music and psycho-analysis into other—even nominally applied—areas like management education.

This identity between education and telling on the one hand, and knowing the right things to say on the other, has resulted in a vicious circle: teaching as a profession recruits a disproportionate number of people who want to be the centre of attention and the source of wisdom [48]—and those are exactly the sort of teachers that many pupils and students think they want. Those who have the skills and sensibilities which are required to facilitate growth tend not to become teachers in the first place—and are often rejected by pupils and students if they do find their way into teaching. The conflict between the satisfactions which most teachers want from teaching and those available to those who facilitate development—even in language laboratories—results in many teachers finding such activities so distressing that they corrupt them back into telling. Nuttgens [49] has developed the argument for pupils and students. In the educational system we promote and advance those who are least willing and able to do anything useful and squeeze out those who are willing and able to do so. The students who remain are those who are least interested in developing, and least able to develop, competencies which are useful for anything other than securing personal advancement. Not only does this make change in the educational system increasingly difficult as one moves to higher levels, we also set those who remain on tracks which lead to influential positions in society. They continue to earn promotion in the world in the same way, scoring management development programmes which will actually help them to do their jobs more effectively but do not provide them with words to show off to their superiors. McClelland [50] independently documented this process several years ago: those people on whom our society is most dependent for innovation—that is, those who have a high need for achievement—are typically drop-outs from school.

These observations suggest that, if progress is to occur, it will be necessary to get this conflict between the role required of teachers if they are to facilitate the development of competence on the one hand, and (i) parents', pupils', and students' accurate observation that the educational system is not mainly about developing competence but about legitimising the rationing of privilege and teaching people how to buy personal advancement by ingratiating themselves with their superiors by saying the right thing and, (ii) the satisfactions which teachers want from their jobs on the other out into the open and ensure that it is carefully addressed.

If more emphasis is to be placed on facilitating the growth of competence it will also be necessary to challenge another assumption which derives even more directly from the pervasive control of thoughts and behaviour that is exerted by the knowledge-oriented, technical-rational, model of competence. This is that learning can be chopped up into40-minute periods or 40-hour modules. While there is no doubt about the need to create a greater variety of short, specialist, up-to-date, knowledge-based, modules to support individualised, competency-oriented educational programmes, it is crucial to recognise that high-level competencies mainly develop whilst people are involved in difficult and demanding activities which occupy an extended period of time but which, in the end, lead to something worthwhile. This enable those concerned to experience the benefits and satisfactions which come from being engaged in those activities. What this means is that it is essential to organise modularised material around the ongoing developmental process—and not to try to organise competency-oriented educational programmes around, or through, modules [51].

(4) The Problems Which Stem from the Transformational Nature of the Educational Activities which are Required to Foster High-level Competencies

To promote the development of high-level competencies one starts by studying pupils' motives and incipient talents. One then tries to invent individualised developmental experiences which will test one's initial hypotheses about incipient interests and talents and the processes which will lead them to flower [52]. One cannot know the outcome of this process in advance. One may end up doing things which are quite different to those one initially envisaged. Unexpected talents surface and develop. In this way pupils are transformed [53]. All of this is fine from an educational point of view. But it conflicts with widely held beliefs about the ways in which it is appropriate to spend public money. It is generally believed that one should not take risks with public money and that contractors (teachers or researchers) should be able to specify in advance what the results of the expenditure will be. Funding an adventure which may (or may not) transform people or existing understandings is viewed as not merely risky: it is illegitimate. The resolution of this problem has not only to do with legitimising venture some activity in the public sector. It also involves finding ways of identifying the sorts of people (teachers or researchers) who are able to capitalise on what they stumble across in the course of an adventure—i.e. people who are able to recognise the value of something they have come upon by chance and turn it to advantage. It is dependent on developing tools for staff appraisal which make it possible to identify, recognise, reward and encourage the very competencies that we have been concerned with in this article.

(5) The Dilemmas Associated with Catering for Diversity

We have seen that high-level competencies can only be fostered when people are doing things they care about, and that this means tailoring developmental tasks to pupils' personal values, priorities and motives. It is sometimes impossible for pupils to pursue goals which they care about in the same way as that in which other pupils undertake tasks which they care about. For example, one cannot, in the same classroom, meet the needs of those pupils who want to develop toughness and strength and those who wish to develop the sensitivities required to learn how to set their minds to the dreamy state required to notice the fleeting feelings which form the germ of nearly all creative new insights and slowly bring them to the centre of attention so that they become usable, and subsequently reflect on, find ways of expressing, and then reformulate, such insights.

This need for variety and choice conflicts with the widely accepted emphasis on equality and uniformity in public provision (cf. the National Curriculum). It is therefore essential to make explicit, and possibly challenge, the reasons for this dispute for variety in the public domain. One of its causes is the experience-based belief that such variety leads to a hierarchy of options—running from those which are of high quality to those which are poor—rather than to alternatives which are very different from each other, but all of which are of high quality. When the quality of provision varies only from good to bad, the more informed, articulate and powerful get the best deal. It was to counteract this tendency that education was brought into the public domain in the first place. If the stultifying effects of the emphasis on equality in public provision are to be reduced, it will be necessary to
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