A critical historiographical analysis of England's educational policies from 1944 to 2011

Alison Taysum[1]

Abstract: The paper aims to reveal how educational policies in England have shifted over time revealing 'policy eras' and underpinning ideologies using Hodgson and Spours (2006) framework from 1944 to 2011. I take a critical policy historiography approach to map the processes and systems of educational developments and reveal the potential relationships between the problems and issues of the present and the past. Two key political eras are identified. The first is an egalitarian approach and engagement with community interests underpinned by respect and recognition for diversity within and amongst human beings. The second era focuses on self-interests within neo-liberal market forces of supply and demand. The argument I make is the nation faces a challenge of how to provide socially just education processes and systems that balance these two interests whilst facilitating civic engagement, or 'participation' with education systems and processes through evidence informed participatory policy making and implementation.

Keywords: ideologies, participatory policy-making, balance, England

[1] School of Education, University of Leicester, 21 University Road, Leicester, LE1 7RF, England. E-mail: ast11@le.ac.uk

Introduction

The paper takes a critical policy historiography approach (Gale, 2001, p. 385), with an aim to examine policy as text and policy as discourse in England for compulsory education. The paper draws on policy documents, government policy texts, academic literature, newspaper cuttings, and websites. The paper examines new and old discourses and maps the key themes that occur and re-occur in the historiography of English policy development. The paper also draws upon Hodgson and Spours Analytical Framework for Policy Engagement (2006, p. 684) that revealed two political eras in English education policy making. Hodgson and Spours (2006) argue that the framework has emerged from limited research. This paper makes a new contribution to knowledge by further testing the framework. Other researches have examined the history of education policy from 1944 including Jones (2010); Whitty (2008) Simon (1991), McCulloch (2007). The second original contribution to knowledge this paper makes is to draw on such researches to reveal how policy decisions from World War II (WWII) and through the last sixty seven years have facilitated participation in education systems and processes. The changes that are taking place in education policy in England today are happening at great speed and I will draw on newspaper cuttings (Simon, 1991) and online web documents to describe and analyse the changes against a backdrop of previous political eras in English Government policy.

The reconstruction of key policy shifts of educational policy-making in England since 1944 in compulsory education will also provide opportunities for policy learning from the past. The paper examines five particular time-frames that are shaped by changes in government. However, the analysis reveals only two different policy eras that are shaped by two ideologies. The first ideology is that of a progressive comprehensive education for all that recognizes values whilst being coupled to a labour market located within a welfare state with a balance between public ownership and private enterprise. The second is a market led managerialist approach that favours a differentiated or segregated approach to education within a discourse of technological advancements, that either seeks to shape citizens' values by changing their behaviour or responsibilizes citizens particularly vulnerable citizens within a discourse of globalization. It is important to note that when mapping the shifts in educational policy

there may appear to be a determinism present that does not capture the messiness of the policy development and the struggles that occurred between agents. Therefore the reader needs to be mindful that as decisions were made regarding education policy and as these policies were implemented, the systems were always open for alternative ways of thinking and doing. To address the aims of the paper I ask three questions. First, how can the development of educational policies from 1944 to 2011 be described and understood? Second, to what extent does a critical historiographical analysis of the educational policies in this given timeframe reveal political eras? Finally how can policy making in England be understood in terms of facilitating civic engagement or in other words, participation in educational processes and systems?

Critical Policy Historiography methodology

This paper uses Gale's (2001) critical policy historiography approach which enables me to trace: 'the processes of educational change and to expose the possible relationships between the socio-educational present and the socio-educational past' (Kincheloe, 1991, p. 234). I will do this by systematically and rigorously examining materials from the past to reveal historical stages (Mills, 1959 cited by Gale, 2001). I will look at stages in terms of what Hodgson and Spours (2006) call 'political eras'. Gale suggests critical policy historiography reveals public issues and private troubles and those who Apple (1996) says have power to enforce policy and choose who can and who cannot participate in policy making. Using Gale's (2001) approach the data analysed were predominantly documentary and included primary sources such as government policy texts, commissioned research, and media releases. I have also used secondary sources such as academic literature and newspaper articles which is an approach Simon (1991) used drawing from both national and educational sources that appeared salient. There is not scope to present all policy documents in this paper, rather I use excerpts to illustrate positions and arguments from within the primary and secondary documents analysed (Taysum & Gunter, 2008). What has been selected for inclusion in the paper and what has been deselected is subjective and based on my own interpretations and therefore I need to be very clear about my position in

the paper to enable the reader to make informed judgements about the quality dimensions of the research (Pollard, 2008; Oancea & Furlong, 2007). The position I take in this paper is that there have been two distinctive political eras over the last sixty-seven years. One focuses on community interests and the other on the interests of the individual. Furthermore the data needs theorizing in this way to reveal how a form of socially critical engagement with policy texts may enable what Howe (1997) calls agents' bare opportunities to become economically and culturally real, that individuals can readily participate with. To this end I have read the data through the lens of participation in terms of the ways in which stake holders have the chance to participate with policy as text and policy as discourse (Ball, 2006) or the extent to which they have become conduits through which educational policy passes (Glatter, 1999). In summary I take a critical position in this paper and the critical analysis and theorization are designed to facilitate reader connectedness rather than present claims to generalized truths (Taysum, & Gunter, 2008).

English Education policy 1944 – 1958

The context of educational development between 1943 and 1947 was a coalition government led by Churchill and the Labour government of Atlee. The main aims of the coalition government were to realize a free national health service, an improved social security system, and full employment (Jones, 2010). However, Jones notes that the cost of WWII meant that the welfare state in 1945 was financed by aid from the United States of America's Government which affirmed Neo-Liberal Market Forces which were not supported by Soviet Union or China (Jones, 2010). Saran (1973) argues that if it were not for Lord Butler a Conservative and President of the Board of Education and his Labour Parliamentary Secretary, working together the 1944 Education Act would not have been passed. The Act included an egalitarian approach to education for the masses, and a desire for the replication of tradition, national identity and differentiation of curriculum. The 1944 Education Act which is sometimes named the Butler Act after the then Secretary of State provided clear systems of implementation starting with: 'a Minister of Education' and the defined roles of Local Education Authorities:

> 6. - 1 Subject to the provisions of Part 1 of the First Schedule to this Act, the local education authority for each county shall be the council of the county, and the local education authority for each county borough shall be the council of the county borough...all property...be transferred by virtue of this section to the local education authority for the county in which the county district is situated' (MoE, 1944, pp. 3-4).

It is important to note that the Local Authority was put in place and part of its duties was to implement what the Act called:

> The Three Stages of the System...organised in three progressive stages to be known as primary education, secondary education and further education, and it shall be the duty of the local education authority for every area, so far as their powers extend, to contribute towards the spiritual, moral, mental, and physical development of the community by securing that efficient education throughout those stages shall be available to meet the needs of the population of their area (MoE, 1944, p. 4).

The Act decentralized power by making Local Authorities responsible for the provision of education whilst putting in place systems of accountability. Local Authorities had to submit development plans to the Minister of Education (MoE. 1944) and once these were approved by the Minister of Education the local education order regulated 'the duties of the local education authority' (MoE, 1944, p. 4) who were responsible for the implementation of the development plan. The Education Act did not define curriculums or pedagogical approaches to facilitate the learning in schools, thereby locating the power in the local and particular. The policy as text intended a more democratic approach to the organization of public education with education for all through primary schools, secondary schools and Further Education. Saran (1973) argues what prevented the democratic 'education for all' from being implemented was the lack of statute in the 1944 Education Act that defined how this was to be achieved and the default position was provided by the Norwood Report's (1943) 'rough groupings' (p. 3) of society into three kinds of minds. Norwood (1943) said it is not necessary to ask: 'whether such groupings are distinct

on strictly psychological grounds, whether they represent types of mind, whether the differences are differences in kind or in degree' (p. 2).

The taken-for-granted assumption that there were three kinds of minds needs to be problematized but first I will represent Norwoods three types of minds. The first mind was suitable to be trained: 'to an occupation where their capacities would be suitably used; that a future occupation is already present to their minds' (Norwood, 1943, p. 4). The second mind can be: 'closely related to industry, trades and commerce in all their diversity' (p. 4). Whereas the third mind was predisposed for a 'balanced training of mind and body... to enable pupils to take up the work of life...and....make a direct appeal to interests awakened by practical touch with affairs' (p. 4). Within Norwood's tripartite framework a child centred approach is 'impossible to carry...into practice'. Such a barrier to education for all denied the possibility of a culturally relevant curriculum that is meaningful and worthwhile for a child. Students took an examination that determined which kind of mind they had and whether they went to Grammar Schools, Secondary Modern Schools or Technical Schools which ultimately determined their social position. The discourse surrounding students having the cultural capital to predispose them to gain higher marks in the examination was overlooked (Bourdieu, 2000). Interrogating the education policy reveals that the examination privileged children from particular cultural and economic groupings (Moll, 2010). Once segregated children were fast tracked via Secondary Modern Schools, or Technical Schools into non-academic vocational subjects and career trajectories their life chances were limited (Moll, 2010).

Norwood (1943) did try to problematize the examination in his report and provides arguments for the examination as 'a tonic' that provides 'stimulus' for both students and teachers and arguments against where he states:

> At present the examination dictates the curriculum and cannot do otherwise; it confines experiment, limits free choice of subject, hampers treatment of subjects, encourages wrong values in the classroom... No one can examine better than the teacher, who knows the child; and a method of examination by the teacher, combined with school records, could be devised which would furnish a certificate giving information of real importance to employer or college or profession. (Norwood, 1943, pp. 31-32).

Recognition of the professionalism of the teacher was important to Norwood and he believed that teachers should engage with pedagogies that would enable participation through education (McCulluch, 2007). Norwood was ambitious for the teaching profession, and ambitious for the working class children though this does seem apparent at first reading of his report and needs further analysis. McCulloch (2007) argues that Norwood came from a family who served fee paying Grammar Schools. The Grammar Schools provided alternative affordable education to middle class parents whose children had the chance to go to Oxford University or Cambridge University and therefore had access to social mobility. Merchant Taylor School was a fee paying grammar school that charged £10 per year in 1860 with a £3 entrance fee and five shillings for moving up a grade. The public school boarding fees in 1860 for nine schools in the Clarendon Report which underpinned the 1864 Public Schools Act were prohibitive for middle class families at £200 per year and £144 per year for Harrow. McCulloch argues that Norwood hoped that state grammar schools might offer a route to an elite education through scholarships to Oxford and Cambridge for working class and middle class children based on merit rather than economic and cultural capital (Bourdieu, 2000). However, the evidence suggests that 'two nations' were emerging (McCulloch, 2007, p. 156). McCulloch also argues The 1944 Education Act had panicked the elite who feared for the decline of society's moral fabric with the onset of educating the masses through the 1944 Education Act. The response of the elite was to further segregate themselves from the masses.

At the same time, the processes of capitalism were chipping away at the class divides Through the development of capitalism fuelled by the industrial revolution that started in the 1700's new emerging infrastructures required new roles to manage it. New 'modern' professions emerged to fill these roles including solicitors, doctors, engineers, accountants, and teachers (Taysum, 2006). There were now two distinct groups within the middle classes made up of the 'old middle classes' such as the clergy, and the military and the 'new middle classes'. With the fee paying grammar schools coming to an end after 1944 the old middle classes, the new middle classes and the working classes were all competing for grammar school places. McCulloch (2007) identifies that the old middle classes moved to the private sector for their education leaving the masses and new middle classes to state education which widened the gap between public schools

and the state. The new professional groups on the other hand had ideologies that included working for the public good, and what Pring *et al.* (2009) affirm is 'Education for All', augmenting moral standards (Lubenow, 2002) and developing capitalist ideologies that provided them with systems to manage their pathway to middle class (Taysum, 2006). These arguments go some way to explaining why Norwood wanted a grammar school pathway to elite Universities and elite social positions, however the redistribution of the old middle classes to the private sector and the growth of newer Universities meant that the grammar schools often provided access to Universities but not to the elite status that Norwood aimed for in his report (McCulloch, 2007). There are clearly tensions between an ideal of full participation and the realization of full participation in education processes and systems that recognize cultural diversity and civic participation through meritocricy. The theme of participation is one I shall revisit throughout this paper.

English Education policy from 1958 - 1975

The Secondary Modern Schools were not meeting the aspirations of the 1944 Education Act and were not providing opportunities for full participation in the education system to enable pragmatic social mobility. Jones (2010) argues there were still clear class divisions realized through behaviour differences for example the boys at a grammar school could not eat chips in public and the girls were not allowed to remove their gloves. Anthony Crosland's book 'The Future of Socialism' represented alternative ways of thinking and doing regarding education. The book impacted upon the The Ministry of Education who produced a report in (1958) 'Britain's Future and Technical Education'. The report advocated that students take public examinations which had the potential of increasing their participation in the education system. The Crowther Report (1959) developed this and aimed for forty per cent of the age group taking public examinations to give access to different life and career trajectories. New participatory approaches in education achieved through public examinations were beginning to realise an education that facilitated social mobility rooted in meritocracy rather than social origins (Jones, 2010). Jones (2010) argues that the economic infrastructure was supporting more

self-determination across England because groups in society were able to participate in decision making in business rather than elite share-holders of companies.

The Robbins Report (1963) argued there was a large pool of untapped educational ability predominantly located in the working class. The Newsome Report in 1963 labelled 'Half our Future' had an aim to free individuals' potential by making an offer of more equitable provision to the 'average' and 'below average' student. The approach was underpinned by an egalitarian ideology that every child mattered and all potential needed to be recognized and nurtured whilst meeting the needs of the developing economic infrastructure. Thus education policy sought to couple together the cultural and economic needs of the nation. In 1964 Labour's election promise was to provide a comprehensive education system that did not need a grammar stream because it would provide a grammar education for all. The Circular 10/65 (DES, 1965) by the then Labour Education of State Antony Crosland was to eliminate 'separtisim' (Maclure, 1973) and segregation or in other words to bring the 'two nations' (Simon, 1991; McCulloch, 2007) that were segregated by the private and state schools, back to 'one nation'. It is important to note that a further divide in the nation was that of grammar schools for the predominantly middle class children and the secondary and technical schools for the working class children.

Crosland argued that a coherent strategy was needed to construct a comprehensive education system with teachers and resources. The new comprehensive system would develop a skilled labour force that was required to operate within the technologically advancing businesses in England and other nations states' infrastructures. The Plowden report (DES, 1967) presented such a coherent strategy to offer a more inclusionary and progressive child-centred education system. Strain (1998) suggests: 'the learner's "busy-ness", (was) [sic] an indication then of fruitful learning in process' (p. 9). Volume 1 Part 5 Chapter 6 of The Plowden Report (1967) 'Children Learning in School' provided a comprehensive review of how children learn in schools and emerged from extensive systematic research including a national survey in 1963 and visits to schools in Denmark, France, Sweden, Poland, U.S. and USSR. The research built on the 1926 Hadow report and states:

> Underlying all educational questions is the nature of the child himself. Are children of today at the same stage of development as children of the same age were in 1926? Ought all, or nearly all, children of the same age to be able to do the same things? How great are the differences between boys and girls, and do they vary with age? If a child's 'intelligence' is tested at the age of eight or eleven, will the results hold good five or six years later? What is the relationship between environmental and genetic factors in the shaping of human ability? (DES, 1967, online).

The Plowden Report began to ask questions about the nature of mind and potential of each child that Norwood (1943) had found 'not necessary' to ask. These questions focusing on the nature/nurture debate were also being asked by teachers. The teachers' inquiries had been made possible by the Newsome Report (1963) that had called for a larger number of teachers who were to be trained for longer. The enhanced teacher training enabled teachers to consider how to try to and succeed in imparting that which is worthwhile and moral to the learners (Peters, 1974, MoE, 1944). Peters (1974) argued success may be evidenced by broad qualities such as accuracy, relevance, and developing resilience. More particular virtues included valour, compassion, and grace (Peters, 1974). However, there were still divisions between Grammar School teachers who had degrees, and Secondary Modern School teachers who had certificates. The divisions presented opposition to progressive education through the Unions. Grammar School teachers were usually male and family 'bread winners' and organized unions with The National Association of School Masters Union who distanced themselves from progressivism preferring either the Grammar School pathway or controlling the masses in Secondary Modern Schools and Technical Colleges. The National Union of Teachers was dominated by female teachers who were not seen at that time as the family 'bread winners' and had less power when advocating for more progressive approaches to education (Jones, 2010). As Jones (2010) succinctly argues asking questions of the mind might impact on developing the innate abilities of working class children who did not have the elaborate language codes or cultural capital of the middle classes that enabled a pragmatic engagement with curriculum (Bernstein, 1990, Dewey cited in Pring, 2007, Freire, 1972). Comprehensive education therefore had the potential to challenge the divide between academic pathways and vocational pathways

and present opportunities for children to participate in communities of learning thus developing the virtues required for effective social cohesion (Peters, 1974). This is affirmed by Jones (2010) who cites Christine Schiller, Her Majesty's Inspector who grasped the opportunity of a de-centralized education system to develop networks of professional educationalists who worked in their institutions for the comprehensive ideal so that children could learn and live more fully. Such a network existed in the Schools Council set up in 1964. The Government could control budgets and could review education plans but were limited in their influence over pedagogies and curriculums. As a result the Government set up The Schools' Council in 1964 to implement education reform. The Schools' Council was made up of mostly teacher representatives enabling full participation of the teaching profession in all the processes of curriculum implementation. Such participation enhanced opportunities to make curriculums culturally relevant (Sleeter, 2005, Gandin and Apple, 2002; Freire, 1972). Working class children who did not have access to the social rules or 'cultural capital' (Bourdieu, 2000) that middle class children had did not know they might be judged for 'eating chips' or 'taking gloves off' in public, could now have a better chance of competing on a more even playing field. The curriculum could be presented to them in ways that were meaningful to their social rules. Teachers were also engaging with how children learn and constructively critiqued the nature, nurture debate along with issues of gender and those recognized as being marginalized or having special educational needs. Arnot *et al.* (2001) concluded that sociologically, the establishment and development of the welfare state along with the expansion of mainstream educational provision influenced enhanced opportunities for social mobility and enhanced civic engagement 3. In summary, English educational policy from 1958 to 1974 had enhanced participation in education processes including public examinations.

English Educational policy 1975 - 1997

In the 1970s a distinctive shift of educational policy was experienced in England. In 1976 the black papers, a series of populist pamphlets critiqued 'comprehensive education for all' and the progressive movement. The move to social collectivism that began with the education of the masses

through the 1944 Education Act made possible by a Coalition government was pathologised. Pathologised here means diagnosed as a disease. Ball (2006) argues The Black Papers pathologised the progressive movement by focusing on: a decline in academic standards, indiscipline resulting in a direct relationship between the decline in traditional values and moral decay, and: 'dangerous politically motivated teachers preaching revolution, socialism, egalitarianism, feminism and sexual deviation' (pp. 28-29), where the sexual deviation referred to Gay, Lesbian, Bi-sexual and Transvestites (GLBT). Ball (2006) argues The Black Papers were an hegemonic discourse of contemptuous mockery that through language and the media became a common sense view. Ball argues the 'madness' of egalitarianism, social engineering and democracy or participation was dismissed in favour of tradition, discipline and authority and from 1976 onwards only certain policies were deemed 'sane'. Where policy as text was being constructed only certain concepts and interests could be heard. A socially just constructive critique of progressivism and comprehensivism through a systematic, rigorous meaningful and worthwhile engagement with the discourses became impossible. The Black Papers therefore facilitated the intellectual basis for affirming an anti-progressive ideology and a swing away from child-centred education. Callaghan's speech at Ruskin College presented a need to focus on a more technocratic education with greater accountability because progressivism and comprehensivism was framed to be the blame for the economic problems in society (Bartlett & Burton, 2003). The international context linked to world trade and oil prices was bleached out of this discussion. However the seeds for 'globalisation' were sown by making clear the relationship between transforming a person's identity by giving them skills or knowledge, and their education that Stevenson and Bell (2006) call 'human capital'. The interplay between the education market and human capital determined the mix of skills and knowledge required for economic growth and was structured by the curriculum content and/or pedagogy. The limitations of human capital theory are that educational objectives and processes are narrowed and learning can become reductionist and linear which impacts upon the joy of learning. Arguably the focus on a narrowed curriculum needed to be determined by the required mix of subjects identified by finding the capital/labour relation (Bertaux & Bertaux-Wiame, 1981).

Lauder *et al.* (1998) argued that a narrowing of curriculum trained incapacity to think differently and therefore removed the opportunities for constructive critical thinking that underpins evidence informed choices required for full civic participation. Not developing the thinking tools of constructive critique reflection and reflexivity (Taysum, 2010) prevents human beings from examining in a meaningful and worthwhile way what Faulkes (1998) calls reciprocal rights and the complex and often opposing set of social and political processes hall marked by political compromise and historiographical and economic contexts.

The Conservatives then implemented a compulsory curriculum for all maintained schools in England with the 1988 Education Reform Act (DES, 1988). Jones (2010) argues that the National Curriculum replicated the grammar school curriculum from Norwood (1943) and effectively realized a tripartite structure with city technology colleges that could deliver the human capital required for the economy. Religious education was compulsory and control of budgets and the appointment of staff was devolved to schools. The reforms did not aim to reduce gender inequalities since feminist discourses had been demonised as discussed above. Rather the reforms foregrounded the accumulation of academic qualifications which could be linked to education outcomes using human capital theory. Conditions were created for different young men and women of different ethnic groups and different social classes to face different sets of choices (Arnot *et al.*, 2001). Parents became customers in the market for a good education. The fees for Private schools are located in one of the two nations identified by Simon (1991) and McCulloch (2007). Middle class parents who found the fees too expensive could opt for grammar schools or send their child to a school at the top of the league tables in the second nation's schooling system. The working class families lack the economic capital required to enable them to participate fully in their community and society (Bourdieu, 2000). Access is denied because working class families cannot afford expensive housing in the catchment areas of high performing schools. Bussing children into schools outside of their catchment area is arguably problematic because the children are segregated from their community during their school life and are in effect having to build two identities that will enable them to thrive in a high achieving school and that will allow them to thrive in their home community where their peers attend a low achieving school (phoenix, 2010). The children of 'middle class'

families on the other hand are able to afford the expensive housing within the catchment areas of high performing schools and therefore building an identity is potentially less complex. In essence selection for school intakes is at play whether that be covert or overt and the stakes are high as schools compete for the highest positions in the schools' 'league tables' (West & Hind, 2003).

Neo liberalist market forces and supply and demand were in operation within the school systems and Walford (2000) argues that industrialised countries around the globe were experiencing similar developments. Such education systems arguably lead to segregation and non-participation. Ball (2004) argues those schools that can select students either formally or informally can more readily control their position in the league tables. Ball draws from his extensive research with head teachers which reveals that the best strategy for improving General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE) performance in the league tables is to manage admissions. There is a significant cost to not getting into an elite school or a school that is well placed in the league tables. Noden and West (2009) argue that there are significant attainment gaps between otherwise similar children who go to schools with different levels of deprivation.

However, Local Education Authorities and the Schools Council set up in 1964 could still play a significant role networking between schools. The Conservative Government reduced the power of the Local Education Authorities through funding and limiting membership of governing bodies. In 1980 the governing bodies had to have at least two parent governors, one or two teachers, and local government officers were restricted (Jones, 2010). Whitty (2008) states the strategy was further embedded in the 1992 White Paper (DfE, 1992) that moved more money away from the Local Authorities to reduce their power through the Local Management of Schools (LMS). Therefore the Conservatives had shifted the control of school budgets from the Local Education Authority to head teachers and governors who controlled staffing levels, material resources, and policy choices. Further, parents could vote on taking schools out of the Local Education Authorities altogether by converting to Grant Maintained Status which gave them funding at a higher level than the average state school (Jones, 2010). Maden (1993, pp. 117-118) states of the dismantling of the Local Education Authorities: the White Paper praises to the skies grant

maintained schools and city technology colleges and the positive achievements of some 99 per cent of schools are largely ignored.

The 1992 Education Schools Act (DfE, 1992) also established the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) as an independent body that inspected primary and secondary schools (Chitty, 2004). Ofsted brought about accountability and the language of attainment and efficiency was further endorsed (Strain, 1998). Ofsted inspected schools to standards commensurate with the education outcomes required for human capital in the labour market. In effect the Conservative Government had isolated head teachers and made them accountable for the attainment of their students in their schools. This was a very different approach and engagement with line management than that found with a network of Local Educational Authorities and Schools Council that joined up groups of educational professionals to ensure that every child mattered in an area. With the isoloation of head teachers, the stage was set to name and shame individual head teachers for students' low attainment including working class boys. The discourse did not acknowledge that in the 1990s the technological advancements eliminated jobs that working class boys would have taken. There was a shift from perceiving working class boys as children who had suffered social injustices and needed welfare structures and support to achieve social mobility, to pathologising them as a minority deviant group. The Conservative Government had therefore not only pathologized comprehensivism and progressivism they had pathologized a group of people in society who could no longer take-up traditional jobs because technological advancement had made them redundant. Rather than acknowledge the shift in the labour market and the decline of apprenticeships (Arnot *et al.*, 1999) the dominant discourse was that schools were producing academic failures for which the head teachers could be blamed. Hatcher (1998) argues that raising attainment for all did not recognize removing barriers to social justice. Rather testing and educational outcomes determined the recognition of specific cultural capital that replicated closed systems. The narrowing of the curriculum and human capital theory had set an agenda that the 1997 New Labour Government continued (Chitty, 2001). The previous Labour social democratic government of the 1960s that implemented comprehensivism and progressivism was excluded by the New Labour. In their stead new groups of people from industry and commerce were invited to the table.

English Educational Policy New Labour 1997 to 2010

Tony Blair the Prime Minister of New Labour stated there were to be three priorities for the Government: education, education, education (Docking, 2000). New Labour continued to develop the agenda of the Education Reform Act (1988) with The 1997 Education Act which aimed to develop standards of attainment with targets (Whitty, 2008) and the language of effectiveness Sammons et al. (1995). Arnot and Miles (2005) suggest there was little of nothing mentioned regarding gender inequality, or a recognition of girls success in maths, science and school leaving examinations. Rather the gender gap at the age of 16 was understood to be predominantly white, working-class boys who lacked educational motivation and achievement. The white working class boys were not participating in education systems and processes. Arnot and Miles (2005) cite Chris Woodhead, the Chief Inspector of Ofsted who called this issue: 'one of the most disturbing problems we face within the whole educational system in these policies' (p. 175). There was a correlation between low educational attainment and low socio-economic status that the Conservatives had not managed to redress in eighteen years of being in power. It is worthy of note that the Conservative's public outcry against educating the working class masses with the Education Act (1944) was that educating the working class would threatened the moral fabrication of society. New Labour wanted to put education processes and systems in place that aimed to recognize children and young people and provide services that would meet their needs. The Every Child Matters agenda attempted to bring together agencies and disparate strands of educational and social policy. Taysum (2010) argues the background to Every Child Matters was the tragic death of Victoria Climbie so that such a tragedy would not be repeated. New Labour also wanted to raise standards of education for all by introducing an extended schools agenda, reforming the workforce and presenting alternatives to failing schools such as academies (Gordon & Broadhead, 2007). Academies were to be constructed in areas of economic deprivation as a strategy to facilitate educational opportunities for working class children to facilitate potential social mobility. The policies focusing on the Every Child Matters agenda followed with the Every Child Matters Green Paper (2003), The Education Act (2004) and The Children's Act (2004). The latter provides legislation underpinning the

transformation of Children's Services as set out in the Every Child Matters agenda. Shortly afterwards Every Child Matters: The Framework for Inspection (Ofsted, 2005) was published as a strategic document for Directors and Managers of Children's Services. Every Child Matters sets out five aims for children: be healthy; stay safe; enjoy and achieve; make a positive contribution; and achieve economic well-being. The Children's Trust provided a framework for change where all children's services worked in partnership to secure the outcomes of children linked to Every Child Matters with a goal of having a network of children centres and extended schools by 2010 (Gordon & Broadhead, 2007). It was recognized that the well-being of children and overcoming disadvantage could not be achieved if services worked in isolation without an overarching coherent strategy. The key was to be responsive so that prevention and early intervention could ensure children and families developed resilience (Gordon & Broadhead, 2007). An independent evaluation of extended schools in September 2006 found individuals and families were able to access learning and influence life chances by improving relationships, raising aspirations, and improving attitudes and self-confidence.

The Further Education and Training Act (2007) followed that focused on the Further Education Sector, and on provision regarding the Learning and Skills Council for England. Diversity was key to the education and training to be made available to learners with a focus on industrial training levels, and joined-up thinking between industry, the third sector and Higher Education Institutions. At this time private enterprise was encouraged in education. Ball (2009) argues that consultants made meeting standards a business. Private consultants such as PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP (PWC), Deloitte and Touche, Ernst and Young, KPMG, McKinsey, the Hay Group, and PKF provided reports, packages and strategies to schools to support improvement (Ball, 2009). The consultants were not working with policy makers, educational leaders and the teaching profession as a whole body to develop the standards and competences as The School's Council founded in 1964 had. Rather the consultants were delivering services in a top down approach to help educational institutions transform and meet targets with policies such as the workforce remodelling (Gunter & Forrester, 2009). The more schools that did not meet the targets, the more business these companies got. Ball (2009) states The Department for Education and Skills increased its spending in three years on private consultancies from £5

million to £22 million and 25% of the consultancy contracts awarded were not put to tender which is arguably not participatory. Educational policies that include individuals having equal rights and responsibilities in the choices they make that affect their lives is participatory and is an important element that contributes to well-being. This is important because Rowland (2008) cites a report from 14 February 2007 from the United Nations Children's Fund that positioned Great Britain as the worst country in the industrialized global village coming 21st in a table of 21 economically developed nations. Well being needs to be at the centre of educational policy and this is important for all children regardless of socio-economic status.

The aim was clear but to deliver on the aim New Labour implemented a plethora of acts to develop the 1988 Education Reform Act and continue the commodification of education located within neo-liberal market forces (see Taysum, 2010) at great speed and with little consultation with teachers. Bangs *et al.* (2011) provide an example of this and cite Michael Barber:

> The crucial concept was the delivery chain...The best way to think about it is to imagine what is implicit when a minister makes a promise...supposing that a minister promises, as David Blunkett did, to improve standards of reading and writing among 11 year olds...implicit in this commitment is that ...the minister can influence what happens inside the head of an 11 year old in for example Widnes. The delivery chain (from Social Exclusion Unit to the 11 year old in Widnes) makes that connection explicit (p. 19).

The 'Instruction to Deliver' with the introduction of the National Literacy and Numeracy strategy into primary schools appears to leap-frog the teaching profession who become instruments of delivery of a curriculum. However, engaging the education profession would take longer. The position for Governments to engage with long-term instruments is problematic because the long term results may not be apparent until after a next government election. There are two problems here. First the government wants to be re-elected and therefore may be positioned to gain 'quick wins' before the next election. Second, if long terms instruments are implemented the successes may not be evident until after the next election and the incoming government might take the credit

for the policies the outgoing government made. This surely acts as a deterrent for long term policy formation for a government that needs to be re-elected for what they view as the 'public good'. Saran (1973) questions the role political parties take in the process of change, and suggests there needs to be further research into this and into the relationship between local politicians, their professional advisers and local pressure groups of various kinds. As Ball (2006) suggests the advocates and technicians of policy change may find themselves the beneficiaries of new power relations. The argument is therefore presented that unless education policy is discursive, the possibilities for thinking 'otherwise' with an enquiring mind are limited. Further the chances for building coherent education policies that build on what worked before and transparently challenge what did not work are limited (Hodgson & Spours, 2006). Aiming for educational policy and its implications need to be understood by all affected by it, in a language that is understood, and in forums that are committed to facilitating civic engagement that can be contributed to (Shields, 2007). Bangs *et al.* (2011) argue that there was a lack of engagement with the teaching profession with regard to changes in educational policy and quote Estelle Morris who states of education reform in England:

> In those early (years) I don't think there was an understanding in the wider government of the demands of teaching...I don't think that, unless you've done it anybody knows the nature of the pressure of the classroom. Michael Barber stated: The effect on leaders of the profession and the profession generally was negative and it was much more negative than I might have guessed, you could say, naively' (p. 24).

The argument is made that those involved with educational policy for the public good need to have informed opinion and Saran (1973) states: decisions about changes in policy and in administrative practice are closely related to changes in informed opinion. Indeed, these two factors reinforce each other (p. 274). There were clear problems that educational policy was not building on previous educational policy or being informed by empirical evidence from educational research. Edwards argues that one of the reasons for this was that the Government viewed educational research with suspicion. Edwards (1993) is highlighting a potential barrier for building on policy and the usefulness of policy memory if research into policy is

viewed with suspicion. Moreover, policies shift and change their meaning in the arenas of politics where representations change and key interpreters such as secretaries of state, ministers and chairs of councils change. It is also possible that key actors change as a deliberate tactic for changing the meaning of policy. Bangs *et al.* (2011) address this issue when they cite Conor Ryan:

> The big problem you've got is the lack of continuity...there's a curious thing that happens with all the policy people of the department...the ones who are really good quickly get moved on...so you lose that memory, so you get someone else who's on a learning curve and may or may not be any good at it...the ones who are plodding stay there (p. 154).

The impact of memory loss on the coherence of policy development is significant because policies structure ways in which a community goes about its busy-ness. Therefore policies and the way in which they are interpreted and mediated shape identities. Struggles also occur over the interpretation and enactment of policies. These shifts may operate within a moving discursive frame which articulates and constrains the possibilities of interpretation and enactment. Where there is stability one policy builds on another and the lessons learned from before inform the changes, if any, to future policy. However, Hodgson and Spours (2006) argue that policy is not grounded on what has gone before and 'policy amnesia' exists. It is arguably important to critically analyse and reflect upon education policy to enable what (Cribb & Gewirtz, 2003) call slow shifts in policy that are guided by wisdom. Stasz and Wright (2007) argue that policies fail for three reasons. First, they are not evidence informed. Second, they are shaped by deeply held beliefs. Third, there is poor alignment between the policy problem and an instrument with a short time frame such as an inducement. However, governments are potentially positioned to act fast when developing and implementing policy because they need to win votes and be re-elected. The speed of policy change arguably prevents capacity building strategies (Wei *et al.*, 2009).

English Educational Policy 2010 - 2011

In 2010 the Conservative and Liberal Coalition Government were elected. Their education policy builds on that of the Conservative Government of 1979 - 1997 and New Labour's education policy 1997 - 2010. Michael Gove the current Secretary of State said teachers not politicians know best how to run schools and need to move forward with evidence informed leadership (DfE (2010). Gove stated:

> I want to see more data generated by the profession to show what works, clearer information about teaching techniques that get results, more rigorous, scientifically-robust research about pedagogies which succeed and proper independent evaluations of interventions which have run their course.

This appears to shift power back towards the professional educationalists to potentially develop evidence informed leadership in school processes and systems (Saran, 1973; Taysum, 2010) so that pedagogues can impart that which is meaningful and worthwhile (Peters, 1974; MoE, 1944) and culturally relevant (Sleeter, 2005, Gandin and Apple, 2002; Freire, 1972). Such professional practice has the potential to achieve what the Schools' Council (1964) achieved and shifts away from Barber's statement of delivering the curriculum from the Government into a child's mind for example in Widnes that Barber later admitted was naieve (Bangs, 2011). Gove affirmed his policy to use evidence to inform practice with a 'mythbuster document' that was put onto the DfE website representing the positive impact charter schools in the US and free schools in Sweden have had (Gunter, 2010, p. 229). However, Gunter (2010) argues that drawing from the Swedish model to inform The Free Schools policy is problematic. The Government state Free Schools are: 'all ability state-funded schools set up in response to what local people say they want and need in order to improve education for children in their community' (DfE, 2011). Allen (2010) argues that the empirical evidence reveals free schools have demonstrated a modest impact on academic improvement compared to municipality schools however low educated families and immigrants' have experienced none of the reported improvements. The Free Schools in Sweden appear to have a direct correlation between low achievement and low socio-economic status. On the other hand, children

from highly educated families have received all the moderate benefits from the Free Schools policy. The Government is therefore moving forward with an educational policy that in Sweden has advantaged children with higher-socio economic status. The strategy does not consider the empirical evidence which contradicts the policy statement to use more rigorous, scientifically-robust research. Further Gove is not using evidence to inform The Academies Programme which builds on New Labour's Academies Programme. New Labour wanted to build academies in areas of deprivation. Gove however is inviting all schools that have been judged 'outstanding' by Ofsted to become academies. Mansell, (2010) argues that academies have higher permanent exclusions for some groups of black and minority ethnic children than in local authority schools. The empirical evidence reveals that academies are excluding vulnerable children who are engaging with 'risky behaviour' (UNICEF, 2007) and sending them to state schools. Further Stewart (2010) cited in Gunter (2010) argues that the Government found that last year only forty nine per cent of academies achieved GCSE or equivalent A* to C grades whilst state schools achieved seventy three per cent. The empirical evidence reveals that it is inappropriate for state schools to convert to academies because they are already out-performing academies. Pring *et al.* (2011) letter to the Times Education Supplement argued that the attainment reported by the academies regarding the EBac which is a new performance measure announced in West Minster on the 6th September 2010 (Education Committee, 2010) drawing on the subjects of English, Maths, Science, a language and a humanities, was insufficient compared to state schools working within the Local Authorities' networks and systems. Pring et al (2011) argue:

> only 16 per cent of pupils achieved the EBac, but in 58 of the 187 academies where pupils sat GCSEs last year, no EBacs were achieved....Only 8 per cent of non-academy comprehensives secondary moderns failed to score on the EBac. Academy schools can argue that the previous Labour government set up academies in deprived areas... However, a study of schools with similar proportions of pupils on free school meals, a total of 970, showed that only 169 completely failed on the EBac, a figure of 17 per cent. This is significantly better than the 31 per cent of the comparable academy proportion. An analysis of the most admired chains of

academies favoured by the Government showed they had achieved a pass rate of only 6 per cent compared to the 16 per cent achieved nationally.

The evidence reveals that academies were not meeting standards (Gorard, 2010; Wrigley, 2010) and that the Government has moved forward with The Academies Programme alongside The Free Schools Policy without considering empirical evidence that demonstrates state schools were outperforming academies which is arguably problematic for two reasons. First the policy contradicts the Secretary of State Michael Gove's call for empirical research to inform decisions. Second the policy is dismantling participatory education networks in eighteen months that have taken sixty-six years to construct starting from the Coalition's Government 1944 Education Act's (MoE, 1944) legislation for local education authorities. Breaking up networks of local authorities to create independent schools who compete for the best children to provide the best examination results will arguably not reduce the attainment gap between children of low-socio economic status and those of high socio-economic status. Rather The Academies Programme and The Free Schools Programme are segragating children and presenting barriers to full participation in school systems and processes. On the other hand Sir Michael Wilshaw the new Chief Inspector for Ofsted and head teacher for Mossbourne Academy recognizes that Mossbourne Academy has a non selective school intake in an economically deprived area. It is important to note that Mossbourne appears to be delivering on New Labour's strategy for Academies to redistribute the wealth and provide opportunities to children of low-socio economic status that have parity with opportunities their peers enjoy from more affluent backgrounds. However, with regard to funding The Times Educational Supplement (2011) argues Mossbourne: 'had revenue funding equivalent to more than twice that of similar comprehensives and received £9600 per pupil'. Moreover, with The Coalition Government education policy, academies are only answerable to The Secretary of State. Gunter (2010) argues the link between public funding of education through local authorities and the benefits that brings with regard to transparency and participation in local and particular decisions about public education for the public good will be finally broken across the system.

A key incentive for converting to an academy is that a large secondary school could get up to £400,000.00 or more and if they had done that

before August 31ˢᵗ they would receive larger Local Authority Central Spend Equivalent Grant (LACSEG) (Bristol Politics, 2011). At the same time Margaret Hodge, chairwoman of the Commons Public Accounts Committee, said it was 'extremely worrying' that one in five secondary schools were in deficit and continued: 'Financial pressures are growing on local authority maintained schools and the need to reduce costs is becoming greater' and at the end of 2009-10 there were already 18% of secondary schools and 7% of primary schools in deficit (BBC news, 2011). Clearly schools that are in deficit are potentially more likely to grasp the chance to become an academy with the promise of additional substantial funding that would remove their deficits. However the first converts to academies are to be those that are outstanding, where other schools will be able to become Academies by joining federations or chains (Conservative Government White Paper The Important of Teaching (2010). It is interesting that Outstanding schools that become independent will be moving closer to becoming grammar schools at a time when the BBC news (2011) announce that private schools are increasing their fees. Parents who cannot afford private education as a result of the economic downturn may be in the market for a good independent school, or in other words an independent academy with no fees.

On the other hand the new Chief Inspector of Ofsted Sir Michael Wilshaw has been quoted by Rustin (2011) as saying: 'It's up to every school to fight for its corner, and that's what happened in Hackney...Hackney was the most improved borough last year in terms of GCSE results. Competition does that...'. It is troubling that the Chief Inspector of Ofsted is contradicting the White Paper that states Academies will work with less successful schools to help them improve and work with schools in federations of chains if the same schools are in competition with each other and fighting their corner. These two extreme positions are irreconcilable and seem to be arguing for progressivism, collaboration and networking whilst setting schools against each other.

With state schools converting to autonomous schools or in other words independent schools, and the introduction of Free Schools it is important to consider the role of private enterprise in these relationships and the financial implications. Independent Schools have won a Charity Commission Fight to enable them to be free to be innovative and creative with regard to their charitable position. The National Council for Voluntary

Organizations (NCVO) has stated that: 'the tribunal had effectively reduced the public benefit of independent schools to a crude calculation of fees and bursaries' (Harrison, 2011). In 2006 independent schools had to prove their wider public benefit to keep their charitable status and could not have charity status on the basis that they provided an education to the children who attended the school. What is important to note is that Sir Michael Wilshaw the Chief Inspector of Ofsted was quoted by Rustin (2011) as saying: 'I'm not philosophically against that (profits for school providers) and I think it might come in at some stage'. There are a significant blurring of boundaries when organizations with charity status working for the public good and enjoying tax benefits such as not paying Valued Added Tax (twenty per cent) may be part of a chain that is declaring profits for school providers. Further research needs to be done here as a matter of urgency.

The economic factors that perpetuate the state of 'Two Nations' with a private and a public sector for education continue and the evidence reveals there is a direct correlation between wealth and achievement at schools. Berg (2011) states:

> Four independent schools - Eton, Westminster, St Paul's Boys and St Paul's Girls - and state-funded Hills Road Sixth Form College in Cambridge, together sent 946 pupils to Oxford and Cambridge between 2007 and 2009. By contrast, 2,000 lower-performing schools combined sent a total of 927 students to the two elite universities, getting less than 6% of available places, the Sutton Trust found. Many of these schools sent no pupils at all, or on average fewer than one per year.

Private schools that are part of 'Two Nations' clearly demonstrate there is a direct correlation between private schools and wealth and achievement. If parents can afford a private education at these schools there is a significantly higher chance of their children going to Oxbridge. Yet The White Paper (2010) argues that a correlation between wealth and achievement at school is a moral outrage:

> we propose to re-focus Ofsted inspections on their original purpose – teaching and learning – and strengthen the performance measures we use to hold schools accountable...For far too long we have tolerated the moral outrage of an accepted correlation between wealth and achievement at school; the soft bigotry of low expectations. Children

on free school meals do significantly worse than their peers at every stage of their education (p. 4).

Is the White Paper therefore calling for an end to private schools and the state of the 'Two Nations'? Or is this argument focused on children with free school meals? It is important to note that the attainment of children on free school meals was significantly lower throughout the whole of the eighteen years of the previous Conservative Government's term of service to the people. Arguably The Academies Programme will not reduce the attainment gap if the school system is moving from Simon (1991) and McCulloch's (2007) 'Two Nations' to a tripartite system of 'Three Nations'. The first nation will continue to be private independent schools, the second nation will be grammar schools and academy independent schools that were outstanding state schools, and the third nation will be all other schools including technical schools and secondary modern schools that have not gained outstanding in an Ofsted report and who cannot convert to academies.

The paper presents that there are two political eras. One era is found with the 1979 Conservative Government, the 1997 New Labour Government and the 2010 Conservative Liberal Coalition Government of 2010 that engages with neo-liberal market forces and a capitalist ideology. However, the evidence reveals that agents from this political era have pathologized progressivism and comprehensivism. The comprehensive commitment to an education for all identified as a political era from 1944 to 1975 not only aimed at providing fair equitable funding that reflects a welfarist approach to those of low-socio economic status including those taking Free School Meals, it also demanded a mix of students from different cultural and economic communities in each class who might grow and learn together. Comprehensivism offers the chance for people of 'one nation' to learn together united by a common national identity, and legislative framework. The masses of the people are made up from members of multifarious communities who have the potential to learn to tolerate their differences and celebrate their commonalities. Here, as Dewey (1915, p. 7) states:

> What the best and wisest parent wants for his own child, that must the community want for all its children. Any other ideal for our schools is narrow and unlovely; acted upon, it destroys democracy

> (participation)...Only by being true to the full growth of all the individuals who make it up, can society by any chance be true to itself.

Being true to the self is a moral imperative that includes virtues of valour, compassion, and grace (Peters, 1974). Perhaps a discourse is needed where the two political eras can be brought together to balance individuals' self interests with the interests of the community. Where there is balance there is stability. Arguably where there has been greed in the global financial markets the world is experiencing financial crises with nation states not only in deficit but also facing bankruptcy and looking for bail outs. There are analogies here with David Cameron, The Prime Minister stating the riots in England in August 2011 were caused by 'greed and thuggery, a decline in responsibility, a rise in selfishness, a growing sense that individual rights come before anything else'. It strikes me that both types of behaviour demonstrating greed are unacceptable. Yet Tony Blair a former New Labour Prime Minister stated: 'the riots were primarily caused by a minority of disaffected and alienated young people who were outside the social mainstream and who constituted 'an absolutely specific problem that required deeply specific solutions' (Sparrow, 2011). Cameron is responding to what he calls a moral panic, whist Blair is asking not to pathologize but to implement systems that will address a particular problem in society. It is worth examining what Adam Smith (1776) states regarding neo-liberal market forces and that is: the individual intends only his own security; and by directing that industry in such a manner as its produce may be of the greatest value, he intends only his own gain...I have never known much good done by those who affected to trade for the public good' (Joyce, 2011). Perhaps an alternative way is finding a balance between individual interests and community interests. The moral imperative needs to include critique, reflection, reflexivity and care about behaviours and their consequences for the self and others (Noddings, 1994; Taysum, 2010). As Gunter (2010) argues what needs to be addressed is how people choose to care or not to care for those they are not legally or genetically connected to and what this means for England's moral fabric in society.

Conclusion

This paper has carefully mapped and analysed education policy in England from 1944 to 2011 using a critical policy historiography approach. Using Hodgson and Spours (2006) framework it is possible to reveal two distinctive political eras. One political era from 1944 to 1975 aimed at meeting the interests of the community through a progressive approach to comprehensivism supported by a welfarest approach. The second political era from 1975 to 2011 was centred on the interests of the individual who was in the market for the commodity 'education' where the education system operated within neo-liberalist market forces. Evidence reveals that education authorities and educational professionals participated in the development of education policy from 1944 to 1975. However, from 1975 to 2011 education policy has been developed by democratically elected politicians who are agents within a system. In the second political era educational professionals as a body have not been able to participate in the development of education policy. What was missing from policy development was a deep understanding of the classroom and as Estelle Morris stated: 'I don't think that, unless you've done it anybody knows the nature of the pressure of the classroom' (cited in Bangs *et al.*, 2010, p. 24). In addition, high quality educational research that has generated new, meaningful and worthwhile knowledge has not systematically underpinned cautious and carefully planned education reform. Rather education reforms were imposed on the teaching profession who were seen as part of a delivery chain (Michael Barber cited in Bangs, 2011). What appears to be missing from educational policy development is the education profession, a network of educational professionals such as The Schools Council, and local authorities who work with schools and educational researchers to develop the highest quality education for all. One of the reasons for this may be because government agents developing educational policy fear criticism of their policies because this could be seen as criticism of a government and may jeopardize that particular government's re-election. I would cautiously suggest the challenge the nation faces now is to invite those that represent the ideologies of the 1944-1975 political era and those that represent the ideologies of the 1975-2011 political era along with educational professionals to sit round a table and develop a strategy that will bring stability back to the education system whilst developing the

highest quality education provision possible. Further, high quality world-class research needs to underpin such a strategy so that evidence informs education policy to actualize social justice (Saran, 1973, Taysum, 2010). Such an approach may prevent correlations between class and potential career and life trajectories and offer a participatory approach to and engagement with education underpinned by respect. The aim of such an education system would be a focus on human beings who belong to one nation state and who work within a common moral and legislative framework, and who continually ask themselves the question: 'what does an educated person in the twenty first century look like?' (Pring, 2007).

End notes

1. There is not scope here to discuss how the increased opportunities for the modern middle classes challenged the University tradition and how the professional corporation legitimized by a royal charter (a guild or collage) offered pathways to the professions. Please see Taysum (2006) and Becher (1994).

2. There is not space to discuss the structuring of pedagogic discourse surrounding Dewey's notion of pragmatism and the reader may like to read more in Pring (2007) and Taysum (2010).

3. Aspirations for participation need to be clear as Stoker (2006) argues citizens do not want to devote their precious time on politics when they have busy lives. Most people are happy with experts, representatives and activists making judgements for the majority of the time. However they do want to engage directly in issues of personal import. Therefore when discussing civic engagement it is important to note that a political system needs to be developed that facilitates these aspirations.

4. There is not space to discuss the EBac in this paper and the issue of the extent to which the EBac offers an appropriate mix of subjects and how this links to human capital theory and further research is needed here.

References

Allen, R. (2010). Replicating Swedish "Fre School" Reforms in England. *Research in Public Policy, 10,* 4-7.

Arnot, M., David, M., & Weiner, G. (2001). Gender and education policy Continuities, transformation and critical engagements. In P. Robert & F. John (Eds.), *Education*

Reforms and the State, Twenty -five years of Politics, Policy and Practice. London: Routledge, Falmer Taylor and Francis Group.

Ball, S.J. (2009). Privatising education, privatising education policy, privatising educational research: network governance and the 'competition state'. *Journal of Education Policy*, *24*(1), 83-99.

Ball, S.J. (2006). *Education Policy and Social Class*. London: Routledge.

Ball, S.J. (2004). *The Routledge Falmer Reader in Sociology of Education*. London: Routledge.

Bangs, J., Macbeath, J. & Galton, M. (2011). *Reinventing Schools, Reforming Teaching. From political visions to classroom reality*. London: Routledge.

BBC News (2011). *Private Schools cutting spending in economic downturn*. Available at: http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/education-15696417 Accessed 12th November 2011.

BBC News (2011). *New Ofsted Chief takes aim at incapable teachers*. Available at http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/education/ accessed 15th October 2011.

BBC News (2011). *Watch Dog Warns of School Deficits*. Available at: http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/education/accessed 19th October 2011.

Bell, L. & Stevenson, H. (2006). *Education Policy*. Oxon: Routledge.

Becher, T. (1994). *Governments and Professional Education*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Berg, S. (2011). *Five Schools send more to Oxbridge than 2000 others*. BBC News. Available at: http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/education-14069516 accessed 2nd January 2011.

Bernstein, B. (1990). *The structuring of Pedagogic Discourse*. London: Routledge.

Bertaux, D. & Bertaux-Wiame, I. (1981). Life stories in the bakers'trade. In D. Bertaux (Ed.), *Biography and Society*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Bourdieu, P. (2000). *Pascalian Meditations*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Central Advisory Council for Education (ACE) (1963). *Half our Future*. The Newsom Report. London: HMSO (accessed July 2008).

Bristol Politics (2010). *Cost of Academies Soaring*. Available at: http://bristolpolitics.wordpress.com/2011/07/27/cost-of-academies-soaring-says-bristol-councillor/ (accessed 27th October, 2011).

Chitty, C. (2004). *Education Policy in Britain*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Chitty, C. & Simon, B. (1993). *Education Answers Back Critical Responses to Government Policy*. London: Lawrence and Wishart Ltd.

Cribb, A. & Gewirtz, S. (2003). Towards a sociology of just practices; an analysis of plural conceptions of justice. In C. Vincent (Ed.), *Social Justice Education and Identity*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Crosland, A. (1956). *The Future of Socialism*. London: Jonathan Cape.

Crowther Report (1959). *Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education* (England): 15 to 18, Volume 1. London: HMSO.

Department for Education (2011). *Mossbourne Data*. Available at: http://www.education.gov.uk/establishments/urn/134693/mossbourne-community-academy/financial (accessed 30th October 2011)

Department for Education (1988). *Education Reform Act*. London: HMSO.

Department of Education and Science (DES) (1965). *The Organisation of Secondary Education*. Circular 10/65. London: HMSO.

Department of Education and Science (DES) (1967). *Plowden Report*. London: HMSO.

Department for Education (2011). *School and Local Statistics*. Available at: http://www.education.gov.uk/establishments/urn/134693/mossbourne-community-academy/financial accessed 3rd November 2011.

Department for Education (2010). *Teachers not politicians know how best to run schools*. www.education.gov.uk/news/pressnotices-newacademiesannouncement (accessed 2nd July 2010).

Department for Education (2011). *Free Schools.* Available at: http://www.education.gov.uk/schools/leadership/typesofschools/freeschools (accessed November 2011)

Department for Education (2010b). *Free School Meals*. Available at: www.education.gov.uk/freeschools (accessed 2 July 2010).

Department for Education (2010c). *The case for school freedom: national and international evidence* (Gove mythbuster 2) Available www.education.gov.uk/news/news/freeschools (accessed 2nd July 2010).

Department for Children, Schools and Families (2007). *Further Education and Training Act*. http://www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts2007/ukpga_20070025_en_1 (accessed July 2008).

Department for Education and Skills (2005). *Education Act 2005*. Available at: http://www.opsi.gov.uk/acts/acts2005/ukpga_20050018_en_1 (accessed July 2008).

Department of Education and Science (2004). Children Act 2004. (Every Child Matters). Available at: http://www.opsi. gov.uk/acts/acts2004/ukpga_20040031_en_1.htm (accessed July 2008).

Department of Education and Science (2003). *Every Child Matters.* London: HMSO.

Docking, J. (2000). *New Labour's Policies for Schools. Raising the Standard?* London:David Fulton.

Dewey, J. (1915). *The school and Society.* London: University of Chicago Press.

Education Committee (2010). *The English Baccalaureate*. London: Parliament. Available at:http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201012/cmselect/cmeduc/851/85104.htm (accessed 2nd January 2012).

Edwards, T. (1993). Researching a controversial policy. *Evaluation in Education 7*(1), 5-9.

Faulkes, K. (1998). *Citizenship in Modern Britain*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Gale, T. (2001). Journal of Education Policy. *Critical policy sociology: historiography, archaeology, and geneology as methods of policy analysis*, *16*(5), 379-393.

Gandin, L. & Apple, M. (2002). Challenging neo-liberalism building a democracy: creating the citizen school in Porto Alegre Brazil. *Journal of Education Policy, 17*(2), 259-279.

Guardian (2011). *The Saturday Inteview Mossbourne Academy's Sir Michael Wilshaw 17th September 2011.* Available at: http://www.guardian.co.uk/theguardian/2011/sep/17/michael-wilshaw-interview/print (accessed 3 November 2011).

Glatter, R. (1999). From Struggling to Juggling: Towards a Redefinition of the Field of Educational Leadership and Management. *Educational Management, Administration and Leadership, 27*(3), 253-266.

Gordon, K. & Broadhead, P. (2007, April). *Every Child Matters and Teacher Education: A Universities Council for the Education of Teachers Position Paper*. London: Universities Council for the Education of Teachers.

Gove, M. (2010). *Michael Gove to the National College Annual Conference*, Birmingham Speech 17th June, Birmingham. Available at:http://www.nationalcollege.org.uk/index/events/conference2010/annual_conference_2010_videos/annual-conference-2010-michael-gove-2.htm (accessed 13th November 2011).

Gunter, H.M. (2010). *The State and Education Policy*. The Academies Programme. London: Continuum.

Gunter, H. & Forrester, G. (2009). School leadership and education policymaking in England. *Policy Studies, 30(5)*, 495-511.

Her Majesty's Government (2010). The Coalition: Our Programme for Government. London Cabinet Office. Available at: www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/media/409088/pfg_coalitionpdf (accessed 2 July 2010).

Harrison, A. (2011). *Independent Schools win Charity Commission Fight*. BBC news http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/education-15305699?print=true (accessed 14th October 2011).

Hatcher, R. (1998). Social justice and the politics of school effectiveness and improvement. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, *1*(2), 267-289.

Hodgson, A. & Spours, K. (2006). An analytical framework for policy engagement : the contested case of 14-19 reforms in England. *Journal of Education Policy, 21*(6), 679-696.

Howe, K.R. (1997). *Understanding equal education opportunity. Social Justice, Democracy and Schooling.* London: Teachers College Press.

Kincheloe, J. (1990). Educational historiographical meta-analysis: rethinking methodology in the 1990s. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 4*(3), 231-245.

Jones, K. (2010). *Education in Britain 1944 to the Present*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Lubenow, W.C. (2002). Making words flesh: changing roles of university learning and the professions in the 19th century. *Minerva, 40*(3), 217-234.

Joyce, H. (2011). *Adam Smith and the invisible hand*. http://plus.maths.org/issue14/features/smith/ (accessed 29th January 2011).

Lauder H., Jamieson, I. & Wikely, F. (1998). Models of effective schools: limits and capabilities. In R. Slee, G. Weiner & S. Tomlinson (Eds.), *School effectiveness fro whom? Challenges to the school effectiveness and improvement movements.* London: Falmer Press.

Maden, M. (1993). Dissolution in All But Name. In C. Chitty & B. Simon, *Education Answers Back Critical Responses to Government Policy*. London: Lawrence and Wishart Ltd.

Maclure, J. (1973). *Educational Documents England and Wales 1816 to the Present day.* London: Methuen.

Mansell, W. (2010). *Threat hangs over appeals panels for excluded children*. Guardian 29th June, Available at: http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/2010/jun/28/school-exclusion-appeal-panels-threatened (accessed 13th November 2011).

McCulloch, G. (2007). *Cyril Norwood and the Ideal of Secondary Education*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mills, C. (1959). *The Sociological Imagination.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Moll, L.C. (2010). Mobilizing Culture, Language, and Educational Practices: Fulfilling the Promises of Mendez and Brown. *Educational Researcher, 39*(6), 451-460.

Noddings, N. (1994). *A Feminine Approach to Ethics and Moral Education*. London: University of California Press.

Norwood Report (1943). *Board of Education, Curriculum and Examinations in Secondary Schools*. London: HMSO.

Oancea, A. & Furlong, J. (2007). Expressions of excellent and the assessment of applied and practice-based research. *Research Papers in Education, 22*(2), 119-137.

Ofsted (2005). *Every Child Matters: The framework for inspection*. London: Ofsted.

Peters, R. (1974). *Ethics and Education*. London: Unwin University Books.

Phoenix, A. (2010). *A short video interview with Professor Ann Phoenix*. Available at: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pt0_VWJFijM (accessed 13 November 2011).

Pollard, A. (2008). *Quality and capacity in UK education research*. Report of the first meeting of the UK's Strategic Forum for Research in education, 16th and 17th October, Harrogate.

Pring, R., Green, Fisher, T., Newsam, P., Price, C., Elliott, J., Fielding, M., Wilcox, D. & Moon, B. (2011). *Time is running out for the defence of the indefensible*. London: Times Educational Supplement Magazine.

Pring, R. (2007). *John Dewey a Philosopher of Education for Our Time?* London: Continuum.

Robbins Report (1963). *Higher Education: report of the Committee on Higher Education.Cmnd 2165.* London: HMSO.

Rowland, K. (2008). Freedom, inclusion, interaction, and growth: let the children fly. In Taysum, A. (Convener and Chair) *All Children Matter: Addressing Special and Inclusive Education. Key Note Panel.* British Educational Leadership Management, and Administration Society.

Rustin, S. (2011). *The Guardian Saturday Interview*: Mossbourne academy's Sir Michael Wishaw. http://www.guardian.co.uk/theguardian/2011/sep/17/michael-wilshaw-interview/print accessed 17th September 2011.

Saran, R. (1973). *Policy-making in secondary education a case study*. London:Oxford University Press.

Sammons, P., Hillman, J. & Mortimore, P. (1995). *Key Characteristics of Effective Schools: a Review of School Effectiveness Research*. A report by the Institute of Education for the Office for Standards in Education.

Shields, C. (2007). A Failed Initiative: Democracy has Spoken – or has it? *Journal of cases in educational leadership, 10*(1), 14-21.

Simon, B. (1991). *Education and the Social Order 1940 - 1990*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Sleeter, C. (2005). *Un-Standardizing Curriculum Multicultural Teaching in the Standards-Based Classroom.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Sparrow, A. (2011). *David Cameron and Tony Blair clash over cause of riots*. The Guardian 16th October 2011 http://m.guardian.co.uk/uk/2011/aug/21/david-cameron-tony-blair-riots?cat=uk&type (accessed 17th October 2011).

Stasz, C. & Wright, S. (2007). A framework for understanding and comparing 14-19 education policies. In D. Raffe, & K. Spours (eds.). *United Kingdom in Policy-making and Policy Learning in 14-19 Education* (pp. 157-185). London: Institute of Education University of London.

Stewart, W. (2010). *Less than 505 of academies' passes are academic*. The Times Educational Supplement, 2 July. Available at: www.tes.co.uk/article.aspx?storycode=6049288 (accessed 7 July 2010).

Stoker, G. (2006). *Why Politics Matters*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Strain, M. (1998). Educational managers' knowledge: the quest for useful theory. In M. Strain, B. Dennison, J. Ouston & V. Hall, *Policy, Leadership and Professional Knowledge in Education*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.

Taysum, A. (2010). *Evidence Informed Leadership in Education*. London: Continuum.

Taysum, A. & Gunter, H. (2008). A critical approach to researching social justice and school leadership in England. Education, *Citizenship and Social Justice, 3*(2), 183-99.

Taysum, A. (2006). The distinctiveness of the EdD within the University Tradition. *Journal of Education Administration and History, 38*(3), 323- 334.

Times Education Supplement (2007). *Academies rake in the cash*. http://www.tes.co.uk/teaching-resource/Academies-rake-in-the-cash-2386547/ (accessed in 7th November 2011).

Walford, G. (2000). City Technology Colleges to Sponsored Grant-Maintained Schools. *Oxford Review of Education, 26*(2), 145-158.

Wei, R. C., Darling-Hammond, L., Andree, A., Richardson, N. & Orphanos, S. (2009). *Professional Learning in the Learning Profession*. A status report on Teacher Development in the U.S. and Abroad. Dallas: National Staff Development Council.

Whitty, G. (2008). Twenty Years of Progress? English Educational Policy from 1988 to the Present. *Educational Management, Administration and Leadership. 36* (2), 165-184.