a Dissertation Prospectus in Sociology. *Written Communication*. 11(4): 483-533.
- Punch, S., McIntosh, I., Emond, R. & Dorrer, N. (2009) Food and Relationships: Children's Experiences in Residential Care. In: James, A., Kjørholt, A. T. & Tingstad, V. eds. *Children, Food and Identity in Everyday Life*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan
- Raheb, M. (2004) *Bethlehem Besieged*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press
- Rapport, N. & Overing, J. (2007) *Social and Cultural Anthropology: The Key Concepts*. London and New York: Routledge
- Rapport, N. (1994) *The Prose and the Passion. Anthropology, Literature and Writing of E.M. Forster*. Manchester: Manchester University Press
- Rapport, N. (1997) Edifying Anthropology: Culture as Conversation; Representation As Conversation. In: James, A., Hockey, J. & Dawson, A. eds. *After Writing Culture*. London: Routledge
- Reed, K. (2010) The Spectre of Research Ethics and Governance and the ESRC's FRE: Nowhere Left to Hide? *Sociological Research Online*. 15(4) 17 Available: www.socresonline.org.uk/15/4/17.html
- Reed-Danahay, D. E. ed. (1997) *Auto/Ethnography*. Oxford: Berg Publishers
- Richardson, L. (1991) Postmodern Social Theory: Representational Practices. *Sociological Theory*. 9 (2): 173-79
- Riessman, C. R. (1993) *Narrative Analysis*. California: Sage
- Robinson, G. (2004) Living in Sheds: Suicide, Friendship and Research Among the Tiwi. In: Hume, L. & Mulcock, J. eds. *Anthropologists in the Field: Cases in Participant Observation*. New York: Columbia University Press
- Rodin, R. (2008) Stretch Marks. In: Cowan, S., Lam, F.T., & Stonehouse, C. eds. *Double Lives: Writing and Motherhood*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press
- Rose, G. (2001) *Visual Methodologies: An Introduction to the Interpretation of Visual Materials*. London: Sage
- Rose, G. (2011) *Visual Methodologies: An Introduction to Researching with Visual Materials*. London: Sage

- Rosenthal, G. (1993) Reconstruction of Life Stories: Principles of Selection in Generating Stories for Narrative Biographical Interviews. In: Josselson, R. & Lieblich, A. eds. *The Narrative Study of Lives*. California: Sage
- Rowland, M. (2005) A Materialist Approach to Materiality. In: Miller, D. ed. *Materiality*. Durham and London: Duke University Press
- Rustin, M. (2010) The Risks of Assessing Ethical Risks. *Sociological Research Online*. 15(4) 18 Available: www.socresonline.org.uk/15/4/18.html
- Ryan, R.M. & Deci, E.L. (2001) On Happiness and Human Potentials: A Review of Research on Hedonistic and Eudaimonic Well-Being. *Annual Review of Psychology*. 52, 141-166
- Sahlins, M. (1993) Goodbye to *Tristes Tropes*: Ethnography in the Context of Modern World History. *Journal of Modern History*. 65: 1-25
- Said, E. W. (2004) *From Oslo to Iraq and the Roadmap*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing
- Sanders, M. (2004) Anke Weihs. In: Bock, F. ed. (2004) *The Builders of Camphill*. Edinburgh: Floris Books
- Sanjek, R. (1990) *Fieldnotes: The Makings of Anthropology*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press
- Sarah, R. (2008) A Double Life. In: Cowan, S., Lam, F. T., & Stonehouse, C. eds. *Double Lives: Writing and Motherhood*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press
- Savage, M. (2008) Histories, Belongings, Communities. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*. 11(2): 151-162
- Scheper-Hughes, N. (2001) *Saints, Scholars and Schizophrenics: Mental Illness in Rural Ireland*. Berkeley: University of California Press
- Scott, J. (1986) Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance. *Journal of Peasant Studies*. 13: 5-35
- Scott, S. (2009) *Making Sense of Everyday Life*. Cambridge: Polity Press
- Scott, S. (2010) Revisiting the Total Institution: Performative Regulation in the Reinventive Institution. *Sociology*. 44 (2): 213-231
- Scott, S. (2011) *Total Institutions and Reinvented Identities*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

- Seden, J. (2003) Managers and their Organisations. In: Henderson, J. & Atkinson, D. eds. *Managing Care in Context*. London: Routledge
- Selg, P. (2008) *Karl König: My Task*. Edinburgh: Floris Books
- Shanahan, N. (2008) Motherhood and the Muses. In: Cowan, S., Lam, F.T., & Stonehouse, C. eds. *Double Lives: Writing and Motherhood*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press
- Shea, T. (2008) Wearing Different Hats. In: Cowan, S., Lam, F.T., & Stonehouse, C. eds. *Double Lives: Writing and Motherhood*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press
- Shukrallah, H. (2002) The Street Reacts to Operation Defensive Shield: Snapshots from the Middle East. *Journal of Palestine Studies*. 31 (4): 44-65
- Simonoff, E. (2005) Children with Psychiatric Disorders and Learning Disabilities. *British Medical Journal*. 330: 742-743
- Skinner, K. & Baron, S. (2011) Camphill: Further Notes from the Boundary In: Jackson, R. ed. *Discovering Camphill: New Perspectives, Research and Developments*. Edinburgh: Floris Books
- Smith, A. D. (1999) *Myths and Memories of the Nation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Smith, C. (2002) Punishment and Pleasure: Women, Food and the Imprisoned Body. *Sociological Review*. 50 (2): 197-214
- Smith, M. (2009) *Rethinking Residential Childcare*. Bristol: Polity Press
- Smith, M. (2011) Whaur Extremes Meet: Camphill in the Context of Residential Childcare in Scotland. In: Jackson, R. ed. *Discovering Camphill: New Perspectives, Research and Developments*. Edinburgh: Floris Books
- Snellgrove, M. L. (2008) *Living Community, Defining Camphill*. Master's Dissertation: The University of Edinburgh.
- Snellgrove, M. L. (2012) The House that Camphill Built. *Camphill Correspondence*. July/August: 5-6
- Staal, F. (1979) The Meaninglessness of Ritual. *Numen*. 26(1): 2-22
- Stacey, J. (1988) Can There be a Feminist Ethnography? *Women's Studies International Forum*. 11(1):21-27

- Stalker, K. (1998) Some Ethical and Methodological Issues in Research with People with Learning Difficulties. *Disability & Society*. 13(1): 5-19
- Stanley, L & Wise, S. (2006) Putting It into Practice: Using Feminist Fractured Foundationalism in Researching Children in the Concentration Camps of the South African War. *Sociological Research Online*. 11 (1) Available: www.socresonline.org.uk/15/3/stanley.html
- Stanley, L. & Wise, S. (1993) *Breaking Out Again: Feminist Ontology and Epistemology*. London: Routledge
- Stanley, L. & Wise, S. (2010) The ESRC's 2010 Framework for Research Ethics: Fit for Purpose? *Sociological Research Online*. 15(4) 12 Available: www.socresonline.org.uk/15/4/12.html
- Stanley, L. (1992) *The Auto/Biographical I: The Theory and Practice of Feminist Auto/Biography*. Manchester: Manchester University Press
- Stanley, L. (2008) On Auto/Biography in Sociology. In: Atkinson, P. Delamont, S. eds. *Representing Ethnography*. Vol. 4 London: Sage
- Steiner, R. (1964) *The Philosophy of Freedom*. London: Rudolf Steiner Press
- Strathern, M. (1986) The Limits of Auto-Anthropology. In: Jackson, A. ed. *Anthropology at Home*. London: Tavistock
- Strathern, M. (1991) *Partial Connections*. Oxford: AltaMira Press
- Strathern, M. (2006) A Community of Critics? Thoughts on New Knowledge. *JRAI*. 12 (1): 191-209
- Surkamp, J. (2007) *The Lives of Camphill*. Edinburgh: Floris Books
- Sztompka, P. (2008) The Focus on the Everyday: A New Turn in Sociology. *European Review*. 16 (1): 23-37
- Tamboukou, M. (2008) Re-Imagining the Narratable Subject. *Qualitative Research*. 8(3): 283-292
- Tanser, C. (2006) Music Therapy In: Jackson, R. ed. *Discovering Camphill: New Perspectives, Research and Developments*. Edinburgh: Floris Books
- Taussig, M. (1992) *The Nervous System*. London: Routledge
- Teaiwa, K. M. (2004) Multi-Sited Methodologies: 'Homework' in Australia, Fiji and Kiribati. In: Hume, L. & Mulcock, J. eds. *Anthropologists in the Field: Cases in Participant Observation*. New York: Columbia University Press

- The Good Retreat Guide (2012) *The Good Retreat Guide*. [Online] Available: <http://www.thegoodretreatguide.com/> [Accessed December 2012]
- Turner, A. (2000) Embodied Ethnography: Doing Culture. *Social Anthropology*. 8(1): 51-60
- Turner, T. (1990) Visual Media, Cultural Politics and Anthropological Practice. *Comm. Vis. Anthropology Review*. Spring 8-13
- Van Maanen, J. (1988) *Tales of the Field*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press
- Van Maanen, J. (2010) A Song for my Supper: More Tales of the Field. *Organizational Research Methods*. 13(2): 240-253
- Visweswaran, K. (1994) *Fictions of Feminist Ethnography*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press
- Ward, A., Kasinski, K., Pooley, J. & Worthington, A. eds. (2003) *Therapeutic Communities for Children and Young People*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers
- Watson, T. J. (2012) Making Organisational Ethnography. *Journal of Organisational Ethnography* 1 (1): 15-22
- Weber, M. (1978) *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. Berkeley: University of California Press
- Weihls, T. (1971) *Children in Need of Special Care*. London: Souvenir Press
- Wellin, C & Fine, G. A. (2001) Ethnography as Work: Career Socialisation, Settings and Problems. In: Atkinson, P., Delamont, S., Coffey, A., Lofland, J. & Lofland, L eds. *Handbook of Ethnography*. London: Sage
- Wetherell, M. ed. (2009) *Identity in the 21st Century, New Trends in Changing Times*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan
- Wharton, E. (1983) *Roman Fever*. London: Virago
- Widdershoven, G. A. M. (1993) The Story of Life: Hermeneutic Perspectives on the Relationship Between Narrative and Life History. In: Josselson, R. & Lieblich, A. eds. *The Narrative Study of Lives*. London: Sage
- Wolf, M. (1992) *A Thrice-Told Tale: Feminism, Postmodernism and Ethnographic Responsibility*. Stanford: Stanford University Press
- Woolf, V. (1928) *A Room of One's Own*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books

Wright, K. (2008) Researching the Views of Pupils with Multiple and Complex Needs. Is it Worth Doing and Whose Interests are Served by it? *Support for Learning*. 23 (1): 32-40

Young, J. E. (1993) *The Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meaning*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press