From: MacLeod, F. (1989) Parents and Schools: The Contemporary Challenge. London: The Falmer Press. P59-101

4 *Equity in Diversity: The Problems Posed by Values - and their Resolution*

John Raven

Introduction: The Problems: Some Illustrations

I once attended a small invitational 'planning' meeting between the Head of a yet-to-be-established new local authority school, a few of the teachers who had been appointed, representatives of community and other interests, and a number of prospective parents.

The Head had set up an agenda with a view to getting agreement to his plans. Among the papers he had distributed was an organizational chart. One of the boxes on the chart, with some arrows going to and from it, was labelled 'guidance'. After an hour or so's inconsequential discussion, one of the parents chanced to say 'guidance, what's that?' 'Oh, that's helping pupils to think about their abilities and their problems, social education, sex education, and . . .' SEX EDUCATION. It was if a volcano had erupted. Everyone pitched in. The parents tore into each other: some were avidly in favour, some utterly opposed. In the end, the Head closed the discussion saying 'There you are, you see, you can never get agreement between parents. I will have to decide that there will be sex education and what will be covered . . . and I will set aside the next two days to listen to parents' complaints'.

I am sure that many of us have had experiences of this sort. Groups of parents on PTAs regularly decide that they want to influence the curriculum. Given an amenable Head — like the one above — a meeting between parents and staff is then convened. At that meeting it becomes clear that, although all parents want change, one group of parents wants to encourage teachers to foster qualities like initiative, creativity, and the ability to ask questions and pursue

the answers. Others are utterly opposed to any such thing: they don't want their children asking questions and being adventurous: they couldn't answer their questions, they would lose control over them, and, anyway, their children might get hurt in the process. What is more, the school should not foster these qualities in other people's children either: if it did, those children would do better in life than their own (and *that* would be bad). What they want is more discipline. The pupils should learn to do as they are told. The children should have the badness beaten out of them. Society will fall apart otherwise: you can't have people deciding for themselves when they will work and what they will work at.[1] The outcome of the meeting is that the Head is left to go his own way.

This example illustrates some of the central problems in public education. It shows that the most important qualities to be fostered by the educational system are value laden. It illustrates the difficulties posed by the need to cater for people who have different priorities and the effects of the widely held belief that the public sector should treat everyone equally. It shows that the equally widely held belief that democracy means taking majority votes which will be binding on everyone, rather than coming to decisions which allow people with different priorities to go their own way, results in decisions which satisfy very few people. It illustrates the impossible situation in which innovative managers find themselves. In fact it illustrates the need to hold managers accountable, not for orchestrating democratic decisions, but for making high level and creative discretionary judgments, based on conflicting information and priorities, but which are in the best interests of as large a sector of the community as possible. Managers exist, not to implement clients' or committees' consensus decisions, but to seek out information and then come to good decisions about what to do. Yet, as can be seen from the illustration, any attempt to hold managers accountable for doing just that is itself fraught with difficulties because people have different definitions of what constitutes the public interest. (All of which is, of course, why Adam Smith and F. A. Hayek said that it was impossible anyway and that one should not even try to do it.)

In the remainder of this chapter I will address some of the issues raised in the last few paragraphs.

The Importance of Coming to Terms with Values in Education

In this section I will summarize research which shows: (i) that most parents, pupils and teachers think that the main goals of education include fostering such qualities as the ability to make one's own observations and think for oneself, the ability to take initiative, and the ability to understand and influence society; (ii) that the opinions of these parents, pupils and teachers are correct; these *are* the main qualities required to lead one's life and do one's job effectively; (iii) that most schools fail to foster these qualities; and (iv) that, while the reasons for schools' failure to foster these qualities include a lack of understanding of how they are to be fostered and assessed, they also include the dilemmas involved in harnessing and influencing values and catering for diversity.

The Main Goals of General Education

Most official documents which specify the goals of general education emphasize problem-solving ability, the ability to work with others, enterprise skills, leadership, and the ability to understand and influence what happens in society.[2] These views are echoed in surveys of the opinions of teachers, pupils, parents, employees and employers.[3] The opinions of all of these groups are supported by research into the qualities which are actually required at work and in society: the qualities which have been mentioned, and others like them, *are* required by machine operatives.[4] by navvies[5] by bus drivers,[6] by nurses,[7] by small businessmen,[8] by civil servants,[9] by doctors,[10] by scientists,[11] by engineers,[12] by managers,[13] and by politicians.[14] They are required if people are to develop their talents and contribute effectively to society.[15] They are also required if leisure is to be used in a satisfying way[16] and if economic and social development (rather than, for example, stagnation and conflict) is to occur.[17]

Most Schools Fail to Foster such Qualities

Despite the exhortations of governments, despite parents', teachers' and pupils' wishes, and despite the demonstrated importance of the qualities mentioned above, most schools do not even attempt to

foster them or even such qualities as the ability to muster arguments, make good judgments, or reconcile different points of view.[18] Worse still, many schools actually stifle them and foster socially dysfunctional beliefs, understandings and values.[19] It is therefore impossible for most parents, by sending their children to state schools, to fulfil their legal obligation to provide them with efficient full-time education suited to their age, ability and aptitude.

The Nature and Development of Competence

In the light of these findings it seems essential to develop a better understanding of the nature of qualities like those which have been mentioned and how they are to be fostered. In this context, one of our most interesting findings[20] has been that, while few teachers understand how to foster them, many parents not only know *how* to do so but actually do so. It emerges that parents are their children's most important educators, not in the sense that they do the things which schools do, or even in the sense that they support schools, but in the sense that they, and they alone, foster these wider qualities. And it is these wider qualities which (unlike the knowledge conveyed to pupils at school[21]) make for the differential life success of those who do well at school.

As the parents we interviewed emphasized, if one is to foster such qualities as initiative, the ability to observe, or confidence in dealing with others, one must create situations in which young people can practise doing these things and thus learn to do them more effectively. Yet these are all difficult, time-consuming, and often frustrating activities. No one is going to make the effort required to practise them unless what they are doing is important to them — and they are also likely to be discouraged if it is not important to at least some other people as well. If people are to be brought to practise undertaking these activities, the tasks they are encouraged to undertake must therefore be tasks which relate directly to their motives, interests, priorities and talents. In short, their educational programmes must be individualized in such a way that they are tailored to their values, motives and talents.

But practice is not the only way in which qualities like initiative, adventurousness, and leadership are developed. As some of the parents we interviewed also pointed out, people learn from the example of others. It is not only other people's observable behaviour — the *results* of their thinking and planning — which it

is important for children to see and to copy. The mental, emotional and striving processes which lie behind that behaviour are also important. So, if people are to develop the competencies which make for enterprise, leadership, and the willingness and the ability to understand and influence the direction in which society moves, their mentors must make these normally private concerns, values, thought processes, agonies and delights visible. In this way they can learn to be sensitive to the cues which beckon and point toward an activity which is likely to pay off, which tell them when corrective action is necessary, or which tell them that things are getting out of hand and they had better either get help or stop. They can learn how to turn a chance observation to advantage.[22]

It is because experiences gained whilst undertaking tasks which are personally significant and whilst working with other people who share one's concerns are so important that the Youth Training Scheme branch of the Manpower Services Commission is correct when it asserts — to the annoyance of many 'educators'[23] — that such qualities are best fostered and developed on the job or in the community. (It is important to emphasize that work is anything but the soul-destroying activity which many teachers take it to be. Some 83 per cent of the young people say that they have been able to identify and develop their talents at work in contrast to only 13 per cent who say they are able to do so at school,[24] and, with the exception of those who work in *large* factories and offices — which employ relatively few people — 80 per cent of young people like their work, like their employers, and find their jobs interesting.[25] They like the variety and the opportunity to use their own particular talents, work with others, and take initiative.)

Fortunately for educators, the home and the workplace are not the only settings in which such qualities can be fostered. If teachers adopt such processes as interdisciplinary, competency-oriented, enquiry-based project work grounded in the environment around the school and explicitly set out to embody important features of work experience in that activity — a *real* task to do, a variety of tasks to do during the day, an opportunity to exercise different talents from those exercised by colleagues — then educational environments *can* be made more developmental.[26] In this context it is of interest to note that more effective teachers, like more effective parents and managers, are the ones who show a greater tendency to think about, harness, build upon, and develop the talents of their pupils.[27] And they are also more likely to share their

own thoughts, their own strivings, and their own feelings with them.[28]

So far, I have noted simply that, if young people are to develop a selection of important competencies, they will need to be engaged in long-term activities which they value and work with people whom they respect in the course of carrying out activities which both value.

Many people find this intrusion of values into education threatening enough. But many of the other qualities which parents, pupils and teachers believe important for the educational system to foster involve *influencing* values. Examples include fostering consideration for others or the desire to work for the long-term good of the community.

The research we have carried out into the nature of competence[29] has, however, led us to a yet more disturbing conclusion. The competencies which make for enterprise, innovativeness, leadership, the ability to work with others and other types of effective behaviour are crucially dependent on understandings of terms like 'democracy', 'participation in management', 'industrial democracy', 'management', 'money' and 'wealth'. If teachers are to foster high level competencies they will therefore have to influence pupils' understandings of these and similar terms. The thought of encouraging teachers to engage in political education of this sort — with all its attendant dangers — makes many people — including me — extremely uncomfortable. It has resulted in the government banning 'political education' from its TVEI and YTS schemes despite the fact that, as we can now see, if they are to achieve their objectives, this is the *most* important ingredient of these programmes. Nor is the discomfort generated by this conclusion entirely dissipated by the thought that teachers *already* — and (since there can be no such thing as value-free education) *inevitably* — influence these beliefs and understandings. Indeed, in an effort to avoid the problem, they give pupils the impression that politics is a dirty, unmentionable, business in which no respectable person would engage. This has had devastating consequences for our society.[30] Thus, teachers' unexamined impact in this area is often not for the better.[31] Informed and explicit action has therefore got to be the only way of handling the problem.[32]

What I hope I have now done is indicate just how crucial it is to find some way of coming to terms with values in public education. Unless we do so we will not only continue to squander some two thirds of the resources devoted to 'education' and stunt

the development of many of our children, we will stunt the development of our society.

I must emphasize that I am talking about *state* education, because it is significant that private schools can inculcate political beliefs, influence values, and foster — through Cadet Corps, house activities, the prefects system and similar activities — the very competencies of which we have spoken with no qualms whatsoever. Interestingly enough, they are caught in the trap I described earlier. It is precisely *because* they are so effective in reaching these 'non-academic' goals that they are so widely opposed by people who would not send their children to them even if they could. Until we find a way of dealing with the fact that people often wish to prevent other people's children developing qualities which they do not want their own children to develop we are unlikely to make much progress in thinking through the issues associated with parent power or identify ways in which the quality of education is to be improved.

The Origins of Variance in Values and Talents

In the course of our research Sigel, McGillicuddy, Pellegrini, Tharp, Gallimore and my colleagues and I[3] have shown that parents believe that they can influence their children's values and foster important competencies by creating developmental environments in which their children can develop those competencies while undertaking tasks which interest them and which they care about. Sigel,[34] McGillicuddy,[35] Rosen and D'Andrade,[36] McClelland,[37] Bloom[38] and I[39] have also demonstrated that these beliefs are correct. Elsewhere we[40] have shown that managers can create developmental environments which release, and lead people to practise and thereby develop, such qualities as initiative, the ability to support innovative colleagues, and the ability to work with others for the long term good of the organization concerned and society in general.

In the next few paragraphs I will refine and qualify these statements in a way which will help to take us forward. Although many parents think they can influence the activities which their children value, many of them also acknowledge that their children come with sharp limits within which they, as parents, must work. Unlike most teachers, parents tend both to accept that their children are as they are and to respect their children's interests and preoccupations. Instead of trying to *change* their children's interests,

parents tend to set about harnessing those interests and motives in order to get them to practise reading, observing, inventing, analyzing, planning, and working with others. They then study their children's difficulties and intervene sensitively, only when help is really required.[41]

Parents' recognition that their own children's dispositions are to a considerable extent pre-programmed is nevertheless frequently in conflict with generalizations they will make about the malleability of human nature. And they are in even greater conflict with the environmentalist stance of many teachers, psychologists and sociologists. However, some large scale research undertaken in the early 1970s[42] supports both positions. What we found was that there is almost as much variation in the values and activities of adolescents who come from similar backgrounds — indeed from the same families — as there is between children who come from different backgrounds. Some children from middle class backgrounds espouse what Kohn[43] and others have called 'working class' values: they want to develop toughness and strength, learn to do as they are told, and to have strict rules to guide their lives. Some children from working class backgrounds espouse 'middle class' values — they want to think for themselves, develop the qualities which make for creativity and originality and to assume managerial responsibilities. (Jackson and Marsden[44] have described some of the family conflicts which stem from this). What is more (as Havighurst and Taba[45] had earlier noted) the values which children espouse are at least as characteristic of the socio-economic groups they will enter as they are of those they have come from. Our own results have been confirmed by the Newsons,[46] by Sokolowska,[47] and by Lempert.[48] Kinsey[49] reported the same thing for sexual behaviour: children's sexual behaviour and attitudes anticipated those of the groups they would later enter. What is most interesting about Kinsey's results is that there is no way in which the children concerned could have acquired through discussion or observation sexual attitudes and behaviour which typify groups with whom they had as yet had little contact.

For the sake of brevity, I have summarized our conclusions by reference to 'working class' and 'middle class' values. It is, however, extremely important to note that this is a shorthand. While a much higher proportion of middle class than of working class parents endorse 'middle class values' and *vice versa*, the relationship between socio-economic status and values is far from perfect. Indeed, in absolute numbers, because there are more working class than middle

class people, there are more working class than middle class parents who endorse 'middle class values'. However, because of implications which will become clear later, one of the most important facts to hang onto is that an absolute majority of parents endorses *working class* values.

Particular mention must be made of the work of Burns *et al.*[50] What they found was that Kohn's results are a product of *two* variables — *true* cultural (SES, ethnic) differences and effects of environment. This makes sense of much other work. We found that while there was a great deal of variation between parents in the qualities they wanted to encourage in their children and the activities in which they engaged in order to foster these qualities, many parents were deterred from engaging in child-rearing activities which they otherwise valued by the quality of their environments. The result is that while children from the same family usually have a predisposition to develop, and value, a wide range of very different competencies and qualities, the environments in which they are reared do have a marked effect on the concerns and competencies they develop.

Taken as a whole, these results suggest that we are dealing here with some poorly understood, but socially important and functional, process. It would seem that children are born with predispositions to develop very different concerns and talents and that, in the process of social allocation, they find their way into very different positions in society which demand different concerns and competencies. It would also seem to follow that society must need a wide range of people with very different concerns and patterns of competence.

Implications of Values Diversity and its Anticipatory Nature: the Barriers to Handling Them

The research summarized above suggests that, instead of fostering only one type of competence in schools (the ability to remember, typically for not more than a year, a smattering of out of date facts[51]), instead of creating school environments characterized by 'working class' values ('sit still, do as you are told, learn what is put in front of you, remember rather than think, be dependent rather than independent'), we may need to do as good parents do — namely to identify, respect, nurture, and find ways of capitalizing upon, the types of behaviour which young people value in order

to foster a much wider range of competencies and talents. We may not only need to harness widely available, but neglected, motives (such as the desire to work with others and the wish to feel that one has really created something[52]) to fuel enthusiasm for educational activities, we may also need to find ways of accommodating the wide variety of different types of activity which young people are motivated to undertake and the diversity of the competencies they tend to display in the course of undertaking those activities.[53]

There are many barriers to respecting the variety of tasks which attract different children and fostering a number of the competencies which may be exercised in pursuit of them. These barriers include:

1. The absence of appropriate theory.
2. The absence of tools for administering individualized, competency-oriented, educational programmes.
3. The fear of exacerbating the climate of mediocrity.
4. The contempt which many teachers have for working class values.
5. The very narrow range — and general inappropriateness — of the concerns and competencies displayed by teachers for pupils to emulate.
6. The definition society has given to the term equality and widely held views about the appropriate nature of public provision.
7. The fear that treating different children in different ways will lead to a caste society.
8. The pressures which focus teachers' attention on low level goals.

I will review all of these in the paragraphs which follow. However, it may be useful first to draw attention to the fact that, if some means of respecting and catering for diversity by offering genuine variety and choice could be found, it would remove the fears of brainwashing which intrude as soon as one envisages that teachers might be encouraged to influence values, engage in political education, and treat different children in different ways. If pupils had the right to opt into and out of educational programmes depending on how congenial they found the values of the teachers concerned it would greatly facilitate the solution of some of the most important problems in education.

I will now discuss the barriers to implementing individualized, competency-oriented, education which harnesses each pupil's

motives and fosters high-level, value-laden, competencies which were listed above one at a time.

1. *The absence of appropriate theory.* Although this is not the right place to pursue it, it would be inappropriate not to mention that one of the main reasons why schools do not make use of the individualized competency-oriented educational programmes which are required to foster such qualities as the ability to make one's own observations, communicate, take initiative and think for oneself is that, despite the voluminous writing on progressive education, there is no generally accepted understanding of how teachers might identify, foster, and point to the development of, these talents. As Jackson[54] has emphasized, educational theory has had particular difficulty with the *transformative* processes which occur in some homes, schools and workplaces. These transformations tend to occur when people are highly motivated and they get an opportunity to develop new self-images and competencies in the course of undertaking tasks they care about or when they are exposed to role models which they find attractive and engaging.[55]

2. *The absence of tools to administer individualized competency-oriented educational programmes.* This barrier is related to the first: if pupils are to develop a selection of important competencies whilst they are engaged on tasks which are important to them, their teachers must be able to identify the particular types of activity which engage them and monitor the development of many 'intangible' competencies. As Fraley[56] and I[57] have shown, most teachers are unable to do this even when they are in 1 : 1 relationships with children (other than their own). This is because they do not know what interests the children, cannot 'read' their body language and do not have time to reflect on its implications, and, as a result, do not know when and how to intervene. They need tools to help them to do these things.

3. *The fear of exacerbating the climate of mediocrity which the public associate with 'mixed ability teaching' and 'progressive education'.* The idea of fostering 'all of the talents of all of the children' is associated in most people's minds with 'mixed ability teaching' and 'progressive education'. These ideas are in turn associated with mediocrity. There is some justification for these associations since, although neither mixed ability teaching nor progressive education have been wholeheartedly and widely implemented,[58] the goals which were to be achieved and the educational processes which were to be used to reach them have been only intermittently articulated[59] — and often poorly at that. As Bernstein[60] noted, they have been multiple

and implicit. Individualized, competency-oriented education is, however, anything but vague and it is, in particular, quite different from the dominant, romanticist, 'leave children to do as they please' version of progressive education. It requires competent teachers as managers to orchestrate multiple and demanding programmes of personal growth.

4. *The disrespect which many teachers (and researchers) have for 'working class' values.* One observation which may be made about the research literature is that our map of middle class values is much more differentiated than our map of working class values. Researchers seem to have the greatest difficulty hearing what working class people are telling them, and they tend to dismiss it as meaningless or inappropriate if they do hear it. For example, when I have presented data which shows that the most widely endorsed child-rearing priority among working class mothers is that their children should 'really need them', I have been repeatedly challenged to say what the item means. I have never been asked a parallel question about items which middle class mothers endorse. Similarly, when some of the teachers involved in the Lothian Region Educational Home Visiting Scheme said they were concerned about imposing middle class values on working class mothers, they were met by the argument that 'We wouldn't be doing this if we did not believe in it, would we? So what's the problem?' Likewise, in the course of our surveys of pupil opinion, we have repeatedly heard pupils who asked some variant of the question 'What use will all this education be to me as a bricklayer?' being told 'You shouldn't have asked that question. You should have asked how it will help you to avoid being a bricklayer' — a reply which denigrates the pupil's interest in being a bricklayer. Yet again, we have repeatedly observed teachers ignoring pupils' interests and talents whilst 'introducing' them to 'new' interests and forcing them to practise doing things in which they were not interested, which they were not good at, and which they would probably never have to do again. (This process, particularly when it is enacted in the course of 'compensatory', 'remedial' and 'enrichment' programmes establishes a self-fulfilling cycle which *creates* a 'general factor' of 'ability'.)

One thing which should perhaps be made clear at this point is that it appears that high level competencies developed in the course of undertaking tasks which are of little social importance can be released in the course of undertaking other activities if those concerned later come to value those other activities. For this reason

it is possible to respect the *competencies* which are being developed and displayed whilst young people are engaged in activities which one does not oneself value.

5. *Teachers on the whole neither present the role models to whom it would be most desirable for young people to be exposed nor, between them, offer a sufficient diversity of models.* We have seen that high-level competencies are not just developed through practice. They are also developed through exposure to people who portray the appropriate values and behaviours in the home, community and workplace. If the energies and talents of all our young people are to be released and developed, it will therefore be necessary either (a) to bring into schools, as mentors, a wide range of people who value different goals and activities and who display the competencies which are needed to translate their values into practice or (b) to develop job placements as a vital part of the educational programme of all pupils. The need for diversity is not, unfortunately, the only reason for underlining the importance of doing these things. It is unfortunately the case that teachers rarely display the competencies required to create an innovative, forward-looking, society.[61] They are rarely interested in innovation or possess the inclination or the competencies required to do new things well: they often feel unable to initiate new activities, monitor the results, and take corrective action when necessary. Instead of inventing the methods they need to do new things, they want courses in which experts will tell them how to do them. They rarely feel in control of their destinies or display the competencies which would be required to get control over those destinies: they do not think it is important to support other teachers who are trying to innovate or band with others to influence wider social forces which constrain their freedom of movement. In all these ways they are very different indeed from small businessmen.[62] They emerge as a rather down-trodden and ineffectual group. They are, therefore, not the best people to whom to expose our children. (One problem for the job placement solution is, however, that British managers and supervisors [unlike, say, Japanese managers and supervisors] rarely see it as part of their job to think about and develop the talents of their subordinates.[63])

6. *The way we, as a society, have defined equality and our understanding of appropriate public provision has tended to deflect teachers' attention away from fostering qualities like creativity and initiative.* Paradoxically, despite the fact that teachers themselves typically espouse 'middle class values', the ethos of state schools is typically 'working class'. This arises partly because, although it is only a narrow majority of

parents who actually endorse the 'working class' value for sitting still and learning what is put in front of one, many other parents end up going along with these parents because of a dilemma which confronts middle class parents. This is that there is no way in which their children can get credit in the examinations which control entry to jobs and courses of further and higher education for possessing such qualities as the ability to think, lead, or take initiative. They therefore come to recognize that schools would be jeopardizing their children's life chances if they pursued these wider goals at the expense of examination success — irrelevant though they recognize that the latter is from the point of view of developing competencies which will actually be of value in later life. Another reason why schools come to be dominated by 'working class' values is that, given current beliefs about equality and public provision, there is no way of catering differentially for the minority of parents who still want schools to foster question-asking, creativity, and initiative. Another is that those pupils who want strong, tough, teachers who discipline them (and who disrupt the work of other pupils if they don't get such teachers) drive out of classrooms the sensitive, reflective, intellectual processes which are crucial to any form of creative activity. (One cannot foster sensitivity to the fleeting feelings on the fringe of consciousness which form the germ of all creative and innovative ideas and a value for working hard at tasks set by others at the same time in the same classroom). For this reason, among others which will be mentioned shortly, it is necessary to cater for some of the diversity in values of which we have spoken by creating variety *between* classrooms and institutions and this raises the spectre of social divisiveness.

The more one moves toward project-based education, the more serious these problems become. Some pupils wish to develop the competencies needed to be successful in business; some to install sewers and electricity supplies; some to apply themselves to the beautification of their communities; and still others to devote themselves to literary creativity. It is necessary to meet the need for much of this diversity on a group basis. It might be thought that this would best be done by creating large schools rather than by having many small units, but this is not the case. Large schools preclude the very educational processes which are most important: they preclude the widespread assumption of responsibility for the effectiveness of the school as an organization and as a community; they preclude children being forced by the objective needs of circumstances (rather than the 'authoritarian' demands of teachers)

into a wide range of responsible roles; they preclude the creation of an ethos which emphasizes high standards of behaviour, innovation and performance; they preclude the processes which force people to become aware of the strengths of their colleagues and the development of the capacities needed to work with others with different priorities and capitalize upon their talents.[64]

7. *The worry that treating different children in different ways in different buildings would lead to a caste society has been exacerbated by the attention which has been drawn to the imperfections in social mobility.* This is an exaggerated fear: there is a great deal of social mobility in our society. Jencks,[65] for example, found that, for the United States, the status inequality between brothers amounted to 82 per cent of status variability in general. Payne *et al*[66] found that 71 per cent of adults in Scotland had been upwardly or downwardly mobile from their fathers' socioeconomic status, and that 10 per cent of those holding class 1 jobs had come all the way from class 7 backgrounds. Hope[67] found that, by age 40, there was no difference in the rates of social mobility between Scotland and the US. What was different was that, in Scotland, pupils had been allocated to their future class status by the time they were 11 years old. The Americans floundered around for another thirty years.

8. *The pressures which focus teachers' attention on low level goals.* As I have shown in *Education, Values and Society*,[68] what happens in schools is not mainly determined by the wishes of teachers, pupils, parents, ministers of education or anyone else but by what is assessed in the certification and placement process. The tests which are available for use in both this process and in evaluation and accountability studies are only capable of assessing low level competencies. These tests therefore focus everyone's attention — including that of parents and administrators — on low level competencies.[69] This pressure is exacerbated by the absence of tools to help teachers to identify each pupil's interests and competencies, administer the individualized, competency-oriented, educational programmes which are required to foster high level goals, and monitor progress toward them. It is important to note that merely abandoning testing would not help. As Bernstein[70] has noted, people cannot work effectively toward multiple, intangible, and high level goals. What would help would be a wider range of diagnostic and prescriptive tools and formative and summative assessment instruments . . . but *that* would mean developing and operationalizing a value-based psychometric paradigm instead of pursuing our quest for value-free measures.[71]

This section may be summarized by saying that refusal to come to terms with values and, in particular, the variance in values, has driven all education which aims to foster high level competencies out of schools. Encouraging variety and respecting 'working class' values would unleash opportunities (for future middle class as well as for future working class children) to enter educational programmes which would engage their concerns and help them to develop important competencies.

Influence, Assessment and Parental Involvement

Earlier, I have shown that more variety and choice, both within and between schools, is essential if the talents of more of our young people are to be identified and developed. In this part of my chapter I will first show that the provision of choice is *in itself* neither appropriate nor effective from the point of view of improving the quality of education or enabling pupils and parents to influence what happens in schools.[72] I will then discuss the expectations, tools, and structures which are required to perform these functions.

Influence through choice

To exert effective influence through choice one must have:

(i) access to a range of distinctively different options which have been explicitly developed to meet the needs of a cross-section of pupils and about which there is good information on (a) the pupils for whom they are appropriate, (b) the distinctive features of the educational processes which are being provided, and (c) the consequences of each of the alternatives for different sorts of children, immediately, for their future lives and careers, and for the society in which they live;
(ii) *convenient* geographical access to these options;
(iii) good information on what is going on in the specific classrooms in which one's children are, or might be, enrolled (this information being distinct from information on the type of educational *programme* on offer);
(iv) access to help (guidance) which enables one to articulate one's often unverbalized needs and become familiar with the aims, processes and consequences of educational programmes which one did not know were possible;
(v) capacity to understand, and time to review, the necessary information (one must not, for example, be preoccupied with securing a precarious hold on life).

If a 'market' system of this sort is to work, there must be some mechanism whereby the range of options which are offered to the public can be extended. In classical theory, this mechanism is provided by the entrepreneurial class whose job it is to notice a previously unmet need and to invent — and put on the market — a product which is designed to meet the need. In education, the scope for such entrepreneurial activity is very limited because the range of educational programmes which can be offered is controlled by what is assessed in public examinations and the sociological process into which those examinations feed. As far as parents are concerned, an option which may jeopardize their children's future life chances because employers will not accept the qualifications [if any] concerned is not a realistic option. To exert effective influence through choice, therefore, parents require some means of influencing the wider constraints which limit the range of options which a local authority is able to provide and which they are able to take up. This means that, if we pursue the examination example, they need some means of initiating the research and development which is required to develop means of indexing the wider outcomes of general education so that their children can get credit for possessing these qualities. And they need some means of influencing national and international manpower policies. The prospect of doing this through existing political structures is slim indeed.

One other prerequisite to the effective operation of a 'market' mechanism arises from the fact that, as has become clear even in relation to the purchase of tangible goods like cars and drugs, the information which is available on the products has become of crucial importance. If pupils and parents are to have access to the information which they will need to use a 'market' system effectively — and especially to use it to stimulate innovation — it will be necessary for them to have a mechanism whereby they can initiate research and development to generate information, the nature of which is at first only poorly articulated, but the importance of which becomes clearer as the results begin to emerge. That is, pupils and parents must have access to a mechanism which enables them to initiate social research and development and which enables them to *ensure* that it is carried through from their own perspective:

researchers tend to recast research to reflect their own perspectives and, while this is not always a bad thing — indeed social researchers have, because of their position and access to information, come to be cast in the role of guardians of the public interest and need to defend that position in the courts — there is a need for research informed by a wider range of perspectives.

Although the changes being introduced by the present government make provision for collecting and supplying partial information on school 'performance', that information does not relate to the outcomes discussed earlier, that is, it does not relate to the *most important* outcomes of education. There is no provision for ensuring that any of the other prerequisites to choice becoming influence are met. Nor are other mechanisms whereby people can influence provision and the constraints on its improvement to be established. The 'market mechanism' which the changes being introduced into education purport to offer will therefore provide neither meaningful nor useful choice nor a mechanism for school improvement. It will only offer some people a choice of supplier; it will not offer people a choice between distinctively different *types* of education.

Influence through Representation

Representation on boards of management or governors (England) or school boards (Scotland), and a requirement that Headteachers report to school boards, is, from the point of view of being able to significantly influence one's children's education or improve schools, no more satisfactory than the right to choose between schools offering educational programmes which have not been developed to differ markedly in character and which do not lead to distinctively different, but equally acceptable, qualifications.

There are two issues here: one is the nature of the information which is to be collected and disseminated on the work of individual teachers and schools. The other is the decision-taking structure into which that information is fed.

What is needed is some mechanism whereby the work of individual teachers can be assessed *in such a way that it highlights realistic possibilities for improvement*, discussed constructively with the administrators and parents concerned so as to identify realistic but challenging strategies for improvement, and monitored so as to see whether the planned changes have been introduced and had the desired effect. The whole process needs to be carried through

constructively and in such a way that those concerned can learn from the things which have not turned out as had been hoped or expected. In the following paragraphs I will discuss two types of assessment which might be useful (assessment of classroom climate and teacher appraisal) and then say a little more about the kind of structure into which such information might usefully be fed.

The Assessment of Classroom Climate

For many years, we have studied the nature of the classroom processes which are associated with the development of the high level competencies mentioned earlier and those which lead teachers to be able to identify and foster very different talents in different children thus producing children who differ from each other in their *areas* of excellence and expertise instead of their 'level of ability'. In the course of this research it has become clear that the presence or absence of relevant educational processes can be indexed by asking pupils about such things as what kinds of behaviours are valued by their fellow pupils and their teachers, what kinds of activity are encouraged and rewarded, whether they themselves are encouraged to do new things and decide for themselves what they will do, whether turning in a first rate performance is applauded and a second rate performance frowned upon by their fellow pupils, and whether a wide range of pupils who have very different talents are encouraged to develop and use them and whether those contributions are recognized and built upon by others. Indices of classroom processes of this sort have, in the literature, been called measures of 'classroom climate'.[73] Both Walberg[74] and Howard[75] (like many others in the industrial sector) have shown that information collected using such measures helps groups of parents, teachers and administrators to think about what is going on and the changes which might usefully be introduced. These researchers have also shown that the same measures can be used to monitor the effectiveness of the changes in such a way that remedial action can be taken when necessary. There is therefore a clear need to initiate further development work in this area.[76]

Teacher Appraisal

Our work has shown that pupils tend to assimilate the concerns, priorities, attitudes, thoughtways and patterns of competence of their teachers.[77] It is therefore crucial to the future of this society that we have an educational system staffed by people who display high levels of innovativeness *as an educational objective in its own right*. It follows that it is necessary to create time within the school day for teachers to involve themselves in educational innovation and to create interschool networks which facilitate teacher involvement in innovative activities. It is necessary to create a staff appraisal system which enables teachers to get credit for involving themselves in the difficult, demanding and frustrating business of innovation. In the course of the requisite staff appraisals it will be necessary to find some way of giving teachers credit for doing such things as paying attention to the idiosyncratic needs of each of their pupils and inventing better ways of meeting those needs. To implement such a staff appraisal system it will be necessary to find ways of assessing teachers' ability to take initiative, invent better ways of doing things and solve problems. This is not necessarily as difficult as may appear. In one of those strokes of genius which cut through brushwood which has engulfed others, Burgess and Adams have suggested that teachers be asked to keep a record of their own achievements in a way which parallels their own and Stansbury's reporting process for pupils. Further development of the value-expectancy measurement methodology which we have ourselves pioneered offers another basis on which more appropriate staff appraisal systems might be developed.

Structures for Parental Involvement

The changes currently being introduced into the educational system are in part a response to the public's awareness that, despite all the changes which have been introduced over the past forty years, there is still something seriously wrong. They are in part a response to the public's desire to be able to exercise more choice of their own instead of being pushed about by faceless public administrators who are not noted for taking their priorities seriously. They are in part a response to the public's desire to be able to influence what happens in schools. However, the Conservative government, while being much more sensitive to these and similar feelings than any of the

other political parties, has characteristically not thought the issues through. The structures being introduced will not provide any form of choice worth the name because the research needed to identify and develop the options which are needed is not being put in hand. They will not yield parent power because it is not possible for the diverse views of parents to be represented in any form of small 'representative' committee. And they will not lead to the improvement of education because that requires the creation of an innovative educational system supported by the fundamental research and development activity which is required to develop the necessary understandings, tools and procedures. Edward Heath was therefore correct to describe the government's Bill as a 'con trick'. There is no connection between the problems which are correctly diagnosed and the remedies which are prescribed.

The reasons *why* the government has not thought the issues through themselves merit serious attention. To do anything about the problems the government has correctly identified it would be necessary for the public to accept and encourage diversity *in public provision*. It would be necessary to introduce new forms of democracy through which people could monitor public provision and exercise choice and influence. It would be necessary to accept that supervising and managing public provision is a genuinely wealth-creating activity which merits financial reward. It would be necessary to establish policy research and development units to develop the concepts and tools which are required to run the public sector effectively and generate the information which is required to monitor its effectiveness.

The school boards and boards of governors currently being introduced are inadequate to the task of stimulating the radical changes which are needed in education. As we have seen, one of the most urgent needs is for a comprehensive range of distinctively different sorts of provision suited to the cross-section of the population who live in each geographical area. No single school board could take the overall perspective which is essential if this is to be done. Likewise, most of the barriers to educational innovation are beyond the control of individual schools: they stem from the absence of clear, research-based, thinking about the type of programme which is required to cater for different types of children, and they stem from the constraints which the centrally-prescribed testing and examination system places on what happens in schools. No single school is in a position to challenge and revise those requirements.[78]

But even if one ignores these wider problems, representative bodies do not provide a mechanism which can ensure that a cross-section of parents who have different priorities are elected and then insist that the school find some way of meeting all of their diverse needs. Compulsory annual reports by Headteachers to school boards are unlikely to be very effective. Experience shows that officials who are required to report to elected boards (including local authority committees) are typically able to manipulate the information they report in such a way as to conceal real problems and options, to stifle debate, and to gain endorsement for the proposed policies.

Traditional representative structures are not suited to this purpose. Instead we need: (i) some kind of participative, or network, structure which makes it much easier for groups of interested parents and other citizens to find out about, comment on, press effectively for change in, and monitor subsequent developments in, the work of individual teachers, schools and groups of schools; and (ii) new concepts of the role of public servants. We need to expect our public servants to solicit, and take steps to generate, the necessary information, invent — or initiate the invention of — ways of catering for a cross-section of pupils and parents, to take steps to monitor the quality of that provision, and to come to good discretionary judgments about what is in the long term best interests of the public. We need to expect them to study parents' and pupils' needs and wishes and to invent ways of accommodating *all* of them. We need to expect them to initiate studies to investigate problems which are not yet clear, the methodology for studying which is not yet formulated, and to develop forms of provision and tools to administer and evaluate diversity for which there is as yet no demand. In other words we need to expect them to be entrepreneurs and innovators. And we need to hold them accountable in these terms. That is, we need some tools and structures to help us to find out whether they are doing these things and structures which will enable us to ensure that remedial action is taken if they are not.

Toward a More Satisfactory Model

We have seen that we need to find some way of holding individual teachers (public servants) accountable for studying each of their pupils' talents and inventing ways of helping them to develop them. We have seen that, in order to find out whether teachers are doing

this, we need new, research-based, classroom appraisal instruments. We have also seen that, if teachers are to monitor their performance and take the initiative needed to find better ways of meeting their pupils' needs, they must devote a great deal of time and energy to risky, frustrating and innovative activity. Their job descriptions need to change so that they are *expected* to take initiative and be adventurers and inventors. They therefore need to work in a structure which encourages contact with teachers in other classrooms and schools and which supports them when their attempts at innovation go wrong, as they surely will. It is important to note that teachers need to be encouraged to do more than improve classroom processes. They need to be encouraged to spend more time outside their own classrooms. They need to spend more time working with parents and bringing effective pressure to bear on politicians and examination boards. This is because what they *can* do in their classrooms is mainly determined by forces from outside.

If the tools, the information they produce, and the structures for innovation mentioned in the last paragraph are to be *used*, it will be necessary to have some public supervisory structure which does not depend on a long chain of authority to a distant elected representative who is necessarily ignorant of the work of a particular teacher and the issues in his or her school — and who, in any case, has many other things to do. Teachers therefore need to be accountable to some local group. Since what it is appropriate for one teacher to do must necessarily depend on what other teachers, locally and nationally, are doing and on what is emerging from national and international research, any one teacher, and his or her supervisory group, must be part of some network of monitoring groups. Some of these would focus on the work of individual teachers, some on schools, some on groups of schools, and some on research, but they would be linked to each other by their overlapping memberships. All should have links with local and national media.

In this description I have focused only on classroom teachers. The work of administrators also needs to be brought within its remit. The administrative structure which has grown up around schools over the past forty years was, indeed, supposed to perform some of the functions which I am now proposing to hand over to this new monitoring structure. The problem with our existing structures has been that they have not functioned very effectively. This is partly because the information which has been collected has often been regarded as if it was for internal use only and not for

public consumption or debate. Its use has been constrained by a concept of democracy which limits it to 'that which happens in city hall'. Furthermore, the job of the administrator (manager) has generally not been understood as involving the creation of an innovative climate in the educational system and society. It has not been understood as involving responsibility for ensuring that there is a balance of different types of provision in a particular geographical area. It has not been defined as involving drawing the attention of politicians and the public to the linkages between educational policy and other aspects of policy (such as employment policy or equitable payment). In other words it has been defined as doing politicians' bidding rather than drawing previously unnoticed problems and tasks to the attention of the public. Clearly, therefore, it will be necessary to establish an exactly parallel set of tools and monitoring groups to oversee the work of public servants as is required to oversee the work of teachers. We are now in a position to draw two other points out of this discussion.

First, if the kind of innovation in the social process which has been envisaged above is to come about, there is a need for an unprecedented public debate, not just about education and educational goals, but about the goals of society, the state of our society and how it is to be run. This debate could occur through the network of monitoring and discussion groups which have already been mentioned, but it could not take place without the assistance of the media, and those who take part in that debate need some mechanism through which they can make their views known. As Toffler[79] has pointed out, modern information technology (such as Prestel) makes it easy for people to do this from the comfort of their living rooms. But the value of the information collected through such referenda is not only dependent on the dissemination of information about the range of possible activities and their consequences, it is also dependent on the development of survey questions which yield more meaningful information than that generated from opinion polls. Furthermore, if useful conclusions are to be drawn from the data which are collected, it will also be necessary for those concerned to develop an understanding of democracy which does not assume that majority decisions are sovereign, but which instead demands that some means must be found to enable people with different priorities to get equitable treatment, geared to their priorities, from the public service.

Second, the time required for many members of the population to engage in the kind of participative — as distinct from

representative — democratic process which is required to oversee the public-sector activities which dominate our society will be considerable. Wider recognition that such civic activity contributes to the efficiency of our society and the quality of life of all, and should therefore correctly be viewed as a *wealth creating* activity, is therefore essential. Such activity merits financial reward. (It is not inappropriate at this point to emphasize that the costs of operating the economic marketplace [which provides for quality control and innovation through the choice mechanism instead of through a managerial and democratic structure] are enormous: two thirds of the cost of the average article goes on distribution and marketing and more goes on the enforcement of safety, health, and other standards. Yet this work — unlike the chore of supervising the public sector — tends to be viewed as contributing to wealth creation, and is certainly thought to merit financial reward.)

To give the ideas I have put forward here greater credibility, it may be useful to mention that one of the most striking features of Japanese society is the network of discussion groups — supported by policy research and development units — which have been set up over the years to examine various aspects of public policy and to bring into being desirable futures. This was how they moved out of shipbuilding and took up Information Technology (IT). It is also relevant to note, with Toffler, that the orchestration of such debates represents one of the most important, but as yet neglected, uses of IT. The evolution of new structures of participation and influence is one of the key issues of our time. What is more, it is an evolution to which research can contribute: what we need to do is to experiment more freely and to compare and contrast the operation and effects of alternatives.

The question of how all this is to be paid for will lead many to dismiss what I have said as unrealistic. However, just as we urgently need new concepts of democracy, so we urgently need new concepts of money, wealth, and wealth-creation. I have discussed these elsewhere[80] and there is room for only a few assertions here. The main point is that one does not have to have money *before* one initiates wealth-creating activity. Nor is wealth something which one must have before embarking on a programme of economic activity. Rather it is a product of wealth creating activity. Nor is wealth to be equated with money. Money is a tool to be used to orchestrate wealth creation, and, like other tools, more can be manufactured (printed) if it would be useful. However, money as the main tool for use in managing wealth-creation and accounting

has outlived its usefulness and needs to be replaced by multiple-bottom line, information-based, accounting procedures which take account of replacement and other externalized costs. Finally, the quality of our lives — our wealth — is now primarily determined by what our public servants do: they are the main producers of wealth.

Education must Remain in the Public Domain

Currently fashionable beliefs about appropriate ways of running society will undoubtedly lead many to think that the need for choice and variety, the need to find ways of combating the deadening hand of the bureaucratic process and its press toward uniformity, and the need to combat the prescription of content by central examination boards point, separately and collectively, to a need to privatize education. It is suggested that there will then be more choice and that market mechanisms will then generate the necessary variety. There are two fundamental objections to this view.

The first is that privatization is in fact no solution even to the problems which have led to its introduction into industry and commerce. It simply does not engage with the nature of modern society. Whether we like it or not, we now, for the best of reasons, live in economies which are managed by public servants. It is public servants who, more than anyone else, determine trade, prices, and profitability. It is they who, more than anyone else, control the quality of our lives: our wealth is now overwhelmingly defined by the quality of public provision. We need public servants to develop and enforce international policies relating to pollution, the exploitation of non-renewable resources, and the replenishment of renewable resources. The word 'customer' as used in free-enterprise propaganda conjures up an outdated image: nowadays most customers are no longer people voting with their pennies to influence the direction of development but corporate giants purchasing on behalf of pension companies, health services, airlines, countries and consortia of countries. Even the increased efficiency apparently gained by the privatization of manufacturing and service industries is illusory, being typically achieved by forcing the weakest members of society to accept casualized working conditions and to forego benefits which must be provided by law for full time employees.

The second is that the measures being introduced by the present

government in the educational sphere have focused entirely on only one prong of the supposed benefits of choice in the marketplace — i.e. the efficiency of the supplier. They have not only entirely ignored the stimulus to the development of new products which Smith, Hayek and others have argued that the marketplace could provide, but actually stifled such developments by prescribing a common curriculum for all schools.

Given what we have seen about the need for variety, choice and innovation in education, it would therefore behove us to be much clearer about why education should remain in the public sector and be funded by the general public rather than by those who are engaged in education.

It is inappropriate to expect people to pay for the education of only their own children or for these children to pay through repayable loans because:

(a) all citizens of well-educated societies — and not just those who have children — reap the benefits of an educated workforce and citizenry;
(b) those who are best able to perform the crucially important task of leading and managing our society in the public interest do not come exclusively from well-off families. Yet they *are* in short supply. We would therefore deprive society of the benefits of crucially important talents if those who were born into poor families were unable to obtain a suitable education;
(c) different people confer quite different benefits on society. It is therefore in society's interests to develop the talents of all of them. This will not happen if some people are unable to pay for their children's education;
(d) as Robertson[81] has shown for the United Kingdom, and as Winter and McClelland[82] have shown for the United States, as things stand, the people who contribute most to society rarely get what is generally considered to be equitable financial reward for their efforts. There is therefore little reason to believe that, in general, those who are going to contribute most to society will be best able to repay any debts they may have incurred in the course of their education;
(e) socio-psychological processes work their wonders in mysterious (ie psychological rather than logical) ways. For example, early Calvinists worked hard, contributed disproportionately to society, needed to know they were doing 'well' in income

terms in order to assure themselves that they were among 'the elect', but then dared not spend that money other than on further investments, still less enjoy the comfortable life it could have purchased. Others who did not have this need to adopt an austere and hard-working life style enjoyed the benefits the Calvinists produced. Both benefited from this symbiotic relationship. (Since his standards were norm-referenced, the Calvinist could not do 'well' if someone else was not indolent). This process is still at work today among 'achievement-oriented' individuals. A similar 'illogicality' is that the innovators on whom we are so dependent are typically comfortably situated and do not have to worry about their financial futures.[83] Security, not insecurity, breeds creativity. Conversely creativity and innovation breeds social instability and financial insecurity (not necessarily so much for the innovator as for others). Those who are responsible for crucial ideas rarely benefit from them financially.[84] Although these people contribute disproportionately to society, they do not get commensurate benefits. Furthermore, creativity and innovation are typically dependent on the possession of unique combinations of up-to-date specialist knowledge. We would choke our life blood if we deprived these people of access to the knowledge they require. Once again, then, the links between earnings and contribution to society are so weak that we cannot afford to rely on them as a mechanism to fund education;

(e) we need in each and every community a balance of institutions offering quite different forms of provision. This is best illustrated by an example. Outstanding entrepreneurs require for their success access to outstanding academics. To produce prototypes of their inventions they may need to employ outstanding machinists who are able to take good discretionary judgments about what should be done and invent ways of doing things. To market their product they may need outstanding managers and sales personnel — they have to sell the idea that there is a need for such a product as well as the idea that buying their product will best satisfy that need. They need customers who are well enough off to purchase their innovations. Yet in a market driven system only the education of those who are going to obtain to the highest-paying jobs would be adequately funded;

(f) a market mechanism would not lead to improvement in the

quality of education in the current economic circumstances because people would buy — are buying — passports to entry to good jobs rather than education itself. The marketplace would offer better ways of beating the system rather than better educational programmes. This is why improvement in educational practice must come from the intervention of public servants (an argument which is also true across most of the developments which are needed to improve the quality of our lives and to conserve resources).

The final three comments relate to the funding of university education:

(g) if our society is to develop, we need an educational system which is very different from the legitimizing-of-rationing-of-privilege system that we have at the moment. We need an open system which admits adults at any time in their lives to the seminar atmosphere characteristic of research-style universities so that they can develop the concepts and tools they need. To flourish, this atmosphere requires continuing funding. (The remarks made in this paragraph of course imply radical change in the universities[85] and the application of new criteria of accountability, not the restoration of the atmosphere of the 1970s);

(h) we cannot expect those who are most conscious of personal benefits and costs to be willing to pay the fees needed to maintain the risky research which society so badly needs;

(i) contract research is not an appropriate way of creating the research climate needed in the universities. All the evidence is that those who have made worthwhile contributions to research have devoted their lives to their chosen topics. (Contract research has proved to be highly inefficient in cost-benefit terms, having high costs and yielding few benefits.)[86]

In conclusion

In the course of this chapter we have seen that the key development needed to improve the quality of education is an increase in the range of distinctively different options on offer. Unfortunately, the notion that public provision should cater for different people in different ways is a heresy which, even if it entertained, is regarded as dangerous. If I am right in arguing that it is important for

education to remain in the public domain, it follows that the effective administration of the educational system demands new concepts of the role of public servants and new concepts of democracy. It demands new concepts of management and new supervisory structures. It demands new concepts of citizenship, wealth, and wealth-creating activity.

There are three striking things about this collection of unexpected, and often unwelcome, conclusions. The first is that they all involve new understandings and new concepts in political-economy. Those who have administered the Manpower Services Commission's (MSC) enterprise programmes have made the same discovery. However the MSC has reacted to the dangers inherent in encouraging old-style political education by banning it. The second is that exactly parallel conclusions emerge from the study of other sectors of the economy: if we are to handle pollution, the balance of payments, conservation of renewable and non-renewable resources, agricultural policy, or international security more effectively, we need public servants who initiate the collection of information about issues which have not yet become clear and we need to get them to link that information together and come to good discretionary judgments which are in the public interest. We need to be able to monitor and influence their work and their decisions. The third is that the evolution and introduction of these new shared understandings is an unmistakably educational task. But it is an educational task which embodies two key features of the educational process envisaged in the first part of this chapter: the educational process requires evolutionary, research-based activities and involves the initiation of further research. The evolution of this new understanding will not depend mainly on the communication of received wisdom. Educators should therefore focus on fostering among students the competence to evolve new civic understandings. If they did so, many of the fears of political brainwashing which represent such serious barriers to the introduction of effective education would disappear.

Acknowledgements

I am very deeply indebted indeed to Bryan Dockrell and Stanley Nisbet for their invaluable help and encouragement in preparing this chapter.

Notes

1 Durkheim (1925) has argued their viewpoint more coherently.
2 HMI (1978), DES (1977), CBI, Scottish Education Department (1965), HMI (1980), 'Munn' Report (1977), MSC (1984–85), DES (1985), Educaton for Capability Manifesto (see Burgess [1986]), Boyer (1983), National Task Force for Economic Growth (1983), National Commission on Excellence in Education (1984), Passow *et al* (1976), Little (1983), Marimuthu (1983).
3 Bill *et al* (1974), Raven, Handy *et al* (1975), Raven (1977), Morton-Williams *et al* (1968), Macbeath *et al* (1981), CES (1977), Flanagan and Russ-Eft (1975), Johnston and Bachman (1976), DeLandsheere (1977).
4 Flanagan and Burns (1955), ITRU (1979).
5 Sykes (1969).
6 Van Beinum (1965).
7 Fivars and Gosnell (1966).
8 See McClelland (1961), Burgess and Pratt (1970), Schwartz (1987).
9 Raven (1984). What is most notable about Schwartz's (1987) study is that, although Schwartz was nominally studying businessmen's responsiveness to changes in their environment, their ultimate success in reaching the objectives the country (ie civil servants) had set for them was dependent on the quality of civil servants' judgments both in establishing the objectives and in correctly understanding how to manipulate prices, grants and the 'business environment' in order to get 'independent entrepreneurs' to achieve these objectives. Their job is, it seems, to manage both businessmen and the economy.
10 Price, Taylor *et al* (1971).
11 Taylor and Barron (1963).
12 Burgess and Pratt (1970), Fores and Pratt (1980).
13 Klemp, Munger and Spencer (1977).
14 Raven (1984).
15 Raven (1984), Flanagan (1978, 1983).
16 Raven (1984), Flanagan and Russ-Eft (1975).
17 Benedict (1976), Raven (1977, 1984), McClelland (1961), Graham and Raven (1987).
18 Raven (1977), HMI (1980), Raven, Johnstone and Varley (1985), MacBeath *et al* (1981), Johnston (1973), Bachman *et al* (1971), Flanagan (1978), Goodlad (1983).
19 Raven (1977), Raven, Johnstone and Varley (1985), Goodman (1962).
20 See Raven (1980), Sigel (1985).
21 Bachman *et al* (1971), Jencks (1973, 1979), Hope (1985).
22 Raven (1977, 1980, 1984), Raven, Johnstone and Varley (1985), Winter, McClelland and Stewart (1981), Klemp, Munger and Spencer (1977), Jackson (1986), McClelland (1965).
23 Benn and Fairley (1986).
24 Johnston and Bachman (1976).
25 Morton-Williams *et al* (1968).
26 Smith (1964, 1966, 1969), James (1968, 1969), Mason (1970), Raven (1977), Raven *et al* (1985).

27 Raven *et al* (1985), Winter *et al* (1981), Schneider, Klemp and Kastendiek (1981), Klemp *et al* (1980), Huff *et al* (1982).
28 Raven *et al* (1985), Jackson (1986).
29 Raven (1984).
30 Raven (1984), McClelland (1975), Winter (1973).
31 Raven and Litton (1976), Litton and Raven (1977/82).
32 See McClelland (1965), Raven (1977), and Raven (1988) for a fuller discussion of this issue.
33 Pellegrini *et al* (1985), Sigel and McGillicuddy-Delisi (1984), McGillicuddy *et al* (1982), Tharp *et al* (1984), Gallimore (1988), Raven (1980).
34 Sigel (1985, 1986).
35 McGillicuddy (1985), McGillicuddy *et al* (1987).
36 Rosen and D'Andrade (1959).
37 McClelland (1961, 1982).
38 Bloom (1985).
39 Raven (1980).
40 Raven and Dolphin (1978), Raven (1984).
41 Raven (1980), Sigel and Kelley (1986), McGillicuddy (1985), Tough (1973), Gallimore *et al* (1974), Tharp *et al* (1984), Tizard and Hughes (1984), Tizard, Schofield and Hewison (1982), Heath (1983), Hewison and Tizard (1980), Bloom (1985).
42 Raven (1977).
43 Kohn (1959; 1969; 1977), Kohn *et al* (1986).
44 Jackson and Marsden (1962).
45 Havighurst and Taba (1949).
46 Elisabeth Newson, personal communication.
47 Sokolowska *et al* (1978).
48 Lempert (1986).
49 Kinsey (1948).
50 Burns *et al* (1984).
51 Numerous studies (for example, Goodlad [1982], ORACLE, HMI [1980], Raven [1977], Raven, Johnstone and Varley [1985]) have demonstrated that school days are typically filled with activities concerned with the repetitious coverage of out of date, low level, factual material. Other evidence, summarized in Raven (1977) and Goodlad (1982), shows that half of what is learned is typically forgotten within one year and 75 per cent within two years. There is little exercise of judgment, creativity, thinking or even writing of continuous prose — let alone the revision of that material to communicate a message which is important to the writer to a recipient who needs to get it.
52 See Raven (1977) for a review of these.
53 Hatch and Gardner (1986), like Calvin Taylor (1971; 1973; 1976) and ourselves, have been delighted by the range, diversity and importance of children's interests and talents which come to light if one bothers to look for them.
54 Jackson (1986).

55 Bachman *et al* (1978), Jackson (1986), Flanagan (1978), Raven, Johnstone and Varley (1985).
56 Fraley (1981).
57 Raven (1980).
58 ORACLE, HMI (1980), Bennett (1976), Powell (1985), Goodlad (1983), Raven, Johnstone and Varley (1985).
59 The goals of mixed ability teaching have, to the best of my knowledge, nowhere been satisfactorily articulated. However, in 1977, (Raven, 1977) I set out the alternative goals of this process insofar as they could be discerned from interviews with teachers. The chaotic activities perpetrated in the name of progressive education are well illustrated in the work of Barth (1972), Aiken (1942), Rathbone (1971), Rugg (1926), Rugg and Schumaker (1928), Wright (1950, 1958), ORACLE, Leith (1981) and Bennett (1976). Cremin (1961), Fraley (1981) and Ravitch (1974) have provided useful summaries of the progressive education movement in America. What is notable is that none of these authors identify even a section of the progressive education movement as wishing to *replace* conventional educational goals by a distinctively different set. None of the teachers Bennett asked to define progressive education did so by reference to distinctive goals. It was seen as a different method of achieving the same goals. By and large, 'progressive education' has involved little more than a reaction *against* a single-valued concept of human quality and excellence — ie one based on performance at school tasks which could be seen to have few correlates outside the classroom but which, as part of a sociological system for allocating position and status nevertheless led, on the one hand, to the wrong (ie purely self-interested) people being placed in influential positions in society and, on the other, to many people who did contribute in very worthwhile ways to society not getting the respect and financial rewards they deserved. The problem was that this reaction against a dysfunctional system did not lead to a better system — but only to teachers addressing themselves mainly to pupils of 'average' ability and even, in some cases, to pouring scorn on those who sought to do 'well' in those terms — and thus to the cult of uniformity and mediocrity. Few sought to implement a 'talents unlimited' (Taylor, 1974; 1985) form of educational programme. Several writers sought to add goals without seeking to basically change teachers' focus. Thus Dewey (1899; 1910; 1916) seems to have been preoccupied with, on the one hand, fostering the skills of the research scientist (the ability to conceptualize, analyze and experiment), and, on the other, with creating 'democratic' classrooms. His writing does not encourage teachers to make use of multiple-talent concepts of ability (for example by encouraging them to think about a wide range of alternative talents which schools might foster), still less encourage them to foster different competencies in different children. Kilpatrick (1918) indicates that, in translating a plan into reality, pupils should practise purposing, planning, executing and judging. These are high level competencies, but Kilpatrick does not analyze them and present them in a way which would encourage teachers to reflect on what it means to, for example,

plan and execute, or on the prerequisites to getting pupils to practise (and thereby develop) the activities which are necessary. Counts (1932) and Rugg (1926) seem to have set out to introduce *particular* understandings of socio-politico-economic processes. Perhaps the largest group of progressive educators — the 'child-centred' teachers who have suggested that the child should be left to do his or her own thing and thereby learn 'instinctively' what is important to him or her to learn — have been opposed to the very idea of stating objectives, believing that these should emerge from an evolving situation. However, they have nowhere discussed how teachers are to facilitate the development of these multiple talents. The 'bible' of the progressive education movement (the 1926 Handbook of the NSSE) nowhere identifies the competencies which are to be fostered, how they are to be fostered, or how they are to be assessed for either formative or summative purposes. French (1957), Stratemeyer *et al* (1947), Caswell and Campbell (1935), Tyler (1936), and the Educational Policies Commission (1938) do attempt to identify goals, but have muddled together goals at a wide variety of levels, the frameworks are not multiple-talent frameworks, and the goals are only weakly linked to curriculum processes. Most accounts of classroom processes focus on encouraging students to take 'democratic' decisions within the compulsory attendance framework of schools (a framework which deprives pupils of citizenship rights and in which most of the sources of power and influence [for example, the option to withdraw and the opportunity to influence decisions and gain treatment suited to their own priorities through the marketplace] which are open to people in capitalist 'democracies' are unavailable) and in which teachers could not allow students to implement many decisions which would command majority support from pupils, on 'discovering' information which the teacher already knows (mostly in classrooms, but sometimes in field trips), or on 'discussions' which involve guessing what the teacher has in mind. Among the few exceptions to the rather damning picture of progressive education presented in this footnote are the writings of Barnes (1932) and her colleagues at the Lincoln school. Unfortunately few students of education are likely to come into contact with this work since it is not referred to in more recent writings on progressive education, such as those of Barth (1972), Ravitch (1974) or the thirteen-volume *International Encyclopaedia of Education*.

60 Bernstein (1975).
61 Raven (1977).
62 Raven (1977).
63 Raven (1984).
64 Raven (1977), Barker and Gump (1948), Raven, Johnstone and Varley (1985).
65 Jencks (1973).
66 Payne *et al* (1979).
67 Hope (1985).
68 Raven (1977).
69 Raven, Johnstone and Varley (1985), Raven (1988).

70 Bernstein (1985).
71 Raven (1984; 1988).
72 Elmore (1986) has also shown from an extensive review of the available evidence that 'there is little evidence that greater choice will, . . . by itself, dramatically change the performance of schools'.
73 To avoid confusion it is important to distinguish measures of process which are theoretically related to aspects of competence from attempts, like those of Pace and Stern (1958), to index the *overall* climate of the classroom.
74 Walberg (1979; 1985), Walberg and Haertel (1980).
75 Howard (1980–82).
76 Preliminary forms of such measures for use in taking stock of organisational climate are available in *The Edinburgh Questionnaires*, Raven (1982).
77 Raven and Varley (1984), Raven (1977).
78 One would, of course, like to see schools banding together to insist on change and to experiment with alternatives. This is something we are only likely to get if we concentrate on introducing an innovatory educational system instead of — as the government is doing — trying to *prescribe* precisely what pupils should be studying.
79 Toffler (1981).
80 Raven (1983).
81 Robertson (1985).
82 Winter, McClelland and Stewart (1981).
83 Raven (1984).
84 McClelland (1961), Freeman (1974).
85 Raven, (1984).
86 Raven (1984, 1985).

References

AIKIN, W.M. (1942) *The Story of the Eight Year Study: Adventure in American Education, Vol. I*, New York, Harper Bros.

BACHMAN, J.G., GREEN, S. and WIRTANEN, I.D. (1971) *Youth in Transition III: Dropping Out — Problem or Symptom?* Ann Arbor, Michigan, The Institute for Social Research.

BACHMAN, J.G., O'MALLEY, P.M. AND JOHNSTON, J. (1978) *Adolescence to Adulthood: Change and Stability in the Lives of Young Men*, Ann Arbor, Michigan, The Institute for Social Research.

BARKER, R.G. and GUMP, P.V. (1948) *Big School Small School*, California, Stanford University Press.

BARNES and YOUNG (1932) *Units of Work: Children and Architecture*, Lincoln School, New York, Bureau of Publications, Teachers' College, Columbia University.

BENEDICT, SISTER M. (1976). 'An analysis of the philosophy of Paulo Freire' MEd thesis, Maynooth, Eire, Department of Education, St Patrick's College.

BENN, C. and FAIRLY, J. (1986) *Challenging the MSC: An Enquiry into a National Disaster*, London, Pluto Press.
BENNETT, N. (1976) *Teaching Styles and Pupil Progress*, London, Open Books.
BERNSTEIN, B. (1975) 'Class and pedagogies: Visible and invisible', in DOCKRELL, W.B. and HAMILTON, D. (Eds) *Rethinking Educational Research*, London, Hodder and Stoughton.
BILL, J.M., TREW, C.J. and WILSON, J.A. (1974) *Early Leaving in Northern Ireland*, Belfast, Northern Ireland Council for Educational Research.
BLOOM, B.S. (Ed) (1985) *Developing Talent in Young People*, New York, Ballantine Books.
BOYER, E.L. (1983) *High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America*, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, New York, Harper and Row.
BURGESS, T. (Ed.) (1986) *Education for Capability*, Windsor, Berks, NFER/Nelson.
BURGESS, T. and PRATT, J. (1970) *Polytechnics in Pakistan*, London, North East London Polytechnic.
BURNS, A., HOMEL, R. and GOODNOW, J. (1984) 'Conditions of life and parental values', *Australian Journal of Psychology*, **36**, pp. 219–37.
CASWELL, H.L. and CAMPBELL, D.S. (1935) *Curriculum Development*, New York, American Book Co.
CENTRE FOR EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH (1977) *Collaborative Research Dictionary*.
COUNTS, G.S. (1932/69) *Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order?* New York, John Day, (1969: Arno).
CREMIN, L.A. (1961) *The Transformation of the School*, New York, Knopf.
DE LANDSHEERE, V. (1977) 'On defining educational objectives', *Evaluation in Education, 1, No. 2*, pp. 73–190. Oxford, Pergamon Press.
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE (1977) *Education in Schools: A Consultative Document*, Cmnd 6869, London, HMSO.
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE (1985) *The Development of Higher Education into the 1990s*, Cmnd 6869. London, HMSO.
DEWEY, J. (1899) *The School and Society*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
DEWEY, J. (1910) *How We Think*, New York, D.C. Heath.
DEWEY, J. (1916) *Democracy and Education*, New York, Macmillan.
DURKHEIM, E. (1925, 1961) *Moral Education*, New York, Free Press.
EDUCATION POLICIES COMMISSION (1938) *The Purposes of Education in American Democracy*, Washington, D.C., National Education Association.
ELMORE, R.F. (1986) *Choice in Public Education*, New Brunswick, Rutgers University, Center for Policy Research in Education.
FLANAGAN, J.C. (1976) *Planning Life and Career Goals: A Cluster of Materials and Manuals*, Monterey, CA, CTB/McGraw-Hill.
FLANAGAN, J.C. (1978) *Perspectives on Improving Education from a Study of 10,000 30-year-olds*, New York, Praeger Publishers.
FLANAGAN, J.C. (1983) 'The contribution of educational institutions to the

quality of life of Americans', *International Review of Applied Psychology*, **32**.
FLANAGAN, J.C. and BURNS, R.K. (1955) 'The Employee Performance Record', *Harvard Business Review*, **33**, pp. 95–102.
FLANAGAN, J.C. and RUSS-EFT, D. (1975) *An Empirical Study to Aid in Formulating Educational Goals*, American Institutes for Research, Palo-Alto, California.
FORES, M. and PRATT, J. (1980) 'Engineering: Our last chance', *Higher Education Review*, **12**, pp. 5–26.
FRALEY, A. (1981) *Schooling and Innovation: The Rhetoric and the Reality*, New York, Tyler Gibson.
FREEMAN, C. (1974) *The Economics of Industrial Innovation*, London, Penguin.
FRENCH, W. *et al* (1957) *Behavioural Goals of General Education in High School*, New York, Russell Sage Foundation.
GALLIMORE, R. (1985) *The Accommodation of Instruction to Cultural Differences*, Los Angeles, University of California, Department of Psychiatry.
GALLIMORE, R., BOGGS, J.W. and JORDAN, C. (1974) *Culture, Behavior and Education*, Beverly Hills, CA, Sage.
GALTON, M. and SIMON, B. (1980) *Progress and Performance in the Primary Classroom*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.
GALTON, M., SIMON, B. and CROLL, P. (1980) *Inside the Primary Classroom*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.
GOODLAD, J. (1983) *A Place Called School*, New York, McGraw-Hill.
GOODMAN, P. (1962) *Compulsory Mis-Education*, London, Penguin Books.
GRAHAM, M.A., RAVEN, J. and SMITH, P.C. (1987) 'Identification of high level competence: Cross-cultural analysis between British, American, Asian and Polynesian labourers', to be published in *Organisation Forum*.
GRAHAM, M.A. and RAVEN, J. (1987) 'International Shifts in the Workplace — Are We Becoming an 'Old West' in the Next Century?', Provo, BYU Dept. Organisational Behaviour.
HATCH, T.C. and GARDNER, H. (1986) 'From testing intelligence to assessing competencies; a pluralistic view of the intellect', *Roeper Review*, 8, pp. 147–50.
HAVIGHURST, R.J. and TABA, H. (1949/63), *Adolescent Character and Personality*, New York, Wiley.
HEWISON, J. and TIZARD, J. (1980) 'Parental involvement and reading attainment', *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 50, pp. 209–15.
HMI (1978) *Primary Education in England: A Survey by HM Inspectors of Schools*, London, Department of Education and Science, HMSO.
HMI (SCOTLAND) (1980) *Learning and Teaching in Primary 4 and Primary 7*, Edinburgh, HMSO.
HOPE, K. (1985) *As Others See Us: Schooling and Social Mobility in Scotland and the United States*, New York, Cambridge University Press.
HOWARD, E. (1980) *Some Ideas on Improving School Climate*, Colorado, Department of Education.
HOWARD, E. (1982) *Instrument to Assess the Educational Quality of Your School*, Denver, Colorado Department of Education.
HOWARD, E. (1982) *Successful Practices for Making the Curriculum More Flexible*, Denver, Colorado Department of Education.

HUFF, S., LAKE, D. and SCHAALMAN, M.L. (1982) *Principal Differences: Excellence in School Leadership and Management*, Boston, McBer and Co.
INDUSTRIAL TRAINING RESEARCH UNIT (1979) *The A–Z Study: Differences between Improvers and non-Improvers among Young Unskilled Workers*, Cambridge, The Industrial Training Research Unit.
JACKSON, B. and MARSDEN, D. (1962) *Education and the Working Class*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.
JACKSON, P.W. (1986) *The Practice of Teaching*, New York, Teachers' College Press.
JAMES, C. (1968) *Young Lives at Stake*, London, Collins.
JAMES, C. (1969) 'Being enquiring, enquiry and enquiries', *Ideas*, II, pp. 2–3.
JENCKS, C. *et al.* (1979) *Who Gets Ahead*, New York, Basic Books.
JOHNSTON, L. (1973) *The American High School: Its Social System and Effects*, Ann Arbor, Michigan, Institute for Social Research.
JOHNSTON, L.D. and BACHMAN, J.G. (1976) 'Educational institutions', in ADAMS, J.F. (Ed.) *Understanding Adolescence*, Third Edition, pp. 290–315. Boston, Allyn and Bacon.
KILPATRICK, W.H. (1918) 'The project method', *Teachers' College Record*, **19**, pp. 319–35.
KINSEY, A.C. (1948) *Sexual Behaviour in the Human Male*, New York, Saunders.
KLEMP, G.O., MUNGER, M.T. and SPENCER, L.M. (1977) *An Analysis of Leadership and Management Competencies of Commissioned and Non-Commissioned Naval Officers in the Pacific and Atlantic Fleets*, Boston, McBer.
KOHN, M.L. (1969) *Class and Conformity: A Study in Values*, Illinois, Dorsey Press.
KOHN, M.L. (1977) *Class and Conformity: A Study in Values, Second Edition*, Chicago, Ill, Chicago University Press.
KOHN, M.L., SLOMCZYNSKI, K.M. and SCHOENBACH, C. (1986) 'Social stratification and the transmission of values in the family: A cross-national assessment', *Sociological Forum*, **1**.
LEITH, S. (1981) 'Project work: An enigma', in SIMON, B. and WILLCOCKS, J. *Research and Practice in the Primary Classroom*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.
LEMPERT, W. (1986) 'Sozialisation und Persönlichkeitsbildung in beruflichen Schulen, dargestellt am Beispiel der Entwicklung moralischer Orientierung', *Die berufsbildende Schule*, **38**, pp. 148–60.
LITTLE, A. (1983) 'Employers and qualitifications: Learning from developing countries', *International Review of Applied Psychology*, **32**, pp. 327–46.
LITTON, F. (1977/82) *Aspects of Civics Education in Ireland: Final Report*, Dublin, Institute of Public Administration. Also available in *Collected Original Resources in Education* (1982), 6 (2), F4E7.
MACBEATH, J., MEARNS, D., THOMSON, B. and HOW, S. (1981) *Social Education*.
MCCLELLAND, D.C. (1961) *The Achieving Society*, New York, Van Nostrand.

MCCLELLAND, D.C. (1965) 'Toward a Theory of Motive Acquisition', *American Psychologist*, **20**, 321–33.
MCCLELLAND, D.C. (1975) *Power: The Inner Experience*, New York, Irvington.
MCCLELLAND, D.C. (1982) *Education for Values*, New York, Irvington.
MCCLELLAND, D.C. (1982) What behavioural scientists have learned about how children acquire values', in MCCLELLAND, D.C. (Ed), *The Development of Social Maturity*, New York, Irvington Press.
MCGILLICUDDY-DELISI, A.V. (1982) 'The relationship between parents' beliefs about development and family constellation, socio-economic status, and parents' teaching strategies', in LAOSA, L.M. and SIGEL, I.E. (Eds) *Families as Learning Environments for Children*, New York, Plenum, pp. 261–99.
MCGILLICUDDY-DELISI, A.V. (1985) 'The relationship between parental beliefs and children's cognitive level', in SIGEL, I.E. (Ed) *Parental Belief Systems: The Psychological Consequences for Children*, Hillside, NJ, Erlbaum.
MCGILLICUDDY-DELISI, A.V., DELISI, R., FLAUGHER, J. and SIGEL, I.E. (1987) 'Family influences on planning', in FRIEDMAN, S.L., SCHOLNICK, E.K. and COCKING, R.R. (Eds) *Blueprints for Thinking: The Role of Planning in Cognitive Development*, New York, Cambridge University Press.
MARIMUTHA, T. (1983) 'Education and occupation in Peninsular Malaysia', *International Review of Applied Psychology* **32**, pp. 347–60.
MASON, E. (1970) *Collaborative Learning*, Edinburgh, Ward Lock.
MORTON-WILLIAMS, R., FINCH, S., POLL, C., RAVEN, J. and RITCHIE, J. (1968) *Young School Leavers* London, HMSO.
MANPOWER SERVICES COMMISSION (1984) *TVEI Review*, London, MSC.
MANPOWER SERVICES COMMISSION/DES (1985) *Review of Vocational Qualifications in England and Wales: Interim Report*, Sheffield, MSC.
MANPOWER SERVICES COMMISSION (1985) *Developing the Youth Training Scheme as Part of an Integrated Vocational Training Provision*, Statement of Intent, Sheffield, MSC.
MANPOWER SERVICES COMMISSION (1985) *Two-Year YTS: Guide to Scheme Content and Quality*, Sheffield, MSC.
MUNN REPORT (1977) *The Structure of the Curriculum*, Edinburgh, HMSO.
NATIONAL COMMISSION ON EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION (1984) *A Nation At Risk*, Washington, D.C., US Government Printing Office.
NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF EDUCATION (1926) *Twenty Sixth Year Book: The Foundation and Techniques of Curriculum Making*, Bloomfield, Ill., Public School Publishing Co.
NATIONAL TASK FORCE FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH (1983) *Action for Excellence*, Denver, Education Commission of the States.
ORACLE *See* Galton and Simon (1980) Galton, Simon and Croll (1980), Simon and Willcocks (1981).
PACE, R.C. and STERN, G. (1958) 'An approach to the measurement of psychological characteristics of college environments', *Journal of Educational Psychology*, **49**.
PASSOW, A.H., NOAH, H.J., ECKSTEIN, M.A. and MALLEA, J.R. (1976)

An Empirical Study of Twenty-One Educational Systems, Stockholm, Almqvist and Wiksell.

PAYNE, G., FORD, G. and ULAS, M. (1979) *Education and Social Mobility: Some Social and Theoretical Developments*, Organization of Sociologists in Polytechnics, Paper No. 8.

PELLEGRINI, A.D., BRODY, G.H. and SIGEL, I.E. (1985) 'Parents book-reading habits with their children', *Journal of Educational Psychology*, **77**, 332–40.

POWELL, J.C. (1985) *The Teachers' Craft*, Edinburgh, The Scottish Council for Research in Education.

PRICE, P.B., TAYLOR, C.W., NELSON, D.E. *et al.* (1971) *Measurement and Predictors of Physician Performance: Two Decades of Intermittently Sustained Research*, Salt Lake City, University of Utah, Department of Psychology.

RATHBONE, C.H. (Ed) (1971) *Open Education: the Informal Classroom*, New York, Citation Press.

RAVITCH, D. (1974) *The Great Schools Wars*, New York, Basic Books.

RAVEN, J. (1977) *Education, Values and Society: The Objectives of Education and the Nature and Development of Competence*, London, H.K. Lewis; New York: The Psychological Corporation.

RAVEN, J. (1980) 'The most important problem in education is to come to terms with values', *Oxford Review of Education*, **7**, pp. 253–72.

RAVEN, J. (1980) *Parents, Teachers and Children*, Edinburgh, The Scottish Council for Research in Education.

RAVEN, J. (1982) *The Edinburgh Questionnaires: A Cluster of Questionnaires for use in Organizational Development and in Staff Guidance, Placement and Development*, London, H.K. Lewis.

RAVEN, J. (1983) 'Towards new concepts and institutions in modern society', *Universities Quarterly*, **37**, pp. 100–18.

RAVEN, J. (1984) *Competence in Modern Society: Its Identification, Development and Release*, London, H.K. Lewis; North America, Toronto: Guidance Centre — OISE press.

RAVEN, J. (1984) 'Quality of life, the development of competence, and higher education', *Higher Education*, **13**, pp. 393–404.

RAVEN, J. (1984) 'The role of the psychologist in formulating, administering and evaluating policies associated with economic and social development in western society', *J. Econ. Psychol.*, **5**, pp. 1–16.

RAVEN, J. (1985) 'The institutional framework required for, and process of, educational evaluation: Some lessons from three case studies', in SEARLE, B. (Ed) *Evaluation in World Bank Education Projects: Lessons from Three Case Studies*, Washington, DC, The World Bank, Education and Training Department Report EDT5 pp. 141–70.

RAVEN, J. (1986) 'A nation really at risk: a review of Goodlad's "A Place Called School"', *Higher Education Review*, **18**, pp. 65–79.

RAVEN, J. (1987) *Learning to Teach in Primary Schools: Some Reflections. Collected Original Resources in Education*, **11**, F3, D07.

RAVEN, J. (1988) 'The assessment of competencies', in BLACK, H.D. and DOCKRELL, W.B. (Eds), *New Developments in Educational Assessment: British Journal of Educational Psychology, Monograph Series No. 3*, pp. 98–126.

RAVEN, J. (1988) 'A model of competence, motivation and its assessment', in BERLAK, H. (Ed.) *Assessing Academic Achievement: Issues and Problems*, Madison.

RAVEN, J. (1988) 'Developing the talents and competencies of all our children', *Gifted International*, **5**, pp. 8–40.

RAVEN, J. and DOLPHIN, T. (1978) *The Consequences of Behaving: The Ability of Irish Organizations to Tap Know-How, Initiative, Leadership and Goodwill*, Edinburgh, The Competency Motivation Project.

RAVEN, J., HANNON, B., HANDY, R., BENSON, C. and HENRY, E.A. (1975) *A Survey of Attitudes of Post Primary Teachers and Pupils, Volume 2: Pupils' Perceptions of Educational Objectives and their Reactions to School and School Subjects*, Dublin, Irish Association for Curriculum Development.

RAVEN, J., HANNON, B., HANDY, R., BENSON, C. and HENRY, E.A. (1975) *A Survey of Attitudes of Post Primary Teachers and Pupils, Volume 1: Teachers' Perceptions of Educational Objectives and Examinations*, Dublin, Irish Association for Curriculum Development.

RAVEN, J., JOHNSTONE, J. and VARLEY, T. (1985) *Opening the Primary Classroom*, Edinburgh, The Scottish Council for Research in Education.

RAVEN, J. and LITTON, F. (1976) 'Irish pupils' civic attitudes in an international context', *Oideas*, Spring, pp. 16–30.

ROBERTSON, J. (1985) *Future Work: Jobs, Self-Employment and Leisure after the Industrial Age*, Aldershot, Gower/Maurice Temple Smith.

ROSEN, B.C. and D'ANDRADE, R.G. (1959) 'The psychological origins of achievement motivation', *Sociometry*, **22**, pp. 185–218.

RUGG, H. (1926) in NSSE Yearbook.

RUGG, H. and SHUMAKER, A. (1928) *The Child-Centered School*, Yonkers, George Harrap.

SCHNEIDER, C., KLEMP, G.O. and KASTENDIEK, S. (1981) *The Balancing Act: Competencies of Effective Teachers and Mentors in Degree Programs for Adults*, Boston, McBer and Co.

SCHWARTZ, H.H. (1987) 'Perceptions, judgment and motivation in manufacturing entrepreneurs', *J. Econ. Behavior and Organisation*, **8** pp. 543–66.

SCOTTISH EDUCATION DEPARTMENT (SED) (1965) *Primary Education in Scotland*, Edinburgh, HMSO.

SIGEL, I.E. (Ed) (1985) *Parent Belief Systems: The Psychological Consequences for Children*, Hillside, NJ, Erlbaum.

SIGEL, I.E. (1986) 'Reflections on the belief-behavior connection: Lessons learned from a research program on parental belief systems and teaching strategies', in ASHMORE, R.D. and BRODZINSKY, D.M. (Eds) *Thinking about the Family: Views of Parents and Children*, Hillsdale, NJ, Erlbaum.

SIGEL, I.E., and KELLEY, T.D. (1988) 'A cognitive developmental approach to questioning', in Dillon, J. (Ed) *Classroom Questioning and Discussion: A Multidisciplinary Study*, Norwood, NJ, Ablex.

SIGEL, I.E. and MCGILLICUDDY-DELISI, A.V. (1984) 'Parents as teachers

of their children: A distancing behaviour model', in PELLEGRINI, A.D. and YAWKEY, T.D. (Eds) *The Development of Oral and Written Language in Social Contexts*, Norwood, NJ, Ablex.
SIMON, B. and WILLCOCKS, J. (Eds) (1981) *Research and Practice in the Primary Classroom*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.
SMITH, L.A. (1964) 'Starting IDE', *Ideas*, **I**, pp. 2–5.
SMITH, L.A. (1966) *The Raising of the School Leaving Age: Pilot Course Report*, London, Goldsmiths' College.
SMITH, L.A. (1969) 'Starters', *Ideas*, **II**, p. 1 and pp. 27–30.
SMITH, L.A. (1969) 'Starting and supporting a project', *Ideas*, **II**, pp. 4–7.
SOKOLOWSKA, M., FIRKOWSKA-MANKIEWICZ, A., OSTROWSKA, A. and CZARKOWSKI, M.P. (1978) *Intellectual Performance of Children in the Light of Socio-Cultural Factors*, Warsaw, Polish Academy of Sciences: Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Department of the Social Problems of Health.
STRATEMEYER, F.B., FORKNER, H.L. and MCKIM, M.C. (1947) *Developing a Curriculum for Modern Living*, New York, Teachers' College, Columbia University Press.
SYKES, A.J.M. (1969) 'Navvies: Their work attitudes', *Sociology*, **3**, 21f and 157f.
TAYLOR, C.W. (1971) 'Multi-talent potential', in *Igniting Creative Potential*, Utah, Jordan School District.
TAYLOR, C.W. (1973) 'Developing effectively functioning people', *Education, Vol. 94, Nov/Dec*, **No. 2**, pp. 99–110.
TAYLOR, C.W. (1976) *Talent Ignition Guide*, Salt Lake City, University of Utah and Bellvista Public School.
TAYLOR, C.W. and BARRON, F. (Eds) (1963) *Scientific Creativity*, New York, Wiley.
THARP, R.G., JORDAN, C., SPEIDEL, G.E., AU, K.H.P., KLEIN, T.W., CALKINS, R.P., SLOAT, K.C.M. and GALLIMORE, R. (1984) 'Product and process in applied developmental research: Education and the children of a minority', in LAMB, M.E., BROWN, A.L. and ROGOFF, B. (Eds) *Advances in Developmental Psychology*, Vol. III, Hillsdale, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum.
TIZARD, B. and HUGHES, M. (1984) *Young Children Learning*, London, Fontana.
TIZARD, J., SCHOFIELD, W.N. and HEWISON, J. (1982) 'Collaboration between teachers and parents in assisting children's reading', *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, **52**, pp. 1–15.
TOFFLER, A. (1980) *The Third Wave*, New York, Bantam Books.
TOUGH, J. (1973) *Focus on Meaning: Talking with Some Purpose to Young Children*, London, Allen and Unwin.
TYLER, R.W. (1936) 'Defining and measuring the objectives of progressive education', *Educational Research Bulletin*, **XV**, p. 67f.
VAN BEINUM, H. (1965) *The Morale of the Dublin Busman*, London, Tavistock Institute of Human Relations.
WALBERG, H.J. (Ed.) (1979) *Educational Environments and their Effects*, Berkeley, CA, McCutchan.
WALBERG, H.J. (1985) 'Classroom psychological environment', in HUSEN, T. and POSTLETHWAITE, N., *International Encyclopaedia of Education*, London, Pergamon.
WALBERG, H.J. and HAERTEL, D. (1980) 'Validity and use of educational environmental assessments', *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, **6**, pp. 225–38.
WINTER, D.G. (1973) *The Power Motive*, New York, Free Press.
WINTER, D.G., MCCLELLAND, D.C. and STEWART, A.J. (1981) *A New Case for the Liberal Arts*, San Francisco, Jossey Bass.
WRIGHT, G.C. (1950) *Core Curriculum in Public High Schools: An Enquiry into Practices, 1949*, Office of Education Bulletin No. 5. Washington, DC, Federal Security Agency.
WRIGHT, G.S. (1958) *Block-Time Classes and the Core Program in the Junior High School*, Bulletin 1958, No. 6, US Dept. Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, DC, US Government Printing Office.