

MASS AND ELITE ASPECTS OF EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS:
A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

by

Robert Cowen

THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE UNIVERSITY
OF LONDON FOR THE DEGREE OF
Ph.D.
1981

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
COMPARATIVE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

ABSTRACT

MASS AND ELITE ASPECTS OF EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS:

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

Chapter One identifies areas of actual and potential confusion in the analysis of 'mass' and 'elite' education systems. It attempts to clarify the area of enquiry. The chapter concludes with a statement of a 'problem'. The problem is the relation between rapidly changing types of school and higher education institutions, and 'theories of general education'.

Chapter Two continues the task of clarification by selecting and explaining the techniques of enquiry which are used to clarify the problem in England. The techniques are reviewed and the tradition within which the analysis is located is briefly identified. This chapter concludes the initial phase of problem analysis.

Chapter Three undertakes the identification of the problem in different contexts, i.e. in four countries. It notes variations in the patternings of the problem. It considers selected aspects of the internal dynamics of educational systems in their relation to the problem.

Chapter Four is a short abstract statement of the ways in which theories in general education are sustained; and thus potentially changed.

Chapter Five offers some comment on the possibilities of changing the 'theory of general education' in England.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I have been fortunate. In my formal education, I have been taught by four remarkable teachers. Of these, two have been Professor and Head of the Comparative Education Department at the University of London Institute of Education.

The impact of these two men, Professor Lauwerys and Professor Holmes on comparative education students, for a period of time which is now approaching forty years, has been extensive and intensive. Extensive, in that their students are now teachers of comparative education all over the world. Intensive, in that the intellectual attraction of their teaching has often been so strong as to change the ways in which individuals see their lives. They had this effect on me. I thank them for their teaching.

My particular debt to Professor Holmes will be clear, to specialists in comparative education, in the pages that follow. Here I would like to acknowledge a crucial departmental institution: the Holmes' research seminar which has been held fortnightly for many years now. The seminar is a normal part of the life of a research student in the department. Everyone attends, and regularly. I suppose most people attend because, like me, they find that their thought processes in difficult comparative analyses are, when fast, not rigorous enough for the seminar; and when rigorous, too slow. One learns. The learning is cumulative. It is possible to meet the standards expected in the seminar; occasionally. For the pressure to meet those standards, for the freely given energy of the teaching process, and for the example of how comparative education work might be well done, I acknowledge with great pleasure a permanent debt.

| <u>CONTENTS</u> | | Page |
|---------------------------|--|------|
| <u>Chapter One:</u> | <u>Confusions in search of a problem</u> | 6 |
| | equality of educational opportunity | 14 |
| | mass and elite | 19 |
| | the problem | 47 |
| <u>Chapter Two:</u> | <u>England: the problem refined</u> | 58 |
| | England | 58 |
| | comparative theories of general education | 69 |
| | England | 89 |
| | concluding reflections and summary | 108 |
| <u>Chapter Three:</u> | <u>The problem located</u> | 115 |
| <u>Section One:</u> | Identification | 115 |
| | USA | 116 |
| | Japan | 125 |
| | USSR | 138 |
| | France | 143 |
| <u>Section Two:</u> | Analysis in Context | 147 |
| | concluding reflections and summary | 162 |
| <u>Chapter Four:</u> | <u>Towards a theory of exclusion</u> | 169 |
| | selected implications and applications | 206 |
| <u>Chapter Five:</u> | <u>Solutions: toward inclusion</u> | 218 |
| | A Review | 218 |
| | England: specific initial conditions | 227 |
| | The Solutions | 235 |
| <u>List of Tables</u> | | |
| Table 1 | Schools: England and Wales | 61 |
| Table 2 | Schools: England and Wales | 61 |
| Table 3 | Schools: England and Wales | 62 |
| Table 4 | Schools: USA | 117 |
| Table 5 | Schools: Japan | 127 |
| Table 6 | Schools: Japan | 128 |
| Table 7 | Higher Education: Japan | 130 |

| | Page |
|---|------|
| Diagram One Hilker-style diagram | 103 |
| Figure One Theories of General Education | 176 |
| Figure Two Higher Education Systems | 178 |
| Figure Three External Relations | 185 |
| Figure Four General Theories and Structures | 189 |
| Footnotes | 248 |
| Bibliography | 291 |

Footnotes

Some footnotes carry important sub-arguments.
These footnotes are starred.

CHAPTER ONE. Confusions in search of a problem.

Problems require explanations; explanations require assumptions or models and hypotheses derived from such models; hypotheses, which are always, by implication, predictions as well as explanatory propositions, require testing by further facts; testing often generates new problems. (1)

R. Dahrendorf

Dahrendorf's description of intellectual work covers much of what follows. A problem is identified. Some attempt is made to explain through models and hypothetical propositions. Some testing by facts is undertaken. The testing leads to new problems, rather than the definitive solution of the first problem.

The intellectual frame within which the work proceeds is the Holmesian problem-solving approach.⁽²⁾ An attempt is made to state a Holmesian problem; to suggest an initial solution; to clarify the problem; and to give some further analysis of contexts in which the problem occurs. The work is, generally, an exercise in reflective thinking. More specifically, it is an enquiry framed by a particular methodology in comparative education.

However, the full logic of the Holmesian problem approach is not exemplified. The final steps in the methodology are underplayed. There is a discussion of the educational policies (solutions) which should be adopted in England and Wales, given certain specific initial conditions, but the solutions are not quite at the status of policy proposals. Nor is there detailed anticipation of the probable consequences expected to attend such solutions.

There is, however, a consistent emphasis in the work on the intellectual operations suggested by the Holmesian methodology. An effort is made to see a problem clearly. Paradoxically, this involves giving considerable attention to the 'stage of confusion'. Then the effort is to state, to clarify and to locate in context an example of asynchronous change in education, and to clarify this problem through cross-national analysis.

The problem is already, embryonically, present in the literature. However, its statement is confused and its theory inchoate. To state clearly the nature of the problem is already to move beyond the literature. To go further yet, and to re-order the problem theoretically may help to improve the literature. On the Dahrendorf thesis, new 'problems' may or may not be generated.

It will have been noted that Dahrendorf's sentence contains an imprecision which the Holmes problem approach does not permit. Whilst Dahrendorf comes close to the Holmesian position in his views on the tentative nature of hypotheses, on the role of testing, and on explanation by prediction, he uses the word 'problem' in its commonsense (i.e. dictionary-derived) meaning. Thus in Dahrendorf's usage, a problem is a direct question which is difficult to answer, or something which is hard to understand (through existing social theory), a puzzle. Testing may throw up fresh puzzles. This meaning is particularly noticeable in the last clause of the Dahrendorf sentence.

This meaning is not, however, acceptable if the Holmes methodology is taken, as it has been, as the starting point and broad frame of the analysis. A Holmesian problem is only incidentally a puzzle. Nor is the statement of a Holmesian problem, in its major meanings, a direct question to answer or something which is hard to understand, in the sense of 'to grasp mentally'.⁽³⁾ On the contrary. The statement of a Holmesian problem is a point of clarity. Phenomena have been understood sufficiently clearly to be identified in a technical statement: 'x' has changed faster than 'y'; and both 'x' and 'y' can be located taxonomically (as norms, institutions or environmental circumstance). Thus a Holmesian problem stated, is already a puzzle partially resolved.

The Dahrendorf concept of problem is more correctly located within the Holmes approach in that stage which precedes problem-statements: the stage of confusion. This usage is not perjorative (either here or in the methodology of the problem approach). The stage of confusions is a legitimate and explicit part of the problem approach, borrowed and extended from John Dewey's view of the processes of reflective thinking.⁽⁴⁾ For the individual, an experience occurs which produces doubt, uncertainty, and confusion. The process of reflective thinking allows a problem to be defined, and perhaps successfully solved. This stage of confusion is, in the problem approach also, a formal part of the methodology. It is here that the process of reflective thinking begins; this may lead to the relatively less confused condition of a problem statement.

In formal methodological terms, then, a state of confusion will be identified. Considerable emphasis is given here to this stage of the problem approach because what is judged to be confusing is important: the selection of problem begins in selection of confusions; and continues through the gradual ordering of those confusions.

Unless the trap of reification is accepted, only individuals can be confused. Thus the statement of a problem begins in the condition of anxiety of an individual experiencing confusions. As, however, the problem approach is a methodological position in a field of study there is some limitation on what it is legitimate to be confused about. Normally, the individual investigator in a professional role will be confused about some aspect of education; and resolution of the confusions will be undertaken within a comparative perspective.

Thus although confusions begin in the minds of investigators, there is an initial limitation, imposed by professional role, on what will be studied. There is a further caveat.⁽⁵⁾ Some problems are more important than others. The problem approach as stated does not lend itself to the study of picayune issues. Ordinarily, some issue of educational policy will be the point of departure. The point of departure will need refinement and technical statement as a problem, of course; but there is a weighting of the worthwhileness of problems.

The point of departure in this work, the psychological source of intellectual irritation, is two policy initiatives by the British government in education: the acceptance of the Robbins Report by the government, and the issuance of Circular IO/65 which outlined a pattern of comprehensive schools. These were at the time seen as major reforms, though one was more contested than the other. Both were acts of policy to be understood in a context of raised aspirations: the educational system of England and Wales would become more 'democratic'. Each child would soon receive an education more fitted to his or her age, ability and aptitude. The increased numbers of children and students demanding and taking up education seemed to confirm this belief.

There would, no doubt, be difficulties. Money would have to be found. More teachers trained. New schools built. Academics were concerned whether 'more' would mean 'worse'. There would be difficulties of transition from the traditional patterns of education to the patterns promised by the reforms.

However, these difficulties would be eased by the growing power to explain and guide which the expanding research capacities of educational studies could provide. Sociologists and psychologists had carefully analysed some of the inefficiencies and injustices of English education. Several of them had been influential in moving professional opinion toward the idea of reform. The comparative educationists knew something of the educational systems of the USA, the USSR and Japan, which had

already begun on some of the reform processes being discussed in England. In the mid-sixties, comparative educationists were rapidly increasing their knowledge as they studied the impact of increased student numbers, world-wide, and the world-wide efforts to 'democratise' educational systems. It was likely then that the English difficulties would be overcome, the kinds of educational policies represented by the Robbins document and Circular 10/65 would be successfully implemented, and this would be in part because powerful explanatory theories were available from the professional students of education, including the comparativists.

This optimism 'in the mind of the investigator' (though perhaps the optimism was widely shared) turned, relatively rapidly, into a state of confusion 'in the mind of the investigator' (though perhaps the confusion was widely shared). The public and professional debate about educational reform in England seemed both confused, and occasionally bitter. The patterns of the higher education system which had emerged, post-Robbins, seemed non-novel: there was indeed more, but it seemed just more of the same. In the same fashion, impressionistic and cursory at first, it seemed that the literature in comparative education held promise. A new 'problem' had been identified and new terms invented to conceptualise it. A closer look at the literature increased the feeling of confusion. The literature was discursive theoretically inelegant and, explained only in simplistic fashion what it took as its 'problem'.

The state of confusion thus took shape in response to two phenomena: new policies in English education affecting the secondary schools and the higher education system, especially the universities; and the new explanations offered in some of the comparative education literature.

At one level of complexity and in policy terms, what was to be understood was clear enough: how might equality of educational opportunity be achieved, and in particular, within the context of increased students numbers of the mid-sixties, how might educational systems be adapted to absorb the numbers demanding 'the right' to education? Very crudely put, in England the comprehensive school was to be the policy answer to the first question; the social demand principle of the Robbins Report (i.e. higher education to be expanded to absorb all qualified students seeking admission) exemplified a policy answer to the second.

At one level of complexity and in theory terms, what was to be understood was clear enough: what instruction did the cross-national analysis of educational systems offer concerning the achievement of equality of educational opportunity, and in particular, in what ways did the example of other nations assist in defining a comparatively based theory of the expansion of educational systems? Very crudely put, comparative research suggested that some nations (e.g. the USA, Sweden and Japan) were better at achieving 'equality of educational opportunity' than others (e.g. England, France and the Federal Republic of Germany); and that these phenomena might be understood through the terminology embedded in new theorising about mass and elite education systems.

The puzzles had received initial answers. But there were puzzles and confusions remaining. Some puzzles could be simply phrased but were difficult to answer. The debate to introduce and to sustain the comprehensive school into English education had been both lay and politicised. International examples of comprehensive school systems were quoted. Often those in favour of comprehensive education cited Sweden; those against, the United States.⁽⁶⁾ The English were, then, in their educational system borrowing or copying or adapting something foreign. How would 'English traditions' (to use a loose term deliberately here) affect the new comprehensive school? The numbers of students in higher education were to be expanded. How would 'English traditions' affect the expansion?

There were also puzzles and confusions remaining which could not be simply phrased. On reflection, at least one of these puzzles seemed to conceal such a degree of confusion as to be seriously misleading. This puzzle was equality of educational opportunity and intellectual approaches to it.

Equality of educational opportunity

Equality of educational opportunity is a social problem. That is, an issue which is publicised, given social visibility. The issue possesses salience. Seeking solutions to social problems is not a dishonourable activity. There is, however, a danger in treating a social problem as a problematic. The danger is that a solution will be sought within the parameters of what is defined as at issue by the social problem. The methods of the social science are then applied to a taken for granted problematic.

For example, the issue of corporal punishment in schools from time to time reaches a level of visibility and publicity which permits it to be termed a social problem whose focus is the educational system. A treatment of corporal punishment as a social problem allows a number of studies to be made. Its incidence by school or geographic region, its distribution to pupils classified by age, sex, social class, and ethnic status, the legal position and privileges of those administering it, the attitudes towards corporal punishment held by concerned groups, can all be researched. Redefining the social problem of corporal punishment as a theoretical problem within sociology directs attention to theories of the social order; perhaps even a particular theory such as Durkheim's theories of retributive and restitutive punishment. Redefining what is problematic suggests different empirical studies (e.g. the complete social ordering of the school is now a more logical object of investigation): what constitutes relevant evidence is thus redefined.

Deciding whether to accept a social-problem definition of what is to be investigated is therefore an important intellectual operation. It is also one which the Holmes methodology enforces. (7)

As a social problem, equality of educational opportunity means educating more people than hitherto, for longer and more efficiently without regard to the ascriptive characteristics of the educands. The principle is of course very much affected by historical and comparative circumstance. In a given time and

place, the framing of the social problem may mean emphasis on elementary education; elsewhere on secondary or tertiary education. But the conventional question, once equality of educational opportunity is taken for granted social problem is, how much equality of education is there?

This is a legitimate question, and one to which, for certain purposes, it is necessary to know the answer. However, it is a Dahrendorf puzzle and not a Holmesian problem. Worse, the answer directs attention to certain classes of data and not others. It directs attention to the question of 'how much' and away from the dynamics of educational systems. It directs attention to the 'causes' of inequality of educational opportunity. The question has produced a massive literature. (8)

Typically the answer given to the question establishes that certain categories of children leave the educational system earlier than others; and/or that, whilst in the educational system, they do less well on tests of attainment than other children at the same level of the educational system, with measured ability (perhaps as defined by I.Q. or non-verbal tests) held, as far as possible, constant. The social characteristics of the relatively less successful children are investigated. These vary, but may include social class position, rural background, tribal or religious affiliation, ethnicity or even femaleness. (9) More sophisticated characteristics, imputed to social background, such as language code or achievement motivation, may be conceptualised and empirically researched. Efforts are made to establish the relative significance of each 'variable'. As new educational

policies are undertaken, the amount of educational equality may after an appropriate period of time be remeasured.

The question, then, takes its answer in the form of empirical sociology. Its intellectual direction comes from the tradition of social accounting which has underpinned much of British sociology since its genesis. ⁽¹⁰⁾ With the question answered, much new data has been added to our description of the social universe. The policy answer is a matter of logic. Typically it is to intervene in educational and social policy to reduce the effects of social and economic background. Scholarships for needy students may be created, or programmes such as the American Head Start initiative may be undertaken. In this fashion the 'causes' of inequality in education will be removed, or their effects modified. Attention is directed away from the educational system to the social and economic causes of relative lack of educational success; and towards social and economic buttressing of the educational system.

This logical sequence begins in accepting the social-problem definition of equality of educational opportunity as a puzzle. The focus of attention also produces a second consequence. Attention is primarily directed, in such sociological research, away from the internal dynamics of educational systems. The focus of research is on the external interrelationships of education systems with other social sub-systems, such as the family and the economic system. If, at a late stage, the educational system is accepted into the problematic, the reforms

proposed are likely to be simplistic. Thus a comprehensive school policy may be favoured on the grounds of ideology rather than analysis; although the social accounting research provides a legitimation for action, it does not analytically establish that it is the comprehensive school solution (rather than alternative solutions) which should be adopted.

There is a comparative argument which accepts both a social-problem definition of equality of educational opportunity and which, in its general form, seems to suggest particular solutions. The abstract argument is: (i) cross-national comparison indicates that country 'a' achieves a higher level of educational opportunity in its formal educational systems than country 'b'; (ii) country 'b', given its stated educational aims, should therefore borrow or adapt educational policies similar to country 'a'; (iii) these educational policies will provide a similar degree of success to that which country 'a' has produced in improving equality of educational opportunity. An alternative formulation would read as follows: (i) in countries 'a', 'b', 'c' and 'd' where policies 'W', 'X', 'Y' and 'Z' are present in education, equality of educational opportunity is high as measured by cross-nationally neutral empirical indices; therefore, (ii) other countries undertaking policies 'W', 'X', 'Y' and 'Z' will improve their levels of educational opportunity, as measured by, etc.

Such a formulation is unfortunate. It accepts that the social-problem of equality of educational opportunity is similar in different cultures. It confuses correlations with causes. It ignores the question of whether the internal dynamics of educational systems are similar in different nations. It glosses over the issue of cross-national transfer. It compounds error: it transforms a 'how much' question too casually into an illegitimate answer to the question 'how to change'. (11)*

Unease and further confusion, then, were generated by the ways in which the problematic was being framed in both educational action in England and in the sociological and comparative education literature. It was not only that there were a number of puzzles (and no Holmesian problem). It was also that the way in which the puzzles had been taken up - through equality of educational opportunity as a social-problem - was constraining the ways in which the problematic might be perceived. How might the problematic be reconceptualised? In particular, was there some way of progressing, beyond the social accounting questions, to address puzzles posed by the internal dynamics of education systems; of taking the educational system itself as problematic? Perhaps in such a framing of the puzzle a better understanding of educational action might be gained and an alternative theoretical grasp, on what was at issue, generated.

There was one line of approach which, whilst acknowledging the social significance of educational opportunity, tended to focus analysis on the configurations of educational systems. The literature was less addressed to the general issue of equality

of educational opportunity than to the specific issue of educational change under the pressure of student numbers. As such, it focussed attention on the dynamics of education, taking the educational system itself as problematic. The literature had the advantage of being explicitly comparative, i.e. written by comparativists. This literature was the 'mass' and 'elite' literature of the sixties and early seventies.

The confusions might be reduced, the puzzles clarified, by some of the literature.⁽¹²⁾ Where this did not occur directly, processes of reflective thinking, stimulated by the confusions which the literature itself contained, might clarify issues sufficiently for a Holmesian problem to be stated.

The specialist comparative educationists who had used, by the late sixties, the terms 'mass' and 'elitist' to describe educational systems included George Z.F. Bereday, Frank Bowles, Nigel Grant, Brian Holmes, Torsten Husen and Joseph A. Lauwerys.

Mass and elite analysis

Bereday identified "... the modern ideal of total mass education for all youth up to graduation level."⁽¹³⁾ Bowles wrote that when the English, German and French educational systems served as 'world models' they "... were starkly elitist in nature, and through their imitators they became models for systems of elitist education which exist throughout the world."⁽¹⁴⁾ With reference to the USSR, Grant suggested that what can be observed "... will usually have been consciously planned for the purpose of running a system of mass education designed for the rearing of the 'new man'..."⁽¹⁵⁾ Grant, later in his text,

offered the comparative judgement that 'tight control' is "one of the most prominent features of Soviet education, which highlights its differences from other large scale systems of mass education ..."⁽¹⁶⁾ Torsten Husen argued that in expanding economies "... the major problem facing educational planners is the need to structure the educational system so as to provide mass education beginning with the secondary level, but followed rapidly at university level."⁽¹⁷⁾ Holmes wrote of this expansion as a fact. "State legislation and the growth of mass education at the secondary level have created pressures on the universities which in some countries have been difficult to resist"⁽¹⁸⁾ Lauwerys pointed out that "... this is an age of mass education"⁽¹⁹⁾ and went on to provide a definition of mass education in terms of changed selection policies in education. "Secondary schools and colleges draw recruits from all levels of the population, from crowded working class homes poor in cultural resources, as well as professional and upper class ones."⁽²⁰⁾

The terms were used without obvious hesitation or lengthy explicit definition. The use of the terms was also quite widespread, as measured by the geographic locations of the authors. There are, in turn, three implications of such non-explicit and widespread use of the terms. One implication is that the meanings were clear and shared by all authors; therefore no definition needed stating. A second implication is that the widespread use indicated that a new classificatory system was available and being used in cross-national comparative research work in education. A third implication is that educational events in the

1960s, on a world scale, had produced phenomena that the terms mass and elitist could describe in a taken-for-granted fashion. Thus, explicit definition and systematic classification were unnecessary, such was the salience of the world-wide phenomena. The educational referents were so obvious, that the meanings of the terms mass and elitist could be left as 'obvious' also. How 'obvious' were the meanings of the terms, how clear was the implicit classification system? What problematic was being addressed?

The contextual usage of the two terms covered a range of meanings, some of which the authors shared. Other meanings were singular to a particular author. The range of meanings and the assumptions made to utilise the terms as adjectives included, collectively, the following:

- (a) elitist and mass attributes are sequential.
Chronologically, elitist characteristics occur first, and mass characteristics in certain circumstances supplant elitist characteristics;
- (b) elitist and mass attributes are dichotomous and oppositional. Elitist characteristics are not merely different from mass; elitist characteristics are cancelled out by mass characteristics;
- (c) the change from elitist to mass characteristics in educational systems will probably require the statement of mass characteristics as a social and political aim, may require educational legislation, will certainly require institutional innovations;

and will probably meet opposition. The shifts from elitist to mass characteristics will be marked in other words by reform proposals and institutionalisation;

- (d) there is no short-term determinism about such a shift. Different societies debate elitist and mass characteristics of educational systems at different times. Opposition to particular 'reforms' may prevail;
- (e) substantively, a mass educational system is distinguishable from an elitist educational systems by the size of its student body. Increased student enrollment and longer enrollment (i.e. higher retention rates) are characteristics of a mass system. Some authors add the idea of enrollment of more students from low status social categories.

The adjectives 'mass' or 'elitist' in the literature of the sixties, then, were used by the authors in two ways. One use, outlined in (e) above, delimited the condition or state of an educational system. An educational system was mass or elitist in terms of the numbers of its student body. The second use, outlined in (a) to (d) above, described a process: a shift from one condition (elitist) to another (usually termed mass).

Propositions (a) to (e) were embedded in the contextual usage by the authors of the terms mass and elitist. How closely are the condition (mass/elitist) and the process (elitist to mass) specified by context? In other words, do the authors' contexts establish an agreed, or at least lowest-common-denominator, conceptual framework which might sustain further comparative analysis?

All authors agreed on proposition (e) - that a mass system of education is characterised by a larger number of students (than an elitist system). No author provided a numerical definition of the condition. There was in other words a general consensus on meaning but no operational definition of the parameter (numbers) by which meaning was attributed.

The authors' contextual specification of the process also produced some difficulties. The time and space frames in which the authors defined the process (and the working out of propositions (a), (b), (c) and (d)) varied. For Grant, the space frame was the USSR, and the time frame was the twentieth century before and after the Communist revolution of 1917. For Holmes, the space frame was 'some countries', the general time frame the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and the specific time frame was post-1945. For Lauwerys, the time frame was the mid-1960s and more generally the twentieth century in contrast to the nineteenth. The space frame within which he subsequently developed his argument was England, France, Germany, the USA

and the USSR. For Bereday, the general time frame included Meiji Japan, but his particular time frame was post W.W.II. Similarly his space frame included Colombia and Denmark, but the immediate referents of his phrase 'mass education' were Japan, the USA and the Soviet Union. For Husen the space frame was most generally developing and developed countries and more particularly the countries of N.W. Europe, and the USA and Japan. Whilst his time frame had references within it to the nineteenth century, the analysis was heavily of contemporary (i.e. 1960s) data. Bowles' time frame was primarily post-1945, though he made extended reference to America in the 1930s and brief reference to Europe in its industrialisation phase. Bowles' space frame concentrated on the USA, France, England and the 'Russian' system as well as various other high per capita/income countries; but reference was also made to the Caribbean, Central and South America, Africa, Asia and the Middle East - where countries had had difficulty with 'democratisation'.

Some consensus is apparent. In terms of a space frame the USA, the USSR and Japan were frequently invoked as examples of mass systems. In terms of a time frame, there was consensus that the nineteenth to the twentieth century is a period in which there was a shift from elitist to mass systems. There was also consensus that the post-1945 period has within it examples of a shift from elitist to mass systems.

Differences of definition of the process are also clear.

For Bereday, post-1945, France and England were

examples of dualistic or tripartite systems - and thus elitist; for Bowles in the same period (i.e. holding time frame constant) France and England provided examples of 'democratisation'.

The authors' contexts leave it unclear how educational systems which in one time frame (the nineteenth to the twentieth century) move from elitist to mass and then move again from elitist to mass in the post-1945 period. It can also be noted that the lack of common operational definitions (especially of an elitist system) allow Bereday and Bowles to disagree about the classification of the condition of France and England.

Thus, whilst there is some consensus in the 1960s literature on both the time and space frames through which an analysis of mass and elitist systems might be conducted, the time and space frames are sufficiently unclear, ambiguous and idiosyncratic to be subject to re-examination before a sustained analysis is attempted.

The authors' contextual specification of the process also produces difficulties in an area other than space and time frames. Among the conventional categories of educational analysis (primary, secondary, tertiary education, teacher education, examinations, curriculum, etc), the educational referents, by which the shift was specified, varied.

Grant's educational referents in immediate context were too nebulous to be useful here. However Holmes' educational referents made it clear that a shift of an educational system to mass characteristics in one area (e.g. secondary) is likely to have consequences for a subsequent stage (e.g. university education). Lauwerys addressed himself to curriculum, in particular to nation-specific conceptions of a legitimate general education. At its broadest the question he asked was what might constitute an appropriate 'general education' in a time of mass education. His other educational referents, whilst by no means pointed, included both secondary schools and universities. Bereday analysed the structural patterns of second level schooling.⁽²¹⁾ The language of this analysis referred to 'dual', 'tripartite' and 'open' second level structures. It was this last term, 'open' which was the structural version of "... the modern ideal of total mass education for all youth up to graduation level."⁽²²⁾ The intellectual point of Bereday's argument was that open structures at the second level produced a larger graduation cohort than dual systems. The immediate referent for mass education was for Bereday a certain kind of second level school structure. Husen's concern was with social class bias in the identification and retention of talent. Dualistic school systems where selection for an academic high school took place early (i.e. Bereday's dual and tripartite system) showed more social class bias than 'unified' school systems.⁽²³⁾ Husen's preference was for the optimal identification, retention and utilisation of talent through 'flexible' school systems, i.e. "... where a definitive choice between various educational paths is postponed as long as

possible ..."(24) Thus Husen's educational referent, his 'conventional category' of analysis for elitist education, was similar to Bereday's. He used certain kinds of secondary school structures. But a vital part of his analysis was the tension between social class bias and talent criteria in selectivity. His intellectual and explicit empirical point, was that within an enlarged graduation cohort a lessened amount of social class bias in the graduation group was produced by 'flexible' second level school structures.

Second level schooling was thus a common point of change for three of the authors (Holmes, Bereday and Husen). Each took change at this level as significant. However, it should also be noted that the analyses immediately diverged. For Holmes, in his particular context, the point was relationships with universities; for Bereday the point was the particular structure at the second level which affected the size of the graduation group; and for Husen the point was the structures and the relationship between social class bias and talent bias which were significant in the analysis.

The nearest Bowles came to offering an educational-referent analysis of elitist systems is quoted in the following passage:

Historically, elitist systems served well in countries where educational demands were simple and easily classified. In such countries a small group of university graduates supplied professional services and made whatever national and professional management decisions were needed. Administrative chores were left to less well-educated, but well-trained, functionaries, and no attention was paid to the apprentice system which trained workers and craftsmen or to the functional illiteracy of the peasantry. Such a system was not costly; it suited a stable society and in fact contributed to its stability.

(25)

How, according to Bowles, an elitist educational system is structured by the division of labour in a 'stable' society is clear. It is less evident what the attributes of an elitist system might be in terms of educational referents, such as first, second, and third level structures, examinations, etc.

Under the impact of industrialisation, according to Bowles, elitist systems expand. This, for Bowles, was a distinct phase in the shift away from elitist systems towards 'democratisation'. In this expansionist phase, the educational referents are clearer. They were "overcrowded secondary schools, high rates of failure in examinations at the end of secondary school and high drop out rates ..." (26) These referents marked the pathologies of an elitist educational system. For the pathologies of the expansionist phase, the solution which Bowles preferred was 'democratisation'. but an interim solution, of varied permanence, might be 'modernisation' of the educational system.

Modernisation involves, according to Bowles, three basic changes: an expansion of the common learning of all pupils, which needs to be reassessed and certainly lengthened as societies have changed; a system for the training and certification of

specialists, the old system heavily geared to the traditional professions being no longer adequate; and the articulation and development of educational research for the alteration of educational practice.⁽²⁷⁾ The conventional category educational referents are here fairly clear. One referent was curriculum - a theme similar to Lauwerys' focus on general education. A second referent was higher education, and the need to devise new institutional patterns - unlike European university patterns - for the training of specialists. The third referent was educational research which must continuously inform educational practice. Here, Bowles provided no specific institutional or organisational recommendations.

For Bowles, 'democratisation' of education is, however, a more significant reform than mere modernisation. Democratisation of education "... is the process of assuring equality of opportunity for educational achievement throughout a given society."⁽²⁸⁾ Accordingly:

... democratisation is not confined just to assuring equality of schooling. This is attainable by standardising the schools, a condition that now exists in most countries. Standardisation, however, does not equalise opportunities for achievement unless the pupils are also standardised. If they are not, a variety of opportunities must be created.

(29)

Now was democratisation for Bowles the same as educational expansion which might simply refer to an increase in educational size:

Democratisation is a larger idea, based on a belief that in individuals at all social levels there are untapped potentials for development which are not reached by the conventional educational system. To tap the potentials requires new insights and new institutions. Democratisation, then, instead of being simply more of the same, is a new order of applied educational thought... Democratisation involves a large-scale effort to teach and to understand the riddles of individual and group differences and then to ensure that, besides achieving the common learning of the time - a task that every system must accept - all students are permitted, if they choose, to develop their own competencies and achieve their own individualities.

(30)

These extensive definitions of democratisation are statements of educational goals. However, "... five European countries have initiated educational change on a scale that can be called democratisation" (31)

It might thus be expected that Bowles who immediately proceeded to comment on each country in turn would provide rather pointed educational referents. This was not the case. The English example was "wellknown" (32), the Swedish reform was "well under way" (33) and the Russian (sic) educational system "... offers further opportunity to those who seek it and encouragement and reward to those who will follow it." (34) The Italian case was exemplified only by the use of school television. (35) The French case had the longest set of educational referents: the removal of "... the failure points where marginal students were diverted into terminal programmes"; (36) "... new programmes at the secondary and higher levels and particularly in technical fields ..."; (37) and "an emphasis on guidance and orientation for each student...". (38) Scattered in the essay two other conventional

category educational referents (of democratisation) may be identified. Japan, post-1945, had seen "a great extension of opportunity for secondary education, including imaginative use of radio and correspondence courses for students unable to continue formal schooling."⁽³⁹⁾ In the USA in the 1930s its "first major democratisation" meant "... broadening the secondary curriculum and launching a vast expansion in facilities,"⁽⁴⁰⁾ whilst at the time of Bowles' essay "... another democratisation is being undertaken in the United States at the level of post-secondary education, with the rapid development of tax-supported community colleges."⁽⁴¹⁾

Thus Bowles' analysis of democratisation of educational systems is not much advanced by his particular conventional category referents. His statement of democratisation as an ideal, or as a principle of policy, is both extensive and clear. His comparative examples might, on closer analysis than he provides, be taken as instances of the implementation of democratisation. As he outlines the examples, however, they are (with the possible exception of the French case) as much examples of efforts to deal with modernisation (or the pathologies of 'expansion') as democratisation.

It is of course possible to offer further criticisms of Bowles. For example, the meaning of his terms "... standardising the schools"⁽⁴²⁾ is far from clear in context and his assertion that standardised schooling is "... a condition that now exists in most countries"⁽⁴³⁾ can be debated. But an extended list of unfocussed criticisms of Bowles is not the major point here.

The issue remains: through what conventional categories of educational analysis did Bowles describe the shift away from elitist education, and how far was there contextual consensus among the writers of the sixties about the educational referents in which the shift is to be described?

Bowles' educational referents were, for the process of democratisation at least, frequently unspecified, and where specified, eclectic and national-specific. His conventional category educational referents for elitist education have to be guessed at by the reader. His referents for expanded systems were negative, i.e. they described the pathologies of a disintegrating elitist educational system. (Bereday and Husen may be also writing about this phase, but Bowles does not provide a sufficiently detailed positive description of the expansionist phase for such a surmise to be checked). The most focussed of Bowles' educational referents were to a 'modernising' system.

Bowles highlights the confusion of the 1960s literature. In so far as a case could be made that there was agreement among the authors of the 1960s about the nature of the shift from elitist to mass attributes of educational systems, it would be that an important locus of change was the second level of educational systems. The next question is what particular educational referents are used to delineate the process in that sector? Bowles summarises the level of confusion by utilising in his own essay the complete range of educational referents that the other

authors use to mark the shift. Like Lauwerys, Bowles had curriculum as one referent for the shift. Like Holmes, Bowles was aware of the impact of an expanded secondary system on the nature of an (unchanged) higher education system. Like Grant, Bowles was conscious that the 'Russian' system (which Bowles called democratised, and Grant called mass) has "... expanded greatly over half a century."⁽⁴⁴⁾ Like Bereday and Husen, Bowles accorded significance to expanded graduation cohorts at the secondary level, though his references to social classes and social background were casual. Bowles, of course, added further educational referents, such as the organisation of educational research and the nature of higher education to the analysis.

The point is not that individual authors were confused in their own writing in the 1960s. Holmes' intellectual point was quite clear in the context of his pages. Similarly, within their own terms of reference, Lauwerys' and Husen's essays for example were clear about the parameters in which they analysed the shift.

The point is that the authors of the 1960s - although there is incipient agreement that expansion at the second level is important - did not share the educational referents by which the process was described or imputed. Bowles' own lengthy set of educational referents serves to highlight the fact that the other authors' referents were individualistic.

Such a varied range of educational referents meant that neither the process nor the condition (of mass and elitist educational systems) was clear and consensual in the literature of the sixties. There was no consensus on the substance of the process. Thus there was no new classificatory system (defined by educational referents) in the literature of the sixties which outlines elite to mass process; only a series of personal classifications created by individual authors and usage of the same vocabulary by several authors.

To make this point of course is not the same as saying that no author had classified. Obviously several had. Nor is it to suggest that the puzzle disappears because some of the authors were relatively imprecise. There are sufficient indications to suggest that the authors, with their time, space and expansion themes, were working hard to analyse similar phenomena.

It remains legitimate therefore to put one more major question to this literature which includes the terms 'mass' and 'elite'. Granted that in some societies, educational systems were changing in ways that were difficult to identify clearly, what social forces did the authors judge to be important, and by extension, were any theories of social change stated which might assist in limiting the nature of the puzzle?

The immediate context of Holmes' use of the term 'mass' did not require, or indeed in the immediate context, logically permit a discussion of theories of social change. (45)

Grant's context provided a number of assertions about significant social pressures. "The mass character of Soviet education is, clearly, a reflection of its social aims." (46)

Political aims, too, have influenced the growth of mass education:

The Soviet regime ... aims higher than mere passive acquiescence, so that for positive political commitment among the masses, mass education is again imperative. 'An illiterate person,' Lenin remarked, 'stands outside; he must first be taught the ABC. Without this there can be no politics; without this, there are only rumours, gossip, tales, prejudices, but no politics' Literacy and the highest development of general education are thus regarded as a political necessity for the government and a civic duty for the individual. It is for this reason that although much has been done in the field of vocational and specialist education, the authorities - and, to all appearances, public opinion - insist on the system's retaining its mass character. Reforms may bring in more diverse courses for senior pupils, special schools may cater for artists and ballet dancers, but underlying the variations is the stress on providing a basic general education, covering the same ground and on the same terms for all, regardless of background or future occupation. A more diversified and selective system would be regarded with grave suspicion as a barrier to the realisation of the political aims of Soviet education ...

(47)

The fact that Grant was writing an area-specific text means, of course, it is unwise to assume that he would have invoked the same variables for a comparative analysis of a shift to mass educational systems. Nevertheless, the idiographic contribution on what are significant social forces in the USSR is clear.

Husen was in no doubt about the general influence of extra-educational forces on educational systems. "One cannot view the school structure and/or the curriculum as if they operated in a socio-economic vacuum ... Even if educational development is less rapid than economic development, there must be a

close relation between them." (48) Substantively, "... the rapidly growing need for trained manpower and the increasing "consumption of education," reflected in the so-called educational explosion, conflict with a school organisation and a curriculum designed for a static economy and a society characterised by a rather rigid social structure." (49) The most general forces making for some kind of transformation of educational systems so that they might better produce trained personnel were, according to Husen, "scientific progress, the transformations that technology has brought to industry, business, and our daily lives, and the expansions of trade and communications ... during the last few decades ..." (50) Fortunately, this kind of writing, taken from the conclusion of the essay, is not typical of Husen. His theoretical view was that there is a correlation between certain types of economies and class structures, and certain types of educational structure:

Until recently both the occupational status structure and the social class system in many economically developed countries could be symbolised by a pyramid. In all sections of the economy the base of the pyramid was formed by a mass of unskilled or semiskilled manual workers. Most of these had a modest formal education provided by a compulsory elementary school. The next level consisted mainly of white collar workers ... The formal education required in most cases exceeded elementary school by a few years, in many cases by some kind of middle school ... with graduation at fifteen or sixteen - a schooling that did not qualify for university entrance. The middle schools either were separate establishments or consisted of the lower section of the pre-university school and/or the university.

(51)

In contrast there were other kinds of economies and social status patterns, which were correlated with different kinds of educational provision:

In developed countries with highly advanced economies, the qualification and social status structure of the occupational universe now increasingly resembles the shape of an egg. At the bottom of the status hierarchy is a diminishing number of occupations that require a modest amount of formal schooling and vocational training over a considerable time. In the middle a rapidly increasing number of occupations require formal education to the age of sixteen to eighteen after which a specialised vocational training is being sought. At the top, finally, the number of persons with higher educational and professional occupations also increases rapidly.

(52)

The extra-educational variables which Husen stressed were thus the level of development of the economy and the nature of the social class/status system as a function of occupational structure. These variables were correlated with certain basic kinds of educational provision. The thrust of the analysis was that economic change and development slowly produced educational systems which allowed "the reserves of talent" in national populations to be mobilised.

There was little stress on the significance of political variables in Husen's essay, in contrast to Grant's. Political aims or the degree of explicit political control over the implementation of educational policies were not directly mentioned. Nor were social aims brought explicitly into the analysis.

However, it is possible to suggest that Husen did accord, in principle, significance to political and social aims, whilst reserving the main body of his initial analysis of extra-educational variables for traditional socio-economic arguments. The point is a matter of interpretation. Consider the following passage:

In the developing and the developed countries alike, two major forces lie behind attempts to reform the school structure, particularly of secondary education. One is the democratisation of secondary and higher education in order to broaden opportunities for young people from all walks of life and especially for talented students from the lower social classes. The other is the need to provide an expanding economy with a sufficient supply of trained manpower at various qualification levels.

(53)

The category of the second major force is clear: it is economic. The first 'major force' is identified in such a way as to come close to being a tautology: 'one major force behind attempts to reform the school structure ... is ... the democratisation of secondary and higher education'. i.e. one major force behind attempts to reform the school structure is one kind of reform of schools. It seems likely that the weight of Husen's intended meaning was on the phrase "... in order to broaden opportunities for young people from all walks of life..." Broadening of opportunities may be expressed by consumer demand, referred to later by Husen in that sense as "consumption of education." The broadening of opportunities can also be a set of political and social aims, in and for education, made articulate in a number of national contexts in the post-war period. To repeat, the matter

is one of interpretation. Husen did not directly mention political and social aims as relevant extra-educational forces. It may be, however, that his intention was to acknowledge them in the post-war context as an obvious aspect of larger effort to broaden opportunities for the young.

Bereday's essay contained acknowledgement of the significance of extra-educational variables: "a reorganisation of the (educational) systems follows at its own pace - a much slower pace and often a reluctant one - other changes in society."⁽⁵⁴⁾ Even in the cases of strong political leadership (as in Ataturk's Turkey or de Gaulle's France), or reform after wars (as in Japan or West Germany), "the new school systems have managed to resemble ... the slowly moving traditional patterns."⁽⁵⁵⁾ So two sets of forces were acknowledged, by Bereday, as effective in producing alterations in educational systems: (unspecified) 'changes in society', and certain immanent forces, (unspecified) 'traditional patterns', in educational systems.

Bereday did not undertake elsewhere in the essay a sustained analysis of the 'other changes in society' which (slowly) are followed by educational change. The style and substance of his analysis in this early section of his essay is wise or elliptical according to the reader's judgement:

School systems ... should be regarded as the given, though it would be nice if this were not so. Let us say that the schools of the sons must in at least half of the cases resemble the schools of their fathers. An effective change of educational patterns can be accomplished only by evolution over three generations. Efforts to harness education in the service of development cannot afford to ignore these persistent social laws.

(56)

The 'persistent social laws' were not specified in the next paragraph, and were thus presumably stated in the quoted paragraph. Law-like statements, that (i) schools should be regarded as given, (ii) that 50% of schools do not change in one generation and (iii) that evolution over three generations is required before effective change in educational patterns can occur, may (or may not) be true; but they do not extend (or confirm) the list of social forces suggested as significant by Grant and Husen.

Lauwerys offered a more detailed definition of significant extra-educational variables: "the problems of modern civilisation and modern education are much the same everywhere - urbanisation, impact of the new technology, the explosion of knowledge, increased geographical and social mobility, rising standards of aspiration and so on."⁽⁵⁷⁾ Reform proposals in education, especially in curriculum, would show similarities "... as a result of the growing resemblances between the great urban centres which increasingly dominate the life of nations."⁽⁵⁸⁾ However, it was clear to Lauwerys that there would also be considerable differences between nations. "It seems as if the historical experiences of each national and cultural group, its social structure, the technology and commerce upon which it relies,

have combined to affect and modify the formulation of the problems and the shape of the answers given." (59) So although, for Lauwerys, the most general extra-educational variables were in the 1960s similar between nations, "... differences in style and approach (in education) remain because the assumptions made are themselves the outcome of cultural history." (60)

Lauwerys continued to stress the significance of social forces in his concluding remarks:

In each of the five countries considered, sustained and vigorous efforts are being made to improve the systems of education, the curriculum of schools, the methods of teaching. The overall aim is modernisation; that is the adjustment of education to the needs of the present and the foreseeable future so that it may serve to improve material conditions and the cultural and spiritual aspirations of the people.

(61)

Education should be responsive to certain kinds of social forces:

What is needed is a drastic and radical reinterpretation of the central meaning of liberal or general education in the light of on-going scientific, technological, economic and political changes. Traditionally it was adapted to the needs of a society sharply stratified into social classes, each with its own rights and duties. Higher education had to develop insights and qualities of leadership in a small elite which wielded power and carried on culture. General education was concerned with maintaining a common universe of discourse among this elite. Science, as we now understand the term, was not an essential part of the common culture, nor did it play an important role in the production and distribution of material goods.

(62)

It is evident that Lauwerys was prepared to acknowledge political and social aims, technology, social structure and economic development as significant social forces. He shared these general categories with Grant and Husen. He added of course in his analysis the forces of urbanism, geographical and social mobility, the social and economic role of science, and placed an especial emphasis upon the significance of cultural history. The substantive significance of Lauwerys' analysis will be considered later. Sufficient here to notice that Lauwerys included in his analysis the themes posited by Grant and Husen - and extended the categories of variables used to explain shifts in educational systems.

Bowles stressed the significance of industrialisation which produced

... three quite separate results. First, incomes were raised in all occupations .. and this brought advanced education into public view as a part of a general rise in expectations. Second, industrialisation created a demand for trained workers which the elitist systems could not meet. Third, it brought to the fore the inadequacy of the elite part of the educational system as a preparation for the management of industrialisation.

(63)

These results of industrialisation did not according to Bowles produce change; they laid the groundwork for change. Change occurred when demands for change were made articulate at the national political level and became part of governmental policy. Even then, with opposition from universities and sometimes ministries of education, democratisation might be slow. However, according to Bowles, to a 'surprising' extent, national

governments had espoused equality of educational opportunity as a policy and his conclusion was that "... educational democratisation is tied to industrialisation ..."(64) The cases of the Danish folk high school and the American land grant colleges meant that democratisation might in certain circumstances occur in an agricultural economy; but "... the fact nonetheless remains that present preoccupations are with industrialisation and the democratisation of education will take place in relation to industrialisation."(65)

Bowles' treatment of extra-educational variables was, however, more subtle than this heavy emphasis on industrialisation might initially imply. Democratisation of education is both expensive and results in high educational productivity. High educational productivity (if it could be afforded in a non-industrialised economy) would produce persons who could not be absorbed easily by the occupational structure. Too early a democratisation of education might be socially disruptive: "... there are many nations whose governing groups see no early prospect of industrialisation and actively resist democratisation as unnecessary and probably dangerous."(66) Thus democratisation of education has tended to be successful only:

... in nations where the process of industrialisation has created a need for educational expansion, and where there is a broad political base which gives the electorate the opportunity to record its educational demands through political channels. In countries where one but not both of these conditions exists, partial moves have been made toward democratisation. In countries where neither condition exists, there is little recognition of the problem of democratisation.

(67)

Bowles thus produces a clear statement of the social forces he considered to be significant in producing shifts in educational systems. The categories, stressing both political aims and economic development, agreed broadly with the categories utilised by Husen and Grant, and some of the categories suggested by Lauwerys. Like Husen, Bowles accorded considerable substantive stress to economic variables, but Bowles was far more explicit about the significance of political forces than Husen. Bowles' overlap with Lauwerys is more difficult to interpret. It could be argued - and it is a matter of judgement - that many of the particular social forces suggested by Lauwerys, such as urbanisation, or the impact of new technology, are contained within Bowles' concept of 'industrialisation'; and that other of Lauwerys' social forces, such as rising standards of cultural and spiritual aspirations, are causes or functions of Bowles' category 'a broad political base'. However, Lauwerys with his concept of cultural history was more explicit than Bowles (or Husen or Grant for that matter) about one aspect of what Bowles termed 'local circumstances'.

Despite the differences it is clear that all authors judge that shifts in the (elitist-mass) nature of educational systems are multi-relationship phenomena, and all accepted the importance of social forces. Secondly, among the substantive analyses of Grant, Husen, Lauwerys and Bowles there was some consensus on the categories of social forces relevant to an analysis of shifts in the configuration of educational systems. Indeed it is possible to suggest that there was rather more consensus among the analysts about the categories of social forces which produce shifts in educational systems than there was about

the categories ('the educational referents') in which the elite-mass educational shifts were described. In this sense the extra-educational classification system of elite-mass process was more developed by the authors than the intra-educational classification system of elite-mass process.

It is possible (and not merely by extension) to identify at least one very clear theory of social change in the analyses. Bowles and Husen both gave emphasis to economic development, in the form of industrialisation, in producing alterations in the configurations of educational systems. Of the two theories Husen's was the most blunt; Bowles gave more stress to intervening political variables. It will be recalled that Husen's analysis laid great stress on the significance of certain kinds of economy, termed 'highly advanced' and 'economically developed'. Highly advanced economies are the ones with egg-shaped qualification and status structures. Economically developed economies are the ones with pyramid-like occupational status, and social class structures. 'Maximisation of talent', which in the substance of Husen's analysis means reducing social class bias, becomes important as the nature of the economy changes from 'economically developed' to 'highly advanced' as the pyramid shape gives way to the metaphorical egg. As the economy changes towards an egg-shaped qualification structure, so there is a tendency for certain kinds of 'flexible' educational structure to develop. Such flexible educational structures maximise talent more than older forms of educational structure which are more suited to providing manpower for pyramid-like occupational status and class structures. Political and social aims are not directly involved, in the substance of the analysis, as explanatory variables. The force producing changes

in the educational systems (Husen's proposition is a comparative one) is the nature of the economy.

As a comparative hypothesis, Husen's theory of change has an attractive simplicity. Identify the condition of a given national economy, and perhaps its speed of change, and as a correlate the structural condition of a given educational system is either described, or what its condition ought to be is known.

Husen's thesis is a particular example of convergence theory: the proposition that industrialised and post-industrialised societies (or educational systems) are growing increasingly alike. Occasionally the two theses are combined in the form: because the demands of technical, industrial society for educated talent are similar, and a function of industrialisation, educational systems in certain kinds of society will become increasingly alike. Thus:

Education is a crucial type of investment for the exploitation of modern technology. This fact underlies recent educational development in all the major technical societies. Despite idiosyncracies of national history, political structure, and social traditions, in every case the development of education bears the stamp of a dominant pattern imposed by the new and often conflicting pressures of technological and economic change.

(68)

It is moot whether the confidence of this statement is matched by its accuracy. It is moot whether Husen is right or wrong. (69) The more important point in the logic of the discussion is that the social change theories assist in the reduction of confusion. The explicitness of the Bowles and Husen versions of convergence theory in its analysis of one aspect of the puzzles makes clear an area of intellectual choice. This is useful, and

can now be combined with the other discussion themes.

The problem

A review of the discussion themes permits some reconceptualisation and, in that synthesis and rejection and reconceptualisation, a Holmesian problem statement will be framed.

Equality of educational opportunity as a social-problem and as a research problem (in one of its major definitions in the literature) was shown to direct attention to certain kinds of data rather than others. Acceptance of the social-problem definition tended to direct attention to questions of how much and to the search for the social causes of inequality. In turn this tended to lead to policies of social and economic intervention to reduce the effects of these 'causes' in the educational system - taking attention away from the internal dynamics of educational systems. Equally worrying was one particular way of treating the puzzle of equality of educational opportunity in the technical literature of comparative education. Although this did direct attention to the internal dynamics of educational systems, unease was expressed about the methodological and epistemological legitimacy of this mode of analysis.

Framing the issue of investigation in either of these ways is therefore rejected.

The mass and elite literature met some expectations: it began the reconceptualisation of what might be taken as a puzzle. It directed attention to the internal dynamics of educational systems. It indirectly identified an asynchronous phenomenon: an

explosion of demand for education and more slowly changing educational structures. In doing so it directed attention away from the immediate question of 'how much equality of educational opportunity is there' and towards the question 'how to change'. The expectation was that educational systems ought to change; in various ways they had not. In particular certain forms of secondary education had not been changed; nor had secondary education expanded fast enough. Blockages were occurring in the absorption of numbers of students. The structures were not 'flexible' enough (Husen), or they were inappropriately dual track systems (Bereday) or elitist or modernising (Bowles). For Bowles and Lauwerys, the question of what to change included the issue of common learning; indeed for Lauwerys the question of a proper 'general education' was the central issue. In these ways, the issue not only of 'how to change' but of what to change (and why) was more tightly linked to the question being asked. Policies proposed might stand in logical relation to the analysis. No doubt ideological elements in the analysis can be identified (e.g. in the social change theories); but the ideological element was recessive rather than dominant. It should further be noted that the choice of countries for analysis of the issue was rather similar. In general, the USA, Japan, the USSR and the European countries (of north-west Europe) were seen as illustrating different aspects of the puzzle. Along with these, however, it should be noted that Bowles' personal list was extremely extensive, at one point being a world-wide survey, with the continents as the unit of analysis. In contrast, Holmes and Grant within the logics of their own analyses were not constrained to carry through a comparative analysis in space terms.

This reconceptualisation of the issues by the mass-elite literature is valuable and assists intellectual choice. An asynchronous base of a Holmesian problem could, for example, be located in the explosion of demand for education in the mid-sixties. This would be legitimate and indeed Holmes identifies three major kinds of social explosion as problem-creating changes in the post-war period.⁽⁷⁰⁾ To incorporate the mid-sixties explosion of demand into a problem statement would require that the explosion be classified. Treated as an explosion in educational demography, it could be taken as a rapidly changing environmental circumstance. It could also be conceptualised, normatively, as indicating an aspirational change. Against one of these relatively rapid changes, a relatively non-rapid change in educational structures (institutions) could be identified. It might indeed be suggested that some of the mass elite literature covered these themes, but kept moving uneasily between the two potential Holmesian problems.

There is, however, a severe surface distractor to conceptualising the Holmesian problem in this fashion. The mid-sixties numbers explosion which assisted in directing the intellectual attention of comparative educationists to the mass-elite analytic mode has subsequently diminished. Contraction of the numbers of potential educands is the immediate past and present social problem whose locus is the educational system in several countries (including the USA, Canada, Australia, several of the European countries and England). This fact does not make it any the less intellectually legitimate to establish a Holmesian

problem partly through explosion of educational demand, in the mid-sixties. A Holmesian problem can still be conceptualised, and alternative current policies compared. (71)

However, it is not necessary to establish the problem in this way and it is convenient to accept the surface distractor so that the elite-mass puzzle can be conceptualised as a structural, sociological issue which is equally important in times of a contraction in the number of potential educands; to suggest that the theoretical and policy issues remain regardless of numbers (which are then not treated as if epiphenomena but as part of the specific initial conditions in which solutions will produce consequences).

What can and will be done is to accept the policy responses in education in the mid-sixties into the initial statement of the problem. That is, the explosion of numbers in the late fifties and early sixties produced, causally or coincidentally, educational reactions, including reactions from national governments. Some of these reactions included reforms of secondary school structures and institutions of higher education. These reforms drew the attention of the mass-elite analysts, and Husen, Bereday and Bowles in different ways addressed this set of puzzles.

More abstractly the formulation is as follows: both the general post-war explosions and the mid-sixties explosion of student numbers were problem-creating changes. Among the

perplexing issues they raised were questions about the appropriate configuration of second and third level educational structures in several countries. This problem-creating change attracted educational policy initiatives for its resolution. The educational policies were intended to be problem-solving.

Some of the results of these educational policies will be incorporated into a problem-statement, as part of a problem creating change. Which in turn requires solution.

The first half of the problem statement is thus: in England in the mid-sixties relatively rapid change occurred in the redefinition and reorganisation of the types of secondary school and higher education institution.

Against what non-change, or relatively slower change, may this part of the problem-statement be located, and in the light of what theory of social change?

Convergence theory will be used. Its 'forces of social change' are taken as an assumption; but the predicted consequences are rejected and indeed inverted. The counter-assertion is: even if and when the pressures to change educational systems everywhere are the same in a certain class of societies, the responses made to these pressures, by individuals, groups and thus societies, will be different and different on a national basis. The pressures to change will be filtered through 'idiosyncracies' of national history, political structure and social traditions.

More specifically and more importantly, certain 'idiosyncracies' in the internal dynamics of educational systems are likely to be important filters. In particular, from the mass-elite literature, Lauwerys' conception of cultural history and Holmes' analysis of the multi-relationships in which universities stand, should be noted. Both analyses point up the possible importance of widely held beliefs about what ought to be the case. Such widely held beliefs would presumably be part of 'national idiosyncracies'.

In his analysis Holmes is discussing universities and Lauwerys is discussing secondary school curricula. The details, then, are different; and the details are important. But there is a theme of unity between the two analyses: Holmes gives part of his analysis over to the norms which inform the university including the kind of knowledge which it should seek. Lauwerys, of course deals with the kind of knowledge which ought to be offered in schools to all. Holmes comes close to uniting the two themes in his own text:

Relationships within education are, of course, important. For example in Europe at least the universities have tended to dominate the rest of the educational sector. Not only have they helped to establish and maintain the aims of secondary schooling, but they have powerfully influenced what has been taught and how. For many centuries they formed a closely integrated system with the academic secondary schools of Europe. Since the school feeding the universities enjoy the highest prestige, attempts have been made by other schools to copy them. Of course, university domination should not be accepted simply as a fact under all circumstances, but should be regarded as a possibility for detailed investigation.

From this literature and from the earlier Bowles' analysis there is thus suggested an area of non-change, which can be placed in the statement of the Holmesian problem as follows: in England in the mid-sixties relatively less rapid change occurred in redefining theories of 'general education'.

Asynchronous change in education has now been suggested and can be incorporated into a statement of a Holmesian problem:

In England in the mid-sixties, relatively rapid change occurred in the redefinition and reorganisation of the types of secondary school and higher education institution; relatively less rapid change occurred in redefining theories of 'general education'.

The problem-statement is classifiable, in the technical terms suggested by Holmes. The first part of the statement directs attention to institutional changes in education; the second half, to a particular type of normative non-change in education.

The verbal simplicity of the problem statement should not be permitted to conceal its intellectual function, which is that it both accepts and rejects. It rejects many lines of possible investigation sketched in the 'stage of confusion'. It forces some issues into the status of assumptions, as is always necessary so that enquiry can proceed. As a matter of logic, it immediately subordinates analysis of 'elite' and 'mass' configurations of educational systems to its own framing. (73) It accepts not merely the internal dynamics of educational systems

as problematic, but two particular aspects of these dynamics.

In other words, the general process of reflective thinking means that "In the face of a perplexing situation possible solutions may immediately spring to mind. Further reflection involves a process of intellectualisation out of which a problem becomes clearly formulated."⁽⁷⁴⁾ And in turn, the intellectual choices forced by the framing of a Holmesian problem statement lead:

... to the formulation of very specific questions about selected social relationships. Its use also directs attention to certain relevant factors within a general context or set of circumstances. As a result the scope of any comparative enquiry based upon it will be narrowed, and some, and not other, data and questions will be considered ... The problem itself ... determines what is relevant and what is not.
(75)

However, the problem has so far only been stated, although stating it required some of the processes of reflective thinking and the reduction of confusion. The problem now needs to be subjected to further processes of reflective thinking.^{(76)*}

CHAPTER TWO. England: a problem refined.

The general adoption of the multilateral idea would be too subversive a change to be made in a long established system, especially in view of the extent to which this system has been expanded in recent years by the building of new Grammar Schools and Technical Schools, and also in view of the success with which the ancient framework of the system has, on the whole, borne the strains and stresses to which it has been subjected by the growth of the new type of Modern School. (1)

The Spens Report.

It is not the concern of this chapter to give a general account of English education. The process of reflective thinking which is being undertaken is framed by the Holmesian methodology of the problem approach. A problem statement has been offered.

What is, then, legitimate is an effort to see clearly the problem statement in general terms. This process is assisted by examining it more concretely than hitherto, i.e. by reflecting on the problem, and how to analyse it in one familiar social context, England.

It is accepted (as a set of working hypotheses) that the operation of major social and economic forces (e.g. industrialisation), strong social aspirations for 'equality of educational opportunity', and social negotiation among competing groups in the educational arena affect the configuration of the problem: how rapidly institutions change; and the statement of (new and old) principles for the selection of knowledge which ought to be offered to pupils aged about 12 to 16 years. These 'causes' of the problem are not the focus of investigation.

The immediate intellectual issue is to subject the problem statement to some refinement so that its constituent elements and the implications of these are clear, and secondly to give some account of how the investigation can proceed. The immediate concrete issue is to analyse English education in the mid-sixties in terms of the problem statement.

It is probably useful to make two simple verbal clarifications. As indicated in chapter one, an assumption has been made that 'national idiosyncracies' (in the usage quoted earlier; not 'national character') will be influential. Thus the nation-state is accepted as a main unit of analysis. No particular inference should be read from this into the use of the term 'England'. The conventional usage is 'England and Wales', which in turn are conventionally analysed within the United Kingdom, as if they were a nation state for the purposes of comparative education. This usage is followed, except that the word 'Wales' is dropped for stylistic reasons.⁽²⁾

The phrase 'mid-sixties' is also awkward stylistically. Unfortunately it cannot as easily be dropped. Like the category 'space frame' or 'nation state' it provides a necessary minimal location of the problem. Substantively, it is crucial. Stylistically, it will be repeated as little as possible.

However, as well as this stylistic irritation, it should also be noted that the phrase contains within it an intellectual dilemma. The problem has been located in the mid-sixties. This locating was not arbitrary. Earlier reflection suggested that

educational policies originally perceived as problem-solving might by the mid-sixties have become part of a problem-creating asynchronous change. Therefore this is the time location of the problem. The logic of the problem approach requires some clarification of the problem - in time; and also in social space. It is as illogical to change the time frame at will, as it would be, in the next chapter, to change the space frames at will. Thus the temptation to step outside the stated time frame will be resisted. Either the problem exists in the time and space frames accepted for analysis or it does not. Unfortunately, (3)* the epistemological dilemma does not quite disappear.

An operational decision can be taken, certainly. Data from the mid-sixties will be used to locate the problem in an identified time in several social space frames. Events in education which have occurred subsequently to the analysis of the problem will be taken into the solution formulation phase of the problem approach, as specific initial conditions.

The term 'redefinition and reorganisation of types of secondary schools and higher education' needs operationalising. Classification systems exist for the analysis of school structures. (4) Here Frank Bowles' classification will be tested. (5)*

Existing classification systems for the analysis of higher education institutions seem to be less usefully developed. Martin Trow's, for example, bases its initial distinctions in the numbers of students in the system, attitudes towards access,

curriculum and forms of instruction and other characteristics.⁽⁶⁾ The classification is, intellectually, most suggestive, but it is not particularly useful for the simple purposes of this chapter. T.R. McConnell bases his classification in numbers also, and then moves into an analysis of transition from one pattern of higher education to another.⁽⁷⁾ The essay is too discursive for present purposes. A simple initial distinction will therefore be used, between universities on the one hand, and other institutions of higher education.

The other main term in the problem statement, 'theories of general education' gives no immediate difficulties in identifying analytic techniques. There are, however, some awkward issues hidden in the intellectual relationships between these techniques. Discussion of these issues is therefore deferred, and immediate attention is given to the structural aspects of English education in the mid-sixties.

England: institutions

By the mid-sixties in England, secondary education was, again, receiving governmental attention. The Labour party government, which had been formed after the 1964 general election, issued to local authorities Circular IO/65 through its Secretary of State. The intent indicated in the Circular was the removal of separatism in secondary education, hitherto based on selection in the eleven plus examination: "The Secretary of State accordingly requests local education authorities ... to prepare and submit to him plans for reorganising secondary education in their areas on comprehensive lines."⁽⁸⁾

The Government stated its awareness that change in secondary school structures would take time, and that the processes of change should not be precipitate or destructive. Change would have to be a constructive process and one which would require careful planning by the local authorities in consultation with other interested parties.

To assist in this planning process, the Circular sketched six main types of comprehensive schools, the types being a result of 'experience and discussion':

- (i) The orthodox comprehensive school with an age range of eleven to eighteen.
- (ii) A two-tier system whereby all pupils transfer at eleven to a junior comprehensive school and all go on at thirteen or fourteen to a senior comprehensive school.
- (iii) A two-tier system under which all pupils on leaving primary school transfer to a junior comprehensive school, but at the age of thirteen or fourteen some pupils move on to a senior school while the remainder stay on in the same school. There are two main variations: in one, the comprehensive school which all pupils enter after leaving primary school provides no course terminating in a public examination, and normally keeps pupils only until fifteen; in the other, this school provides GCE and CSE courses, keeps pupils at least until sixteen, and encourages transfer at the appropriate stage to the sixth form of the senior school.
- (iv) A two-tier system in which all pupils on leaving primary school transfer to a junior comprehensive school. At the age of thirteen or fourteen all pupils have a choice between a senior school catering for those who expect to stay at school well beyond the compulsory age, and a senior school catering for those who do not.
- (v) Comprehensive schools with an age range of eleven to sixteen with sixth form colleges for pupils over sixteen.

- (vi) A system of middle schools which straddle the primary/secondary age ranges. Under this system pupils transfer from a primary school at the age of eight or nine to a comprehensive school with an age range of eight to twelve or nine to thirteen. From this middle school they move on to a comprehensive school with an age range of twelve or thirteen to eighteen.

(9)

The Circular acknowledged that which particular pattern of comprehensive school was adopted would depend on 'local circumstances', and that these local circumstances would include the constraints of existing school buildings. Thus the less preferred patterns - (iii) and (iv) - of which the Circular did not express full approval as they were not 'fully comprehensive' were perhaps necessary in certain local situations, "but they should be regarded only as an interim stage in development towards a fully comprehensive secondary organisation ... (10) The implications of this view of the process were made clearer in 1966, when Circular IO/66 was issued. The nominal topic was school buildings:

it would clearly be inconsistent with the Government's long term objective if future school building programmes were to include new projects exclusively fitted for a separatist system of secondary education. Accordingly the Secretary of State will not approve any new secondary projects ... which would be incompatible with the introduction of a non-selective system of secondary education ...

(11)

The intent, then, was clear and in this instance was to be backed by the allocation of financial resources. (Circular IO/65 and Circular IO/66 carried with them a long subsequent history. (12) That is not the point here.)

The practice, that is the reorganisation of school types, bore some relationship to the intent:

TABLE ONE

Secondary School Structure (as of January 1960):

England and Wales

Schools maintained by Local Education Authorities

| <u>Type</u> | <u>Institution</u> |
|----------------------------|--------------------|
| Modern | 3,837 |
| Grammar | 1,268 |
| Technical | 251 |
| Bilateral and Multilateral | 57 |
| Comprehensive | 130 |

Source: Education in 1960 being a report of the Ministry of Education and Statistics for England and Wales. HMSO Cmnd. 1439, Table I, p. 147.

TABLE TWO

Secondary School Structure (as of January 1968):

England and Wales

Schools maintained by Local Education Authorities

| <u>Type</u> | <u>Institution</u> |
|---------------|--------------------|
| Modern | 3,200 |
| Grammar | 1,155 |
| Technical | 121 |
| Comprehensive | 745 |

Source: Statistics of Education 1968, Volume I: Schools. Department of Education and Science, HMSO, 1969, Table I, p.2.

The process of change was not, however, evenly distributed throughout the decade. There was a gradualness to the increase in the number of comprehensive schools in the early and late parts of the decade, with the greater expansion occurring in the mid-sixties:

TABLE THREE

Secondary School Structure by year;

England and Wales

Schools maintained by Local Education Authorities

| <u>Type</u> | <u>1960</u> | <u>1965</u> | <u>1968</u> | <u>1969</u> | <u>1970</u> |
|---------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Modern | 3,837 | 3,727 | 3,200 | 2,954 | 2,691 |
| Grammar | 1,268 | 1,285 | 1,155 | 1,098 | 1,038 |
| Technical | 251 | 172 | 121 | 109 | 82 |
| Comprehensive | 130 | 262 | 745 | 976 | 1,250 |

Source: Statistics of Education 1973, Vol I: Schools, Department of Education and Science, 1974, p. 10.

Thus the rise in the number of comprehensive schools in the period 1965 to 1968 and 1965 to 1969 was marked. The second obvious comment on the figures is to stress the relative survival of the grammar school, and the way in which the numbers of modern and technical schools declined as the comprehensive type of school grew in numbers. Strictly speaking, this latter point does not have complete relevance to the problem statement, as the problem statement is currently phrased. The stress in the problem statement is on the reorganisation of types of secondary school institutions, at a relatively rapid pace in the mid-sixties in

England. The precise balancing of how this reorganisation occurred is a matter of considerable anxiety to English commentators; it is of less direct relevance to the first half of the problem as stated. The point is, however, noted for later comment.

This process of change can be typed in terms of the Bowles classification as a movement from Structure B characteristics to Structure C characteristics.⁽¹³⁾ This typing of the process of change is not quite as unambiguous as the previous statement would imply. It is proper, therefore, to outline the Bowles' classification and to review briefly its constituents.

For Bowles, the 'three basic forms of organisation for secondary education' are firstly Structure A 'the separation of secondary programmes into three parallel lines'. The lines of 'student direction' are (a) general secondary education leading in general to basic qualifications for university entry; (b) a pedagogy line for intending primary school and specialist teachers; and (c) a technical and vocational training line (available after a higher primary school course). There may also be (d) a 'higher primary school' programme which is mainly terminal. Each of these characteristics is located by Bowles in terms of examinations and of prospects of admission to higher education (which is the main theme of his analysis). A further criterion for Structure A is that the school leaving age tends to be at the normal age of completion of primary school, i.e. about 12 or 13 years.⁽¹⁴⁾

The second of the three basic forms of organisation, Structure B, is characterised by two lines of student direction: (a) general secondary education leading to basic qualifications for university entry and (b) a common programme of general education as the first-cycle of secondary education. This common programme may be terminal or may lead to (primary) teacher training or to technical and vocational schools. A further criterion of Structure B is that the school leaving age tends to be 12, 13 or 14 years of age.

The third of these basic forms of organisation, Structure C, is a 'common programme' followed by a separation into two or three lines. Thus the criteria for Structure C systems are: (a) a common first cycle of secondary education for which no examinations are required; (b) the movement into the higher educational sector of teacher training and a technical programme frequently built into the options available within a 'comprehensive' school, and (c) the growth of specific university entrance examinations. A further criterion for Structure C is that the school leaving age tends to be fifteen years or older.

The immediate utility of the Bowles classification system is clear. The term 'lines of student direction' is useful. It permits, for example, the analysis to continue despite local variations in the nomenclature and type of secondary schools. Thus the English 'grammar school' provided a general secondary education leading to basic qualifications for university entry.

In the period under review, the 'technical', 'multilateral and bilateral' and 'modern' schools can be seen as a line of student direction but not as coming within the meaning of Bowles' 'common programme of general education as the first cycle of secondary education'. The existence of some comprehensive schools (and the provision of a minimum school leaving age of fifteen in the 1944 Education Act) means that the educational system was beginning to show Structure C characteristics by the mid-sixties. It is also, however, possible to note that the relative imprecision over the characteristics of secondary schools in the Structure C model may produce difficulties in comparative analysis (i.e. for the analysis of some countries other than England in the mid-sixties). The classification system may or may not need extension ; or even rejection.

As with the relatively rapid change in English secondary education institutions of the mid-sixties, the relatively rapid change of higher education institutions can be identified, initially, with a statement of intent, albeit the intent was dependent on the acceptance of a Report.

The charge given to the Robbins Committee in 1961 was:

to review the pattern of full time higher education in Great Britain and in the light of national needs and resources to advise Her Majesty's Government on what principles its long term development should be based. In particular, to advise, in the light of these principles, whether any new types of institution are desirable and whether any modifications should be made in the present arrangements for planning and co-ordinating the development of the various types of institution.

Many of the Robbins Report's recommendations were to do with teaching and post-graduate work, and are irrelevant in the context of the analysis. Other recommendations, although to do with the structure of higher education, were not accepted. For example, the Robbins Report recommended a number of 'Special Institutions for Scientific and Technological Education and Research' be created, on the model of prestigious technological universities in Europe and the USA. Five such 'sisters' were proposed.⁽¹⁶⁾ The plans met considerable opposition from existing universities and none were created. Similarly, the Robbins Report recommended the creation of six new universities. This recommendation was not implemented in England.

What was created, as recommended in the Report, were the technological universities from institutions which had been previously Colleges of Advanced Technology.⁽¹⁷⁾ Thus by 1966 the Universities of Aston in Birmingham, Bath University of Technology, Bradford, Brunel, City University and the University of Surrey were created. The University of Salford opened in 1967.

An important innovation recommended by the Report was the creation of the Council for National Academic Awards (which was to replace the National Council for Technological Awards, hitherto linked to the CATs many of which became universities).⁽¹⁸⁾ The CNAA had an important effect on the redefinition of many institutions of higher education in England: it turned them, de facto, through its own de jure powers of accreditation, into

degree awarding institutions. The CNAA was established rapidly - in 1964 - after Robbins had reported in 1963. So by the mid-sixties possibilities were open for institutions, especially colleges of education, to avail themselves of these new structures.

The Robbins Committee advocated the redefinition and re-organisation of teacher education, which it saw as moving increasingly inside the universities, or at least, taking place under an increased degree of institutional and academic support from the universities. (19)

The (teacher) Training Colleges were to be renamed Colleges of Education, and some of them might become individually constituent parts of a university. Some might combine with a major technical college to become a separate (new) university. The possibility of taking a four year degree (a B.Ed) should be made available to some students training to be teachers. And the colleges should be linked with new 'Schools of Education' which would comprise all the colleges in each university's Institute of Education. Such a School would be responsible to the university Senate for the award of the new degrees. (20)

As indicated, not all the Robbins proposals were implemented. It was not the case, for example, that the colleges of education became integrated with the universities in the way Robbins had envisaged. It was not the case that major technical colleges and teacher training colleges were combined to make new universities; instead several of the major technical colleges became 'polytechnics', a proposal made separately (in a White Paper) in 1966.

Overall, however, there was both reorganisation and redefinition of the institutions of English higher education in the mid-sixties. There was the reorganisation suggested by the Robbins Report, notably the creation of technological universities. The CNAAC was also created at the recommendation of and following the Report. The CNAAC in turn contributed to the redefinition of the system in that it permitted a larger number and a different kind of institution to offer degrees. The Robbins Report also contributed to the (literal) redefinition of the teacher training colleges, and to their reorganisation. Thus, the system was explicitly reorganised; and the system was redefined through a diffusion of the power to grant degrees and also redefined by an expansion in the numbers of institutions of higher education.

This is not, however, a very satisfactory conclusion. Clearly the substantive conclusion that there was major change is correct, but the classification of the reforms is blurred. It seems sensible to re-analyse the conclusion, with refinements to the classification system, before comparative analysis is attempted. Before that is undertaken, it may be equally sensible to review the other half of the problem statement in case a similar revision is required there.

The immediate referent for the other half of the problem statement is, of course, Lauwery's paper on 'general education in a changing world':

Comparative Theories of General Education

Let us therefore seek, by the comparative method, the theory of general education. Let us try to understand what this particular aim and purpose implies, what it seeks to achieve. Secondly, by studying what our colleagues in other lands do, we may get ideas helpful in our own - but we shall be able to borrow usefully and constructively only if we understand the basic principles.

(21)

Lauwerys moves into his argument by pointing out that there is some agreement that young people should be educated without regard to their future vocational intentions. The dispute is about the age that is taken as a proper point for acknowledging those intentions. His immediate question therefore is whether the idea of liberal education retains relevance. His answer is a qualified affirmative. That is:

Yet in general there are some old ideas which can still be accepted. Most of us, perhaps all of us, would still gladly agree with the most general statement of the aim of liberal education, namely that the objective is to train all future citizens in the use of freedom through the attainment of wisdom. All of us, whatever our national or cultural backgrounds, think that all men and women can and should be made to appreciate the value and importance of seeking truth, of pursuing beauty and of loving goodness. But perhaps we begin to feel doubt when we go further and consider what used to be said regarding the means to be employed in the pursuit of such aims. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries ...

(22)

His argument continues with the idea that the responses to the question of how attempts are made to realise these general aims will vary because of 'the history of thought and by the philosophy current' in different cultural environments (which are taken as national environments). He concludes his opening argument by writing:

Let us insist, therefore, that in what follows, an attempt will be made to delineate in broad outline some of these semi-conscious assumptions and not the nature of the (curriculum) proposals now put forward or considered in Europe or America.

(23)

Lauwerys then proceeds to sketch 'traditional concepts of general education' for England, France, Germany, the USA and 'communist views'.

For England:

Liberal education to the English means above all the attempt to foster the development of personality through the training of moral character. In one of his sermons (about 1835) Dr. Arnold of Rugby stated his aims: "What we must look for in this school," he said, "is first - first in order of importance not merely first - is first religious and moral principle: secondly, gentlemanly conduct; thirdly, intellectual ability."

(24)

The whole school was to be an educative environment devoted to this purpose, whilst within the classroom the emphasis given to the classical literature of Latin and Greek, was not a linguistic emphasis but a chance to reflect on the social and human condition from which lessons 'could be drawn of moral, social or political importance'. Lauwerys points out that 'the whole theory is expressed in the report of the Schools Enquiry Commission, which enquired into the eight old public schools in 1864':

There should be some one principal branch of study invested with a recognised and, if possible, a traditional importance, to which the principal weight could be assigned and the larger share of time and attention given.

This is necessary in order to concentrate attention, to stimulate industry, to supply to the whole school a common background of literary interest and a common path of promotion. The study of the classical languages occupies this position in all the great English schools ...

(25)

After a commentary on the claims of science as a replacement for the classics, and of the claims of utilitarian knowledge, Lauwerys points to the displacement of the classics; but also the refusal to incorporate into the school more and more subjects:

This solution was impossible in England. The belief that there should be "some one principal branch of study" persisted and is still whole-heartedly accepted. Most educators consider that young people really should come to grips with not more than one or two subjects and learn to master them. So what was done was to move towards a limited form of specialisation. Schools began to be organised into sides.

(25)

This kind of specialisation (in, say, the arts or the sciences) is subsequently reflected in the examination structure, with the result that "as a rule examinations themselves are attacked and their effects considered pernicious. That is, as usual, the tool or the instrument is blamed, not those who use it." (26)

Lauwerys proceeds to compare this English definition of a theory of general education with that of the French:

As a rule the phrase used is culture générale and the theory, so it seems to me, has been deeply affected by the Cartesian reinterpretation of scholastic philosophy and logic. I like to call it a reinterpretation, because although Descartes was profoundly affected by Bacon and considered him in a sense his master whom he tried to learn from, his whole approach to the problem of the acquisition of knowledge is, of course, one which in a sense was the scholastic belief in logic and method, while Bacon's approach was a vastly more empirical and experimental one.

(27)

Lauwerys then draws a distinction between the way in which an intellectual tradition developed and goes on to outline some of the implications of these developments for a French view of the important part of general education:

... to see the truth is to love the good. The pursuit of truth is the common enterprise of mankind. And the truth must be pursued through the rigorous and consistent application of the highest of all human virtues, namely, reason ... Education must base itself upon rational elements or cease to be education. Seen from such a point of view, the aim must be to develop in the pupils the power of reasoning correctly and to the point. (28)

The ways in which such an education may be transmitted are clear:

The faculty of reason is best trained, so it is thought, through the growth of skill in the use of highly structured languages which are themselves the expression of logic: mathematics, French, Latin in that order. The sciences provide bodies of knowledge organised by the application of logical ideas and theories. The latter may be important, the former are accidental, mere facts or illustrations. Evidently the application of this approach to education involves stressing above all the careful inner examinations of mathematical principles and of extracts from literature chosen because of their clarity and cogency. To the superficial observer this may appear dry, abstract, and formal. In truth, however, the objective of French education is and remains moral and social. (29)

The rather lengthy process of documenting Lauwers' interpretations of theories of general education should not be permitted to distract from the theme of the analysis.

The theme of the analysis remains the attempt to see clearly the elements and implications of the problem statement. General education has been taken as the common school knowledge which will be offered to children aged about 12 to 16; different theories of general education are being outlined for comparative purposes. However these in turn are embedded in a tradition of normative analysis. It is as well to make this explicit, as there are several assumptions in giving importance to the theme of normative analysis.

In the literature of comparative education the main writings around this theme have come from English based comparative educationists drawing on European traditions of comparative analysis, rather than North American comparative educationists. Within this English tradition a major emphasis on the ways in which ideas have influenced education systems have been of general interest to several theoreticians, who in the immediate pre-war and post-war period were exploring views of 'national character'. In their different ways, both Nicholas Hans and Vernon Mallinson took a grasp on this as a conceptual problematic. (30)

Lauwerys, and later, Holmes also attempted to understand the significance of the ideational (as well as the material) realm for cross-national study. Neither, however, wished to use existing techniques of national character analysis. Yet the intellectual issue, of course, remained, with three themes: if analyses were not to be conducted through national character techniques, then how might one understand what immediate impressions would suggest are important differences between the assumptions and attitudes of many people in France, England, etc? Secondly, and borrowing from European scholars such as Schneider and Hessen, ideas themselves were probably 'causal factors' - and were incorporated directly into the work of Nicholas Hans as such. There was thus a major emphasis given in what may loosely be termed 'the London school of comparative educationists' to the role of major ideas, ideals and traditions of thought in constraining the different national patternings of educational systems. If however analysis through such major factors as religious

traditions, (Lutheranism, Catholicism, etc) and political traditions was not always suitable for all topics being subjected to analysis, what might be put in their place? Thirdly, if the ideas of men in different national situations were accepted as significant by comparative educationists, i.e. necessary concepts for analysis, how might this analysis be done without ethnocentric judgement? Lauwerys and Holmes, Hans to some extent and Edmund King have addressed themselves to this general issue (with differences in emphasis) on several occasions. (31)

Lauwerys outline of theories of general education should thus be understood as being within one tradition of analysis of comparative education which has addressed itself to an important, perhaps crucial question, which comparative educationists must solve before they can carry through analyses; or more carefully phrased, which they should anticipate and attempt to solve by a publicly declared technique whilst they do their work. In this sense, Lauwerys analysis whilst based in an intellectual tradition which has been made explicit, is also a technique.

The technical question, here, is specific. How may one half of the problem statement be readied for subsequent analytic use? What techniques, classification systems, typologies, or intellectual constructs, or models may permit cross-national analysis? And what may assist comparative analysis in an especially difficult area, the normative?

It is in terms, then, both of the problem approach and the subordinate questions just outlined that the lengthy and deliberately detailed accounting of the Lauwerys' analysis should be understood.

The implicit question is whether the content of Lauwerys' analysis is likely to direct or misdirect investigation in terms of the asserted non-change element in the problem statement.

It remains to complete the review of content. Lauwerys' next country for analysis is Germany. This is omitted. (32)*

Lauwerys had reviewed each of the traditional concepts of English and French general education in the light of subsequent social change and technological development. He suggested in particular that in the nineteenth century there was a sharp battle in both countries between those who wished to diminish classical and literary studies in favour of rather more attention to the knowledge of science which had been generated. The counter-claims in Europe, were difficult to sustain.

Lauwerys contrasts this non-responsiveness to changing circumstances in Europe (i.e. France, England and Germany) with, in the first instance, the USA. Its education, he suggests, began to become American during the later eighteenth century and was therefore affected by the physiocrats and the encyclopaedists:

Middle class men have long expressed more freely in America than in Europe their repudiation of aristocratic values. Note how Benjamin Franklin wrote about what was to be taught to all in the Philadelphia Academy: "As to their studies, it would be well if they could be taught everything that is useful and everything that is ornamental." This is a typically middle class notion - not a Platonic one. "But art is long, and their time is short. It is therefore proposed that they learn those things that are likely to be most useful and most ornamental, regard being paid to the several professions for which they are intended."

(33)

Lauwerys points out that during the nineteenth century this stress on the concept of the 'useful' was strengthened, with some specification that useful would mean useful in the organisation of small self-governing communities of free citizens and useful in the production of material goods and the manufacturing process. To the extent that European ideas were 'in tune' with these tendencies, they were acceptable, as in the case of the ideas of Herbert Spencer. As in the other examples, Lauwerys proceeds to sketch the intellectual principles which follow for the general education of the young:

encyclopaedism, stress on the useful and the social, concern with process. They often attempt to cover material drawn from many subject fields: a challenge to traditional disciplines. They frequently consist of an investigation of "challenging problems". Processes of problem solving are looked upon as important, while there is less stress than in Europe upon rigour of demonstration, or upon mastery of traditional subjects, not one of which, incidentally, is considered essential. Attention is often paid to social competence and social adjustment.

(34)

The final category to which Lauwerys turns his attention is 'communist views on education'. Context makes it clear however that his main referent is 'Russia':

From one point of view, the theory expresses a wish to use education as an instrument for changing the conventional attitude to work and production. "One of the principal evils of the old society was the great gulf between manual and mental labour. The separation of manual work from mental work took place with the appearance of private ownership of the means of production and the division of society into hostile, antagonistic classes." This is a rejection of the high European tradition, embodying the Aristotelian dichotomy between knowledge which is worthy of a free man because it deals with general ideas and that of a craftsman or artisan, concerned with skills of hand...

(35)

This view of general education finds expression in the polytechnical principle:

... it is always stressed by communist theorists that the tendency towards vocational or professional studies, considered as ends-in-themselves, is to be resisted. The courses offered in schools are to be poly- and not mono-technic in intention... An attempt must be made to relate the entire curriculum to the production process of the region round the school, or indeed of the whole nation.

(36)

Lauwerys stresses that the creators of the theory, such as Marx, Engels, Lenin, Makarenko and 'Madame Krupskaja' viewed the term 'production process' broadly, and in no sense the mere satisfaction of the simple requirements of a need for skilled labour in industry. He also outlines how the theory has a strong moral aspect in that the Marxist society is expected to be more humane and its morality more universal than that possible in class-based stratified societies; "Clearly, then Soviet educators, like their Western colleagues, fully accept the notion that the aim of the education offered to all the children of all the people must be moral and social."

(37)

Lauwerys concludes his analysis with some reflections of the similarities and differences between the traditions of general education that he has outlined, especially in terms of the differences between the European societies on the one hand and the USSR and USA on the other.

The outline of the content of Lauwerys analysis as a whole is also completed. It remains to assess the analysis in terms of the questions raised earlier. Granted that Lauwerys' work is part of an important theme in the analytic literature, how useful is it for this analysis?

What Lauwerys is doing, in his own terms, and apart from those statements of intent which have already been quoted is to analyse general education in terms of two themes which unite the Western European tradition of liberal or general education. This tradition:

embodies at once a doctrine of the nature of man and a doctrine of the nature of knowledge. It stresses the views that (i) character can be trained and personality developed by example, exercise and exhortation, and (ii) that the mind can be shown how to use a good method of thinking correctly and abstractly, so as to arrive at truth; and that, moreover, only that is knowledge which is rationally organised into a system of ideas and of theories.

(38)

In other words, the detailed specifications are organised around two principles - apart from the detailed specification of what the principles involve. Similarly his material for the USA and USSR make the same principles explicit; though of course the detailed specification varies.

Thus Lauwerys provides an analytical tool which makes clear at the level of both principle and of detail what categories of data may be seen as relevant. He provides then an instrument of measurement which, whilst it cannot be perfect, is at least public. The measuring instrument could, in principle, be used by other investigators to repeat this, or undertake alternative, analysis.

The analytic instrument is, then, public and conceptually clear. It permits comparative analysis - indeed is specifically designed for it. It permits comparative analysis by a technique similar to the technique of an ideal-typical construct. (39)

In fact, a version of ideal-typical construct technique has been suggested by Holmes as a possible method for use in conjunction with the problem approach, and specifically for the analysis of normative phenomena. He writes, "the construction of normative patterns presents the most serious difficulties ... Another cautionary note should be sounded. It is not to be supposed that useful patterns for any society can be constructed in vacuo. The purpose which the composite picture of information is to serve is important ... and naturally of primary interest is the use to which the model can be put in conjunction with the problem approach." (40)

The technique is that of rational constructs:

The second method in which philosophical techniques and sources (particularly the writings of representative thinkers) are employed has the advantage of reversing the emphasis from the specific to the most general statements of norms. A pattern resulting from this approach could be described as a rational construct of the Weberian type ...

Obviously, a normative pattern cannot include all the norms by which members of a society live. Nor if established philosophically can it include everything a chosen philosopher (or his followers) has written. Rational constructs are designed, as Weber said, 'to facilitate the presentation of an otherwise immensely multifarious subject matter'. Hence the pattern should simplify rather than complicate.

(41)

Thus the theories of general education outlined by Lauwerys have a double advantage. They are highly relevant to the problem under investigation; and they simplify an 'otherwise immensely multifarious subject matter'.

Further, Lauwerys made explicit the principles by which he was organising his data: theories of general education were to be grouped around views of character and views of the mind. This accords with Holmes' principle that "the criteria on which this selection is based should be made explicit. No choice is ever either entirely arbitrary or objective."

However, this is not punctilious enough. The full quotation exposes a difficulty:

Hence the pattern should simplify rather than complicate. Consequently having selected a philosopher as providing material for a rational construct the investigator then selects data from among the writer's various works or from among the ideas that he expresses. The criteria on which

this selection is based should be made explicit. No choice is ever either entirely arbitrary or objective. In this presentation it is based upon a particular analysis and evaluation of some features of philosophical discussion. Three issues have been debated at length by western philosophers - the nature of man, the nature of society, and the nature of knowledge, and methods of acquiring it.

(42)

Therefore, Lauwerys is not himself using a rational construct approach, nor may the use of Lauwerys' analysis be termed, methodologically, a rational construct analysis. Technically, given the way in which Holmes has defined how rational constructs are arrived at, it cannot be.

The full logic of the methodology therefore suggests that rational constructs be devised for the countries to be analysed comparatively. Practically, of course, this would be a major task. It will not be undertaken.

The task is not, however, rejected on practical grounds. Instead the view is held that the methodological function of Lauwerys' analysis is the same as the methodological function which rational constructs are designed to fulfill. Intellectually, the role of an ideal-typical construct is to permit the handling of certain kinds of multifarious subject matter. The Lauwerys analysis not only permits this analytic mode; it also works in the same taxonomic category which the rational construct is designed for - the normative.

Thus Lauwerys' work will, in this function, be used for analysis in the normative half of the problem statement, and it will be combined with a normative analysis of Japan already

constructed by Brian Holmes. This, too, represents an awkward methodological choice in the construction of the classification system; but the choice is between two principles. On the one hand, it would clearly be extremely useful if Lauwerys had continued his analysis to another three or four countries, especially countries outside of the European cultural network. Then a tool for the measurement of certain kinds of normative change or non-change would be available with a high degree of consistency. He did not. This is precisely the difficulty in this area of analysis. Whilst there are several classification systems available for the investigation of educational institutions, the normative area is consistently underexplored in the literature; or at least underexplored in a systematic way. (43)*

One of the consequences of this is that normative analyses of the kind being attempted here are rarely undertaken in the literature. (44)

Thus, the methods of research come to determine the content of research. The assertion is made that this vitiates the development of comparative education as a whole, and that this tendency should be resisted. Unless normative analyses of a certain kind are undertaken even though major difficulties can be anticipated, the intellectual definition of comparative education is unlikely to change. (45)

Holmes' analysis of Japan is located in a discussion of the Japanese normative pattern, in the latter half of his text where he explores various problems in particular national situations. Having acknowledged the difficulties of compiling a

normative construct for Japan he writes "the construct proposed here is necessarily highly selective. It may nevertheless serve as a basis for further analysis":⁽⁴⁶⁾

Any Weberian construct for Japan, drawn from philosophy not empirical data, would inevitably contain aspects of Buddhism, Confucianism, and certain European theories ... few elements which cannot be reconciled with indigenous Shintoism have much chance of survival. The Imperial Rescript combined Confucianism with State Shintoism. Of European theories perhaps only those associated with Hegelianism have made much headway in Japan, although it is clear that Christian belief profoundly influences a small minority of people, and that American pragmatism permeates much of economic life.

If the pattern is drawn up in the light of theories of society, the individual and knowledge, its broad outlines would be of the following kind.

Social theory is derived largely from Confucian paternalism, with the principles of loyalty and filial piety blending harmoniously with the ancestor worship of Shintoism. Rules guiding the behaviour of an individual in five sets of relationships also stem from Confucianism ... The five relationships were those between (a) sovereign and subject, (b) father (or mother) and child, (c) husband and wife, (d) elder and younger brother or sisters, and (e) friends. The virtues which should guide action are clearly stated in the Imperial Rescript. Individuals should be loyal, filial, affectionate, modest, benevolent, law-abiding ... recognising/their/ obligations.

As for the individual, Shinto belief was that all men were descended from the gods ... who were, however, unequal in standing and importance. Hence the acceptance of inequalities among men was justified. There is also the extremely important concept of Jikaku, an inner spiritual quality, acquired through introspection to give knowledge of self, possessed by some men, a minority, but not others, which derives from Zen Buddhism. One of the chief tasks of education is to develop this immensely respected ability ...

For a representative theory of knowledge it is perhaps necessary to turn to Zen Buddhism... Zen in particular has contributed to the aristocratic way of life - Bushido. It united aestheticism with military prowess. Indeed so strong was the aesthetic element that 'life itself has become identified with art'...

Learning, however, was regarded with mild contempt. Certainly the rational logical elements were weakly represented compared with intuition. Spiritual training, however, gave assurance of discovering an ultimate reality which transcends all individual differences ... Zen Buddhism holds that knowledge cannot be easily verbalised. What is known is known intuitively, in experience and emotion. It is hardly surprising that of all the European epistemologies only the dialectic and mysticism of Hegel were widely accepted ... Neither Cartesian rationalism nor the empiricism of a Locke or Mill is very evident.

(47)

It should immediately be noted that the analytic themes of the construct include the theories of character and knowledge (and mind) which were present in Lauwerys' analysis. Of course the Holmes' construct is more explicit on the social relationships which are proper in Japan. This is partly a function of the particular Holmesian problem which is the theme of his analysis; and partly a function of the country which is being analysed, Japan. This aspect of the construct may therefore be treated as a properly full outline of the theory of character and morality which would be incorporated in a traditional theory of general education in Japan.

Two points should be acknowledged before proceeding to the next major question (of how to measure relative change in theories of general education). Firstly, as with the techniques for the classification of the types of secondary and higher education institutions, there are alternate ways to classify theories of general education.⁽⁴⁸⁾ * Secondly, it is possible to cross-check the analytic mode to be used.⁽⁴⁹⁾

The answer to the question indicated above - how to measure relative change or non-change in current 'theories of general education' - is based on the idea that it is theories of general education which have to be measured.

For this purpose, details of curriculum practices are a poor guide. For example, changes in the contents of what is taught as geography may indeed be a function of a shift in theories of general education; they are as likely to be function of a shift in what geographers think geography is. Similarly, it is doubtful whether shifts in examining - in themselves - are a reliable index. Apart from the Lauwerys argument quoted before, the more general point is that examination patterns may be altered for reasons quite other than a renegotiation of a theory of general education. The gradual abolition of the 11 plus for example was a function of a theory about to whom education should be distributed. What should be distributed as knowledge to those who no longer sit the 11 plus is part of what is being discussed. There are difficulties too in accepting an important part of curriculum practice - teaching styles - as an indication of shifts in the theory of general education. A shift in teaching style may, conjecturally, occur because of alterations in conceptions of authority, and authority figures. It is also doubtful whether, at the level

principle, individual or small scale curriculum projects are a useful guide for the measurement of change and non-change. The tentative transitory nature of several of them suggests that the sociological forces which produced them are as likely to be located in the internal politics of the education system. It is accepted, however, that in all these cases some kinds of changes in content, examining, teaching style and experimental (curriculum) projects might point to a shift in the theory of general education. The question is whether a superordinate category can be suggested which would permit cross-national analysis.

One major and one minor category are suggested. The major category is a document made public at the national level, offered directly or indirectly for validation by political agencies, and in which the principles on which curriculum of schools ought to be based are discussed. The document may take the form of a law, or a national report or a widely publicised statement by a major politician. Directly or indirectly, the statement should be being offered for national acceptance, which will usually imply some process of political legitimation will be accorded the document. It is important that the proposals be issued in the form of a document; this permits some analysis of change and non-change. Given that the document is addressed to the principles which should inform 'general education', change may be measured by the rejection (and presumably renegotiation) of the constructs outlined above; non-change by the confirmation of the principles present in traditional theories of general education.

Such documents do not arise in a social vacuum. It is likely therefore that the processes of generating such a document will be preceded by debate and discussion about the 'curriculum'. This debate may be lay or professional, or more likely, both.

This debate - among professionals, about the principles on which 'general education' should be based - will constitute a second indication of acceptance (non-change) or denial (change) of traditional theories of general education.

In social contexts in which these two processes both occur, then the statement at national level should be taken as the more important definition of the situation. For purposes of assessing relative change or non-change in theories of general education, a national statement is taken to mean that the confirmation or rejection of traditional theories has wide social importance; that the traditional concept of 'general education' needs defence in changing social circumstances, or that it should be modified in changing social circumstances.

Where a national statement has been made, then, debates among educationists may be categorised as a minor index of change and non-change. Their debates will still occur; but the social effort to defend or redefine theories of general education has been taken into a larger social arena and into a larger debate. Educationists will contribute to this debate, and may be highly influential within it, i.e. they may affect the outcomes, But the outcomes (the solutions) are not, here, the point.

If no national statement has been made, then this itself is likely to be an index of non-change.

Where no national statement attempting to redefine or renegotiate the principles of general education has been made, then debates among educationists are likely to be a useful index of a wish of some of them to alter the principles which inform 'general education', and these debates may (or may not) signal the beginnings of a process which leads through to a national statement.

It is possible that there will be no debate among educationists, as defined; that is, no debate about the principles which inform 'theories of general education', particularly if specialist groups among educationists - such as philosophers of education and curriculum experts - concern themselves with other matters. This is an extreme hypothetical case. In practice it is more likely that the literature of education will contain some commentaries on the principles which should inform general education; but that these commentaries do not attract the attention of other educationists away from their academic sub-specialities.

Conjecturally, these techniques of measurement will work. It remains to use them against the English context of the mid-sixties. The techniques may produce unclear definitions of normative change or non-change. If that is the case, then they like the techniques for analysing change and non-change in the redefinition or reorganisation of types of secondary and higher

education institutions, may have to be reviewed before cross-national analysis is attempted.

England: norms

There were two major national reports which were offered for public acceptance and which included major analysis of the principles on which educational knowledge could be selected in secondary schools. One of these, the 'Crowther Report' was published before the 'mid-sixties', Volume One appearing in 1959, Volume II in 1960.⁽⁵⁰⁾ It is accepted for analysis nevertheless because in conjunction with the other report (the 'Newsom Report'⁽⁵¹⁾) it makes one intellectual aspect of the problem clear, and, further, has implications for the comparative analysis.

The terms of reference for the Central Advisory Council were:

to consider, in relation to the changing social and industrial needs of the society, and the needs of its individual citizens, the education of boys and girls between 15 and 18, and in particular to consider the balance at various levels of general and specialised studies between these ages and to examine the inter-relationship of the various stages of education.

(52)

As a consequence of these terms of reference, the Report investigated and commented on several important themes of English education, such as the wastage of talent it identified, the issue of whether to raise the school leaving age, the extension of the further education system, and expected difficulties over the supply of teachers.

At the core of the Report, however, was the explication of a set of principles which should inform the selection of knowledge for pupils aged about 16 years.

It set up its argument with the use of international example, including the USA:

The spur of competition, the demand for hard work and high standards are, we are told, lacking. Certainly the American High School is under heavy criticism from the universities.

(53)

On the other hand:

On the continent, the complaints are nearly as insistent but strikingly different. They are concerned with the pressure on pupils of a curriculum which has serious academic demands, often of a competitive nature, over too wide a range of subjects. The strain, it is said, is altogether too great.

(54)

This was clearly not a good thing, because "... the acquisition of factual knowledge is by itself a poor test of any education... The proper test of education is whether it teaches the pupil to think, and whether it awakens his interest in applying his brain to the various problems and opportunity that life presents." (55)

The way out of the apparent dilemma (apart from a rhetorical argument which the Report sets up and then carefully rejects) is the acknowledgement that:

The first step in the argument for specialisation is that able boys and girls are ready and eager by the time they are 16 ... to get down to the serious study of some one aspect of human knowledge ... "subject mindedness" ... is one of the marks of the Sixth Form.

(56)

The conclusion (which actually in the text precedes much of the argument quoted) is:

For ourselves, after considering the matter most carefully, we are agreed in accepting the English principle of specialisation, or intensive study, as it would be better described. It is the principle we endorse .. the best line of advance, in our opinion, is to reaffirm the principle and reform its application rather than abandon it entirely.

(57)

The particular 'reform of application' which the Report suggested was to try and control the effect the principle had on narrowing the curriculum "to save scientists from illiteracy and the arts specialists from innumeracy" (58)

More important here is to see how the principle of specialisation is expected to inform the mind and character of the pupil:

A boy can be introduced to one or two areas which can throw light on the achievement of man and the nature of the world he lives in. The honours school of Literae Humaniores at Oxford is a classic example of specialisation or study in depth. With the aid of a precise linguistic discipline, it develops a knowledge of the literature, the history, the art and the thought of one of the great cultures of the world. At the schoolboy's much lower level, similar studies in depth can be developed from starting points in half-a-dozen literary or scientific subjects ... We should reject certain fields, which are eminently suitable for specialisation at a later age, such as law or the technology of a particular industry because they are not among the best means of introducing a boy to the fundamental processes of thought and the greatest achievements of the human mind. It should go without saying that a school should not offer a subject for specialisation just because it will be vocationally useful in later life.

(59)

It is suggested that the Lauwerys ideal-typical construct of an English theory of general education permits the Crowther Report's position to be located successfully. That is, in Crowther there is not the emphasis on character and moral and religious principle which would produce a complete fit with the construct, but there is a clear emphasis on 'some one principal branch of study... to which the principal weight could be assigned and the

larger share of time and attention given'. The specialisation chosen should clearly be somewhat traditional: law and certain kinds of technological studies are inappropriate for the transmission of general education. From them, presumably, can be drawn neither implications of moral, social or political importance nor are they examples of the fundamental processes of thought or the greatest achievements of the human mind.

The Crowther Report may be interpreted as a reaffirmation of a traditional theory of general education; as importantly, non-change in the normative area is identifiable in this case. (There is also an element of change being negotiated in the tradition. This, it is judged, is in the suggestion for diminishing the intensity of specialisation.)

The other major report affecting secondary education was the Newsom Report which had as its terms of reference:

To consider the education between the ages of 13 and 16 of pupils of average or less than average ability who are or will be following full-time courses either at schools or in establishments of further education. The term education shall be understood to include extra-curricular activities.

(60)

The Newsom Report like the Crowther Report, in following its terms of reference, covered several issues, such as how to improve teacher training, school buildings, and agreed with Crowther in recommending a raising of the minimum school leaving age. It also made a plea for extra resources (including skills as well as cash) to be devoted to what were:

... half the pupils in our secondary schools; they will eventually become half the citizens of this country, half the workers, half the mothers and fathers and half the consumers. Disraeli once said that on the education of the people of this country its future depended and it is in this sense that we have entitled our report "Half Our Future".

(61)

Like Crowther, it also made acknowledgement of social change especially economic change. The costs of education are rising:

We therefore think it essential to state at the outset the economic argument for investment in our pupils.

Briefly, it is that the future pattern of employment in this country will require a much larger pool of talent than is presently available; and that at least a substantial proportion of the "average" and "below average" pupils are sufficiently educable to supply that additional talent. The need is not only for more skilled workers to fill existing jobs, but also for a generally better educated and intelligently adaptable labour force to meet new demands ... technological advance... is not leading to widespread unemployment among skilled workers... If anything, the progress of automation and the application of other technological developments are likely to be delayed by lack of trained personnel.

(62)

Granted, then that the Newsom Report had a clear theory of social change (which is quoted because it informs and relocates principles on which knowledge selection should take place), and granted that what was required was "... a change of thinking and even more a change of heart" (63) and that "we cannot stress too strongly that the solution to these problems is not necessarily to be found by a reorganisation of the present pattern of secondary education" (64), what were the principles around which a 'general education' might be organised for half the pupils in the country?

Before they can tackle their problems the schools have to be clear about their ultimate objectives. What ought these to be for our pupils?...

Most teachers and parents would agree with us about general objectives. Skills, qualities of character, knowledge, physical well-being, are all to be desired. Boys and girls need to be helped to develop certain skills of communication in speech and in writing, in reading with understanding, and in calculations involving numbers and measurement: these skills are basic, in that they are tools to other learning and without some mastery of them the pupils will be cut off from whole areas of human thought and experience. But they do not in themselves represent an adequate minimum education at which to aim. All boys and girls need to develop, as well as skills, capacities for thought, judgement enjoyment, curiosity. They need to develop a sense of responsibility for their work and towards other people, and to begin to arrive at some code of moral and social behaviour which is self-imposed. It is important that they have some understanding of the physical world and of the human society in which they are growing up.

(65)

In terms of the Lauwerys' construct this quotation is of extreme interest. 'Education' has been defined with 'skills' as the first concept. Simple basic tools for communication have been placed first in order. It is accepted that these, in themselves, are not an 'adequate minimum education at which to aim.' But this in turn implies that what follows will fill out the definition of an adequate minimum education. Granted that the Lauwerys construct stresses the highest aspiration of a traditional concept of 'general education', and that Newsom is attempting to define a minimum, the concern of the Report with a minimum is of interest in itself.

The Newsom Report continues its analysis by identifying selection criteria which might assist in choosing what pupils should learn. The Report identifies several characteristics of the world outside school: science and technology, the threat of nuclear war, machines and tools in every day living, world-wide economic interdependence, the role of women, new leisure, mass entertainment.⁽⁶⁶⁾ The conclusion which the Report chooses to draw is that "Our pupils, more than most, need training in discrimination."⁽⁶⁷⁾

To deal with the range of demands imposed by the world, "some of the most urgent questions which all secondary schools are having to ask themselves just now are about the total patterns of the curriculum, for all their pupils. They are finding that it is not enough to tinker with the separate pieces."⁽⁶⁸⁾ Therefore there will be certain aims which will inform, not subjects, but the whole curriculum: "very high on this list we should place improvement in powers of speech... a general extension of vocabulary, and, with it, a surer command over the structures of spoken English and the expression of ideas."⁽⁶⁹⁾ Immediately afterwards, the need to develop judgement and discrimination is, again stressed.⁽⁷⁰⁾ For these reasons, the formal Recommendations in this section of the report are:

(a) Basic skills in reading, writing and calculation should be reinforced through every medium of the curriculum.

(b) More demands should be made on the pupils, both in the nature and in the amount of work required. There is a need to stimulate intellectual and imaginative effort, and to extend the pupils' range of ideas, in order to promote a fuller literacy.

(c) The value of the educational experience should be assessed in terms of its total impact on the pupils' skills, qualities and personal development, not by basic attainments alone.

The principle that one should stimulate intellectual and imaginative effort and extend the pupils' range of ideas 'in order to promote a fuller literacy' quite accurately locates a practical issue in such schools; but it is a considerable normative distance away from the traditional theory of general education which Lauwerys outlined.

To the earlier principle of the 'demands of a changing world' is added the proposition that the pupils themselves have expectations. "We believe that these four words - practical, realistic, vocational, choice - provide keys which can be used to let even the least able boys and girls enter into an educational experience which is genuinely secondary."⁽⁷²⁾ 'Secondary' has already been carefully defined:

The work in a secondary school becomes secondary in character whenever it is concerned, first, with self-conscious thought and judgement; secondly with the relation of school and the work done there to the world outside of which the pupils form part and of which they are increasingly aware; and, thirdly, with the relation of what is done in school to the future of the pupils... in adult life. The first of these characteristics, the quality of self-conscious judgement, differs in kind from the other two. It describes a mental process that involves the use of reason and imagination to bring order into the world of things perceived. The other characteristics define directions in which this process must be employed, at least for the boys and girls of this report, if they are to develop the power of judgement.
(73)

This balance between the outside world, the pupils' probable futures, and pupil interest in having an element of choice in education that is practical, realistic and vocational (all of which are extensively defined in context) provide the principles on which a general education should be defined, albeit there is

an affirmation of a compulsory subject which is needed for spiritual and moral development:

(a) Religious instruction has a part to play in helping boys and girls to find a firm basis for sexual morality based on chastity before marriage and fidelity within it.

(b) The schools have a duty to give specific religious instruction, which is more than general ethical teaching...

(c) We reaffirm the value of the school act of worship as a potent force in the spiritual experience of the pupils.

(74)

That is, religious instruction is recommended before a discussion of 'subjects' which occupies the later part of the Report. Such instruction, like numeracy, literacy and physical education, is needed by all pupils.

This insistence on religious instruction (sic) is one of the few elements of similarity between the Newsom Report analysis of what education should be offered to half of 'our children', and the Lauwerys construct.

The criteria (of the 'outside world' and the pupils' social needs and psychological preferences) permit finally the statement of a theory of general education:

What should be taught? We have already made clear the importance that we attach to literacy, numeracy and that part of religious upbringing which falls to the schools. Physical education, too, is something which all growing boys and girls need... If this report were about all the pupils in secondary schools instead of only half we should still hold that up to the age of sixteen nobody should go without some practical work, some experience in mathematics and science and some in the humanities... Up to this point we are rigorists. We would like to prescribe this for all pupils in all secondary schools as an obligation.

But beyond this point we become permissive. We would neither draw up a fixed table of information, subject by subject, which all pupils should master, nor even prescribe beyond the minimum essentials set out in the preceding paragraph a set list of subjects which all should study ...

(75)

The particular selection of knowledge in each of the areas of knowledge/enquiry, will include "on the pupils' side ... relevance to what they are going to do when they leave school; on the schools' side, the selection is bound to be influenced by the strengths and weaknesses of the staff." (76)

The final element in the theory of general education is:

For our least able pupils, then, "subjects" hardly come into the field of possibility; for the better ones there is often no compelling educational reason why one should be chosen rather than another. Why, then, should the customary division of the curriculum into certain traditional subjects be retained?

(77)

These claims in Newsom, about what ought to be the case, are rather different from the traditional theory of general education.

There is retained, through religious instruction, an emphasis on religious and moral principle. Spiritual and moral development, and 'character' are accorded a status which precedes the major discussion of what should be taught; though of course the result of this is that religious instruction is defined as necessary. There remains too a frequent repetition of the notion of forming judgement and discrimination.

However, the report's assumptions about the principles or criteria of selection of knowledge in a theory of general education are rather different. To begin from the condition of the world outside of school, and to take into account the concerns of the pupils and their probable futures is to build an education around the needs of the young and their preparation for the world. In this preparation, an 'adequate education' would have some ingredients that the report pre-specifies: a few 'subjects' and exposure to certain general areas of knowledge/enquiry: practical work, mathematics and the sciences, and the humanities. This education would be realistic, vocational (i.e. oriented toward the world of work but not job-specific training), and practical. In the process, 'subjects' disappear and much of the detailed curriculum is made up at the intersection of pupils' ideas of relevance and staffing problems.

This view is far away from 'some one principal branch of study', and the theory of the virtues of specialisation. Preparing the young for the difficulties of life after school is also very different from providing an education through understanding the intellectual principles on which a subject is based.

The Newsom report, it is suggested, represents an attempt to reject the traditional theory of education. It offers in its place practicality and usefulness, social competence and social adjustment. In part, it reflects elements of the Lauwerys construct for the USA; with a strong residue - in the emphasis on moral guidance and on the formation of discrimination and judgement

- of the traditional theory in which general 'lessons of moral, social or political importance' might be drawn into teaching.

To say that the Newsom Report attempted to reject the traditional theory of general education is not to say, here, that it succeeded. The long term impact of Newsom's concept of general education, and its relation to the theorising of the Schools Council, is taken up, later, in the analysis of 'specific initial conditions' on which any proposed solution to the problem must be predicated.

Here, the point is that the Lauwerys' construct enables one half of the statement-of-problem to be identified, at least in the English case. Using the Lauwerys' construct and major public documents enables theories of general education to be analysed and change and non-change located.

What emerges, in terms of change and non-change in normative assumptions, is that the Crowther Report had strongly affirmed the traditional theory, often in great detail. Newsom offered an (occasionally muddled) attack on the traditional theory. There was a counter-assertion of what ought to be the case. Some effort was being made to renegotiate the traditional theory; at the same time, the traditional theory had been reaffirmed.

The conclusion is drawn that change in normative assumptions was beginning ⁽⁷⁸⁾ - a debate was picking up strength - but that the change was slow.

The short term impact of the Newsom Report became rapidly muddled with public debates about one of its other recommendations, the raising of the school leaving age, and with the debate about the structures of secondary education - the secondary reorganisation movement toward a form of comprehensive schooling crystallised in Circular IO/64.

The point is noted therefore that the negotiation of normative change in theories of general education is not completely separable in the English case from the negotiation of institutional change or non-change in secondary (and higher education) institutions. (The point will be developed in the concluding part of the chapter).

But these two aspects of change and non-change are already related - in a different way - in the statement-of- the problem. The terms 'relatively slow' and 'relatively rapid' in the statement of problem refer not to how rapidly or how slowly change was occurring within the normative area, and how rapid or slow was the change in institutional organisation, but to the asynchronous relationships between the two areas: normative and institutional. Was change in one area (the institutional) occurring more rapidly than change in the other (the normative)?

It is both useful and convenient therefore to review here the conclusions drawn in the institutional analysis of English education undertaken earlier in this chapter. There the conclusion was that considerable institutional change had occurred

in a relatively short time, about the period of the mid-sixties. There was some discussion, however, about whether the conclusion could be precisely stated with the classification technique being used, and some concerns were entered that these difficulties might increase when an effort was made to identify and locate the statement-of-problem in other social contexts, i.e. in the cross-national analysis.

There were two issues in particular which produced analytic imprecision. One was that the distinction between 'universities and other institutions of higher education' was initially useful but in terms of the phrasing of the conclusions did not easily permit a distinction between reorganisation (in what sense?) and redefinition (in what sense?) Secondly, although Bowles' classification was very useful for identifying a Type B structure, and (probably) a Type A structure, it was not clear whether it would (or would not) be equally useful in identifying change to and in a Type C structure.

The third issue is that it would, of course, be convenient if changes in both secondary and higher education institutions could be classified in the same model, and if potential ambiguities about what was an institution of 'higher education' could be reduced.

Such a superordinate model, of potential usefulness, is available. It is usually associated with the name of Franz Hilker,⁽⁷⁹⁾ It has been used for the analysis of educational systems with some success in Holmes' International Guide to Educational Systems.⁽⁸⁰⁾ from which the following diagram is taken:

| Age | Years at School | Level | Stage | Description | School Type | Courses | Examination |
|--------------|-----------------|-------|-------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------|
| 22, 23 24 | | IV | | Fourth Level (8) | Professional | e.g. post-graduate | e.g. B.A., B.Sc |
| <hr/> | | | | | | | |
| 18, 19 20 | | III | 6 | Second stage Third Level | University | | |
| | | | 5 | First stage (7) Third Level | Short cycle Higher | Degree Diploma | |
| <hr/> | | | | | | | |
| 14, 15 16 | | II | 4 | Upper stage (6) Second Level | Sixth form | (1) Pre-university (2) Vocational | 'O' Level |
| | | | 3 | Lower stage (4) Second Level | Middle | Common and options | |
| <hr/> | | | | | | | |
| 10, 11 12 | | | | Transfer (3) | | | |
| <hr/> | | | | | | | |
| | | | 2 | Upper stage First Level | Junior | | |
| | | I | 1 | Lower stage First Level | Infant | Common | |
| 5, 6 7 | | | | Compulsory school begins (2) | | | |
| | | | | Pre-school (1) education | Nursery Kindergarten | | |

Structure of an education system (using examples of terminology from the U.K.) (81)

- (1) Pre-school provision may be made for children between 2-6 depending on the system.
- (2) First-level school-the age of beginning compulsory attendance varies between 5 and 7.
- (3) Transfer from the first to second levels may involve change of school and frequently occurs between the ages of 10 and 12 with, or more recently without, selection.
- (4) Second-level schooling has been the object of much debate and reorganisation.
- (5) Compulsory schooling may be defined in terms of the numbers of years completed, e.g. 9, or by age reached, e.g. 16 years of age.
- (6) The upper stage of second-level schooling is usually post-compulsory. One school type or course is usually pre-university. A range of provision is now made at this stage.
- (7) The third level includes university undergraduate courses. Alternative types of third-level institutions and shorter courses have been established.
- (8) Fourth-level institutions and courses include professional, doctoral and research students.

The model is of course comprehensive and will not in itself determine the collection and classification of data, which remain relevant or not as defined by the first half of the problem statement.

The model will, however, be used superordinately: that is, in the event of Bowles leaving ambiguities in aspects of the redefinition and reorganisation of secondary education, the Hilker model will be used to clarify the issue. Similarly, in the event of ambiguity about whether an institution is or is not a part of 'higher education' the Hilker model will be used to clarify the situation.

The English data provided earlier can now be stated more precisely:

(a) reorganisation of types of secondary school in England in the mid-sixties is marked by an emerging shift from Bowles' Type B to Type C category. The existence of separate secondary schools - grammar, modern and technical - was being affected by the creation of bilateral and multilateral schools. In turn, these were being consolidated into a 'common programme' of general education in the structural form of the comprehensive school. This comprehensive school existed contemporaneously with other types of secondary school. In particular, it was developing and existed alongside the grammar school which provided a 'general secondary education leading to basic

qualifications for university entry'.

The simultaneous existence of the comprehensive school and the grammar school locates the system as a Type B system.

The rapid increase in the number of comprehensive schools in the period marks the beginnings of a shift to a Type C system. This institutional reorganisation marks one kind of redefinition of the system: the effort to create a common school in lower secondary education. That is, more precisely in terms of Hilker's classification system, Level II, Stage (3), i.e. the Second Level, Lower Stage is undergoing institutional redefinition. The process is not completed in the period under review. Reform proposals had been made which would have affected the reorganisation of Level II, Stage (4), i.e. Second Level, Upper Stage. The evidence available indicates that this proposed reorganisation had not begun implementation in any significant degree in the period.

(b) Change in the institutions of higher education in the period was rapid. The universities were notably increased in number. In particular, selected Colleges of Advanced Technology were, in Hilker's terms, located as universities in Level III, Stage (6), i.e. Third Level, Second Stage.

Teachers' training colleges were renamed colleges of education. They, like the 30 polytechnics which were to be created, were separated from the universities

(in terms of administrative control) but could gain access at Level III, Stage (5), i.e. Third Level, First Stage, to an extra function. They could enter students for degree-bearing courses. The colleges had access to the universities for the purpose of validating these awards. The colleges and the polytechnics in particular had access to a new degree-validating body, the CNAA (which is not in itself locatable in the Hilker typology except in terms of function, in which it covers Levels III and IV of the classification system). Thus the system was redefined by the creation of new institutions, the new technological universities and the polytechnics. It was redefined by being expanded through the creation of other new universities. And it was redefined by permitting functional access to Level Three on the part of colleges of education and the polytechnics.

In more general terms, the classification system permits clearer distinctions to be drawn. 'Reorganisation' is the re-arrangement of existing institutions within a stage. 'Redefinition' carries two main meanings: the invention of new institutions; and the relocation of old institutions in a different Stage or Level of the Hilker classification. 'Redefinition' is permitted a third meaning: redefinition through an increase in the number of institutions.

Thus reorganisation can occur without redefinition; and vice versa. However, reorganisation and redefinition can occur together; but redefinition is the more significant process.

Concluding Reflections and Summary

It is suggested that not only is this classification system clearer, but that in turn it makes clear the nature of redefinition and reorganisation of Second Level, Lower Stage and Level III institutions in English education in the mid-sixties.

It is also suggested that the data presented earlier indicate that these processes were rapid; and that the normative analysis undertaken indicate that changes in the traditional theory of general education were slowly underway.

More importantly, it is suggested that the mutual relation was that institutional change occurred more rapidly than normative change.

It is held therefore that the problem as technically defined - an asynchronous change in specified institutional and normative areas - has been identified in England.

It is therefore also judged that the techniques utilised have, at least in the case of England, permitted the general problem as stated to be identified.

More broadly, it is suggested that the processes of reflective thinking and problem analysis so far undertaken have clarified a number of general issues.

Firstly, it became clearer that whilst there is one main traditional theory of general education in England there are two 'educational traditions'. The Crowther Report was affirming the traditional theory of general education; the Newsom Report was struggling to understand the contemporary version of Disraeli's 'two Englands'. It may be anticipated that some variant of this theme will be identifiable in varying aspects in other countries. It would be unwise to take as an a priori assumption that conflicting 'educational traditions' are only an English phenomenon.

In particular variations it may be important in other systems of education. In turn this may also affect 'solutions' to the problem which are possible in England or elsewhere.

Secondly, it was noted that the issues of structural reform and normative change were not entirely unrelated. The Crowther Report, by its terms of reference, gave considerable attention to the 'Sixth Form' in its reaffirmation of the traditional theory of general education. Newsom, it is judged, had difficulty in arriving at its theory of general education which "we would like to prescribe... for all pupils in secondary schools as an obligation." (82)

In turn this raises two general points. It may be that systems of education in (structural) transition at second level, lower stage, will experience a variant of the 'same' problem compared with those countries that have already undergone a greater degree of structural change at the second level, lower stage.

More generally, it can be suggested that an implicit dynamic in the problem statement can be made explicit. The two parts of the problem statement, the elements of asynchrony, are by assertion comparatively, and by some demonstration, in England both changing. In technical terms (or problem statement), change is occurring at different rates in the institutional and normative areas.

It is clear that in the English case, the intent of structural reforms at the secondary and higher education levels was to include more pupils for longer in the educational system. It is possible, even likely that the effect of widely held assumptions about traditional theories of general education was, de facto, to exclude pupils from further experiences in the educational system; this effect working through particular mechanisms internal to the school (such as teacher expectations, termly examinations and so on.)

Thus the problem becomes the more severe the longer structural openness is implemented and increased, and normative non-change continues. Finding solutions takes on greater urgency (on certain assumptions) as the 'gap' between the two aspects of the problem-statement widens.

Thirdly, possible ambiguities over the term 'general education' should now be clarified in the light of the earlier analysis. General education has two meanings. One of these

meanings is contained in the sets of extensive and culturally-specific constructs outlined in the body of the chapter; against these ideal-typical constructs, analysis of selected aspects of reality can proceed. The second 'common-sense' definition of general education - as 'some curriculum content offered to all' is not the precise point of analysis; otherwise in the earlier pages an analysis of a major report on education in the English infant and junior school would have been included.

The problematic of 'general education' occurs at the level of the educational system before the majority of pupils leave school or have specialised curricula lines into which they can move. Therefore, the contemporary first-level of education systems in high per capita income countries cannot be the locus of the general education problematic. The first-level of education systems provides an example of 'curriculum content offered for all' but not the problematic of general education.

This throws two other aspects of general education into focus. Several countries have had major traditional concepts of general education, but at the level of implementation they have had rather different and two or more practices through which different educations have been transmitted.⁽⁸³⁾ Thus the issue of what should be 'general education' is raised not merely by rapid changes of various sorts in the world outside of school but in the attempt to synthesise earlier educational practices. New theories are required.

The issue is most sharply focussed when all children are placed in a 'common school'.

Fourthly, a methodological comment is necessary. Certain processes of reflective thinking have been followed in chapters one and two. Several intellectual operations suggested by the Holmes problem approach have been carried out. These operations have assisted in the clarification of what might be taken as problematic; and what should not be. They have assisted in the formation of a problem-statement; and in some clarification of the implications of the problem statement, and how the general problem might be analysed subsequently in comparative context. It is understood, however, that the precise canons of the methodological sequences have not been followed, within the phase of 'problem analysis'.⁽⁸⁴⁾ The atypical step of giving such stress to the stage of confusion was necessary, it is held, because the professional literature on the social problem of equality of educational opportunity, and on the puzzles of mass and elite systems in comparative perspective has not only itself been confused, but, where clear, often mistaken. It was thus of greater than usual importance to establish how and why the themes for investigation were being selected; and why other themes and approaches were being rejected. Throughout these first two chapters an effort has been made to write of problem clarification rather than use the more technical term of problem intellectualisation.

Fifthly, the argument of this chapter should be summarised before venturing an 'initial solution' to the problem. It has been suggested that choice of the analytic techniques to locate the asynchronous change, asserted in the statement of problem, is in itself usually conjectural. The techniques were tested, and as appropriate refined. It has been suggested that whilst the choice of analytic techniques is usually the source of some difficulty, analytic techniques in the normative area are particularly difficult to select (and to invent in the first place). However, wide refusal to undertake normative analyses severely skews the condition of the field. The tradition of certain European and English scholars should be continued, but the importance of investigating the normative area without judging was suggested as an almost-central part of the role of a comparative educationist.

The analysis of England led to the conclusion that whilst some change had occurred in both areas of the problem statement, institutional change had been the more rapid. In this sense the problem was 'identified' in England.

It is to this 'identified' problem that an initial solution may be addressed.

Logically, as a Holmesian problem statement identifies (relative) change and non-change in two areas within a taxonomy, the solution involves acting on one, on the other, or on both. As the approach is termed the 'problem-solving' approach some action or policy proposal is assumed; even though in hypothetical circumstances a policy solution of 'no action' might be recommended.

Here, the logical possibilities are to restructure the institutional pattern, so that it accords more with what is taken to be the normative situation; or to increase the rate of normative change in appropriate ways so that normative assumptions are in accord with the changed institutional pattern.

Substantively, which solution is chosen depends on what is stated as a desired educational and social goal. It will be taken-for-granted that the general normative frame of English education remains the 1944 Act. It will be accepted that there is no official intention that the educational system should, in its second and third level institutional patterns revert to its early 1960s condition, and that if such an official intention were declared, there would be considerable public opposition.

The initial solution is therefore to alter normative assumptions to accord with a changed institutional pattern.

How this may be done, what is indirectly suggested as an appropriate solution and some of the difficulties, may be illuminated by identifying and analysing the problem in other countries.

CHAPTER THREE. A problem located

Where is Perm?

Ann McCaffrey

Section One: Identification

The task of this chapter is to continue the investigation of the problem and "... to reveal its specific features in selected contexts. The result may be to show that what appear to be common problems are in some respects not."⁽¹⁾ Thus the first section of the chapter is given over to the job of outlining as briefly as possible whether the problem as stated existed in the countries selected, at approximately the same time as the problem in England. With the problem identified as the same problem, though no doubt with some variations, the next task is to try to understand some of the dynamics of these specific features in social context. This is done in Section Two of the chapter. Guiding both tasks is the idea that alternative solutions to a rather similar problem may be identifiable through international example. The potential sources for 'alternative solutions' are conjectured (on grounds outlined earlier) as the USA, Japan, France and the USSR. The statement of problem remains the same. The same techniques will be used; though it should be noted that the English example was subjected to a rather detailed analysis to assist in the subsequent identification of the 'specific initial conditions', including the normative specific initial conditions, under which a solution might be expected to work. Close textual analysis of individual national reports will not be attempted in this comparative section. Secondary accounts and analysis will be

used as much as possible. There is another relaxation, vis-a-vis chapter two, which should be noted: not as sharp a stress will be placed on the chronological time frame. The focus will remain the sixties, but there is an acknowledgement that 'social time frames' may vary. However, and this is of importance, the chronological time frame is not superseded by the other time frame. This is especially the case in Section One. The sequence of analysis is first to outline and classify, for each country, the institutional aspects as defined, and secondly to describe normative change or non-change, as defined, and then to enter a judgement about the way in which the problem exists in a particular country, if it did in the sixties.

The U.S.A.

In the United States, the system of second level education in the early sixties was characterised by three main types of secondary school structure. The types were: (a) a secondary school structure organised on a three year junior high school and a three year senior high school basis; (b) a pattern organised on a six-year basis and termed a 'junior-senior' high school; and a situation where a four-year high school followed an eight year elementary school. Some movement in favour of the 6-3-3 pattern is apparent:

Table Four USA
Secondary School Structures

| School Year | Type of School | | | |
|-------------|------------------|--------------|---------------|---------------------|
| | i Traditional | ii Junior | iii Senior | iv Junior-Senior |
| 1958-9 | | | | |
| Number | 6,024 | 4,996 | 3,040 | 10,130 |
| Percent | 24.9 | 20.6 | 12.6 | 41.9 |
| 1963-4 | | | | |
| Number | 7,173 | 7,143 | 5,568 | 6,042 |
| Percent | 27.7 | 27.6 | 21.5 | 23.3 |

Footnotes included in original table:

- i. Includes regular 4 year high schools preceded by 8 year elementary school. No reorganisation has taken place.
- ii. Includes 2- and 3-year junior high schools.
- iii. Includes 3- and 4-year senior high schools preceded by junior high schools.
- iv. Includes 5- and 6-year high schools.

Source: Digest of Educational Statistics: 1967 edition, Kenneth A. Simon and W. Vance Grant, U.S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education 1967. Table 60: Number and percent of public secondary schools by type of school: United States, 1919-20 to 1963-64, p.46.

The distinctions between the three modes of organisation arise from the degree of local control over schools in the United States. The three modes of organisation in 1959 and the mid-sixties are to be distinguished in principle neither in terms of, for example, examination or entry points, nor in terms of Bowles' lines of student direction. Similarly there are no significant differences, on the Bowles' criteria between the 8-4 and 6-3-3 patterns. (The 8-4 pattern is not, for example, interpreted as the provision of a terminal upper primary school line.)

Teacher education was provided within higher education for both primary and secondary school teachers.

Technical and vocational education were provided within the common school; but it is possible to find specialist academic or vocational schools in large urban areas.

In terms, then, of the Bowles typology, the USA almost without exception had a common first (and second) cycle of secondary education institutions for entry to which no examination successes are required. It located its primary school teacher training in higher education and a technical-vocational programme is built into the options available within a 'comprehensive' school. It had also seen the growth of specific university entrance examinations; graduation from high school was marked by the amassing of the correct number of credits. It is argued here, therefore, that the USA met, in the late fifties and mid-sixties, the criteria of Structure C outlined by Bowles.

In terms of Hilker's classification system, the so-called 'elementary school' (of the pattern termed 'traditional' in the Table) extended into Level II, Stage (3), i.e. Second Level, Lower Stage, to be followed by a four year high school which is locatable in Level II, Stage (4) i.e. Second Level, Upper Stage. Similarly the 'junior-senior' pattern indicated in the Table is locatable there, and the growing pattern of 'junior' and 'senior' high schools fits the Hilker classification at Level II, Stages (3) and (4) respectively.

In terms of the problem statement, relatively rapid reorganisation was taking place, in that the 'junior-senior' pattern was being replaced by the structures of the 6-3-3 system. There was not, however, any redefinition in the common school concept. In so far as there was redefinition it was a redefinition in the numbers of institutions which increased considerably, even allowing for the reorganisation of 'junior-senior' pattern into the 6-3-3 pattern.

There was, then some reorganisation and redefinition of the system occurring, but it is clear that there were no especial social meanings given to the creation of a common Second Level, Lower Stage; or even Second Level, Upper Stage. This had already been done.

Where there was both considerable reorganisation and redefinition of the system was in higher education. Between 1955 and 1966, the number of schools awarding Ph.Ds increased from 180 to 235, schools awarding the MA (typically teachers colleges) increased from 415 to 483, and BA awarding institutions went from 732 to 826 in number, and schools awarding less than BA qualifications went from 510 to 685 in the same period. (2)

It is also the case that US methods of categorising statistics of higher education permit an indication of the movement of institutions between levels, as these are classified in the USA, that is (a) institutions awarding less than a BA; (b) institutions awarding a BA; (c) institutions awarding an MA; and (d) Ph.D. granting institutions. On average, in the period, ten institutions per annum moved into the Ph.D. awarding category, about 20 a year moved into the MA awarding category and 30 a year moved into the bachelor awarding category. (3) In Hilker's terms, then, there was a steady movement of institutions from Level III, Stage (5), i.e. Third Level, First Stage to Level III, Stage (6); and some movement of institutions from Level III, Stage (6) to Level IV. 'Upgrading' was in progress.

The redefinition and reorganisation of the higher education system was identifiable and continuous. The higher education system, rather than the second level system was being redefined.

Normative change in traditional theories of general education was occurring, to some extent. Certainly, there had been a strong challenge to existing theories, which may be marked in a public document.

The National Defense Education Act was passed in 1958. (4) The phrasing of Title I of the Act is indicative of, not merely a changing world, but particular implicit concerns about the changes:

The Congress hereby finds and declares that the security of the Nation requires the fullest development of the mental resources and technical skills of its young men and women.... The defense of this nation depends upon the mastery of modern techniques developed from complex scientific principle. It depends as well upon the discovery and development of new principles, new techniques, and new knowledge.

We must increase our efforts to identify and educate more of the talent of our Nation. This requires programs that will give assurance that no student of ability will be denied an opportunity for higher education because of financial need; will correct as rapidly as possible the existing imbalances in our educational programs which have led to an insufficient proportion of our population educated in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages and trained in technology... (5)

Subsequent sections or Titles of the Act went on to specify financial provisions for the strengthening of instruction in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages as well as, under Title V, which covered guidance counselling and testing, provisions for the 'identification and encouragement of able students'.

The NDEA was itself symptomatic of an earlier debate which had occurred among academics and educationists and which was to continue, for some time.

Admiral Rickover was to go so far, by the mid-sixties as to argue:

If the school cannot develop its pupils' intellectual powers to their highest potential because studies cannot be done when children differing widely in mental age are kept together, it follows that the only possible solution is to abandon comprehensive schooling at the point when those differences become unmanageable - about 11-12. Otherwise, no pupil gets an intellectually challenging education." (6)

Richover's claim for the alteration of the structures of lower secondary education was extreme. But he like others had been at least since 1954 arguing for a change in the normative area, i.e. in the theories of general education which informed the American common school. (7) The acquisition of intellectual principles was to Rickover, as to other critics, the important part of education:

Once a principle has been acquired it becomes a part of one and is never lost. It can be applied to novel problems and does not become obsolete as do all facts in a changing society. American education in general emphasises learning factual know-how at the cost of absorbing fundamental principles, just as it stresses conditioning of behaviour at the cost of developing the ability to think independently. (8)

This assertion should, of course, be balanced against available evidence if the actual condition of American education is to be known. (J.B. Conant in 1959 issued an

account of the American high school which redressed some of the assertions that a large amount of time was not given over to mathematics and science, for example.⁽⁹⁾ But the actual condition of American education is not the point.

The point is that counter-claims against the traditional theory of general education, as identified in the Lauwerys construct, were being entered. Complaints were offered by Jacques Barzun, in the House of the Intellect⁽¹⁰⁾ and were indicative of the views of several members of the academic community; and lay groups expressed their concern institutionally by establishing the Council for Basic Education. Its statement of purpose in 1956 was:

The Council for Basic Education was established in the belief that the purpose of education is the harmonious development of the mind, the will and the conscience of each individual so that he may use to the full his intrinsic powers and shoulder the responsibilities of citizenship. It believes in the principle of universal education and in the tax-supported public school system. It insists that only by the maintenance of high academic standards can the ideal of democratic education be realized - the ideal of offering to all the children of all the people of the United States not merely an opportunity to attend school, but the privilege of receiving there the soundest education that is offered any place in the world.⁽¹¹⁾

To these general assertions, indirect support was added by theorising at the intersection of psychology and curriculum, and views of the 'structure of knowledge' from philosophers of education.⁽¹²⁾

The attacks in turn drew forth a defence from educators which suggested, "... there simply is an impasse in so-called curriculum debate, and it is not going to be overcome with profit to anyone by a continuation of selective reporting, name-calling, assignments of guilt by association (whether with Dewey or Rickover), or even appeals to force." (13) The solution was "... for professional educators... to create a curriculum view which is defensible in regard to the school's obligation to a democratic mass society and excellence of individual life in that society." (14)

Overall it is argued that the American traditional theory of general education was being discussed in terms of European notions of mastery of traditional subjects, a point which is precisely the opposite of one defined in the construct. That there should be a movement away from the immediate concern with the useful and the social was being asserted, so that more time could be given to the mastery of intellectual principles and even the mastery of particular, and particularly difficult subjects, such as mathematics and science and the modern foreign languages.

There was, then a recovery of a weaker tradition in American education, the tradition of essentialism; this tradition was made highly explicit in a time judged to be an emergency in international politics. It represented an alternative view of a theory of general education.

The conclusion drawn is a double one. Firstly, that there was a highly public debate on the principles which should inform a general theory of education in the USA during this period. In that sense, normative change was considerable, up to and including Federal intervention in the area of curriculum, an act traditionally interpreted as de jure and de facto a response to national concerns. Normative change, as measured by the stated indices of the last chapter including the use of the 'minor' technique, was marked.

Whether the change in the institutional area was more or less rapid than the change in the normative area is a judgement which it is not possible to make in general; what can be suggested in particular, is that normative change was more rapid than institutional change at the second level of education. The problem, in other words, takes on a particular variation in the USA.

The second point in conclusion is to note that the traditional theory of general education in the USA, although under attack in the mid and late fifties, is a set of principles which inform the provision of general education in a schooling system characterised, structurally, by a pattern which was the intent of some reformers in England in the mid-sixties. It represents one 'alternative solution'.

Japan

Japan had, in the American reform period immediately after the Second World War, adopted the American pattern of school organisation, of 6-3-3. In 1959, the lower secondary

school was a common school and took the period of attendance to fifteen years of age.

The upper secondary school, for both part and full-time students included examinations among its admission procedures and served both pupils who wished to continue higher education and those who wished for vocational or technical offerings.

A proportion of students at the upper secondary school level (and higher education levels) attended the 'miscellaneous schools'. These admitted and admit students from the upper secondary schools, frequently for specialised occupational courses, but the category also covers cramming schools for students aiming at university entrance examinations.

In the intention of post-war reformers the training of teachers for primary school was placed within higher education - i.e. for other than emergency certificates; graduation from junior college or universities was required for teacher certification.

As of 1957, the institutional pattern was as follows:

Table Five

JAPAN

Summary of School Statistics (as of May 1957)

| Type | No. of Institutions |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Lower Secondary school | 13,622 |
| Upper secondary school (full time) | 3,028 |
| Upper secondary school (part-time) | 3,045 |
| Miscellaneous schools ^I | 8,075 |

I. Mainly private

Source: Education in Japan, May 1959, Research section, Research Bureau, Ministry of Education, Government of Japan, 1959, p. 46, Chart XVIII.

By the mid-sixties the only major change in institutional pattern in Japanese secondary education had been the introduction of technical colleges (by a reform of 1962); these schools recruit(ed) from the lower secondary schools and run a five year course aimed at technological training. They extend beyond the normal leaving age of the upper secondary school, thus spanning the age ranges between school and higher education.

Table Six

JAPAN

Summary of School Statistics (as of May 1966)

| Type | No. of Institutions |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Lower secondary school | 11,851 |
| Upper secondary school (full time) | 4,059 |
| Upper secondary school (part time) | 2,091 |
| Technical colleges | 54 |
| Miscellaneous schools | 7,897 |

Source: Education in Japan, April 1967, Research Section, Minister's Secretariat, Minister of Education, Government of Japan, Chart XXIII, p.55.

In terms of Bowles' criteria, then, Japan provided in both 1959 and the late sixties a common first cycle of secondary education. Primary school teacher training was located in higher education. The school leaving age was fifteen. In terms of the final criterion of Structure C, the kind of examination which regulates entry into higher education, Japan occupies a position similar to that of the USA: credits are awarded towards a graduation certificate. In addition to the formal requirement of graduation credits, it is important to mention that admission to university is dependent upon successful performance in a competitive university entrance examination.

On the Bowles' classification system Japan in both 1959 and 1967 met the criteria for location in Structure C.

In terms of the Hilker classification system it may be noted that the lower secondary school is at Level II, Stage (3), i.e. Second Level, Lower Stage. The new technical colleges of the early sixties occupy a position as Level II, Stage (4), i.e. Second Level, Upper Stage institutions; but in their advanced courses stretch into Level III.

Thus in terms of institutional change at the second level of the schooling system, Japan was characterised by little new organisation. Given that the lower second level was a common school, there was no debate about the reform of structures. There was an element of redefinition of the second level school system in that the numbers of pupils remaining after the compulsory school leaving age rose sharply during the 1960s and expansion of upper secondary institutions occurred.⁽¹⁵⁾ That is, in Hilker's terms, specialised and general Level II, Stage (4), i.e. Second Level, Upper Stage institutions increased in number in the mid to late sixties.

Within the higher education sector of Japanese education, it is possible to distinguish at least three types of institution: the university with graduate school, the university and the junior college. As indicated the last two years of the technical college course is also in Level III. The length of time involved for studying in the other three

institutions is two to three years in the junior college which provide a combination of general and professional education; ⁽¹⁶⁾ as well as the possibility of using the accumulated credits to transfer into a four year university course. The graduate schools, which were provided in 84 universities in 1960 ⁽¹⁷⁾ offer two and three year courses leading to master or doctoral degrees.

Tetsuya Kobayashi has summarised the growth of these institutions in the post-war period. ⁽¹⁸⁾ He includes technical colleges in the category of higher education institutions.

Table Seven

JAPAN

Higher Education Institutions in 1950, 1960 & 1968.

| | | 1950 | 1960 | 1968 |
|--------------------|---------|------|----------|------|
| Universities | total | 201 | 245 | 377 |
| | state | 70 | 72 | 75 |
| | public | 26 | 33 | 35 |
| | private | 105 | 140 | 267 |
| Junior colleges | total | 149 | 280 | 468 |
| | state | 0 | 27 | 23 |
| | public | 17 | 39 | 43 |
| | private | 132 | 214 | 402 |
| Technical colleges | total | | (1962)19 | 60 |
| | state | | 12 | 49 |
| | public | | | 4 |
| | private | | 7 | 7 |

Source: Tetsuya Kobayashi, Table II Higher Institutions in 1950, 1960 and 1968, in Changing policies in higher education - the Japanese case, p. 370.

In terms of the Hilker classification then the junior colleges are located at Level III, Stage (5), i.e. Third Level, First Stage. They underwent a notable expansion in the sixties. The universities should be located in Hilker's terms at Level III; and universities with graduate schools, at both Levels III and IV. Both increased in number in the sixties.⁽¹⁹⁾

It is suggested therefore that the system of higher education was redefined by expansion in the numbers of institutions. It did not undergo (in the period under review) major reorganisation. It did take however a new institution, the technical college into its Third Level, First Stage.

In terms of the problem statement, it is suggested that Japan did undergo rather speedy institutional redefinition through an increase of numbers of institution at Second Level, Upper Stage, and at the Third Level. Little reorganisation occurred.

The normative debate in Japan was extremely sharply focussed. The Ministry of Education itself expressed concern about rapid developments in the industrialising society of Japan and argued that the necessary task of the school was to

safeguard the full development of the individual. This anxiety was expressed officially to the Central Council on Education. Its response should be placed in the context of an increasingly utilitarian movement in Japanese education in the 1950s, which had some impact on curriculum in 1958.

The 1958 reform had strengthened both moral education and the sciences and mathematics, vocational studies, the industrial arts and technology. It was in this context that the Central Council on Education in 1966 issued its statement on the "Image of the Ideal Japanese".⁽²⁰⁾ The statement was of a philosophy for the expanding upper secondary school sector, the sector of the education system in which the concept of 'general education' was becoming problematic:

This is the age of science and technology. However, the industrialization process has produced a dehumanizing effect upon man... Thus man is in danger of being mechanized for the sake of technological advancements.

The economic prosperity which Japan has been enjoying has produced hedonistic tendencies and a spiritual vacuum...

Our people are labouring under the delusion that everything in Japan's past is wrong, with the result that they ignore Japanese history and the national ethos. To be sure there are negative aspects about Japan's past, but there are also many positive characteristics which must be understood in developing a new image of a Japanese man.⁽²¹⁾

As well as these major social forces, there were misunderstandings about the nature of democracy in post-war Japan. Democracy had,

not yet taken root in the Japanese mind. Opinions are divided between those who interpret democracy from the standpoint of independent individuality and those who interpret it as a class struggle... After the War, the Japanese people lost their traditional virtues of national solidarity and consciousness. In addition a firm sense of individual dignity has not been achieved. While continuing the development of individuality, it is also our task to assume a common responsibility for our country. (22)

From these considerations emerged a conception of the "ideal Japanese", as an individual, as a family man, and as a member of society.

The ideal Japanese as an individual would accept the responsibilities to be 'free, to develop individuality, to respect oneself, to be strong minded and to be reverent'. (23) These ideals are general enough, and it is in their balance and relation to each other that the ideal Japanese takes definition. All men have human dignity, and "the fundamental element of that dignity is freedom. But responsibility accompanies freedom." (24) Individuality is developed by developing one's talents. (25) Respect for oneself "means to cultivate one's ability and respect for life." (26) A strong minded man is not a blind follower of another. And the ideal of 'to be reverent' is interpreted:

As a basis for the above, it is important to have reverence for the origin of life. At the source of our being are our parents, our nation, and mankind. Love for mankind, human dignity, and true happiness grow out of this feeling of reverence for life's origin. (27)

The double stress on the themes of social responsibility and self control, and also on the idea of the cultivation of talent and ability - "men are equal in dignity but different in individuality"⁽²⁸⁾ - is clear. It is an indirect reaffirmation of social relationships in which man finds himself and of the possibilities of an inner spiritual strength; both of which were suggested in the normative construct.

'Home' is a place of 'love, rest and education'. "Chastity, filial duty, and love between brother and sisters are the moral traits to be cultivated."⁽²⁹⁾ In the home, mutual education by parent of child, and by child of parent occurs. "Children must listen to their parents. We must, however, never forget the dignity of parents as well as parental love for children"⁽³⁰⁾

As members of a society, the ideal Japanese will 'respect work' and 'contribute to the social welfare'. Modern interrelationships mean that "it is essential that a spirit of social service be promoted based on a sense of social solidarity."⁽³¹⁾ 'Creativity' and 'Respect for the Social Norm' are the two other social virtues of the ideal Japanese. "We must develop a productive and creative society emphasising our traditional virtues of work and economy".⁽³²⁾ And in the area of social norms, the Japanese are not sensitive enough to social justice and the observation of the law.⁽³³⁾

The requirements are similar to the Confucian themes which were outlined in the construct. Here and in the family individuals should be law-abiding, filial, affectionate and recognising of their obligations.

These themes come out strongly in the remaining section which is concerned with the ideal Japanese as a citizen. Its affirmation of traditional values is strong and clear and contains themes from both the Imperial Rescript and the themes outlined in the construct in chapter two:

Proper patriotism. It is through the state that we find the way to enjoy our happiness and contribute to human happiness throughout the world. To love our nation properly means to try to enhance the value of it. The man who is indifferent to his own nation is the enemy of his country.

Respect for Symbols. We have loved and respected the Emperor. "The Emperor is the symbol of Japan and the unity of its people. This position is based on the will of the people wherein lies the sovereignty." We must give deep thought to the fact that loving and respecting Japan is synonymous with loving and respecting the Emperor.

Development of Japanese Character. Those nations that have contributed most to the world have all had their distinctive characteristics. And so it was during and after the Meiji Period when the unique characteristics of the leaders and people of those days made the modernisation of Japan possible. We can be distinctively Japanese today by looking back upon our own history and traditions.

(34)

It is, of course, noteworthy that the social act of reaffirming a tradition should be made in this way. But the way itself is traditional. A model had been provided by the Imperial Rescript in the nineteenth century. The Rescript had framed the philosophy, and the educational philosophy of Japan until the occupation of 1945.

The virtues which the ideal Japanese was to cultivate were Confucian in the definition of social obligation, and national and Confucian in their definition of loyalty to the Emperor. They were the traditional virtues; and they accord well with the construct.

It is to be remembered that the outline of the characteristics of the ideal Japanese was not a document whose audience was to be the nation at large. The document was compiled, at the request of the Ministry of Education, by the Central Council on Education. The particular concern was the upper secondary school, where expansion and differentiation were making the issue of general education problematic. The document was part of the response, i.e. it contained the abstract principles around which a theory of general education was to be constructed. (This was gradually done, and revisions began to affect the whole school system in 1971 and 1972).

The document should also be understood in terms of the debate about a particular subject in the curriculum - shushin - which had implemented the teachings of the Imperial Rescript in the schools. Under American influence the subject had been abolished. The Japanese put it back into the curriculum as a compulsory subject. The principles of the model of the 'ideal Japanese' were to inform it, as well as the theory of general education.

As indicated earlier this reaffirmation of tradition was made partly in response to pressure in the mid-fifties on into the sixties to make all education more focussed on science, technology and vocational studies. These principles began to affect the actual curriculum; the document was a response to these pressures among others.

There was, in other words in Japan in the late fifties and mid-sixties a debate in progress about the principles which should inform general education. There was a 'modernising' claim for scientific studies; and a traditional claim, that the organising themes of general education should be those which had been made explicit over half a century ago, in another major document.

This debate was related to the changing external and internal, social, political and economic relations of Japan. It was also related to structural expansion of the education system itself, at the upper secondary level.

The normative response was non-change.

It is suggested therefore that the problem as defined existed in Japan. The form the solution took was a particular Japanese stress on morality, recognition of social obligation, harmony in the home and the wider society, strongly linked with an obvious respect for work, talent and achievement.

Japan, in this fashion, also provides a potential solution to the problem.

The USSR

The USSR, in 1959 and the mid-sixties, had a secondary school system which was characterised by a basic common school, the eight year incomplete school of general education (of which grades 1-4 are locatable in elementary education). Pupils could leave these schools at the age of fifteen and enter employment.

From the age of fifteen other types of education were available. Students could attend a secondary labour polytechnical school of general education, or a vocational technical school, or a secondary specialised school (or a part-time school).

General labour polytechnical education could be obtained in the same building as an eight year school (i.e. in a complete secondary school) or in a separate institution. Completion of the programme qualified a student for entry into higher education, after a competitive examination. The vocational technical schools for graduates of the eight year school did not lead directly into higher education, but their graduates could later enter higher education after completing (by a variety of methods) the full course of secondary education. Specialised secondary schools (technicums and other specialised secondary schools) admitted pupils after an examination, whether immediately after leaving the eight year incomplete secondary school or after work experience. Courses led to the completion of general secondary education or to a vocational qualification.

On Bowles' criteria, the system of 1959 in the USSR did not have a 'separate line' of general secondary education leading to the basic qualifications for university entry. At the completion of the minimum legal requirement for attendance at school until fifteen years of age, various types of schooling were available. One of these in particular led on to higher education. In this aspect, the system met a Structure C criterion - a common first cycle of secondary education, entry to which did not depend on examination success. However, despite reform intentions, pedagogical schools were not in 1959 part of higher education. This means that the system did not meet the criteria of Structure C. There was, also, for example, the retention of a formal school leaving examination.

In Hilker's classification, the basic school in its upper grades is locatable in Level II, Stage (3), i.e. Second Level, Lower Stage. The other schools are locatable in Stage (4). In the period under review there was no structural reorganisation, except for a steady decrease in the number of pedagogical schools. The numbers of these dropped from 447 in 1957-58 to 359 by 1965-66.⁽³⁵⁾ The pedagogical schools are classifiable at Level II, Stage (4) and in Level III. Their closure indicates that upgrading of teaching training was in progress. Apart from this there was no structural reorganisation in the Level III system as defined by Hilker, but the number of universities increased from forty in 1960 to fifty-one in 1970.⁽³⁶⁾

Overall, then, major structural reorganisation of the system did not occur in the period under review; there was however a redefinition through expansion of the system. In this aspect institutional change was notable and with the gradual reorganisation of the pedagogical schools, and the rapid expansion of the universities, may be judged to have been relatively rapid.

In the normative area there was a major national debate. In terms of the Lauwerys construct the traditional theory of general education was heavily reasserted by Mr. N. Krushev. The Krushev confirmation of tradition, i.e. traditional post-revolutionary, and tradition in the sense of affirmation of the construct, became part of a Resolution of the Central Committee of the CPSU and the Council of Ministers, which made the decision to publish the Krushev theses in the press for nationwide discussion. The resolution was (a) to approve, (b) to publish the theses and (c) to bring up the question of 'strengthening the bonds of the school with life'.⁽³⁷⁾

Krushev addressed himself to core themes outlined in the Lauwerys construct:

Obviously in training and bringing up children in the schools, they should already from the first form be psychologically prepared for the fact that in the future they will have to take a part in socially useful activity, in work, in creating values necessary for the development of the socialist state. We still have a sharp distinction drawn between manual work and mental work... this is fundamentally wrong and runs counter to our teaching and aspirations.

(38)

The attitudes which had developed in the young and their parents, attitudes of seeing college entrance as the goal of education, were incorrect. An education which offered no respect for physical work and which was 'divorced from life'

can no longer be tolerated. For in a socialist country work must be valued by its usefulness, must be stimulated not only by remuneration, but also, and this is most important, by the high respect of our Soviet people. It must be constantly inculcated in the young people that the chief thing for society is that by which society lives, that is, productive labour, because only it creates material value.

(39)

Kruschev in stating his theses drew on the central political figures in the communist movement, quoting both Marx and Lenin, indirectly stressing the legitimacy of his theory of general education. Even the theory of general education itself was succinctly outlined:

The schools must produce people with an all-round education who know the fundamentals of science and are at the same time able to do systematic physical work; they must instil in the young people a desire to be useful to society, to take an active part in the production of values society needs.

(40)

The Kruschev confirmation of the traditional theory of general education is in one way clear: it represents normative non-change.

This normative non-change situation, as against the now relatively rapid change in institutions, allows the judgement to be offered that a version of the problem-statement can be identified in the USSR.

It also allows, at one level, the comment that the USSR represents an alternative solution. This formulation however is doubly unfortunate. Firstly, what is on offer is a theory of general education which is communist - the phrasing of the Lauwerys construct. Secondly, it is clear that the 'traditional' theory of general education had not fully established itself in the national policies of the country that had adopted it. Whether it would therefore be more easily established elsewhere is immediately (though not analytically) moot.

The point can be clarified somewhat by reference to a 'strong' and 'weak' tradition of general education, which was noted in both the USA and in England. European ideas of a general education had been institutionalised in the educational institutions of the Czarist regime. It is perhaps the case that these ideas had slowed down the full acceptance of the 'new' theory of general education, for which the term 'traditional' has hitherto been used.

Kruschev himself held an hypothesis which he made explicit: "We must reshape the system of higher education, draw it closer to production, and link it with production properly."⁽⁴¹⁾ This idea will be explored in some of its variations in the second section of this chapter.

France

In France in 1959 the secondary school level was characterised by considerable complexity of types of schooling. There are two main analytic points. Firstly, the structures were closer to the Bowles 'A' model than any system of education examined so far. Secondly, institutional change was extremely rapid, as the Berthoin Decree of 1959 began to take effect. (42) The core of the reform was the introduction of a two year orientation cycle. The implications of this orientation cycle were strengthened by the introduction in 1963 of new 'colleges of secondary education', which were intended to facilitate ease of transfer of children between courses at lower secondary education, during the observation cycle. (43)

The analytic consequence was that Level II, Stage (3) instead of being characterised by an extended elementary school, an advanced primary school and a lycee, became characterised by the C.E.S. which was implemented rapidly, growing from 200 such institutions in 1964 to 876 in 1967. (44) And further characterised by great weight being given to the 'observation' of children for two years in Stage (3) and their 'orientation' in the further two years that characterised the extended guidance cycle. The lycee and colleges of technical education which are separate institutions function at the Upper Stage, of Level II.

Thus the French system of secondary schools underwent extremely rapid institutional change in the mid-sixties in particular, in terms of both redefinition - the introduction of the CES and the guidance cycle - and the reorganisation and and redefinition of the place of the lycee in the stages of the system.

A similarly rapid change occurred, institutionally, in the last half of the 1960s. An attempt to create a more flexible pattern of technical-scientific training led to the creation in 1966 of University Institutes of Technology.⁽⁴⁴⁾ The intent was to prepare students for senior level technical and executive positions. The new IUTs would assist in increasing the supply of technical-scientific workers who had been forthcoming from various engineering schools, including the national higher engineering schools. At the time of their establishment they were in short-cycle higher education.

They however, like the universities, were affected by another major structural reform, the Orientation Law of 1968 which provided certain possibilities for institutional movement, and also re-organised the university faculties into 'units of teaching and research'.⁽⁴⁵⁾ Discussion of the consequences of these new possibilities for institutional movement is placed in the next chapter.

It is clear that the types of school and higher education institution of France underwent major reorganisation and redefinition in the period under review. It is unnecessary to offer an opinion about whether they were more or less rapid than structural change in other countries; sufficient to note that they were rapid in their domestic context.

The extent of the normative challenge to traditional theories of general education is extremely difficult to judge. That there was challenge is clear. (The challenge was explicit in the Langevin Wallon Report itself.⁽⁴⁶⁾) But it is not until after the period under analysis, with the Haby reform, that there is available from major national documents a sustained redefinition (or at least a clear question which implies certain answers) of a new theory of general education. The 'minor' debate was a continuous one, and is well documented in the secondary literature which is reported in a footnote.^{(47)*}

Here two points will be taken as an index of 'relative' non-change in the normative area. Firstly, the absence of a major national statement. This, it was suggested in chapter two, might itself constitute evidence. And secondly, and more importantly, it is judged that asynchronicity occurred given the very rapid change in the types of secondary and higher education institutions in France. Even if there was some normative shift, the relative institutional shift was much greater.

A short interim summary can be made. A fuller discussion of some of the themes in this section is located at the end of the section two in this chapter, so both commentaries together may indicate their relevance (or not) for the statement of solution-of-problem.

Firstly, it is suggested that a variant of the problem was shown to exist in all the countries analysed. Two of these countries (England and France) undertook considerable institutional reform, but efforts to renegotiate traditional theories of general education were ambiguous. Non-change in the normative area can be identified.

Secondly, reaffirmation of traditional theories of general education was undertaken at the national level in the USSR and Japan.

Thirdly, some renegotiation of traditional theories of general education was demonstrable in the USA.

Fourthly all of these changes and non-changes were responses to the rapidity of change in technology and industry - which were themselves culturally interpreted.

Fifthly, all countries offer in principle potential solutions to the problem, as defined, of general education in England.

Consider first the mechanics of
normative challenge.

Brian Holmes

Section Two: Analysis in context

The general question addressed in this section was first asked by contemporary comparativists in the 1957 (World) Yearbook of Education, which carried the particular title Education and Philosophy. The Yearbook was not about philosophies but about how they come to be adopted, and sustained.

How are traditional theories of general education sustained in a number of national contexts? Certainly, in the thinking of education decision makers in some situations. Partly by curriculum practice, no doubt. Curriculum practice, with its associated examinations, text-books, hierarchies among teaching staff no doubt makes change difficult. But one or two subjects can disappear from a curriculum without disturbing a traditional theory of education; the reverse relationship does not hold.

If some of the institutional linkages (the sociological laws) which sustain a traditional theory of general education (a normative phenomenon in the minds of men, perhaps as semi-conscious assumptions), are examined in a range of contexts, then, ways of adapting theories of general education to specific initial conditions might be better anticipated. In what way does context illuminate potential solution?

It is initially suggested that attention should focus away from schools and curriculum. In the first instance it should be directed towards universities, ⁽⁴⁸⁾ and higher education systems.

In what ways do universities and other institutions of higher education institution relate to each other? How, if at all do they institutionalise Max Weber's distinction between the 'expert' and the 'cultivated' (which places into two groups the Lauwerys constructs)? What are the latent relations between these phenomena and theories of general education, in a variety of national contexts? ^{(49)*}

In England the traditional sharp differentiation in prestige between the universities and other sectors of higher education is well attested. Consider, for example, the following forthright statement:

But it is a great mistake... to blur the distinction between the university and the technical college. It is here that Oxford and Cambridge can be of peculiar service, because they have a peculiar power, from their very position, of keeping the true and pure 'idea of a University'... the old universities... have a great and bounden duty of defending, for the sake of the rest, the stronghold of pure learning and long-time values against the demands of material progress and the zest for immediate values and quick returns.

(50)

This pre-war statement stresses not simply the idea that there is a proper separation of university higher education and other forms of higher education, but also that within the university sector the position of pre-eminence of Oxbridge is so

marked that it is a natural example: a role model for the rest of the University system. In fact, English universities in general have attempted to be residential, to be tutorial and, until the advent of the 'new universities' had rather specialised undergraduate courses. Attempts to reform English higher education in the post-war period have had to deal with the prestige of the university system; of this prestige Oxford and Cambridge have traditionally been the apex embodiment.

Differences in prestige may be marked by informal judgement or formal arrangement. The differences in prestige between universities themselves in England and Wales are largely a matter of informal judgements which are indicated by priorities in application of very able students, the preferences of private employers or governmental agencies to recruit graduates from a range of universities, and the attractiveness of a university as measured by the kind of qualifications which applicants for academic staff positions possess. Between university and non-university higher education institutions the prestige gap, at least until the advent of the CNAAs, was very formally marked by locating degree granting powers with the universities. Even external degrees were under the aegis of the University of London. Paradoxically, the formal naming of the binary system itself - which was part of an effort to redistribute resources between the non-university and university sectors of higher education - also served to stress prestige differences.

The mechanisms for boundary maintenance between the higher and lower prestige sectors of higher education in England and Wales were powerful. The final transition is an act of sponsorship. Prior to the creation of the new universities in the post-war period, an institution aspiring to university status occupied an interim status as a 'university college'. (The new universities were not asked to move through this sequence.) The creation of a new institution of university status was typically seen as a highly significant national decision.

The decision was informed by a principle, which Robbins stated:

... while emphasising that there is no betrayal of values when institutions of higher education teach what will be of some practical use, we must postulate that what is taught should be taught in such a way as to promote the general powers of the mind. The aim should be to produce not mere specialists but rather cultivated men and women.

(51)

The twin stresses - against vocationalism and for 'cultivation' seem to be continuing. The new universities were to be centres of innovation. Most of these new universities devised new curricula, which placed greater stress on inter-disciplinary study, the single honours degree being seen increasingly as an anachronism. But vocational subjects seemed still to be suspect in the new universities. (52)

Contrast this with the vocational role expected of the grandes écoles when they were founded to provide skilled administrators and experts for the running of the French state in the nineteenth century. However the education which is offered by the grandes écoles has tended to evolve toward a celebration of a certain kind of rationality:

Both Polytechnique and Normale, although their creation was intended to supply the country's needs in trained specialists, have evolved towards a very broad intellectual formation. The scientific culture given to the polytechniciens is based on extensive study of mathematics and physical sciences, but completed by an 'initiation' into other subjects relevant to understanding the modern world. It is intended as a 'general training for thought and action'. In so far as normaliens read for university degrees (licence es lettres or licence es sciences during their first year and agregation during their third and last year at the school), they share in the general instruction given by the Sorbonne. But, within the school itself, the second year is a period of unrestrained freedom of study and, throughout the course, intellectual curiosity is never subordinated to a narrow view of the future teachers' responsibilities. Individual development predominates over teacher training.

(53)

In one sense then the products of the grandes écoles are experts - through a very competitive process they have established their competence in an area of study. But more importantly they have become cultivated experts, whose 'general training for thought and action' allows them to move between high status positions in different occupational spheres with maximum self-confidence. Their educational identities are predicated less upon their subject expertise than upon the initiation into logicity, the verbal skills and the intellectual 'penetration' cultivated in the grandes écoles. (54)

The bifurcation of prestige between the university Faculties and the grandes écoles has allowed and is correlated with a bifurcation of function. The university Faculties, partly because of the existence of the grandes écoles, were able largely to ignore any implied need to produce experts. They were free to devote themselves to 'pure' knowledge and research. As a consequence "the people they have educated have not been prepared to fill roles in... society other than teaching or highly abstract research ..." (55) Indeed the kind of research which the old Faculties, especially of Arts and Sciences, produced was the subject of strident criticism, in part because the research produced came to be linked with career requirements and the nature of the examination system, rather than the 'demands of scientific work'. (56) In so far as the old Faculties ritualised research they created educational identities among their students which increased the gap between their students and the world.

These two examples of university systems stressing cultivation should be contrasted with the Soviet situation. In the USSR, institutions of higher education can be seen as being divided into two groups. (57) The universities, which contain about 10% to 15% of the students in higher education, produce research workers and teachers with high qualifications in the natural and social sciences. The specialised institutes are intended to produce specialists for particular fields of study or

positions in the national economy, "The chief types of institutes for definite fields are pedagogical, agricultural, medical, metallurgical, mining, chemico-technical, civil engineering and certain others" (58)

Soviet authors do not draw distinctions between institutions of higher education in terms of their formal prestige. In so far as distinctions are drawn they tend to refer to the range of specialities which are offered. For example Igor Ekgolm, having discussed the range of courses offered in universities, goes on to distinguish between institutes in the following terms:

An important place among the technical colleges belongs to polytechnical institutes, which are establishments preparing engineers in a great number of lines. The Leningrad Polytechnical Institute, for example, has eight departments - the Physico-metallurgical, Mechanical Engineer, Electronic-Mechanical, Hydraulic Engineering, Electronics and other Departments - and graduate engineers of 62 specialities.

Another type of technical educational establishment is represented by branch (or sectoral) colleges which usually train specialists for some one branch of industry with related metallurgical, mining, building, chemical engineering, transport and other colleges. The number of departments and specialities is usually smaller in such colleges compared with polytechnical institutes. The Sverdlovsk Mining Institute, for example, which trains engineers for the coal-mining industry, has the Departments of Geological Prospecting, Mining, Geophysics, and Mineralogical Chemistry.

Thus, in general, sharp dichotomies in prestige distinctions seem difficult to draw in the higher education system in the USSR. However, more informal prestige distinctions

are visible. Moscow University holds its examinations earlier than other universities. (60) Similarly the universities of Leningrad, Kiev and Novosibirsk have been termed 'the leading universities' which is related to probable differences in career chances which graduation from these institutions brings. Some pedagogical institutes are very well known.

It is suggested that the kind of prestige dichotomies visible in the higher education systems of France and England are not present in the USSR. This in turn means that issues of boundary maintenance, which are a function of prestige dichotomies, are not raised in any acute form. There are discussions of differences and differences in quality between institutions, (61)* but the debate is not in the same terms as in France and England. In part at least this debate seems to be concerned with the themes of boundary creation - i.e. specialisation and differentiation among institutions of higher education which have not markedly changed their function and inter-relationships since their creation after the Revolution.

The Robbins Committee stated flatly in reference to the USSR:

Higher education is completely professional in aim. Each course earns a qualification entitling the holder to practise in some branch of the economy, such as power station construction or schoolteaching. The total enrolment of the universities and colleges in the Soviet Union is determined by the requirements of the nation for specialists.

(62)

Robbins' own statement of the purposes of a university will also be recalled; but to judge that the balance in the system is toward the training of the expert rather than the education of the cultivated in Weber's terms is probably accurate.

The prestige distinctions within Japanese higher education have been somewhat graphically described in an OECD Examiners Report:

Amongst the universities a few are clearly demarcated from the others in terms of their financial resources, their prestige and the quality of the education they are thought to offer. The resulting university structure is akin to a double structure of pyramids with very narrow apices and little movement, either of students or staff, between levels or pyramids. In the public sector pyramid are the 76 national and public (prefectural and municipal) universities. At the apex of this pyramid stand Tokyo and Kyoto universities, with one or two specialised universities such as Hitotsubachi and the Tokyo University of Technology, and the five other ex-Imperial universities a little below them. At the lower reaches are the 46 national universities newly created in each prefectural capital after the war, and some of the less prestigious municipal universities. Paralleling this is a much larger pyramid of private universities which accommodates 75 percent of Japan's student body, and includes some few universities of high prestige, and quality but which also reaches down to a far lower level at its base.

(63)

These prestige distinctions are based on a number of significant internal and external factors. Internal factors include, for example, the fact that teacher-student ratios, expenditures per student, and teachers' salaries are all markedly worse in the private universities than in the public ones.⁽⁶⁴⁾ The financial position of the private universities is currently highly problematic which accounts for many of the above indices.

The external factors are linked to the patterns of boundary maintenance which account for the fact that, despite a major structural post-war revision, the prestige hierarchy still retains, in general, a pre-war referent.

The prestigious Imperial universities, especially the University of Tokyo, lead to particular positions in the occupational structure. In this aspect the prestige Japanese universities are paralleled by the role of the grandes ecoles and Oxford and Cambridge. But the mechanism through which this placement works, whilst displaying similarities to certain aspects of French and English societies, is especially Japanese in its linkages and impact. What is offered as well as a formal academic qualification is a "lifetime identification with a clique."⁽⁶⁵⁾ The cliques have important career (and sociological) functions:

These cliques, or batsu as they are called, are intimate, informal groups based on personal loyalties that span many fields from the university into business, the professional world, government, and politics. A person without batsu faces Japanese society unsupported, with no one to sponsor him or to help him in times of crisis. It is one's batsu that opens the closed doors. Characteristically, each batsu has its own sphere of influence, which it guards jealously against outsiders and opens only to its intimates. Universities form their own batsu, and even individual departments within the university may have batsu on their own.

(66)

The other major factor which has contributed to the maintenance of prestige boundaries is the general influence on the universities of the German model and in particular a notion of academic excellence. One consequence of the American

post-war reforms was the introduction of general education requirements in the first two years of university study. In general this requirement has not been well received by the Japanese; and the prestigious universities may make a distinction between their admittance procedures to the general education faculty, and to the upper-division professional faculty. Thus a paradoxical effect of the American reform of higher education in Japan, which in some measure went against Japanese notions of what constituted a proper university, was to re-emphasise "... the quality gap, and with it, the competition for entry into the better schools.:" (67)

That sharp prestige differences and boundary maintenance protect general notions of academic excellence and also access to occupations of a certain sort is clear. It is also clear that there are strong tendencies within Japanese education toward the position that "general education ...(is)... far more valuable than specific technical knowledge." (68)

Galtung further contends:

The basic point about education in Japan ... is its function as a substitute for the old caste structure. That the knowledge function is of secondary importance is most clearly demonstrated in the significance of in-service training in companies and ministries. Only about 2 percent of the students are graduate students, and graduate study is actually in-service training for university careers. Like in old feudal societies one learns on the job, one learns by being taught by one's bosses, not by outside teachers. What the work organisations in industry and government want is for the educational establishment to do the basic sorting for them.

(69)

As a corollary of this process it matters less which knowledge contents are the focus of an individual's education and more where the knowledge contents were transmitted; which in turn is important because of the formative effects of the severity of the competition which the individual has survived. The process is not in fact too dissimilar from the competitive aspects of French higher education, and especially the problem of gaining access to the grandes écoles; a major difference lies in the explicitness with which the French version of rationality can be built into educational contents.

American higher education is characterised by a very large number and a very wide range of institutions. As indicated earlier in the chapter, one of the themes in the literature is an attempt to categorise these institutions by type or function.

One consequence of this varied and extensive pattern is that there are a range of prestige distinctions visible in American higher education. One prestige grouping is old established universities whose college antecedents go back to the opening up of the Eastern colonies. Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Rutgers, Brown and a number of other universities carry the generic title 'Ivy League' institutions, which reflects their age, setting and original aims. Another set of prestige distinctions is based upon the degree to which universities have developed prestigious graduate schools, which attract higher calibre faculty and students (and research grants). Examples of this latter category would be the Universities of Chicago, Harvard, Yale, Princeton, M.I.T., California at

Berkely and Columbia. And similarly among liberal arts colleges Grinnell, Amherst, Antioch, Swarthmore and Lawrence have high reputations as being among the 'best' colleges.

Among the varied prestige rankings it is, however, clear, that the major universities hold prime place:

The full university is concentrated at and near the "top" of the hierarchy of deference of the academic system. The rest of the system varies not only in quality but also in the range of functions performed. The continued cohesion of teaching and research, of graduate and undergraduate teaching, of the whole range of intellectual disciplines and of the liberal arts and the more technical and professional faculties, constitutes a major feature of a full university. (70)

Prime place is held in part because the 'full university' has within it the range of functions which other parts of the higher education system perform, and in addition is arguably part of a national rather than a local reference network.

This is not, however, to argue that what is at issue is the kind of sharp prestige dichotomies between institutions of higher education which are noticeable in Europe. To repeat, there are gradations of prestige rather than dichotomies and it is possible to carry out educational functions in higher education which are divorced from the research task and still retain high prestige. For example, on the argument of Parsons and Platt, Vassar, Dartmouth and Smith Colleges concentrate upon the two functions of providing their undergraduates with cultivated and scholarly attitudes and sending them on to

professional and advanced academic schools. Doing this job well, despite their lack of involvement in research, they retain high prestige, among academics and consumers of education.

Boundary maintenance between the institutions of higher education in the United States is, by and large, weak. Institutions may change their prestige ranking by competition. This competitive process is visible historically:

Up to the mid-1920's, the five most productive institutions (Columbia, Chicago, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, Yale) awarded about half the doctorates in this country.

In the 1930's, the five most productive (Columbia, Chicago, Harvard, Wisconsin, Cornell) awarded about a third of the doctorates.

In the 1950's, the five most productive (Columbia, Wisconsin, California, Harvard, Illinois) awarded well under a quarter of the doctorates. (71)

This trend reflects competition from the rise of the large, public state universities.

The complex and shifting nature of prestige differentiation in American institutions of higher learning is matched by the range of answers to the question of whether the stress in American higher education is upon the education of the 'cultivated' or the training of the 'expert'.

The major stress in the junior colleges is upon vocational and technical preparation, though it should be noted that they also act as transfer institutions, allowing

students to move on to four year colleges to complete a bachelor degree. At the other end of the prestige scale the graduate schools also stress expertise rather than cultivation. Concluding his survey of graduate education in the United States, Berelson argues:

In short, the graduate school should aim at training the skilled specialist - not, if I may say so without being misunderstood, at producing the "educated man", the "cultured man", the "wise man", (nor, for that matter the "mere technician", either). Liberal education is the task of the college and if it is not done well there, then it is not the best solution to push the demand up on to the graduate school, which has another spirit to serve. (72)

This, of course, is a fairly conventional division of labour within academe - a stress on some form of cultivation, nationally interpreted, in undergraduate studies was noted for France and England, with further specialisation reserved for post-bachelor degree work. Within this general framework, however, what begins to distinguish the United States is that the prestige of the university tends to be tied heavily with the size and quality of the graduate school; and thus with the production of specialists. The model for emulation, at the apex of the system of national higher education, is a specialised one, modified of course by the strong tradition of a rather broad undergraduate training.

Concluding reflections and summary

The previous description and analysis of higher education systems was extremely condensed and deliberately so. The analysis and description were undertaken to a particular end: what are some of the potential relationships between higher education systems and traditional theories of general education.

The main analytic theme remains the same: the problem as stated. But it was suggested at the start of this section that it might be more easily possible to understand some of the dynamics of the problem in a number of countries if attention was turned away, temporarily, from a concentration on rapidly changing types of secondary and higher education institutions, and more slowly changing theories of general education.

In particular, and continuing to take for granted certain major social forces external to the education system, what aspects of the internal dynamics of education systems might repay attention, and comparative analysis? It was suggested that the degree to which higher education systems stressed, through the views of the people who worked in them, the 'expert' or 'cultivated' man in Weber's terms might display relevant variation among the countries under analysis; and that the interrelationships between different parts of the higher education system might vary in important ways.

These two questions were framed with the third: what are the latent relationships between these phenomena and traditional theories of general education. This can equally

be phrased in terms of the anticipation of relevant specific initial conditions: what are the latent relationships between these phenomena and new theories of general education.

The earlier analysis of higher education systems suggests that some distinctions can be drawn.

Firstly, it was suggested that there is some consciousness that higher education systems do stress either the expert or the cultivated. Both the English and American evidence actually used that vocabulary for description. The analysis tended to suggest that in the USA and the USSR there was a preference for the training and education of the expert; in England and in France, by a peculiar osmosis, an emphasis on the education of the cultivated, at least in the English university and the French grandes ecoles. What it was to be 'expert or 'cultivated' was of course subject to cultural definition. It is also accepted that all higher education systems possess structures which ensure the production of both the cultivated and the expert; what is being discussed is a matter of emphasis.

Secondly, it is suggested from the analysis that, in the countries under review, the higher education systems are of two types: prestige-graded and prestige-dichotomous.

Prestige-graded is taken as meaning that (a) prestige is not accorded to category of institution, but to individual

institution, and (b) that therefore movement up and down the prestige rankings is a matter of the mobilisation of resources rather than ritualised alteration of category. In different ways, the USSR and the USA provided examples of prestige-graded higher education systems.

Prestige-dichotomous is taken as meaning that (a) prestige is accorded to category of institution and (b) that boundary maintenance between the category of institutions is carefully marked; perhaps in law, or in a system of administrative control; or in the academic award structure. In different ways, the English system (especially in its binary form), the French distinction between the grandes ecoles, the university and the IUTs and the Japanese distinctions between the Imperial universities, and others, are examples of prestige-dichotomous systems. Within a prestige-dichotomous system, universities themselves in relation to each other, are likely to be prestige-graded.

In practice, there is likely to be some blurring of these distinctions. For example, a private university in Japan may develop an excellent reputation placing it at par, or nearly so, to the Imperial universities. In England, a particular non-university institution may develop a national reputation; perhaps this was the case with the CATs as a group. But it is suggested that the distinction, which is a structural and comparative one, holds.

Thirdly, it is suggested that these two analyses can be combined.

Those systems of higher education in which prestige is marked dichotomously - France, England and Japan - are also those in which there is a tendency to embrace cultivation as an educational goal. In those systems of higher education which have been termed prestige-graded, there is some stress on the training of specialists, Weber's 'experts'.

That is, the categories seem applicable in pairs and among the small number of higher education systems under review seem capable of clarifying distinctions in comparative terms.

It is not suggested that, stated so, the propositions have any explanatory power. The 'why' and the 'how' of their relation with other social and educational phenomena needs further examination.

Tentatively, one relationship may be suggested. Earlier, a distinction was glossed over in the beginning of this Section. It was suggested that Weber's conceptualisation of the expert and the cultivated permitted theories in general education to be placed in two categories. The categories are expert and cultivated; the two groups of traditional theories of general education are those of France, England and Japan, on the one hand stressing forms of cultivation, and the theories of general education is the USA and the USSR which do not. They do not, but what they do stress is, at the moment unclear, and open to further analysis and suggestion.

There is thus some kind of relationship between the normative patterns and institutional relations within higher education and traditional theories of general education in England, France and Japan; and another kind of relationship between the normative pattern and institutional relations within higher education and traditional theories of general education in the USSR and the USA. There is a grouping within the five countries. There is an overlap of the sort sketched between patterns of the higher education system and theories of general education, in all five countries.

The overlap is noted. It has not been explained.

If some of these relationships could be understood, or at least, linked to other aspects of the educational system or other social phenomena, then the patterns of institutional relationship within which theories of general education are located might be made more visible.

Some approach could thereby be made both to the anticipation of relevant specific initial conditions in England, and to the question raised by the 1957 Yearbook of Education - of how philosophies of education (here, theories of general education) are sustained.

This analysis should be explicitly combined with the themes of section one of this chapter. That is, the earlier interim summary of section one of this chapter was skeletal. It identified a somewhat similar version of the problem in all

countries examined. It drew the conclusion that almost everywhere (though not in the relation of second-level institutions and theories of general education in the USA) normative change had been less rapid than institutional change. It identified cases of where traditional theory had been strongly reaffirmed from the national level (the USSR and Japan); renegotiated somewhat at the national level (the USA) and shown ambiguity (France and England). In all cases, explicit acknowledgement was made in the country concerned of economic pressures and rapid social change; in at least two countries (the USA and Japan) there was some acknowledgement of international political pressures. The conclusion also suggested that - in principle - all countries offered a potential solution to the problem as defined, of general education in England.

But the interim summary was merely that: a summary of main themes, a reporting of content. What was not raised were questions of the dynamics of context. Was there, for example, a distinction to be drawn between those systems of education (France and England) which were redefining their lower secondary education system structurally while debating their theory of general education, whilst other countries had already redefined their lower secondary education structures? Was there some significance (for theories of general education) in the 'upgrading' phenomenon and the location of old, or creation of new institutions in Level III, Stage Five? These internal dynamics of the education system were left under-explored. Given that both structural reforms of secondary and higher education were explicitly acknowledged as taking place in

response to rapid social and economic change, perhaps the incursion of the 'dominant patterns' of the convergence theorists, what is the relation of theories of general education to these 'dominant patterns'?

It has already been suggested that questions of this kind may not be able to be answered successfully. They certainly can not be answered definitively.

But even a sketch of an answer to such questions, which arise logically enough in the attempt to locate the problem in context, may help with understanding the range of specific initial conditions relevant to problem solution in England.

It is to such a sketch that attention is given in the next chapter. It is not perhaps a matter of surprise that the chapter is rather brief.

CHAPTER FOUR. Towards a theory of exclusion

Both the Hindu and the Confucian gentleman avoided too close a contact with the Western barbarian - the Hindu in order not to be disturbed in his quest, the Confucian in order not to allow any coarsening of the elegance of his aesthetic gestures.

(1)

Max Weber

The point of this chapter is to develop an abstract statement of the relation of theories of general education to other selected institutional and normative patterns of educational systems. The abstract statement should be capable of subsuming a large amount of descriptive data, and it should be flexible enough to be used for comparative analysis. That is, it should in principle be capable of subsuming a large amount of descriptive data collected for several countries.

The implicit question behind the abstract statement is how a particular philosophy in education - a traditional theory of general education - is, sociologically, sustained. The simple form of the question is, why have not traditional theories of general education changed easily and quickly? What is it, in institutional terms, which makes these semi-conscious assumptions in the minds of men so tenacious? How are such theories (ideas) located sociologically (i.e. institutionally), given that their expression in the institution of curriculum is not a complete explanation? It is accepted, as indicated in Chapter Three, that curriculum reform - where curriculum is taken as a set of organised practices - is also difficult. But here the implicit

question addressed is not how the practice of general education is sustained, but how theories of general education are sustained.

The explicit question behind the abstract statement is how may a theory of general education be changed? That is, if an alternative theory of general education is proposed, one which is different from a theory already widely held, what should be taken into account as specific initial conditions in addition to the phenomena typically identified in the curriculum development literature. It is no doubt important to understand the structure of power relations in schools on a comparative basis, to analyse and anticipate the competing claims of lay and professional groups in education, to understand the role of curriculum development units themselves. A suggested innovation is unlikely to be successful unless such an analysis is undertaken before (and not during) the innovation process. These are necessary questions; but, it is suggested neither necessarily sufficient nor necessarily the first questions. Particularly this is so if what 'needs' to be changed is widely held assumptions about an appropriate general education. Change in this area involves changing the whole of curriculum practice. The chances of correctly anticipating difficulties are improved, it is suggested, by taking more than a proto-theoretical perspective.

The answers to these implicit and explicit questions will be given as schematically as possible. Little extra description will be offered of details of educational systems

though it is judged to be proper to make reference to material already assembled in earlier pages. The analysis takes its point of departure from that material.

It was noted at the end of Chapter One (in the final footnote) that the mass and elite literature had contained within it some apperception of principles of openness and closure in educational systems. That is, for example, Bereday's dual structures, Husen's flexible structures of schooling were concerned with the questions of what kinds of educational structures would permit more pupils to pass through them than other structures. The theme was variously termed democratization, or maximization of talent. Bowles extended the range of educational referents by which such an end goal could be achieved by drawing distinctions between elitist, modernising and democratized educational systems, without being noticeably concrete about any of them. Nevertheless, all the analysts just mentioned were concerned implicitly with the openness of educational systems, and Bowles and Husen in particular made their points very much in terms of an historical sketch of pre-industrial and industrial societies and the educational systems which best fitted these.

It was stated at the end of Chapter One that the problem statement subordinated direct analysis of mass and elite educational systems. Such direct analysis would no longer be methodologically proper. It was also accepted that the 'vaguely perceived tension' between openness and closure had been incorporated into the problem.

This tension was again recognised in the conclusion to Chapter Two. There it was recognised that in the English case, the intent of structural reforms at the secondary and higher education levels was to include more pupils for longer in the educational system. However, it was also recognised as possible, 'even likely' that the effect of widely held assumptions about traditional theories of education might be de facto to exclude pupils from further experiences in the educational system. (There the mechanism suggested for this process was the internal mechanisms of the school, such as teacher expectations, and termly examinations). An aspect of the tension was also recognised in the acknowledgement of 'two traditions' of education in England and in the special anxiety of the English reformers over the proportion of grammar schools remaining in the transitional phase toward comprehensive education. Finally a different framing of the tension was recognised in the conclusion to Chapter Two in the point that the longer structural openness is implemented, and normative non-change continues, the worse the problem becomes.

A version of this aspect of the problem may also be noted in France where the invention of the orientation cycle was rapidly followed by the creation of the CES; to increase further the possibilities of openness, in the structures of second level education.

Thus the issue of openness and closure is at the centre of the problem statement: on the one hand, rapidly changing second and third level structures; on the other less rapidly changing norms of general education. It is this tension

which gives the problem its initial intellectual (and policy) dynamic.

However, it is suggested that the issue of openness and closure is built into the problem statement in a second and entirely different way.

It is built into, embedded in, the theories of general education themselves.

It is suggested that one type of general education theory in its cultural specificities calls for certain qualities of mind; the other type of general education theory, in its cultural specificities, calls for certain qualities of (social) relation. Concretely, the English and French theories of general education demand the development of intellectual qualities, the one through specialisation in depth (which provides a general education) and the other through the cultivation of reason (which provides a general education). In contrast, the Soviet and American theories of general education call for the social organisation of intelligence, the one through an emphasis on the dignity of all work and on the virtue of cooperation, the other in the social art of organising useful knowledge for problem solving purposes.

The significant difference between the two groups of theories is not especially located in the differences between the psychological theories widely held in the four countries (though no doubt these in a fuller analysis should be carefully examined).

Nor is it suggested here that the slightly greater stress on the individual and his formation in the French and English cases is of major differentiating power.

What is suggested is that the category 'quality of mind' provides a concept which readily permits the exclusion of some individuals from some parts of the educational process; the category 'quality of (social) relation' provides a concept which encourages the inclusion of all individuals. Of course these concepts have to be socially organised i.e. institutionalised. Here, prevailing theories of psychology, forms of testing and examining, types of school structure and so on are of great importance. The institutionalised form of the theory of general education is the curriculum (as a Holmesian institution). It is here that the principle is made practical.

But what is being suggested is that the practice follows, comparatively, from a principle embedded in the two pairs of theory.

It is further suggested that the theories of general education contain, again as pairs, and comparatively, another differentiating principle. This is the external orientation to action of those educated within the two theories of general education.

The first type of theory orients towards action through and on the ideational universe and the second type suggests action through and on the material universe. Both types take on

cultural specificities but within their category share the main distinction.

Concretely, the English and French general education theories and their institutionalised forms stress that the educated man has, as a personal possession, access to major principles by which the intellectual and moral world may be understood. The difference again is by the method that produces this condition, the English stressing the formation of character partly through 'some one principal branch of study' and partly through explicit exposure of religious principle; the French arriving at morality through logical deduction from first principles. In contrast, the Soviet and American theories of general education and their institutionalised forms stress that the educated man has, in conjunction with others, access to major principles, which permit useful, working activity, especially the production of material goods and the organisation of processes of industrial and agricultural production. (The Khrushchev and NDEA complaints were that these processes were not being well carried out, because of deficiencies in the educational system).

What is being suggested is that the first type of general education theory contains, through its emphasis on access to the ideational world as a personal possession, a principle of exclusion; the second type, with its emphasis on social and individual access to the material world and the organisation of production, a principle of inclusion of all individuals.

The point may be presented schematically as follows:-

| SUB-PRINCIPLE | THEORIES OF GENERAL EDUCATION | |
|--------------------------|--|--|
| | EXCLUSION | INCLUSION |
| quality valued | of MIND England, France | of SOCIAL RELATION USSR, USA |
| external arena of action | THROUGH AND ON IDEATIONAL WORLD England, France | THROUGH AND ON MATERIAL WORLD USSR, USA |

Figure One

Data can be located. For example, the Newsom Report attempted to renegotiate both sub-principles of exclusion in England. Capelle it is suggested mainly tried to renegotiate the second sub-principle of exclusion; that is, by a stress on technology (taught in a certain way) an effort was to be made to disturb the external arena of action, rather than the first, 'quality valued'. In the USA critics such as Rickover were stressing not merely rejection of the traditional theory of education- but the renegotiation of the sub-principle, quality valued. Rickover certainly, continued to expound the external arena of action through and on the material world. Other American

critics of the traditional theory such as the essentialists were trying to renegotiate both sub-principles. Krushev whilst in the USSR of the time facing some difficulties in organising production was publicly trying to reaffirm the first sub-principle of inclusion, an affirmation of social relation in a communist society. Clearly his critique may, if held in force as policy longer than till 1964 have had an impact on processes of industrial and agricultural production, also.

Overall, then, it is suggested that traditional theories of general education contain within themselves a preference for some qualities rather than others; and some types of action on the external world rather than others. In so far as these preferences mean that only a few persons can meet the criteria demanded the theory of general education contains in itself a principle of exclusion; conversely, a theory of general education may suggest inclusion as an operational principle.

These theories of general education can also be seen, comparatively, as standing in relation to higher education systems. Much of the verbal description and analysis of this relationship was outlined at the end of Chapter Three. There, a distinction was drawn between prestige-dichotomous higher education systems and prestige-graded (or prestige-differentiated) systems of higher education. It was further suggested that the higher education systems contained a second distinction, in terms of the emphasis they gave to the formation of Weber's expert; or to the education of the cultivated.

Here the idea is made explicit that the system of higher education contain principles of exclusion and inclusion, That is, a system characterised by exclusion will contain two sub-principles (a) not all institutions that so aspire may become universities, and (b) not all persons who so aspire can have potentials for the gaining of cultivation.

Here again, it is suggested that the educational systems may be grouped in pairs around the principles of exclusion and inclusion.

Schematically, the presentation is as follows:

| <u>HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEMS</u> | | |
|---------------------------------|------------------|--------------|
| | PRINCIPLES OF | |
| | EXCLUSION | INCLUSION |
| internal | PRESTIGE | PRESTIGE |
| structural | DICHOTOMOUS | GRADED |
| | England, France | USSR, USA |
| ----- | | |
| internal | | |
| epistemological | 'CULTIVATED' (2) | 'EXPERT' (2) |
| | England, France | USSR, USA |

Figure Two

It was suggested at the end of Chapter Three that whilst this overlap between the theories of general education and the configuration of higher education systems could be noted, it was not yet explained.

One way to begin the explanation is to reduce the degree of reification which dominates the sentence phrasing in this section.

Acknowledging that the principles of exclusion and inclusion are given social meaning by individuals and groups, and by the aspirations and expectations which these groups and individuals express, then it is clear that people in the educational system act of norm senders and message carriers. Thus 'children in the schooling system form expectations that...' 'Teachers who work in the schooling system have been trained in higher education systems which are prestige-dichotomous or prestige-graded'. 'Universities in their admission requirements stress...'

Such phrasings, which are rather lengthy and difficult to use consistently in the body of the analysis, makes more explicit how Figures One and Two interrelate in social action. It should finally be noted that message transmission is not a one way system. Messages flow both ways. Thus complaints from university academics that their first year students no longer know sufficient mathematics (cf. the NDEA) or mathematics of the right sort, are messages passing one way through the system. Complaints from school personnel that teacher training systems are inadequate, that they should not train children for jobs are messages the other way. The balance is probably downward.

The Figures thus contain the possibility of social relation by the people that occupy positions in the parts of the educational system which the Figures represent. In both cases

of course a theory of general education is held by more than educationists, just as a theory of what higher education systems ought to embrace is held by more than educationists. But both theories can be construed, also as social systems within which people act.

It is noted that there has still not been offered any suggestion about what gives the patterns suggested in the Figures an external dynamic. That is, some of the possibilities for the internal dynamic - the relation between the two Figures - have been suggested. It is still unclear how the Figures stand in relation to other social forces, forces external to the educational system.

Throughout the work so far, at least since Chapter One, there has been an acknowledgement of 'major social forces', which have not been analysed. Nor will they be here. However, it is appropriate to remember a distinction drawn in Chapter One: that the forces of technology and industrial systems were, for certain classes of society, broadly similar. That is, the 'casual factors' of convergence theory were accepted. What was denied was that the 'effects' would be the same everywhere. It was suggested instead that 'idiosyncracies' would prevail. The quotation used included the following sentence. "Despite idiosyncracies of national history, political structure, and social tradition, in every case the development of education bears the stamp of a dominant pattern imposed by the new and often conflicting pressures of technological and economic change."⁽³⁾ It was also clear as the analysis proceeded that a

number of the major national documents accepted a similar analysis of the 'causal force' of economic factors, including technology and industrialisation.

The analysis of the changing structures of secondary and third level education systems suggest that there was a degree of convergence in education occurring. That is, in all countries examined, rapid change in educational structures included the invention (or retention) of a common school at the lower secondary level. Almost everywhere there was some upgrading of teacher education. There was the addition of short-cycle higher education institutions, especially those devoted to applied studies in science and technology. Structurally, then, there was emerging similar institutional solutions to a similar puzzle: how to adapt to the forces of industrialisation.

It was, however, also noted that almost everywhere adaptation in the normative area, here in theories of general education, was slower. It is suggested that the adaptations remained, also, markedly 'idiosyncratic'. Deeply held beliefs about what ought to be the case were much more difficult to renegotiate than the formal reorganisation of old types of institution; even the act of redefinition, i.e. the invention of new institutions or the relocation (as defined) of old institutions was relatively successfully negotiated.

In other words, little change occurred in theories of general education in the mid-sixties. Why? Despite the

impact of technological and economic change, which is supposed to give the development of education the stamp of a dominant pattern, convergence in theories of general education did not take place. It is accepted that proposals which were somewhat 'convergent' were made, e.g. the Newsom proposals had American themes in them; but these proposals were not accepted widely. How is it that theories of general education most of which were socially constructed in the late nineteenth or early twentieth centuries - at the latest - have such tenacity?

It is suggested that this is because higher education systems in particular stand in different relation to work systems, especially industrial work systems.

Underlying the point is the conception of universities as 'utilitarian' or otherwise. That is the degree to which there are widely held social expectations that universities will be responsive to rapidly changing social and economic needs expressed by a variety of publics. The fuller version of the argument has been developed elsewhere;⁽⁴⁾ and it is judged to be improper to repeat the full argument here. However, its conclusion will be incorporated into the analysis.

The conclusion of the argument was that some university and higher education systems were 'more utilitarian' than others. Specifically, that the higher education systems of the USA and the USSR were socially expected to contribute to the solution of pressing secular issues, were encouraged through a

variety of social mechanisms to involve themselves with industrial work through the generation of useful and applied knowledge, and in this sense had experienced cultural definition of Ashby's 'inner logic' of the university ideal. In contrast, the higher education systems of France and England had, partly through the boundary mechanisms which protect sectors of the higher education system, retained in their most prestigious institutions much of the traditional 'inner logic' of the traditional university ideal. They were, in comparative terms, non-utilitarian. Special sub-sectors of higher education - the non-university sector - had been invented to undertake utilitarian tasks.

This conclusion - the differential relation of various systems of higher education - to the industrial work system, is combined now with another proposition.

This proposition is that university systems, and higher education systems generally, stand in different relationship to the political system on a comparative basis.

The comparative form of the proposition is that whilst all education and higher education systems select and train political elites, in some systems of education the relationship between particular educational institutions and political elite formation is especially tight; and in other national situations, elite selection is mediated less by the education system and more by processes within the political system itself.

Secondly, that those educational systems which do not stress elite formation stress, conversely, citizen formation as the major social role given to the educational system. Concretely, in the USSR and the USA, for example, the theories which inform the social role of the education system in this area are derived from Lenin and Dewey. Both stressed the culturally specific nature of the political assumptions in their nations; both stressed the role of the education system in preparing citizens able to function within such systems.

Thus four propositions have been advanced:

(a) that higher education systems, and especially universities, stand in different relation on a comparative basis to industrial work systems;

(b) that higher education systems, and especially universities, stand in different relation on a comparative basis to political systems;

(c) that education systems, and especially higher education systems, can be distinguished in terms of the emphasis which they give to the utilitarian function or to the traditional 'inner logic' of the traditional university; and

(d) that educational systems, and especially higher education systems, can be distinguished in terms of the emphasis which they give to citizen-formation or perform a rather direct role in political elite-formation.

These propositions can be represented schematically as follows:

| <u>EXTERNAL RELATIONS</u> | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| PRINCIPLES OF | | |
| | EXCLUSION | INCLUSION |
| industrial work system | NON-UTILITARIAN, loose relation with i.w.s. England, France | UTILITARIAN tight relationship with i.w.s. USSR, USA |
| political sub-system relation | POLITICAL ELITE FORMATION loose relation with citizen formation England, France | CITIZEN FORMATION loose relation with political elite selection and formation USSR, USA |

Figure Three

This suggested set of relationships perhaps assists in understanding the differential impact of common major forces of economic and technological change asserted by convergence theorist, even if it is granted that these forces are the 'same' for certain classes of society.

It is suggested that the major structural and normative formation of the educational systems of France and England act,

in their mid-sixties configurations, as insulators to pressures from the technological and industrial system; that the educational systems of the USSR and the USA in their mid-sixties structural and normative configurations act to receive and accept pressures of technological and economic change.

The principles of exclusion and inclusion are extendable into the wider society, outside of the educational system and give the earlier Figures their dynamic, i.e. their theory of external change. There is a selection among the messages from the industrial and political sub-systems. Some of these messages are muted and rejected - as in the French and English cases by the cultural definition of the higher education systems. In the cases of the USSR and the USA, the cultural redefinition of the inner logic of the higher education system ^{SERVES} to amplify and accept some of these messages. In the French and English cases, the principle of exclusion extends to reject urgent pleas about the condition of the industrial system; more carefully phrased, makes the acceptance of these messages a major social process of negotiation and the invention of new institutions. In the USSR and USA cases the principle of inclusion extends to accept relatively quickly pleas that the educational, and higher educational, systems should be adapted to changing economic needs. It was noted earlier that a relative breakdown in this area was Khrushchev's complaint - and his hypothetical solution was also clear and very explicit.

Conversely, (except in the case of Japan which has so far been left out of the analysis) political messages about elite formation were rapidly accepted into the educational systems of France and England in the mid- and late sixties respectively. It was noted that the Robbins report based its recommendations not on an analysis of an economic condition (Britain's relative economic decline in international terms) but on an internal political principle - the possibility of leaving unsatisfied legitimate social demand for higher education from qualified candidates. In France after the political events of 1968, the reform effort was major - in contrast to the rather more modest response of the creation of IUTs in 1966 under continuing economic pressure.

It is, however, accepted that political and economic messages were received in both types of educational system; there was no complete exclusion of one kind of message. Clearly, the NDEA was a response to international political pressure; Robbins proposals for SISTERS and the upgrading of the CATs was a response to economic messages, and Kruschev's theses were in part political messages about the formation of Soviet citizens.

What is being suggested, however, is that the educational systems, through the widely held beliefs of the politicians outside the system and the beliefs of those who work in them, are biased in their receipt of messages. It is also being suggested that the structural supports for these widely held beliefs can be sketched.

It remains to assemble the various Figures into a composite diagram, which may make clearer some of the linear relationships between the various structures described and the theories of general education from which the analysis began.

THEORIES OF GENERAL EDUCATION AND
SELECTED STRUCTURAL RELATIONSHIPS

| | | PRINCIPLE OF | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|
| | | EXCLUSION | INCLUSION |
| EXTERNAL SUB-SYSTEMS | education and higher education | SUB- SYSTEM | |
| | industrial work system | NON-UTILITARIAN loose relation with i.w.s. | UTILITARIAN tight relationship with i.w.s. |
| | political relation | POLITICAL ELITE FORMATION loose relation with citizen formation | CITIZEN FORMATION loose relation with political elite selection and formation |
| | ----- | | |
| INTERNAL EDUCATION SYSTEMS | internal structural | PRESTIGE DICHOTOMOUS | PRESTIGE GRADED |
| | internal epistemological | CULTIVATED | EXPERT |
| | ----- | | |
| THEORIES OF GENERAL EDUCATION | SUB-PRINCIPLE | | |
| | quality valued | of MIND | of SOCIAL RELATION |
| | external area of action | THROUGH AND ON IDEATIONAL WORLD | THROUGH AND ON MATERIAL WORLD |
| | | e.g. England, France | e.g. USSR, USA |

Figure Four

As a matter of logic and aesthetics, it would seem appropriate to extend the analysis into the first Level of educational systems. Clearly theories of general education are preceded by exposure to the theories which inform elementary education systems. Here it would be of some interest to see if a distinction could be drawn in terms of the exclusion and inclusion principles embedded in the psychological theories which informed elementary education. That is, what formal psychological theories were exposed and transmitted by psychologists of education, and what psychological theories widely held by teachers in the schooling system. The initial analytical distinction between psychological theories stressing the significance of inheritance and those stressing the significance of environmental influences could be pursued, comparatively. This very interesting distractor is refused.

What may perhaps be reiterated is that the selected structural relationships outlined in the Figure - that is the sociological relations - are transmitted by persons holding views and beliefs. The social actors hold semi-conscious assumptions about what ought to be the case. In that sense the Figure also represents a social message carrying system. However the major intent is to try and reveal the 'exteriority' and 'social constraint' in the sociological relationships outlined; to reveal hypothetical regularities in the relationships between phenomena in the institutional and normative areas.

The Figure expresses comparative relationships. That is, different national systems of education can be located using the Figure and similarities and differences between these national systems located.

The Figure makes explicit some of the more delicate and complex relations which, it is suggested, exist in the sustaining through time of theories of general education. The Figure offers an interpretation of the complex way in which universities strongly influence other parts of the education system, and makes more concrete the implications of the comment that 'university domination should not be accepted simply as a fact under all circumstances'. Here universities do not dominate; but they are influential. What is of importance in comparative terms, is the relationships in which they stand with other institutions of higher education, and with the industrial and political sub-systems. In addition, and in turn, they stand in different comparative relationship with theories of general education. The centre of the figure, the 'university and higher education system' is not, because of its visual location, to be accorded more weight than the other elements in the Figure.

In so far as weight, or significance is assigned to the elements in the Figure, the weight goes on three elements: theories of general education, the principles of exclusion and inclusion, and the relationships, and consistency of relationships between the three 'sections' of the Figure.

This emphasis is not readily shown in a visual presentation and linear diagram. The techniques which are available, such as the use of colour or the drawing of vertical up- and down-arrows through the complete diagram, require qualification and explanation in turn. It is perhaps worth repeating that such arrows, were they drawn, would run both ways on the diagram. That is, it is not merely that the industrial sub-system exerts (comparatively different) claims on theories of general education; but that the theories of general education widely accepted exert (comparatively different) constraint on the industrial sub-system. Thus any vertical arrows drawn would stretch from top to bottom of the page; and would run in both directions.

It will be noted that the Figure does not handle or locate several of the conventional distinctions of comparative analysis. For example, no distinction is drawn between 'centralised' or 'decentralised' education systems. It is suggested that this is quite proper. The distinction between centralised and decentralised educational systems is an a priori distinction of some crudity occasionally useful for an approach to some themes. Here it is not merely not relevant to the problem; it is also destructive in its categorisation. It directs attention to the wrong data and to the wrong sociological relationships. Similarly, it will be noted that another conventional distinction - between capitalist and socialist systems of education - is not followed. This too is not merely not relevant to this problem; it is also wrong.

The macro-theory within which the Figure stands and from which elements of the Figure are drawn provides a superordinate category within which capitalist and socialist educational systems are not relevant even as sub-categories.

This final analytic element is implicit, thus far, in the Figure. Making the relation explicit permits a final comment for the purposes of this chapter on how theories of general education are sociologically located in abstract terms.

The final analytic element in the modern are three themes from Max Weber's thinking.

Firstly, the distinction between the expert and the cultivated:

Expressed in slogan-like fashion, the 'cultivated man', rather than the 'specialist' has been the end sought by education and has formed the basis of social esteem in such various systems as the feudal, theocratic, and patrimonial structures of dominion: in the English notable administration, in the old Chinese patrimonial bureaucracy, as well as under the rule of demagogues in the so-called Hellenic democracy.

The term 'cultivated man' is used here in a completely value-neutral sense; it is understood to mean solely that the goal of education consists in the quality of a man's bearing in life which was considered 'cultivated', rather than in a specialised training for expertness. The 'cultivated' personality formed the educational ideal, which was stamped by the structure of domination and by the social condition for membership in the ruling stratum. Such education aimed at a chivalrous or an ascetic type; or, at a literary type, as in China; a gymnastic-humanist type, as in Hellas; or it aimed at a conventional type, as in the case of the Anglo-Saxon gentleman. (5)

In contrast to the cultivated type of man, the modern type of man which is demanded by modern bureacratic structures is the 'expert' type of man, whose specialist knowledge of 'rational matter-of-factness'. i.e. secular knowledge of the contemporary world, is measured and attested by complex qualification (and examination) structures:

Educational institutions of the European continent, especially the institutions of higher learning - the universities, as well as technical academies, business colleges, gymnasiums and other middle schools - are dominated and influenced by the need for the kind of 'education' that produces a system of special examinations and the trained expertness that is increasingly indispensable for modern bureacracy. (6)

Thus this first element in Weber's thinking makes an explicit appearance on the Figure, in the distinction between the 'cultivated' and 'expert' definition of the internal epistemological sub-principles which inform higher education systems.

It will be noted that on this point Weber's application of his distinction has been rejected. It is not accepted that throughout Europe the expert man is the type of man celebrated in higher education systems. It is conceded that there has indeed grown up in Europe, and in the United States, Japan and the USSR , a complex system of examinations in education. And it is conceded that in all the countries under discussion there are major, modern bureacratic structures. Yet it is held that in an important way, Weber was in error.

The suggestion made here is that in France, and in England, the educational system took on apparently rationalised and expert characteristics (for example, in its selection and sorting procedures and in that efforts are still underway to make these seem even more rationalised, based in measured 'expertise' and thus socially 'just'). It is however, argued that these structures were added to a culturally biased (cf. French rationalist, and English type) of 'cultivated' man. It is these types of cultivated man which the 'rationalised' structures of selection identify and education. The rationalised structures of selection, which are public and thus in Weber's terms 'de-mystified', legitimate the continuing selection of an earlier, culturally framed, 'type of man'.

Thus, although the terms expert and cultivated have been taken from Weber, they have been applied, for the reasons stated, in a way which diverges from the use Weber gives them in the passages quoted. It is held that - in their comparative application - the terms distinguish between European systems of education in their sub-specification of the definition of the contents of 'cultivated'; and that the important distinction is between the USSR and USA as 'expert' systems of education - as compared with France and England.

Why this is so requires the introduction of the second theme in Weber's thinking which is particularly relevant to this analysis. In his discussion of Chinese Confucian education Weber writes:

Historically, the two polar opposites in the field of educational ends are: to awaken charisma, that is, heroic qualities or magical gifts; and, to impart specialised expert training. The first type corresponds to the charismatic structure of domination; the latter type corresponds to the rational and bureaucratic (modern) structure of domination...

The charismatic procedure of ancient magical asceticism and the hero trials, which sorcerers and warrior heroes applied to boys, tried to aid the novice to acquire a 'new soul', in the animist sense, and hence, to be reborn. Expressed in our language, this means that they merely wished to awaken and to test a capacity which was considered a purely personal gift of grace. For one can neither teach nor train for charisma. Either it exists in nuce, or it is infiltrated through a miracle of magical rebirth - otherwise it cannot be attained.

Specialised and expert schooling attempts to train the pupil for practical usefulness for administrative purposes - in the organization of public authorities, business offices, workshops, scientific or industrial laboratories, disciplined armies. In principle, this can be accomplished with anybody, though to varying extent.

The pedagogy of cultivation, finally, attempts to educate a cultivated type of man, whose nature depends on the decisive stratum's respective ideal of cultivation. And this means to educate a man for a certain internal and external deportment in life. In principle this can be done with everybody, only the goal differs. If a separate stratum of warriors form the decisive status group - as in Japan - education will aim at making the pupil a stylized knight and courtier, who despises the pen-pushers as the Japanese Samurai have despised them. (7)

The quotation was extended because there is again a refusal of part of the Weberian interpretation. It is held that - and is made explicit in the Figure - there is a difference between the potential distribution of the two

types of education. It is not accepted, given the analysis Weber offers subsequently on the details of Chinese Confucian education, that the concept of 'the cultivated' is as selectively-neutral as Weber suggests. The point is not merely that selection actually took place in systems of education stressing cultivation: it is also that the concept of cultivation retains something of the elements of charisma - the theme of awakening magical gifts. Thus the point is retained that the 'cultivated' epistemology in the Figure contains principles of exclusion: because, just as there is a subsequent overlay of rationalistic surface features on the continued selection of the cultivated, so there is a cultivated overlay on the charismatic elements identified by Weber in his polar type.

Obviously in practice, the wide acceptance of Platonic assumptions in Europe reinforced this embryonic theoretical distinction: only those who typically had inherited certain gifts held, in nuce, the important potentials for gaining cultivation. Thus cultivated status should not be, could not be, and was not attained by all.

The second theme in the quotation was the main point: the Weberian linkage between types of education and structures of domination. Weber suggested that the types of education followed the definition given to them by the 'decisive stratum's respective ideal of cultivation'. (How

this was and is done in concrete cases is the concern of a considerable professional literature currently; though not all the literature is self-conscious in terms of the Weberian question. Most of this literature is conventionally-organised 'history of education'.) Thus for Weber the examples included, as indicated, an 'ascetic type' or a 'gymnast-humanist type' and so on.

Similarly the creation in Europe, especially from the nineteenth century of (modern) bureaucratic rational structures, meant that the 'dominant status group' renegotiated the balance of its requirements between the cultivated and the expert. The Chinese Confucian education was:

... of a similar, yet of a more specific nature than, for instance, the humanist educational qualifications of the Occident.

In Germany, such an education, until recently and almost exclusively, was a prerequisite for the official career leading to positions of command in civil and military administration. At the same time this humanist education has stamped the pupils who were to be prepared for such careers as belonging socially to the cultured status group. In Germany, however - and this is a very important difference between China and the Occident - rational and specialized expert training has been added to, and in part has displaced, this educational status qualification. (8), (9)

In other words, in particular conditions the 'dominant status group' renegotiates gradually some of its requirements, some of its definitions, of the kind of education preferred.

Under other, particular conditions, the dominant status group itself changes.

It is suggested that in the USSR and the USA this change occurred. There, in historical terms, the new dominant status groups redefined the educated 'type' required. The dominant status groups shifted, explicitly and consciously, the expectations they held for the work of the education system - towards the production of Weber's 'experts'. In France and England, in contrast, as the politically dominant status groups did not change, there was some reluctant concession to the production of 'experts', but a marked latent stress on the continued education of the cultivated. (The details of these negotiations and renegotiations have been separately traced: in late nineteenth century and early twentieth century USA, in the immediate post-revolutionary USSR; in nineteenth century France and England.⁽¹⁰⁾ It is suggested that a comparative historical analysis would be of great interest.)

In the process of these negotiations and renegotiations and rejections, the politically dominant status groups confirmed or rejected the structure of domination as this was defined within the education system through the balance between the education of the cultivated and the training of the expert.

Crucially, this affected the definition of theories of general education.

Theories of general education are, in sociological terms, statements of extreme political sensitivity expressing and revealing an important aspect of the structure of domination.

The principles of exclusion and inclusion contained within theories of general education express educational and political principles of inclusion and exclusion.

A significant shift in theories of general education marks a significant shift in the structure of domination; and in the political principles of exclusion and inclusion.

Theories of general education are thus not merely sociologically framed, constrained and supported by the interna of the educational system as outlined in the Figure; and not merely framed in some reciprocity with the externa of the industrial and some aspects of the political sub-systems.

Theories of general education are sociologically constrained and supported (and on occasion contradicted) by the externa of the politically dominant status group(s).

The important and direct relationship of theories of general education is thus with politics; not economics, in the sense of a conventional economic crisis, or economics in the simplistic technological determinism of the weaker kinds of convergence theory.

Economic crises, and continuing major economic structural change is likely to bring into public salience discussion of the theory of general education. Political crises and major political structural change are more likely to change the theory of general education.

This is certainly a testable hypothesis. As an hypothesis in the conventional meaning of the term it can be checked against historical evidence.

As an hypothesis in the Holmesian sense of a 'solution to a problem' it is not particularly useful. It is a hypothetical solution to all Holmesian problems. Nor is the hypothesis noticeably related to specific initial conditions, one of which was in Chapter Two identified as the 1944 Education Act. Nor does the hypothesis seem especially wise. If it is difficult enough to anticipate consequences within the methodological frame accepted here, it is even more difficult to anticipate accurately the consequences of major structural political change.

The proposition then should be understood less as a solution and more as part of the analysis of contexts, anticipating the identification of specific initial conditions in Chapter Five. What the proposition does help to clarify is, firstly, an aspect of the social tenacity of theories of general education and secondly, one of the less immediate sociological relations in which theories of general education

may stand; and the social contexts in which - as in the USA and the USSR - the theories may undergo change.

It is of equal importance to acknowledge that theories of general education are 'multi-relationship phenomena'. The selection and identification of one of these relationships - with politically dominant status groups - is of importance, analytically. Subsequent over-simplification of all of the preceding analysis to the proposition, 'change status groups and theories of general education will change' is absolutely improper, analytically. This is not the argument. The argument was and is comparative, i.e. comprehend as delicately as possible similarities and differences (between nation states) in the theories of general education which are widely held by social actors. And here the argument is the sociological comparative analysis of the social contexts in which these theories are held, i.e. comprehend as delicately as possible similarities and differences in the institutional regularities which provide sociological support for a 'philosophy', here theories of general education. The sociological supports are multiple and complex, mutually interrelated, and also - it is hypothesised - differential in their impact depending on whether a time-frame of relative stability is being analysed (as here with these countries) or a time frame of relatively instability is being analysed (cf. Algeria or China or Cuba in identified recent decades).

Given, then, that a caveat has been made about the over-interpretation of theories of general education through one, among many, of the sociological relationships in which they stand, the third and final theme from Max Weber may be introduced.

Weber writes:

Behind all the present discussions of the foundations of the educational system, the struggle of the 'specialist type of man' against the older type of 'cultivated man' is hidden at some decisive point. (11)

The immediate argument, of course, is that one area or point where this struggle is somewhat obscured is in theories of general education, comparatively considered.

Weber continues:

This fight is determined by the irresistably expanding bureacratization of all public and private relations of authority and by the ever increasing importance of expert and specialized knowledge... (12)

and three paragraphs later writes:

the bureacratic structure is everywhere a late product of development. The further back we trace our steps, the more typical is the absence of bureacracy and officialdom in the structure of domination. Bureacracy has a 'rational' character: rules, means, ends, matter-of-factness dominate its bearing. Everywhere its origin and its diffusion have therefore had 'revolutionary' results, in a special sense, which has still to be discussed. This is the same influence which the advance of rationalism in general has had. The march of bureacracy has destroyed structures of domination which had no rational character, in the special sense of the term. (13)

Weber distinguishes types of rational action.⁽¹⁴⁾

In this context, the significant meaning of rational action is the sense of employing appropriate means to achieve a given end, "that is, the agent may use his expectations of the behaviour of external objects and other human beings as 'conditions' or 'means' to achieve as the outcome his own rationally pursued and calculated purposes,"⁽¹⁵⁾ "A person acts rationally in the 'means-end' sense when his action is guided by consideration of ends, means and secondary consequences; when, in acting, he rationally assesses means in relation to ends, ends in relation to secondary consequences, and, finally, the various possible ends in relation to each other."⁽¹⁶⁾

'Rationalism' or rationalization is the macro-historical form of this process. Rationalization is the demystification of the world, the secularisation of major social processes and social sub-systems. Bureacracy represents the principle in action in the organisation of one form of authority; capitalism in its ideal or pure form, with its careful calculation of means-end relations in terms of profit, is another version of the same process; and the two processes are linked in their modern form: "large modern capitalist enterprises are themselves in most cases unrivalled models of strict bureacratic organisation."⁽¹⁷⁾ In turn, "among the necessary conditions of capitalism in its specifically modern Western form is obviously, and very importantly, the development of certain technical

possibilities."⁽¹⁸⁾ These technical possibilities offer possibilities of pre-calculation, and exact calculation. "What that in fact means, however, is that it depends on the peculiar features of Western science, especially the mathematically and experimentally exact natural sciences with their precise rational foundations."⁽¹⁹⁾ It is suggested, here, that the phenomena apply, by extension to contemporary societies characterised by socialist forms of planning - attempts at precise pre-calculation of means-endsrelations for a given goal, and to the extensive bureacratic systems of socialist societies. For Weber, rationalism was an extremely pervasive force of history, affecting for example not merely the legal structures which were necessary for the definition and sustaining of legal-rational forms of domination, but also the rationalisation of religion and the styles of tension between bureacracy and democracy, And, of course, education.

What is being suggested here is that the educational systems of the USA and the USSR have, in the sociological relations outlined in the figure, established patterns which make them more responsive to the Weberian forms of both rational action and rationalisation; and that in contrast the educational systems of France and England in the sociological relations outlined in the figure possess both structures of higher education, and theories of general education which are less 'rationalized' in the Weberian sense.

The 'major social forces' of the convergence theorists are thus subordinated to and subsumed within Weber's concept of rationalization, as the dynamic which gives the figure at the highest level of abstraction its theory of social change.

Selected applications and implications

Japan has not yet been located in terms of the Figure. The omission was deliberate. The difficulties of constructing the abstract elements of the 'theory of exclusion', whilst at the same time keeping the line of argument relatively clear were sufficient in themselves. Simultaneously to try and locate what is probably - in terms of the particular themes being analysed here - the most puzzling of the five systems of education was judged to be unwieldy, and therefore unwise. Equally it is acknowledged that locating Japan properly in terms of the Figure calls for a full essay, a separate chapter. But it should be noted that to accept such a task would be to break the logic of the analysis. The task is not to try and fully understand Japan, but to analyse specific initial conditions in a number of contexts. The analysis of specific initial conditions in context is further subordinated to a particular problem-statement. It is the problem statement which determines the line of analysis. Japan and the tentative theory about the sociological relations of 'general education' are parts of that line of analysis; not themselves the point of the analysis. The location of Japan in terms of the figure is therefore conducted with some abruptness, and as with the other countries, data assembled earlier is not repeated, merely used.

Firstly, it is suggested that both the traditional theory of general education and the contemporary theory as represented in statements of the 'ideal Japanese' permit the locating of Japan in Figure One as stressing the sub-principle of social relation. The importation of Confucian thought and the strong reaffirmation of obligation networks in the contemporary statement suggests the propriety of the classification. It is, however, immediately noted that the social obligation stressed, in its cultural framing, is that of hierarchy (not relative equality as in the USSR and the USA).

Secondly, it is suggested that in terms of the sub-principle 'external arena of action' Japan emphasised in its traditional theory of general education action through and on the ideational world; and in its contemporary statement, with its emphasis on work, the use of talent and the effort to achieve has adapted parts of the samurai ethic to stress action through and on the material world. Indeed elsewhere it has been argued that the samurai ethic appropriately adapted and modified in the Meiji period provided the equivalent of the 'protestant ethic' for Japan, and was one of the ingredients in its relative success in adapting rapidly to 'modernization' and industrialisation. (20) It may then be the case that Japan retains in more equal balance than the other countries under review both external arenas of action, in its theory of general education. Obviously it is the case that all theories of general education retain

both elements. Earlier it was argued that the relative emphasis in the USSR and the USA was different from the relative emphasis in France and England. Here it is being suggested that Japan has managed to establish a relatively equal emphasis. Thus Japan is atypical in the definition of both sub-principles. Stressing quality of social relation, it combines this with unequal relations compounding the tendency towards inequality present in the traditional, perhaps charismatic, concept of Jikaku.

In terms of Figure Two a commentary on Japan was offered in the second half of Chapter Three. There it was suggested that the Japanese higher education system was characterised by being, in its internal structural principles, 'prestige-dichotomous' and in its internal epistemological principles, 'cultivated'. Expertness seemed, in the earlier analysis, to be provided after formal education, in the place of work. However, it is additionally noted that the Japanese higher education system underwent very rapid expansion, of an artificial kind because of post-war American convictions that Japanese education was undemocratic. So Japan had added, in an atypical way, foreign assumptions and institutions drawn from a prestige-graded higher education system. The mix of this innovation with older traditions means that it is possible to suggest the OECD examiners in the passage quoted earlier understressed the prestige-dichotomies of Japanese higher education.

The system is a double-dichotomous system, with prestige-grading in its lowest sectors. In the public

university sector, only the older established universities were allowed to award Ph.Ds. These graduate school universities were organised around the 'chair', and took the name kozasei universities. The newly created universities in the post-war period were to be teaching universities, and their basic unit was the academic course. They took the name gakkamokusei universities. Teaching rather than research was the function assigned to them by the Ministry. This "... had the effect, despite the new system's egalitarian ideology, of perpetuating the dualistic pattern of the old system. Significantly, since the Occupation reform not a single gakkamokusei national university has been "promoted" to the kozasei level."⁽²¹⁾

So a dichotomy was established among the national universities themselves. In addition to this dichotomy there was the dichotomy between the public and private sectors which the OECD examiners stressed. It has been the private sector and the junior college system which has expanded markedly in Japan to absorb the demographic impact of the 'democratisation' of higher education; and it is in this lower sector of the higher education system that competition has produced within one of the sectors of one of the dichotomies, the phenomenon of prestige-gradation. The major reform plans of the sixties and seventies (the Central Council for Education in 1963, and 1971, and the OECD examiners' arguments) have addressed themselves to these dichotomies. The Japanese plans seem to point to a reinforcement of the traditional patterns, albeit in the name of 'diversification'.⁽²²⁾

The reinforcement of the traditional patterns is of some importance in locating Japanese higher education in terms of Figure Three. Japan is again a particularly difficult case. The efforts of industry and industrial pressure groups to move higher education into a more direct utilitarian relationship with the industrial work system were, as earlier indicated, strenuous in the mid-sixties. The pressures seem, however, to have affected mainly the upper secondary school, and the lower sectors of the prestige-graded parts of Japanese higher education. (23)* The stress in the prestigious university sector on a non-utilitarian (direct) relationship with the industrial work system seems to have survived. But there is a complicating factor in the Japanese case, occasionally referred to as 'degreeocracy'. (24)* This pattern of placement in occupation through the prestige of the university from which graduation occurred means that, whilst universities are rather unresponsive to the utilitarian demands of the industrial work system, they stand in exceptionally tight relationship with the occupational system - through their placement and not their knowledge function.

Finally, in terms of Figure Three, the balanced double stress on both citizen formation and elite formation in Japanese education should be noted. The 'political relation' of elite selection is well attested in the literature, (25) and has surfaced in much of the preceding analysis. What perhaps needs emphasis here is the tight relation with citizen formation. The point is put well in condensed form by Passin,

in a discussion of Arinori Mori's conception of the new educational system of Japan in the late nineteenth century:

What he did was to establish a dual system: on the one hand a compulsory sector heavily indoctrinated in the spirit of the traditional morality and nationalism, on the other, a university sector for the elite in an atmosphere of the greatest possible academic freedom and critical rationalism. Although the relative freedom for the university involved a certain degree of risk, Mori felt that it was minimized by the fact that all the students would come to it only after a thorough nationalistic indoctrination in the lower schools. The gap between higher and lower education was bridged by the normal schools, and to this Mori devoted a great deal of attention. Normal school students, who were state-supported, lived in dormitories under strict military-style discipline. Mori's solution has resulted in that curious dichotomy between the relative academic freedom of the Japanese university and the severely controlled and indoctrinated system of lower education. (26)*

The pathologies of this system of citizen formation was marked in the inter-war period. It was these pathologies which the American Occupation authorities tried to correct. The debate and the American reforms were about the content of citizen education - not the emphasis on it.

It is accepted that some version of the Mori policies were pursued in France, Germany and England in the nineteenth century. It is possible that the Japanese undertook the policy with a greater degree of conscious awareness and explicit intent than elsewhere - and retained the policies longer, in more careful balance.

Overall, then, in terms of Figure Four, it is suggested that Japan can be located, but that this locating is

by no means a straightforward task. Partly this is the case because the Japanese educational system in its structures and in its relations between the structures manages to a notable extent to fulfil double roles in most of the categories. It is finally suggested that this was, in the plans of the Meiji reformers - especially Mori - a conscious policy; and part of the problem (sic) which the Japanese posed to themselves: how to maintain a balance 'Eastern morality and Western technique'.

In this way both the Imperial Rescript and the 'image of the ideal Japanese' which provided a theory of general education can be seen as reflecting quite self-consciously the concerns of a politically dominant status group. The balance between 'the expert' and 'the cultivated' is, it is suggested, therefore deliberate and the patterning of institutions as complex as the aim.

In the ways described, it seems as if Japan has made a remarkable adaptation to some of the phenomena characteristic of 'rationalization', whilst sustaining mores and institutional patterns in education which are not 'de-mythologised'. The most spectacular and publicised aspect of this is the way in which the University of Tokyo acts in an almost ideal-typical Confucian manner to convert secular educational certificates into an institutionalised guarantee of charisma, acceptable to both private enterprise and government-level employers. Within the general frame provided by such charisma-conferring institutions, secular education finds a place, ie. adjustment of other institutions, such as technical colleges or the less

prestigious private universities permit, some of the pressures of 'rationalization' to be met. That the OECD examiners suggested various ways to change the university system toward greater equality (for individuals and individual institutions) is understandable. The consequences of democratisation would, from the analysis presented here, be of extreme social importance. Japanese policies in higher education since the visit of the OECD examiners do not seem to have changed markedly in the sensitive areas.

The case of Japan may now be combined with the more general framework of the analysis in this chapter to direct attention to issues which are judged to conceal potentially important specific initial conditions.

Japan represents a case of the resurgence of a 'weaker' tradition within education. Here, the resurgence of the utilitarian element (within the modernising Meiji period) became visible in fresh form in pleas from industrialists in the mid-to-late sixties for more science and technology to be taught within the schooling system. This was not dissimilar from France and England in the period. The response of the Japanese Ministry of Education was a double one: to alter curricula, and in particular to strengthen the provision of technical studies in the upper second level and in short-cycle higher education. At the same time, the traditional theory of general education was, through the 'image of the ideal Japanese' strengthened, and the hierarchies of higher education left undisturbed.

In other words, the resurgence of the 'weaker tradition' and the 'forces of economic convergence' that it represented drew a response in educational reform. But, at the same time, insulation of the potentials of the reform occurred. There was explicit reaffirmation of the theory of general education; the prestige-dichotomous university and higher education system was left unreformed; and the linkages between the industrial and political sub-systems remained, in their main features, unchanged.

This should be contrasted with the relatively smaller use (or availability) of insulation mechanisms in France in approximately the same period. In France the creation of the IUTs represented a similar institutional response to similar pressures. But the sequences before and after the reform were somewhat different. In France there was no major national reaffirmation (in a culturally appropriate and specific fashion) of the traditional theory of general education. The minor debate continued. In France the introduction of the IUTs was followed by the 'events of May' 1968. The response to these events included the Law of Orientation which attempted to redefine the structural principles on which higher education should be organised. The impact of this seems to have been muddled. ⁽²⁷⁾ But this in itself is part of the point; insulation mechanisms for reducing the significance of 'expert' epistemologies in the higher education systems which had hitherto embraced cultivation were - for particular reasons in the French case - not readily available. And thirdly, in the French case, structural reorganisation at the lower second

level had exposed even more forcefully the question of what might constitute an appropriate theory of general education; and lent some force to the theorising of the minor debate. The Haby reforms can be seen in this sense as an attempt to restabilise the situation, to exert some insulation elements in the change processes.

In other words, Figure Four if it is not used simplistically directs attention to interrelationships of a non-linear sort.

Change can occur in any level or sector of the Figure. In the example just used, Japan, it occurred in the initial effort by industrialists to re-emphasise utilitarian elements in a theory of general education. Other sectors of the Figure now become relevant categories, i.e. the categories direct attention to areas of change and non-change which may strengthen or supplement the initial change process; or contradict it. In the Japanese case, the most significant change other than an alteration in the politically dominant status group, would have been in the reform of the University of Tokyo and the other Imperial universities. Similarly, it will be remembered in the French case that the Grandes Ecoles were left unreformed by the 1968 Law. However, in the French case, other categories in the Figure, which represent potential areas of insulation, underwent prior, parallel or subsequent change. The change process may or may not have been halted by the Haby intervention. What is important in the French case is not merely the verbal definition of a theory of general education provided by Haby,

but whether the associated structural recommendations confirm or contradict (through insulation) the reform processes underway.

Conversely, in the USA or the USSR the emergence (for whatever reasons) of a prestige-dichotomous higher education system would have implications for the theory of general education; whether these implications became fully manifest would depend on the degree to which the other sectors of the figure changed or did not change, fulfilled or failed to fulfil a potential role as insulators of the consequences of a shift to prestige-dichotomy. Similarly in the USA and the USSR any strengthening of the role of the higher education system in the formation of political elites (not as a stated goal, but as a sociological fact) has implications for the internal structural characteristics of higher education systems, and also for the balance of qualities valued in the theory of general education.

In changing situations then, affirmation or partial affirmation of a theory of general education, or silence are important sociological (as well as normative) acts. Affirmation confirms an insulation mechanism; silence or acceptance that the minor debate is for the moment sufficient, is a failure (on the part of a national government) to strengthen one obstacle in and to a change sequence. In particular, a failure to reassert a traditional theory of general education whilst change occurs in several sectors of the Figure is to increase the likelihood that some aspects, at least, of the traditional theory of general education will be renegotiated.

Overall, it is perhaps sufficient to reiterate two points. Theories of general education are semi-conscious assumptions in the minds of men. It is also suggested that such theories can be approached comparatively through the sociological categories of the Figure. These categories identify some of the other phenomena to which theories of general education are structurally related. The framework suggested is neither definitive (it has been constructed and 'tested' only in retrospect, not prospect); nor determinist (change can begin in any sector of the model).

Secondly, the question was raised in Chapter Three of whether the specific initial conditions (in which theories of general education might be changed) could be located. The figure gives a sketch-in-principle of such specific initial conditions. Each system of education discussed was located in terms of the figure, retrospectively.

How, perhaps whether, the figure provides a point of entry into the specific initial conditions of England is the concern of the next chapter.

CHAPTER FIVE. Solutions: toward inclusion

In fact a Dewey was needed who could work out a new rationale appropriate to the new institutions which had evolved from the time the common school movement was initiated. (1)

Brian Holmes

The preceding quotation is offered neither as a modest statement of intent by this author nor as an indication of appropriate expectations. Rather, the quotation is used to point to the magnitude of a complete analysis of the specific initial conditions in which a problem-solution is offered. There are a number of limitations on the terms in which a solution will be sought. These limitations are framed by the problem and the earlier analysis. It is of use to review the later stages of the analysis.

A Review

The problem was established in asynchrony between relatively rapidly changing institutions and relatively slowly changing norms, i.e. theories of general education.

At the end of Chapter Two, after the stage of problem analysis, an outline was given of a simplistic logic of choices of solution. Either the relatively rapid change in institutions could be slowed down; or the relatively slow change in norms could be speeded up. After noting other logical possibilities such as the recommendation of no-action,

and identifying a number of simple assumptions, an initial solution was selected: more rapid and appropriate change in the normative area.

In the comparative analysis of the problem-in-context (section one of Chapter Three) attention was focussed on both institutions and norms. The analysis was carried out not by comparing countries directly with each other, but by analysing each in terms of the stated problem. Thus for each country there was identification of both change and non-change in institutions, and change and non-change in norms. The problem was located. In addition, in the case of each country other than England, it was noted that the particular contemporary theory of general education might be an 'alternative solution'; more correctly, one of several potential solutions. This identification was made for the USA, the USSR, and Japan. In each case, in other words, the analysis followed the emphasis suggested by the 'initial solution' of Chapter Two. Attention was given to the normative area.

France was an exception, in that the judgement was not offered that the theory of general education in France provided an alternative solution. The epistemological principles of closure in the French theory of general education (Cartesian rationalism) and the specific conditions of England, implicitly approached in Chapter Two, combined to suggest that the French solution would compound English difficulties rather than resolve them. Therefore the French theory of general

education was not accepted as an 'alternative' solution in the first section of Chapter Three. However the inclusion of France in the analysis of problem was of considerable interest and point, as the example drew attention to a system of education in which redefinition of both lower second level and level three institutions was proceeding at the same time as efforts to redefine a theory of general education. This was also the case in England. The French example served to highlight some of the implications of institutional change for normative renegotiation.

It was on normative renegotiation, however, that the main emphasis was placed, and this theme continued into section two, of Chapter Three. There was some initial discussion in that section of the dynamics of educational systems in relation to theories of general education in various national contexts. In particular, an initial effort was undertaken to extend the account of the various national specific initial conditions in which the problem was framed. Attention was directed mainly to the internal dynamics of the educational system. One aspect of the problem received particular attention: how is a philosophy, i.e. here, a theory of general education sociologically sustained by institutional arrangements. Following suggestions in the literature and elsewhere, a tentative answer was sought in the comparative configurations of higher education systems. Some patternings of the relationships between higher education institutions and

theories of general education were suggested by the specific initial conditions in different national contexts, but the dynamics of the relationships were not clear even granting that the area does not lend itself to simple analysis.

Therefore the analysis was extended, in a relatively abstract form, into Chapter Four. Attention remained on the main theme: what are the specific initial conditions in which theories of general education are to be understood in a variety of national contexts. In context, what are the specific initial conditions which should be taken into account before solutions are proposed for change in theories of general education? The mode of analysis built on the conclusions of section two of Chapter Three, but made more explicit a question of openness and closure which, it was suggested, had been somewhat obscured in the problem, although visible from time to time in various parts of the analysis.

These hints about openness and closure in various parts of the analysis were pulled together, reviewed and made somewhat more coherent. They were, in the form of principles of exclusion and inclusion, used to systematise some suggested, hypothetical relationships between theories of general education and a range of sociological supports and constraints on these theories. The analysis was macro-sociological and comparative. In itself, it anticipated, rather than carried

out, the particular identification of particular specific initial conditions in a particular national context. The Chapter concluded with a commentary on some of the possible reciprocal relationships between the two halves of the problem statement, hitherto held rather distinct so that problem identification could be carried out and the specific initial conditions of normative non-change identified.

The substance of the Chapter concentrated on the interrelations of theories of general education, higher education systems and two sub-systems, the industrial work system and the political sub-system, especially in the balance accorded to elite formation of citizen formation. In turn these possible relations were placed in a broader framework of three ideas drawn from Max Weber: distinctions between the expert and the cultivated; the significance of politically dominant status groups; and, finally the broad social process Weber termed 'rationalization'. These categorisations were also organised around a judgement about whether they expressed, sociologically in their effects, principles of inclusion or exclusion. It was possible to locate the systems of education under discussion in terms of this framework. That is, the framework had some utility for comparative analysis. Under ideal circumstances the framework would be tested more carefully with special reference to Japan, a most difficult case for analysis; and the analysis extended by using

the concept of social-time to investigate particular variants of the renegotiation of theories of general education in late nineteenth USA and early twentieth century USSR.

In the process of this general analysis carried out in Chapter Four the implications, and perhaps some of the limitations of the simpler forms of convergence theory became clearer. Whilst institutional change, especially of second and third level structures of education, seemed to show some patterns of convergence, it seemed less and less likely that convergence theory even asked the right questions about normative change. Much more promising, despite their high level of generality, seemed to be the Weberian theses.

The Weberian theses directed attention to structures of domination which combined economic, political, technological and administrative elements; and which directed attention to cultural questions. In particular, the way in which the Weberian theses directed attention to the expression of structures of domination in the education system itself was valuable, and the effort to construct 'a theory of exclusion' was informed by these ideas.

The proposition was put forward that theories of general education were important and delicate political statements, which incorporated into the educational system political principles of exclusion and inclusion as well as, or in the form of, educational principles of inclusion and

exclusion. It was noted that these principles reflected the definitions of cultivation, in the cases of France and England, negotiated in an historical period earlier than the contemporary period under review. These definitions of cultivation had been adapted somewhat to the pressures and processes of 'rationalization'; but the cultural framing of the 'specialist' or 'expert' defined within the educational system and favoured by it retained much of the patterning established by politically dominant status groups of an earlier period. The consequence was a double one. The framing of theories of general education, and the ways in which they were institutionally supported tended in England and France to mute and muffle messages from the industrial work system; though the changing industrial work system was in some discontinuity with theories of general education and higher education structures and ~~was~~ thus 'economics' was typically invoked in pleas for reform. Secondly, theories of general education were especially sensitive to political change, and whilst, implicitly (the historical evidence was not reviewed), could be continually adapted in small particulars without losing their general form, they were highly vulnerable in times of major political restructuring; especially of course in times of a change in the politically dominant status group.

It was suggested that the different type of theory of general education held in the USSR and USA was a consequence of this kind of shift in the politically dominant

status group, and that thus the central principles of the theory of general education had been renegotiated in both countries. It had earlier been suggested that, whilst the higher education systems of the USSR and the USA stressed the training of experts, it was not clear what the theories of general education stressed. It was suggested that it was not, of course, cultivation. In this later discussion, the idea was put forward that what theories of general education stressed was action on the material world, the importance of social relation, and citizen formation. It was secondly suggested, as would follow from the bureacratic aspects of both socialism and capitalism and from the calculability which they both stress in different ways, that both the USSR and the USA had moved further in their educational systems into the 'de-mythologising of the world' i.e. Weberian rationalization. In consequence the theories of general education reflected better, and were inclined to amplify and accept messages from the economic and industrial work system. Thus the impact of the forces identified in convergence theory is divergent, in the ways described, among the countries under review.

Finally Japan was briefly analysed in terms of the themes presented in Figure Four. It was suggested that Japan's balancing of the 'cultivated' and the expert, the use to which a prestige-dichotomous higher educational system was put and the double-stress on citizen formation and political elite selection was deliberate, a product of

the theorising of the politically dominant status group of the Meiji period. In the Japanese case, the two halves of the problem statement were reintroduced and explicitly related through the concept of insulation. This concept was invented and used in an attempt to indicate that, given educational change could begin in any sector of the figure, insulation (or failure to insulate) could occur in the other sectors. France was suggested as an example of the non-insulation of change in the sixties. In that sense France and Japan were examples of ways in which changes in the two halves of the problem statement might have some reciprocity of interaction, or ways in which this reciprocity might be controlled (insulated).

This review of the discussion reviews also the terms through which the specific initial conditions of England will be identified. The framing of the problem, and the way in which it is operationalised, directs attention to some specific initial conditions and not others. Here an effort has been made to locate comparatively the specific initial conditions (especially within education systems, as necessary outside of them) which sustain theories of general education. As a matter of logic, and as a matter of necessity so that the analysis can proceed, other potentially relevant specific initial conditions are located in a ceteris paribus clause. It is accepted, but not analysed, that major economic or international political instability might occur. It is accepted but not analysed that the social

problems of education are being redefined and are likely to become major claimants on such educational resources as are available, and so on. Such issues are not judged to be irrelevant; they are merely made temporarily so by intellectual location as ceteris paribus.

For the same reasons no effort will now suddenly be made to approach specific initial conditions through 'futures analysis', or to approach 'solutions' in any other way than the line of analysis would suggest. There is no intention to hypothesise or fictionalise a completely new system of teacher training; an alternate school structure; or suddenly to enter into a detailed discussion of curriculum practice. In a particular instance in Chapter One, the complaint was entered that it was not possible to see how a specific recommendation (rather than other solutions) followed from a line of analysis. It is hoped that here the line of analysis determines the solutions suggested.

England: specific initial conditions

It is accepted that some of the Weberian forces of rationalization are both suffused within and having current effects on the social structures of England. Both the capitalist forms and the socialist forms of production which are co-mixed in the economy represent such forces. It is also accepted that some institutions, such as the church, the unions and affective institutions such as the family and sexual

relations are less completely rationalized than, for example, the armed forces. It is expected that pressures toward rationalization will continue whether through the admission of women to senior positions in the church hierarchy, the redefinition of the unions' position in law, the interventionist approach to families through social work and the clarification of sexual rights and relations through codification in public documents. It is expected that parallel processes will affect education.

It is accepted that an economic crisis of public salience will continue for a decade. This is not to say it will continue in its present form; merely that a particular version of an economic crisis will receive salience. As a corollary, there will be intermittent claims that the educational system should respond to the crisis. Some of these claims will take the form of expectations that the theory of general education be changed.

It is accepted, following Guttsman, that until the last decade there was no significant difference in the politically dominant status groups in the country; both political parties, for example, drew their senior members from the same status groups; and both in the last two decades have changed at approximately the same rates. It is however noted that the left-wing of the current Labour Party shows aspirations to alter the status group membership of the Party. Whether it will succeed (a) in parliamentary terms and (b) in conjunction with other groups in redefining the

nationally dominant political status group is unclear. If it succeeds, implications for the theory of general education have already been hypothesised. That is, it is probable that the theory of general education will be 'rationalized'; and likely that this will be one of a number of reform proposals which will, in education, stress citizenship formation, the reduction of prestige dichotomies in higher education and so on. With this exception (and subject of course to the ceteris paribus clause), there is little likelihood of a shift in the politically dominant status group.

However, it should be noted that there is a divergence of view, within the politically dominant status group, about how best to respond to the forces of rationalization. One sub-section of the group identifies solutions in the bureaucratic i.e. rationalized forms of socialism within a national egalitarian conception of Gemeinschaft; the other sub-group identifies solutions in the Weberian rationalized efficiencies of capitalism within a national meritocratic conception of Gesellschaft.

This distinction is of importance and affects the ways in which structures i.e. second and third level institutions, of education are rationalized. In turn this has implications for other specific initial conditions under which theories of general education may be renegotiated.

Equally importantly, it should be noted that neither sub-group has in a major way attempted so far directly to

restate or reaffirm a theory of general education. This task in England has traditionally been given over to a Committee, established at national level, whose report on education is accepted or otherwise by part of the politically dominant sub-group formally constituted as the Government.

Within this first framing, following Weber, of specific initial conditions, an important additional process has occurred if Figure Four directs attention correctly.

Destructuring has occurred. That is, the relatively rapid institutional changes that were earlier identified as having taken place in secondary and higher educational institutions have implications for the renegotiation of theories of general education.

Firstly, the rapid initial and slower subsequent adoption of the comprehensive form of schooling in itself exposes the lack of a coherent theory of general education. As suggested in the earlier analysis the twin traditions of English education were crystallised by parts of the Crowther Report, compared with the Newsom analysis. The act of institutional transition itself draws attention to normative non-transition. The issue had been somewhat anticipated by the comparativists, both in the general theme of the 1957 yearbook and by Lauwerys as early as 1945; but domestic reorganisation on such a scale draws the issue to the attention

of all theorists of education and the 'minor debate' was underway by the late sixties and early seventies from which time specialist chairs in curriculum studies can be identified.⁽²⁾ Within this pattern the raising of the school leaving age was itself an extra stimulus to national debate about the principles which should inform the selection of school knowledge.

Secondly, the incorporation of the CATs into the higher educational system as technological universities weakened in principle the internal epistemologies of the prestige-dichotomous higher education system as, in a different way, did the experimentation of some of the 'new universities' with the way knowledge was to be organised in undergraduate courses. "Easily the most important characteristic of the New Universities is their readiness to experiment with what is taught, in what combinations, and with different methods of teaching and assessment ... In particular, there has been in all of them some attempt to take the ... English problem of too early specialisation and to provide a broader education not merely for some but for all their students."⁽³⁾

It should also be immediately noted that there were insulation mechanisms at work. In the same analysis as quoted above Perkin doubted whether "any university syllabus can redress the overspecialisation which is built into the English educational system from about the age of 14 onwards, at least if it is also to turn the same students

into employable specialists in three years ..."(4)

Similarly, there is some doubt whether any of the technological universities have been able to establish a sharply separate identity from the other universities of Britain. But it is clear that the relative purity of the message sending system was diminished. This process was further compounded by a third development.

The effort to move away from a 'snobbish, caste-ridden and hierarchical' obsession with universities was made explicit by the Secretary of State for Education in 1965. The institution which would achieve this would be the new polytechnics, created from the regional colleges of technology. The effort led to the creation of 30 polytechnics, which spanned both degree work and vocationally oriented courses in the further education sector. The assumption was that the new institutions might deal in 'expert' knowledge, especially the knowledge of applied science and technology which would contribute to a technological revolution in Britain. Their clientele was to be students reading for a degree, especially in vocational subjects; students pursuing diploma work, especially in scientific and technological subjects and thirdly, part-time students following part-time courses. Students of law, accountancy and architecture were later added to this list.(5)

Again it has been pointed out that some insulation mechanisms are at work: "over the last ten years polytechnics

have tended to move closer towards the university model, in that far from developing part-time, sandwich course and sub-degree level work, they have opted for more degree-level and even postgraduate work." (6)

However, this tendency is somewhat modified in turn by the broader impact of the CNAA, which as indicated in Chapter Two has been placed in a position to validate academic awards of the polytechnics and other colleges. The invention of the CNAA as indicated in the earlier chapter broke the concentration of degree-awarding powers of the universities. Its sociological effect in the terms under discussion here is to contribute to the multiplicity of messages which now originate in higher education, including short-cycle higher education. The CNAA, the polytechnics, and the new Institutes of Higher Education are elements in a 'destructuration' process which cumulatively weakens the institutional structural principle of 'prestige-dichotomy' identified in Figure Four and which also weakens the 'internal epistemological principle' of the higher education system, the distinction between the expert and the cultivated.

How far this process will continue is unclear. What may be of importance is the balance of material resources accorded to the various sectors of higher education by the government. Large resources devoted to the universities would, of course, strengthen the traditional distinctions; acting as an insulation mechanism. Similarly, to reassert

the intention of Robbins to locate teacher education in the universities would be to establish an insulation mechanism in another way. Both developments seem highly unlikely. (The point is a sociological one; there is no suggestion here that either development should take place.)

To these 'destruction' processes should be added a further major development which occurred in the early seventies. The 'minor debate' in England remained that, as technically defined in Chapter Two. In sociological terms it became, however, a debate of major significance in that a massive delegitimation of traditional theorising about educational knowledge took place. Following the publication of 'Knowledge and control', edited by Michael Young, English sociology of education took the curriculum itself as problematic. The book was one of several, but was especially influential through its adoption by and influence on course definition at the Open University, and through the network of young sociologists who chose to link their writings to its themes.

Debate was sharply joined by English philosophers of education. The debate which followed saw the philosophers stressing the proper epistemological basis of the knowledge which should be offered in a theory of general education. The extent, length and degree of obfuscation in the debate does not obscure the fact that the philosophers' solution was an affirmation - in comparative terms - of the

traditional theory of general education, an insistence on the internal epistemological principles of non-expert knowledge, and at best an effort to revitalise for the contemporary world knowledge as individual possession, and 'mind' rather than social relation as the organising principle of a theory of general education. In comparative terms, the philosophers' contribution to the debate was as ethnocentric as the French effort to reaffirm rationalism whilst modifying encyclopaedist influences in their tradition.

The Solutions

By the mid to late seventies, it is being suggested, a number of processes were underway in England which affected most parts of Figure Four, i.e. the specific initial conditions in which a change in the theory of general education might occur.

The debate between the sociologists and the philosophers, termed non-dismissively, the minor debate, was renegotiating the content of categories in the general theory part of the figure. The 'destructuration' processes outlined above had called into question both the internal structural and the internal epistemological principles of the higher education system. The higher education system (and the rapid extension of the upper second level further education system) had moved into closer utilitarian relation with the industrial work system. And in this situation, there

was intervention from the national level by the Government, on the principle of citizen formation:

Four fifths of our boys and girls now attend comprehensive schools. The comprehensive school is at the centre of the Government's policy on secondary education. The objective of the comprehensive system is to offer every boy or girl educational opportunities appropriate to his or her ability, aptitudes and personal motivation. It recognises the importance of educating together young people from different backgrounds, as an essential preparation for a more united and understanding society. (7)

The intervention was not limited to a reiteration of the virtues of comprehensive schools embodying the normative principles of the 1944 Act in a united and understanding society. The curriculum was "not the school's sole means of realising the purposes of comprehensive education ... But all these serve the cause of the pupils' learning, which is the school's main business, and which is embodied in the curriculum." (8)

Thus the Government had committed itself to cautious, and of course, cooperative intervention on the curriculum through a theory of general education:

... it is clear that the time has come to try to establish generally accepted principles for the composition of the secondary curriculum for all pupils. (9)

Three things are of extreme importance here.

Firstly, the intervention of the Ministry of Education rather directly, through a national debate, in curriculum principles was an important addition to specific initial conditions. In fact the government changed, and the

issue of the principles of the curriculum seems to be in abeyance - which in turn affects potential solutions. However, not merely the different potentials for different solutions should be noted, but also the possibility of the politicisation of curriculum issues - as the issue of secondary reorganisation was politicised, at the national level.

Secondly, had the previous government stayed in office it seems likely that through some appropriate legitimisation process (a detailed consultative document, or a national committee) the theory of general education would have been restated at the national level. In such circumstances, it is suggested, the views of the advocates of a core curriculum based on clear epistemological principles would have been extremely influential.

Thirdly, if the current government (1981) stays in office and particularly if it is re-elected, the terms of the theory of general education debate are changed, the chances of acceptance of some kind of proposals similar to those of the Black Papers are increased; and politicisation of the 'curriculum debate' is likely to follow. Of equal importance in that context is that the 'destruction' processes outlined are still in unstable equilibrium. Further attention will be given to the second and, very briefly, to the third point.

It was suggested above that had the previous government stayed in office it was likely that a new theory of general education would have been advanced and that the content of this theory would have owed much to the 'philosophers' debate.

In the Consultative document, the Ministry moved to a position as follows:

The balance and breadth of each child's course is crucial at all school levels, ... In most secondary schools the curriculum of the main school course is broadly traditional for the first two or three years. Options begin to shape the curriculum significantly in the fourth and fifth years. English and religious education are in most schools a standard part of the curriculum for all pupils up to the age of 16, and it is not true that many pupils drop mathematics at an early stage. (10)

However,

... the offer of options and the freedom to choose do lead some boys and girls to abandon certain areas of study at an early age. This is questionable in a society like ours where the rapidity of change puts a premium on the sound acquisition of certain basic skills developed in up-to-date terms to the limit of the pupil's ability and understanding. Few, inside or outside the schools, would contest that alongside English and mathematics, science should find a secure place for all pupils at least to the age of 16, and that a modern language should do so for as high a proportion as practicable. (11)

Thus certain basic skills, especially English, mathematics, science, a modern language and possibly religious education, might constitute an essential part of the curriculum.

The document went on to report the anxieties expressed at regional conferences. One major theme was the possibility of increasing inequality of educational opportunity

by variation in the curriculum of different schools, especially important if a child moved residence.

The other basic concern was expressed in two principles:

- (i) the curriculum has become overcrowded; the timetable is overloaded and the essentials are at risk; ...
- (ii) the curriculum in many schools is not sufficiently matched to life in a modern industrial society. (12)

Both principles were made explicit in both the Crowther and the Newsom reports. An English solution is being framed.

However, the effort to 'establish generally accepted principles for the composition of the secondary curriculum for all pupils' was to take a subsidiary but important framing:

... there is a need to investigate the part which might be played by a "protected" or "core" element of the curriculum common to all schools. (13)

The point is repeated almost immediately:

It would not be compatible with the duty of the Secretaries of State to "promote the education of the people of England and Wales", or with their accountability to Parliament, to abdicate from leadership on educational issues which have become a matter of lively public concern. The Secretaries of State will therefore seek to establish a broad agreement with their partners in the education service on a framework for the curriculum and, particularly, on whether, because there are aims common to all schools and to all pupils at certain stages, there should be a "core" or "protected" part. (14)

Consultations and review of practices were called for, with the local authorities to write their reports within twelve months and to send results to the Secretary of State. This would be prior to any advice the Secretary of State 'might issue on curricular matters'.

The range of areas for review was specified and included:

- Local arrangements for the co-ordination of the curriculum and any plans for its development ...
- Balance and breadth in the curriculum
- Preparation for working life, including all aspects of schools/industry understanding and liaison and careers education.
- The study of selected subject areas (e.g. English, mathematics, modern languages, science). (15)

It is suggested that the intervention of the Secretaries of State in the area of the curriculum is likely to have unintended consequences. It is secondly suggested that the amalgam of English essentialism and acknowledgement of the need to prepare for working life is a solution devoid of imagination and one that does not even do justice to the serious reflection which Hirst, Lawton and White, among others, had already given to questions of the core curriculum. However, it is also hypothesised that if the process of negotiation had continued, the core curriculum would have, in its details, been more informed by that coherent body of professional opinion.

It was acknowledged earlier that the government of 1977 was unable to complete its reform negotiations, and that the current government has not yet involved itself in discussion

of the principles of curriculum. If it does, then the 'unintended consequences' of the earlier intervention of the Secretaries of State in 1977 will likely be a severe politicisation of the theory of general education. The consequences of this, in turn, are difficult to assess. It may be that a full prolonged national debate is required; it may also be that politicisation may result in an impasse that prevents any significant change, as has happened at times in both France and Germany over curriculum issues.

What seems also possible is that the educational policies pursued by the present government will have the effect of slowing 'destructuration'; this in turn will have implications for the reaffirmation - sociologically - of a version of the traditional theory of general education. Some of the detailed specification of content is currently underway, partly through the medium of the Black Papers, but also in the professional literature.⁽¹⁶⁾ The consolidation of the higher education system as a prestige-dichotomised system on the Japanese model, and the retention of grammar schools and the encouragement of versions of the 'public schools' would be important parallel policies.

This review of the incipient 'solutions' partially under construction in the English situation raises a severe question. At the end of Chapter Two, in the discussion of an initial solution, it was suggested that certain minimal

assumptions could be made, including assumptions that the normative frame of English education was still the 1944 Education Act.

At one level this clearly remains true: most reform proposals will be justified in terms of the 1944 Education Act. Alternatively, the Act will be renegotiated formally with major new legislation.

Nevertheless the solutions being proposed to the question of what might constitute an appropriate new theory of general education in England raise the issue again in acute form.

If the preceding analysis of the principles of exclusion and inclusion embedded sociologically in theories of general education and in their structural constraints and supports has any validity, then it may be suggested that the tentative solutions under discussion in England are unlikely to embody particularly well the 'forces of rationalization', and more specifically different attitudes towards citizen formation and the industrial work system. (This point is made in the knowledge that 'citizen formation' was identified in the quotations from the consultative document earlier).

At one level, the point is a simple one. Unless a theory of general education is informed by the principle of social relation, by the principle of utilitarianism as earlier

defined, by intended close articulation with both citizen formation and with the industrial sub-system it is likely to contribute neither to 'democratisation' of education nor to 'modernization', in Weber's terms; except in very exceptional circumstances and with very clear policies determinedly pursued and imaginatively conceived - as in the Japanese case. Thus unless the English renegotiate their theory of general education in a more radical way, they are likely to sustain a considerable discontinuity between the institutions they have invented - on one theory of society - in the last fifteen years, and the retention of a different theory of society in reform proposals they are currently making in a significant normative area.

It is of course perfectly possible that this discontinuity is very acceptable to significantly large numbers of the English. As a value choice - the refusal of the excessive de-mystification of the world - it is understandable. It may indeed be preferable to alternative choices; but it is inconsistent with widely expressed social goals for the educational system, at the time of writing.

Obviously any alternative choice would have to build on English specific initial conditions, including at least some of the normative traditions of curriculum debate. Some synthesis between these traditions and a cautious exploration of American theories of general education might lead to principles of openness in the normative area.

Oddly such a beginning can be identified; though it draws critique from both sociologists of the curriculum and philosophers of the curriculum. Nevertheless, it is a continuation and strengthening of the renegotiation begun by Newsom, building on the 'weaker' tradition of English education, and offers sufficient flexibility in its detailed outline to be a point of departure: an 'alternative solution',

The document is the Schools Council statement of the aims of the 'Whole Curriculum', which begins by an effort to define the school's aims in:

an acknowledgement of the legitimate expectations of various groups of people who are involved in secondary education. We saw the aims of the school as emerging from an assessment of the balance of expectations to be met and thought of them as constituting a covenant or social compact. This covenant defines the reasonable expectations and mutual responsibilities of the pupils, for whose welfare the school exists, the parents, the teachers, and such agencies as boards of governors, local education authorities and the Department of Education and Science. Seen as a covenant, the curriculum reveals what view the school takes of its pupils, what it regards as their legitimate entitlements, and what sort of people it thinks it should help them become. Similarly in the ways in which its relations with parents and the wider community are conducted it will show, more eloquently than in any other way, what it regards as the proper place of the school in society. Finally, in its definition of roles and responsibilities, a curriculum incorporates a concept of teacher professionalism. (17)

The point which is drawn out of this quotation and which is taken as a significant part of the solution is the social role of the school and the social negotiation of its aims. As yet, this social role is precisely undefined; but

potentials for recognising a curriculum as legitimate if it is based on other processes than deduction of curriculum from the epistemological characteristics of disciplines exist.

Of the part of pupils in the 'educational covenant', the report suggests:

Pupils may reasonably expect the school, first, to do all in its power to make available to them the widest possible range of the kinds of knowledge, arts, crafts, and skills which form the basis of a rich life in an advanced society. The general education which the schools provide should, secondly, equip pupils to enter upon a job and, thirdly, provide them with an adequate basis for further education and training... Pupils may reasonably expect to receive a political education appropriate to participation in the life of a democratic society... All political opinions should be subject to impartial and critical scrutiny. Schools should help pupils understand our society as it stands and equip them to criticize social policy and to contribute to the improvement of society. Pupils should have opportunities to gain knowledge of and evaluate the claims of religion... (18)

Again the point which is drawn out of this quotation is the recognition of the significance of societal relations in defining the knowledge to which pupils should be exposed. The conservatism of the recommendations on political and religious education is noted. It is suggested that it is an unrealistic expectation to believe that this is other than the minimally necessary definition to produce any chance of the generation of consensus, in a liberal-democratic society.

The expectation of parents and teachers in the educational covenant are also sketched. In terms of the line of analysis being pursued it is important to note, however, that society

... at large also has claims upon the school. If it is to provide resources sufficient to support an efficient system of education, it, in return, may reasonably expect the schools to equip their pupils to contribute to the community's economic well-being. Vocational education should not... be so narrow as to cast the pupils in the role of mere instruments... the quality of their contribution to society's well-being will be the better if their initiative, rationality and discrimination are developed to the full... Society may reasonably expect that the schools will provide an education which sees today's child as tomorrow's parent and that it will offer the pupil a knowledge and understanding of what parenthood entails... Society may reasonably expect that schools will help their pupils gain a general knowledge of the democratic process and a respect for the law, as well as an understanding of how to participate in political processes, to change the law and defend oneself from injustice. In pursuit of these twin objectives the school should help pupils, so far as it is within its power to do so, to realize in their individual lives the paradoxical combination of conviction and tolerance of others which is fundamental to democracy. (19)

Again the point which is drawn out of this quotation is the clarity expressed in the expectations that pupils will be prepared for life in the economic area, as parents, and as citizens of a democracy.

It is clear that the overall emphasis is on preparing the young in terms of their social responsibilities (and rights) in their life after school. In the statement of general aims the document is not dissimilar from those negotiated in late nineteenth and early twentieth century USA as adjustment took place to the new common school.

At this point in the discussion, closure occurs in the Schools Council Working Paper. It moves into psychological

characteristics of the pupil, ('interest'), extension of horizons (which justifies 'worthwhile' knowledge) and the wishes of parents and pupils (expressed in choice of course options - at the end of the third year) as major criteria for the principles on which curriculum should be constructed.

In other words the Schools Council avoids one possible logical extension of its stated 'educational covenant': the explicit choice of basing a theory of general education on the social criteria of the problems young men and women are likely to face on entering the world after school; but its proposals could be taken as the strengthening of a 'weaker tradition'; and as something of a counter-balance to the more traditional reaffirmations of the English position. Of course, the processes of building around the Schools' Council proposals would be complex. It is of importance that in this area a near-compulsory curriculum be defined for the 13-16 year old. The act of legitimation of such a novel proposal would almost certainly require a major national Committee, which would have to be prepared to reject the typical 'English solution' as well as approve the new proposals. But it should be noted that a 'weaker tradition' in elementary education on principles borrowed and renegotiated from Dewey was acceptable to Plowden. Strengthening the 'weaker tradition' in secondary education, with an espousal of non-English epistemological principles, from the same American thinker, represents an 'alternative solution' more in accord with the explicit agenda which informed the rapid institutional change in English education in the mid-sixties.

Footnotes to Chapter One

1. R. Dahrendorf, "Out of utopia", p. 122, in Ralf Dahrendorf, Essays in the theory of society.
2. See Brian Holmes, Problems in education, passim, but especially pp. 3-93.
3. The term 'to grasp mentally' is taken from the Oxford English Dictionary and refers here to the verbal meaning of a statement of a Holmesian problem. There is no intention to gloss over the more difficult question of the criteria of understanding which are demanded by Holmes' theory of explanation through prediction.
4. Holmes, op. cit., p. 32.
5. The caveat is necessary because the point has occasionally been missed in the specialised literature. Holmes makes the point clearly enough: "Of these problems, comparative educationists who wish to use their studies for the purpose of reform will be primarily interested in present day issues" (B. Holmes, op. cit., p. 35) and "The choice of problem will depend upon the investigator - his own experience, background of knowledge, and awareness of current educational discussion and debate, will focus his attention either on issues which appear important in his own culture, or on questions which have international significance" (ibid) and "Having said this, it is worth repeating that contemporary issues and their immediate determinants are of particular interest to the comparative educationist who sees his study as an instrument of reform." (op. cit., p. 36).

Footnotes to Chapter One

6. "With the horrible example of American comprehensives before them, why are the British busily destroying their own excellent system of quality education and replacing it with American-style comprehensives?" Richard Lynn, "Comprehensives and equality: the quest for the unattainable", quoted in Harold Silver (ed.), Equal opportunity in education, p. 290. The author gives an answer.
7. A social-problem is not quite half of a simple statement of a Holmes problem. For example, equality of educational opportunity must be classified (as norm, institution or environmental circumstance). Assume this can be done. It must now be identified as standing in asynchronous change to another phenomenon, which in turn must be classifiable.
8. For a readable and very detailed account of contemporary research, see Sarane S. Boocock, Sociology of education: an introduction, Boston, 1980, especially chapter 3-6, and bibliography.
9. For the identification of 'social factors' expected to bear on such categories of relatively disadvantaged, see Alfred Sauvy, Access to Education, Vol. III pp. 68-77. cf. Boocock, op. cit., Chp 5.
10. See, A.J. Welford, Michael Argyle and D.V. Glass, Society: problems and methods of study, R.K.P., London 1962.

Footnotes to Chapter One

11. This point is typically denied in literature of this kind; and then a 'reasonable' inference is offered. For example: "Of course, no correlational analysis can prove causality. However a showing of strong partial effects can give powerful support to a theoretical framework which presents a reasonable basis for causality and which includes all those variables which might reasonably be effective determinants." Walter I. Garms, Jnr., "The correlates of educational effort: a multivariate analysis", p. 428, in Max A. Eckstein and Harold J. Noah, (eds), Scientific investigations in comparative education. Compare also:

The first practice to be examined was that of retentivity - the inverse drop-out rate of a system of education. The proportion of an age group still in school in the pre-university year varied for those students studying mathematics from four percent in Belgium to eighteen percent in the United States and for those not studying mathematics from three percent in the Netherlands to fifty-two percent in the United States.

The average level of mathematics performance of pre-university students is lower in those countries with larger percentage of an age group still in school at the pre-university level. This is true for both students studying mathematics and those not. However, the performance of the best students is much the same in all systems. However, when the achievement "yield" (mean score multiplied by the proportion of an age group in school) of the pre-university students is examined, it can be seen that by increasing the retentivity of a school system, it is possible for a system to have both a high overall yield and an undiminished elite yield. Germany and Belgium have relatively high yields at the 13-year-old grade level and relatively low yields at the pre-university level.

These facts are of interest particularly in those European systems of education where the possibility of increasing retentivity is being examined and where many strong rearward actions are being fought

Footnotes to Chapter One

mainly concerning the maintenance of academic standards. In future research, it should be possible not only to refine the measurement... The final decision of whether or not to increase the retentivity of a system will be based on economic, political and many other factors. (N. Postlethwaite, "School organisation and student achievement", in

Eckstein and Noah, op. cit., p. 93). Thus the change issue is not analysed, Specifically, the issue of cross-national transferability of the solution, with (correctly) predicted results in the light of specific initial conditions, is not discussed. The argument is: certain patterns of school organisation cause certain retentivity rates. If these retentivity rates are valued, transfer certain patterns of school organisation into a European system of education. Retentivity rates will increase. In other words, from a certain kind of comparative research, a solution is known and will work. The issue is merely its social acceptability.

12. A stress is placed on the phrase 'some of the literature'. The analytic mode is emphatically not that of a 'literature survey'. The analytic mode remains that of reflective thinking. The question asked is thus not 'what literature has been written', but how is the particular reflection (and argument) in process in the text clarified, or not, by a small number of writings which a priori seem to address precisely the same puzzles.
13. George Z.F. Bereday, "School systems and mass demand: a comparative overview", p. 97, in George Z.F. Bereday (ed.) Essays on world education.
14. Frank Bowles, "Democratization of educational opportunity", p. 52, in. Bereday (ed), op. cit.

Footnotes to Chapter One

15. Nigel Grant, Soviet education, p. 31
16. op. cit., p. 32.
17. Torsten Husen, "School structure and the utilization of talent", p. 68, in Bereday (ed.) op. cit.
18. Brian Holmes, op. cit. p. 71. See also for an extended discussion on secondary education, pp. 221-263.
19. Joseph A Lauwerys, "Opening Address", General education in a changing world: proceedings of the Comparative Education Society in Europe, 1967, p.8.
20. *ibid.*
21. Bereday, op. cit. pp. 96-98.
22. Bereday, op. cit. The quotation is from p. 97; the term 'open' from p. 98.
23. Husen, op. cit., p.70.
24. op. cit., p. 92.
25. Bowles, op. cit., p. 52.
26. op. cit., p. 53.
27. op. cit., p. 63.
28. op. cit., p. 51.
29. *ibid.*
30. op. cit., pp. 53-54.
31. op. cit., p. 54.
32. *ibid.*
33. *ibid.*
34. op. cit., p. 55.
35. *ibid.*
36. *ibid.*
37. *ibid.*

Footnotes to Chapter One

38. *ibid.*
39. *op. cit.*, p. 58.
40. *op. cit.*, p. 56.
41. *ibid.*
42. *op. cit.*, p. 51.
43. *ibid.*
44. *op. cit.*, p. 55.
45. Holmes, *op. cit.*, pp. 69-72.
46. Grant, *op. cit.*, p. 29.
47. *op. cit.*, p. 30.
48. Husen, *op. cit.*, p. 69.
49. *op. cit.*, p. 70.
50. *op. cit.*, p. 91.
51. *op. cit.*, p. 70.
52. *op. cit.*, p. 71.
53. *op. cit.*, p. 68.
54. Bereday, *op. cit.*, p. 94.
55. *op. cit.*, p. 95.
56. *ibid.*
57. Lauwerys, *op. cit.*, p. 9.
58. *op. cit.*, pp. 9-10.
59. *op. cit.*, p. 9.
60. *op. cit.*, p. 10.
61. *op. cit.*, p. 22.
62. *ibid.*
63. Bowles, *op. cit.*, p. 53.
64. *op. cit.*, p. 59.
65. *ibid.*
66. *ibid.*

Footnotes to Chapter One

67. op. cit., p.60.
68. A.H. Halsey, Jean Floud & C. Arnold Anderson, (eds.)
Education, economy and society, p. 1.
69. It is difficult to know whether he is right or not. His theory is close to being a non-testable hypothesis. Assume, however, that the egg-like and pyramid-like status and occupational structures can be operationalised for testability. Assume the same for 'flexible' school structures. Without a theory of 'lag' to suggest time sequences between the establishment of an egg-like structure of occupations and a flexible school structure, the theory remains uncomfortably loose. Assume, however, the invention of a lag theory. Conjecturally, a refutation is now offered by the case of the two Germanies. This would not be so with the Bowles' change theory which incorporates political variables between the condition of the economy and the configurations of the educational system.
70. Holmes, op. cit., pp. 36-39.
71. One possible conceptualisation is to take as relative non-change the institutional expansion of the 1960s, e.g. in the number of universities and institutions of higher education. The putative relative rapid change is current decline in students demanding admission. Alternative policies to deal with (a more precisely formulated version of) this problem could be compared.
72. op. cit., p. 71.

Footnotes to Chapter One

73. i.e. sustaining the analysis through these concepts is now improper. The problem statement takes priority. The concepts remain subordinate having been submerged in the problem-statement.
74. op. cit., p. 35.
75. ibid.
76. It is accepted that the major concern of many of the mass-elite analysts - some vaguely perceived tension between 'openness' (mass) and 'closure' (elite) in educational systems - remains embedded in the problem statement. Indeed, it is asserted conjecturally that reformulating the puzzle of mass-elite into the Holmesian problem as stated offers better potentials for perceiving the nature of this vaguely perceived tension.
- The tension will be re-examined after a more careful specification of the problem in chapters two and section one of chapter three. But it is also repeated that the direct treatment of mass and elite educational systems, as conceptualised by most of the analysts, is rejected and the line of analysis refused. That line of analysis is subordinated to the problem as stated.

Footnotes to Chapter Two

1. Consultative Committee to the Board of Education, Secondary Education with Special Reference to Grammar Schools and Technical High Schools, (Spens Report), HMSO, London 1938, pp. 291-2.
2. The offence that this may give is acknowledged. Similar offence is acknowledged in the use of Occam's Razor on the 'him/her' problem.
3. The dilemma is the distinction between chronological time and social time. Chronological time is (taken here as meaning) a conventional referent of dating, e.g. 1918 or 'the twentieth century'. Social time is (taken as meaning) the timetabling of social events (e.g. the granting of votes to women) as the organising unit of chronology - a different framing of what will be taken as time. Historians use chronological time to date social timetabling, usually. Thus the granting of votes to women occurs in 'different' times. Holders of evolutionary theories will often give more priority to social timetabling. Thus the granting of votes to women occurs in the same social time. Simplistic Marxism provides an example of analyses based on social timetabling.

It is suggested that the problem approach contains a double asynchrony. The first is in the formal statement-of-problem. The second is in its use of social-timetabling. Thus the universality of commonality of a problem can be tested not only by the criterion of space frame, but also social-timetabling frame. (This is not to suggest that the problem approach therefore contains evolutionary assumptions.)

Footnotes to Chapter Two

On many statements-of-problem of contemporary issues, the time question may be irrelevant. More generally, the issues of chronological time and social time in the different methodological approaches has not been raised in the comparative education literature. It is suggested that the theme needs exploration, because each methodological position in its specification of the 'what' and 'how' of comparison is likely to make assumptions which include a concept of time.

4. For example, the OECD classification, which classifies 'by type of education and not by institution providing the education'. See Methods and Statistical Needs for Educational Planning, OECD, 1967, Chapter IX. See also, A. le Gall, in A. le Gall, et. al., Present problems in the democratization of secondary and higher education, Unesco, Paris, 1973. This classification distinguishes Types A to D. The classification system begins with institutional separation as the main criterion, but then extends into 'curricula and methods' (pp. 35-43). This should be compared with the analysis provided by J.A. Lauwerys, B. Holmes and A.B. Dryland, in the same text, which utilises the Bowles classification system (pp. 147-171). There is also available the International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED), Paris, UNESCO, 1975, which classifies by course. See also Franz Hilker, in Relevant data in comparative education: report on an expert meeting, (presented by) B. Holmes and S.B.

Footnotes to Chapter Two

Robinson, Unesco, Hamburg, 1963, p. 57; and the statement of the classification in Franz Hilker, "Les Etapes Principales de l'Enseignement: une classification des systemes scolaires", in Western European Education, Vol. I, 1965, See also the four Level system outlined in International Guide to Educational Systems (prepared by Brian Holmes, ibedata, Unesco, Paris, 1979, p. 17. The Hilker and Holmes' classifications identify by the concepts of 'level' and 'stage', and may include courses and examinations.

5. What is being suggested is that the choice of a classification system is always arbitrary to some degree. It is picked, with a guess about its probable usefulness, to the Holmesian problem investigation. How useful the classification system will be is, initially unknown. Will the classification system permit a large amount of descriptive data to be understood? This is unknown before the classification system is 'tested'. The analogue is a pilot survey in empirical work.
6. Martin Trow, Problems in the transition from elite to mass higher education, Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, (through) McGraw Hill Book Company, New Jersey, 1973.
7. T.R. McConnell, "From elite to mass to universal higher education: the British and American transformations", in T.R. McConnell et. al. From elite to mass to universal higher education: the British and American transformations, Centre for Research and development in higher education, University of California, Berkeley, 1973.

Footnotes to Chapter Two

8. Department of Education and Science, Circular 10/65: the organisation of secondary education, London HMSO, 1965.
9. *ibid.*
10. *ibid.*
11. Department of Education and Science, Circular 10/66: London, HMSO, 1966.
12. i.e. the fact that Circular 10/65 was replaced by Mrs. Thatcher's Circular 10/70 ('against a uniform pattern of organisation'), which in turn was later modified, is outside the area of analysis permitted by the initial statement-of-problem. This principle has already been asserted in the main script; it is repeated here in terms of a particularly tempting and distracting datum.
13. Bowles, *op. cit.*, indicates three potential classifications of education systems: (i) "systems emphasising university preparation" (pp.68-71); (ii) "systems giving equal weight to all forms of secondary education" (*ibid.*) and (iii) a classification outlining "three basic forms of organisation for secondary education" (pp. 106-112). This is the most narrowly focussed classification and it is the one initially used.
14. Bowles, *op. cit.*, p. 106.
15. Higher Education Report: of the Committee appointed by the Prime Minister under the Chairmanship of Lord Robbins, 1961-1963, London HMSO, 1963, p. iii.

Footnotes to Chapter Two

16. op. cit., p. 281.
17. ibid.
18. op. cit., p. 291; and pp. 142-143.
19. op. cit., pp. 279-280.
20. op. cit., pp. 109-120 and p. 280.
21. Lauwerys, op. cit., p. 8.
22. op. cit., pp. 8-9.
23. op. cit., p. 10.
24. op. cit., p. 11.
25. op. cit., p. 12.
26. op. cit., p. 13.
27. ibid.
28. op. cit., p.14.
29. ibid.
30. See N. Hans, Comparative education: a study of educational factors and traditions, RKP, London, 1949, and V. Mallinson, An introduction to the study of comparative education, Heinemann, London, 1957.
31. See Phillip E. Jones, Comparative education: purpose and method, University of Queensland Press, Queensland, 1971.
E.J. King has given the issue a great deal of attention in the latest (fifth) edition of Other Schools and Ours, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1979.
32. This is to anticipate the making of an intellectual choice. Whilst a discussion of choice of countries could be placed, in practice, in chapter three before the comparative discussion is undertaken, it would logically occur after 'the intellectualisation' of the problem had produced greater clarity about what the problem was. Then, given the

Footnotes to Chapter Two

principle that the problem determines what is relevant data, a major data choice would take place: the selection of countries in which conjecturally the problem was likely to be 'the same'. In that sense, to take the decision at this stage is improper. It cannot be completely justified if the methodology is rigorously implemented.

The choice does however have some methodological propriety, on both minor intellectual and major practical grounds.

The decision is not completely arbitrary. The intellectual grounds for the choice of countries were sketched-in-principle in chapter one. The comparative literature tended to suggest that the dynamics of its puzzle could best be approached through an investigation of certain countries, especially the USA, the USSR, Japan, Sweden and other European systems of education including England, France and Germany. This sketch-in-principle is still accepted. The choice of countries is of course itself a conjecture, as suggested above. Here the conjecture is based on data surveyed during the process of reflective thinking in the stage of confusion; probably, certain countries will be the social location of the Holmesian problem as well as the puzzle(s) identified in chapter one. These countries will include the countries listed above, and perhaps Australia, Canada, etc.

Footnotes to Chapter Two

The difficulties of extending the analysis to many more than two or three countries are practical. There is, however, an intellectual issue buried in the practicalities of collecting data for a large number of countries. The practical difficulties of dealing with many data may encourage the investigator to seek classes of data which are easily handled (e.g. statistics). At this point, fresh criteria for what constitutes relevant data may be subtly introduced.

33. Lauwerys, "General education...", op. cit., p. 17.
 34. op. cit., p. 18.
 35. op. cit., p. 19.
 36. ibid.
 37. op. cit., p. 20.
 38. op. cit., p. 16.
 39. See, for example, Don Martindale, "Sociological theory and the ideal type", in L(lewellyn) Gross, (ed.) Symposium on sociological theory, pp. 57-91.
 40. Holmes, op. cit., p. 54.
 41. op. cit., p. 55.
 42. ibid.
 43. The point has already been made, of course, that 'the London school' of comparative educationists has tried with a high degree of continuity to focus on normative issues.
- For the general condition of the liter
C.A. Anderson (and compare also method

Footnotes to Chapter Two

There are two reasons for coming to closer grips with the task of comparing the ideological components in educational systems. If one views ideologies as epiphenomenal, lacking significant causal force, then we must identify this component in order to separate such functionless material from the "real" factors of education. On the opposite assumption that philosophical assumptions are the distinguishing features of an educational system, it becomes even more essential to devise techniques for analyzing this cluster of influences. Indeed, it is widely believed that comparison cannot be comprehensive because each educational system derives its coherence mainly from particular ideals.

As Hans has taken so much care to demonstrate, there is an intimate connection between the nation-state and schools...

A first step in comparative analysis of educational ideologies would be simply to map them. (pp. 40-41.)

However:

We could exploit the fund of public opinion poll data to obtain a preliminary survey of expectations about education in different countries. Combining these data with content analysis of views among legislators, leaders of opinion, and educational philosophers, would help us to relate contrasts in school systems to differences in aims. One notices that arguments used to justify or attack school programs take both similar and different patterns in various countries, but this knowledge is inchoate. (p. 41) C.A. Anderson,

"Methodology of comparative education", in Eckstein and Noah, (eds.) Scientific investigations in comparative education, pp. 24-43.

44. The principle of the problem approach that it is the problem which determines relevant data may also be appropriately repeated here; and the secondary principle should be repeated, that available methods should not, rather than the problem, define the countries for research. It is accepted that in practice and as a rule of thumb it may be unwise to contemplate investigating particular countries on which there is almost no data available, short of carrying out field research.

Footnotes to Chapter Two

45. See, for example, Comparative Education Review, Vol. 21, Nos. 2 and 3, June/October 1977, for an extremely ethnocentric definition of what comparative education is, as viewed from North America.
46. Holmes, op. cit., pp. 300-301.
47. op. cit., pp. 301-302.
48. For example, Brian Holmes has classified curriculum theories - essentialism, polytechnical theory, encyclopaedism and pragmatism - for comparative purposes. See B. Holmes, "Curriculum development: a comparative survey in curriculum innovation at the second level of education", in Educational Documentation and Information, No. 190, 1974, esp. pp. 18-24. It is clear that these theories are usable in that they rather precisely inform on what ought to be in the curriculum. Similarly, a technique of 'ideal man' constructs may be used. In this context see Brian Holmes essay on John Dewey in P. Nash, Andreas Kazamias and Henry J. Perkinson (eds.) The educated man: studies in the history of educational thought, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1965. Holmes' account of Dewey's thinking is indicative of what could be done to produce 'ideal man' constructs.

Clearly, the three possible techniques for classification and implicit measurement stand in relation to one another. Which technique should be used is in principle a matter of what problem has been identified. Here, as part of the problem statement included the term 'general education', it seemed appropriate to 'test' this technique first.

Footnotes to Chapter Two

49. i.e. by constructing 'models of man' from major philosophers such as Descartes, Locke, Marx etc. These possibilities have at least been sketched and utilised for analytical comparative purposes elsewhere. See, R. Cowen "The Utilitarian University" in B. Holmes and D. Scanlon (eds.) Higher Education in a changing world, The world Yearbook of Education 1971/72, Evans Bros., Ltd., London, 1971, pp. 90-107.
50. Central Advisory Council for Education (England): 15 to 18, Ministry of Education, London, HMSO 1960, Vols. I and II. (The 'Crowther Report').
51. Central Advisory Council for Education (England): Half Our Future, Ministry of Education, London, HMSO, 1963. (The 'Newsom Report').
52. Crowther, op. cit., p. xxvii.
53. op. cit., p. 261.
54. ibid.
55. op. cit., p. 262.
56. ibid.
57. op. cit., p. 261.
58. op. cit., p. 275.
59. op. cit., p. 263.
60. Newsom, op. cit., p. xv.
61. op. cit., p. xiii.
62. op. cit., p. 5.
63. op. cit., p. xiii.
64. ibid.
65. op. cit., p. 27.
66. op. cit., pp. 27-28.

Footnotes to Chapter Two

67. op. cit., p. 28.

68. op. cit., p. 29.

69. ibid.

70. ibid.

71. p. 31.

72. p. 114.

73. pp. 112-113

74. p. 58.

75. p. 124.

76. ibid.

77. ibid.

78. More accurately, the process, which has a long history, was continuing. See concluding section of text in the chapter. It is also accepted that the writings of some educational philosophers and the very popular 'Black Papers' on education were part of this debate. Such writings are taken as the 'minor' indices of the existence of the problem, and are not subjected to analysis. Clearly, however, such writings should be acknowledged as part of the specific initial conditions in which solutions are to be suggested.

79. Franz Hilker, op. cit.

80. Brian Holmes, op. cit.

81. op. cit., p. 17.

82. Newsom, op. cit., p. 124.

83. See, for example, the first part of R. Cowen, "The legitimacy of educational knowledge: a neglected theme in comparative research, Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, Vol. 285, N.Y., 1977.

84. See Holmes, op. cit., esp. pp. 32-35.

Footnotes to Chapter Three

1. Holmes, op. cit., p.35.
2. See Harold H. Hodgkinson, Institutions in transition: a profile of change in higher education (incorporating the 1970 statistical report), sponsored by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, McGraw Hill Book Company, 1971, pp.51-68.
3. *ibid.*
4. The National Defense Education Act of 1958: a summary and analysis of the Act prepared by the staff of the Committee on Labour and Public Welfare. United States Senate, September 1958, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 1958.
5. op. cit., p. 1581.
6. H.G. Rickover, Education for all children: what we can learn from England, Washington, US Government Printing Office, 1963 p. 38.
7. Rickover was not, of course, a professional educationalist, Neither were several of the contributors to the Black Papers, which received national publicity also. Both Rickover and the Black Papers are accepted into the analysis as evidence (a) because they debated theories of general education and (b) they reached a lay and professional audience in national terms. The similarities diminish thereafter; Rickover was attacking a tradition, the Black Papers defending one.
8. Hyman G. Rickover, Education and Freedom, quoted in Sol Cohen, ed. Education in the United States: a documentary history, Vol IV, p. 3159.

Footnotes to Chapter Three

9. J.B. Conant, The American High School Today, pp. 23-24.
10. J. Barzun, The House of Intellect, New York, 1959.
11. Mortimer Smith, A citizens manual for public schools, Boston 1959, p. I., quoted in, Sol Cohen, op. cit., p. 3146.
12. See for example, Donald Vandenberg, ed. Theory of knowledge and problems of education, University of Illinois, Illinois, 1969.
13. Harry S. Broudy, Othanel Smith and Joe R. Burnett, Democracy and excellence in American secondary education, Rand McNally, Chicago, 1964, p.8.
14. op. cit. p.9.
15. See Unesco, Access to higher education, Vol. II., 'Japan', p. 245.
16. ibid., p.245.
17. ibid.
18. See Tetsuya Kobayashi, "Changing policies in higher education - the Japanese case, in Holmes and Scanlon, eds. Higher education in a changing world, pp.368-375.
19. ibid.
20. Ben Duke, "The image of an ideal Japanese" in The Educational Forum, Vol XXXII, No. I, Nov. 1967, pp. 31-37.
21. op. cit. p.32.
22. op. cit., p. 33.
23. ibid.
24. ibid.
25. ibid.
26. ibid.
27. ibid.
28. ibid.

Footnotes to Chapter Three

29. *ibid.*
30. *op. cit.*, p. 34.
31. *ibid.*
32. *ibid.*
33. *ibid.*
34. *ibid.*
35. Compare Unesco World Survey of Education, Vol III, Secondary Education, p. 1142 with Unesco World Survey of Education Vol. V., Education Policy and Legislation, p. 1176.
36. See J.J. Tomiak, "The University in the Soviet Union", pp. 161-162.
37. See Soviet Education, Vol., No.4., p. 3.
38. N.S. Kruchov, "Proposals to reform Soviet Education....", p. 5.
39. *ibid.*
40. *op. cit.*, p.6.
41. *op. cit.*, p. II.
42. See OECD, Directorate of scientific affairs, Educational policy and planning: France, OECD, Paris, 1972, pp 15-22; the Berthoin Decree (and the observation cycle) made clear some of the inadequacies of lower second level structures in the face of increased enrolments. From 1963, the new CES institutions expanded rapidly in number.
43. See, W.D. Halls, Education, culture and politics in modern France, p. 89.
44. See Laurent Capdecombe, "France: the expansion of the universities" in Council of Europe, Reform and expansion of higher education in Europe, p. 125, Table, University Institutes of Technology.

Footnotes to Chapter Three

45. Halls, op. cit., p. 208.
46. See Jean Capelle, Tomorrow's education: the French experience, p.44.
47. In the secondary literature, E.J. King, Vernon Mallinson and W.D. Halls, for example, give attention to the renegotiation of the traditional theory of general education. King explains the issue as follows under the sub-heading 'the intellectual tradition':

Judged by modern standards in more experimental countries like the United States and Britain, the French system is still excessively formal and bookish. In actual practice, in the average school, it still bears little relation to the everyday life of the local community. Even after very substantial reform it still takes insufficient account of France's urgent need for higher industrialization and modern workaday knowhow...

But the merger of the two strands - the intellectual with the practical - and still more of the two populations, or 'two cultures' involved, is still an acute problem for France despite a succession of reforms intended to emphasize the 'technological' aspect of all studies (or at least the technological interdependence of all careers in a modern society)... The sharp contrast between school and life is exemplified by the French phrase 'la vie active' for a working life - as though schools were not active or practical at all. A decade of reforms culminating in 1977 sought to change that emphasis fundamentally; but the intellectual tradition dies hard...

A greater criticism of the system to anyone brought up on Anglo-Saxon methods, is that the vast majority of French children, undergoing a 'general education' of standardized type, encounter so little of topical interest to bring their schooling to life. Reform movements have not impinged markedly on the system in the remoter areas. Such criticism does not worry the French parent or teacher as much as we might expect. Old-style rationalist notions are as strong among faithful Catholics as among their opponents. 'General education' (culture générale) is believed to result from formal intellectual exercises, and from acquaintance with great ideas, great books, and supporting facts...

Footnotes to Chapter Three

In the most technical or professional training, thoroughly practical though it may be, the sense of training the intellect is still paramount; this emphasis continues throughout all schooling. Reason is used as a searchlight on life, illuminating whatever it brings into focus...

The influence of Plato and of Descartes is very strong. In fact, Frenchmen are proud to boast that their educational system is 'Cartesian'... Instead of encouraging educators to think of personality as a harmony of complementary activities, the French view emphasizes the ascetic cultivation of 'the mind'. 'We are priests of the intellect', says the representative teacher. (E.J.King, Other schools

and ours, pp. 117;120).

It should be remembered that King's text is a general introduction to 'other schools', in this chapter, to French schools. Therefore the analysis ranges widely to indicate the significance of regional variations in French life, the gap between the town and country, ('the two cultures') the stress on equality of educational opportunity, the role of Catholicism in French thought, the development of vocational education and the elementary school tradition (pp. 117-120); but the theme is clear - the renegotiation of a traditional theory of general education in times of political, social, economic and, especially, technological change.

Mallinson sums up the reform issue succinctly:

No other country in Europe provides over the past thirty years a more bewildering picture of shifts, stresses and strains leading to first one reform in education and then another. And all turns on the traditional major objectives accompanying the concept of culture générale - a schooling based on a study of literature and the humanities which will enable the student to attain that wisdom which is an essential of civilised life, and which places an emphasis on training in the art of rational, objective thinking

Footnotes to Chapter Three

(l'art de bien penser), Reluctantly over the years the French have had to recognise that such an education is suitable only for an academic minority, whilst they have also had to come to terms with the pressing needs of a modern industrial democracy. It is this dichotomy between the desire at all costs to retain the benefits of a culture générale and the imperative need to invoke the egalitarian principle in education, if only to flush out all available talent to create necessary new elites (particularly in the technological fields), which has caused all the strains and led to the implementation of reform after reform. (V. Mallinson,

The Western European idea in education, p. 192).

King and Mallinson, then, in their general texts give some account of reform issues, including the difficulties posed by a widespread acceptance of a theory of general education.

King's discussion (of the acceptability of the tradition) should, however, be understood within the context of his broader position: his theories of 'newness' and 'three technological idioms' which are forces making for the rejection of the tradition. Mallinson is pointing to the centrality of the tradition in French education, and the difficulties of denying the traditional theory.

W.D. Halls discusses at length the changes in the traditional theory of general education in France.

The guiding light of French education has been intellectualism, the "doctrine that knowledge is wholly or mainly derived from the action of the intellect, i.e. from pure reason"... This intellectualist view of the nature of education has expressed itself in the peculiarly French concept of "culture générale" which has held sway since the Renaissance. This concept is now at last undergoing a change of focus and enlargement... a transformation. The ambition had formerly been to give the student a mastery over his total environment. Now there is a more restricted aim which chimes better with the more specialized nature of modern society... The "new men" in France rule as technocrats or bureaucrats and are best characterized as cultural relativists. That "unity of school and life" which Langevin postulated is now seen as a link between education and contemporary culture rather than with

Footnotes to Chapter Three

the eternal values that the classics allegedly epitomized. "Real life culture" is now to be preferred to "la culture universitaire", that devotion to the ideal, to the world of abstraction, the withdrawal from "the harsh imperatives of life as it is"... Administrators, technologists and the owners of the means of production now rate as paramount educational objectives those relating to material prosperity rather than those concerning the disinterested pursuit of knowledge or the fostering of metaphysical values. These changes have been documented by a French sociologist, Mme Viviane Isambert-Jamati... (W.D. Halls,

Education Culture and politics in modern France, pp. 24-30).

Hall's discussion is a valuable overview. He points to the tendency to avoid the word 'instruction' and the use of 'éducation' instead; to the debate over the place of Latin and philosophy in the curriculum; and to Isambert-Jamati's analysis of horatorical speeches on school speech-days. These can all be taken as empirical indices of a partial rejection of traditional theories of general education. Halls also points to a particular theoretical denial of the traditional theory - Capelle's.

Capelle's critique should be understood alongside these difficulties of getting away from 'the primacy of the rational in French education' as Marcel Hignette described the tradition in the 1957 (World) Yearbook of Education. Capelle's argument is that technology is now part of general culture, and that technology should be taken into the 'general culture' of schools. His attack is wide-ranging and extends, in the form of a scenario, to an account of pre-school education in France to the grandes ecoles. As an example of his general position, his views on the principles which should inform pedagogical work in the orientation phase provide a critique of

Footnotes to Chapter Three

traditional theory and some account of what should be put in its place, in the unreformed secondary school structures:

Since it is desirable to produce citizens who are socially and technically adaptable, the college will devise activities most likely to develop the pupil's personality in such a way as to stimulate his ability to work with his fellows and to reflect, in contrast to the hitherto excessive tendency to individualism and book learning... the pedagogical methods of the college must be directed towards three aims.

1. To develop the means of expression, that is to say the possibilities offered the pupil to externalize in a systematic way his capabilities... this essential goal concerns the "languages", or means of communication, among which figure not only the languages proper (the mother tongue and foreign languages, both modern and ancient), but also mathematics and the standardized form of drawing known as industrial design.

2. To open up a path to the methodology of the experimental sciences and their technical applications... It is a matter of regret that it is not yet generally agreed to add to the study of natural functions that of mechanical functions, which over thousands of years the civilization of mankind has gradually discovered and which constitute a priceless treasure-house, although one which is pedagogically under-exploited... (Capelle, Tomorrow's education: the French experience,

pp. 61-62.)

And in the general lycee:

But we must protest against the unreal dilemma, which consists of being obliged to choose between a general culture defined as the simultaneous study of almost all the disciplines, or the abandonment of general culture by the introduction of options limited to an over-restricted number of disciplines...

There must be preserved the polyvalent character of secondary education, which means the broadening of the mind and the wide choice traditionally given. But this virtue in no way implies a simultaneous introduction to all the constituent parts of a culture enlarged and enriched by the discoveries of each generation.

Such a concept would indeed end by being a refutation of general culture, which according to Valery remains "the ability to situate oneself" in relationship to a whole which one cannot master in all its parts...

Footnotes to Chapter Three

it may be thought that general culture can be safeguarded and developed by constructing for each section of the general lycee a coherent entity including six or seven subjects at the most... To be precise, general education in the maturity phase might have from grades 10 to 12 three sections... the humanities section, the exact sciences section, the experimental sciences section... (Capelle, op. cit. pp. 85-87).

Capelle then enters two main claims: a demand that 'general culture' recognise technology and its impact on man's civilisation(s), and a rejection of simplistic encyclopaedism as an educational aim. He retains the expectation that such an education would enable one to "situate oneself". In general it may be noted that Capelle outlines a new definition of what ought to be included in general education. His theory is atypical in its stress on technology. It is typical in that it represents a claim for the reduction of encyclopaedism as a principle for the organisation of school knowledge.

By the late sixties the attack, in the 'minor' debate, on encyclopaedism was considerable:

Constituer un programme d'instruction de base en se bornant à additionner diverses matières jugées complémentaires, c'est aller très exactement à rebours du processus de généralisation. Le résultat, c'est l'encyclopédisme. Avec la lourdeur et le manque de cohésion des programmes est apparue une difficulté gradissante d'adapter l'enseignement à la diversité des aspirations et des tempéraments, des curiosités et des besoins, à apprendre aux élèves 'à apprendre', à compléter et renouveler sans cesse leur savoir, à se préparer 'à la vie civile et sociale autant que professionnelle'. Peut-on y remédier? (Louis

Cros, 'Sur L'Instruction Generale' in Paedagogica Europea, Vo. IV, 1968, p.51.)

Footnotes to Chapter Three

The answer to the question was confident:

Il est assurément possible et souhaitable - et beaucoup de professeurs s'y emploieront - de'enseigner chaque matière du programme pour l'exercice des facultés de réflexion et de jugements plus que pour la possession détaillée des connaissances étudiées... Un enseignement de base n'est donc vraiment 'générale' que s'il fait d'activités qui provoquent et satisfont la curiosité globale (et par là motivent et orientent les spécialisations), fournissent la langue et la méthode communes, incorporent enfin la formation intellectuelle à l'éducation morale et affective, sensorielle et artistique, manuelle et pratique, sociale et civique.

Que s'il fournit une compréhension unitaire du monde et la capacité de s'y situer; la connaissance des instruments universels de la pensée (abstraite et concrète) et la capacité de s'en servir; le discernement des fins de l'action et la capacité de choisir. C'est la vieille et triple notion du savoir, du pouvoir et du devoir... (op. cit., p. 53).

Within such a framework of intentions, it would be possible to control the extreme effects of encyclopaedism:

... chaque matière peut également contribuer, à condition de n'être pas conçue comme une entité indépendante des autres et une fin en soi mais comme un approfondissement partiel du savoir global, une application spéciale de la langue et de la méthode générales, un apport particulier au système commun de valeurs. Le problème est donc de fixer l'attention des élèves sur ce que les différentes disciplines ont en commun, de dégager dans les méthodes et les résultats ce qui est généralisable (autrement dit d'utilisable à d'autres formes de réflexion, de recherche et d'action). (op. cit., p. 53.)

This line of critique is echoed elsewhere in the late sixties. Encyclopaedism is under attack; with a wish expressed to retain another of the 'hallmarks' of the education system:

Footnotes to Chapter Three

To teach everything is impossible. To teach as much as possible leads to encyclopaedic programs. Weighing, selecting, and omitting are therefore essential; good limited knowledge is preferable to an enormous accumulation of poorly assimilated facts... The third aim has always been in spite of its troubles and attendant difficulties, the hallmark of our educational system: the development of a person's sense of judgement, taste, and critical attitude, of his ability to think objectively... (P. Deheuvels, 'Aims and development of secondary education' in

Western European Education, Vol. I, No. 1., 1969, p. 52)

In this situation, "a reasonable solution would be for teachers to limit their ambition in each subject matter to the establishment of sound groundwork, an awakening of understanding, and the acquisition of a working technique." (op. cit., p. 55.)

Encyclopaedism, rather than the general virtues of the power of reason, was under attack; that is, what was being renegotiated was the way to 'situate oneself' through the exercise of a clear rational faculty. Increasingly, claims for some form of multi-disciplinarity were advanced. These found some expression in the Orientation Law of 1968 on a sector of the education system - higher education.

It is suggested, then, that there was a normative challenge to the traditional conception of 'general education' in France in the mid and late sixties, and that this challenge is visible in the 'minor' debate of the French. The challenge is acknowledged by secondary interpreters of

Footnotes to Chapter Three

French education, and also by the publications of the French themselves. The attack was particularly a challenge to the virtues of encyclopaedism. Overall, however, it is suggested that normative change was less rapid than the reorganisation and redefinition of institutions and secondary and higher education.

48. cf.

Relationships within education are, of course, important. For example in Europe at least the universities have tended to dominate the rest of the educational sector... Of course, university domination should not be accepted simply as a fact under all circumstances, but should be regarded as a possibility for detailed investigation.

This quotation is from Holmes, *op. cit.*, p. 71. The full quotation was used in Chapter One, on page 52. Cf. the Kruschev hypothesis, on page 142.

49. Thus the broadest question is: can, in comparative perspective, the dynamics of context be understood; can some of the comparative evidence after review and extension be subsumed into a general statement which explains something about the relationships of theories of general education to other social phenomena? Secondly, and more specifically, in terms of the question raised by the 1957 Yearbook of Education, how are theories of general education sociologically sustained? Thirdly, following the suggestion of Holmes (see footnote 48 above), is there a set of relationships between theories of general education and the institutional patterns (and norm-sending potentials) of higher education systems? Fourthly, is it possible after such an analysis to offer a comparative statement about such relationships?

Footnotes to Chapter Three

The chances that a definitive statement can be offered are, of course, small. But even a partial statement would fill a theoretical gap in the literature, and would assist in the identification of relevant specific initial conditions which should be taken into account in a country, here, England.

On the 'cultivated' and the 'expert' see W.G. Runciman ed. Weber: selections in translation, pp.226-250.

50. Ernest Barker, "Universities in Great Britain", in Walter Kotschnig and Elined Prys, eds. The university in a changing world, p. 119.
51. Robbins Report, op. cit., p.6.
52. See H.J. Perkin, 'The New Universities in Britain', in Western European Education, Vol. II, No.4., 1970-71, pp. 290-313.
53. Michalina Vaughan, "The Grandes Ecoles", in Rupert Wilkinson ed. Governing elites, p. 91.
54. Ibid.
55. OECD, Reviews of national policies for education: France, p. 25.
56. C. Grignon and J.C. Passeron, Case studies in innovation in higher education: French experience before 1968, p. 98.
57. Detlef Glowka, "Soviet higher education..." in B. Holmes and D. Scanlon eds. Higher education in a changing world, p. 180. A three-category model - universities; poly-; and monotechnic institutes- is also frequently used.

Footnotes to Chapter Three

58. Robbins Report, Appendix V, p. 198.
59. Igor Ekgolm, "Higher education in the Soviet Union", in B. Holmes and D. Scanlon, eds. Higher education in a changing world, p. 288.
- 60,61. Judgement on the prestige rankings of different kinds of institution in Soviet higher education is difficult, and it is important not to overstate the case. However a judgement must be entered because of the line of the subsequent analysis in Chapter Four.

Ekgolm (a Soviet academic) makes the point that there were difficulties after the revolution:

Among the urgent problems the Soviet government tackled from the very first was that of raising a new people's intelligensia whose interest would concur with those of the people. Lenin wrote in April 1918: 'Without the guidance of experts in the various fields of knowledge, technology and experience, the transition to socialism will be impossible, because socialism calls for a conscious mass advance to greater productivity of labour compared with capitalism...' Raising a thousand-strong army of university teachers has been a major achievement which took years of concentrated effort.

The creation of a force of college teachers was an important point in reforming the institutions of higher learning. For some time after the revolution the more reactionary-minded university professors stiffly opposed the radical reorganization of the system of higher education... (op. cit., p. 286).

Of the current system Ekgolm writes:

The aims, content and methods of teaching and the organization of the process of study at universities and at specialized colleges have much in common, although there are some distinctive features as well. The universities, which train students for research activities in the first place, lay particular stress on scientific training, and the institutes, while providing a good theoretical grounding, concentrate on the application of the results of research to practice. (op. cit., p. 287).

Footnotes to Chapter Three

A foreign observer, D. Glowka, begins from the same point - that the system took shape in the early twenties - but draws a slightly different conclusion:

Out of nearly 800 higher educational establishments only 48 are universities; the others consist of so-called Higher Educational Institutes, many of which are relatively small and highly specialized establishments... Often the quality of instruction at universities is much better than at institutes. Therefore one of the main duties of the universities, especially leading universities in Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Novosibirsk and some others, is to provide the higher educational institutes and research establishments with instructors and scientific personnel. The smaller provincial universities rank considerably below the bigger ones; on the other hand, however, some of the institutes can compete with leading universities... (Glowka, op. cit., p. 180-181).

On this initial evidence, there is prestige gradation in that some of the institutes rank with the leading universities; whilst among the universities themselves, there are gradations in prestige; and at the same time - in general - the 48 universities are higher in prestige than the institutes - in general.

Glowka's conclusion is that:

In theory together they form a unified system of higher education without differences in rank. But secondary school graduates know very well there are real differences of quality of instruction and, as a consequence of career chances; the ratio of applicants to vacancies at higher educational establishments differs between one to one and fifteen to one. These differences are mainly due to a prestige scale of institutes and faculties. (ibid).

The crucial word is 'rank'. It is suggested that there are, on Glowka's analysis, no differences in rank - i.e. formally marked boundaries between universities and other institutions of higher education. What Glowka marks in the second quotation is differences in prestige.

On the same theme, Nigel Grant enters a comparative judgement:

Footnotes to Chapter Three

In standard and esteem, too, the gulf that is usually assumed in Britain between the universities and the rest is not apparent in the Soviet higher institutions. Since they are all subject to the same kind of ministerial control, one of the props of the British binary system is missing; they are also organised internally in much the same way...

The system of diplomas and higher degrees is the same. Professions such as teaching that draw their members from different types of VUZ do not distinguish for salary purposes between university diplomas and those taken elsewhere. Nor do the universities dominate the field of academic research to anything like the extent taken for granted in the U.K... Nor are the universities the apex of the pyramid; this is to be found not in the higher education sector at all, but in the special research institutes. Legally, then, and to a large extent functionally, all classes of VUZ are equal.

This point is slightly qualified:

But in practice some are more equal than others, and some less. It is probably true that the universities as a group enjoy greater prestige than most other institutions... But one should not make too much of this, for the differences in prestige are generally greater between individual institutions than between categories... such VUZy as the Kalinin Polytechnic in Leningrad or the Moscow Power Institute enjoy a reputation greater than that of many universities. Nor are the pedagogic institutes uniformly low in esteem; those of Moscow or Leningrad, or the foreign language institutes there and in Gorky and Minsk, are quite different from the more remote 'mini-institutes', and are more highly regarded than the Universities of, say, Alma-Ata or Dushanbe. Though the differences are real both in reputation and standards, there is no clear-cut distinction between the various categories of higher educational institution.

(Nigel Grant, "U.S.S.R." in Margaret Scotford Archer, ed. Students, university and society...pp. 81-82).

It is suggested that it is possible from this evidence to draw the conclusion that the higher education system of the USSR is characterised by prestige - gradations - rather than sharp dichotomies in prestige, and careful formal marking of the boundaries of the university system.

Footnotes to Chapter Three

62. Robbins Report, Appendix V, p. 199.
63. OECD, Reviews of national policies for education: Japan, pp, 69-70.
64. op. cit., p.70.
65. Herbert Passin, Society and education in Japan, p. 125.
66. ibid.
67. op. cit., p. 113.
68. op. cit., p. 93.
69. OECD, Reviews of national policies for education: Japan, p. 140.
70. Talcott Parsons and Gerald M. Platt "Considerations on the American academic system", in Minerva, Vol VI, No.4., 1968, p. 522.
71. Bernard Berelson, Graduate education in the United States, p. 93.
72. op. cit., p. 222.

Footnotes to Chapter Four

1. Max Weber, quoted in W.G. Runciman, ed. Max Weber: selections in translation, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1978, p. 200.
2. The distinction is exemplified, by long quotation, later in the text of Chapter Four.
3. Halsey, Floud and Anderson, eds. *op. cit.*, p. 1.
4. See R. Cowen, "The utilitarian university" in Holmes and Scanlon, *op. cit.*
5. B. Cosin, ed. Education: structure and society, p. 227, quoting Max Weber, Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft, trans. H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, pp. 227-228.
6. *op. cit.*, p. 225.
7. *op. cit.*, pp. 233-234.
8. *op. cit.*, p. 234.
9. The earlier disagreement with Weber is retained, i.e. that European education did not everywhere become 'expert', in comparative terms. Weber's point here tends to confirm the view that, in comparative terms, European systems of education made only a partial adaptation to the requirements of rationality. The point in the Figure - that comparatively the USSR and the USA made a more complete adaptation to the 'need' for experts - is retained.
10. For example, M.S. Archer, R. Callahan, S. Fitzpatrick and M. Vaughan.
11. *op. cit.*, p. 228.
12. *ibid.*
13. *op. cit.*, p. 229.

Footnotes to Chapter Four

14. See Runciman, *op.cit.*, p.28.
15. *ibid.*
16. *op.cit.*, p.29.
17. *op.cit.*, p.350.
18. *op.cit.*, p.338.
19. *ibid.*
20. See Reinhard Bendix in Reinhard Bendix and Guenther Roth, eds., Scholarship and partisanship: essays on Max Weber, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1971, pp.188-206.
21. Ikuo Amano, "Continuity and change in the structure of Japanese higher education". See, William K. Cummings, Ikuo Amano, Kazuyuki Kitamura, eds., Changes in the Japanese university: a comparative perspective, p.34.
22. See, for example, Amano, *op.cit.*, p.37:

The Central Council proposed a new system composed of several different types of higher educational institutions: (1) full universities with graduate schools that offer Ph.D's; (2) graduate-level universities that do not offer an undergraduate program; (3) undergraduate universities that also offer a master's degree; (4) four-year undergraduate universities; (5) two-year junior colleges; (6) higher technical schools that combine the high school curriculum with advanced technical instruction; and (7) four-year schools specializing in art and music, for example.

Amano himself points out, "however, Japan's particular problem is that these various conceptions of diversification tend to overlap with ideas for reform of the entrenched institutional hierarchy. The radical egalitarians who maintain the initial ideals of the postwar reform have interpreted these diversification plans as sinister schemes for reinforcing the long-established hierarchical structure." (*ibid.*) Both the Occupation

Footnotes to Chapter Four

Authorities and the OECD examiners, it may be added, looked to a loosening of these hierarchies through a process of competition - i.e. looked in the terms used in this work to prestige-grading as a 'solution'.

23. Cf.:

Otherwise, the demand of the private industries for more educated human resources was met by an increased number of high school graduates. High school students increased by one-third between 1960 and 1970. The percentage of the eligible population attending high school rose from 57.7 per cent in 1960 to ... 82.1 in 1970... At the level of higher education, the percentage of the eligible population attending four- and two-year colleges also rose from 10.3 percent in 1960 to ... 24.0 in 1970. The number of students in institutions of higher education increased dramatically from 711,618 ... in 1960 to 1,715,042... in 1970 - a rapid rise of student enrollment by 241 per cent. Seventy-five per cent of all college students were enrolled in private institutions in 1970. The expansion of college enrollment had also exceeded the government's expectation.

Both the government and private industries were content with the extension of upper secondary and college education to a greater number of Japanese and the subsequent increase of human resources... (Nobuo K. Shimahara, Adaptation and education in Japan, p.134).

However, there remained anxiety, not only over student unrest but over the supply of science and engineering 'human resources'. The Council for Education proposed that the system of education should be reorganised into a 5-4-4-x system, where 'x' permitted, in higher education a period of years for specialised training. "A major characteristic of the proposal is that, under the proposed system, there would be much more extensive and intensive specialized training at the upper level of education." (op.cit., p.141).

Footnotes to Chapter Four

24. The term in English seems to be Galtung's, the process, Japanese:

Access to large private firms and governmental institutions is determined not only by the level of a young person's education but, more important, by the reputation of the university from which he or she is graduated. In other words, major employers regard the level of institutional prestige as a major criterion for judging the qualifications of job applicants. It is interesting to note that university prestige is associated with the rating of entrance examinations regardless of students' performance at their universities...

Major employers also use the level of prestige as a criterion when recruiting at universities. This employment practice is called shiteikosei ... survey indicated that 300 major firms depend in varying degrees on this employment practice. Sixty-five universities are often patronised by these major firms, including seven formerly imperial universities, two non-imperial national universities, and two large private universities, these being regarded as the most prestigious in Japan. These eleven universities, particularly Tokyo University, also serve as the major source of graduates in elite fields, such as politics, business, medicine, law and academia.

It is evident that admission to these prestigious universities, and other patronized universities, is vital to students if they are to gain access to groups of their own choice - work organizations with security and prestige ... A guarantee of graduation in four years is implicit ... (Shimahara, op.cit., p.91).

25. See, for example, Herbert Passin, 'Japan', in James S. Coleman, ed., Education and political development, pp.288-295; pp.298-304.
26. Passin, op.cit., p.306. Compare also:

Except for the totalitarian states, no modern nation has used the schools so systematically for purposes of political indoctrination as Japan. Although the early builders of the modern school system spoke a utilitarian language, they did not for a moment forget problems of morality and patriotism. They simply took them for granted. The purpose of education was ...

Footnotes to Chapter Four

to create loyal as well as trained citizens, and there were always people ready to see to it that over-enthusiastic utilitarians and Westernizers did not go too far. (op.cit., p.304) (Mori himself was assassinated.)

Passin draws part of his interpretation from Michio

Nagai, who writes:

The educational system Mori designed was a remarkable creation. No part of it was self-contained, the functions of all components in the system - elementary, middle, normal and vocational schools as well as the university - were vitally interrelated. This was essential. For if Mori's elementary school had been the only institution of public education, Japan would probably not have developed men capable of working diligently and effectively within the existing system ...

the logic that lay at the base of Mori's conception of the structure was as follows:...

On the one hand, nationalistic compulsory education could limit any excessive freedom and questioning which might result from education at higher levels. But, on the other hand, upper level education acted as an antidote to the intellectual rigidity which was a part of education at the lower levels. The system can best be described as a social mechanism, which, by choosing men of talent from among the masses and attracting them to the power structure, sought both to stabilize the social order and to provide for maximum mobility within that order ... To put it in other terms, although able men could improve their social status by climbing the educational ladder, this advancement was always "promotion" within the existing order in ways that served only to reinforce the power structure ...

(Michio Nagai, Higher education in Japan: its take-off and crash, University of Tokyo press, 1971, pp.187-189.

27. See Margaret Scotford Archer. 'France', in Margaret Scotford Archer, ed. Students, university and society: a comparative sociological review, pp.145-149; John H. Van de Graaff, 'The politics of innovation in French

Footnotes to Chapter Four

higher education: the University Institute of Technology, in Higher Education, Vol.5, 1976; Jacques Fomerand, "The French university: what happened after the revolution?" in Higher Education, Vol.6, 1977 and OECD, Short-cycle higher education: a search for identity, esp. pp.211-234.

Footnotes to Chapter Five

1. B. Holmes, *op. cit.*, p. 83.
2. See Maurice Galton ed. Curriculum change: the lessons of a decade, p. 7.
3. H.J. Perkin, "The New Universities in Britain", in Western European Education, Vol. II, Winter 1970-71, p. 297.
4. *op. cit.*, p. 304.
5. See Peter Scott, Strategies for post secondary education, pp. 77-86.
6. See Gerald Bernbaum, ed. Schooling in decline, Chp. I., p. 44.
7. Department of Education and Science, Education in schools: a consultative document, HMSO, London 1977, p. 9.
8. *op. cit.*, p. 10.
9. *op. cit.*, p. 11.
10. *ibid.*
11. *ibid.*
12. *ibid.*
13. *ibid.*
14. *op. cit.*, p. 12.
15. *op. cit.*, p. 13.
16. See G.H. Bantock in R. Hooper, ed., The curriculum context, design and development.
17. The Schools Council, The Whole Curriculum 13 - 16, Working Paper No. 53., Evans Educational, 1975, p. 24.
18. *op. cit.*, p. 25.
19. *op. cit.*, p. 27.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbreviations used: OECD for Organisation for Economic Cooperation and development.
- UNESCO: United Nations Scientific and cultural organisation.
- ABLIN, F. Contemporary Soviet education: a collection of readings from Soviet journals, International Arts and Sciences Press, White Plains, N.Y., 1969.
- ANDERSON, C.A. "Equality of opportunity in a plurastic society" in International Review of Education Vol 21, 1975.
- ANDERSON, C.A. "Methodology of comparative education", See ECKSTEIN, M.A. and NOAH, H.J. eds. Scientific investigations....
- ANDERSON, A.C. ed. Education, economy and Society.... See HALSEY, A.H., FLOUD, Jean and ANDERSON C.A. Education.....
- ANTOINE, Gerard and DEHEUVELS, Paul. "Rapport Final" in 'Pour une Ecole Nouvelle: Formation des Maîtres et Recherche en Education, Actes du Colloque d'Amien, Mars, 1968, Dunod, Paris, 1969.
- APPLE, Michael Ideology and the curriculum, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London 1979.
- ARCHER, Margaret Scotford. Social origins of educational systems, Sage Publications Ltd., London and Beverly Hills, 1979.

- ARCHER, Scotford Margaret "France". See ARCHER, Scotford Margaret, ed. Students, university and society...
- ARCHER, Scotford Margaret and VAUGHAN, Michalina, "Domination and assertion in educational systems". See HOPPER, Earl, ed. Readings...
- ARCHER, Scotford Margaret, Social conflict and education change... See VAUGHAN, Michaelina and...
- ARCHER, Margaret Scotford, ed. Students, University and society, Heinemann Educational Books, London, 1972.
- ASHBY, E. Any person, any study, New York, Magraw Hill, 1971.
- BANKS, Olive, Parity and prestige in English secondary education: a study in educational sociology, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1955.
- BANTOCK, G.H. "Towards a theory of popular education". See HOOPER, R. ed. The curriculum: context, design and development.
- BARKER, Ernest. "Universities in Great Britain". See KOTSCHNIG, Walter and PRYS, Elined, eds. The university in a changing world...
- BARNARD, H.C. Education and the French revolution, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1969.
- BARZUN, Jacques The American university, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1969.
- BARZUN, J. The House of Intellect, Mercury, London, 1962.

- BEECHER, T. and MACLURE, S. The politics of curriculum change, Hutchinson, London, 1978.
- BECK, Robert H., Change and harmonization in European education, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, 1971.
- BELL, Daniel, The coming of post-industrial society, Basic books, New York, 1973.
- BEN-DAVID, Joseph Centres of learning: Britain, France, Germany and the United States, McGraw-Hill Book Company N.Y., 1977.
- BEN-DAVID, Joseph and ZLOCZOWER, Awaraham, "Universities and academic systems in modern societies",. See KAPLAN, Norman, ed. Science and society, Rand McNally and Co., Chicago, 1965.
- BENDIX, Reinhard and ROTH, Guenther, Scholarship and Partisanship: Essays on Max Weber, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1971.
- BENEDICT, R. The Chrysanthemum and the sword: patterns of Japanese culture, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1946.
- BENN, Caroline and SIMON, Brian, Half way there: report on the British comprehensive school reform, 2nd ed., Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1972.
- BEREDAY, George Z.F. Essays on world education: the crisis of supply and demand, N.Y. Oxford University Press, 1969.

- BEREDAY, George Z.F. School systems and mass demand: a comparative overview, in BEREDAY, George Z.F. (ed) Essays on World Education... pp. 93-110.
- BEREDAY, G.Z.F. Universities for all, Jossey Bass, San Francisco, 1973.
- BEREDAY, George Z.F. and LAUWERYS, Joseph A., eds., The yearbook of education 1958: the secondary school curriculum, London, Evans Bros. Ltd., 1958.
- The yearbook of education 1959: higher education, London, Evans Bros, Ltd., 1959.
- The yearbook of education 1961: concepts of excellents in education, London, Evans Brothers Ltd., 1961.
- The yearbook of education, 1962: the gifted child, London, Evans Brothers Ltd., 1962.
- The world yearbook of education, 1965: the education explosion, London, Evans Brothers Ltd., 1965.
- BERELSON, Bernard, Graduate education in the United States, McGraw Hill, New York, 1960.
- BERNBAUM, Gerald, ed. Schooling in decline, The Macmillan Press, London, 1979.
- BIENAYME, A. Systems of Higher Education: France, International Council for Educational Development, New York, 1978.
- BOOCOCK, Sarane Spence, Sociology of Education: an introduction, 2nd ed., Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1980.
- BOUDON, Raymond, "The French university since 1968" in Comparative Politics, Vol. IX, No. 1, 1977.
- BOURDIEU, P. "Cultural reproduction and social reproduction"
See BROWN, R. ed. Knowledge, education and cultural change, Tavistock, London, 1973.

- BOURDIEU, P. "The school as a conservative force": Scholastic and cultural inequalities". See EGGLESTON, J. ed. Contemporary research in the sociology of education...
- BOURDIEU, P. and de SAINT-MARTIN, M. "Scholastic excellence and the values of the educational system". See EGGLESTON, J. ed. Contemporary research in the sociology of education...
- BOURDIEU, Pierre and PASSERON, Jean-Claude, Reproduction in education, society and culture, Sage Publications, London, 1977.
- BOWLES, F. Access to education, Vol. I, Unesco, Paris, 1965.
- BOWLES, Frank, Democratization of educational opportunity, See BEREDAY, George Z.F. ed. Essays on World Education, pp 51-67.
- BRENT, Allen Philosophical foundations for the curriculum, George Allen and Unwin, London, 1978.
- BROUDY, Harry S., SMITH, Othanel, B., and BURNETT, R. Joe, Democracy and excellence in American secondary education: a study in curriculum theory, Rand McNally and Company, Chicago, 1964.
- BROWN, Richard, ed. Knowledge, education and cultural change: papers in the sociology of education, Tavistock publications, London, 1973.
- BRUNER, J.S. The process of education, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass. 1960.
- BRUNER, J.S. Toward a theory of instruction, Harvard, Cambridge, Mass., 1966.

- BUCHANAN, R.A. "The technological universities", in *Universities Quarterly*, Vol. 21, No. 1, 1966.
- BURN, Barbara et.al. *Higher education in nine countries*, McGraw Hill, New York, 1971.
- BURNETT, Joe R. *Democracy and excellence....* See BROUDY, Harry, S. et. al. *Democracy and excellence ...*
- CAHIERS PEDAGOGIQUES. *Les Collèges d'Enseignement Secondaire*, Vol. 75, Mai, 1968.
- CAPDECOMME, Laurent, "France: the expansion of the universities", See COUNCIL OF EUROPE *Reform and expansion of higher education in Europe...*
- CAPELLE, Jean, *Tomorrow's education: the French experience*, Pergamon Press Ltd and Presses Universitaires de France, Oxford, 1967.
- CASTLE, E.B. *The English 'public' schools: character and responsibility*, See BEREDAY, George Z.F. and LAUWERYS, Joseph A., eds. *The yearbook of education*, 1958, pp. 206-214.
- CENTRE FOR CONTEMPORARY CULTURAL STUDIES, *On ideology*, Hutchinson, University Library, London, 1977.
- CENTRE FOR INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH AND INNOVATION, *Alternative education futures in the United States and Europe*, OECD, Paris, 1972.
- CERYCH, L., *A global approach to higher education*, International Council for Educational Development, New York, 1972.

- CERYCH, L., Comparative higher education: relevance for policy making, International Council for Educational Development, Occasional Paper, No. 10, New York, 1974.
- CHEIT, E.F. The useful arts and the liberal tradition, McGraw Hill, New York, 1975.
- CLARK, Burton R., The "cooling-out" function in higher education, See HALSEY, A.H. and others, eds. Education, economy and ... pp. 513-523.
- CLARK, Leonard H. and others, The American secondary school curriculum, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1965.
- COHEN, Sol, ed. Education in the United States: a documentary history, Vols. I-V, Random House, New York, 1974.
- COLEMAN, James, S. ed. Education and political development, Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 1965.
- COMMITTEE ON HIGHER EDUCATION, Higher Education, Report, Cmd. 2154, London, H.M.S.O., 1963.
- Higher Education, Appendix V. Cmd. 2154 - V. London, H.M.S.O. 1963.
- COMPARATIVE EDUCATION SOCIETY IN EUROPE PROCEEDINGS, Berlin 1965. General Education in a changing world, CESE, Berlin 1965.
- COMPARATIVE EDUCATION REVIEW, "The state of the art", Vol 21, Nos 2 and 3, June/Oct. 1977.

- COMPARATIVE EDUCATION SOCIETY IN EUROPE, The university within the educational system, The Society, Ghent, 1967.
- COMPARE Volume 10, Number 2, 1980. Special Number (2). The curriculum in the lower secondary school in Western Europe.
- CONANT, J.B. The American high school today, McGraw Hill, New York, 1959.
- CONANT, James B., The comprehensive high school: a second report to interested citizens, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967.
- CORDASCO, F. Equality of educational opportunity: a bibliography, Rowman and Littlefield, New Jersey, 1973.
- COSIN, B.R. ed. Education: structure and society, selected readings, Penguin Education, Middlesex, 1972.
- COUNCIL OF EUROPE, Reform and expansion of higher education in Europe: national reports 1962-67, Strasbourg, 1967.
- COWEN, R. "The legitimacy of educational knowledge: a neglected theme in comparative research" in Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, Vol. 285, N.Y. 1977.
- COWEN, R. "The utilitarian university". See HOLMES, B and SCANLON, D. Higher education in a changing world.
- COX, C.B. and DYSON, A.E. Fight for education: a Black Paper, Critical Quarterly Society, London, n.d.
- CREMIN, L.A. The transformation of the school, Knopf, New York, 1965.
- CROWTHER REPORT, See GREAT BRITAIN, Ministry of Education, 15 to 18...

- CROWTHER REPORT, See GREAT BRITAIN CENTRAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
- CROS, Louis, "Contribution à la Stratégie de la Rénovation Pédagogique" in Pour une Ecole Nouvelle. Formation des Maîtres et Recherche en éducation. Actes du Colloque d'Amiens, Mars, 1968, Dunod, Paris, 1969.
- CROS, Louis, "Sur l'Instruction Générale" in Paedagogica Europaea, Vol. IV, 1968.
- CUMMINGS, William K., Education and equality in Japan, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1980.
- CUMMINGS, William K., et. al. eds. Changes in the Japanese university: a comparative perspective, Praeger Special Studies, Praeger, N.Y., 1979.
- CURTI, Merle The social ideals of American educators, Littlefield Adams, new edition, 1974.
- DAHRENDORF, Ralf Essays in the theory of Society, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1968.
- DAHRENDORF, Ralf "Out of Utopia", See DAHRENDORF, Ralf, Essays in the theory of Society, pp. 106-128.
- DAVIES, Harry, Culture and the grammar school, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1965.
- DAVIES, Ioan, "Knowledge, education and power". See BROWN, Richard, ed. Knowledge, education and cultural change...
- DAVIES, Ioan, "The management of knowledge: a critique of the use of typologies in educational sociology". See HOPPER, Earl, ed. Readings...

- de SAINT-MARTIN, M. Scholastic excellence and the values of the educational system. See BOURDIEU, P., and de SAINT-MARTIN, M., "Scholastic excellence...."
- DEHEUVELS, P. "Aims and development of secondary education" in Western European Education, Vol. I, No. 1, 1969.
- DENT, H.C., The Education Act 1944: provisions, regulations, circulars and later acts. 10th edition (paperback), London, University of London Press, 1964.
- The educational system of England and Wales, 2nd edition, London, University of London Press Ltd., 1963.
- DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION and SCIENCE, See GREAT BRITAIN, Department of education...
- DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION and SCIENCE, See GREAT BRITAIN DEPARTMENT OF...
- DROPKIN, Stan and others, eds., Contemporary American education: an anthology of issues, problems and challenges, Paperback edition, London, Collier-Macmillan Ltd., 1965.
- DEWEY, J., Democracy and education: an introduction to the philosophy of education, Collier Macmillan, London, 1966.
- DEWEY, J., How we think, Heath, Boston, 1910.
- DRYLAND, Ann "Polytechnical education in the USA and the USSR" in Comparative Education Review, Vol. 9, No. 2, 1965.
- DUKE, Ben, "The image of the ideal Japanese" in The Educational Forum, Vol., XXXII, No. I, 1967.

- DYKHUIZEN, George, The life and mind of John Dewey, Southern Illinois University Press Carbondale and Edwardsville, Feffer and Simons, Inc., London, 1973.
- ECKSTEIN, M.A. The elitist and the popular ideal - prefects and monitors in English and American secondary schools, International Review of Education, Vol. 12, 1966, pp. 184-195.
- ECKSTEIN, M.A. Towards a science of comparative education... See NOAH, H.J. and ECKSTEIN, M.A., Towards a science.....
- ECKSTEIN, M.A. and NOAH, H.J., eds. Scientific investigations in comparative education, Macmillan, London, 1969.
- EDWARDS, R. et. al. eds. Relevant methods in comparative education, Unesco Institute of Education, Hamburg, 1973.
- EGGLESTONE, J. ed. Contemporary research on the sociology of education, Methuen, London, 1974.
- EGGLESTON, John. The sociology of the school curriculum, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1977.
- EKGOLM, I., "Higher education in the Soviet Union". See HOLMES, Brian and SCANLON, David, eds. Higher education in a changing....
- EMBLING, Jack, A fresh look at higher education: European implications of the Carnegie Commission Reports, Elsevier Scientific Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1974.

- ETZIONI, Amitai and ETZIONI, Eva, eds. Social change: Sources, patterns and consequences, New York, Basic Books Inc, 1964.
- EVETTS, Julia, The sociology of educational ideas, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1973.
- FEDOTOVA, V.E. "Preparing for life - the most important goal of the Young Communist League", in Soviet Education, Vol. I, No. 1, 1958.
- FITZPATRICK, S. The Commissariat of Enlightenment, Cambridge, The University Press, 1970.
- FLECKER, H.L.O., Character training: the English boarding school, See KING-HALL, Robert and LAUWERYS, J.A. eds. The yearbook of education 1955, pp.261-270.
- FLOUD, Jean, The sociology of education, See WELFORD, A.T., and others, eds. Society.... pp. 521-540.
- FLOUD, Jean and HALSEY, A.H., English secondary schools and the supply of labour. See HALSEY, A.H. and others, eds., Education, economy and... pp. 80-92.
- FLOUD, J.E. and others, eds., Social class and educational opportunity, London, William Heinemann Ltd., 1956.
- FOMERAND, Jacques, "The French university: what happened after the revolution?" Higher Education, Vol. 6., 1977.
- FRASER. W.R., Reforms and restraints in modern French education, RKP, London, 1971.
- FROESE, Leonhard "University reform: a comparative analysis of the American, Russian and German universities". See HOLMES, Brian and SCANLON, David, eds. Higher education in a changing world....

- GALTON, Maurice ed. Curriculum change: the lessons of a decade, Leicester University Press, Leicester 1980.
- GALTUNG, J. "Social structure, educational structure and lifelong education: the case of Japan". See OECD, Review of national policies for education: Japan.
- GARMS, Walter I., Jnr. "The correlates of educational effort: a multivariate analysis", in ECKSTEIN, Max A and NOAH, Harold J. (eds) Scientific Investigations in... pp. 410-428.
- GERTH, H.H. and MILLS, C.W. eds. and trans. From Max Weber: essays in sociology, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, paperback edition, 1970.
- GIDDENS, Anthony Central Problems in Social Theory Action, structure and contradiction in social analysis. The Macmillan Press Ltd., London, 1979.
- GILPIN, Robert, France in the age of the scientific state, Princeton University Press, New Jersey, 1968.
- GIDEONSE, Harry, "The higher learning in a democracy". See HOFSTADTER, Richard and SMITH, Wilson, eds. American Higher education...
- GLOWKA, Detlef, "Soviet education between government policy and self-determination - a German view". See HOLMES, Brian and SCANLON, David, eds. Higher education in a changing world...
- GORDON, Peter and LAWTON, Denis, Curriculum change in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Hodder and Staughton, London, 1978.

- GORDON, Peter and WHITE, John, Philosophers as educational reformers: the influence of idealism on British educational thought and practice, R.K.P., London, 1979.
- GRANT, Nigel, Soviet education, Penguin books, Harmondsworth Middlesex, England, 1964.
- GRANT, Nigel, "U.S.S.R." See ARCHER, Scotford Margaret ed. Students, university and society...
- GREAT BRITAIN, BOARD OF EDUCATION, Secondary education with special reference to grammar schools and technical high schools (Spens Report), H.M.S.O., London, 1938.
- GREAT BRITAIN, THE BOARD OF EDUCATION, Curriculum and examinations in secondary schools: report of the Secondary Schools Examination Council appointed by the President of the Board of Education in 1941, London, H.M.S.O., 1943.
- The public schools and the general educational system, London, H.M.S.O., 1944.
- GREAT BRITAIN, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION and SCIENCE, Circulars and administrative memoranda; issued during the period 1st January 1965 to 31st December 1965, London, H.M.S.O., 1966.
- Education in Schools: a consultative document command 6869, H.M.S.O., London, 1977.
- Education in 1965: being a report of the Department of Education and Science, Cmd. 2938, London, H.M.S.O., 1966.

- Education in Schools", Cmd 6869, H.M.S.O., 1977.
- Statistics of education, Part I, London, H.M.S.O., 1964.
- Statistics of education, 1969, Vol. 6, Universities, H.M.S.O.,
London, 1971.
- Circular 10/66, London, H.M.S.O., 1966.
- Circular 10/65: the organisation of secondary education,
H.M.S.O., London, 1965.
- GREAT BRITAIN, MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, A guide to the educational
system of England and Wales: pamphlet No. 2, London
H.M.S.O., 1945.
- 15 to 18, A report of the Central Advisory Council for
Education (England) Vols. I and II, London,
H.M.S.O., 1959.
- The new secondary education: Pamphlet No. 9, London, H.M.S.O.,
1947.
- GREAT BRITAIN, CENTRAL ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR EDUCATION (ENGLAND),
Half our future, Ministry of Education, London,
H.M.S.O., 1963.
- GREAT BRITAIN, CENTRAL ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR EDUCATION (ENGLAND),
15 to 18, Vols. I and II, Ministry of Education,
London, H.M.S.O., 1960.
- GRIGNON, C. and PASSERON, J.C., Case studies in innovation in
higher education: the French university before
1968, OECD, Paris, 1970.
- GROSS, Llewellyn, ed. Symposium on Sociological theory. Harper
Row, New York, 1959.
- GUEDON, Jose Marie, "The orientation law for higher education" in
Western European Education, Vol. II, No. 4,
1970-71.

- GURVITCH, G. The social frameworks of knowledge, Presses
Universitaires de France, Paris, 1966.
- GUTTSMAN, W.L., The British political elite, London, MacGibbon
and Kee, 1963.
- HALL, Stuart, "The hinterland of science: ideology and the
'sociology of knowledge'. See CENTRE FOR
CONTEMPORARY CULTURAL STUDIES, On ideology.
- HALLS, W.D. "Culture and education: the culturalist approach to
comparative education" in EDWARDS, R. et. al.
eds. Relevant methods in comparative education,
Unesco Institute for Education, Hamburg, 1973.
- HALLS, W.D. Education, culture and politics in modern France,
2nd ed. Pergamon, Oxford, 1976.
- HALLS, W.D. "Elites and the content of education," in
Paedagogica Europea, 1970/1971.
- HALSEY, A.H., FLOUD, Jean and C. ARNOLD ANDERSON, eds.
Education, economy and society: a reader in the
sociology of education, The Free Press of
Glencoe, New York, 1961.
- HALSEY, A.H., British universities and intellectual life, See
HALSEY, A.H., and others, eds., Education,
economy and... pp. 502-512.
- The changing functions of universities, See HALSEY, A.H.
and others, eds., Education, economy and
... pp. 456-465.
- HALSEY, A.H. and FLOUD, Jean, English secondary schools and...
See FLOUD, Jean.

- HALSEY, A.H. and others, eds., Education, economy and society: a reader in the sociology of education, Paperback edition, London, Collier-Macmillan Ltd., 1965.
- HANS, Nicholas, Comparative education: a study of educational factors and traditions. Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., London, 1949.
- HANS, N. The independent schools and the liberal professions. See HANS, N. and LAUWERYS, J.A., eds. The yearbook of education 1950, pp. 219-238.
- HANS, N. The Russian tradition in education, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963.
- HANS, N. and LAUWERYS, J.A., eds. The yearbook of education 1950, London, Evans Brothers Ltd., 1965.
- HIGNETTE, Marcel, "The primacy of the rational in French education". See BEREDAY, George Z.F. and LAUWERYS, Joseph A. eds. Yearbook of Education 1958: the secondary school curriculum...
- HILKER, Franz, "Classification system", in HOLMES, B. and ROBINSON, S.B., Relevant data...
- HILKER, Franz "Les étapes principales de l'enseignement: une classification des systèmes scolaires" in Western European Education, Vol. I, 1965.
- HIRSCH, Walter and ZOLLSCHAN, George K, (eds) Exploration in Social change. See ZOLLSCHAN, George K and HIRSCH, Walter, eds, Exploration in Social Change...

- HIRST, P.H. and PETERS, R.S., *The logic of education*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1970.
- H.M.S.O. *Education in schools: a consultative document (the Green Paper)*, Cmnd 6869, London, H.M.S.O., 1977.
- HODGKINSON, Harold K. *Institutions in transition: a profile of change in higher education (incorporating the 1970 statistical report)*, sponsored by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, McGraw Hill Book Company, 1971.
- HOFSTADTER, Richard and SMITH, Wilson, eds. *American higher education a documentary history*, Vol. II, paperback edition, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1961.
- HOLMES, B. "Curriculum development: a comparative survey of curriculum innovation at the second level of education," in *Educational Documentation and Information*, No. 190, 1974.
- HOLMES, Brian, *International guide to educational systems*, Ibedata, Unesco, Paris.
- HOLMES, Brian, "General education: some comparative guidelines," in *General Education* No. 17, Autumn 1971.
- HOLMES, Brian, "Rational constructs in comparative education." in *International Review of Education*, Vol. XI No. 4., 1965, pp. 466-478.
- HOLMES, Brian, *Problems in education: a comparative approach*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1965.
- HOLMES, Brian, "The development of higher education: a comparative survey", in *Paedagogica Europaea*, Vol. VII, 1972.

- HOLMES, B. "The reflective man: Dewey" See NASH, P. et.al., eds. The educated man...
- HOLMES, B. "Towards a general education" See LAUWERYS, Joseph and TAYAR, Graham, eds. Education at home...
- HOLMES, B. and ROBINSOHN, S.B. Relevant data in comparative education: report on an expert meeting, March 11-16, 1963, Unesco, Institute of Education, Hamburg, 1963.
- HOLMES, Brian and RYBA, R. (eds) Curriculum development at the second level of education, Proceedings of the Comparative Education Society in Europe, Prague 1969.
- HOLMES, B. and SCANLON, D. eds. Higher education in a changing world,: The World Yearbook of Education 1971/72 Evans Bros, London, 1971.
- HOLT, Maurice, The Common curriculum: its structure and style in the comprehensive school, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1978.
- HOPPER, Earl, A typology for the classification of educational systems". See HOPPER, Earl, ed. Readings...
- HOPPER, Earl, "Notes on stratification, education and mobility in industrial societies". See HOPPER, Earl, ed. Readings...
- HOPPER, Earl, ed. Readings in the theory of educational systems, Hutchinson University Library, London 1971.
- HOOPE, R. ed. The curriculum context, design and development, Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh, 1971.

- HOYLE, E. "How does the curriculum change? I. A proposal for enquiries", *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, Vol. 1, No. 2., 1969.
- HOYLE, E. "How does the curriculum change? Systems and strategies" *Journal of curriculum studies*, Vol. I, No. 3., 1969.
- HUSEN, Torsten, *School Structure and the utilization of talent.* See BEREDAY, George Z.F., ed. *Essays on world education*, pp. 69-92.
- INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT: *Higher Education: crisis and support*, ICED, New York, 1974.
- ISAMBERT, Jamati, *Crise de la société, crise de l'enseignement*, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 1970.
- JOBLING, Raymond, "A traditional theme in general sociology and its relevance for the study of universities". See BROWN, Richard, ed. *Knowledge, education and cultural change...*
- JONES, P.E. *Comparative education: purpose and method*, University of Queensland Press, St. Lucia, 1971.
- KAIROV, I.A. "Basic questions relating to school reorganisation", in *Soviet Education*, Vol. I, No. 3., 1959.
- KALININ, M.I. *On Communist education*, Foreign Languages Press, Moscow, 1950.
- KALTON, Graham, *The public schools: a factual survey of Headmasters' Conference schools in England and Wales*, Paperback edition, London, Longmans Green and Co Ltd., 1966.

- KAPLAN, Norman, ed. Science and society, Rand McNally and Co., Chicago, 1965.
- KARABEL, Jerome and HALSEY, A.H., eds. Power and ideology in education, Oxford University Press, 1977.
- KAZAMIAS, A.M. "Woozles and wizzles in the methodology of comparative education," See Comparative Education Review, Vol. 14, 1970.
- KAZAMIAS, Andreas, The educated man... See NASH, Paul, KAZAMIAS, Andreas, PERKINSON, Henry J. eds. The educated man...
- KEPPEL, F. The necessary revolution in American education, Harper Row, New York, 1966.
- KERR, Clark, The uses of the university, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1964.
- KERR, J.F. ed. Changing the curriculum. University of London Press, London, 1968.
- KING, E.J. Other schools and ours: comparative studies for today, Holt, Rinehard and Winston, London, 1979.
- KING, Edmund J., Society, schools and progress in the U.S.A., Oxford, Pergamon Press, 1965.
- KING, Edward, J., Comparative Studies and educational decision. The Bobbs-Merill Company Inc., Indianapolis, 1968.
- KING-HALL, Robert and LAUWERYS, J.A., eds. The yearbook of education 1956. London, Evans Brothers Ltd., 1956.
- KING-HALL, Robert and LAUWERYS, J.A., eds. The yearbook of education 1955, London, Evans Bros. Ltd., 1955.

- KITAITZEV, V.A., "U.S.S.R." in Access to higher education. Vol. II (National Studies), Unesco and the International Association of Universities, 1965.
- KOBAYASHI, Nobuo Victor, John Dewey in Japanese educational thought, The University of Michigan School of Education, Malloy Lithoprinting, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1964.
- KOBAYASHI, Tetsuya "Changing policies in higher education - the Japanese case" See HOLMES, Brian, and SCANLON, David, eds. Higher education in a changing world...
- KOBAYASHI, Tetsuya, Society, schools and progress in Japan, Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1976.
- KOERNER, J.D. Reform in education: England and the United States, Weidenfeld and Nicholson, London, 1968.
- KOGAN, M. and PACKWOOD, T. Advisory councils and committees in Education, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1974.
- KOROL, A.G. Soviet education for science and technology, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass. 1957.
- KOTSCHNIG, Walter M and PRYS, Elined, eds. The university in a changing world: a symposium, Oxford University Press, London, 1932.
- KRUCHOV, N.S. "Proposals to reform Soviet Education: memorandum by N.S. Kruchov on strengthening the ties of the school with life and further developing the system of public education, Soviet Booklet No. 42, October 1958.
- KRUPSKAYA, N.K. On education, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1950.

- LAMBERT, Royston, The public schools: a sociological introduction,
 See KALTON, Graham, The public schools....
 Introduction, pp. xi-xxxii.
- LANE, D. Politics and society in the USSR, Weidenfeld and
 Nicholson, London, 1970.
- LAUWERYS, Joseph and TAYAR, Graham, eds., Education at home and
 abroad, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1973.
- LAUWERYS, J.A. "General education in a changing world, Opening
 Address" in COMPARATIVE EDUCATION SOCIETY in
 EUROPE PROCEEDINGS, Berlin 1965.
- LAUWERYS, J.A., See BEREDAY, George Z.F. and LAUWERYS, Joseph A.
 eds. The world yearbook of education 1965...
- See BEREDAY, George Z.F. and LAUWERYS, Joseph A., eds.,
 The yearbook of education, 1958...
- See BEREDAY, George Z.F. and LAUWERYS, Joseph A., eds.
 The yearbook of education 1959...
- See BEREDAY, George Z.F. and LAUWERYS, Joseph A., eds.
 The yearbook of education 1961...
- See BEREDAY, George Z.F. and LAUWERYS, Joseph A., eds.
 The yearbook of education 1962...
- See HANS, N. and LAUWERYS, J.A. eds. The yearbook of
 education 1950...
- See KING-HALL, Robert and LAUWERYS, J.A. eds. The yearbook
 of education 1956.
- See KING-HALL, Robert and LAUWERYS, J.A., eds. The yearbook
 of education 1955.
- LAWTON, Denis, Class, culture and the curriculum, Routledge and
 Kegan Paul, London 1975.

- LAWTON, Denis Curriculum change in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries... See GORDON, Peter, and LAWTON, Denis...
- LAWTON, D. Education and social justice, Sage Publications, London, 1977.
- LAWTON, D. Social change, educational theory and curriculum planning, Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1973.
- LAYARD, Richard et. al. The impact of Robbins, Penguin, Middlesex, 1969.
- le GALL, A., et.al. eds., Present problems in the democratization of secondary and higher education, Unesco, Paris, 1973.
- LENIN, V.I. Lenin on culture and cultural revolution, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1970.
- LIDDLE, Clifford S., The foundations of the American secondary school curriculum, See BEREDAY, George Z.F. and LAUWERYS, Joseph A., The yearbook of education 1958... pp. 78-86.
- LITTLE, Alan and KALLEN, Denis, "Western European schooling systems and higher education: a warning for comparative education" in Comparative Education, Vol. 4, No. 2, 1968.
- LOCKWOOD, D., "Social mobility". See WELFORD, A.J. and others eds. Society: problems and methods of study, pp. 501-520.
- LOWE, R.A. "Determinants of a university's curriculum", in British Journal of Educational Studies, Vol. XVII, 1969.
- LILGE, Frederic "Lenin and the parties of education". See KARABEL, Jerome and HALSEY, A.H. eds. Power and ideology...

- LYNN, Richard "Comprehensives and equality: the quest for the unattainable" in SILVER, Harold ed. Equal opportunity in education... pp. 285-295.
- McCONNELL, T.R., "From elite to mass to...". See T.R. McCONNELL et.al. From elite to mass to universal higher education...
- McCONNELL, T.R. et. al. From elite to mass to universal higher education: the British and American transformations, Centre for Research and development in higher education, University of California, Berkeley, 1973.
- MACLURE, J.S. Educational documents, 1816-1968, Methuen, London, 1968.
- MALLINSON, V., An introduction to the study of comparative education, 4th ed. Heinemann, London, 1975.
- MALLINSON, Vernon, The Western European idea in education, Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1980.
- MARRIS, Peter, The experience of higher education, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1964.
- MARSHALL, T.H., Class, citizenship and social development: Essays by T.H. Marshall, with an introduction by Seymour Martin Lipset. Doubleday & Company Inc., Garden City, New York, 1964.
- MARTINDALE, Don. Sociological theory and the ideal type. See GROSS, Llewellyn, ed. Symposium on Sociological theory, pp. 57-91.
- MEDSKER, Leland, The junior college: progress and prospect, McGraw & Hill, N.Y. 1960.

- MERTON, Robert K., Social theory and Social structure. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1957.
- MICHIO, Nagai, Higher education in Japan: its take off and crash, University of Tokyo Press, 1971.
- MIKHAILOV, S.V., "Certain questions as to the program for character training in the schools," in Soviet Education, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1958.
- MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, See GREAT BRITAIN, Ministry of Education...
- MONTGOMERY, R.J. Examinations: an account of their evolution as administrative devices in England, London, Longmans Green and Co Ltd., 1965.
- MUSGRAVE, P.W. Knowledge, curriculum and change, Melbourne University Press, Melbourne 1973.
- MUSGRAVE, P.W. Sociology, history and education, Methuen, London, 1970.
- NARITA, Katsuya, Systems of higher education, International Council for Educational Development, N.Y., 1978.
- NASH, Paul, KAZAMIAS, Andreas, PERKINSON, Henry J. eds., The educated man: studies in the history of educational thought, John Wilty & Sons Inc., New York, 1965.
- NOZHKO, K. et.al., eds. Education planning in the USSR, Unesco, International institute for Educational Planning, 1968.
- NOAH, H.J. eds., Scientific investigation in comparative education. See ECKSTEIN M.A. and NOAH, H.J., eds. Scientific investigations...

- NOAH, Harold J. and ECKSTEIN, Max A., eds., Toward a science of comparative education, The Macmillan Company, Collier-Macmillan Limited, London, 1969.
- NEWSOM REPORT, See GREAT BRITAIN, CENTRAL ADVISORY COUNCIL...
- NOGEE, J.L., Man, state and society in the Soviet Union, Pall Mall, London, 1972.
- NORWOOD REPORT, See GREAT BRITAIN, BOARD OF EDUCATION, Curriculum and examinations.
- OAKESHOTT, M., Rationalism in politics, Methuen, London, 1962.
- OECD., Methods and statistical needs for educational planning, OECD, Paris, 1967.
- OECD., Case studies of educational innovation: strategies for innovation, Vol. IV, Paris, OECD, 1973.
- OECD., Classification of Educational Systems: Belgium, Denmark, United States, OECD, Paris, 1972.
- OECD., Classification of educational systems: France, Norway, Spain, OECD, Paris, 1972.
- OECD., Classification of Educational Systems: United Kingdom, OECD, Paris, 1962.
- OECD., Educational policy and planning: France, Directorate for scientific affairs, OECD, Paris, 1972.
- OECD., Reviews of national policy for education: Japan, OECD, Paris, 1971.
- OECD., Reviews of national policy for education: United States, OECD, 1971.
- OECD., Reviews of national policy for education: France, OECD, Paris, 1971.
- OECD., Short-cycle higher ed: a search for identity, OECD, Paris, 1973.

- OGBURN, W.F., "The hypothesis of cultural lag". See Etzioni, Amitai and Etzioni, Eva eds. Social change... pp. 459-462.
- OLLMAN, B., Alienation, Marx's conception of man in capitalist society, Cambridge, The University Press, 1971.
- PARSONS, Talcott and PLATT, Gerald M, "Considerations on the American academic system" in Minerva, Vol. VI, No. 4., 1968.
- PASSERON, J.C, Case studies in innovation... See GRIGNON, C, and PASSERON, J.C. Case studies in innovation in...
- PASSERON, Jean-Claude, Reproduction in education... See BORDIEU, Pierre and PASSERON, Jean-Claude, Reproduction in education...
- PASSIN, A., Society and education in Japan, Teachers College Press, New York, 1965.
- PASSIN, Herbert, "Japan" in COLEMAN, James S., ed. Education and political development.
- PATTERSON, Michelle, "French university reform: renaissance or restoration", in Comparative Education Review, Vol. 16, 1972.
- PATTERSON, Michelle, "Governmental policy and equality in higher education: the Junior Collegization of the French university", in Social Problems, Vol. 24, 1976.
- PERKIN, H.J., Case studies in innovation in higher education: the New Universities in the United Kingdom, OECD, Paris, 1969.

- PERKIN, H.J., "The new universities in Britain", in Western European Education, Vol. II, No. 4, 1970-71.
- PERKINSON, Henry J. ed., The educated man... See NASH, Paul, KAZAMIAS, Andreas, and PERKINSON, Henry J. eds. The educated man...
- PETERS, R.S., The logic of education... See HIRST, P.H. and PETERS, R.S., The logic of education.
- PERRUCCI, Robert and ZOLLSCHAN, George K., Social stability and social process... See ZOLLSCHAN, George K., and PERRUCCI, Robert "Social stability and Social process..."
- PHENIX, Philip H., Realms of meaning: a philosophy of the curriculum for general education, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1964.
- PHENIX, Philip H., "The disciplines as curriculum content". See VANDERBERG, Donald ed. Theory of knowledge and problems of education...
- POIGNANT, R., Education in the industrialised countries, Nijhoff, The Hague, 1973.
- POSTLETHWAITE, N., "School organisation and student achievement" in ECKSTEIN, Max A and NOAH, Harold J. (eds), Scientific investigations in... pp. 84-96.
- REDL, H.B. ed. and trans. Soviet educators on Soviet education, The Free Press, New York, 1964.
- RICHARDS, Colin, ed. Power and the curriculum: issues in curriculum studies, Nafferton Books, Drifffield, 1978.

- RICKOVER, H.G. Education for all children: what we can learn from England, Washington U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963.
- RINGER, Fritz, K. Education and society in modern Europe, Indiana University Press, Bloomington and London, 1979.
- ROBBINS REPORT, See COMMITTEE ON HIGHER EDUCATION, Higher Education...
- ROBSINSOHN, S.B. Relevant data... See HOLMES, B. and ROBSINSOHN, S.B. Relevant data in comparative education...
- RODERICK, G.W. Universities in a changing world... See STEPHENS, M.D. and RODERICK, G.W., eds. Universities in a changing world...
- ROSEN, Seymour M., Education and modernization in the USSR, Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Reading, Mass., 1971.
- ROUCEK, Joseph S., The American background to the quest for excellence, See BEREDAY, George Z.F. and LAUWERYS, Joseph A., eds., The yearbook of education 1961 ... pp. 140-171.
- The role of educational institutions with special reference to highly industrialised areas. See BEREDAY, George Z.F. and LAUWERYS, Joseph A., eds., The world yearbook of education, 1965... pp. 136-161.
- RUNCIMAN, W.G. ed. Max Weber, Selections in Translation, trans. E. Matthews, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1978.
- RYBA, R. ed. Curriculum development at the second level... See HOLMES, B. and RYBA, R. eds. Curriculum development...

- SANDFORD, Nevitt, ed., The American college: a psychological and social interpretation of higher learning, New York, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962.
- SAUVY, Alfred, Access to education, Vol. III. Martinus Nijhoff The Hague, Netherlands, 1973.
- SCHOOLS COUNCIL, THE Raising the school leaving age: a co-operative programme of research and development, Schools Council, H.M.S.O., London, 1965.
- SCHOOLS COUNCIL, THE Society and the young school leaver: a humanities programme in preparation for the raising of the school leaving age. Working paper No. II., Schools Council, H.M.S.O., London, 1967.
- SCHOOLS COUNCIL, THE The whole curriculum 13-16, Working Paper No. 53, Evans Educational, London, 1975.
- SCOTT, Peter Strategies for post secondary education, Croom Helm, London, 1975.
- SHAPOVALENKO, S.G. Polytechnical education in the U.S.S.R., Unesco, Paris, 1963.
- SHIBANOV, A.A. "On the bond between school and life", in Soviet Education, Vol. I, No. 3., 1959.
- SHIMAHARA, Nobuo K., Adaptation and education in Japan, Praeger Special Studies, Praeger Publishers, New York, 1979.
- SILVER, Harold Education and the social condition, Methuen, London, 1980.
- SILVER, Harold ed. Equal opportunity in education: a reader in social class and educational opportunity. Methuen & Co Ltd., London, 1973.

- SMITH, D. "Codes, paradigms and folk norms", in *Sociology*
Vol. 10., No. 1.
- SMITH, Dennis, "Power, ideology and the transmission of
knowledge: an exploratory essay." See HOPPER,
Earl, ed. *Readings...*
- SMITH, Dennis, "Selection and knowledge management in education
systems." See HOPPER, Earl, ed. *Readings...*
- SMITH, Othanel B. *Democracy and excellence...* See BROUDY,
Harry S. et. al. *Democracy and excellence...*
- SMITH, Wilson ed. See HOFSTADTER, Richard and SMITH, Wilson,
eds. *American higher education...*
- SPENS REPORT, See GREAT BRITAIN, BOARD OF EDUCATION...
- SPENCER, Herbert, *Essays on education: and kindred subjects*,
Everyman edition, London, J.M. Dent and Sons Ltd.,
1911.
- SPLTON, L. *The upper secondary school: a comparative survey*,
Pergamon, Oxford, 1967.
- SPRINGER, Ursula K. *Recent curriculum developments in France,
West Germany and Italy: a study of trends at the
middle level of education*, Teachers College Press,
New York, 1969.
- STENHOUSE, L. *An introduction to curriculum research and
development*. Heinemann, London, 1975.
- STEPHENS, M.D. and RODERICK, G.W., *Universities for a changing
world: the role of the university in the later
twentieth century*, David and Charles, Newton
Abbott, 1975.

- STEVENS, Frances, *The living tradition: the social and educational assumptions of the grammar school*, London, Hutchinson and Co., 1960.
- SULEIMAN, Ezra N., *Elites in French society: the politics of survival*, Princeton University Press, Princeton New Jersey, 1978.
- TAYAR, Graham ed., *Education at Home and Abroad*. See LAUWERYS, Joseph and TAYAR, Graham eds., *Education...*
- TOMIAK, J.J. *The Soviet Union*, David and Charles, Newton Abbott, 1972.
- TOMIAK, J.J. "The university in the Soviet Union". See STEPHENS, M.D. and RODERICK, G.W. eds. *Universities in a changing world...*
- TROW, Martin, *Problems in the transition from elite to mass higher education*, Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, McGraw Hill Book Company, New Jersey, 1973.
- TURNER, Ralph, *Modes of social ascent through education: sponsored and contest mobility*, See HALSEY, A.H. and others, eds., *Education, economy and...* pp. 121-139.
- TURNER, Ralph, H. "Sponsored and contest mobility and the school system", See HOPPER, Earl, ed. *Readings...*
- ULICH, Robert, *The contemporary academic scene in the United States*, See BEREDAY, George Z.F. and LAUWERYS, Joseph A., eds., *The yearbook of education 1959...* pp. 122-130.

- UNESCO, Access to higher education: Vol. II (national studies)
Unesco and the International Association of
Universities, 1965.
- UNESCO, The International Standard Classification of Education,
(ISCED), Unesco, Paris, 1975.
- UNESCO, World survey of education, Vol. 3. Secondary education,
Unesco, Paris, 1961.
- UNESCO, World survey of education, Vol. IV, Higher education,
Unesco, Paris, 1966.
- UNESCO, World survey of education, Vol. V., Educational policy
and legislation, Unesco, Paris, 1971.
- UNITED STATES, DEPARTMENT of HEALTH, EDUCATION and WELFARE,
See UNITED STATES, Office of education.
- UNITED STATES, OFFICE OF EDUCATION, Digest of educational
statistics 1962, Washington, United States
Government Printing Office, 1962.
- UNITED STATES, OFFICE OF EDUCATION, Digest of educational
statistics, 1965, Washington, United States
Government Printing Office, 1965.
- UNITED STATES SENATE, COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE,
The National Defense Education Act of 1958:
a summary and analysis of the Act prepared by
the staff of the Committee on Labor and Public
Welfare, United States Senate, Spet. 1958, U.S.
Government Printing Office, Washington, 1958.
- USSR, COUNCIL OF MINISTERS and CPSU, "On strengthening the
bonds of the school with life and the further
development of the public education system in the
country. Theses of the Central Committee of the
Communist Party of the Soviet Union and Council of

- Ministers of the USSR," in Soviet Education, Vol. I, No. 4., 1958.
- VAN de GRAAFF, John, "The politics of innovation in French higher education: the University Institute of Technology" in Higher Education, Vol. 5, 1976.
- VANDENBERG, Donald, ed. Theory of knowledge and problems of education, University of Illinois Press, Urbana, Illinois, 1969.
- VAUGHAN, Michalina and ARCHER, Scotford Margaret, Social conflict and educational change in England and France 1789-1848, Cambridge, at the University Press 1971.
- VAUGHAN, Michalina, "The Grandes Ecoles", in WILKINSON, Rupert, ed. Governing elites: studies in training and selection, Oxford University Press, New York, 1969.
- WARNOCK, Mary, Schools of Thought, Faber, London, 1977.
- WELFORD, A.T. et. al. Society: problems and methods of study, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1962.
- WHITE, John Philosophers as educational reformers... See GORDON, Peter, Philosophers as...
- WHITE, J.P. Towards a compulsory curriculum, Routledge and Kegan, Paul, London, 1973.
- WHITTY, G and YOUNG, Michael Explorations in the politics of school knowledge, Nafferton Driffield, 1976.
- WILKINSON, Rupert, ed. Governing elites: studies in training and selection, Oxford University Press, New York, 1969.

WILKINSON, Rupert, *The Prefects: British leadership and the public school tradition*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1964.

WILLIAMSON, Ann, "Innovation in higher education: French experience before 1968". See HOLMES, B. and SCANLON, D. eds. *Higher education in a changing world...*

ZLOCZOWER, Awaraham *Universities and academic systems...* See BEN-DAVID, Joseph and ZLOCZOWER, Awaraham, *Universities and academic systems...*

ZOLLSCHAN, George K. and PERRUCCI, Robert, *Social stability and social process: an initial presentation of relevant categories*, See ZOLLSCHAN, George K. and HIRSCH, Walter eds. *Explorations in Social Change*, pp. 99-124.

ZOLLSCHAN, George K. and HIRSCH, Walter, "Working papers in the theory of institutionalization". See ZOLLSCHAN, George K. and HIRSCH Walter, eds. *Explorations in Social Change*, pp. 89-97.

ZOLLSCHAN, George K. and HIRSCH, Walter, eds. *Explorations in Social Change*, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1964. With an Introduction by Don Martindale.

Ann McCaffrey who is quoted at the head of Chapter Three is a novelist. The fictional reference is to a place in her 'Dragonflight' series of novels. Perm is also located at 56° E and 58° N, approximately.