

Durham E-Theses

Factors affecting primary school head teachers and the running of their schools

Hunt, Alan

How to cite:

Hunt, Alan (1987) *Factors affecting primary school head teachers and the running of their schools*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online:
<http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/6767/>

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

FACTORS AFFECTING
PRIMARY SCHOOL HEADTEACHERS
AND THE RUNNING OF THEIR SCHOOLS

ALAN HUNT

M.A.(Ed).

UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

1987

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.



A B S T R A C T

Factors affecting Primary School Headteachers and the Running of their Schools

Since the early part of this century primary education has existed within a laissez-faire structure. The professional autonomy of teachers has, up to now, never been seriously threatened. The independence of individual schools is a feature of the English education system. However, because education is a fundamental part of society it is inevitable that differing aspects of society affect education both directly and indirectly.

The main area of interest examined in this study is the tension between the numerous factors affecting headteachers and the laissez-faire framework within which the headteacher has to work.

This area of interest is examined by using two strategies.

First, by using an historical perspective the study will evaluate the effects of society on primary schools. The investigation will assess how external influences and historical events have affected primary headteachers.

Second, an investigation into the internal life of primary schools - factors affecting headteachers on a day-to-day basis. The focus will be upon the interaction of parties within the institutionalized setting. The role of the headteacher as a leader, educational manager and administrator will be explored in the context of the present major redefinition of education, which has at its heart the dismantling of the laissez-faire tradition.

* Author's note.

The radical and ceaseless nature of the redefinition of education following the 'Great Debate' of the mid seventies has created severe problems for the writer. Certain arguments and comments have been 'overtaken' by the march of history. The summer of 1986 is the finishing point of this investigation and the reader will need to bear this in mind.

T A B L E O F C O N T E N T

PAGE 1	INTRODUCTION
PAGE 10	CHAPTER ONE A brief history of curriculum change (Pre Plowden)
PAGE 29	CHAPTER TWO The 'Progressive' Era
PAGE 44	CHAPTER THREE The conservative back-lash
PAGE 54	CHAPTER FOUR Accountability
PAGE 74	CHAPTER FIVE Curriculum Consistency - A general discussion
PAGE 94	CHAPTER SIX Problems of the eighties
PAGE 121	CHAPTER SEVEN Teachers
PAGE 147	CHAPTER EIGHT The Headteacher - management skills
PAGE 164	CHAPTER NINE Search for a Framework
PAGE 178	BIBLIOGRAPHY

I N T R O D U C T I O N



"Factors affecting the role of primary headteachers" may be deemed by some to be an overly ambitious investigation. Education is a fundamental institution of society and as such, with intellect and imagination, any social, political or economic aspect of society could probably be claimed to affect education to some degree. For example, the oil crisis of the mid-seventies has had a most important effect on this country's finance and hence the financing of education. Changes in our society's class structure and socialization processes since say the First World War have occupied the minds of many sociologists and historians. Likewise, political action or inaction has had both direct and indirect effects on education. However, as with social and economic matters, the sheer weight and complexity of the 'macro' world of politics makes an investigation and evaluation an awesome task.

Life within schools is no less complex:

- Differing educational philosophies, aims and objectives
- The interaction of the actors within the institutionalized setting of the school.
- The interaction between 'external' actors and the school.

Under the 'English' education system there has been, to use Weberian concepts, great legal, rational and charismatic authority invested in one person - the headteacher. This basic idea is the focal point for the critical evaluation of this investigation.

It is necessary to think along these lines because of the wide ranging nature of headteachers' responsibilities. In the 'English' system the primary headteacher is not simply a manager entrusted with putting into action a programme prescribed by a higher level of management. Rather, he or she is entrusted with the philosophical direction of a school and stemming from this a programme of 'action' is expected to emerge.

Management within a laissez-faire framework is the key area to be explored and evaluated. A simple 'hierarchical' management model disguises complex authority relationships.

It is therefore necessary to construct a plan which permits as many differing factors to emerge that can be reasonably shown to affect headteachers. This study will employ two strategies:

The history of primary school education.

A major tenet of this study is that education is not an intellectually 'pure' institution, but heavily laden with Society's values, which have an historical basis. A teacher's career could span over forty years. Therefore, Society's values and the on-going flow of historical events must affect teachers and the institutions they work in. Of particular interest is the extent of the interaction between political/socio/educational philosophies on one hand and the 'realities' of school life on the other. This strategy will investigate the interaction of an apparently autonomous institution (the school) with numerous 'pressure groups' who attempt to exert influence in complex and confusing ways. In simplistic terms one could claim this interaction creates external factors affecting the role of the headteacher.

The process of running a school.

Headteachers are concerned with leadership and management. Using simple phraseology once more, one could claim that the often hectic, complex, on-going, problem-solving world of the school form the internal factors affecting the role of the headteacher. The focus will be upon the interaction of parties within the institutionalized setting. A description of the actors involved will probably be inadequate. It is the attempt to understand the often unstated, unstructured and covert relationships that is the challenge. This situation exists because of the structural context of schools - the management framework and the tradition of professional autonomy for teachers.

Both strategies revolve around the effects of the laissez-faire system. This system has permitted each group of actors to sustain their own sphere of influence. A complex and subtle balance has been maintained for most of this century. However, the relationships between the groups of actors have never been based on actual equality, but rather on legitimacy. This is a critical division, for equality has a connotation of bureaucratically apportioned power, whereas legitimacy is a perception of authority and as such is a far more difficult concept to have to cope with. This can be illustrated by considering one aspect from each of the two strategies offered - a model of educational change and the notion of the professional autonomy of teachers.

If one wishes to evaluate the effects of society upon education by using an historical perspective, then some broad plan or model would seem desirable. P.W. Musgrave (1) meets such a need. He claims 'the development of the definitions of education in England over the last 100 years has been marked by a sense of continuity; change has come about in an evolutionary way'. Musgrave argues that in education, goals, particularly at societal level are vague, and it is, therefore, easy for schools to justify to the public as legitimate their interpretation of any definition.

This intrinsic vagueness is one source of change within an educational system, but in England there has been an additional source and that is the strong support for the ideology of laissez-faire which has made possible a wide range of tolerance in the three major definitions of education in 1870, 1902 and 1944.

The reports of various educational 'bodies' have given quasi-official standing to the many minor-redefinitions of sectors of the educational system that otherwise might not have gained easy recognition. Musgrave states - 'This piecemeal method of redefinition has given continuity between major definitions of education and enabled educational revolutions to take place'. (2)

Musgrave apparently takes the view that the laissez-faire system works to the advantage of those educationalists seeking change. However, his argument regarding headteachers' ability to justify their own position permits an alternative interpretation in that this system accommodates a wide variety of elements to co-exist. The phenomena lets 'traditionalists' argue from the 'status quo' at the same moment that 'progressive educationalists' are gaining confidence through experience. This has important implications for this investigation because the laissez-faire system permits 'inaction' as well as 'action'. As a result of such freedom the headteacher has to select a school philosophy and programme of action from a long continuum of possibilities, and in coming to a decision must cope with not only overt and specific 'pressure groups' representing any particular educational stance, but also the far broader, subtler forces in society who at one end of a continuum seek to maintain the

'status quo' in society generally through the values expressed in education, and at the other end those who see education as a means of a radically changing society.

Musgrave's evolutionary model is the key concept for this study. The notion of education in the 'melting pot' in between major re-definitions is a useful line of investigation. However, major re-definitions must be considered as a separate issue, because preliminary reading indicates there is no simple casual relationship between an evolutionary period and a period of major re-definition. For example, the broad sweep of the 1944 Education Act created unexpected and indirect consequences for the primary sector. This brings into focus the whole complex question of power distribution.

This introduction has claimed that headteachers have considerable freedom of action, with most restrictions taking the form of persuasion in direct and indirect ways. The headteacher can be seen in the role of an assessor of educational philosophies and values. This is not the case when a major re-definition occurs. Here, headteachers' political and educational masters take the decisions. Perhaps it can be seen that the headteacher's role is reversed. It is politicians, civil servants and top level educational administrators that will make the decisions having assessed the information available. The role of the headteacher has changed - they become the pressure group. One therefore has a separate line of enquiry; namely, how do headteachers affect re-definition within the laissez-faire system?

This question raises one of the major concerns regarding the laissez-faire system. By permitting each group of actors to claim a sphere of influence without employing overt bureaucratic perimeters, there is the distinct possibility that each of the groups have over the years become wary of stepping over some vaguely defined boundary because of the possible effects of damaging the balance. As a result, one line of 'defence' is low level communication networks where no one group can damage another by impinging on another territory. All is well until someone, usually central government, changes the rules. Then the insular characteristics of the groups of actors exposes a major weakness - poor communication and hence poor political leverage.

The distribution of authority and responsibility throughout the education sector is a key area for investigation and evaluation. It will be shown that the authority structure is confusing, vague and complex.

An example of internal influence affecting the headteacher's authority is one of the main features of the English education system - the professional autonomy of teachers.

Detailed prescription of curriculum by the central government had long been abandoned in England and Wales. The final ending of payment by results in 1898 enabled teachers in the public elementary schools to exercise a greater freedom of judgement. The Elementary Code only set out very broad requirements. A Handbook of Suggestions for Teachers was first published by the Board of Education in 1905. The preface to the 1918 edition stated that 'The only uniformity of practice that the Board of Education desire to see in the teaching of public elementary schools is that each teacher shall think for himself and work out for himself such methods of teaching as may use his powers to the best advantage and be best suited to the particular needs and condition of the school. Uniformity in detail of practice is not desirable, even if it were attainable.' (3)

This bold approval of the professional autonomy of teachers offers a possible explanation for the subsequent development of primary education along laissez-faire rather than statutory lines and such a strong statement begs certain questions and ideas:

It was the headteacher who had legal and traditional responsibility for running the school. However, within a few short years teachers had moved from 'payment by results' to 'professional autonomy' without the benefit of any structural or bureaucratic power base change to match the newly established freedom and responsibilities. It seems fair to claim that the authority base of headteachers had been blurred.

Secondly, the preface refers to 'methods of teaching' and 'detail of practice' with regard to the professional autonomy of teachers, but where did that leave the contents of the curriculum?

A simple model might offer that it was the headteacher's responsibility to look to the philosophy of the school, its broad aims and perhaps even a detailed syllabus of work, leaving the 'methods of teaching' to individual teachers. The model has obvious attractions - the headteacher overseeing the general strategy and ensuring continuity, whilst the individual teacher, released from the pressure of deciding what to teach, could devote her time to the creative execution of 'the syllabus', tailoring details to suit the children under her care - a classical hierarchical situation.

However, this model contains a fatal flaw and this flaw is still a matter of major concern today. Child-centred education has been a growing force since probably the nineteenth century. The actual definition of child-centred education is most certainly open to controversy and is another matter of major concern still. Nevertheless, one aspect of child centred education is a central concept, and that is that 'process' is just as important as 'content'. Some people argue that in certain curriculum areas process is more important than 'knowledge'. In the 'Facts versus Experience' argument, one example is 'Primary Science' where the covering of specified scientific principles within the allotted time a child is at primary school, is most certainly not the main objective; rather, it is the development of scientific and organisational skills coupled with a growing awareness of the environment through direct and practical experience. Content is an argument for the future.

The model of professional autonomy does not, of course, preclude so called 'progressive' education. One could claim the freedom of individual schools is a most important prerequisite for development. Without freedom there is a danger of inhibiting development, because one needs the confidence and opportunities to go forward, make mistakes, modify and even abandon ideas.

The problem lies not in the concept of freedom, but in the reality of the structure in which it operates. Progressive education requires a holistic approach to education, not a neat division of labour.

Finally, having given authority for the day to day running of the school to the headteacher and professional autonomy to

individual teachers, where does that leave 'outside agencies' and 'pressure groups' attempting to have their viewpoint accepted?

The major form of communication appears to be subtle and uncertain forms of pressure and persuasion rather than overt conflict situations resolved by defined decision-making structures. General reading of the history of primary education indicate many stresses and strains suffered by primary educators, but the actual resolution of conflict seems shrouded in mystery. This whole question will be pursued later in depth.

Governments, of course, have an alternative in the form of legislation and 'authoritative' reports, but a note of caution is introduced by David Wardle - 'It is the untidy and unpredictable nature of the development of popular education in England which makes it unrewarding to write its history around major reports and education acts. These were important in marking points at which changes in direction were made, but to find out why the direction was changed it is necessary to get behind the acts and reports to the aims and ambitions of pupils and teachers and to the social, political and economic pressures which bore upon them'.(4)

The problem is deciding where to start and in deciding what the key 'pressure' areas were. This will be resolved in the chapters to come. Nevertheless, this introduction has signposted some of the more important aspects to be investigated in this study. The perception of a headteacher as an autonomous leader of an independent institution will be seriously questioned.

The laissez-faire system has structured most of the external and internal factors affecting the role of the headteachers and must therefore be the dominant concept to be assessed.

In this introduction examples have been offered which indicate the complex framework of the laissez-faire system. In the opening chapters the advantages and disadvantages of the system will be examined. Later chapters will show the astonishingly well organised and purposeful pursuit of the destruction of this deep rooted system.

- (1) MUSGRAVE, P.W. (1968) Society and Education in England since 1800. London:Methuen & Co., p.138.
- (2) MUSGRAVE, Ibid. p.138.
- (3) GOSDEN, P. (1978) The Education System Since 1944. London:M. Robertson & Co.
- (4) WARDLE, D. (1975) English Popular Education 1790-1970. Cambridge:Cambridge University Press.

C H A P T E R 1

A brief history of curriculum change (Pre Plowden)

Schooling has a distinct identity as an institution within society, but because society affects education so intimately in terms of social, political and economic aspects one could build a whole perspective from any of the numerous factors involved. However, one element stands out as the focal point and this is the curriculum.

The D.E.S. pamphlet 'The School Curriculum' claims in its very first sentence that 'The School Curriculum is at the heart of education'. (1)

It is the focal area because it is very rationale for the existence of schools. The curriculum is manufactured; it is not a tablet handed down from God. It is, to varying degrees, spiritually, intellectually, philosophically, historically, pragmatically, economically and socio-politically based.

Added to this, there is the important difference between the formulation of curriculum and its actual execution - (Philosophy/Action managements).

Finally, given the evolutionary/redefinition model, the onus of responsibility lies at the door of one individual - the primary headteacher.

The laissez-faire system permitted curriculum freedom and as an inevitable result a variety of perspectives occurred. What is a fascinating line of enquiry is deciding whether or not the structure that permitted such freedom was capable of ever reaching firm conclusions and plans of action regarding the curriculum. It is a fundamental decision - on one hand, one permits a 'free-for-all' to go indefinitely. On the other hand the 'hierarchy' dominates the situation by prescribing the curriculum, as is found in other countries.

That 'freedom' permits a huge divergence of opinion cannot be denied. Neville Bennet, writing as late as 1976, asked teachers what teaching behaviours they considered differentiated progressive and traditional teaching styles. Bennet isolated eleven differentiating elements.

Progressive

1. Integrated subject matter.
2. Teacher as guide to educational experiences.
3. Active pupil role.
4. Pupils participating in curriculum planning.
5. Learning predominately by discovery methods.
6. Intrinsic motivation.
7. Not too concerned with conventional academic standards.
8. Little testing.
9. Accent on co-operative groupwork.
10. Teaching not confined to classroom base.
11. Accent on creative expression.

Traditional

1. Separate subject matter.
2. Teacher as distributor of knowledge.
3. Passive pupil role.
4. Pupils having no say in curriculum planning.
5. Accent on memory, practice and rote.
6. Extrinsic motivation.
7. Concerned with academic standards.
8. Regular testing.
9. Accent on competition.
10. Teaching confined to classroom base.
11. Little emphasis on creative expression.

(2)

To a certain extent, the evaluation of which characteristics are 'right' or 'best' is not the major relevant argument. What certainly is relevant is that there are profound differences between the two styles. It is the history of these differences that appears to be the logical starting point to investigate external factors.

'The Primary School' (1931) H.M.S.O., - Report of the Consultative Committee of the Board of Education boldly states 'the curriculum is to be thought in terms of activity and experience rather than of knowledge to be acquired and facts to be stored' (3)

This is a firm principle of so called 'progressive' education. To this can be added the comments of W.K. Richmond - 'Child centred theory has a long and respectable intellectual history. ----- finding its expression in a school of thought represented by a line of Great Educators from Rousseau, Pestalozzi and Froebel down to Montessori and John Dewey. It seems idle to suppose that enlightened infant schools were influenced to any great extent either by Froebelian principles or by the new developmental psychology

Practical rather than theoretical considerations led them to adopt what later came to be called a child centred approach - the nature of young children.' (4)

It can be claimed, given the above, that child-centred education was given a good boost in the 1930's - a Government report, an impressive intellectual lobby, and perhaps most significantly, a practically orientated sector of education - the infant school.

However, it is important to differentiate between Government Reports on 'education' and Government Reports on 'educational organisation'. Seeds of future conflict were plainly planted by the Spens Report 1938 - 'Report of the Consultative Committee of the Board of Education Secondary Education with Special Reference to Grammar Schools.'

The purpose of repeating the tortuous title is to emphasize that this report was not concerned with 'primary education'. Consider this point, as the following ideas were put forward - 'Intellectual development during childhood appears to progress as if it were governed by a single central factor, usually known as 'general intelligence'Our psychological witnesses assured us that it can be measured approximately by means of intelligence testsWe were informed that, with few exceptions, it is possible at a very early age to predict with some degree of accuracy the ultimate level of a child's intellectual powersIt is accordingly evident that different children from the age of 11, if justice is to be done to their varying capacities, require types of education varying in certain important aspects'. (5)

The point is emphasized by reviewing Neville Bennett's divergent set of teacher characteristics, when a profound difference between the two perspectives can be seen. Child centred education can claim to look to the individual development whereas, looking through the traditional points, one can see the criteria of 'sorting' children out into groups as a consistent factor.

This idea illustrates two important notions mentioned previously. Firstly, one is faced with the idea of 'indirect' influence, namely, that the strong social and political desire to sort out 'secondary education' had an indirect and serious affect on primary education.

The second idea previously discussed was that of the difference between philosophy and reality. Both the 1931 and 1938 reports were intellectual, the 'school' of 'Great Educators' was experimental, only the work in infant schools could claim to be 'ideas in action'.

What was the reality of the situation?

John Blackie in his book 'Inside the Primary School' described some of the circumstances facing teachers and also the state of primary education immediately before and then following the Second World War. 'The Elementary schools of the period between the wars had changed since the end of the nineteenth century, but they had not changed much. The curriculum had been expanded but the emphasis was still on the three R's. Some teachers were better trained but there were still large numbers of untrained teachers and in charge of infant classes many supplementaries who needed only to be British and to be vaccinated . . .

The Hadow report on the Primary School (1931) was beginning to be read and it gave respectability to ideas which had hitherto been thought of as cranky or idealistic. Nevertheless at the outbreak of the war, the number of junior schools which had been substantially affected was very small, even in the infant schools, which had started earlier and moved faster, there was still a solid block of conservatism'. (6)

The English Infant school (with its own headteacher) developed on its own lines and it was here that most of the new educational ideas which have now spread upwards into junior schools were first tried out. Musgrave's explanation for this progressive development is that great interest was shown in child development and behavioural/psychological works. He goes on to say, 'This had much influence on the teaching methods used, especially with younger children. These more child-centred techniques were greatly at odds with those of the school tradition that put so much stress on the child learning merely the three R's and sitting still at his desk. This change can be seen in the 1937 handbook for teachers which emphasised the importance of the personal relationships between the teacher and the child'. (7)

How then did the changes come about, if there were so many influences which were hostile to change? Blackie claims that 'firstly, however gingerly some teachers grasped it, the freedom of the individual headteacher was genuine. He had a far wider latitude in deciding what to teach, how to teach it and what books to use, than was or is enjoyed by headteachers in any other country in the world.

Secondly, the influence at work on him were becoming more experimental in outlook. The training colleges rather slowly, IMI's more quickly, became the agents of innovation'. (8)

What conclusions can be drawn so far with regard to the process of 'change' in the primary sector?

On the negative side, it would appear that teachers tended towards conservatism and that conservatism, probably because of its concern with the status quo, appears to be passed on from one generation of teachers to the next. The word 'negative' needs qualification. Scepticism towards 'change' is probably a valuable asset. The critical appraisal of innovation is likewise to be applauded. It is a matter of semantics - if conservative tendencies inhibit a fair and reasonable assessment of 'developments' then as a value system it leaves itself open to criticism.

As for 'agents of innovations', there appears to be at least two distinct groups.

Firstly, there is the previously mentioned notion of 'outside agencies' persuading schools and headteachers to adopt their particular view of education.

Secondly, there is the notion of individual schools' internal development of the curriculum - sometimes referred to as 'school based curriculum'. Blackie mentioned the English infant system developing new lines of educational thought and practice. Richmond describes it far more strongly 'the more permissive approach to learning and teaching, stemming originally from a handful of nursery and infant schools has provided the secret leavers permeating upwards However fitfully and sporadically, child centred theory

and practice infiltrated from infant school into junior schools, thence to the lower reaches of the secondary modern school. Although it met all points with stiff opposition, it is hardly an exaggeration to claim that every significant advance in British education can be traced back to this source'. (9)

If Richmond's remarks are only half accurate, then this concept is of considerable relevance because one may claim:

- a) School-based development vindicates the evolutionary aspect of the English system.
- b) The slowness with which change took place poses questions regarding the effectiveness of 'outside agencies' to successfully impose their views.
- c) Although the evolutionary aspect of the system created the freedom for school-based developments, the suggestion that it met opposition at all points and took many years to expand indicates the possibility that there was no structure for the new philosophies to gain a full and wide appreciation by the education world as a whole.

Although only half way through the first chapter, the implications of Richmond's arguments encapsulate the main discussion point of this study. The freedom granted to headteachers permitted the growth of significant advances in education. This is a powerful justification of the laissez-faire system. However, the central question to be answered is whether or not 'freedom' is an adequate or sufficient enough basis for maintaining this system. Evidence of conservatism, stagnation and a painfully slow rate of progress can be levelled at the laissez-faire tradition. Supporters of this tradition could counter criticism by pointing to individual headteacher's freedoms and responsibilities - don't blame the system - blame the headteachers. It is the differences between the perception of roles within the laissez-faire system and the reality and effectiveness of those roles that is one of the major areas to be investigated.

Within its historical setting the 1944 Education Act is an excellent example of this line of enquiry.

The fascination of this 'major redefinition', lies in the indirect ways in which it affected the primary sector. Its importance lies as much with what it did not do, as with what it did do.

Michael Hyndman described the Act thus: 'The 1944 Education Act finally gave legal sanction (in a curiously circumlocutory way) to that long standing feature of the educational scene, the 11+ transfer; it also confirms the hopes of the 1920 departmental committee (reiterated and amplified in Spens) that no fee should be payable in maintained schools. But it contained no mention at all of the form which secondary education should take, tripartite or otherwise. The omission was noticed; one Labour MP (Mr. Silkin) rather sceptically commented that: "..... we may find that things go on very much the same and that we have merely changed the names of the schools and increased the age to 15 and that is all." Hansard Vol. 396 (20th January, 1944).

There could be little doubt about government preferences: The Hadow, Spens and Norwood Reports, together with the 1943 White Paper on Educational Reconstruction all pointed towards a segregated system of secondary education In 1945 the Socialists took office Since 1942 the Labour Party had been committed (albeit in rather vague terms) to a comprehensive form of secondary education. When, therefore, the new minister endorsed 'The Nations Schools' (the very first pamphlet issued by the new Ministry of Education which put forward a dictate of tripartism); her action was received with unconcealed indignation by some members of her party.

....."The Right Honorary Lady is a danger to the whole Labour movement so far as educational policy is concerned. She is not true to the policies which we have adumbrated over a series of years.

She does not believe in the capacity of the ordinary child, in the provision of educational facilities for the ordinary child, nor does she believe in an equalitarian system of education, W.G. Cove Hansard Vol. 424 (1st July, 1946)." (10)

Given that the socialists were in power, the question has to be posed, how did those favouring radical change fail?

The 1944 Education Act was concerned with macro political and philosophical perspectives:- 'secondary education for all', 'free education', 'meritocracy', 'IQism', equalitarian concepts and changing the on-going social trend of conservatism and the class system. Musgrave (11) claimed 'The main political strain that was to become important during the inter-war years lay in the changing concept of social equality'.

In this respect education was only one of the many aspects of our society that politicians wished to change. However, change was not desired by everyone. Musgrave speaks of 'strain'. Bowles and Gintis (12) offer a somewhat extreme 'manipulative' theory of conservatism -

'Throughout history, patterns of privilege have been justified by elaborate facades. Dominant classes seeking a stable social order have consistently nurtured and underwritten these ideological facades and, in so far as their power permitted, blocked the emergence of alternatives. This is what we mean by 'legitimation' : the fostering of a generalized consciousness among individuals which prevents the formation of social bonds and critical understanding whereby existing social conditions might be transferred. Legitimation may be based on feelings of inevitability (death and taxes) or moral desirability (everyone gets what they deserve). When the issue is that of social justice, these feelings are both present.'

This well known theory has created a furore of controversy. However, it does offer one explanation for the slow rate of educational change and perhaps one way in which change is deflected and absorbed. It is open to debate as to whether or not there exists a consciously manipulative elite nurturing ideological 'facades'. A less strident stance could claim there exists a subconscious desire of the dominant classes to maintain the status quo and although not directly manipulative is a strong enough force to modify change.

The concept of generalized consciousness whereby our categories of thought and even our sense of reality are derived from and in part express the legitimate social order seem worthy of further thought.

Is it the explanation, or partial explanation for the apparent conservative nature of the whole education service? Education is not just concerned with the transmission of 'universal facts'; it is heavily value-laden. The history of education in this country stems directly from the middle and upper classes traditions and values.

There may well be a further argument to illustrate the importance of generalized consciousness legitimating the education sector's conservative nature.

Although 'freedom' is a key note of the laissez-faire system many writers have observed the conservative nature of education. It may well be that the system itself promotes the status quo. This may happen because of the lack of bureaucratic control. A laissez-faire system is justified on grounds of general values and thus is very difficult to assess or even criticize, whereas a highly structured form of organisation is also highly 'visible' and capable of assessment, specific criticism and modification. Within the laissez-faire system most of the actors can feel secure so long as they maintain the system and to do so they must maintain the general values as well. Therefore, headteachers have their independence, teachers have their professional autonomy, governors have supportive duties, L.E.A.'s can get on with their administration, H.M.I.'s can have their political freedom and central government can look to their resource and organisational commitments.

The laissez-faire system blurs lines of communication and responsibility. Each actor can maintain his own power base only if he does not challenge other actors. Without rules and regulations, without dialogue, the system survives and continues because the actors involved accept the system as legitimate. The inherent vagueness of the laissez-faire system has advantages for all the parties involved in education, but the relative lack of internal monitoring and interaction between parties encourages the status quo rather than conflict and by accepting the status quo the parties involved most probably also accept the value system of the status quo.

An obvious strategy of control found in many countries is the prescription of the curriculum. Central government control of the curriculum implies a set of relationships totally alien to relationships found in the English system until recent times. Concepts such as accountability, curriculum consistency and curriculum continuity flow easily from a 'continental' control model. Central government control of curriculum within the laissez-faire system can be claimed to be very different, as shown in the 1944 Education Act.

The curriculum prescribed by the 'act' is non-existent - 'full time education suitable to the requirements of junior children' - 'children who have not attained the age of twelve years - except for Religious Instruction and Act of Worship in all schools, subject to the right of withdrawal for pupils and teachers' - Section 114.

Some people may find this an extraordinary situation but it is nevertheless correct -

'Much of the 1944 Act was taken up with the problem of denominational differences and little attention was given to what proved to be one of the dominant educational controversies of the last twenty years, namely, the kind of school which should be provided for secondary schools', (Bell, Fowler & Little) (13).

Historically, the various churches had been responsible for in particular, the development of the elementary system of education. Because they built, financed and 'manned' these schools it is obvious they held considerable influence. It also seems plain that as the 'church' was a fundamental part of society for many centuries; its influence on society cannot be denied.

However, there is the possibility that the 'power' of the church does not match the reality of modern industrial society. It may well be another example of generalised consciousness.

Ryder and Silver (14) found 'A Religious Census in 1351, and a local count in the Borough of Sheffield in 1881, both arrived at the rough conclusion that one person in three whom there were places attended for worship on an average Sunday. In Sheffield between the two dates the population had slightly more than doubled, so that although the ratio remained the same the absolute number of non attenders doubled across the period. Since 1881 the population had almost again doubled, but attendances in 1957 were far less than in 1881'.

There is always a danger in interpreting statistics, but nevertheless, an argument presents itself which claims that the 'church's' influence was (is) far greater than it statistically merited. Musgrave claims - 'For those who wished to keep religion a power in education the problem was the perennial one of raising sufficient income There followed a shift of emphasis of policy for all except the Catholics. Rather than stressing the retention of

separate schools the denominations came to see that the best way of bringing religion to the children of the nation was to spread their influence throughout the state system. This new emphasis was to have effect on the 1944 Act It can be seen that the religious agencies were very successful in their objectives, both in terms of finance and control of part of the curriculum.' (15)

Given that religion is a minority interest, conflict regarding religion has not been a major issue in England since the 'act'. Both teachers and pupils have the right to 'contract out' of the religious aspects of school, but apparently few actually do. Does the explanation lie within the Bowles and Gintis framework - the legitimation of values (religious) being absorbed into the generalized consciousness of parents, teachers and pupils? One does not have to be a Christian to believe Christianity should be taught in schools.

As for schools themselves, religious education has had no small impact. Responsibility for the transmission of that value system is put firmly on the shoulders of headteachers. They ask teachers to conform to a value system, which is one of the traditional pillars of our society, by passing it on to their pupils.

To add to problems of belief, some teachers find themselves compromised on a more direct level, namely promotion. Questions of faith and commitment often figure in interviews and can cause some distress to teachers.

Definition is perhaps the most severe problem. It must be remembered that schools have to legally teach Religious Instruction not Religious Education. A prescribed syllabus of Christianity has given way to a far more liberal regime but it lacks the 'Law of the Lands' approval. The 1944 Act was solely concerned with Christianity, but of course we live in a multi-ethnic society and pressures to satisfy those needs, together with fighting racial prejudice, have caused great difficulties. The National Association of Head Teachers has joined the growing lobby to change the 'act' with regard to religious education, but it remains to be seen what will be achieved.

The way in which religious matters were dealt with under the 1944 'act' and their maintenance without radical change since that time is a most interesting example of how both a redefinition works and also how the laissez-faire system operates.

Referring to conditions found in schools. It is obvious that education is expensive. The allocation of resources is, of course, a mainly political decision. However, the economic condition of a country must have considerable influence on levels of spending.

This country had to endure the 'Depression' of the 1930's ; the country then had to fight 'fascism' virtually unaided until America came into the Second World War. The debts Britain owed following the war were huge. Expectations for a new beginning were high and paved the way for a radical Socialist government in 1945. Several consequences emerged from this situation which directly affected the primary sector. The sheerscale of proposed change throughout every part of society inevitably meant that certain aspects would gain more interest and resources than others. In education, the focus was most certainly on secondary not primary education and this had at least two interesting effects.

Firstly, primary resources were very limited - buildings, teacher training and resources generally were in a poor state, so the actual physical day-to-day job of teaching was demanding and stressful.

Secondly, because of the lack of interest shown by central and local government, coupled with the well-established notion of professional autonomy, primary schools were left to develop independently. Schools wishing to advance child-centred philosophies must have had to grapple with appalling resource difficulties given that this form of education requires far more resources than the tradition methodology. Whereas schools adopting formal and didactic methods could justify their position by pointing to long established traditions, the 'logic' of IQ ism, the demands of secondary schools for the categorizing of children , growing parental interest in grammar schools and given the extremely difficult resource situation following the war, the idea that a bureaucratic, 'mechanistic' approach to the teaching of primary school children was the only realistic way of coping.

It can be seen that the tripartite system heightened the difference between 'progressive' and 'traditional' ideologies. Infant schools were virtually unaffected, so child-centred education could continue to develop in spite of resource difficulties. However, the 'Junior' schools and departments were under great pressure to become part of the overall scheme of things by acting as

'agents' of differentiation and to this end the early 'streaming by ability' took place in many schools, as did the careful and systematic 'coaching' of suitable candidates for the 11+ examination. For supporters of child-centred education this situation must have appeared to be a mortal blow to their hopes. It was a plain case of an 'imposed' structure dominating a strong educational ideology.

However, within a very short time criticism of secondary education was heard. Most L.E.A.'s had opted for a tripartite system of grammar, technical and secondary modern schools. Douglas (16) claimed 'The emphasis shifted to the question of how seemingly objective selective processes distributed children within the frame work of secondary education, as well as to the level of performance and degree of wastage within the secondary school system' - in other words the use of the 11+ examinations and the tripartite system.

Douglas found many instances of inequality between one child and another, of particular importance was the child's social background and parental influence. However, he also severely criticised the system itself -

- (a) Regional differences in the provision of Grammar School places.
- (b) Little flexibility regarding the transfer of pupils within the tripartite system - only a very small proportion of pupils moved from secondary modern to grammar school, or vice versa.
- (c) Poor facilities for older pupils at secondary modern and this contributed to many bright children leaving at 15.
- (d) Criticism of the mechanics of selection - the relevance of I.Q., tests, age of transfer and sex differences.
- (e) Criticism of the whole notion of differing forms of curriculum - academic, technical, practical.

Referring specifically to primary schools in 1957, Douglas asked over 3,060 primary schools to describe their situation. 'Their answer showed a familiar picture of crowded class rooms and of schools which are grossly lacking in amenities. 45% of the children are taught in classes of 40 or more. Primary schools built in the nineteenth century accommodate 48% of children and of these old schools, nearly half have not been modernised in any way since the war'. (17)

Criticism of the tripartite system continued to flow throughout the 1950's and 60's - parity of esteem, parity of conditions, the credibility of the 11+ selection procedure were all brought into question. The works of P.E. Vernon, 'Secondary School Selection' (1957), p.169 and p.177 and J.E. Floud, 'Social Class and Educational Opportunity' (1956) together with the 1957 NFER Third Interim Report (A. Yates & D.A. Pigeon - Admission to Grammar Schools) and the Crowther Report 15-18, (1959) echo the disquiet expressed by Douglas. A body of opinion was questioning the whole basis of secondary education and by implication much of what was going on in primary schools.

The response to the secondary sector situation was political. Within eight months of the Labour party's victory in the 1964 General Election, Anthony Crossland, Secretary of State for Education and Science, issued a Circular 10/65 inviting local education authorities to submit plans for the re-organisation of their secondary schools in order to eliminate selection into separate and different types of secondary school at 11.

What was happening inside primary schools during this period of growing disquiet regarding selection and secondary education?

A tantalizingly obscure picture emerges. R. Aldrich (18) found that Surveys of 1962 and 1964 showed that 85% of primary teachers and two thirds of parents favoured streaming.

K. Evans saw the conflict situation in the following way 'The broadening and humanising process in primary education drawing its main inspiration from the 1931 Hadow Report, made slow but sure headway, in spite of certain obstacles being placed in its way. The influence of the eleven plus examination and its logistical priority given to the latter stages of education after 1944 were both unfavourable. The widespread adoption of streaming in the Junior school produced a certain rigidity which encouraged the continuance of the traditional class-teaching approach'. (19)

Streaming by ability means far more than the practical solution to a difficult problem, it is indicative of a whole ideology - formal, didactic, traditional, teacher dominated. If this is an accurate assumption, then it would seem given those statistics,

child-centred education was dead and buried - but was not dead, it was alive and kicking and growing and what is of interest is the way in which it grew, subject as it was, to such apparently considerable traditional-structural pressure.

The question still remains to be answered - How did child-centred education survive and eventually expand? The answer is of critical interest to this investigation and hence to any discussion of the role of the headteacher.

Michael Hyndman gives a fascinating answer - 'Primary schools which appeared to jeopardize the 11+ success of their pupils by experiment with non-subject-based progressive methods of teaching were in consequence liable to come under intense criticism The trend towards informality in junior education was, however, undoubtedly accelerated in the post 1945 period. Change appears to have come about largely on a local, grassroots basis in a number of fairly well-defined parts of the country. It seems far less to have been the result of any imposition from above of closely argued educational theory The development of the trend toward progressive primary education in the postwar years appears to have been largely due to the individual efforts of a number of convinced educationalists . Administrators such as J.H. Newson of Hertfordshire and A.R. Clegg in West Riding showed themselves actively prepared to encourage teachers. The progressive methods of many of the latter probably owed far more to intuitive response and to experience at a purely personal level than to any theoretical considerations. During this period, too, child centred and discovery methods of teaching were continuously publicized by a number of H.M.I's On a more local level, L.E.A. advisers (themselves mostly ex-teachers) did a great deal to breakdown the sense of isolation which had previously tended to restrict innovation But it is unlikely that such activities would have had as deep impact without the positive support of a significant number of the teachers themselves there emerged increasingly a resilient yet informal network of contacts between

progressively minded teachers and the advisers, H.M.I.'s and education officers who supported them. Discussion groups, area conferences, courses, all helped teachers to achieve a sense of identity and unity'. (20)

Hyndman's ideas are so important and relevant because they reinforce what is emerging as a major tenet - the notion of structure. In the case of the progressive movement, it was not a macro hierarchial bureaucracy, but an informal network that succeeded in very adverse circumstances. However, would the progressive movement have gained status if it had not been for macro changes at secondary level? The introduction of secondary comprehensivisation removed the need for pedagogy directed towards 11+ selection procedures in primary schools. This is another example of the direction of primary education being affected by the actions of others.

Comprehensive schooling offered new forms of internal structure and organisation - mixed ability teaching, counselling, setting, banding, form tutors, integrated studies, humanities etc. Whether or not these structures were successful is not part of this debate. What is relevant is that it was the 'new' system's response to change. Perhaps secondary education has always sought to cope through structural measures, but was this the response of primary schools?

How the primary sector coped with the 'progressive era' will be explored in the next chapter, nevertheless two notions seem worthy of repetition for the closing paragraph of this chapter.

X First, the much vaulted claims of the supporters of the laissez-faire system with regard to the freedom of individuals schools must be seriously doubted. Primary schools were subjected to intense pressure to conform to the needs of the tripartite system. Primary schools faced many difficulties in developing 'progressive' ideologies, even though the lobby for such developments had been so strong pre-war. Second, although there were informal networks encouraging child centred education, evidence suggests that the vast majority of the teaching profession were largely conservative in character. This had serious implications for headteachers, as the main change agents under the English

system and brings into question whether or not the laissez-faire system was ever capable of coping with change. The management of change implies structure, strategy and dialogue, so what happened in the 'progressive era' should throw further light on the worthiness or otherwise of the English education management model.

- (1) D.E.S. (1981) The School Curriculum. London:H.M.S.O.
- (2) BENNETT, N. (1976) Teaching Styles and Pupil Progress. London:Open Books Ltd.
- (3) CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (1931) The Primary School. London:H.M.S.O.
- (4) RICHMOND, W.K. (1978) Education in Britain since 1944. London:Methuen & Co.
- (5) CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION ON SECONDARY EDUCATION (1938) The Spens Report. London:H.M.S.O.
- (6) BLACKIE, J. (1967) Inside the Primary School. London: H.M.S.O.
- (7) MUSGRAVE, P.W. (1968) Society and Education in England since 1800. London:Methuen & Co., p.138.
- (8) BLACKIE. op cit.
- (9) RICHMOND op cit. p.24.
- (10) HYNDMAN, M. (1978) Schools and Schooling in England and Wales. London:Harper & Row p.95.
- (11) MUSGRAVE. op cit.
- (12) BOWLES & GINTIS (1976) Schooling in Capitalist America. London:Routledge & Kegan Paul p.104.
- (13) BELL FOWLER & LITTLE (1973) Education in Great Britain & Ireland. London:Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- (14) RYDER & SILVER (1970) Modern English Society. London: Methuen & Co.
- (15) MUSGRAVE. op cit. p.94.
- (16) DOUGLAS, J.W.B. (1964) The Home and the School. London: Panther Books Ltd.
- (17) DOUGLAS, Ibid.
- (18) ALDRICH, R.(1982) An Introduction to History of Education. London:Hodder & Stroughton. p.87.
- (19) EVANS, K. (1975) The Development and Structure of the English Educational System. London: University of London Press.
- (20) HYNDMAN, M. op cit. p.50-51.

CHAPTER 2

The 'Progressive' Era

During the mid 1960's 'Progressive' education gained great publicity. The 'Progressive' perspective had, of course, been around for many many years. Previous chapters have recorded the various sources of this perspective - individual colleges of learning, separate infant schools, which were not subjected to the same pressures or traditions of elementary schools, H.M.I.'s who presumably saw examples of 'good practice' and as a result favoured a more 'experience' orientated view of the curriculum.

However, it is very difficult to assess how strong this tradition was during the 1950's and early 60's when the Junior school curriculum was dominated by the selection procedures for the tripartite system. Certainly, circular 10/65 requesting plans for the reorganisation of secondary schools issued by the Labour government in 1964, created a vacuum in Junior school curriculum in that it removed one justification for a whole style of teaching and a whole area of the curriculum.

With the comprehensive system resisting on philosophical grounds the need for such objective testing, there was a gap to be filled. The progressive tradition was ready to stake its claim, but it needed some stamp of approval. This measure of esteem or confidence was available in the shape of the 'Plowden Report', whose committee had started work the year before in 1963.

Can we fully appreciate what a traumatic period of history this was for many primary school teachers? There had been growing dissatisfaction with the restraints placed upon them by the 11+. However, 'progressive' education lacked definition and was a total departure, both philosophically and organisationally, from what had gone before. With hindsight, it was vital that a strong lead be given by someone in authority to help headteachers and teachers cope with such a turn around. In the event, the Plowden Report had to be the definitive article of faith.

However, it will be shown that the Plowden Report failed to help the primary school profession and led to much confusion and unhappiness which culminated in the William Tyndale affair - thus leading to the era we find ourselves in at this moment - the age of intervention.

M. Wright claimed 'Progressive primary schooling is the outcome of a very lengthy and gradual evolution whose roots stretch way back into the last century. There have been ebbs and flows

leading to what some regard as the climax - or perhaps the turning point - in the Plowden Report 1967. The Plowden committee was appointed by Sir Edward Boyle Conservative Minister of Education in 1963, with instructions to examine primary education in general. The report gave firm approval to the progressive movement, which it saw as a 'general and quickening trend'. Some critics blame Plowden for causing a wide spread departure from sanity in schools. But, Plowden was not so radical as those who have not read it seem to think, and it was not so much a cause of progressivism as a legitimisation'. (1)

Because the 'progressive' school was such a departure from 'traditional' schools, it was inevitable that the two systems would be compared, but it is essential to remember that they are using different methods and emphasising different aims. Indeed, it is more complicated than that, in progressive education the method is part of the aim. In other words, the emphasis is placed as much on the process as on the end product.

On the question of aims, we have the results of a major survey to consider. This survey, conducted for the School Council (The Aims of Primary Education) studied between 1969 and 1973 a sample of 1,513 teachers in 201 schools to discover how they saw the aims of primary education. The teachers were given a list of 72 possible aims and asked to rate each one according to how important they felt it to be. The major findings is that there was enormous range and variety of opinion (2) Wright states 'It hardly needs to be said that not everyone regards this as a good thing, clearly too, the more numerous the aims the less emphasis that can be put on any one of them. In the end everyone will have their own notions about aims, and as their notions differ, so will their judgement of the quality of education provided in this or that school. The Plowden Report a product of its age, only served to add to the wide spread confusion about aims (3)

The point about aims is of course very important and the committee themselves recognised this. They were critical of phrases such as 'whole personality', 'happy atmosphere', 'full and satisfying life', 'full development of powers', 'satisfaction of curiosity', 'confidence', 'perseverance', and 'alterness'. They stated 'This list shows that general statements of aims..... tend to be a little more than expressions of benevolent aspiration which may

provide a rough guide to the general climate of a school, but which may have a rather tenuous relationship to the educational practices that actually go on there' Plowden (4).

Having read the above, it seems reasonable to expect that the committee would offer something better. Richmond claims they did not - 'the 1967 report was conspicuously lacking in the 'astringent intellectual scrutiny' which it suggested teachers should bring to bear in their day' to day problems in the classroom. Much of what it had to say about primary curriculum amounted to little more than stale cliches to the effect that 'finding out' was better than 'being told' Under the heading of 'Some Practical Implications for the Time Table', it indulged in airy-fairy pronouncements about the 'free-day' and 'integrated curriculum' . Generalization about flexibility (Any practice which pre-determines the pattern and imposes it on all is to be condemned) and about the 'boundless curiosity which children have about the world about them,' were so flaccid as to leave themselves open to the charge of being complacent, not to say slap happy'. (Page 49). (5)

R. Aldrich adds further fuel to this argument by criticising, on the basis of vagueness, Plowden in the following way 'Good schools for Plowden were schools in which children were 'to be themselves' and to live 'as children and not as future adults'. They were to lay 'special stress on individual discovery' and teach 'that knowledge does not fall into neatly separate compartments'. (6)

Pity the poor headteacher who had to deal with post-Plowden!

Criticism of teacher training.

Older headteachers with limited teaching experience.

Younger headteachers promoted, at least partly, because of their success in gaining their pupils places at grammar schools.

A much wider curriculum.

An emphasis on process as well as content.

Demands to help average and below average pupils.

Greater resource demands.

Demands for parental involvement.

The need to persuade staff to adopt new philosophies.

Some assistant teachers having apparently more knowledge than the headteacher with regard to progressive education. Finally, and perhaps most critical of all, trying to decide the school's aims.

Looking back it seems painfully obvious that 'dialogue' should have been the number one priority. The definition handed down from 'above' (The Plowden Report) was inadequate not so much for what it said, more because too few people understood what it said. The 'progressive' perspective was such a major departure for the majority of teachers and educationalists working in the primary sector that the apparent lack of a structure within which dialogue could take/^{place}became a main stumbling block for development.

Certain themes appear to be emerging in this study; one theme is the balance between 'freedom' and 'structure'. This present aspect is another example of this tension. On one hand 'freedom' permitted the growth of the progressive movement through informal networks; but the apparent lack of structure (another definition of freedom?) probably inhibited the growth of the 'progressive movement'.

A structure for 'dialogue' seems a logical and reasonable framework for development.

The 'report' itself, was plainly a structure for 'dialogue' and for action. The committee can look back with some pride at the success of some of their recommendations and initiatives - Educational Priority Areas, parental power movement, middle schools and even the legitimization of progressive education. However, as previously claimed, it was inspirational rather than a blue print for action. Perhaps it could not have done much more, but unfortunately it appears to have stood alone because other agencies of 'dialogue' do not seem to have been able to cope.

If 'dialogue' was critical during the 'progressive' era, then it is important to investigate who were and who should have been these agencies of dialogue.

Local Authorities were content to deal with administration such as reorganising or not reorganising secondary schools. They left curriculum matters to their advisory service. Some L.E.A. advisers were part of the 'informal network' described earlier. However, not all headteachers could rely upon adviser expertise, because it was common practice for many L.E.A. to appoint specialist secondary advisers to oversee twenty or more primary schools.

Some H.M.I.'s were also part of the 'informal network' system, but presumably because of the huge school population at that time H.M.I. were spread thin on the ground.

Teachers' centres, possibly one of the more potent agencies for dialogue, were in their infancy. Many large authorities supported Teachers' centres, but whether or not every school and teacher was in reasonable striking distance of a centre is doubtful. However, a far more important point relative to teachers' centres was that they were a completely voluntary institution and given the independence of schools and professional autonomy there was no question of heads and teachers being made to attend centres.

A further interesting point regarding Teachers Centres is to question the type of course on offer at that time. There is no data but nevertheless, one wonders which type of course was in the majority - 'tips for teachers' type of course, where the emphasis was placed upon micro process/content or courses which concentrated upon philosophy, aims and objectives? Probably the former and if so, this would only add to the confusion present during the 'progressive' era, because as claimed earlier progressive education was such a major departure from traditional education that philosophy had to be the fundamental base.

One is left with two further institutions who should have been capable of contributing to this debate. Namely, the Training Colleges, who were the professional source of teacher legitimation and the Schools Council, a specially created dynamic agency for change.

The system employed to 'train' teachers up to the mid sixties fell into two broad channels. Firstly, a person could gain a first degree at a university and then gain employment as a teacher without any formal teacher training. A one year Post Graduate Teaching Certificate was introduced later in the decade.

Secondly, a person could be trained at a specialized teacher training college. These institutions were usually isolated from other forms of higher education. During the three year certificate course the student was assessed academically and by satisfying the demands of teaching practices in schools.

A successful student was recognised by the D.E.S. after completing one year's teaching (probationary year). Here, the onus for assessment fell heavily upon the headteacher.

Having become a qualified teacher, the fledgling professional was under no overt pressure to continue his or her education or professional development. Although teachers' centres were developing, there were already numerous 'courses' and 'further qualifications' a teacher could complete, but the onus was very much on the individual teacher to construct any form of 'training' or 'development' plan. Advice could be sought from fellow teachers, the head or advisers, but there was no 'staff development structure' as such.

When one imposes onto this situation the confusions and complexities of the growing traditional/progressive tension, then clearly an explanation needs to be sought.

Teacher training came under scrutiny by the Robbins Report. They decided "in England and Wales many of the colleges (for the education of teachers) are very small. Some of the students have the capacity to do work of degree standard; and although the colleges will continue to concentrate in the main on courses of the present kind, it is unjust that there should be no facilities for obtaining a degree. But to confer degree-giving powers on all the existing colleges would be inappropriate because of the number involved, the variation in their sizes and the diversity of standards We recommend a radical change ... a closer association with universities we are convinced that immense benefit will flow from closer links with the universities

and that our proposals offer the best hope of raising the status and standards of the colleges'. (7)

The implied criticism of some training colleges is obvious, as was the committee's solution - the raising of status and standards, but in one respect the committee's solution was not radical in that it was still the same basic model as previously employed - raw recruit- input of philosophy, knowledge, academic standard and a 'dab' of experience, followed by no structured follow-up or professional development.

Nevertheless, leaving aside the 'professional development' argument for some while, even post-Robbins teacher training was not without its critics.

N. Middleton & S. Weitzmann heavily criticize both Anthony Crosland (Minister of Education 1965-67) and the training system in the following manner - 'Mr. Crosland must also bear the responsibility for the failure to make the most of opportunities to re-organise teacher education, which was in the end cobbled in the worst traditions of British gradualism. The training colleges had been repeatedly condemned as indifferent. The source of this was easy to see; they were too small, geographically and intellectually isolated with mediocre staff. In some hundred years of development they had produced no educational research, developed no applications of psychology and sociology to the work in schools, there was no body of theory or knowledge about education based on field work, and no scholars of standing had emerged from the colleges. Every investigation showed them to be generally reactionary and indifferent in quality The chance was presented to both radically re-organise these colleges, virtually the sole source of teachers in the unselected part of the system and at the same time use their sites, as the base for expansion on polytechnic lines. What happened was a perpetuation of the binary system of teacher education. To meet the teacher shortage, other small colleges were founded, and worse still small colleges expanded but solely for teacher training. The result was that their faults were writ large as the poorly qualified instructors of one subject were promoted to take over newly created departments and progress was hampered by lack of experience in any other form of education. The renaissance of State education was put back at least a

quarter of a century'. (8)

The model was wrong in that the system limited itself to producing newly qualified teachers, leaving professional development to the individual teacher. However, if Middleton & S. Weitzmann's criticisms are accepted then the system failed to reach even its limited objectives. To this must be added once more the comment that this situation was occurring during one of the most traumatic periods of history for the classroom teacher.

There are numerous points to be drawn from this section, but two seem worthy of immediate debate. First of all, the system was basically reactionary and conservative in nature and as such would be one more part of the education industry that would resist change. Secondly, and probably a partial explanation for the first point, is the emphasis placed on the insular nature of teacher training institutions. If this phenomena is a trait of the whole education industry, then it is most serious matter with far reaching implications. Insular circumstances coupled with reactionary tendencies do not encourage dialogue; and surely the one single need above all else during a period of change is 'dialogue'.

Apparently, setting up Governing bodies for Colleges of Education, three year courses, closer liason with universities, the emergence of University Schools of Education, BEd. degree courses and Post Graduate Teaching Certificate courses, was still considered inadequate, because in the early seventies the government of the day decided to set up another committee to look into this perceived problem - The James Report
They decided that:

- a) The structure of teacher training should be radically altered.
- b) All intending teachers should undergo at least a four year course of training leading to a degree.
- c) Teacher training should consist of three cycles.
 1. Two years of non-vocational studies Diploma of Higher Education or a three year degree course.
 2. Two years of vocational pre service training and induction leading to qualification and to degree of B.A.(Ed).

3. In-service courses taking up the equivalent of at least one term every seven years of service.

d) Creation of a new network of professional centres and administrative councils to supervise teacher training.(9)

Michael Hyndman claimed 'Official reaction to the James Report appeared in the form of a White Paper 'A Framework for Expansion(1973). The Third Cycle (In-service recommendations) were accepted and then put into storage on account of financial cutbacks of the early and mid 1970's The suggestions for the induction year (second year of the second cycle)were largely accepted; five government sponsored pilot schemes were planned. Three of these were subsequently cancelled due to financial difficulties leaving two in Liverpool and Northumberland Individual L.E.A.'s also started up schemes of their own - many of which were soon curtailed owing to lack of funds. The proposed second cycle award of B.A. (Ed)., fell flat, and the James Report's insistence upon the exclusion of concurrent teacher training institutions was not endorsed by the government. Teacher training institutions displayed a dogged and occasionally surly attachment to concurrency; according to the Times Higher Educational Supplement, by mid 1976 virtually only one college in England had followed the pattern suggested by James.(10)

Economic and political influence seems of particular relevance. The expansion of teacher training in the mid-sixties was a logistic problem to be solved; the quality of the training was not the major concern. Likewise, the James Report offered the most radical model to date, but economic pressure overcame political decisions and hence the full force of the various 'reports' was dissipated.

Pursuing this argument further, one could claim that this country has had, apart from a period from the late fifties to early sixties, economic problems. As a result each and every department of government has had to fight for its share of limited resources. It therefore seems reasonable to attempt to assess this factor, for it is one matter to draw up plans and recommendations and quite another matter to implement those plans. In one respect this line of enquiry returns to one of the basic tenets already offered- the difference between

philosophy and reality.

Middleton & Weitzman (11) discussed the relationship between politicians and their administrators. In particular they looked at Mr. Edward Short, Minister for Education in the late sixties - 'He looked round for professional advice, only to discover that he was the only educationalist in decision making circles (ex headteacher) for the department was dominated by the administrators, while the specialists, the members of Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Schools were relegated to an advisory capacity Situations are dealt with on administrative and not educational grounds, indeed the ruling seems to be often contrary to professional advice which is brushed aside. All but a handful of the ministers in charge of education have been educated outside the state system and consequently have little understanding or sympathy with a department which by the nature of its work can show few dramatic triumphs. To such people the part played by local authorities and the attitudes of professional bodies are hard to understand. The department has been used patently and repeatedly as a parking place for politicians between posts. In such conditions the permanent officials have worked out their own course, which they will try to follow, adding on the way gestures of the appropriate official flavour. Such officials are not sympathetic to the problems of non-selective education. Bureaucracy, no matter how enlightened, favours the known routine and the unruffled cycle of the administrative year, which means acceptance of the guidance of the senior department, the officials of the Treasury.'

If this scenario holds a grain of truth or reality, then it is one further part of the same picture - a picture that confirms the status quo and offers barriers to change. Professional autonomy, a reality found in individual schools, can be seen to be capable of continuing only if it does not make demands upon the system as a whole, because the system is not geared for change.

However, the 1960's saw an agency constructed specifically to generate 'change' in a dynamic manner. Namely, the Schools Council.

Until 1964, arrangements for promoting curriculum reform were the prerogative of the individual school and the local authorities. However with the establishment of the teacher controlled Schools Council in 1964 a national body was established in which central government could become deeply involved in curriculum reform and development. The Schools Council was jointly funded by the DES and the local authorities and although it was teacher controlled it sought neither to control teachers, nor to tell them what to teach or how to teach it. It was a body that offered its beliefs to teachers. There was never any hint of compulsion or pressure. Its main tenet was that curriculum reform could only be achieved by involving teachers nationally and locally in the identification of curriculum development projects and in the packaging, dissemination and possible adoption of any results.

They adopted a strong philosophical stance which was in keeping with the times - 'Plowden' and the 'progressive' era. Did it meet its main aim? Probably not. It produced masses of valuable information; it was creative and intellectually honest, but it was not, in some peoples' view, effective.

Throughout the 'progressive' era (1965-75) many primary schools were desperately seeking 'coat hooks' - manageable pieces of curriculum that could be quickly and rationally put into action. However, as claimed elsewhere, 'modern' education demands clear philosophy, organisation, process and content. Plowden supplied a vague but valuable philosophy and the School Council attempted to supply the rest.

Teaching is a dynamic job; teachers have to 'produce the goods' from day one to the last day of term. The history of primary schools does not show that the majority of teachers had the time and/or the inclination to engage in the necessarily complex model offered by the School Council. Three examples will perhaps confirm this view point. Firstly, Breakthrough to Literacy (Initial Literacy Project 1970). It has been adapted for use in many languages. Over 370,000 Word Makers, over four million Breakthrough books and over 200 million word and letter cards were sold - one of the Schools Councils greatest successes, but read again - an excellent educational package that can be used by infant teachers within days of opening the requisition order.

Secondly, Science 5-13, a profound project, with over 183,000 books sold in the U.K. The matching of scientific principles with Piagetian stages of development cannot be criticised on philosophical or intellectual grounds. Nevertheless, it was fifteen years later that an extension project 'Learning through Science' was published. This project gave teachers 'pupil materials'.

Thirdly, in contrast to the School Councils general style and perspective - the Bullock Report, Language for Life, was published in 1975 by the DES. There was criticism of so-called 'political' aspects of this report - attitudes to the Teaching of English, Standards of Reading and Monitoring, but no criticism of the other sections - Language Development and Reading, Organisation, Reading and Language Difficulties, Resources, Teachers Education and Training. The sections relating directly to teaching are defined, positive, digestible and more often than not capable of being implemented. The report uses phrases like 'should be' again and again. There are 333 single paragraph conclusions and recommendations.

The Bullock Report demanded attention and action, it had status and something to say. In Liverpool, children were given an occasional day's holiday so all schools could discuss the report. It was expected that each school should produce a policy document.

Putting the point bluntly, School Council asked too much of teachers in that particular era of our development. This has to be regretted, particularly as the likes of the late Lawrence Stenhouse so forcefully drove home the need for schools to incorporate research and philosophy in their own curriculum development.

Disappointment with the Schools Council is shared by others. Writing in 1975 Evans (12) stated 'It is both too difficult and too early to evaluate the impact of the School Council upon curriculum and teaching methods. Whilst it is obviously a major source of influence in favour of change, many of its ideas are either costly to implement, unsuitable for large classes or too emancipationalist to attract the average teacher. The sheer output of papers and projects may also be calculated to overawe

rather than inspire many of the Councils potential customers.'

Gordon and Lawton claim (13) , 'it has been increasingly questioned whether the School Councils 'cafeteria' approach to curriculum - simply offering a range of alternatives from which to choose has been sufficiently successful'.

Referring specifically to Science 5-13 Gordon and Lawton (writing in 1978) claim 'Science 5-13 has been disappointing in terms of numbers of children reached. There are two reasons for this which remain unsolved. The first is the problem of diffusion of innovation. The School Council has not yet been able to spread ideas from projects to teachers in schools - most primary teachers simply have not heard about Science 5-13. Secondly, there are not enough science teachers available. This is partly a problem of shortage of scientific manpower and partly the failure of colleges of education to match the needs of the schools with the right balance of specialist and semi specialist teachers'.

If it is accepted that the twin vehicles for change, The 'Plowden Report' and the 'Schools Council' were found wanting, then any search for explanations must be of value. This study has already touched upon some factors - the historical development of education, teacher training, economics and political re-definitions.

However, none of the above mentioned factors hold the centre of the stage. That place is filled by what Gordon and Lawton call 'the problem of diffusion of innovation'. It is the lack of an adequate structure and the lack of positive relationships between all the actors within the education industry that is the prime barrier to progress.

If one single aspect of 'factors affecting the role of the headteacher' can be satisfactorily resolved before the completion of this study, then it is the assessment of the tension between the philosophical stance of 'freedom of action in the laissez-faire system', and the notion of 'structuralized relationships.'

- (1) WRIGHT, M. (1977) Progress in Education. London: Croom Helm.
- (2) ASHTON, KNEEN, DAVIES & HOLLEY (1975) School Council Research Study. The Aims of Primary Education: A Study of Teachers' Opinions. London: Macmillan Education.
- (3) WRIGHT, M. op cit.
- (4) CENTRAL ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR EDUCATION (1967) Children and their Primary Schools. Volume. London: HMSO Para:497.
- (5) RICHMOND, W.K., (1978) Education in Britain since 1944. London: Methuen & Co.
- (6) ALDRICH, R. (1982) An Introduction to History of Education. London: Hodder & Stroughton.
- (7) ROBBINS REPORT (1963) Report of the Committee on Higher Education appointed the Prime Minister. London: HMSO.
- (8) MIDDLETON, N. & WEITZMANN (1976) A Place for Everyone. New York, Victor Gollancz.
- (9) JAMES REPORT (1972) Teacher Education and Training. London: HMSO.
- (10) HYNDMAN, M. (1978) Schools and Schooling in England and Wales. London: Harper & Row.
- (11) MIDDLETON & WEITZMAN. op cit. P. 355.
- (12) EVANS, K. (1975) The Development and Structure of the English Educational System. London: University of London.
- (13) GORDON, P. & LAWSON. D. (1978) Curriculum change in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Century. London: Hodder and Stroughton.

CHAPTER 3

The conservative back-lash

In retrospect, criticism of the progressive movement was inevitable. Many of the difficulties encountered in implementing change have already been mentioned and discussed. What is interesting at this point is to examine the vehicle of that criticism and to assess its effect.

The major vehicle of criticism of the progressive movement was a collection of articles known as the 'Black Papers'.

Becher, Braut and Knight described the 'papers' as follows. 'It is true that the first of these (Black Papers - Cox and Dyson 1969) was concerned in the main with university rather than with school standard, but two of the articles (Pedley 1969 and Johnson 1969) in that first issue were levelled at the heart of the maintained schools. Pedley, choosing to attack the comprehensive system (system which was at that time so new that it had barely seen the light of day), declared categorically 'The move towards the nationwide provision of comprehensive schools, was part of a sinister attack on excellence'.....

Johnson's article disclosed (without the writer feeling a need to quote the source of his evidence, beyond 'some of my friends in junior school tell me ') that marking and correcting work in the junior school was a thing of the past. He later made implicit connections between his carefully constructed picture of the primary school as a miserable collection of uncivilized adults and children aimlessly wandering around 'following their own inclinations', and his assertion that 'never before have there been so many people mentally disturbed'. Not only were the primary schools failing to teach the three R's they were actually engaged in something far more alarming; producing a generation of people seriously deranged'.

The first Black Paper was followed by four others. Presented in an authoritative manner they wielded considerable influence and hammered their message home with unremitting insistence. The general message that filtered through to the wider public was that the schools, like everything else in an enfeebled nation, were falling apart'. (1)

Of course there were real problems in introducing and developing forms of child-centred education within primary schools. This study has examined the numerous difficulties

facing headteachers and teachers at that time. There were also well thought out intellectual and academic arguments offered. For example, Peters, argued that the Plowden report was not satisfactory from a theoretical point of view. Peters claimed that the very proper reaction against some aspects of the elementary tradition had resulted in a one sided and misleading set of beliefs in the Plowden Report. He criticised a number of the unexamined concepts and assumptions in the Report, including 'development'; he suggested that 'development', in the educational sense would include scientific, mathematical, moral, historical, inter-personal, aesthetic and religious forms of awareness. (2) Surely, this level of debate is superior to that found in the Black Papers, but returning to the point being made earlier, the lack of structure which would permit meaningful dialogue between all the actors in education, permitted the 'Black Papers' to lead a strong counter-attack on progressive education. The fact that the language used was emotive and the ideas muddled is on one level irrelevant. What is relevant is that they articulated feelings of uneasy and perhaps even anomie and frustration in not being able to control the situation. The lack of structure for dialogue meant they had to mobilize their pressure group upon almost military lines and 'attack' the ultimate source of power - the politicians.

Gordon and Lawton describe it thus

"By the late 1960's a conservative counter-attack took shape in the very interesting form of the Black Papers. The first of these, Fight for Education (1969) although not a Conservative Party publication, was frankly political in its intention: a copy was sent to every M.P., and the editors urged all readers to write to their own M.P.'s as a means of exerting pressure. The first article in the collection was by a Conservative M.P., Angus Maud, on 'The Egalitarian Threat'..... The second Black Paper 'The Crisis in Education (1969) contained an even longer introductory letter to M.P.'s The third Black Paper was published in November 1970 after Mrs. Thatcher had withdrawn Circular 10/65; this paper was called 'Goodbye Mr. Short' and gave the impression of being on the winning side at last. The Black Papers are interesting social documents,

representing a strong body of opinion inside the teaching profession as well as the general public, (page 74.) (3)

The Black Papers did not by themselves create the circumstances for a major re-definition. Nevertheless, as Hyndman puts it "there seems to be little doubt that the report (Flowden) itself and the reaction to it, finally dissipated the mist of laissez-faire acquiescence which had for some time enveloped primary education".(4)

Perhaps one can claim that the early 'seventies' was a period of 'society' stirring, watching and waiting. The education field appeared to be incapable of putting forward a coherent argument, so it was left to the 'voice' of society to act or perhaps more accurately react to events. Those events soon came. Three events were probably most influential in bringing about re-definition. They were 1972 N.F.E.R. report 'The Trend of Reading Standards, the William Tyndale affair and the findings of Neville Bennett.

In 1972 an N.F.E.R. report, 'The Trend of Reading Standards' led Mrs. Thatcher to set up a committee of enquiry under the guidance of Sir Alan Bullock into 'all aspects of teaching the use of English. ' This was an important development for several reasons.

Firstly, any indication that reading standards had declined could be claimed as 'proof positive' that progressive education was as 'dangerous' as the Black Papers warned. In truth the Bullock Report - A Language for Life, H.M.S.O., spends many pages discussing the accuracy of the various tests. Prominent researchers were asked to comment directly on standards from a study of the statistical evidence. One said "There is no convincing evidence that there has been a reduction in standards", another claimed "The most that can probably be said about the movement of reading standards in the last third of a century is that there was a considerable downward movement during the war followed by an upward movement in the 20 years after the war which may have levelled out in the last few years." A third research said "Though the N.F.E.R. Report showed that the improvement in reading standards appears to have ceased, the improved standard of 1960 has been maintained. Nevertheless, more and more children are leaving infant school unable to read,

and fewer teachers in junior schools seem to be equipped to teach the basic reading skills". see (2.10) page 15.

This apparent divergence of opinion was accepted by the committee, who also added that they felt "In both the English and Welsh surveys the sampling was inadequate in a number of ways" (2.17) page 18. Having considered varying difficulties they then stated "We have said enough about the limitations of the results derived from the national surveys, and we must add that it is not the fault of the authors that many people have ignored their reservations" (2.19) page 19. That is a most interesting remark for it holds within it a basic truth. In the introductory paragraph of Chapter 2 'Standards of Reading' the report said, "Many people who wrote to us took as their starting point the belief that standards of literacy had fallen." (5)

The point to be made is that 'pressure groups' could and did act on the political hierarchy by using polemic, generalized and often muddled arguments, backed up by far from satisfactory research data and the education sector had neither the will or the means to offer any stern resistance. This situation was of direct relevance to the primary school head-teacher for the era of laissez faire was quickly coming to an end and individual headteachers seemed powerless to contribute to any redefinition.

The Bullock Report was also important in a way touched upon during the discussion regarding the School Council, namely, the report was aggressive, dynamic and prescriptive. In the 333 conclusions and recommendations the word 'should' appears again and again. The report demanded strategies and structures for action from every sector of education. In-service training, specialization and management figure highly throughout the committee's findings. Whether or not all the conclusions and recommendations were put into action will be returned to, but at this point the most relevant argument to offer is that the report was a radical body of knowledge - not just an educational philosophy, but also an organisational philosophy. Its historical setting is no accident. It can be seen as a clear attempt to kill off the laissez-faire tradition.

Following the Black Papers, the 1972 N.F.E.R. survey and the Bullock Report, the need to know whether progressive education was superior or inferior to traditional methods became critically important. Neville Bennett (6) provided for some, what simple reading surveys could not convey, an apparently thorough investigation into the whole perspective. Neville Bennett constructed a study of 37 primary teachers and their 950 pupils. The children were tested on a wide range of attainment and personality tests in September 1973 and again to assess their progress in June 1974. Bennett claimed that the ensuing results were not only 'very similar' to those obtained by the most recent American research, but also that they were 'in line' with what all the teachers had expected. (see Page 152-154). Bennett claimed 'The results form a coherent pattern. The effect of teaching style is statistically and educationally significant in all attainment areas tested. In reading, pupils of formal and mixed teachers progress more than those of informal teachers, the difference being equivalent to some three to five months difference in performance. In mathematics formal pupils are superior to both mixed and informal pupils, the difference in progress being some four to five months. In English formal pupils again out-perform both mixed and informal pupils, the discrepancy in progress between formal and informal being approximately three to five months' - page 152.

Richmond (7) neatly puts it when he says 'The biased, not to say sensational reporting of Dr. Bennetts findings from his teams reasearch into the effects of different teaching styles - findings which were relatively innocuous in themselves but quickly seized upon by the anti-progressive lobby on the principle that any stick is good enough to beat a dog with - illustrate the complex forces at work'.

On a pressure group/macro political level, generalizations appear to be acceptable. The laissez-faire system could not respond.

The education industry did not have either the will or the vehicle to argue any counterpoint.

Once more, pity the poor primary headteacher - pressured into accepting what was for many a complex and confusing progressive philosophy during the sixties, they were asked to reject that

philosophy in the seventies.

However, nothing could have preempted the 'shock' of the William Tyndale affair. Politicians and their re-definitions were apparently accepted fatalistically by the teaching profession. Reports and pressure groups surely came and went. Researchers, if read at all, always qualified their findings, but these factors pale into insignificance compared with the 'horror' of the William Tyndale Affair. For headteachers, this was no abstract intellectual dispute, it was the shadow at the door.

Dale and Dalton considered the importance of the William Tyndale case. They claim 'it has enormous implications for the analysis and practice of schooling in our society that the press reaction to Tyndale created a climate which enabled a number of previously politically unutterable views on education not only to be uttered, but also seriously to influence educational policy. Certainly, there are very few articles treating the need for closer supervision of teaching standards and curriculum in any section of the media that do not quote William Tyndale as the clearest example of the danger of the absence of such supervision. At an even more specific level the number of primary inspectors in Inner London has doubled, and the curriculum of primary schools has been much more systematically monitored since the Tyndale case'. (8)

The last sentence is particularly interesting in view of the fact that this booklet was written in 1977 and it is obvious that since that time even greater steps have been taken to ensure a closer supervision.

Dale and Dalton broke down the complex notion of control into three overlapping sections:

(a) Managerial v Political control

They claim many essentially political decisions in education become reduced to administrative decisions. Operations are carried out 'according to the book'. At one level this is 'what happened' to William Tyndale. The existing machinery for the control of schooling was found wanting - none of the parties could effectively achieve what they wanted through it.

(b) Community v Bureaucratic Control

It is the problem of whether effective control of the schools should be in the community which they immediately serve or in the wider community which funds, staffs and equips them. Ideally, there should be no conflict between these bodies, of course, but the Tyndale case indicates a number of ways in which their relationship is challenged. For example, how is the school's local community to be represented? Advocates of 'Parent Power' in schools frequently appear to presume that 'parents' are a homogenous body. The area around William Tyndale school reflects the diverse nature of the school's population. Further more, the majority of the managers were from one segment - the middle class, 'trendy left' segment. In addition to this the L.B.A. is a huge authority with over 900 primary schools and the layers of authority involved in the structure undoubtedly enhanced parents' feelings of distance from the real source of control over children's school.

(c) Professional v Lay Control

One of the points of dispute between the teachers and the managers was the question of the extent of the right which teachers' professional qualifications gave them to decide the pattern of children's education. The Tyndale teachers used the professional expertise argument against the managers, but did not accept its validity when it took the form of advice to them from highly qualified inspectors.

Dale and Dalton considered the issue of control important-ance and it certainly has relevance to this study. However, they went on to consider the content of schooling, the curriculum and pedagogy.

Their ideas fell into three parts:

(a) Progressive education

What has become the popular explanation of William Tyndale holds that it is really about the value of progressive education. the case has been used to demonstrate the perils and weaknesses of progressive education. But yet again, such a view dangerously simplifies the case. In the first place, the issue was not originally or basically about progressive education at all, but rather about the control of schooling. In the second place, the teachers who have been dubbed 'progressive', entirely reject that label and thirdly, Mrs. Walker, the teacher most commonly regarded as a traditional rather than a progressive

would probably be the most likely of all those at the school to claim that she was a progressive teacher.

(b) Assumptions about curriculum and pedagogy

The most important implication of the William Tyndale case is its revelation of the assumption about what can be taught and how it can be taught in schools. The traditional assumption is that these matters are the preserve of the headmaster in English schools, with religious education the only compulsory element of the curriculum. What happened at William Tyndale has exposed the unreality of that assumption.

(c) Efficiency and standards

It is impossible entirely to separate the issue of efficiency and standards of teaching from what is taught. It is important to bear this in mind, for a number of those involved in the Tyndale affair contended that it was not what was taught in the school that was at issue, but its efficiency - the managers' reiterated frequently, for instance that the managers were not opposed to the teachers' educational philosophy, but to the classes as they saw them in school and the outcomes in terms of pupils' performance and attitudes.

Dale and Dalton claim 'Tyndale was not the cause of increasing emphasis on efficiency and standards so much as its occasion. There were already distinct 'rumblings' which Tyndale made possible to express. That is true of so much that we can learn from this sad case'.(9)

Written in 1977, their ideas provoke reaction. Firstly, from an early stage arguments have been offered that organised, structured communication is a critical notion. However, Dale and Dalton offer a subtle warning in that they argue that a rigid set of rules or procedures possibly hold defects and dangers. Therefore, one is drawn towards some form of structure that allows flexibility and this notion will be pursued. Dale and Dalton offer caution with regard to 'parent power' - an extremely topic subject.

They cleverly foresaw the whole question of accountability. Most importantly, they cast great doubt upon the idea that the headteacher was capable of controlling the curriculum.

The scene was set, the Great Debate could begin.

- (1) BECHER, BRAUT & KNIGHT (1981) Policies for Educational accountability. London: Heinemann. P.3.
- (2) PETERS, R.S. (1969) Perspectives on Plowden. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- (3) Gordon P. & LAWSON, D. (1978) Curriculum Change in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Century. London: Hodder and
- (4) HYNDMAN, M. (1978) Schools and Schooling in England and Wales. London: Harper & Row.
- (5) BULLOCK REPORT (1975) A Language for Life. London:HMSO.
- (6) BENNETT, N. (1976) Teaching Styles and Pupil Progress. London:Open Books Ltd.
- (7) RICHMOND, W.K. (1978) Education in Britain since 1944. London: Methuen & Co.
- (8) DALE & DALTON (1977) Schooling & Society Media Booklet No.2. Milton Keynes: open University Press.
- (9) DALE & DALTON Ibid.

C H A P T E R 4

Accountability

- i) Governing bodies
- ii) Parent Power
- iii) L.E.A. Accountability
- iv) Teacher appraisal

Education in Schools - a consultative document, 1977 (HMSO) (1)

This document, known as the "Green Paper", emanated from the DES as the culmination of the so-called "Great Debate", initiated by the Prime Minister, Mr James Callaghan in a speech at Ruskin College Oxford in October 1976.

The burden of the speech was the need to reopen public discussion of educational issues which had become 'professionalised.' Mr Callaghan voiced public anxiety on standards and priorities, whilst expressly rejecting criticism put forward by radical conservative critics in the series of publications known as the Black Papers (1969-1977). He implied that professionals had tried to keep control of the curriculum to themselves, resisting attempts to get them to explain themselves and their actions to their pay masters and clients.

This major speech was, in its turn, based on a confidential memorandum from the DES, leaked to the press on the eve of the Ruskin speech. This concluded by arguing that the DES should be allowed to give a firmer lead and that the Inspectorate should have "a leading role to play" in bringing forward ideas of curricula matters.

After the PM had spoken, the Secretary of State embarked on an elaborate programme of public and private discussions. These meetings were used as the basis for a series of papers put forward by the department.

J.S. Maclure, (2) claimed "Having orchestrated the debate and largely shaping the discussions, it fell to the DES also to sum it up and outline future intentions. This was the purpose of the title Green Paper. It covered inter alia curriculum standards and assessment, teachers (foreshadowing stronger managerial control) and school and working life."

When the Labour government initiated the 'Great Debate' in 1976 it was obvious that an attempt would be made to gain greater control of the schooling system. What was not clear was the nature of the methodology employed to make change happen. * Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (3) claim that "The formal, legal approach, had, in the case of the rebellious Tameside local authority, generated a great deal of political criticism for the Labour Party. By forcing or attempting to force Tameside to adopt a comprehensive policy

during the summer of 1976, the government had avoided a political argument over comprehensivization per se by using a recourse to law as the sole level of struggle. However, recalcitrant local authorities were still able to buy time..... thereby protracting the issue and giving renewed weight to criticism of the government as authoritarian."

The political dangers of further direct legislative action must have been apparent to the Callaghan government, because the format decided upon by the Labour government was "to be an exercise in persuasion and the construction of consent. The required object, an increased centralization of control over the actual processes of schooling would be sought through a political campaign rather than through administrative dictates." (4)

Rather than a frontal attack upon the professional autonomy of teachers, the D.E.S. proposed the extension of the work undertaken by the Assessment of Performance Unit and an examination of the make up and work of the School Council (then heavily dominated by teacher representatives).

As for the "Great Debate" itself it had a strong 'economic' aspect to it. Britain was suffering economic difficulties following the 'Oil Crisis' of 1974; it was clear educational expansion had come to an end. The argument of 'value for money' seemed reasonable and could, using superficial logic, be simply linked with the need for greater 'accountability' within schools.

To this must be added that the unions, prior to Callaghan's speech, were making strong and critical sounds. There is little doubt that they were ready to fight for the status quo.

The political decision to pursue a line of apparently reasonable and rational debate through legitimate channels such as authoritative reports and the H.M.I.'s forms the basis of the 'era of intervention' that has continued until the summer of 1985

Legislation has certainly played its part but it has been the relentless flow of persuasive documents that has been the major feature of this era and, of course, this mass of documentation has been chiefly directed at the head teacher.

In view of the degree of 'intervention' and debate from so many sources since the mid-seventies, it would not seem appropriate to strictly list 'events' in chronological order, but rather group

developments, so some patterns and reasoned thoughts can emerge.

To this end, this section of the investigation will concentrate on two interrelated but distinct 'control' concepts -

- (i) control through greater accountability
- (ii) control through greater curriculum consistency

In this chapter control through greater accountability will be discussed by considering:

- (i) Governing bodies
- (ii) Parent power
- (iii) L.E.A. accountability
- (iv) Teacher appraisal

i) Governing Bodies

Following William Tyndale and Callaghan's 'Great Debate' it seemed obvious that measures would be introduced with regard to the control of schools. Reform of some nature was long overdue. Baron and Howell, (5) writing as 'late' as 1974 clearly show the narrow power base of primary schools. "It has been rare for local education authorities to develop systems of primary school management that take into account the individuality of their schools. There are far more primary schools, their needs appear more uniform and their internal structure is more simple than secondary schools. To provide them all with their own managing bodies, it is claimed, makes far too heavy demands on administration and clerical staff and presents insuperable problems in finding suitable people prepared to serve on them. Except in more rural areas, therefore, the general rule is for primary schools in a given area to be grouped together, in some cases this means all primary schools in the authority..... The utility of managing bodies is not rated highly by the chief education officers of urban authorities, particularly in those where there is some system of visiting schools by individual education committee members. This was generally considered to have many advantages, as that it enabled councillors to get to know the schools and to deal with local enquiries and complaints."

Within a few short years of the above being written, the Taylor Report was issued and moving into the 1980's, the Conservative government issued an Education Act totally overhauling the governing body procedures.

Nevertheless, the attitudes of teachers and administrators cannot be changed overnight. Whilst educationalists, pressure groups and politicians have laid down 'philosophies' and law, the realities of the situation can be different.

W. Bacon (6) claims "The historical weakness of the governing bodies matched with the growth of the grammar schools and local authority schools service tended to subsume many of the important functions which once gave local people the opportunity to participate in the management of their own local school. The local educational service gradually took over all of the tasks which had once been performed by lay managers and at the same time built up large specialised teams of professional workers. In general the

administrators who controlled the new developing school systems remained unsympathetic to school governors. This was because they worried that influential and independent school heads might not only challenge their own position but might also hinder their attempts to create a uniform, efficiently administered local educational service."

Howell claims, (7) "Sceptics doubted whether there was any real justification for schemes of government which could be expensive, time consuming, irritating and essentially fruitless. There was a sense in which the governors were a fifth wheel on the coach. They were essentially reactive bodies (and quite often reactionary) in relation to initiatives which were taken on behalf of the school either by the head or the L.E.A. Their direct influence on the L.E.A. was hard to identify, and schools anyway had their own well-developed channels of communication with the authority. They could not be regarded as significant partners in the local educational system."

Given the apparent difficulties facing 'governing bodies' it is not surprising that legislative measures were taken to remedy such a woeful situation. However, it is not possible to assess whether or not the remedial overhaul of these 'organs of control' have been successful for a most interesting reason namely, in many schools throughout the country the reformed governing bodies have yet to meet. (September 1985) Some authorities reorganised their governing bodies voluntarily, but many more have waited for the slow grind of legislation. The point has to be made clear that although the Taylor Report met in 1977 it has taken eight years for reform to be bureaucratized. Presumably, it will take several more years for the system to settle down, but whether or not these new bodies will make any impact is open to speculation.

Two points seem worthy of further consideration.

Firstly, the 'authors' quoted in this chapter consistently argue that the L.E.A. administrators have not encouraged an imaginative and politically successful governing body system. Will the reforms alter this situation? Probably not, because the main thrust of the reforms are aimed at the relationships between the governors and the school and NOT the relationship between the governors and the L.E.A.

Secondly, because the main thrust is to make schools more

accountable to their governors, there would seem to be greater 'pressure' placed upon headteachers to justify their own and their staff's action. Nevertheless, this is not such a straight forward situation as one might first understand.

Schools may respond in ways different from the apparently simple notion of being more accountable to governors..

It is possible to imagine that headteachers can use the governing body's 'right' to oversee curriculum to coerce teachers into falling in with a school curriculum policy. The justification being Weber's notion of 'rational' authority. The confused authority relationships found between many headteachers and their staff could be effectively by-passed by the headteacher using the governors to legitimate the curriculum.

On a totally different track, it is possible to imagine headteachers continuing to dominate governing bodies, much as is the present situation. Guidelines have been issued to headteachers regarding the format of governor meetings. There are strict procedures to be followed regarding the composition of bodies and the structure of meetings. However, the 'heart' of the meeting remains unchanged, namely, the 'Headteachers Report.' It is what is said or not said by the headteacher that will continue to be the core of the meeting. No doubt some governors, particularly following training, will be adept at searching questions and critical understanding. Nevertheless, the opportunity still strongly exists for the headteacher to control events through skilful communication.

No matter what scenario can be imagined or foreseen, one matter seems clear and that is that head teachers will need to develop skills and strategies for interacting with their governors.

ii) Parent Power

The Education Act 1980 has re-written the parents' charter as far as maintained school education is concerned. Underlying this is the intention of Parliament to encourage parental involvement in the education of children and, therefore, with the schools themselves.

Sections 6-9 of this act contain the provisions which deal with parental preferences, appeals against admission decisions and the publication of information about schools and admission arrangements.

With specific regard to the above mentioned sections, at least two areas directly affect headteachers.

Firstly, parental preference has ended the 'catchment area' form of admission. The neighbourhood school notion was a relatively sound system for the school. The onus was firmly placed on the parent to do battle with a formidable bureaucratic structure if their preferences lay elsewhere. However, the 1980 Act turns this system on its head, for now it is the parents not the schools who have the bureaucratic edge. Falling rolls have left many empty seats in schools, so market forces can be added to the legal right to choose. Obviously, geographical location still has a part to play, but nevertheless many schools have had to think long and hard about its image, content and relationship with parents. Added to this must be the possible stress of the 'admission appeal procedure' where parents may damage a school's reputation by appealing against admission decisions on grounds which involve criticism of the school or invidious comparisons between one school and another.

The second major aspect stems from the Education (Schools Information) Regulation 1981 with particular reference to the information relating to individual schools. A fifteen point schedule was issued outlining what information had to be made available at the school for distribution to parents on request and that the information in relation to each school year should be published in advance of that year. Many of the points on the schedule could be described as valuable administrative information. However, certain points have had a profound affect on primary schools:

Section 10 'Discipline arrangements including in particular the practice of the school as respects corporal punishment and the arrangements for bringing school rules to the attention of pupils and parents'.

It seems fair to claim that primary schools have adopted a 'casual' attitude to discipline, loosely based upon the legal position of the 'reasonable parent' approach - (loco parentis).

Many primary schools have used the 'cane' as the final solution, relying instead on a great variety of verbal and physical forms of punishments which depended upon the reaction of the individual teacher to the individual situation. However, having to formulate a policy statement regarding discipline creates positive and negative possibilities. Positive in that it affords the opportunity for a school to sit down and work out a coherent discipline policy. Negative in that if the statement is too detailed and teachers do not follow the statement properly, they risk courting disaster, especially as parents and the 'authority' will be well aware of the framework for discipline.

Section 4. "Particulars of the school curriculum including in particular

- a. of the curricula for different age groups
- b. of subject choices, if any, available
- c. of the manner and context in which education respects sexual matters is given".

The publishing of the school curriculum is a profound step in that it assumes certain things:

- a. it assumes the school has actually got a school curriculum.
- b. it assumes that the curriculum statement is actually being put into action. This is not necessarily the reality of the situation. There are schools where the teachers follow their own line irrespective of any policy statement.

Publishing a curriculum policy statement is a double edged sword. On one side it gives the head and his staff the opportunity to review, possibly annually, the curriculum. However, on the other side there is the possibility that 'parties' reading the policy could demand to see tangible evidence of its existence in actuality.

In particular parents will have the channel of the governing body now that parent governors are mandatory.

Turning from structural to philosophical changes affecting parent/school relationships, there seems little doubt there has been a great increase in differing forms of liaison in the recent past. These

activities include Parent/Teacher Associations, social activities, fund raising activities, drama, music, sports, open days, curriculum explanation meetings, displays and parent helpers involved in every part of the curriculum.

The reasons for this greater contact may be partially found in the need of schools to 'market' their product better. However, there are probably deeper, more profound explanations. Looking into the past many schools presented themselves as an institution totally separate from the home. This attitude was probably based upon the public school tradition, the welfare state inventionist approach and the stand taken by teachers of professional expertise. There are still signs rusting on school gates and doors declaring 'No parent passed this point.' Undoubtedly parts of the teaching force still resist parental involvement. Nevertheless, growing parental involvement is fact of life.

It has probably occurred because of a fundamental change of perspective. Instead of schools being perceived as an isolated institution, many educationalists now see schools as only part of an inter-related system. Perhaps the discipline of 'Sociology of Education' contributed to a growing interest in a holistic philosophy. Certainly, agencies tackling serious urban problems have continually emphasised the need for co-operation. On a different level, the professional confidence, status and independence of teachers has surely been damaged by the events of the past two decades. A philosophical stance of partnership is now generally perceived as natural and of value.

However, generalisations regarding education are dangerous. The degree of school/parent cooperation varies from school to school and depends upon many factors. Circumstances, parent demands and teacher attitudes affect the outcome. It is the headteacher who must orchestrate a complex set of variables.

iii) L.E.A. Accountability

Structural changes to improve control over schools by governors, parents (and other parties) were complemented by central government making greater demands on L.E.A.'s to oversee curriculum in their schools.

Following the publication of the D.E.S. document 'The School Curriculum' in March 1981, the D.E.S. published a circular (6/81) setting out the action which the Secretary of State considered should be taken in the light of the said document. In the circular the Secretary of State indicates that he considers that:

"Each local authority should, in the light of what is said in the 'School Curriculum':

- (a) review its policy for the school curriculum in its area and its arrangements for making that policy known to all concerned.
- (b) review the extent to which current provision in the schools is consistent with that policy; and
- (c) plan future developments accordingly, within the resources available.

In taking these actions, local education authorities should consult governors of schools, teachers and others concerned." (8)

This is a fascinating document for several reasons:

Firstly, a 'review of policy regarding school curriculum' assumes one existed in the first place. How many authorities actually possessed a coherent, defined policy regarding curriculum? How many local authorities regularly reviewed this policy? How many local authorities assessed the extent to which current provision in schools was consistent with that policy?

In 1979, 'Local Authority Arrangements for the School Curriculum' - a report on the Circular 14/77 review was issued. Here the D.E.S. summarized local authorities responses as showing 'substantial variation within the education system in England and Wales in policies towards the 'curriculum' and pointed out the need to 'See what conclusions can be drawn that will lead to a more coherent approach to curriculum matters across the country' (p2) Under the heading 'The next steps' the report continued 'The summary of responses to Circular 14/77 suggest not all authorities have a clear view of the desirable structure of the school curriculum, especially

its core elements. The Secretaries of State believe that they should give a lead in the process of reaching a national concensus on a desirable framework for the curriculum.' (9)

Because the L.E.A. is the headteacher's immediate employer it seems obvious that the L.E.A.'s response to central government's directives and objectives could affect the way in which headteachers run their schools. This study has spent sometime detailing the considerable changes that have occurred in central government thinking since the mid seventies. They have employed differing strategies to gain their ends - legislation, authoritative reports, financial measures and policy statements. However, the critical question remains unanswered at this time - will L.E.A.'s efficiently and whole heartedly endorse and follow through on central government wishes? There are arguments to suggest that this has not and will not happen. It would be mean spirited to argue that a major obstacle to change would be that administrators do not actively seek or adopt changes because such changes interfere with the administration systems they have running smoothly and efficiently. Nevertheless, that suspicion remains. A more 'concrete' argument concerns resources. The changes demanded by central government and H.M.I. service hold serious resource implications in terms of time, money and manpower. It is unfortunate, to say the least, that growing calls for radical changes have been made during a decade of severe financial difficulty. L.E.A. administrators have political masters and depending upon their political colouring, councillors will respond to calls for action in differing ways.

Perhaps the most potent argument is philosophical. All educational administrators and advisers were at one time teachers and as such worked within the laissez-faire system. One of the most intriguing aspects of English education is the maintenance of the laissez-faire system. As suggested earlier, it can be argued that one of the fundamental advantages of the system is that it can absorb widely differing groups. Conflict is also largely absorbed by each group remaining within its own sphere of influence. Thus, progressive groups and conservative groups can co-exist so long as there is little or no interventionist activity.

The advantages of a liberal philosophy are real and deep rooted. Central government is attempting to destroy this system. The fact that many of their proposals hold merit is lost in the wider context. The LEA defence of a liberal ideal, which also happens to suit many parties, may well end or negate many of central government's initiatives.

A further possible barrier to change is the uncertain relationship between the administrative arm and the advisory arm of the LEA service. Firm conclusions are hindered by a lack of information, but it can be claimed with confidence that some LEA have no formal bureaucratic links between the two services. This tends to follow the laissez-faire state of affairs and would also seem to be a barrier to change, simply because the sheer range and complexity of the demands of central government beg a holistic and integrated perspective.

Interestingly, the N.F.E.R. announced in their Autumn 1985 Educational Research News pamphlet (10) that they have started a new project to study the roles, management and practices of L.E.A. advisory services throughout England and Wales. The pamphlet argues that advisors have to meet widely varying types of demand and that the question of how their limited resources can most effectively be deployed is one of critical importance.

They go on to claim 'So far, the work of L.E.A. advisory services has attracted relatively little study. L.E.A. wishing to review or develop their services cannot turn to any source of information which will tell them how other authorities manage their advisers nor is there any systematically collected body of information which indicates the nature and range of the tasks advisers carry out or what their role is in relation to other parts of the education provision within localities'.

Conclusions based on one or two ideas and general impressions have to be treated with caution and this chapter is not helped by the lack of investigative feedback. Nevertheless, the independence of schools and subsequent huge variations found

therein is apparently mirrored in the 100+ local education authorities. There is also the suggestion that administrators naturally seek simple solutions to ensure the smooth running of their bureaucracies.

It is central government that has fundamentally altered their view of their responsibilities, but it is the L.E.A. who have the main responsibility to ensure the implementation of national policy. Headteachers cannot gain confidence from this mismatch between central and local government. Added to this, government is not just using local government as the sole vehicle for the dissemination of its ideas. Headteachers are being 'reached' by other agencies - H.M.I.'s, numerous in-service institutions and the unions. They have to assess and act upon a mass of claims and debate.

Almost certainly, the laissez-faire system and poor lines of communication will add to individual headteacher's confusion and uncertainty during this radical period of re-definition.

iv) Teacher Appraisal

In earlier parts of this study there was an attempt to draw out some of the confusions and difficulties facing primary headteachers since the introduction of laissez-faire traditions in the 1920's and the growing acceptance of teachers' professional autonomy. Both these concepts run counter in spirit to notions of teacher assessment and evaluation and also directing teacher work patterns. Perhaps these matters are of less significance if there is a broad consensus regarding aims, as was apparently the situation during the early 'fifties' with regard to the pedagogy of selection. However, the advance of 'progressive education' created confusions and conflict, bringing into question teacher autonomy and the whole laissez-faire philosophy.

The 'era of intervention' has seen wave upon wave of measures designed to control schooling and teachers, but what of the structure that is expected to put into action these perceived needs?

Gerald Grace describes the situation thus - "the sense of freedom among teachers in state schooling probably reached a high point in the early 1970's viewed historically, the relative

gain in teacher autonomy at this time can hardly be denied. Teachers within state schooling were no longer judged and evaluated by the close, formal and visible mechanisms of the past The process of teacher assessment and evaluation was now mediated through notions of legitimated professionalism and the operation of the process was decentralised to individual schools. In effect the changes of 1926 and the changes in the role of the inspectorate had devolved the process of teacher evaluation upon the headteachers It is true that both H.M.I.'s and the local inspectorate could act from time to time as the formal agents of these processes but the new ideology of advisor work tended to play down these functions. The term by term evaluation of teachers was seen to be the business of the headteacher because, among other reasons, it was the headteacher who had to write the references and testimonials which were in high production as a consequence of the fluid teacher labour market. The problem for headteachers was how to carry out this aspect of their role given the absence of any central policies or guidelines on staff evaluation and given the legacy of hostility among teacher in state schooling to any form of surveillance that might be reminiscent of nineteenth century obnoxious interference.* (11)

At the time of writing (Summer 1985) the teacher unions have side-stepped the issue of 'teacher assessment' claiming a no strings pay rise for this year, with the possibility of discussing changes in the teachers' contract of employment forming part of next year's negotiations. However, there does appear to be the strongest possibility that some form of teacher assessment will arrive in the foreseeable future. There are many pilot schemes and evaluations taking place. The National Association of Headteachers are part of a growing lobby in favour of assessment and central government seems firm in its intention of linking pay and terms of employment.

It is a time for speculation. Many arguments present themselves for and against, but as these arguments unfold the role of the headteachers and their relationships with their staff can be seen to be at the heart of the matter.

In the following pages some of the main debating points are aired:

1. There is the argument that appraisal gives heads greater control of school direction. It provides opportunities for detecting the need for change and managing that change, ensuring continuity and separating out key aims:

It has been consistently argued that the management structure within which headteachers have to operate is vague and unsatisfactory. Appraisal demands communication. Staff meetings have a limited use, whereas one to one dialogue can be far more valuable. Classroom observation is not common, but if accepted can lead to greater understanding as to what actually happens in schools.

2. There is the argument that the person to whom each teacher is responsible needs to be clarified. The professional autonomy of teachers has no legal authority. There is no code of conduct explaining and defining teachers' duties. It is an unsatisfactory situation for teachers and headteacher alike.

3. It can be argued that the lack of appraisal of headteachers and their security, virtually regardless of their level of performance, sets the expectation level of the whole system. Promoted posts are awarded in perpetuity and teachers are not required to gain re-certification. There is a clearly defined procedure for removing all teachers who are deemed unsatisfactory. However, it is a lengthy and painful experience for all concerned. Regular assessment could facilitate a professional attitude towards staff performance. Assessment could permit dialogue in circumstances where teachers are thought to be weak.

4. There is the argument that there is no career development structure or advice for teachers, so some form of appraisal could help. However, a school unit is too small to arrange career development opportunities effectively:

Any development structure within schools has to be an improvement on the present situation. It is true that the school is too small a unit to cope with all aspects of career development opportunities. Nevertheless, it could form part of an heirarchical structure, as is found in commerce and industry.

5. It can be argued that senior teachers' lack of expertise in appraisal techniques could be a great demotivator, could build up resentment and create conflict! This must be accepted. There are serious resource implications in respect of in-service training and time.

6. There is the argument that annual appraisals with no back up; no opportunity to discuss a revised objective; no day to day advice, encouragement and correction will negate the whole point!

This is one of the most profound arguments to emerge from the current debate. Assessment strongly suggests a radical re-think of relationships and working practices within schools.

7. What format should be employed? There are a variety of assessment criterion and methodologies:

- a) assessment of personal traits of teachers.
- b) the pass/fail method of responding to statements with a satisfactory/unsatisfactory decision.
- c) the degree of appraisal - numerous gradings or under appraisals caused by too few gradings.
- d) self appraisal.
- e) performance criterion.
- f) classroom observation.
- g) target setting.

In view of the lack of expertise, will enough time, effort and resources be made available for a decision to be reached and accepted by a wide circle of educationalists? This is a political decision and on past evidence individual headteachers will have little impact on such decisions.

8. What is the objective to be achieved by appraisal?

- 1) a means of allocating salaries.
- 11) punish the poor performer.
- 111) improve staff performance.

This will be a pditical decision probably embodied in legislation. The degree of negotiation and consultation is as unknown as the outcome.

9. There is the argument that the resource implications of any appraisal scheme are huge. A study, reported in the T.E.S. (5.7.85) commissioned from Suffolk L.E.A. by the D.E.S. warns that appraisal will only work if it is properly designed and implemented - potentially at enormous cost to education authorities:

This seems obvious because if headteachers are to be the principal assessor, then it is difficult to understand how they can accomplish this task, given that in most authorities the headteacher is included in pupil/staff ratios. Likewise, given L.E.A. advisors' heavy work load it is difficult to see who is going to assess the headteachers.

Just as obvious, but on a different tack, is the financial complication of remedial support following appraisal. What is the point of appraising if suitable action does not follow?

10. There is the possibility that assessment would impose a single restrictive view of education, encouraging conformity and suppressing initiative:

This argument has merits. This era has seen considerable advances regarding 'accountability' in education and the construction of a national framework for the curriculum. Assessment can clearly be seen as a further instrument of control, which could encourage conformity and suppress initiative. However, the following chapter will examine the notion of 'curriculum consistency' and what will hopefully emerge is that H.M.I. and D.E.S. curriculum documents do not support some narrow, didactic 'core' of knowledge and skills, but are in fact advocates of much that is termed 'progressive' education. This is a most interesting development. Superficially, one could picture the down-trodden and misunderstood progressive teacher being bound to conservative pedagogies. However, other possibilities emerge through assessment - the isolated conservative teacher bristling with professional autonomy could find himself under the spot light.

In conclusion, it can be claimed that the concept of accountability is a direct attempt to destroy the laissez-faire system by disrupting the stable, if introverted, relationships that existed between the various actors. The main pressure appears to fall on headteachers, particularly with respect to governors and parents.

Teacher assessment will also radically alter relationships inside schools and add to headteachers' difficulties.

As these factors unfold it may become obvious that these pressures may not be to the disadvantage of headteachers, because these pressures may lead to a more constructive management model within which headteachers can operate more effectively. The major stumbling block to change appears to be the attitude of L.E.A.'s. If L.E.A.'s still see themselves as part of the laissez-faire system in terms of being a relatively isolated institution with perimeters of perceived interest that are basically reactive rather than proactive, then headteachers seem bound to struggle, for accountability is only one half of the equation found in the 'age of intervention', the other half is the curriculum.

- (1) DES (1977) EDUCATION IN SCHOOLS HMSO
- (2) MACLURE, J.S., (1979) Education Documents. London. Methuen.
- (3) CENTRE FOR CONTEMPORARY CULTURAL STUDIES (1981) Unpopular Education - Schooling and social democracy in England since 1944. London. Hutchinson:page 217.
- (4) CENTRE FOR CONTEMPORARY CULTURAL STUDIES Ibid.
- (5) BARON & HOWELL (1974) The Government and Management of Schools: London: Athloen Press.
- (6) BACON, W., (1978) Public Accountability and the Schooling System: London: Harper & Row.
- (7) HOWEL, D.A., in Simons B. & Taylor W. Education in the Eighties. London: Batsford Academic & Educational Ltd. Page: 194.
- (8) DES (1981) The School Curriculum. HMSO
- (9) DES (1979) Local Authority Arrangements for the School Curriculum. London: HMSO Page 2.
- (10) NFER (1985) Educational Research News. NFER.
- (11) GRACE, R. (1985) Judging Teachers. British Journal of Sociology of Education. Vol.6 No.1.

CHAPTER 5

Curriculum Consistency - A general discussion

Callaghan had rejected the claims of the 'conservative backlash', so a simplistic argument regarding standards would never suffice as a basis for reform.

Because of the complexities of primary curriculum a free-for-all debate would surely have ended in chaos in intellectual terms, quite apart from the administrative difficulties involved. Realistically, three contenders had some claims to be a host vehicle for debate and they were teacher training establishments, the School Council and the H.M.I.

The teacher training establishments can be dismissed quickly given the comments and criticisms found in previous chapters. By the mid seventies they were in full retreat due to falling roles.

For obscure reasons, the government felt the need to change the School Council's framework. In 1978 a new School Council was established at the request of Mrs. Shirley Williams. The new council had a different committee structure and two of the three of its most powerful and influential committees were not teacher controlled. Another example of the 'age of invention.' The government together with the local authorities had a more predominant role in deciding the scope, character, content and cost of particular aspects of curriculum reform.

In 1982 the Conservative Minister for Schools, Dr. Rhodes Boyson introduced proposals to disband the Schools Council and introduce small advisory bodies appointed directly by the Minister, thus leaving the H.M.I. as the obvious winners. Their greatest advantage was their integrity; their legitimacy. What is intriguing is that by choosing the H.M.I. service as the vehicle for debate, the government chose a lobby that had been to the fore of progressive education and as such were direct opponents of the conservative backlash that had done so much to create the major re-definition that is presently occurring. The irony of this situation will be returned to later.

Continuing the main theme of the opening paragraphs, the H.M.I. service may have been perceived as legitimate, but nevertheless a justification for intervening in curriculum content remained to be resolved. That justification was soon supplied by the H.M.I.'s first post 'Green Paper' report.

Commenting on their findings in their 1978 Survey the inspectorate argued "This would seem to suggest that in individual schools either some difficulty is found in covering appropriately the range of work widely regarded by teachers as worthy of inclusion in the curriculum or that individual schools or teachers are making markedly individual decisions about what is to be taught based on their own perceptions and choices or a combination of these. Clearly ways of providing a more consistent coverage for important aspects of the curriculum need to be examined". (1)

What followed can only be assumed to be a carefully orchestrated plan of action, made more surprising by the past record of governmental intervention. When added to the moves towards greater accountability, the H.M.I. and D.E.S. pursuit of curriculum consistency amounts to the most radical educational re-definition this century. Events appear to fall into the following pattern:

1. Find out what is going on.
 - a. 'Primary Education in England' 1978.
 - b. 'Education 5 to 9: an illustrative survey of 80 first schools in England' 1982.
 - c. '9-13 Middle Schools' 1983.
2. Identifying broad educational aims -
 - a. 'Education in Schools' 1977.
 - b. 'A framework for the school curriculum' 1980.
 - c. 'The school curriculum' 1981.
3. Preparing L.E.A. and school policies of common aims -
 - a. 1980 Education Act.
 - b. 'The School Curriculum'
Circular 8/83 D.E.S. 1983.

4. Identifying agreement about objectives -
 - a. The announcement by the Secretary of State in his speech in Sheffield in January, 1984 that he intended to seek broad agreement about objectives.
 - b. A White Paper, 'Better Schools' (Cmnd 9469) in which the first aim states 'The Government will take the lead in promoting national agreement about the purposes and the content of the curriculum'.
 - c. The publication of a series of discussion documents issued by H.M.I. under the general title of 'Curriculum Matters'.
 1. 'English from 5 - 16'.
 2. 'The Curriculum from 5 - 16'.
 3. 'Mathematics from 5 - 16' (Based on Cockcroft Report).
 4. 'Music from 5 - 16'. etc.

(see bibliography for details)

5. D.E.S. policy statements -

Stemming from 'Science Education in Schools' D.E.S. consultative paper (1982) and the H.M.I. paper 'Science in Primary Schools', the D.E.S. issued 'Science 5 - 16 a statement of policy; in March 1985. (2)

The significance of this 'fifth' element of the pattern is great indeed. This is not a consultative or discussion document but a clear call for action. Quoting from paragraph 15 "The task for all concerned is to define policies for the development of science in primary schools and to plan and implement strategies for putting those policies into effect which draw on the experiences of earlier initiatives". paragraph 19 - "In the light of these developments, the Secretaries of State consider that L.E.A.'s should continue to develop and publish not only policies for science education in the primary schools in their areas but also plans for implementing those policies".

"Experience suggests that certain features are crucial if such plans are to succeed:

- a. each school concerned should include the teaching of science among the curricular aims it formally adopts, should develop programmes of work and should monitor its own progress in putting its aims into effect.
- b. the headteacher should be committed to the principle of science education for primary pupils and should be accountable to the governors and to the L.E.A. for the rate at which progress is made.
- c. the school needs to have at its disposal at least one teacher with the capacity, knowledge and insight to make science education a reality.
- d. the objective should be that all class teachers, without exception, should include at least some science in their teaching". paragraph 20

The implications for the laissez-faire system are obvious. The teaching of science could be the first of a series. Policy documents not only demand L.E.A. policies, school policies, transfer to secondary school policies, but also demand that those policies are 'accountable'. By demanding commitment from the headteacher, the creation of specialists and that every teacher should teach science, the D.E.S. is interfering in the internal organisation of schools. By clearly stating skills, processes and content areas they are creating pressure to follow a 'national curriculum'.

In the summer of 1985 the degree of government control over curriculum structure and content reached new heights with the follow up to the D.E.S. policy Document 'Science 5-16'. L.E.A.'s had to put in bids to gain 70% of the cost of running a highly defined course of action:

1. Appointment of Advisory Teachers for a three year period funded through the D.E.S. scheme.
2. The advisory teachers major role is to develop school policy for science and assist staff in matters related to relevant pupil activities, teaching methods and organisation. This school policy is to be directly related to the D.E.S. Policy Statement 'Science 5 - 16' and to a local policy statement relevant to transfer documents at eleven years old.

3. A complex model of in-service work -
 - a. A designated (free) five day residential course for headteachers and/or a teacher who may act as school co-ordinator of science.
 - b. In-school work by Advisory Teachers.
 - c. Occasional meetings in schools or a focal Teachers' Centre where need arises.
 - d. Visits by staff from local Colleges of Education who will be attempting to evaluate the effectiveness of the programme.
 - e. Discussion between headteachers and local authority advisors.

This is a fascinating departure from other strategies for change. The plan appears to be:

1. a discussion document.
2. a policy statement from central government.
3. an in-service course (almost compulsory).
4. advisory support (almost compulsory).
5. group headteachers meetings.
6. production of a school policy, L.E.A. policy, and feeder school policy.
7. assessment by college lecturers.
8. Follow-up in-service.

It takes little imagination to appreciate that making 'inroads' into such sensitive areas as 'accountability' and 'curriculum' consistency' is akin to opening a can of worms. Richards (3) points out - "By claiming there is a need for curriculum consistency one opens the door to many other matters:

teacher autonomy
 headteacher independence
 local responsibility for curriculum
 decision making
 the 'core' curriculum

Finally, the most complete departure from the past - a national framework for the school curriculum".

The word 'irony' deserves a second airing in this chapter. H.M.I.'s had been instrumental in helping to develop INFORMAL NETWORKS during the fifties and sixties with regard to experimental progressive education, but superficial reading of their 1978 surveys and talk of 'core' curriculum would indicate a formal conservative regime. This was not the case: structure - yes, conservative backlash - no. In every post 'Green Paper' report issued by the H.M.I. service two elements seem clear.

Firstly, they have not abandoned progressive tenets. There is a clear resistance to formal, didactic teaching methods and the teaching of isolated units of skills and knowledge. Practical work and use of 'real' situations is continually encouraged.

Secondly, the need for structure and organisation. The need for clearly defined policies, aims and objectives is persistently demanded.

Those hoping for a return to formal teaching can gain no comfort from the H.M.I. On the other hand their pursuit of definition is a direct attack upon those educationalists who follow 'progressive' lines without committing to print and scrutiny the philosophical and intellectual justification for their actions.

The H.M.I. reports have affected headteachers and teachers.

Colin Richards claims "H.M.I. surveys, in particular, have helped to strip primary and middle schools of many myths, both positive and negative. The quickening trend towards enquiry - based approaches detected by Plowden has not materialised on a substantial scale most proposals for curriculum change made in the 1960's and early 1970's were based on assumptions of teaching and learning which were not shared by the majority of teachers " (4)

The resistance to change has been a recurring theme in this study, but perhaps the numerous research findings and reports of the late seventies to the present day are part of the painful process education and hence headteachers have to undergo if radical change is to succeed. One part of this study attempted

to show the difficulties facing headteachers with regard to the 'progressive era'. The self doubts caused by vague educational philosophies and buoyant teacher autonomy stances, must have been considerable.

However, the reports and findings since 1976 could at least go some way to helping headteachers form a more rational picture of education than previously was the case.

A further recurring theme is the poor structural model the headteacher has to work in. However, there is some evidence that headteachers and teachers have attempted to grapple with structural re-organisation. Colin Richards concluded that little advance had been made regarding curriculum development but - "Judging from the evidence, the major distinguishing feature of primary education during the last twenty years has been organisational rather than curricular change - in particular, the remarkable spread of non streaming, the introduction of vertical grouping in a substantial number of infant and junior schools and the resultant changes in internal class organisation including a much larger degree of individualization of work". (5)

If Richards is correct it offers an interesting insight into headteachers and teachers. Explanations can only be guessed at but perhaps the following holds merit:

The professional autonomy of teachers and simple division of labour whereby the headteacher decided on what to teach and teachers decided how to teach it, is a totally inadequate structure for coping with 'progressive perspectives'. Richards is one of many who claim there has been little advance regarding curriculum development and this is almost certainly due in part to the inability of headteachers and teachers to readjust to a new working relationship where such a simple division of responsibility holds no place. However, there has never been any doubt in anyone's mind as to who has responsibility for the internal organisation of the school. The headteacher has therefore, according to Richards, had a major effect in bringing about organisational change. The point seems clear in that structure is important and that clearly defined and accepted spheres of responsibility matter.

The difficulties facing headteachers have not escaped the attention of the H.M.I. The H.M.I. may well have been the major vehicle of dialogue and legitimation of change, but that does not mean they have been central government's puppet. As previously claimed, H.M.I. support much of the progressive movement's philosophy and of equal importance, they are well aware of the problems of implementation within the existing structure.

Norman Thomas, Her Majesty's Chief Inspector stated: "The good showing of music and physical education made us wonder, as we prepared the report (H.M.I. 1979 Primary Education in England H.M.S.O.), about the importance of teachers with curricular responsibilities. Our suspicion that good leadership from such teachers mattered was reinforced when it became clear from the evidence that the level of work generally was much more often well matched to children's abilities where teachers with special responsibilities had a strong influence".

This finding has important implications for the management of primary schools. The primary school curriculum has become more complex during the last thirty years. Children come from a wider range of cultural and language backgrounds than formerly, and there is the prospect that some children who might have been transferred to special schools will remain in ordinary schools.

Mr. Thomas asked "Is it any longer reasonable to expect each teacher to be a master of all that is to be done?"

The development of specialist roles in primary schools requires time and great care so that it does not lead to fragmentation of the work. It cannot occur successfully without careful planning and organisation by the head and staff, and account has to be made of a wide range of factors. It calls for a more subtle and complex development of teachers and children than has been customary in many schools".

Mr. Thomas then goes on to claim that there may well be a case for larger classes, if this afforded the opportunity for specialist teachers to be released from responsibility for a particular class. This would be in addition to the headteacher not having responsibility for a class.

With regard to falling roles and smaller schools, Mr. Thomas thought that the curriculum "Can be managed in small schools only if teachers from a group of schools are allocated that time and are prepared to work together. Even so, geographical conditions may make a consortium of the necessary size difficult, and there are advantages in being able to call upon the services of peripatetic, advisory teachers".

Because of the falling roles, some urban schools are now becoming small and some are likely to close; the report advocates that it might be better, in some circumstances, to combine infant schools and to combine junior schools rather than to combine infant with junior schools and to have too few pupils in each group to form single-age classes. (6)

The comments of Norman Thomas offer an exciting set of proposals. The admission that classroom teachers could not be expected to cope with an extensive curriculum is a most important one. The need for specialist teachers and varying forms of organisation is a major departure from the primary school tradition. Management is vital here and so obviously must be training, but can the 'structure' of education cope?

The D.E.S., at the request of the Induction and In-Service Sub Committee of the Advisory Committee on the Supply and Training of Teachers, issued in November 1978 a booklet entitled

'Making INSET Work'. What it basically said was that the old systems whereby educational institutions offered courses and seminars as they saw fit was inadequate. INSET appreciated the random nature of many courses and thus set out to view the situation from the customer's eye. On page 4 of the booklet they claim "the first step is to identify the various needs which there are in any school INSET needs can usefully be considered at three main levels:

- The needs of individual teachers
- The needs of functional groups within the school
- The need of the school as a whole

The document then goes on to describe a variety of options, both in terms of courses and other approaches, such as exchanges, free time through timetabling, observation, use of teacher centre, courses based on the particular school rather than the more usual outlets.

Having formulated a programme, the document encourages the reader to evaluate any programme.

The document finishes with a most interesting section. Namely, 'Ways and Means'. The document stated that if INSET was to be effective, it would require adequate resources and careful thought to ways of organising the release of teachers. At one end of the scale individuals may be pursuing academic studies which require full or part time release for a term, a year or longer; at the other end of the scale a teacher may require half a day to visit a neighbouring school. Therefore, a flexible approach to the replacement of teachers was needed.

The report argued that needs could not and should not be met in teachers own time and that at any one time, a proportion of the teaching force should be released for INSET. Indeed, there was a national commitment to the figure of 3% release by 1981.

Of course, not all the activities require release. The report suggested school programmes included a variety of activities such as staff seminars, working parties, conferences, courses, school visits and exchanges and that these may be held during lunch hours, after school, in the evenings or on the day before a new term begins; some schools had used occasional closures; block time table and team teaching may release all members of a department for a meeting during school time; one teacher may take a class for a colleague or two classes may be put together for singing or story.

Time would also have to be found for planning and co-ordinating a school's INSET policy. At the most basic level, there is a need for someone to co-ordinate information. Simply

to display course lists on staff notice boards was thought not enough; a member of staff should be asked to take responsibility for collecting, displaying and disseminating information about courses to colleagues in the light of their own known interests and responsibilities. In secondary schools this may be taken on by a deputy head in association with heads of department whilst in the primary school it is most often managed by the head dealing directly with individual teachers.

The final paragraph of the document makes a forceful plea, "INSET is currently at a take off point in this country. If it is to achieve its full potential then every teacher in every school needs to be involved in an on-going discussion about it". (7)

How successful have these H.M.I. and INSET initiatives been ? An article from the Times Educational Supplement dated 2nd November 1984 (fully five years after INSET was launched) comments thus:

"An H.M.I. vision of primary schools staffed by subject experts depends on teachers having free time to prepare lessons and to advise colleagues, plus more in-service training" said Eric Bolton, senior chief H.M.I.

Mr. Bolton stressed that he was fully aware that his ideas about subject 'consultants' in the primary sector has resource implications.

"There is no way that the primary school can 'deliver' on its present average class contact ratios", he said in answer to a questioner. "Non-contact time is needed. Time and INSET are not without cost. We shall go on saying that because it happens to be true".

Mr. Bolton also implied that his plan could bring with it a justification for curriculum-led staffing at the primary level. "Surely there is more to a primary school than eight teachers for eight classes. It's certainly not worked out like that at secondary level". (8)

Undoubtedly many L.E.A.'s have set up INSET committees and re-organised Teachers' Centres, but the simple truth is that in-service training is still basically un-coordinated. Headteachers

receive through the post details of courses from universities, colleges of education, H.M.I. courses, advisor courses, teachers centre courses, 'association' courses (e.g. N.A.R.E.) and union courses. The need for a co-ordinating structure is plain. What is also plain, is that central government must find the funds for any such action. They have reacted to in-service difficulties, but in perhaps what one may claim to be a peculiar way . In-service Teacher Training Grants Circular 4/84 3/83 can be seen as further examples of disquiet regarding in-service provision.

As the reader is aware, education is financed through the 'rates' and through a system of 'block grants' financed by central government, but the disposal of the grant is basically the responsibility of local government. The introduction of In-service Teacher Training Grant scheme in 1983 is an interesting change of procedure. In difficult financial times, perhaps it is regrettable but not surprising that money is scarce for employing temporary teachers whilst permanent staff attended full time in-service courses. What is interesting therefore, is that the D.E.S. should finance such a system directly on the conditions that it would only apply to 'approved' courses. These courses are detailed below:

1. Management Training for heads and other senior teachers.
2. Mathematic Training.
3. Special Educational Needs in Ordinary Schools.
4. Pre-Vocational Education in Schools.
5. Teaching of Science.
 - a. Science co-ordination in the primary school.
 - b. Heads of science dept., in secondary school.(9)

There are at least two points of interest; firstly, although the D.E.S. organise some courses, basically in-service training has been run by local authorities and/or 'further education'. However, in this case, the D.E.S. did not increase the block grant and urge local authorities to use the money for specific courses, rather they introduced a direct grant scheme for 'approved' courses.

It is the degree of control that the D.E.S. thought was necessary that is interesting. Why could not these courses have been organised through more normal channels? Could it be that central government lacks faith in local government/further education carrying out its wishes? In one respect this study is concerned with 'control'. The patterns of control have and are continuing to change and this has direct bearing on the headteacher and his school.

The second point of interest tends to bear out the first point, namely, choice of 'approved' courses. They are all areas of education directly relevant to discussion of the past decade -

Mathematics - Cockcroft Report

Science - H.M.I. Reports

Special Needs - 1981 Education Act

Pre-vocational Education - rising unemployment

Finally, Management Training for headteachers. The need for training is in-escapeable. What is not so obvious is that given numerous 'management' courses, why does the D.E.S. feel it is necessary to depart from normal procedures to ensure this area of training is given high profile status and financial backing? It may well be that this initiative is purely part of the comprehensive package of control measures described earlier in this chapter. If this is so, one can only admire (?) the thoroughness of the strategy. However, one could also criticise central government for 'tinkering' whilst a major overhaul is necessary.

Another example of central government's intention to intervene in curriculum matters, is its continuing support for the A.P.U. which was set up in 1975.

The A.P.U. operates through a co-ordinating group which reviews the general development of its work, a widely-based Consultative Committee which advises on broad outlines of policy, and Working Groups or Steering Groups, each of which is responsible for the monitoring policy in a specific curriculum area.

The first national monitoring tests were being administered

in 1978 in Mathematics, followed by Language in 1979 and Science in 1980. Other areas of monitoring have subsequently been introduced.

The terms of reference of the A.P.U. are 'To promote the development of methods of assessing and monitoring the achievement of children at school and to seek to identify the incidence of under achievement'.

Its four tasks are:

'To identify and appraise existing instruments and methods of assessment which may be relevant for these purposes'.

'To sponsor the creation of new instruments and techniques for assessment, having due regard to statistical and sampling methods'.

'To promote the conduct of assessment in co-operation with local education authorities and teachers'.

'To identify significant differences of achievement related to the circumstances in which children learn, including the incidence of under achievement and to make the finding available to those concerned with resource allocation within the D.E.S., local authorities and schools'. (10)

If the notion of 'the age of invention' is acceptable then surely the A.P.U. must be one of the more 'sharp' examples of control. The inference is obvious - support demands for curriculum consistency with statistical evidence. It is a highly logical argument last used before the 'progressive era' in the form of IQism - the 11+ and selection.

By 1985 its potential, which is great, has not been fulfilled, its destiny is still uncertain. It is an enigma - many teachers cannot understand what it says. However, if the A.P.U.'s original data is hard to digest, then unfortunately educationalists are going to have even greater difficulty in resisting the 'second wave' set of reports from the A.P.U., where the A.P.U. not the teachers, interpret their own data and

claims and conclusions.

It seems fair to claim that central governments radical approach to 'accountability' and curriculum planning has still to be matched in areas such as INSET and the organisation, staffing and management of schools.

Headteachers have, through their control of the internal organisation of their schools, introduced a great variety of devices and structures to free specialists and teachers for INSET. These include team teaching, co-operative teaching, team planning, doubling up classes, using students and parents and, of course, the careful use of the headteachers teaching time.

However, at least three matters need to be explored. They are radical solutions and thus face many difficulties:

1. the present staff/pupil ratios are inhibiting.
2. a more critical co-ordination of INSET - who is going to do it? Who is going to finance the co-ordination?
3. a radical look at teachers' contract of employment. Teachers work from 9.00 a.m. to 3.30 p.m. for 40 weeks per year in one specific school. These bare facts of course hide the truth, but nevertheless by changing these facts one could radically change INSET and working practices generally.

1. Staff/pupil ratios have long been a source of dissatisfaction, particularly as the headteacher is often included in the calculations. However, growing curricular, organisational and INSET needs have led to even great criticism of this ratio system. As a result demands for 'Staffing by needs' are growing. A few L.E.A.'s are now moving towards reform. One L.E.A. intends to introduce such a system in Autumn 1986. The system works on the notion of allocating 'decimal fractions', of teachers for various 'factors'. When all the 'bits' for all the 'factors' are added up the school will be granted a staffing number. The factors include:

Number of pupils
 Reception children
 Special needs children
 Above-average ability children
 Buildings
 Probationary teachers
 Specialists
 INSET
 Administration
 Staff development

This is a most interesting development. Unfortunately, the system must operate within present financial levels. However, in the event of economic upturns the L.E.A. can improve the worth of any 'decimal' factor as they see necessary.

2. The co-ordination of INSET. Quite apart from the resource implications of organising such a co-ordination, the chief difficulty lies within the laissez-faire system because numerous INSET agencies would have to integrate their efforts. There are serious doubts as to whether or not this would happen as any integration inevitably leads to winners and losers.

An alternative strategy would be for individual L.E.A.'s to control the output of their courses by agreeing with head-teachers on some strategy of need.

A further strategy would be to train headteachers or scale posts to produce a rational school policy regarding INSET.

3. Teachers contract of employment. It has been claimed in this study that one of the main tenets of the laissez-faire system is that groups are permitted to protect their own sphere of influence, thus avoiding conflict. Teachers have their concept of professional autonomy and this unwritten notion is supported by the structure of pay negotiations. The fact that the Burnham Committee specifically excludes discussion of changes in terms of employment is important. Many employees bargain conditions for better pay, but not in teaching, for that would destroy the professional autonomy of teachers. Many

would argue that the present form of professional autonomy should be continued but others disagree.

The principle argument seems to be that by changing the terms of employment of teachers profound changes in the way schools are run can be achieved. It is possible to argue that a better trained, better directed and more flexible work force could be achieved through re-negotiation of the contract of employment. Assessment, compulsory training and directed movement from one workplace to another are not uncommon in commerce and industry.

The teachers pay negotiations for 1985 and 1986 has at its heart the struggle between central government and the unions regarding terms of employment. Central government looks set on making fundamental changes.

Curriculum consistency when coupled with 'accountability' adds up to concerted effort to bring about change, but although the laissez-faire system may have died, many of the actors do not appear to want to go to the funeral. Central government have been remarkably radical in altering policy but do they understand the reality of school life? Local Education Authorities are still apparently reactive in nature. They may see themselves in liberal terms, non-inventionalist, thus preserving the individuality of schools, but can this stance be defended given the changes that are still occurring? Teachers are at a low ebb, demoralized and criticised on all fronts and yet still they defend a nebulous and in many ways unsatisfactory professional stance. Headteachers have to make sense of this complex and confusing state of affairs. They have to make their schools work. They have to operate within a management structure that is now defunct. Hopefully this study will move towards some answers, but the following chapter describes factors that only add to the pressure felt by headteachers - problems of the eighties.

A change of emphasis will become apparent during the rest of this study. The shift in perspective concerns a growing concentration on what happens on a day to day basis inside schools. External factors cannot be ignored; nevertheless, the following chapters will become more interested in the realities of school

life and less interested in the world of historical events. The first part of this study has attempted to demystify the historic, romantic image society had of headteachers and of educational management within the laissez-faire system. The second part seeks to understand the headteacher as a manager, and also seeks to investigate the development of an education and management structure within which the headteacher could cope more effectively with so many demands.

- (1) HMI (1978) Primary Education in England HMSO
- (2) DES (1985) Science 5-16 A Statement of Policy HMSO
- (3) RICHARDS, C. (1982) New Directions in Education. London. Falmer Press.
- (4) RICHARDS, C. (1983) Utopia Deferred In Changing Schools, Changing Curriculum. Galton M. & Moon, B. (ed) London. Harper Row.
- (5) RICHARDS, C. I bid P.41.
- (6) THOMAS, N. (1979) In Primary Education Review, a publication of National Union of Teachers No. 6 - Spring Issue 1979.
- (7) DES (1978) Making INSET work, HMSO.
- (8) Time Educational Supplement - 2.11.84. regarding E. Bolton's (Senior Chief HMI) Views on Primary Reorganisation.
- (9) DES (1984) In Service Teacher Training Grant Circular 4/84 HMSO.
- (10) APU (1980) Science Progress Report HMSO

C H A P T E R 6

PROBLEMS OF THE EIGHTIES

The effects of history cannot be swept aside overnight. The present profound re-definition may have many points of merit but the question still to be answered is whether or not the existing system can manage the radical changes already introduced or proposed.

In this chapter three unrelated topics have been chosen to illustrate the difficulties facing headteachers as a direct result of re-definition.

The first topic concerns resource difficulties. Change often leads to resource demands and in this section those demands and difficulties will be looked at from the headteachers' view point.

The second topic illustrates the demands made by society for schools to become more involved in the community and to accept the challenges of being an integral part of society, instead of a claimed historical view of schools as isolated, introverted, specialist institutions. This change of role is illustrated by considering the 'micro' moves towards greater involvement of parents in schools and the 'macro' aspirations of society for this country to live in multicultural harmony, free from racial prejudice.

The third and final topic concerns itself with the practical implications of central government's curriculum initiatives.

In all three topics thought needs to be given to the role of the headteacher within the existing management model.

RESOURCE DIFFICULTIES

Times Educational Supplement - 28.9.84

"Staffordshire is to axe more than 400 teaching jobs next year in a programme of education cuts drawn up to avoid Government penalties for over-spending."

"Opposition councillors in East Sussex claim the authority is being pushed to the bottom of the education league table because of continuing cuts."

" Gloucestershire education committee has been warned that proposed cuts of more than £2.5m could prevent it from achieving minimum standards or meeting its obligations next year.

In a private report to a budget review subcommittee, the chief education officer say the authority could face criticism for the low level of its provision by H.M. Inspectorate. "

" Conservative controlled Somerset county council, which two years ago was criticized by H.M. Inspectorate over its provision of books and class sizes, has announced a £1m cut in its education budget next year. "

Times Educational Supplement - 2.11.84

"An H.M.I. report on Conservative controlled Norfolk is expected to criticize the low spending on books, equipment and school maintenance. "

The quotations from two editions of the Times Educational Supplement have been taken almost at random. They are just a few examples of many publicized over the last few years. There is no doubt that education is in a situation of financial retreat compared with the expansionist days of the late '60s and early '70s.

Resource difficulties have created many problems and difficulties for headteachers and these are summarised below:

1. Pupil-Teacher Ratios

The argument for lower PTR seems strong on educational grounds. However, financial constraint makes the lowering of the PTR unlikely. This simple statement has merit in its own right, but the existing PTR situation is also shrouded in controversy. Any actual improvement or worsening of the PTR may be disguised by any of the following factors:

- whether the headteacher is included or not
- the state of the classroom ancillary provision
- the availability of supply teachers which is a major influence on organisation
- the extent to which mixed age classes are involved.

2. Falling Roles

The H.M.I. survey of 1978 pointed to the most likely serious effect of falling roles - mixed aged classes. As school roles fall, the number of classes may have to be reduced. This could lead to there being more classes of mixed age ranges than previously. There is some evidence that the performance of children in these circumstances can suffer.' (1)

The National Association of Headteachers in their submission to the House of Commons enquiry into Primary Education (1984) claim that although some headteachers do have mixed age classes out of choice, they can only do so in acceptable conditions, a good pupil - teacher ratio, staff enthusiastic and able to teach in this way, sufficient help and time for adequate record keeping.

However, the association found in a recent survey of N.A.H.T. membership that mixed age classes are being forced on schools for economic reasons, in far from favourable conditions and without serious educational implications being addressed.

Many headteachers, opposed to mixed-age classes on educational grounds, are forced to choose between the alternative of large classes or mixed-age classes and then have to justify their choice to parents strongly opposed to both. In some cases the problems associated with a wide spread of ability, maturity and educational needs are exacerbated by the inclusion of children with special educational needs, children from difficult or deprived backgrounds and children from an extensive ethnic mix.(2)

The HMI report on Effect of LEA expenditure Policy 1983, echo earlier HMI misgivings "The quality of work seen in Primary school classes was influenced by the size, mix and age range of teaching groups in those lessons seen where work was judged less than satisfactory a wide age range within the class was commonly considered a major influence". (3)

The damage done by falling roles was carefully detailed in the NAHT submission. A brief resume is offered below:

- i. As the school rolls get smaller, many key teachers with specialisms are lost through redeployment, and at the same time the school loses points which prevents it attracting other specialists.
- ii. Another major problem is that of mis-match. The initial impact of falling roles was felt in infant classes and recruitment of infant teachers was limited. There is now a slight increase in infant number and a corresponding shortage of teachers.
- iii Falling roles have reached the secondary sector and there is concern at the pressure in some areas to redeploy teachers to teach age groups for which they are ill-equipped in terms of training, expertise or motivation. Some secondary trained teachers, for example are being persuaded into the primary sector where most of the vacancies are in infant classes. Such redeployment is inconceivable without extensive in-service training.(4)

The concern over mis-match has been expressed repeatedly by HMI, not least in the publication "The New Teacher in School" (5) and again in the report on LEA expenditure policies: "The resource factors commonly associated with work judged less than satisfactory at the primary level were, in descending order of importance, the mis-match between the qualifications and experience of the teacher and the age group being taught, inadequate or poorly deployed equipment and books, and inappropriate accommodation". (Section 19)

"In Primary schools the problem most commonly identified was one of teachers being required to teach age groups for which they had not initially been trained". (Section 27). (6)

The effects of losing teachers in proportion to falling roles are nearly always harmful. The calculation of pupil-teacher ratios is complex and claims are often made that because pupil roles have generally fallen on a national scale more quickly than the fall in numbers of teachers, then class sizes must have decreased.

In practice, the likely picture is perhaps best shown by one possible scenario which is no more than an example. It demonstrates also just how any flexibility of staff deployment within a school for remedial or supportive work which will include extending the more able, can quickly be lost.

- a. A two form entry school has an intake of 60 children divided 30 to a class with one full time teacher for each.
- b. The following year's intake is only 45.
- c. The authority calculates that .5 of a teacher must be lost.
- d. The solution is that 45 children are still divided into two classes (22 and 23) one taught by a full time teacher and the other by a part time (.5) teacher for half the time and the teacher presently being used for remedial work in the school (.5 of the time) covering the other half of that class.
- e. On paper the PTR has remained the same (1:30) and the class size has gone down from 30 to 23 or 22, but at that cost:
 - the original full time teacher when faced with a cut to part time is likely to have been redeployed or to have sought a job elsewhere;
 - a part time replacement has to be found (this becomes more difficult the more it happens);

- one class would no longer have the "one teacher, one class" contact time which is at the heart of our primary system;
 - remedial education would have been badly effected.
- f. If this situation goes on for a second or third year, it becomes impossible to find any spare teacher time within the school. The next steps are large classes, mixed-age classes and full-time teaching heads with no remedial help at all.
- g. It can be seen therefore, that with a stable or even an improved PTR within one school, conditions which would encourage achievement have seriously deteriorated. It follows that PTR figures across a local authority and particularly for the whole nation, have little bearing on the reality of what is actually happening at a time of falling roles.

It has been known for some time that falling roles are having a damaging effect on the teaching profession which is ageing and in a desperate need of new blood. The opportunities for promotion, extending experience or staff development are also few.

A restructuring of the salary scale calculations is long overdue. Promising teachers are having to wait an average of 13 years before moving from Scale 1 to Scale 2. This must be an important factor in the rapid decline of morale within the profession. A further implication is that the head teachers of tomorrow are not receiving the opportunity to take on necessary responsibilities to fit them for this post.

Throughout this study, the need for increased and pertinent in-service training is called for - a need accepted without reservation by the Secretary of State.

In Primary schools at a time of falling roles, INSET opportunities are seriously reduced and are often non-existent because of the unavailability of replacement staff.

Falling roles can be seen as the source of much unhappiness and frustration for headteachers. Given political and economic factors, the problem is laid solely at the door of the head teacher. The head can 'fiddle' with internal organisation

but plainly the crucial action to be taken by heads is the construction of a comprehensive staff development strategy to encourage morale and flexibility amongst staff. This will be returned to later.

For small schools the situation is even more serious. It is acknowledged by many that the village school is the centre of the village life and the lynch pin of the community and yet the future of many must now be in doubt. Small schools have been closing steadily over the last few decades. However, up to the mid-seventies the sole justification for closure was financial. As a result many schools were saved by strong community lobbying. Since that time financial stress has increased, but of equal significance are the arguments for a wide curriculum and criticisms of mixed age classes. Village schools are on trial. They are now faced with a dual threat to their continuing existence; a threat the headteacher has to combat.

3) Capitation

Some politicians and administrators may claim falling roles has led to an improvement in financial provision when it is quite clear to many head teachers that this kind of simplistic arithmetic lies behind the claims:

School role falls by 25%

Capitation reduced by 20%

This therefore represents an increase of capitation of 5%.

In reality a considerable proportion of the original capitation is still required whatever the roll - particularly as some local authorities add to the items which must be paid for from the capitation and which may include telephone bills, postage, insurance, cleaning materials and television licences.

There is no doubt that primary schools are less and less able to support costly subjects such as creative arts, needlework, pottery or woodwork or to think of enriching the curriculum or extending say science. Indeed, many of the schools are apparently finding it increasingly difficult to provide the books they need, let alone find the money for computer software and maintenance.



4) Resources

The HMI report on LEA expenditure - 1983 (7) states " But the best resource, lavishly supplied, and the most efficient management and organisation cannot redeem the poorest teaching". This would seem to echo the DES and central government position. Many would agree with that statement but the preceding sentence, placed stress on the words "for a short time": "Good teaching, well matched to appropriate resources, can, for a short time, override resource provision and ineffective organisation".

Three further extracts from the same report claim -

- (i) "In some cases the circumstances in which education takes place and the availability of appropriate resources in the right quantity was found to be such as to make worthwhile learning well-nigh impossible" (Paragraph 8).
- (ii) "But good management alone cannot deliver for each pupil and student in an appropriately broad, balanced, practically orientated and differentiated education. There must be good teaching and adequate resources of the right sort equitably distributed throughout the country" (Paragraph 14).
- (iii) "But the evidence indicates that satisfactory or better provision, without waste, is closely associated with satisfactory or better quality work" (Paragraph 59).

Clearly the resource implications of the numerous factors affecting headteachers are of great importance.

The concept of resource covers many areas - capitation, time, training, advice, equipment, manpower and space. All these aspects of resourcing are expensive and very often a satisfactory solution to many of the demands facing headteachers involve more than one resource.

Matching resource implications to all the demands facing headteachers is a depressing exercise that is now attempted below. Nevertheless, the point seems obvious:

- curriculum initiatives
- probationary teachers' initiatives
- special needs implications
- multi ethnic education
- school governors

parental involvement
liaison and continuity
falling rolls - mixed aged classes
falling rolls - PTR
falling rolls - capitation
disruptive pupils
teachers industrial action

The future holds more challenges and hence more resource implications:

appraisal
staff development
further moves toward a curriculum framework

Headteachers have always faced resource difficulties, but the laissez-faire system permitted varying responses - from ignoring curriculum issues, to fudging through, to self help schemes. The present redefinition is restricting headteachers options because of the dynamic nature of the demands.

COMMUNITY DEMANDS

Colin Morgan claims:

'All the research on environmental factors affecting ability suggest that in disadvantaged areas only an ameliorate action upon the whole community can make the most, educationally, of its children. (8)

In the first part of this study increasing parental and community involvement in schools was seen in terms of the need for greater accountability and control. However, Morgan is arguing a different, perhaps more profound point. Here one is moving towards a educational and philosophical stance on interaction between schools and community. Definition of any interaction is difficult. On a continuum line one end would be parents fund raising activities, whereas the other end would be involving schools with the social services agencies. At one end contact is restricted to school prize day whereas the other end of the line sees parents deeply involved in the curriculum as helpers.

At institutional level the major structure is the P.T.A. It is difficult to assess how widespread P.T.A.'s are in this country. The Plowden Committee investigating P.T.A.'s in America, warmly endorsed the high quality of parent-teacher relations seen by them, gave the lie to the myth that American P.T.A.'s take over the running of the school, and strongly recommended the development of parent-teacher relations via P.T.A.'s 'if the gap between some schools and some homes was to be closed to the learning advantage of some children.' (9)

The organisation and encouragement of any P.T.A. is firmly in the hands of the headteacher. However, there is evidence that whereas most parents definitely do want closer contact with the schools in which their children are taught, teachers for their part take an unflattering view of parents. In the survey of Musgrave and Taylor the teachers saw parents as indifferent to the moral and intellectual values forming the primary goal of their teaching. In fact, the priorities rated by the parents were in substantial agreement with the list made by the teachers. (10)

Two points seem clear. Firstly, headteachers need to overcome or combat teacher-resistance. Secondly, if parents rate moral and intellectual priorities so highly, there is no reason why parents cannot involve themselves in these matters in addition to the usual functions such as fund raising and public-relation events. One thinks of curriculum explanation exercises and parental involvement in the

internal organisation of the school; not only non-teaching activities but also in many vaguely defined teaching areas - cooking, stitchery, pottery, listening to reading and demonstrations are not uncommon in some schools. However, one returns to teacher attitudes.

Thanks to 1980 Education Act, parents have far more access to information and far more chance of influencing school policy than was the case. The internal organisation of the school is the responsibility of the headteacher. Nevertheless, it's the teachers who would have to operate any scheme. Cohen claims 'Heads' own belief about the desirability of affecting closer links between home and school are circumscribed by what they see as strong misgivings on the part of teachers and perhaps over - zealously on the part of parents'. (11)

A report of the National Foundation for Education Research in England and Wales found, following a research project, that "teachers were in reality anxious to defend the professional integrity of their role from the wholesale intrusion of 'parental amateurs' and worried that the demands made on their time, by those parents seeking 'counselling' impinged unjustifiably on their proper task, the education of the children." p.149.

They add, 'teachers are under pressure to make fairly radical changes in their ways of working, in the hope, rather than the certainty, that the outcome justifies the effort.' p. 150. (12)

Clearly, if the headteacher believes in closer links between school and home, then considerable managerial skill has to be employed to ensure success.

Drawing a parallel with curriculum development it would appear necessary for the headteacher to develop a clear philosophical base and hence aims and objectives in an effort to convince teachers of the worthiness of the strategy.

Societal pressure for greater parental involvement can be claimed to be relatively straightforward when compared with more general calls for schools to solve society's economic, moral and religious problems. Multicultural education is but one example of education's response to these demands.

Craft (13) defines multicultural education in the following terms 'Curriculum development needs to take account of any major social change, such as the increase in cultural diversity in modern Britain. Education in a multicultural society aims to help children of all cultural groups maximise their potential achievement; education for all multicultural society aims to give all pupils knowledge and understanding appropriate for a school, locality or adult world where they will meet, live and work with fellow citizens from a variety of cultural backgrounds'.

An important distinction made by Craft is that multicultural curriculum development and anti-racist teaching are not necessarily seen as integrated concept. The fact that these twin notions are cross-curricular adds to an already complex situation. However it seems obvious that given the inner-city riots, racial disharmony and controversies such as those surrounding the Bradford head teacher Mr. Honeyford, many head teachers feel it necessary to take some action.

Head teachers and schools have tried to make sense of this highly controversial area by adopting differing strategies.

Cohen and Manion (14) offer an evolutionary model of society's attitude towards multicultural education and in doing so clearly show the numerous difficulties facing teachers. They claim that three differing educational responses to the immigration has taken place during the last twenty years.

1. Assimilation

The viewpoint that dominated government policy during the early years of immigration in 1960's was that if newly-arrived immigrants could be supported during their initial period of disorientation and helped to acquire a working knowledge of the English language then they would quickly be absorbed by the host society and all would be well. The educational response reflected a policy of assimilation and led to an emphasis on the teaching of English as a second language.

2. Integration

Supporters of the idea of integration believed that factors other than initial cultural shock and the acquisition of spoken English ought to be taken into account. They called for more detailed,

planned programmes of educational and social support. However, the emphasis was still on integrating minorities with the host society and culture in order to create a culturally homogeneous society.

3. Cultural Pluralism

The emergence of a second generation of ethnic minority pupils during the late 60's and 70's together with the realization that neither assimilation nor integration has worked, has led to a growing appreciation on the part of the host society that these earlier ideas of assimilation and integration were both patronizing and dismissive of other cultures and life styles. Cohen and Mauion claim further that minority groups now actively assert their determination to maintain cultural continuity and to preserve their religious, linguistic and cultural differences. Cultural pluralism, then, implies a system that accepts that people's life-styles and values are different and operates so as to allow equality of opportunity for all to play a full part in society.

It is doubtful, due to the evolutionary nature of these responses, that many schools have adopted a precisely defined package or response. More likely, teachers have had to struggle forward. It takes little imagination to appreciate the demands placed on teachers. E. Bolton , puts it this way, 'The complexity of the educational and social issues involved gives teachers a very onerous and difficult task to perform - a task most of them were not prepared for in their teacher training nor in their own experience of life. It is easy for society to lay the problem down at the door of education and leave it there, but if teachers are to tackle the changes of attitude, practice and approach demanded, they deserve the support and understanding of society'. (15)

Given society's growing concern with inner-city and multiracial problems it was not unreasonable for the education field to look to central government for guidance. They duly set up a committee of enquiry in 1979.

The Swann Report recently issued in March 1985 recognises a dual problem: eradicating discriminatory attitudes of the white majority and evolving an educational system which ensures that all pupils achieve their full potential.

The main steps of the argument for 'education for all' can be summarised as follows:

- i. The fundamental change that it is necessary is the recognition that the problem facing the education system is not how to educate children of ethnic minorities, but how to educate all children.
- ii. This challenge cannot be left to the independent initiatives of education authorities and schools.
- iii.. Education has to be something more than the reinforcement of the beliefs, values and identity which each child brings to the school.
- iv. It is necessary to combat racism, to attack inherited myths and stereotypes and the ways in which they are embodied in institutional practices.
- v. Multicultural understanding has also to permeate all aspects of a schools work. It is not a separate topic that can be welded on to existing practices.
- vi. Only in this way can schools begin to offer anything approaching equality of opportunity for all pupils.

The committee recommended strongly that:

1. The first priority in language learning by all pupils must be given to the learning of English and that all teachers (not just English teachers) have a responsibility to help them and should be given support and training to do this.
2. Although the linguistic, religious and cultural identities of ethnic minorities pupils should be fostered, bi-lingual education should not be introduced in maintained schools and mainstream schools should not provide mother tongue maintenance. However, minority languages should be included in the language curriculum of secondary schools where there is sufficient demand.
3. The committee favoured a non denominational and undogmatic approach to religious education and felt the government should look afresh at the 1944 Education Act. If this was done they felt the demands of ethnic minority committees to establish their own voluntary aided schools would diminish.

4. The committee laid great store on a variety of in-service initiatives.
5. The committee regarded the under representation of ethnic minorities in the teaching profession as a matter of great concern. They looked to ways of changing the position.

It seems plain that the Swann committee were interested in an integrated approach to such a complex problem. They criticised the government for failing to respond to the interim report and its lack of a coherent strategy for fostering multicultural education.(16)

Swann stresses that all parts of education needed to be involved: D.E.S., L.E.A. policy statements, L.E.A. advisory services, H.M.I. guidance, School Curriculum Development Committee review of existing materials, Examining Boards reflexing cultural diversity, school policies, revision of Government Acts.

However, Sir Keith Joseph lost no time in telling the House of Commons he had no intention of changing the statutory requirement for daily collective worship and religious education in maintained schools. The Government would not call into question the present dual system of county and voluntary schools, change the policy on mandatory awards, nor would it amend Section 1 of the 1966 Local Government Act. Structural changes seem to have been ruled out, so it would therefore appear that once more the main vehicle for change will be the construction of policy statements, some advisory and in-service work (probably not compulsory) and finally the efforts of individual headteachers and their staff.

There is little doubt that if there is any solution to this complex problem then the action of schools can only be part of the jigsaw. Nevertheless, that challenge is facing every head teacher in the county. What must be seriously doubted is whether there will be enough support and resources to make an impact.

Bolton (17) is probably accurate when he states, 'Heated debate about definitions, aims and methods is likely to continue; evaluation of new development is rare; dissemination slow and patchy. However, none of this is unique to multicultural education, and amidst the problems and polemics there is a growing number of teachers willing to try out new ideas and activities in their schools and classrooms'. The onus appears to be placed on the head teachers.

CURRICULUM INITIATIVES

In the first part of this study a chapter was devoted to an investigation into how the D.E.S. through the H.M.I. had orchestrated a thorough and logical curriculum debate. (see chapter 5).

This section will attempt to make a simple point - that reports and consultative documents have tumbled from the postman's sack with such regularity that it is difficult to see how head teachers have managed to digest them, let alone constructed strategies for their implementation. The present 'Curriculum Matters; an H.M.I. series' will eventually number over twenty. They are discussion documents only, so presumably the moment the series is completed the revised versions will start to be issued. In addition to H.M.I. contributions to the curriculum debate, the D.E.S. offer their own opinions and far more seriously, the first policy statement (Science) has been issued. The replacement for the School Council, the School Curriculum Development Committee, is now offering material, the National Foundation for Educational Research in England and Wales maintains a full programme of research, the government created specific inquiries such as Bullock, Cockcroft and Swann and all reported at length, and the almost incomprehensible A.P.U. issue regular bulletins.

It would be totally inappropriate for this study to quote 'chapter and verse' from the numerous reports, consultative documents policy statements, enquiries and research finding that headteachers are expected to respond to. Nevertheless, a carefully made precis of one of the reports is included to emphasize the points being made in this section.

MATHEMATICS IN THE PRIMARY YEARS

A summary of the Cockcroft Report 'Mathematics Counts' HMSO 1982. (18)
Chapter 6 with some statements from Chapters 5 and 7.

Success in Mathematics

The committee considers that a child should engage in a variety of mathematical tasks.

The criteria for success include:

1. The child should understand what he is doing.
(289,298,300,307,308,316,334,336,343,347,349,369,370).
2. The child can apply what he knows to new situations (288,301,321).
3. The child has begun to develop some of the skills of a mathematician including problem solving. (321.4, 331,346,347,369).
4. The child enjoys what he is doing. (345-7).

References, either specifically or implied, to these criteria can be found in the paragraphs listed.

The Primary Curriculum

The Committee welcomed the broadening of the curriculum (286,288) and considered that the 'back to basics' approach would not produce the results its advocates desire (278). In particular children need to be able to do calculations and apply what they have learnt to practical problems. In general, a piece of mathematics should only be pursued as far as children can understand it.

The Committee visited classrooms where there was a 'lively and supportive' atmosphere and the children were successfully enjoying a variety of appropriate mathematical tasks. However, they also visited classrooms where the mathematics teaching was over formal and inappropriate tasks were presented to the children (347).

Two Central Problems for All Teachers of Mathematics

1. Mathematics is a difficult subject both to teach and learn (228-230).
2. A wide range of attainment in mathematics likely to be found in any given year group of children (340-344).

The challenge is to match the mathematical task to the child. More able children should be given more mathematically challenging tasks with teacher support and guidance (330-333) while low attainers should be individually diagnosed and helped (230, 334-338).

Suggestions for the Teaching of Mathematics

Mathematics teaching at all levels should include opportunities for:

1. exposition by the teacher (245)
2. discussion between teacher and pupils and between pupils themselves (246)
3. appropriate practical work (247)
4. consolidation and practice of fundamental skills and routines (248)
5. problem solving, including the application of mathematics to everyday situations (249)
6. investigational work (250)

In particular, at the Primary level each new mathematical topic should be presented as a series of 'practical and intuitive' activities. The teacher and the children (often in ability groups) should discuss both new mathematical activities and their outcomes (319). There should also be whole class discussions and some problems should be posed with this in mind (317). Textbooks and workcards are best used to provide a framework of ideas and back-up material (313,320). New topics should be introduced through activity and discussion, for children can seldom learn a new piece of mathematics simply by reading about it (312).

There are many references, either specifically or implied, to the fact that the work presented to children should be carefully structured (286,292,296,298,299,305, etc., etc., The teachers' methods should reflect awareness of the need to make doing mathematics a positive experience for the child (369-370) and encourage him to act as a semi-autonomous problem-solver (321-324).

The Committee notes that there has been a decrease in the use of mental mathematics in schools of all kinds in recent years and suggests that this trend should be reversed (315). All children should develop mental methods of calculation with the accompanying discussion between teachers and child and between different children. (316, 317). The ability to calculate is fostered by a teacher who adopts a flexible, varied and imaginative approach to work with numbers and the operations on them, both in the way problems are presented and in the language used to present them (306-310). Young children should not be allowed to move too quickly to written work in mathematics (316). The National Primary Survey HMSO 1978 stated that in about a third of the classes, at all ages, children were spending too much time undertaking repetitive practice of processes which they had already mastered.

School Organisation

Recommended ways of organising include:

1. Involvement of staff in the planning and review of the mathematics that is taught and how it is taught (363,364).
2. Stronger mathematics teachers should offer support to the weaker ones, perhaps by team teaching (351,355).
3. The avoidance of vertical grouping, where possible, in order to reduce the range of attainment with which the teacher has to cope (349).
4. The appointment of a 'mathematic co-ordinator' to plan, co-ordinate and monitor the mathematics work of the school (354-356).

The Committee considers that the time allocation for mathematics should not fall substantially below four hours or exceed five hours per week (353).

Calculators

Calculators are a positive help in the Primary Classroom (384-388) and research evidence strongly suggests that the use of calculators has no adverse effect on basic computational skill (377). Calculators should be used to develop children's understanding of fundamental mathematical principles (392).

ATTITUDES

Perhaps the most important sentences of the report appear in paragraph 346.

'By the end of the primary years a child's attitude to mathematics is often becoming fixed and will determine the way in which he will approach mathematics at the secondary stage.'

'He may be well on the way to mastering some of the mathematician's skills, or he may already see mathematics as an area of work which he cannot understand and in which he always experiences failure.'

It seems obvious to claim that headteachers have to digest masses of written material, but the critical factor is that most of this material is dynamic - consistently calling for action. As most of the calls for action uphold modern teaching perspectives, many headteachers are probably facing serious management and philosophical difficulties, particularly if recent research is accurate in asserting that traditional pedagogies still dominant much of the primary sector.

Because every aspect of the curriculum is being examined (Home Economics for infant and juniors is at the time of writing the current H.M.I. curriculum document) the headteacher needs to develop a hierarchy of need, for to attempt to look at every aspect spells confusion and failure.

The overwhelming emphasis in so many of these reports is placed on what happens inside the classroom and what headteachers can do to help the classroom teacher. This emphasis will dominate the rest of this study. However, before considering headteachers' relationships with their staff in detail, it is important to appreciate that headteachers' responsibilities for curriculum innovation lies not just with the digestion and dissemination of initiatives, but also with ensuring some degree of continuity and consistency between neighbouring primary schools and the secondary schools involved at transfer.

The argument for closer liaison between primary and secondary schools has been supported for only the last few decades. Reference to closer liaison can be found in most of major reports and consultative documents since Plowden (19). The H.M.I. survey (20) found that in over four-fifths of the schools heads and occasionally other teachers, were able to visit the schools to which children would be transferring and in over 90 per cent of the schools the children visited their future school before the transition took place (4.10).

However, a line seems to have been drawn at easing any trauma on transfer, for the H.M.I. discovered only half the school received information on the subsequent progress of the children in their new school. Feedback was obviously not deemed a high priority. A more profound situation was uncovered by the H.M.I. with regard to the notion of continuity. They found joint meetings of teachers from the contributory and receiving schools for discussion about the curriculum took place in less than a third of the schools. While considerable efforts were clearly made to ease children's transition from one school to the next the importance of continuity in the curriculum of the schools was largely overlooked. The H.M.I.'s argued that the planning of the curriculum and the preparation of schemes of work should take into account the requirements of the new stage of education as well as the effects of the previous stage. They concluded that this can be achieved only if there is regular and systematic consultation between teachers from the associated schools (see 4.11).

Seven years later the Thomas Report (21) 'Improving Primary Schools' recommended 'A unified system of record keeping should cover the last two years of primary education and the first three years of secondary education. Wherever practicable, teachers should meet and discuss children at points of transfer'.

'In time it should be possible to offer parents a guarantee of continuity if they choose secondary schools within a cluster. Each school having one teacher specifically responsible for promoting liaison between all schools in the cluster.'

The education service is only just beginning to accept that education is a continuous process throughout the whole of

an individual's life and that formal school education should also be seen as a continuum from nursery or infant school to the completion of compulsory schooling or beyond.

Clearly, what is needed is a commitment by heads and local authorities to do everything in their power to avoid all unnecessary breaks in continuity and to minimise the effects of unavoidable disruption such as a change of teacher, a change of class, a change of school or a change of learning approach.

In attempting to achieve continuity, however, particular care and thought does need to be given to the following, which superficially may seem to contradict the above: (a) The assumption that a change of learning method/classroom organisation is of itself harmful and therefore to be avoided at all costs. (b) The belief that children will always benefit from having the same teacher for as long as possible. (c) The assumption that the passing on of information, records and profiles will in itself produce the desired continuity. (d) The fear of some teachers in the later primary years that their children might, in some way, be disadvantaged on arrival at secondary school. As a result, syllabuses are often narrowed quite unnecessarily for what primary teachers imagine the receiving school to want. (e) The belief that attention need only be paid to transfer between schools when, in fact, continuity in learning may also be lacking between classes in the same school.

There are recognised differences between the traditional primary approach of the teacher working with a class of children for the majority of the curriculum time and the secondary pattern of subject teachers meeting several different classes each day. This change is one which must be accepted as necessary at some stage in the learning programme and need not be harmful if it occurs with appropriate liaison and continuity.

Much more significant than class-teacher or specialist organisation is the variation in method between the following extremes:

- (i) Child-centred experimental learning based on practical problem-solving approaches and investigation using, where appropriate, a range of apparatus and conducted largely on

individual and small group bases;

or

(ii) Teacher-centred, didactic method involving whole-class instruction, and which places great demands on abstract thinking.

Clearly, a sudden change from one of these approaches to another can be disastrous for many pupils.

There are several important ways in which closer liaison could lead to greater continuity in learning, especially across the age of transfer.

By the passing on of appropriate information which will be helpful in matching the learning programme to pupil needs, the receiving teacher can thus be aware of pupils needs and problems in advance of teaching them. It is important to recognise however, that the passing of information can be greatly overdone and receiving secondaries so bombarded with detailed profiles from feeder schools (of which there may be quite a number) that they will never have the time or enthusiasm to use them, especially when the format is variable from school to school. The wish to send an excess of detail may be direct result of the fundamental differences in learning approach known to exist on transfer; if that aspect were tackled the desire to send so much detail might be reduced. Conversely, the desire of some primary schools to send no information at all may stem from the feeling that it would be misused, if used at all, and that the secondary attitude will be one of 'a fresh start and a new approach', whatever is sent.

All this high lights the very sad and quite unnecessary attitude of distrust that can exist between primary and secondary colleagues and the first aim of any liaison must be to overcome this.

The ideal situation for primary-secondary transfer might be where: (a) An agreed curriculum exists in the feeder schools; (b) The secondary curriculum builds directly onto this; (c) Teachers regularly visit and exchange between the school and important information is passed between them about the special needs of individual pupils arising from both learning difficulties and from special talents or abilities. Feedback should continue throughout the child's secondary career; (d) The change in school is not accompanied by a dramatic change in learning approach.

In such a situation it could be possible for pupils arriving at the secondary school to take their work with them and to use familiar materials and apparatus in order to continue where they left off two months before.

Plainly, the headteacher has more to do than encourage some pleasant, vaguely useful, part public relations exercise. Liaison and continuity runs straight across the individuality of primary schools. The need to develop continuity from one class to another and one year group to another may set some headteachers difficulties. To then develop some level between feeder schools compounds the difficulties. Finally, to have to communicate and construct strategies for liaison and continuity with an institution (the secondary school) that historically is viewed as a totally separate entity with its own pedagogy, makes great demands on headteachers.

The side issue of record keeping and testing mean differing things to different people. Varying philosophical stances clash with the perceived needs of the transfer procedure.

Throughout the country headteachers are finding that the demands for greater liaison and continuity are gradually altering the once often isolated nature of their schools and of their roles.

This chapter has tried to draw out examples of the pressures facing headteachers since the era of intervention started in the mid seventies. Even a casual comparison between the role of the headteacher of a few decades ago and the present cannot fail to throw up startling differences. Nevertheless, one aspect of the headteacher's role has not altered and that is the necessity for headteachers to create the circumstances and give inspiration and leadership to ensure the teaching staff can operate at a high professional level. In the next chapter classroom teachers will be assessed with regard to the new demands made upon them within the existing management structure.

- (1) HMI (1978) Primary Education in England. HMSO.
- (2) NAHT (1984) NAHT Submission to Education, Science and Art Committee of the House of Commons Selective Committee Enquiry into Primary Education found in NAHT Newsletter No. 102 (June, 1984).
- (3) HMI (1984) Effect of LEA Expenditure Policy - 1983. HMSO.
- (4) NAHT (1984) op cit.
- (5) HMI (1982) The New Teacher in School. HMSO.
- (6) HMI (1984) Effect of LEA Expenditure op cit.
- (7) HMI I bid.
- (8) MORGAN, C. (1978) Community Involvement in Decision Making in British Education Systems, Open University Course Material Unit 13, Milton Keynes.
- (9) PLOWDEN REPORT (1967) Children and the Primary Schools Vol L. London. HMSO.
- (10) MUSGROVE F. & TAYLOR P.H. (1965) Teachers and Parents conception of the teachers role. British Journal of Ed. Psychology XXXV Part 2 p.p. 171-8.
- (11) COHEN L. (1972) The Headteachers point of view in CRAFT M., RAYNOR, J., and COHEN L. (Ed) Linking Home and School. London: Longman.
- (12) CYSTER, R., CLIFT, P.S., BATTLE, S. (1979) Parental Involvement in Primary Schools. NFER.
- (13) CRAFT, A. in SKILBECK M. (Ed) (1984) Readings in School based Curriculum development. London: Harper & Row.
- (14) COHEN, L., & MANION, D. (1981) Perspectives on Classrooms and Schools. London: Holt Rinchart and Winston.
- (15) BOLTON, E., (1979) Education in a multicultural society. Trends in Education 4, 3-7.
- (16) DES., SWANN REPORT (1985) Education for All. Committee of Inquiry Command 9455, HMSO.
- (17) BOLTON, E. op cit.
- (18) COCKCROFT REPORT (1982) Mathematics Counts: an Inquiry into Mathematics in the Primary Schools. HMSO.

- (19) PLOWDEN REPORT op cit.
- (20) IMI SURVEY Primary Education in England op cit.
- (21) THOMAS REPORT (1985) Improving Primary Schools, London/LEA Learning Resource Centre.

CHAPTER 7

Teachers

One of the very first ideas 'floated' in this study was that much of primary education's development has been evolutionary in character. Evolution in educational terms has the connotation of slow rate of reform, consensus rather than conflict and a strong conservative element. Later in the study it was argued that the post-Flowden revolution was little short of a shambles and the conservative backlash was quick in coming. It would be difficult to argue that we have returned to a stable evolutionary model since the 1976 Great Debate. A more reasoned argument would claim numerous radical actions have been imposed upon an education system which is ill prepared for change.

At the 'chalk face' this translates itself into a possible conflict situation between what is almost certainly the most critical relationship in the whole of education - head and staff.

If headteachers are trying to cope with radical change and if teachers are basically conservative, then headteachers face a daunting task. The matter is of course complicated by the fact that headteachers are merely promoted teachers. If they share their teachers' perspective then the never ending demand for change must cause many headteachers great difficulties. The point that traditional and conservative forms of teaching have survived needs re-emphasising.

Wright claims "Progressive primary schools are blamed for all kinds of things, from a wholesale decline in educational standards, through delinquent violence and unrest and rising crime statistics to the growth of anarchy....."

Let us be clear that when we talk about progressive primary schools we are talking about a minority of schools. Many remain firmly traditional while the majority aim at a compromise with a traditional bias. The Flowden Report estimated that one third of primary schools could be called progressive. Other surveys suggest that the proportion is considerably less (see Ashton, Kneen and Holley, the Aims of Primary Education MacMillan 1975)" (1)

Dr Joan Barker Lunn author of research into junior methods writing as late as 1984 said "What is clear is that the vast majority of junior school teachers are firmly in control of their classrooms."

They determine what activities their pupils will undertake; they prefer a didactic approach rather than a reliance on discovery methods, they are making increasing use of class teaching; and there is no need to exhort them to go back to basics." (2)

Even if the Plowden Report is assigned to the dustbin, Barker Lunn's findings bear no relation to anything written by the H.M.I. or Bullock or School Council or Cockcroft and even the D.E.S.

Most probably there is not one particular reason for the teaching profession's apparent inability to respond en masse to demands for a modern perspective and an 'open' educational system. In this chapter the notion of conservatism will be explored.

The concept of conservatism is a broad one. It is characterised by the maintenance of the status quo and hence a value system. Progress occurs in an evolutionary/concensual manner with the laissez faire system protecting the interests of the parties involved. Clearly, that framework is under threat from central government's ceaseless intervention since 1976. The question to be answered is - can the teaching industry respond to these challenges or will they be perceived as the supporters of a value system that is 'closed', insular and introverted? If the latter is confirmed by continual attempts to thwart steady change, then conflict seems inevitable, given that those seeking a more 'open' education system can maintain the support of central government.

Leaving aside specific curriculum initiatives, it is the opening up of the education system that touches every school - governors, parents, liaison, continuity, curriculum consistency and accountability. Can the teaching industry cope with what appears to be a complete reversal of what has gone before?

In the discussion regarding governing bodies Bacon argues that local authorities 'robbed' governors of many of their functions through the gradual centralization of authority and funding.

He also argues that these centralising trends were often tacitly, if not always explicitly supported by the majority of teachers working within the state system and that most of them tended to support the view point that lay people, including parents as well as locally recruited governors or managers, ought to be tactfully discouraged from taking too

close an interest in the day to day work in the school.

Professionalism is not Bacon's only argument - "..... the teachers concern to insulate their schools as effectively as possible from local control, or lay influence was also in part stimulated by the narrow peculiar nature of their own educative experience." Bacon describes a conventional teacher career trajectory thus "They have spent some fourteen years at school, two or three years at training college and they have finally returned to the class room there to reside for the remaining forty years of their working lives." (3) Historically the phasing out of the pupil/teacher system at the turn of the century and the adoption of the deliberate policy of selecting prospective teachers from amongst able grammar school pupils, meant that the social experience of teachers, both within the educational system itself and also in relationship to their local community was a particular kind.

Bacon argues critically that during the formative years at school, they not only received a selective type of schooling, which effectively isolated them from the social and cultural experiences of the bulk of young people of their generation, but also received an education which attempted to replicate the public school and emphasise the value of a distant metropolitan high culture. Moreover, for many teachers their professional training often merely served to reinforce this disdain of the local and the commonplace. They typically spent some of the most formative years of their young adult lives in residential, semi-monastic, total institutions, which were not only effectively cut off from the world of industry and commerce, but which actively encouraged students to adopt a view of the remainder of their society which was elitest in perspective, as well as evangelical in content. Consequently, early on in their careers many teachers learned to assume an implicit semi-missionary role and saw their life task either as one of leavening the broad middle brown culture of suburbia, or simply acting as restraining and civilising influence on the more hedonistic impulses of the working classes. It was perhaps almost inevitable that teachers adopting this view of their 'life task' not only tended to support the 'centralist' policies advocated by the educational administrators, but were equally unhappy if lay people

sought to take too active an interest in the day to day affairs of their schools.

Bacon took a long term perspective and perhaps it needs to be said that certainly in the last few decades more 'working class' teachers have joined the profession; possibly bringing with them a different set of values and political base. One must use the word 'possibly' for it may well be the case that men and women with a working class background either actively seek, or have been absorbed into, the insular 'elitist' culture described by Bacon. The second point that has to be made is that following the work of Douglas (The Home and the School) and the Plowden Committee (Positive Discrimination) there developed in most colleges of education a course of study often termed 'sociology of education' which attempts to broaden students' understanding of society as a whole.

Nevertheless, Bacon's remarks demand serious thought. They have important implications for this study. It can be argued that schools are 'opening out' at an accelerating rate. However, if teachers are insular, elitist, and represent the values of one particular class, then surely they face great difficulties in coping with what appears to be general progression towards an 'open' school system.

Recent developments appear to have occurred at a national level. Some people may claim that national government is attempting to control schools through a policy of centralism. This may or may not be accurate, but nevertheless, it can be seen that 'action' is demanded or requested. Bacon argued a different form of 'centralism' with regard to local government. Here, the notion of centralism is pointedly different. If one accepts Bacon's argument then local government centralism is concerned with 'elitism' and 'control' and 'stability'. The crucial point being that this form of 'centralism' is not necessarily interested in 'change' and this may well be mirrored in teachers. Thus, it is difficult to see many teachers welcoming radical change given Bacon's arguments.

Nevertheless, changes do happen, progress has occurred, open-school philosophies are developing. Perhaps Connell 'catches' the right balance when he claims, "There is a reasonably widespread social

radicalism among teachers, muted in practice and opposed by several conservatisms. Teachers have had an ambivalent relation to the decentralisation of control in education and progressive reforms of curriculum..... The conventional rhetoric of education, even while stressing teachers role in shaping the hearts and minds of the next generation, casts them basically at society's agents and invites them to submit to a fate they have not made. This is profoundly pessimistic." (4) Connell's pessimism is understandable. For decades teachers have been part of society's regulatory mechanisms . They supported a value system almost certainly sub-consciously as well as on a conscious level. However since the abandonment of the narrow, conservative and didactic pedogogy of selection following the virtual abolition of the tripartite systems, society's relationships with teachers has drastically changed:

1. Teachers have been asked to accept modern teaching perspectives that make radically new demands upon them. Perhaps the most serious demand is for the lessening of direct teacher control over the pupils. For many teachers this is a painful demand that strikes at the very heart of their self perception.

2. Society has always asked teachers to maintain the dominant value system, but this was done spiritually and philosophically and by using education as an institution for social division through pupils gaining access to further education and high status occupations. The last few decades have seen new demands from society and in particular equality of opportunity. Now every child must succeed to some degree. Teachers have had to move into the field of social work to help children make progress. However, given teachers deeply rooted insular profile and philosophical background it can hardly be surprising that some teachers find the broadening of their role into the social world a source of difficulty and frustration.

3. Teachers are losing control over relationships with the hierarchy. The H.M.I.'s, central, local government and now governors are damaging teachers' professional autonomy through accountability structures and calls for curriculum consistency. The unstated spheres of influence protected by the laissez faire system have been destroyed.

4. Teachers are losing control over parents. Open school philosophies

are bringing more and more parents into school and in one respect the authority standing of teachers is diminishing through regular contact. More parents are making greater demands on teachers,- they want their children to succeed. Most parents will accept modern methods after detailed explanations, but still show concern over handwriting, spelling and times tables. Some teachers find this interaction healthy and valuable, but others feel they are under the microscope.

5. Society finds itself in the throws of economic upheaval. Britain is struggling to meet the challenge of new technology. Unemployment is unacceptably high. The crime rate is rising. Inner cities hold the most desperate problems. There is multi-racial disharmony. Teachers are waiting for the next (in a long line of) public figures to blame them, once more, for society's ills.

6. Teachers are being asked to take on board more and more curriculum initiatives and responsibilities in under-resourced schools. The unending stream of change can in itself be a source of stress to teachers and the lack of adequate resourcing only compounds feelings of anomie.

7. Many teachers feel undervalued by society. Since the Houghton salary negotiations in 1974 the teacher unions have been faced with statutory pay awards and then a series of bitter industrial disputes that have brought scant rewards, but have damaged teachers' image, relationships and most probably teachers' self esteem.

Not surprisingly, the stress teachers find themselves under is being commented upon by educationalists. An NOP survey, summarized in the T.E.S. in September 1984, showed, among other things, that teachers feel unpopular and underpaid.

T.E.S. reported on 14.12.86 that the plight of primary school teachers 'logjammed' on the lowest salaries, working in under-resourced schools, being asked to take on extra duties with no hope of promotion or financial reward, was spelled out to MP's of all parties on the Commons Select Committee on Education and Science.

Reporting on an N.U.T. document 'Today's Teacher' the T.E.S. (18.1.85)

quote an inspector for primary education with 25 years experience

"There is a significant increase in teachers retiring on health grounds and most advisers will testify to the large number of teachers who have become 'problems' as a result of having to cope with a changed role in stressful situations. Confidential discussions reveal how many teachers are receiving medication."

T.E.S. (13.12.86) Mr Chris Patten, the new Minister of State at the D.E.S. has acknowledged the teacher morale is low. He added that rising expectations and an increasingly demanding curriculum, combined with falling roles and restraints in expenditure had made many demands on teachers. Pay was not the main reason for depressed morale.

Bernstein (5) has suggested that the teachers' power of control now derives not from position or status, as it used to, but from personal qualities. Tattum (6) claims "Respect for the teacher quo teacher can no longer be assumed as a social fact. No longer is the office held in awe....." Lowenstein claims (7) "Both teachers and heads are concerned about the increase in vandalism in schools. Disruption in class, while largely of a non violent nature, is increasing in terms of insolence, disobedience and verbal abuse."

Caspari (6) argues that the exhaustion experienced by most teachers at the end of term is more closely linked to the demands made on the skills and personality of the teachers in keeping discipline over the children than to any other respect of their work. Caspari writes that "Children with behaviour problems show aggressive defiance to the teacher at the slightest provocation. In an infant (primary) school one would find such children to be hyperactive and inclined to throw temper tantrums. Secondary school children are more likely to fight their peers, or to be rude to the teacher, defy school rules or damage school property.

Dunham (9) found five major stress situations reported by teachers:

1. Educational change: too many innovations in the curriculum and

in teaching methods.

ii. Problem pupils: lack of interest, inattention, apathy, lack of effort and concentration, hostility, lack of cooperation, disruption.

iii. Poor working conditions: size of schools and classes and noisy levels.

iv. Poor staff communications and cooperation: size, poor communications systems, ill defined structure.

v. Role conflict and role confusion: an increasing number of expectations demanded of teachers.

The challenge facing headteachers is great indeed. Brodie (10) argues 'Teachers cannot be blamed for nervousness, uncertainty and a reluctance to embrace managerial considerations warmly. There are rarely quick or easy responses to problems of sensitivity and complexity. The quest, however, must be for a climate of constructive involvement, intellectual effort and a readiness to learn from related fields of experience.'

This study has continually striven to shed light on the structure within which education has to work. However, it would be wrong for the reader to perceive this study as a search for a perfect bureaucratic solution to all of education's ills. Education is an intensely human activity. The history of primary education indicates the importance of the actors cultural heritage and of a value system probably ingrained into the consciousness. Therefore management structures must be complemented with management appreciation of the importance of relationships, philosophy and an understanding of what has gone before. The need for a holistic approach is well illustrated when considering an example of a source of stress to teachers - school discipline.

Discipline in schools is a complex issue. The NAHT claim

'The question of discipline and punishment is increasingly relevant to primary schools some children under the age of eleven can be very disruptive. It is not unusual to hear extreme use of foul language from children under seven or to observe violent and aggressive behaviour in playgrounds. It has been found necessary, for example, to settle a special unit for primary children in Birmingham.'(11) Society seems confused:

The media highlighted disruption in some Liverpool schools but there seems little doubt that society's attitude to children generally has become more permissive.

There is dissatisfaction with mid-day supervision in schools. (This will be dealt with in detail later in this study). Demands to end corporal punishment no doubt hold merit, but phasing out of corporal punishment surely needs to be accompanied by the introduction of supportive alternatives for serious offences and this has resource implications. The matter does not seem aided by the government's notions to divide children into those who can be caned (with parental approval) and those who cannot.

The rock bed of teacher authority - loco-parentis is not as sure as it was. Clearly headteachers need to address themselves to this area of school life.

The extent to which disruptive behaviour in schools is a serious factor concerning headteachers and teachers is hard to establish. In their report on truancy and indiscipline in Scottish Schools, the Pack Committee (12) noted the difficulties of obtaining statistics on disruption. They stated that, after considering the feasibility of commissioning a research project it was 'decided that the difficulties were too great, not least the problem of trying to determine what should constitute a recordable offence'. 'The chances of realistic results were too problematical to make the exercise worthwhile'. They also recognised the limitations of alternative methods, and conceded that in the circumstances, they were unable to quantify the problem.

This difficulty does, of course, hinder progress, for there is little doubt that disruption occurs. An obvious solution to both monitoring disruption and developing a remedial programme of action would be a report system. However, there are difficulties

in that teachers may feel reluctant to admit disruption has happened. Teachers may judge that an admission of frequent disruption will reflect adversely on their own skills of management. Reporting on a survey of primary and secondary school teachers throughout Britain, Comber and Whitfield (13) clearly felt that their respondents were not 'telling all'. 'Perhaps the most significant impression they comment, 'is that of the great reluctance of most teachers to admit to any disciplinary problems and the stigma attached to not being able to keep order'.

If this is accurate, then there are serious implications for the pupils, teachers and school. One of the major tenet of modern educational philosophy is that schools must be organic wholes and not a collection of isolated classrooms. The headteacher has an obvious role to play in creating an interactive school. However, Frude and Gault (14) claim teachers are specifically reluctant to refer a problem 'upwards' to a headteacher - 'Teachers are aware that if such referrals are frequent they are likely to be seen either as 'complaining' or as 'inadequate' in maintaining control. Problems need to reach a certain level of seriousness before they are made apparent outside the classroom, and thus a major 'bias' in any statistics collected from heads will relate to the fact that only relatively serious disruption will be accounted for. Some heads, in turn, will be reluctant to refer problems to the Local Authority, lest this reflects badly on 'the good name of the school' and on their own reputation as an administrator. Heads might also judge that such a 'call for help' may be regarded as an admission of 'defect' and weaken their perceived competence in the eyes of pupils, parents, colleagues and authority administrators'.

With regard to specific acts of disruptive behaviour there would seem much for the headteacher to do. Successful lines of communication and clear and thoughtful remedial action appears necessary. However, such a simple and bold statement may mask the complex reality of the situation.

Frude (15) states 'There is convincing evidence to show that aspects of school organisation and 'ethos' can contribute markedly to the frequency of disruptive incidents. This has led some authors

to suggest that there are 'disruptive schools' (Page 33) Rutter (16) stressed the importance of balance between children of different ability levels, emphasis on reward rather than punishment, the immediacy of action on indiscipline, and democratic organisation of teachers. Reynolds and Sullivan (17) stress the benefits of the incorporation of pupils in the school organisation and of engaging parents in an active involvement with the support of the school.

Can the headteacher profoundly affect these factors? Can the headteacher create an 'atmosphere' or 'ethos' within a school which can lessen or heighten disruption?

The headteacher can:

- create the opportunity for formal staff discussion and decision making
- lay down rules
- encourage or discourage pupil participation in decisions
- decide upon the emphasis placed on academic achievement as a criterion of the overall quality of the school (even in mixed ability classes children are well aware of differing abilities)
- decide upon the strictness of rules
- decide upon the degree to which they encourage or discourage teachers to refer problems to him or her
- decide whether or not to refer disruptive pupils to LEA agencies and inform their parents

Comber and Whitfield claim 'Many of the incidents reported to us indicated some weakness in the school organisation'. (18)

There are obviously psychological and sociological influences involved in any discussion of disruptive pupils. Nevertheless, there seems strong arguments indicating that headteachers need to employ not only specific strategies to deal with disruption, but possibly of greater importance, strategies of a broader philosophical nature with regard to the 'ethos' of the school.

The need for headteachers to have some level of control over organisation, philosophy and relationships seems plain. For organisation and philosophies to succeed it also seems plain that a headteacher's relationship with his staff is of primary importance.

There are serious doubts that the autonomous headteacher model of management has ever been successful to any great degree in this country. Leadership has depended upon the style and skill of the individual headteacher rather than a strong 'authority' framework. The headteacher may be legally responsible for the day to day running of the school, but with 'weak' statutory obligations, almost nonexistent conditions of service and little or no guide lines from local authorities, the responsibility for constructing a framework of management has, until very recent times, fallen almost solely onto the shoulders of the headteacher.

It is important to explore the notion of authority further. Aron (19) reviewed the work of Max Weber. Weber describes the concept of authority in the following manner: it refers to the social power that a person or social group believes to be legitimate. The important point here is to stress the legitimacy of the power exercised. In other words social groups who recognise the authority believe that it is justified and proper and for these reasons the exercise of this authority tends to be effective in achieving its aims.

Max Weber distinguishes three types of authority or domination. The three types are distinguished according to the kind of legitimacy that they claim. Legitimacy may be based on:

1. Rational Grounds - resting on a belief in the 'Legality' of patterns of normative rules and the right of those elevated to authority under such rules to issue commands (Legal Authority). Weber suggests that: "The purest type of exercise of legal authority is that which employs a bureaucratic administrative staff."

2. Traditional Grounds - resting on an established belief in the sanctity of immemorial traditions and the legitimacy of the status of those exercising authority under them.

3. Charismatic Grounds - resting on devotion to the specific and exceptional sanctity, heroism or exemplary character of an individual person, and the normative patterns or order revealed or ordained by him.

It seems plain that primary school headteachers employ, consciously or unconsciously, all three forms of authority. There can be little doubt that there is a strong base of authority on traditional grounds.

Authority based on rational grounds is far more complicated. Headteachers do have legal authority, but it is vague and general legal authority. Charismatic authority depends upon individual headteachers. The nature of schools lends itself to this form of authority in that the headteacher, if he so wishes, has many opportunities to 'perform' upon the stage that is school. However, it is the teachers who implement the parent-school interaction and activities. Likewise, it is the teachers who implement curriculum development, discipline, and numerous aspects of internal organisation. The headteacher should be responsible for the creation, development and overseeing of a school philosophy and should be instrumental in organising ways of putting it into action - but how does the headteacher justify his position, his authority?

Perhaps years ago, there was no need for the headteacher to rely upon any other prop but his authority on traditional grounds. However, given the history of primary education, with its pressures and changes and confusions, can one expect teachers to totally conform to the authority model of management based on traditional grounds and a vague and unsatisfactory rational-legal position?

Certainly, open hostility, even open criticism of headteachers by their staff is rare - William Tyndale was the exception that proved the rule. The conservative nature of teachers ensures the continuing legitimation of the headteachers' authority. However, this does not mean that headteachers have a secure and satisfactory authority base. Assuming the headteacher has a coherent plan of action is no guarantee it will be put into action. The lack of control by 'higher' levels of management has left each individual headteacher to sort out authority relationships.

Historically, it is difficult to believe that any 'progress' was made in schools without the framework of cooperation. One thinks of the new 'pre-war' infants schools embarking upon totally different educational perspectives. It is inconceivable that they could have succeeded without understanding, patience and support. However, conflict is inevitable in any institution. It is probable that the development of progressive education created much conflict. This study has already discussed the very slow rate of change over the last

fifty years; the arguments about the curriculum of selection and the confusion and 'disguised' reality of the 'progressive era'. It is difficult to believe that conflict has not occurred in numerous instances. If we accept that conflict is not often resolved in stark blunt terms, then how are conflict situations resolved?

In the vast majority of schools there appears to be a situation of unstated consensus. A subtle balance is drawn. Staff accept the authority of the headteacher, and for his part, the headteacher is expected to employ such qualities as common sense and reasonableness, thus leading to 'goodwill' on both sides.

Many a headteacher's strategy probably includes the concept of 'goodwill', but what does it mean?

'Goodwill' can mean 'give and take', 'working as a team', 'pulling together', the emphasis is that the school is philosophically 'in tune' and working as a whole; as a unit. This state of empathy between the parties involved is an important and desirable goal. Highly motivated teachers probably do a better job than those who are not. Striving to meet agreed aims is one of the more satisfying and pleasant aspects of the human spirit. This concept may well be heightened in the teaching profession due to its conservative, value laden culture.

There is probably a deep rooted notion of 'fair play' within the teaching profession; this is complemented by the 'authority' base of the headteacher - tradition authority, vaguely defined but nevertheless real legal authority and the opportunity, the stage, for charismatic authority. It may further be argued that this 'loose' authority relationship has survived primarily because it works. Many primary schools are not large bureaucratic institutions - personal relationships do matter.

Clearly, these complex and subtle relationships are of the deepest significance and relevance to this study. Some attempt to unravel these relationships has to be made.

The SSRC Cambridge Accountability Project (20) discussed the notion of tacit contracts. They argued that until recently, there has been little public demand to place responsibility for the goals of education anywhere but in the hands of teachers and that in part this

is due to the implicitly contractual nature of the relationship between school and society.

Two such contracts usually ensure for schools a high degree of implicit agreement over ends. First there is the contract made between teachers and parents (and governors) when a child enters a school. Teachers assume the obligation to do the best that they can for the child and in return parents (and governors) offer patience and support.

Underpinning this tacit contract is another, which is according to the research team, even more fundamental. The main thrust of this contract is that all participants are pledged to give priority to the interests of the children.

These contracts, claim the research team, provide safeguards for schools, ensuring that they operate within fairly wide boundaries of tolerance and that consensus and compromise are usually preferred to conflict.

These implicit contracts hold obvious advantages for schools. However, we find ourselves in an era which demands greater dialogue and accountability. There are serious doubts as to whether or not implicit and tacit contracts are adequate dialogue/communication structures to meet these new demands.

This matter cannot be aided by teachers claims to professionalism. It could be argued that teachers want society to accept their 'shared' 'moral' contract to do their best for children but if faced with criticism (another word for dialogue and accountability?) teachers want to fall back on notions of professionalism.

The Cambridge research team claim "..... as long as the meaning of 'professionalism' continues to be confused and inexplicit the ethical commitment of teachers will be open to attack because of its reliance upon their status as 'experts'" (21)

They call for formal procedures to facilitate the growth of trust.

The reader could be forgiven for believing these arguments have been placed in the wrong chapter. They clearly refer to the relationship between society and schools. However, in the following pages there will be an attempt to draw comparisons with these arguments and the relationship found between many headteachers and their staff.

This comparison will be based on the four major conclusions stemming from the 'Cambridge Research' comments:

1. Teachers form part of a strong 'moral' contract concerning children. However, this 'contract' is implicit and tacit.
2. Teachers claims to professional autonomy based on 'expert' knowledge.
3. These contradictory stances have survived up to now in vague channels of communication.
4. Growing demands for change highlight both the contradictory stances of teachers and the structure of dialogue they operate within.

This uneasy alliance between the tacit 'moral' agreement and claims to professional autonomy leaves teachers and headteachers unsure as to the terms of their relationship during this time of change. Of course not all teachers resist all change all the time. However, for the teacher these tacit agreements and the concept of professional autonomy can form a strong barrier to change. Both head and teacher agree implicitly that the teacher is doing his or her best for the children, so change has to be handled carefully or relationships can be damaged. Change can also damage the teacher's perception of his or her professional autonomy. The fact that this authority base is undefined and varies from one school to another merely adds to the headteachers problems, and because the teacher has totally different defence strategies against change - he or she has the opportunity to switch from one to another at will.

For the headteachers the problems are compounded because they were teachers and may have even employed these strategies themselves. In addition, the degree to which these strategies are used in a rational, conscious manner is impossible to assess; this is in part because of the chaotic implicit, tacit channels of communication that exists, irrespective of any traditional staff meeting or formal communication system.

So one returns to the notion of 'goodwill'. However, this time 'goodwill' is not employed in the way previously offered, namely, a philosophical stance whereby the school can progress successfully. This time 'goodwill' takes on a different meaning. It takes on the

connotation of a bargain. Survival becomes the major objective, not the educational 'good' of the school. Open conflict is avoided but then so are possibly fundamental questions regarding education. The headteacher and staff negotiate their positions, with the concept of 'goodwill' being the trump card in each player's hand, often without a word being spoken.

This as a partial explanation for the major differences found in one school compared with another. There are schools where every teacher does, voluntarily, a dinner duty, whereas in other schools no one except the headteacher does dinner duty. Likewise, similar situations are known with regard to extra curricular activities. In these examples, the teacher has a clear right to choose. What makes one school different from another is the extent to which subtle pressures are applied by the head and/or fellow teachers and the shared value system existing within the school.

The question of lunch-time supervision is worthy of further thought. In 1968 the NAS/UWT won a court ruling stating that 'dinner duty' did not form part of a teachers' contract of employment. This decision has caused headteachers no end of difficulties, because although the headteacher has responsibility for the school during the mid-day period there is no way in which a headteacher can force teachers to supervise children during this time, apart from a general duty of care. If teachers stay in the staff room and are therefore unaware of any problems, the headteacher is powerless to order or request general supervision and is left with the vague authority to ask teachers to 'react' to specific events. As prevention is thought better than 'remedial' action this is not a happy state of affairs.

The matter is not aided by the often low quality of the supervisory assistants employed by the local authority. This leaves heads cautiously appealing to teachers to help out for the good of the school and the price of a school meal.

Clearly, lunch time supervision is a matter of subtle negotiation between head and staff. All concerned appreciate the advantages of adequate supervision, but the lack of legal authority leaves the head with either the problem of persuading teachers to help and/or being careful not to alienate teachers who could withdraw at will. There is

an element of negotiation and it is not necessarily a stated and rational process.

The problem has been compounded by the teachers' industrial action. The demands of teacher unions to withdraw cooperation at lunchtime has been met by a government scheme to pay people to take over these duties. The headteachers' union, N.A.H.T. has had enough. In February 1986 they balloted their members with the recommendation that schools should be closed during lunch time. Their grievances seem justified. For sixteen years they have had to indulge in complex relationships with teachers regarding an area of the school day that everyone agrees can be a source of indiscipline amongst pupils and can seriously damage the ethos of the school. The government scheme attempts to remove teachers from the frame, but leaves many unanswered questions - who will appoint these supervisors?

What will be the headteacher's precise responsibility?

What will be the authority of these supervisors?

The government wishes to allow each individual LEA to organise their own scheme and the N.A.H.T. take particular exception to this diversification. They demand a thorough and detailed national scheme that leaves no question unanswered.

This is a further example of one of the main tenets of this study - structure could be of help to headteachers but will the laissez faire system permit its development?

Returning to this chapter's main theme of evaluating the quality of communication and relationships between teachers and head, there seems little doubt that standing ahead of all difficulties facing schools is introduction and maintenance of modern educational practices. The opening pages of this chapter made claims of teacher conservatism with regard to curriculum initiatives. Central governments response has been bureaucratic with the responsibility for change falling naturally upon headteachers as the end of the chain of command. Undoubtedly headteachers do need to use bureaucratic management devices within their schools but before organisational strategies are employed there is the strongest argument that philosophy has to be settled. This was certainly one conclusion one could draw from various writers claims regarding discipline in schools. A firm philosophical stance seems an obvious requirement for curriculum change. One relevant philosophy is that of school based curriculum precisely because of its emphasis on dialogue.

The belief that individual class teachers should be involved deeply in the curriculum innovation and development in their own schools has a strong lobby. Bassett (22) argues "One of the central issues in the process of innovation is the role played in it by teachers, since, whatever the source of the ideas, it is the teachers who have to make most of them effective at the practical level. This role will be very difficult if they carry out this work with a high degree of professional responsibility from that if, at the other extreme, they act merely as functionaries under close supervision or direction. In the first case they will be expected to cooperate with other change agents, or even to take the initiative; in the second, they will be expected only to adopt the new procedures as required." p 123

Bassett is in no doubt as to which direction he would wish the role of teachers to develop..... "it should be recognised that to strengthen the professional freedom of teachers in the surest way to guarantee a continuing concern for progressive ideas, and that all steps taken to introduce or accelerate change should promote or at least be in accord with, this professional freedom."

The defence of liberal ideologies is often recast in terms of protecting the laissez faire system that permitted their development. Nevertheless, this study has catalogued central governments attempts to destroy the system, and quote after quote claiming the system is conservative, insular, and inefficient - it is important to emphasise the difficulties facing school based curriculum development. Setting aside difficulties stemming from resource implications, curriculum development must interest itself in a philosophical base, the construction of goals, aims and objectives, the formation of some plan of action and evaluation. However, this 'classical' model has serious defects. It is too simple; it fails to take into account what happens inside classrooms and the difficulties found in assessing efforts.

In a previous chapter, it was suggested that the laissez faire system permitted a simplistic division of labour between head and staff. The headteacher could concern himself with general supervision over what was taught, whereas the teachers could decide how to teach the prescribed curriculum. This division ensured the independence and authority of the headteacher and the professional autonomy of teachers. It was further suggested that this interesting balance was disrupted by the development of progressive perspectives because 'process' is an essential aspect of modern education. The way in which learning is organised must be the concern of the school and hence headteacher and not just the individual teachers.

There is now evidence to suggest that headteachers probably need to intervene on a more basic level, namely, classroom management.

Bennett, Desforges, Cockburn, Wilkinson (23) conducted a research project of the learning environments provided by 16 able teachers of 6 and 7 year old children. The teachers were rated as better than average by the advisory service. The researchers found these teachers both dedicated and conscientious. Leaving aside their finding regarding the curriculum, the major problem area they discovered was classroom management.

Apparently the teachers typically adopted what has been termed a crisis management style. This requires that they be all things to all pupils at all times. The consequences of this style include constant interruptions, divided teacher attention, lack of adequate classroom supervision, lack of opportunity for adequate diagnosis and explanation and, in many instances, teacher frustration. As the authors put it "In short, a learning environment which is far from optimal for teacher or taught."

The authors suggest that one main difficulty to be overcome is teachers apparent desire to individualize pupil's work. They claim this creates serious difficulties in both teaching and marking

(queue at the teachers desk). They point out that teaching groups of children rather than to the class or individual is currently prescribed by H.M.I(1980) and in the Plowden Report (1967) which stated that groups ought to be utilized since it was recognised that teachers could not be expected to individualize instruction in large classes of children.

The authors recommend that thought should be given to additional assistance in the classroom - peers, parents and/or assistants and, of course, further and more detailed training.

Clearly, any school based curriculum initiative is threatened by inadequate classroom management. It would appear that if school based curriculum development is to succeed all aspects of the teacher's role must be open to discussion and many heads and teachers may well find this open approach difficult to accept.

Stenhouse (24), believes that the most important barrier to change is that of control. "Schools are the only institutions taking in a conscript population covering the whole of society. It follows that the school has a considerable problem of morale and control. This problem can be compounded if curriculum changes, in so far as they imply changes in the nature of educational knowledge, threaten the teacher's control habits and thus threaten control. More important still, curricula changes of real significance almost always involve changes in method of ways of working. To a considerable extent the control element in the relation of teachers and pupils rests on the teachers fulfilling the expectations the pupils have about how they will behave, and change also threatens this. Radical curriculum changes involve changes in the entire term, code or ethos of the teacher pupil relationships".

Shipman (1968), (25) claims "I believe that change does threaten control and order and it is perfectly reasonable that that teachers should be concerned about this. Most teachers would ascent to the proposition that 'coercion' is preferable to disorder. The professional satisfaction and even the personality of the teacher can be destroyed by disciplinarian problems. And there is more fear of disorder than is commonly admitted."

It would therefore seem important to include discussions about control when attempting curriculum innovation. In a later book

Shipman (26) perceives another problem "... .. teaching is about assessment. But this assessment tends to be exclusive. Teachers tend to assess their own courses and objectivity can be low. Team teaching tends to breakdown this exclusiveness and facilitates collective assessments or multiple assessment of each pupil's work."

Once more, school based curriculum development can be threatened by poor evaluation. It is unlikely many schools will indulge in highly specialized attainment and attitude profiling of their curriculum efforts, so Shipman's solution holds great merit and not just for evaluation but for curriculum innovation and maintenance as well.

However, the same difficulty arises that was offered regarding classroom management and control. teachers have to abandon their isolated autonomous position and enter a world of negotiation; a world where one's professional standing is open to criticism and failure, but also a world offering support, companionship and satisfaction.

For teachers to accept radically different working conditions and self perception demands a full management strategy from the head teacher. There is much to be said for the notion that curriculum development is almost entirely a management function. Stenhouse claims "Any far reaching innovation which is likely to effect attainment or attitude is likely to need to be faced by the school as a whole and to be implemented by policy. These observations do not imply that effective change is necessarily based on concensus. Change must often come through conflict within a staff; but it is important for the leadership of the school to recognise squarely what is happening and to manage conflict in the school rather than pretend that it does not exist. The management of innovation in a school is a matter of orchestrating different voices and negotiating the right to experiment and hence cope with possible failure. In most British schools the head teacher assumes the responsibility for the general direction of policy and for such management. More and more commonly he consults and takes advice, often from staff committees, but in the last resort he is responsible to the local authorities and few are prepared to take the responsibility for decisions which go against their

their better judgement. The government of most British schools is consultative rather than democratic." (27)

Davies (28) questions one of the most common assumptions in the literature on educational change and also in practice, in that the headteacher can be an effective change agent. Davies claims "The essence of this assumption is correct providing the lasting success of the innovation is not under discussion. It has always been open to headteachers to use power-coercive strategies to achieve change but few would deny that change by these means, without the involvement and commitment of the teachers, is shallow and transient." Davies argues that democratic staff groups are more likely to respond critically to innovative ideas, judging them on their merits where once they might have acceded publicly to an authoritarian decision only to ignore it in the privacy of the classroom.

The message seems plain - headteachers must 'manage' change. The remaining chapters of this study will consider how this can be accomplished.

- (1) WRIGHT, M. op cit.
- (2) BARKER-LUNN, J. (1984) Junior Teachers Method and Practice. in Educational Research. VEER/Nelson.
- (3) BACON, W. (1978) Public Accountability and the Schooling System: London: Harper & Row.
- (4) CONNELL R.W. (1985) Teachers' Work. London:George Allen & Unwin. p.206.
- (5) BERNSTEIN, B. (1967) Open Schools, Open Society? New Society 10, 351-3.
- (6) TATUM D. (1982) Disruptive Pupils Schools and Units. Chichester: Wiley.
- (7) LOWENSTEIN, L. (1975). Violent and Disruptive Behaviour in Schools. Hamel Hampstead: NAS/UWT Publications.
- (8) CASPARI, I. (1976) Troublesome Children in Class, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- (9) DUNHAM, J. (1976) Stress Situations and responses in NAS/UWT (Eds) Stress in Schools. Hamel Hampstead.
- (10) BRODIE, M. Understanding Organisation and Management in PAISEY, A. (1983) The Effective Teacher. London: Ward Lock.
- (11) NAHT (1984) NAHT Submission to Education, Science and Art Committee of the House of Commons Selective Committee. Enquiry into Primary Education found in NAHT. Newsletter No. 102 June, 1984.
- (12) PACK REPORT (1977) Truancy and Indiscipline in Schools. Scottish Education Department.
- (13) COMBER, L.C., and WHITFIELD, R.C. (1979) Action on Indiscipline: A Practical guide for teachers. NAS/UWT in association with the Department of Education Enquiry - University of Aston.
- (14) FRUDE, N. & GAULT, H. Children's disruption at school. In Frude, N. & Gault, H. (ed) (1984) Chichester, John Wiley.
- (15) FRUDE, N. Frameworks for Analysis. Ibid
- (16) RUTTER, M. (1980) Changing Youth in a Changing World, London: Nuffield Provincial Hospital Trust.
- (17) REYNOLDS D., & SULLIVAN M. (1981) The effects of School: a radical faith restated in GILLHAM, B. (Ed) Problem behaviour in the Secondary School. London: Croom Helm.
- (18) COOMBER, L.C., & WHITFIELD, R.C. op cit.

- (19) ARON (1970) Main Currents in Sociological Thought. Vol III, London: Penguin.
- (20) ELLIOTT, J. BRIDGES, D., EBUTT, D., GIBSON, R., NIAS, J., (1981) School Accountability - SSRC, Cambridge. Accountability Project, London: Grant McIntyre Ltd.,
- (21) ELLIOTT, J., BRIDGES, D., EBUTT, D., GIBSON, R., Ibid.
- (22) BASSETT, G.W. (1970) Innovation in Primary Education, London: Wiley - Interscience.
- (23) BENNET, N., DESFORGES, C., COCKBURN, A., WILKINSON, B.(1984). The Quality of Pupil Learning Experience. LEA, London.
- (24) STENHOUSE, L. (1975) An Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development London: Heinemann.
- (25) SHIPMAN, M. (1968) The Sociology of the School. London: Longmans.
- (26) SHIPMAN, M. (1979) School Evaluation. London: Heinemann.
- (27) STENHOUSE, L. op cit.
- (28) DAVIES, E. in SKILBECK, M. (Ed) (1984) Reading in school based curriculum development. London: Harper & Row.

CHAPTER 8

The Headteacher - management skills

The T.E.S. (6.9.85) briefly reported on a N.F.E.R. research project on the first years of headships in secondary schools. According to its research leader, Dr Weindling, teachers wanted the new heads to take on a 'messianic role'. Staff said they were hoping for a saviour, a 'Moses' figure who would lead them out of the wilderness.

Researchers found that the personal and professional qualities demanded by teachers of a new head were awe-inspiring - ranging from charm to implacability, and from firm leadership to the ability to consult and delegate.

One of the most interesting inferences to draw from this research is that the role of the headteacher is not seen in terms of an efficient administrator.

Owens (1) draws an important distinction between the person who exercises leadership and the administrator. 'If we think of an organisation as having goals, then the administrator is a person who helps operate the mechanisms for the achievement of these goals. He is a stabilizing force in a school, clarifying its goals and providing the resources to help teachers and other staff to play their parts effectively. He is a facilitating mechanism. But the person who exercises leadership initiates changes in the organization, changes either in the goals themselves or in the way the organization operates or in the way the organization achieves them.'

The quality of leadership is perceived as an essential aspect of the headteacher's role and this leadership concept is interwoven with strong personality traits. The D.E.S. (2) attempted to define the desirable personal qualities found in certain headteachers as "Their sympathetic understanding of staff and pupils, their accessibility, good humour and sense of proportion and their dedication to their task has won them the respect of parents, teachers and taught. They are conscious of the corruption of power and though ready to take final responsibility they have made power sharing the keynote of their organisation and administration."

The emphasis placed on the headteacher as a communicator is very strong. The same report stated that a good head needs to be:

1. a public relations officer
2. a diplomat
3. a negotiator
4. a personnel manager

Woolcott (3) argues that the formulation of management strategies will not be successfully put into action without an adequate communication strategy. He states " a failure to communicate effectively is one of the most common management problems." Such failure frequently stems from two major misconceptions.

1. that conveying information is the same as communicating
2. that the planning of communications is unnecessary since they are such everyday occurrences.

The first misconception is caused by a misunderstanding of the meaning of communication. It is essentially a two way process, requiring a recipient and feed back. The latter is not obtained in the process of conveying information via, for instance, a notice on a notice board. Furthermore, it is an equal misconception to assume that, since much of everyone's day is spent in communicating with others, one must therefore be competent, if not excellent, at that pursuit" p 157.

A most interesting insight into how heads see their roles was given by Cook & Mack (4) The following list represents the range of tasks and duties that headteachers considered most important:

- Having a clearly defined policy
- Building a team of competent teachers
- Facilitating the professional development of teachers
- Establishing good personal relationships
- Being seen as a good teacher
- Resolving conflict
- Keeping up to date on educational development
- Introducing new ideas
- Administering and maintaining the organisation
- Appointing staff
- Knowing the children
- Evaluating the work of the school

Communication skills rate highly in many of the tasks stated and this cannot be by chance. The importance of communication has a very strong philosophical perspective associated with it. Headteachers may still employ consultative rather than democratic forms of government, but if the quality of the dialogue is high enough, a holistic,

integrated school life becomes far more probable. This point seems endorsed by Hoyle (5) "Genuine innovation does not occur unless teachers become personally committed to ensuring its success."

Hoyle claims that there is little research which would enable us to predict the likelihood of a school being receptive to curriculum innovation nor the strategies which it can employ to induce a greater innovativeness. However, he believes useful inferences can be drawn from Halpin's Organisational Climate Description Questionnaire.

A factorial analysis of responses to questions relating to administrative relationships in the school reveal six distinct school profiles which are referred to as organizational climates. Halpin ranged these climates on a continuum from open to closed which he concedes is based upon his own value preferences.

Open

The head is a leader who works hard himself and thus sets an example. He establishes rules and procedures and is prepared to be critical, but he also flexible and to a large extent meets the social needs of his staff. He does not monitor the teachers' work too closely and allows leadership acts to emerge from his staff. Morale is high owing to a feeling of accomplishment by the staff and their experience of good personal relationships.

Autonomous

The head gives greater autonomy to his teachers than the 'open' climate head, but does not give them the same degree of positive leadership nor meets their social needs satisfactions to the same extent. He is aloof but gives a free hand, and all the teachers experience a sense of task accomplishment.

Controlled

The head is an authoritarian who controls his staff closely, works them hard, and provides for little social satisfaction. Nevertheless, the staff respond to this militant behaviour and derive satisfaction from their task achievement.

Familiar

The head is centrally concerned with creating a happy family atmosphere in the school. Hence he exerts little leadership or control and is disinclined to be critical. The staff enjoy friendly relationships but their morale is diminished through having little sense of task achievement.

Paternal

The head tries to exert control over his staff with little effect. He is constantly busy within the school but this is regarded as interference rather than leadership. The teachers pay little heed and rather little is achieved. The head also attempts to fulfil the social needs satisfactions of his staff, but this is characterized in Halpin's terms as a 'seductive oversolicitousness' which is regarded as non-genuine and is therefore non-motivating.

Closed

The head is aloof, controlling, impersonal, arbitrary and unconcerned with teachers as people. He gives no leadership and provides no example. The teachers gain little satisfaction from either their social relationships or their achievements.

Halpin concedes that this climate dimension is not necessarily linear but feels that at least the open-closed dimension is meaningful. It would appear from Halpin's description of the 'open' climate that such a school could be said to be in a state of organizational health and hence innovative.

Clearly the willingness of a school to institutionalize curriculum development is very much dependent upon the manner in which the head-teacher performs his leadership role; whether he is, in fact, a leader in the sense that he attempts to keep the school moving rather than simply ticking over. It is also dependent upon the administrative structure which he creates since communication and decision-making patterns of a school can clearly be motivating or otherwise. Strategies for change must complement leadership and communication styles. Skilbeck's situational analysis (7) is offered as an example of the far ranging management models headteachers will almost certainly have employed, given the complexity of school life, in addition to successful personal and leadership qualities:

1. Situational analysis

Review of the
change situation

external

Analysis of factors which constitute
the situation

i. cultural and social changes and expectations including parental expectations, employer requirements, community assumptions and values, changing relationships (e.g. between adults and children), and ideology.

ii. educational system requirements and challenges e.g. policy statements, examinations, local authority expectations or demands or pressure, curriculum projects, educational research.

iii. the changing nature of the subject-matter to be taught.

iv. the potential contribution of teacher-support systems e.g. teacher training colleges, research institutes etc.

v. flow of resources into the school.

internal

i. pupils: aptitudes, abilities and defined educational needs.

ii. teachers: values, attitudes, skills, knowledge, experience, special strengths and weaknesses, roles.

iii. school ethos and political structure: common assumptions and expectations including power distribution, authority relationships, methods of achieving conformity to norms and dealing with deviance.

iv. material resources including plant, equipment and potential for enhancing these.

v. perceived and felt problems and short-comings in existing curriculum.

2. Goal formulation

The statement of goals embraces teacher and pupil actions (not necessarily manifest behaviour) including a statement of the kinds of learning outcomes which are anticipated. Goals 'derive' from the situation analysed in 1. only in the sense that they represent decisions to modify that situation in certain respects and judgements about the principal ways in which these modifications will occur. That is, goals imply and state preferences, values and judgements about the directions in which educational activities might go.

3. Programme building

- a. design of teaching-learning activities: contents, structure and method, scope, sequence.
- b. means-materials e.g. specification of kits, resources, units, text, materials etc.
- c. design of appropriate institutional settings, e.g. laboratories, field work, workshops.
- d. personnel deployment and role definition e.g. curriculum change as social change.
- e. timetables and provisioning

4. Interpretation and implementation

Problems of installing the curriculum change e.g. in an on-going institutional setting where there may be a clash between old and new resistance, confusion etc. in a design method, these must be anticipated, pass through a review of experience, analysis of relevant research and theory on innovation and imaginative forecasting.

5. Monitoring, feedback, assessment, reconstruction

- a. design of monitoring and communication systems
- b. preparation of assessment schedules
- c. problems of continuous assessment
- d. reconstruction/ensuring continuity of the process

"However determined the head may be to succeed, however carefully the curriculum is planned, however conducive to creative learning the buildings are, the vital factor upon which the success of the school will depend is the nature and quality of the staff. No other single element has quite so much power to influence the way that a school develops." Whitaker (8) p 80

In the previous pages two important management strategies were offered:

1. 'man' management based on the personal leadership and professional qualities of the headteacher. The key areas being an emphasis placed on communication style and by implication a strong philosophical base.

2. plans of action such as Skilbeck's situational analysis, where the emphasis is placed on assisting managers to clarify their thoughts through the use of some rational/sequential device.

Ways will now be examined in which staff participation in management can be encouraged.

Initially, the notion that staff participation is in need of encouragement and expansion may seem a very strange one. School is a complex institution and teachers have always been involved in the internal organisation of schools and the development of school and societal philosophies. However, this study has attempted to draw out some of the realities of school life:

- Many teachers find themselves suffering from stress and low morale.

- The notion of professional autonomy has always been vague and now greatly eroded over the last decade.

- Teachers' bureaucratic title is 'Assistant Teachers': a poor job description vaguely refers to 'assisting the headteacher'. The extent of this 'assistance' is negotiable and variable from one school to another.

- Headteachers need all the assistance they can get to cope with ever increasing demands.

- Modern education demands a holistic approach to schooling, both philosophically and structurally. Demands for 'process' rather than 'content' and calls for greater curriculum consistency and continuity is creating pressure on teachers to become more interactive and pressure on headteachers to enable these interactions to be of sustained value.

- It can be argued that asking teachers to participate more fully in the running of the school at a time of such stress and upheaval is only adding to that stress.

- An alternative argument could claim that the growing demands for change has produced feelings of anomie within the teaching profession. An antidote to feelings of helplessness is action and by giving teachers a greater stake in the running of the school it is possible to raise morale and bring about a more successful school.

Raising teachers' management expectations does hold difficulties for the headteacher. Headteachers have to decide upon the extent to which they are willing to permit their authority to be affected. Management relationships in schools are still basically consultative. By encouraging greater participation there is the possibility of teachers demanding a democratic management structure and therefore headteachers have to decide on the perimeters of all the actors authority and responsibility.

Finally, if teachers are expected to become part of a management team, then it would seem more than reasonable that they should be entitled to a full and varied professional career. Headteachers and employers have a responsibility to mount a staff development programme.

In the following pages examples are offered showing ways to encourage greater teacher participation and some of the problems involved.

The Deputy Head

"As things stand, deputyheadship often appears to be neither intrinsically satisfying, nor an adequate preparation for headship, since the aspiring deputy rarely has the opportunity to make the types of decision which will face him after promotion. The extension and elucidation of the deputy head's authority and discretion in school matters might enhance his satisfaction in his present post; it might also provide a more adequate preparation for further promotion"

Coulson (9)

The job description of deputy heads concerns itself almost solely with investing the deputy with the head's authority and responsibilities in the absence of the head. As the head is not absent for the vast majority of time, the deputy is left without a role, besides what each individual head might ask the deputy to do. This had led to a huge variation in the training and experience of deputies.

Coulson and Cox (10) claim that deputies in many schools have a collection of administrative tasks to perform, but seldom a special area of responsibility which they can call their own. They point out that few deputies come to a post without previous experience as a scale post holder, and that it is vital that curriculum expertise is put to good use. They offer various staffing structures to aid curriculum leadership.

A.	Head	Upper school
	Deputy	Lower school
B.	Head	Curriculum design and content
	Deputy	Curriculum evaluation
C.	Head	Curriculum
	Deputy	Support services (resources)
D.	Head	Curriculum
	Deputy	Organization

Deputies are often teachers looking for promotion, so by giving them a specific role the school would benefit from the efforts of a person determined to succeed. Delegation would invest the deputy with status and be an excellent form of training.

One of the authority stances granted to headteachers is the control of communication. Deputies need to gain access to knowledge if they are to begin to understand the complexities of being a manager. Some authorities have recently set up Deputy Head Groups, where deputies meet regularly and share information and experiences; visits are arranged and guest speakers attempt to shed light on some of the numerous factors involved.

A most interesting development regarding access to knowledge has occurred in 1985. The National Association of Headteachers has, after many years of argument, opened its doors to deputies. One of the N.A.H.T. main purposes is to keep heads well informed of all aspects affecting their job. The union issues every new member with a package of information and then regularly updates this. The quality of this information is high and all deputies would gain through membership.

However, inservice training, peer group meetings and union insights should not replace a close relationship between head and deputy.

Scale Posts

The H.M.I. survey argue (11) "It is important that teachers with

special responsibility for say mathematics should, in consultation with the head, other members of staff and teachers in neighbouring schools, draw up the scheme of work to be implemented in the school; give guidance and support to other members of staff; assist in teaching mathematics to other classes where necessary; and be responsible for the procurement, within the funds available, of necessary resources for the teaching of the subject. They should develop acceptable means of assessing the effectiveness of the guidance and resources they provide, and this may involve visiting other classes in the school to see the work in progress."

It is difficult to imagine the H.M.I.'s giving a fuller, more definitive job description than above. The message is clear but so are the problems:

- The head must delegate.
- The scale post must accept the challenge
- There are resource implications.
- The staff must act as an interactive unit and not a collection of isolated teacher/pupil units.

The H.M.I. survey did not find an encouraging picture in 1978 when they claimed "In a quarter of the schools in the survey teachers with positions of curriculum organization responsibility were having a noticeable influence on the quality of the work in the school as a whole. In the remaining schools there was little evidence that the influence of teachers with curricular responsibilities spread beyond the work of their own classes."

Clearly there are barriers between the perceived role of a scale post and the reality of the situation. In one school a scale post may be used as a reward for loyalty to that school. In another school they are used to compensate 'good' classroom teachers who do not wish to leave the classroom through gaining promotion.

However, the standard joke applied to some schools is that someone was given a scale post for making the tea. The point being that many teachers know of other teachers who have scale posts for no discernable reason. Certainly, there has been a lack of interest shown by the 'employers' regarding the reasons for the allocation of posts, apart from the arithmetic structure and financing of such posts.

If this situation is as widespread as suspected how can it be

explained? Pure conjecture has formulated this answer - by not allocating specific responsibilities to scale post teachers one is rewarding him but at the same time removing a 'structural framework' from which may come criticism and disruption of the existing situation. If a school, and its headteacher, perceives itself as a 'stable' ship on the stormy waters that have been primary schools' history and development, then the parties concerned may well not want to 'rock the boat'.

In other schools the opposite perception holds sway - 'debate' and 'action' are the norm. In one school, where the writer worked, there was a comprehensive management structure. For example, the writer was responsible for language development and this entailed:

- a) studying the Bullock Report
- b) organising discussion groups
- c) formulating policy statements
- d) organising book exhibitions and requisition to meet policy decisions
- e) reviewing record keeping and
- f) monitoring national and inservice developments.

Goodwill was a vital ingredient in this school, as was the shared perspective of the teachers. However, in addition to the more usual authority base of traditional and charismatic influence, the headteacher created the necessary circumstances through the intelligent use of 'structural frameworks' - concrete, defined, easily assimilated pieces of information that the teachers perceived as legitimate because of their legal/rational or quasi legal/rational source.

For example:

1. Justifying a review of procedures regarding the movement of children around the school; conduct and organisation of the supervision of children before school started, at 'playtime' breaks, dinner time and at the end of day, by referring to the Health and Safety at Work Act.
2. Claiming anyone holding a scale post must expect to be held responsible for a set of specific duties and responsibilities - it was an obvious stance.
3. Using the governing body to raise teachers' self esteem through a) minuting individual teacher's achievements b) organising at the earliest opportunity the introduction of teachers representation on the governing body following the Taylor Report recommendations.
4. Using the Taylor Report to justify closer liaison with parents,

thus leading to greater consultation, exhibitions and explanations of the curriculum to parents, a school magazine and regular musical and drama events.

5. Justifying regular curriculum reviews through referral to anyone of the many 'national documents' that were published during the mid and late seventies.

6. Involving the teachers in school based In Service training, after school, by pointing to the INSET initiative.

7. Insisting advisers meet teachers in their classrooms. Thus giving those teachers who were looking for promotion some tangible help, whilst at the same time creating pressure on teachers to ensure their teaching and classrooms were of a good standard.

8. Involving staff in the running of the school in a structured manner - regular staff meetings, personal interviews, staff run discussion groups, opportunity to become the teacher representative (governors), taking school assemblies, writing requisitions and writing curriculum papers, which were not lost in the headteacher's desk, but printed and bound to high specification and then distributed and made widely available.

In subsequent schools, the writer has seen similar devices employed, but never with the same style and purposeful intent. With regard to recent years, the most relevant use of legal/rational authority has been the legitimization of the need for accurate records and clearly planned and executed programmes of action stemming from the 'Special Needs' Act of 1981.

Gaining the full participation of teachers appears to be possible if three strategies can be employed:

- i) Justification of change on rational grounds
- ii) A genuine delagation of responsibility - intellectual and professional demands
- iii) Status rewards

In addition to the above, the headteacher will also have to use the management strategies found in previous pages - leadership, communication and sequential planning.

Staff development

There is no doubt that one of the saddest aspects of the education industry is the way the system treats teachers. The price of professional autonomy within the laissez faire system is high - isolation.

One possible answer to some of the problems facing teachers, in particular teachers adapting or failing to adapt to change and the growing difficulties in finding promotion and/or movement due to falling roles, is structural career guidance. There can be little doubt that as a profession there is no overall strategy for giving advice. Lyons (12) found, in a study involving the career perceptions of 122 teachers in comprehensive schools, that just under half had no clear perception of their career goal and the method of obtaining it, while just under a quarter had started teaching without such a career pattern in mind.

Coulson (13) writing about the role of the headteacher, suggested that a large proportion of teachers in primary schools appear to be less committed to long range career patterns. This apparent lack of interest in evolving a professional career is interesting and may offer an explanation as to why so many teachers seem unable to appreciate how staff development can be of assistance to them. This throws down a serious challenge to headteachers. Not all teachers want promotion, but will need 'stretching' intellectually and professionally and those who seek promotion need a career plan and advice.

The headteachers need to develop a relationship with teachers whereby the teacher's career can be seen in some form of context. This necessitates formal, private communications and some record keeping - casual contact may be of value in developing and maintaining relationships, but a regular, formal procedure seems more likely to lead to a rational picture emerging.

Perhaps a twice yearly personal interview would meet needs. This would partly be an opportunity to discuss any general and specific difficulties. However, it would also give the opportunity for the headteacher and teacher to agree decisions regarding teacher development. The following would be of value:

- i) curricula responsibilities
- ii) resource responsibilities
- iii) in service education, which could include school-based in-service.
- iv) extra curricular activities
- v) age range of children taught

- vi) internal organisation of the school
- vii) promotion and career prospects
- viii) personal matters

Staff development is an important part of a package to enable teachers to participate more fully in the running of their school and raise their own expertise, experience and morale.

However, given the comparative insularity of individual schools and that they are unable to give the fullest support to all their teachers with regard to professional development and promotion, should not the L.E.A.'s, as immediate employers, consider this part of their brief?

Apparently not, Hilsom and Start (14) asked whether L.E.A.'s regard it as part of their functions to identify and encourage able teachers to think of teaching as having a career structure, either generally or within a particular authority. The paucity of information obtained by the authors led to their concluding that the notion of positive career advancement was virtually non-existent.

Careers advice Most L.E.A. ignored the issue, while a few tended to rely on casual conversations between advisers and teachers.

Promotion schemes Only two of the existing L.E.A.'s which responded, indicated that they operated a formal promotion scheme.

Preferential consideration A number of L.E.A.'s stated that they did tend to give preference for promotion to candidates who possessed present or past experience with the authority. In other authorities 'internal' candidates were interviewed but could not be guaranteed actual appointment.

With the onus placed firmly on the individual teacher, it is difficult to imagine significant improvements in the situation without major structural change.

Morant (15) offer a four point strategy:

1. Reporting on teachers' work - to arrive at a fair and equitable method of evaluating the professional performance of teachers.
2. Career consultancy - a proper system of career consultancy to provide expertise and advice. Morant is not in favour of L.E.A. authority staff assuming this task as they are not disinterested having

to draw up short lists. Morant prefers a small team of specialists operating outside the normal post-filling process.

3. In-service education - Morant argues for L.E.A. 'focussed' in-service fashioned as co-ordinated response to all professional needs identifiable within the whole local education service. L.E.A.-focussed in-service should be able to prepare teachers for transference from one institution to another, from one post to another e.g. teacher to headteacher.

4. Appointment policies and procedures. Morant argues there is a good case for standardizing appointment procedures. In particular, all appointing committees should be expected to follow a code of practice in which precise guidelines are laid down on how candidates should be selected for posts.

These reforms seem, with the exception of appraisal, to be in the future. Resource implications and the attitudes of the L.E.A.'s make it probable the main burden will fall on the headteacher.

This chapter has shown that individual headteachers can do much to cope with change by employing a variety of management strategies:

- personal and social leadership
- rational/sequential models
- staff participation by encouraging -
 - i. school based curriculum
 - ii. job description definition
 - iii. the legitimation of actions
 - iv. staff development

These strategies could transform the English education system, but at the risk of being repetitious one must return again to the laissez faire system. This study took as a central theme that education cannot escape from its own history and while individual headteachers can put into action management measures of high merit, the conscious and subconscious attributes of the laissez faire system still remain. In the final chapter the future framework for education will be discussed.

- (1) OWENS, R.G.(1970) Organisational Behaviour in Schools. Englewood Cliffs New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- (2) DES. (1977) Ten Good Schools - A Secondary School Inquiry: HMSO.
- (3) WOOLCOTT, Achieving administrative efficiency in PAISLEY A.
(1983) The Effective Teacher, London: Ward Lock Educational.
- (4) COOK, A., & MACK, H. (1971) The Headteachers Role. London: Macmillan.
- (5) HOYLE, E. How does the curriculum change? in HOOPER, R. The Curriculum (1971) London: Oliver & Boyd.
- (6) HALPIN A.W. (1966) Theory and research in educational administration. New York: Macmillan.
- (7) SKILBECK, M. Situational Analysis in School Based Curriculum Development. Open University course material OUE 203 unit 26.
- (8) WHITAKER, P. (1983) The Primary Head. London: Heinmann.
- (9) COULSON, A.A. (1976) Leadership Functions in Primary Schools. Educational Administration.
- (10) COULSON, A.A. & COX, M. (1975) What do deputies do? Education 3-13, 3,2.
- (11) HMI Survey, op cit (8,46)
- (12) LYONS, G. (1981) Teacher careers and career perceptions, Slough: NFER/Nelson.
- (13) COULSON, A.A. (1980) The role of the primary head in BUSH, T. (ed) Approaches to school management. London: Harper & Row.
- (14) HILSUM, S. & START, K.B. (1974) Promotion and careers in Teaching. Slough: NFER.
- (15) MORAN, R. in PAISEY A. op cit.

CHAPTER 9

Search for a framework

In this final chapter an attempt will be made to 'place' the headteacher within some management framework.

If there ever was a 'golden age' for headteachers then the Medieval notion of the earth being the centre of the Universe - with the head, of course, being Earth holds some merit. The model certainly lacks modesty. Nevertheless the idea is enhanced by image of deferential orbiting planets.

It can be claimed that the headteacher has been the focal point of the English educational system, both in perception and to a lesser degree in reality. As for the deferential orbiting planets, it can be claimed interested parties, irrespective of their actual power, preferred to persuade rather than to order or force individual schools to follow their particular line.

The past decade has seen the start of the dismantling of this laissez faire system. The rules are changing and headteachers need to reassess their position. The reasons for the destruction of such a strong traditional framework has been set out in this study. Simply put the laissez faire system was all things to all people and thus was able to be maintained. The system permitted progress, conservatism, stagnation and stupidity. The system survived by appearing to give each interest group what they wanted:

1. Parents were promised for their children equality of opportunity and social mobility.
2. Governors could show token interest
3. Colleges had their 'Ivory Towers'.
4. Any pressure group could have their say.
5. L.E.A.'s had centralized and bureaucratized their authority.
6. Central government could leave education well alone and then occasionally send 'bolts of lightning' changing direction and then leave education to sort out the implications.
7. Teachers had their professional autonomy.
8. and headteachers had so much freedom they were envied throughout the world.

However, the laissez faire system has failed to reach the standards set by society; conservatism still dominates:

Parents are more political, more demanding. They have seen the unhappy confused state of education and are naturally anxious for their children's future.

Central governments attempts to sort out education has seen the greatest departure in policy strategy this century. They have and are pursuing structural changes to bring about greater accountability and curriculum consistency.

Pressure groups may have had the opportunity to have their say but research continually discovers a lack of progress.

The fight for change is on, but the task is a major one. The various actors involved in education have been unable to untangle themselves from their traditional roles and respond to change. Resourcing and finance are obviously important factors, but it is the perception of role that is the critical factor:

Colleges and universities can still be accused of being isolated and divorced from the reality of schools. L.E.A.'s have centralized authority but to what purpose? History has shown them to be almost entirely reactive but the immediate employers of teachers, one could argue, should be proactive.

The D.E.S. has orchestrated many changes, but doubts linger regarding the political will of central government to finance the restructuring of education.

Teachers cling to their professional autonomy, even though the system is crashing round their ears. Many teachers are demoralized by society's demands and the framework they work within and yet they seem incapable of forming a strong enough lobby to affect the re-definition that is presently occurring.

Headteachers struggle to sift through the numerous demands placed upon them and organise an adequate response. Their job is to manage change, but the framework they operate within is totally inadequate. The Medieval notion of Earth dominating the Heavens has sunk like a sunset.

The defence of the laissez faire system hinges on one argument and that is that schools must have freedom to grow, to learn, to change. Structural changes and calls for curriculum consistency will destroy the most imaginative school system in the world. This argument has the strongest merit. Stenhouse (1) claims "Students in training often notice a gap between the educationalist and the school not unlike that between Haig's headquarters and the mud of Flanders. So

many seem elated by the discussion of educational idea; so far few are encouraged by close critical scrutiny of their own classrooms. The gap between aspiration and practice is a real and frustrating one. The gap can only be closed by adopting a research and development approach to ones own teaching."

The implications of Stenhouse's claims are serious. Domination of teaching by central or local government will probably fail - the gap between aspiration and practice would be too large.

Nevertheless, the laissez faire system must be replaced by something.

Analogies can be drawn with a model based on an American commercial system - the franchise system. Briefly, in this American commercial system, which incidentally has not fared particularly well in this country, a company will set up a person as a manager of one of their particular outlets. The company will supply most of the capital outlay, stock, intensive training, advertising, and managerial advice. The manager, however, is not a paid employee. He has had to make a financial investment in the company and subsequently takes profits directly stemming from his efforts in running the outlet. Whilst this form of commercial enterprise has never taken a strong hold in this country, it is a formidable part of the American economy. The major reason for success is plain to be seen, in that whilst the 'company' looks after all the resources, the motivation, the driving force is supplied by the manager who is financially committed and also dependant for his livelihood upon his own efforts.

To claim the manager is self employed is in fact over stating his position considerably. In truth, there are very severe restraints placed upon him. The parent company does not relinquish control of product quality, stock, customer relations and outlet image. It sees itself in very strong management terms - laying down rules, chains of communication and comprehensive training of both managers and staff. The parent company justifies these actions by claiming that any poor links in its corporate image could damage any expansion plans. In certain franchise outlets there are strict financial controls and monitoring of standards. The ultimate price of failure to meet those standards is the withdrawal of the franchise.

The message to be taken from the franchise model seems plain. Schools need freedom but education needs managing. There is an urgent need for central government, H.M.I., local authority administrators and advisers to introduce proactive management structures aimed at supporting headteachers, teachers and schools. A fully integrated comprehensive management structure is needed to replace the reactive, insubstantial and erratic pattern of management now found. The emphasis should not be placed on making defined demands on schools but on aggressively helping schools to succeed. In this way aspirations will begin to be discussed in a more rational framework.

Franchise companies do not just set up outlets and then leave 'them' to get on with it, but one can claim this is what has basically happened in the English education system.

Management should be dynamic. There should be a sense of partnership, a communication system, a training scheme, resourcing by needs, a monitoring device and these management elements need 'housing' in a recognisable package.

However, management in education has to be accepted as part of the whole. There is almost an anti-management tension running through education, as if it was 'not quite the done thing', but without better management the way ahead seems clouded with unhappiness.

With some regret, this study closes not with optimism but with a warning. Brodie (2) states "..... we can no longer allow management to be a missing dimension in education. The school is a social institution of particular subtlety and sensitivity. The individual teacher has all the pressures which come from working in a situation largely not his or her own making. Many factors and conditions which determine effectiveness lie beyond immediate control. There are large distances, organisational and psychological, between the teacher and others who make up the larger educational system. Timetabling and the other day to day demands squeeze out the time and often the energy and motivation to give adequate thought to the longer term. Preoccupation with subject curricula and examinations takes priority over questions of policy, organisation and resources.

Objectives and priorities are left unstated and are not considered matters for the intimate involvement of staff. The interaction of a school with its environment is often ambiguous. Autonomy, which should bring with it a sense of freedom to initiate and experiment turns too readily to insularity and conservatism. Tensions which ought to be productive of open debate and of creative development may be left unresolved with relationships at arms length." p 63

To ask the hierarchy of educational management to adopt a pose of aggressive proactive support for schools without unduly dominating the creativity and sensitivity of individual schools is certainly feasible. In particular, the H.M.I. and many L.E.A. advisory services appeared to support the liberal ideologies found within the laissez faire system. On a different tack one could argue that a microscopic domination of schools by the 'hierarchy' is unlikely given the history of educational management prior to the Great Debate. It seems fair to claim that central government's comprehensive plan of action has not been matched with the same enthusiasm by the L.E.A. administrators.

One could argue that the various changes outlined in this study are profound in nature but nevertheless do not destroy all of that which makes the English primary sector so unique. However, because teaching is so concerned with human contact and communication there is a serious stumbling block to change and that is persuading the actors involved to alter self perception. For change to succeed the actors involved must internalize the changes and perceive them as legitimate. Part of the present difficulty is that many of the actors see the laissez faire system as legitimate and it is for this reason that so much of this study has concerned itself with looking at the historical development of primary education.

The absorption of new values and roles may literally take years. Easing that process must be a primary management function. Offered below is an outline management structure based on the conclusions drawn from this study. The following must be considered inadequate given the complexities of the situation. Nevertheless, two perspectives seem of particular relevance and they are the need to manage personal relationships and the need to employ management structures to legitimate actions.

The Role and Coordination of management agencies

Earlier in this study the phrase 'bolts of lightning' was used to describe many of the past actions of central government. The point being that both politicians and administrators have thought it adequate to decide broad aims or strategies and then expect lower levels of the hierarchy e.g. L.E.A.'s to implement any such policy. Likewise, it has been argued that the L.E.A.'s have appeared anxious not to closely control what happens inside schools, justified by defending liberal ideologies. These liberal ideologies have also contributed to the apparent stance of many H.M.I.'s, L.E.A. advisers, in-service agencies and headteachers in respect of an acceptance of the undefined concept of the professional autonomy of teachers and with that serious implications for curriculum development and classroom management. Headteachers have been granted wide ranging powers that are viewed as legitimate by most of the education world, but without the benefit of a defined job description. The laissez faire system has permitted vague role definition and spheres of influence. Arguments claiming the various management agencies have become isolationist, conservative and reactive rather than proactive hold merit.

An argument presents itself there are unacceptable divisions between educational policy, organisational structures and management. Being charitable, one could claim these divisions have occurred because of one group's faith in another group's professional competence. Another argument would claim that the uniqueness of individual schools makes defined management by 'distanced' hierarchies both undesirable and impracticable. To be less charitable one could argue that by concentrating on broad policy these management agencies have evaded their responsibilities. The development of intellectually satisfying directives without accepting responsibilities for ensuring adequate structure, resourcing, dissemination and management leaves these agencies open to serious criticism. The American franchise system, and one suspects most of modern commerce and industry, would never permit such a gap to exist between policy and implementation.

The following suggestions stem from the notion that the distance

between policy, organisation and management must be closed if the immense support task facing management is ever to succeed.

1. The first idea undoubtedly 'grasps the nettle' in suggesting that one major problem area is unravelling the source of decision making, with political decisions being confused with problem solving managerial decisions. We live in a democracy where 'education' becomes an occasional 'hot potato' only to be followed by possibly years of low profile interaction. Perhaps more serious is the unstructured system of consultation that appears to be the norm. There are formal bureaucratic links - parliament and the D.E.S., D.E.S. and H.M.I., Local Council and L.E.A. administration, Burnham, C.L.E.A. etc. but given the complexities of education and the apparent distance between policy and implementation, one must question the ad hoc approach to consultation and the simplicity of the existing formal bureaucratic links. There is a strong rational argument that wide formalized dialogue increases the possibility of problem solving management occurring because every issue would be seen from differing standpoints. Whereas informal, ad hoc dialogue could be manipulated to suit the sponsoring agency by the inclusion or exclusion of certain parties and the emphasizing or deemphasizing of any particular pressure group's stance. The laissez faire system's avoidance of conflict may well have been an important brake on change. Conflict should not necessarily be seen as something to be avoided, but rather as something likely to occur within a framework of frank dialogue. If the headteacher's role is ever to be defined in realistic terms and if the rest of education is going to be mobilized into a comprehensive support machine, formal dialogue must be a priority. The following is worthy of consideration:

- a. A professional teachers council including H.M.I., D.E.S., L.E.A. and teacher representation.
- b. The various teachers unions concerning themselves more with professional matters than with salaries. (A new salaries negotiating mechanism would greatly help).
- c. Formalized dialogue between L.E.A. administrators and advisory service.

- d. Formalized dialogue between headteachers and L.E.A. advisory service and L.E.A. administrators.
- e. Proactive role for governors with regard to their relationship with the L.E.A.
- f. Advisers and inspectors need job specifications and training in consultancy skills and in management. They are a key management level.
- g. Management training initiatives need careful thought. There is always the danger of courses being run along traditional didactic lines. The point being that whilst the management skills offered in Chapter 8 are most certainly interesting, their value would be greatly increased if they were housed in a system whereby there could be a shift from didactic to learning-by-doing and more geared to performance improvement.
- h. The question has to be posed - should educational managers be selected for their managerial skill or because of their ideological or pedagogical stance? The liberal tradition has always favoured managers with a strong educational philosophy, but the notion that 'good teachers are promoted to become poor managers' is also commented upon. Perhaps the time has come to reexamine the basis of appointment strategy.
- i. There is a commonly held view that education holds a unique position in the scheme of things. Perhaps this needs to be reassessed as it may well be that the management of commerce, industry and other parts of the public sector have aspects of training and organisation relevant to education.
- j. The reshaping of actors roles and consciousness will require a total revision of the present in-service provision. The argument for a coordinated comprehensive scheme has been documented in this study. The existing cafeteria system targets far too randomly upon the individual. If major changes are to occur the need to target upon strategic positions is inescapable.

Staff Development - the teachers

Only a concerted effort by all levels of management can make in-roads into this sadly neglected area of the education industry. The motivation of the teaching profession must be considered as a high priority:

- a. Job specification
- b. Agreed contract of employment
- c. Independent careers advice
- d. Rationally thought out opportunities to develop expertise and experience in:
 - i. curricula matters
 - ii. resource matters
 - iii. in-service education
 - iv. age range of children
 - v. extra curricula activities
 - vi. internal organisation e.g. school assemblies, requisition, teacher governor, concerts, school camps etc.
- e. Appraisal and formal regular lines of communication
- f. Standardized promotion procedures.
- g. Schemes to ease the transfer of teachers from one school to another.
- h. Performance related to reward system.

The headteachers

1. The use of bureaucratic inputs to legitimate actions.

Some readers may still find this management strategy hard to justify. This study has drawn attention to the many ways in which a headteacher's authority base has been eroded during this century. Growing governmental intervention, growing teacher demands for professional autonomy, curricula difficulties, expanding societal aspirations, worthless contracts of employment and job descriptions, resourcing and the basic conservative nature of the teaching profession have all placed pressure on headteachers as they attempt to manage change. A weaker authority based on Weber's rational and traditional lines has left many headteachers relying on charismatic leadership and/or subtle forms of negotiation. However, rational bureaucratic demands can remove the onus of responsibility from the

headteacher's shoulders. Headteachers can present bureaucratic inputs as problems to be solved. The headteacher does not have to justify his or her own stance, but becomes the head of a receiving agency. If bureaucratic demands are perceived as legitimate the headteacher's managerial function must be eased.

Examples are set out below:

1. L.E.A.'s demands for a triennial review of the curriculum.
2. Annual parent prospectus.
3. Termly reports to governors.
4. Health and Safety Act.
5. Appraisal.
6. Posts of responsibility.
7. H.M.I. and D.E.S. reports.
8. Coordination of In-service work.
9. Special Need Act 1981.
10. 1944 Education Act - Religious Instruction.

What is also necessary, of course, is to ensure the headteacher can affectively contribute to the formation of these bureaucratic inputs.

2. Development of leadership skills in headteachers.

There may well be a 'gut' feeling that leadership qualities cannot be acquired, and in some way they are so bound up with an individual's personality as to make their acquisition by all personality types doubtful. One could further argue that the ever increasing public relations/social interaction aspects of the job require headteachers to 'perform' high profile skills. However, there is a dilemma - is it right to employ headteachers solely on the basis of their charismatic personality or highly developed communication skills when the fundamental job of a headteacher must be the development of a school philosophy? Without an intellectually stimulating and humane philosophical base a school is built on sand. One is therefore left with no option but to seek to help headteachers develop leadership skills. The following seems necessary:

- a. Deputy heads need a detailed job description which includes a leadership skill element so they can begin to learn the ropes.
- b. Heads and deputies require compulsory comprehensive

management training which unashamedly and uncompromisingly tackles personal relationships and communication.

c. The expansion of the advisory service so that headteachers can develop regular contact with someone who should be an ex-headteacher of the highest quality.

d. A large part of the appraisal system relevant to headteachers should be devoted to the use of leadership skills.

e. The development of a local peer discussion group.

The headteacher's job can be a lonely one, so by creating a situation whereby regular contact can be made, any sense of isolation can be possibly broken, matters of mutual interest explored and the L.E.A. administration/advisory service could use any such group as a sounding board or a vehicle for the dissemination of information or debate.

There is a real need for primary schools to meet regularly in respect of liaison with the local secondary school, so this offered framework needs little bureaucratic justification given the calls for curriculum consistency and continuity.

Referring back to the opening paragraph of the previous chapter, the T.E.S. (6.9.85) reported on a N.F.E.R. research project which found that the personal and professional qualities demanded by teachers of a new head were awe-inspiring - ranging from charm to implacability, and from firm leadership to the ability to consult and delegate. In many respects one could argue that this view of the role of the headteacher is, and perhaps always has been, faintly absurd. This study has recorded the comments of authors with respect to the difficulties facing headteachers from the earliest part of this century. One could argue the role of the headteacher resembles Hans Christian Anderson's story of the 'Emperor's Clothes'. One could certainly sustain an argument that society asks too much of headteachers. Having said that it is difficult to imagine a different form of organisation within schools. Is it just a myth to claim good schools have good headteachers? Probably not, schools

are not just processing mechanisms but places where profound spiritual, social and intellectual activities take place - leadership does count.

The need to explore, discuss, persuade, show by example, generate enthusiasm, console, encourage, re-examine and take firm decisions all point towards an educational leader rather than some non-educational administrator. The progressive development of co-operative decision-making by teachers is desirable but requires careful management and co-ordination.

One is left with the inescapable conclusion that the re-organisation of education should be directed to the support of head-teachers and their schools, but will this happen? The destruction of the *laissez-faire* system and its replacement with structures to encourage 'accountability' and 'curriculum consistency' is proceeding at a furious pace. Unless the actors accept their new roles the future looks uncertain. It is the quality of the structural relationships that still has to be established.

- (1) STENHOUSE, L. (1975) An Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development. London: Heinemann.
- (2) BRODIE, M. Understanding organisation and management in
PAISEY, A. (1983) The Effective Teacher London: Ward Lock.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALDRICH, R. (1982) An Introduction to History of Education. London: Hodder & Stroughton.
- AFU (1980) Science Progress Report HMSO
- ARON (1970) Main Currents in Sociological Thought. Vol III, London: Penguin.
- ASHTON, KNEEN, DAVIES & HOLLEY (1975) School Council Research Study. The Aims of Primary Education: A Study of Teachers' Opinions. London: Macmillan Education.
- BACON, W. (1978) Public Accountability and the Schooling System: London: Harper & Row.
- BARKER-LUNN, J. (1984) Junior Teachers Method and Practice. in Educational Research. VEER/Nelson.
- BARON & HOWELL (1974) The Government and Management of Schools: London: Athlone Press.
- BASSETT, G.W. (1970) Innovation in Primary Education, London: Wiley - Interscience.
- BELL FOWLER & LITTLE (1973) Education in Great Britain & Ireland. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- BENNETT, N. (1976) Teaching Styles and Pupil Progress. London: Open Books Ltd.
- BENNET, N., DESFORGES, C., COCKBURN, A., WILKINSON, B. (1984). The Quality of Pupil Learning Experience. LEA, London.
- BERNSTEIN, B. (1967) Open Schools, Open Society? New Society 10, 351-3.
- BLACKIE, J. (1967) Inside the Primary School. London: H.M.S.O.
- BOLTON, E., (1979) Education in a multicultural society. Trends in Education 4, 3-7.
- BOWLES & GINTIS (1976) Schooling in Capitalist America. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul p.104.
- BUSH, T. (ed) . (1980) Approaches to school management. London: Harper & Row.

- CASPARI, I. (1976) Troublesome Children in Class, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- CENTRAL ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR EDUCATION (1967) Children and their Primary Schools. Volume. London: HMSO Price:497.
- CENTRE FOR CONTEMPORARY CULTURAL STUDIES (1981) Unpopular Education - Schooling and social democracy in England since 1944. London. Hutchinson:page 217.
- COHEN, L., & MANTON, D. (1981) Perspectives on Classrooms and Schools. London: Holt Rinehart and Winston.
- COMBER, L.C., and WHITFIELD, R.C. (1979) Action on Indiscipline: A Practical guide for teachers. IAS/UWT In association with the Department of Education Enquiry University of Aston.
- CONNELL R.W. (1985) Teachers' Work. London:George Allen & Unwin. p.206.
- CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (1931) The Primary School. London:H.M.S.O.
- CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION ON SECONDARY EDUCATION (1938) The Spens Report. London:H.M.S.O.
- COXCRONF REPORT (1982) Mathematics Counts: an Inquiry into Mathematics in the Primary Schools. HMSO.
- COOK, A., & HACK, H. (1971) The Headteachers Role. London: Macmillan.
- CRAFT M., RAYNOR, J., and COHEN L. (Ed) (1972) Linking Home and School. London: Longman.
- COULSON, A.A. (1976) Leadership Functions in Primary Schools. Educational Administration.
- COULSON, A.A. & COX, M. (1975) What do deputies do? Education 3-13. 3.2.
- CYSTER, R., CLIFT, P.S., BATTLE, S. (1979) Parental Involvement in Primary Schools. NFER.
- DNS (1985) Better Schools! (Cmd 9469) HMSO.
- DNS (1977) 'Education in Schools' HMSO
- DNS (1980) 'A framework for the school curriculum' HMSO

- DES (1984) In Service Teacher Training Grant Circular 1/84 IMSO.
- DES (1979) Local Authority Arrangements for the School Curriculum. London: IMSO Page 2.
- DES (1978) Making INSEI work, IMSO.
- D.N.S. (1981) The School Curriculum. London: H.M.S.O.
- DES (1985) Science 5-16 A Statement of Policy IMSO
- DES., SWANN REPORT (1985) Education for All. Committee of Inquiry Command 9455, IMSO.
- DES. (1977) Ten Good Schools - A Secondary School Inquiry: IMSO.
- DOUGLAS, J.W.B. (1964) The Home and the School. London: Panther Books Ltd.
- ELLIOTT, J. BRIDGES, D., EBUTT, D., GIBSON, R., NIAS, J., (1981) School Accountability - SSRC, Cambridge. Accountability Project, London: Grant McIntyre Ltd.,
- EVANS, K. (1975) The Development and Structure of the English Educational System. London: University of London.
- PRUDE, N. & GAULT, H. (ed) (1984) Children's disruption at school. Chichester, John Wiley.
- GALTON M & LAWSON D. (ed) (1983) Changing Schools, Changing Curriculum. London. Harper Row.
- GILLIAN, B. (Ed) (1981) Problem behaviour in the Secondary School. London: Croom Helm
- GORDON, F. & LAWSON. D. (1978) Curriculum change in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Century. London: Hodder and Stroughton.
- GOSDIN, R. (1978) The Education System Since 1944. London: N. Robertson & Co.
- GRACE, R. (1985) Judging Teachers. British Journal of Sociology of Education. Vol.6 No.1.
- HALPIN A.W. (1966) Theory and research in educational administration. New York: Macmillan.
- HILSUM, S. & START, K.B. (1974) Promotion and careers in Teaching. Slough: NFER.

- HOOPER, R. (1971) The Curriculum
London: Oliver & Boyd.
- IMI (1984) Effect of LEA Expenditure Policy - 1983. IMISO.
- IMI (1982) 'Education 5 to 9: an illustrative survey of
80 pilot schools in England' IMISO.
- IMI (1984) 'English from 5 - 16'. IMISO.
A series of discussion documents
- IMI (1983) '9-13 Middle Schools' IMISO.
- IMI (1982) The New Teacher in School. IMISO.
- IMI (1978) Primary Education in England. IMISO.
- HYNDMAN, N. (1978) Schools and Schooling in England and
Wales. London: Harper & Row.
- JAMES REPORT (1972) Teacher Education and Training.
London: IMISO.
- LOWENSTEIN, L. (1975). Violent and Disruptive Behaviour in
Schools. Hamel Hampstead: NAS/UWI Publications.
- LYONS, G. (1981) Teacher careers and career perceptions,
Slough: NFER/Nelson.
- MACLURN, J.S., (1979) Education Documents. London.
Methuen.
- MIDDLETON, N. & WHITZMANN (1976) A Place for Everyone.
New York, Vitor Gallance.
- MORGAN, C. (1978) Community Involvement in Decision Making in
British Education Systems, Open University Course Material
Unit 13, Milton Keynes.
- MUSGRAVE, P.M. (1968) Society and Education in England
since 1800. London: Methuen & Co., p.138.
- MUSGROVE P. & TAYLOR P.M. (1965) Teachers and Parents conception
of the teachers role. British Journal of Ed. Psychology XXXV
Part 2 p.p. 171-8.
- NAHFF (1984) NAHFF Submission to Education, Science and Art
Committee of the House of Commons Selective Committee
Enquiry into Primary Education found in NAHFF Newsletter
No. 102 (June, 1984).
- NAS/UWI (nda) (1976) Stress in Schools. Hamel Hampstead.
- NFER (1985) Educational Research News. NFER.

- OWENS, R.G.(1970) Organisational Behaviour in Schools. Englewood Cliffs New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- PACK REPORT (1977) Truancy and Indiscipline in Schools. Scottish Education Department.
- PAISEY, A. (1983) The Effective Teacher London: Ward Lock.
- FLOWDMN REPORT (1967) Children and the Primary Schools Vol I. London. IMSO.
- RICHARDS, C. (1982) New Directions in Education. London. Falmer Press.
- RICHMOND, W.K., (1978) Education in Britain since 1944. London: Methuen & Co.
- ROBBINS REPORT (1963) Report of the Committee on Higher Education appointed the Prime Minister. London: IMSO.
- RUTTER, M. (1980) Changing Youth in a Changing World, London: Nuffield Provincial Hospital Trust.
- RYDER & SILVER (1970) Modern English Society. London: Methuen & Co.
- SHIPMAN, M. (1979) School Evaluation. London: Heinemann.
- SHIPMAN, M. (1968) The Sociology of the School. London: Longmans.
- SIMONS B. & TAYLOR W. (1985) Education in the Eighties. London: Batsford Academic & Educational Ltd.
- SKILBECK, M. (Ed) (1984) Reading in school based curriculum development. London: Harper & Row.
- SKILBECK, M. Situational Analysis in School Based Curriculum Development. Open University course material OUB 203 unit 26.
- STENHOUSE, L. (1975) An Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development. London: Heinemann.
- TATTUM D. (1982) Disruptive Pupils Schools and Units. Chichester: Wiley.
- THOMAS, N. (1979) In Primary Education Review, a publication of National Union of Teachers No. 6 - Spring Issue 1979.

THOMAS REPORT (1985) Improving Primary Schools, London/LEA Learning Resource Centre.

WARDLE, D. (1975) English Popular Education 1790-1970. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

WHITAKER, F. (1983) The Primary Head. London: Heinmann.

WRIGHT, M. (1977) Progress in Education. London: Croom Helm.

