APPROACHES TO UNDERSTANDING URBAN EDUCATION

IN THE U.K AND THE U.S.A, WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE

TO THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN CONSIDERED TO HAVE SPECIAL NEEDS

Trying to learn to use words, and every attempt
Is a wholly new start, and a different kind of failure
Because one has only learnt to get the better of words
For the thing one no longer has to say, or the way in which
One is no longer disposed to say it.

<div align="right">T. S. Eliot</div>

Dissertation presented for the Ph. D
to the University of London Institute of Education

David Coulby
1985

-oOo-

ABSTRACT

An approach to urban education developed within comparative education is discussed. Its foundation in reflective thinking and critical rationalism is explained. Another approach related to urban social theory is identified. A range of such theories are examined. It is not seen as possible to reconcile the two approaches. General urban educational issues are discussed indicating ways in which each approach may be used.

Conflict framework is examined as a means of identifying some (limited) common ground between the two approaches. The constituents of conflict in urban education are specified. The conflict framework is then used to discuss the changing pattern of educational provision for children perceived to have special needs in the U.K and the U.S.A. This framework allows both the large-scale and small-scale conflicts in this area of education to be revealed.

-oOo-

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1

THE COMPARATIVE APPROACH TO URBAN EDUCATION

1.1 The 1970 Year Book

The World Year Book of Education 1970, Education in Cities,[1]
broke new ground in two respects. Firstly, it suggested that urban
education should be studied within wider terms of reference than those
limited to programmes and interventions designed to assist particular
client groups located within cities. It was the main educational
provision within cities, not just a few isolated projects which were
of concern to the initiators of this approach to urban education. Of
course specific innovatory programmes were of special interest to the
urban educationist but they should be considered within the wider
context of urban educational provision. Furthermore, in some of the
chapters, and particularly in Holmes' introduction 'Education in
Cities"[2] the approach was specifically concerned with the influence of
social change. Issues relating to "the growth of metropolitan areas"
and "rural and urban typologies"[3] were considered necessary to under-
stand education in cities. The growth of cities, the social and
cultural composition of their populations, the location of specific
groups, processes and institutions within cities were seen to be the
changing patterns in terms of which the issues or problems of urban
education could best be understood. The book initiated an approach to
urban education which makes it possible to consider problems in any
urban educational institution or process and analyse them within a
context of wider social interaction and change.

The second respect in which this book broke new ground was in
the way in which it placed the study of urban education in a comparative
perspective. The growth of cities has been an international phenomenon

though it happened earlier in some countries than in others. Common elements may be discerned in this growth, such as the attraction of relatively higher wages in the industrial and service sectors of the developing urban economies, as against the disincentive to stay in impoverished rural areas.[4] Likewise differences between cities, particularly concerning social and planning policy, may also be informative. For instance parallels and contrasts may be drawn between governmental attempts to limit the population and conurbation spread of cities such as Moscow[5] and systematically to lower the density of inner city areas such as central London[6]; the relative advantages and problems of such policies in urban areas need to take account of national educational systems, but also pay attention to the level and type of urbanisation found in a specific city and of its individual social, economic, demographic and political circumstances.

1.2 The problem-solving approach

In attempting to consider approaches to urban education, then, this book and specifically the foundation-laying introduction by Holmes, provides an appropriate starting point. However, Holmes' rigorous methodology, elsewhere so much in evidence, is used implicitly in this article, rather than elaborately stated in a manner inappropriate to an introduction. Since the objective of this thesis, at this stage, is precisely to investigate those methodological criteria on which the subject matter and theories of urban education have been based, it is necessary to consider those writings of Holmes in which these issues are fully and firmly addressed.[7] Drawing on this substantial material it may be possible to summarise some of the points of Holmes' methodology specifically with regard to its relevance as an approach to urban education. It is necessary to bear in mind from the outset that Holmes draws on two theorists whom he himself acknowledges to have had an inspiring and enduring influence on his work. In acknowledging his debt to Dewey and Popper, Holmes also sets out the parameters of

his own approach:

> "Thus in very early days I was offered a choice
> between two methods of scientific enquiry and
> two theories of societal planning. I rejected
> Mill's inductive method in favour of Dewey's
> reflective thinking (or problem-solving) approach
> and rejected Mannheim's notion of total planning
> and accepted Popper's theory of piecemeal social
> engineering"[8].

Holmes' methodology may be seen as appropriate to enquiry in many areas of the social sciences and not confined to comparative education. He suggests that the appropriate criterion for initiating a social scientific enquiry is an identified "problem". The tasks of the social scientist are the location and analysis of a problem, together with the hypothesis of potentially successful policy solutions, and, where possible, a comparison of predicted outcomes with the observed results of policy. What then constitutes a problem for Holmes? and how may one be located? He sees problems as resulting from asynchronous change.

Central to Holmes' method for identifying asynchronous change is a taxonomy adapted from Popper's critical dualism. Popper[9] elaborated the Aristotelian distinction between doxa and logos, between the opinion of an individual or group and ascertainable aspects of the social or natural world. Holmes' most recent elaboration of Popper's distinction is in the construction of a model whereby data can be classified in four different categories: normative patterns, institutional patterns, patterns of mental states, natural environment and physical worlds. Normative statements by individuals include what they think ought to be the case with regard to man, knowledge or society:

> "How ought knowledge to be acquired? What is its
> status? Who should legitimise it? How should
> individuals be regarded? How should they be
> treated? Again, how should communities and societies
> be organised? How and by whom ought they to be run?[10]

Holmes suggests that it is possible to choose philosophers who address these questions and, on the basis of their written statments, draw up ideal typifications[11] of normative patterns in different countries and societies. Religious, moral, artistic, economic, political and educational views are among the sub-categories which may be included in the normative pattern. Institutional patterns include, for instance, descriptions of the procedures and organisations of local and national government, religious, economic and educational institutions. It is to help establish this pattern that Holmes utilises Parsons' model of formal organisations. Whilst institutions may be studied in a separate pattern it is important to remember that they "are invariably set up with specific norms or aims in mind"[12]

Consideration of Pareto's 'residues', or Myrdal's 'lower valuations', Tonnies' 'mores', Ogburn's 'non-material non-adaptive culture', Sadler's 'living spirit' and Mallinson's 'national character' led Holmes to adjust his typology to include a pattern of mental states. Holmes follows these theorists in suggesting that people's mental states are exceedingly resistant to change. Progressive or idealistic changes in the normative pattern, then, might only be accepted by individuals at the level of their 'higher valuations' whilst their 'lower valuations' or mental states resist the rhetorics of innovation.

The natural environment or physical world is that dimension of Holmes' typology which includes such things as mineral resources, climate and possibilities for agriculture. Change in this dimension, for example the discovery of oil in Saudi Arabia or the deforestation of the Amazon Basin can profoundly influence many aspects of the lives of people not only in those regions but also elsewhere. Problems are likely to occur if normative and institutional patterns do not adjust synchronously with development of the natural environment.

As an example of the use of this typology, the demand for Islamic schools in U.K cities (which is examined subsequently at greater length) could be located as a problem as change in the normative pattern (rising of Muslim aspirations) is not accompanied by change or changes in the institutional pattern. It is important to recognise that the problem is located in terms of asynchronous change. It is not then, the arrival of the Islamic groups in the U.K which is the problem (though this is the initial demographic change which brought with it a change in the normative pattern of the residents in some inner city areas), no more is it their demands for separate and different schooling. The problem is located in the lack of synchroneity between the normative demands and the educational institutional provision. If the problem is not adequately formulated and analysed then suggested policy solutions are hardly likely to be successful. For Holmes is not concerned merely to locate and analyse problems which would be a futile procedure without some attempt to formulate solutions and possible policy options.

His approach then is problem-solving and is linked to a philosophy of science which prefers hypothetico-deduction to induction[13] and which considers it more productive to hypothesise outcomes and then check the predicted events with observable events rather than to search for causes. Popper, the most rigorous proponent and originator of this philosophy, insists that a theory should be in terms whereby it can be falsified by experimental procedure[14]. In Holmes' adaptation of this hypothetico-deductive method to the methodology of the social sciences the constituents of the approach include:

> "1. problem analysis or intellectualisation,
> 2. hypothesis of policy solution formulation,
> 3. the specification of initial conditions
>   or the context,
> 4. the logical prediction from adopted hypothesis
>   of likely outcomes,
> 5. the comparison of logical predicted outcomes
>   with predictable events"[15].

Comparative education may be seen as a particularly suitable field of study in which to employ this methodology. Various policy alternatives to observed problems are likely to have been attempted in different counntries. Thus, after making an appropriate hypothesis or policy formulation and predicting logically the likely outcomes, it may be possible to select countries which have utilised this policy and thereby make the crucial comparison of the predicted outcome with the observable events in that country. This comparative approach allows for the analysis of a whole range of social problems and policies not only those concerned with education. As far as urban education is concerned this approach has the advantage of including comparative elements.

Within this framework Holmes draws on Weber's notion of the ideal typical model[16] as a useful instrument for analysis and hypothesis. An ideal typical model may represent a data category or a systematisation of the various processes of individuals or groups. Two examples both mentioned above would be Holmes' adaptation of Popper's critical dualism for the former and for the latter his use of Parsons' models of formal organisations. Further, such models may be used to typify the different views of wo/man, knowledge and society found in various countries. In this respect for instance Holmes would see it as being possible to construct appropriate ideal typical models for Western Europe on the basis of Plato and the Bible, for the USSR on the basis of Marx and Lenin and for the USA on the basis of the Bible, Jefferson and Dewey.[17] Ideal typical models utilised in this way would seem to raise two major objections: firstly, that at a conceptual level they are crude and unsupportable generalisations; secondly, that in practice their use may lead to stereotyping of countries, institutions or, most dangerously, groups and individuals. The first objection tends to misunderstand Weber's purpose: every aspect of reality is not

meant to be represented by ideal typical models. The point is that
they are ideal and they are useful precisely because they are
generalisations. The generalisation allows for the articulation
between whole ranges of concepts (such as wo/man, knowledge and society)
to be meaningfully organised. Each individual case may well differ
from the ideal type but the model allows analysis to concentrate on
such variations and to make comparisons with other cases which may
differ from the ideal type in other respects. This partly answers
the second objection because it is the usefulness of the ideal typical
models that, for Holmes (strictly pragmatic), is their major justification.
Nevertheless, they may be open to misuse as in stereotypical generali-
sations about another group which may be applied by racists in a
perjorative way to all members of that group. Holmes acknowledges the
danger of this misuse but separates himself firmly from it:

> "There is no reason to suppose that all members
> of an identifiable group share the same mental
> states or will behave in the same way. Indeed
> central to my problem (-solving) approach is the
> assumption that in most communities, societies
> and nations there will be diversity of opinion
> and belief and that men and women will question
> the norms they recognise"[18]

1.3 Holmes' consideration of urban education

After this protracted yet all too brief a summary of some of the
points of Holmes' wider methodology, it may be possible to return to
his essay "Education in Cities" mentioned in the opening paragraph
and to understand some of its fuller implications. The essay begins
with a discussion of the general issue of the growth of cities before
going on to consider more specifically educational topics. Holmes'
approach is comparative in its range of theoretical reference and in
its use of varied examples particularly drawn from the USA and the USSR.
The broad methodology outlined above is not explicitly stated though it
informs much of the discussion. Holmes describes the processes of

urbanisation as well as some of the features specific to rural life.
The growth of cities is seen as due to demographic change rather than
to natural increase. Rural populations lacking local opportunities
and amenities are attracted to the better economic possibilities and more
comprehensive range of social provision to be found in cities. Whilst
mentioning Burgess' concentric circle model, the radial-sector model
which suggests rather that cities grow up along major ocmmunication
links and the multiple-centre model elaborated by Hall, Holmes' inter-
national perspective makes him cautious of a model meant to fit all
cases:

> "These processes are widespread but somewhat
> different patterns occur outside Europe and
> North America. Characteristic of many Latin
> American and Asian urban centres is the shanty
> town for rural immigrants on the periphery of
> the old city"[19].

This emphasis on the rural nature of the population moving into the
cities is central to the essay. People moving from Patagonia to
Santiago, from Sylhet to Whitechapel, from Puerto Rico to the Bronx
have one thing in common, despite the fact that some are moving across
national frontiers whilst others are migrating within a nation state;
they are nearly all rural peoples unfamiliar with the life, institutions
and experience of cities.

By reference to Tonnies, Durkheim, Marx, Wirth and Redfield, Holmes
draws attention to rural-urban typologies, In particular he focusses
on the diffiuclties of the rural migrant newly arrived in the city:

> "Consequently the rural newcomer faces problems
> of adjustment in the political, economic and
> familial aspects of his life. Well known
> expectations are unlikely to be fulfilled, and
> if he is to succeed in his new occupation he must
> learn new attitudes which are often antithetical
> to those he brings from his previous environment"[20].

In Holmes' analysis of urban education then the change element is seen
to be demographic shift bringing rural peoples to urban areas and the

no-change element is the institutional pattern of the city which is
not adapted to the needs of these new groups. The different experiences
associated with rural and urban areas are fundamental to this asyn-
chronous change and for this reason education is a crucial ameliorative
resource:

> "Here the view is held that because the mores of
> the big city are very different from those of the
> rural area, village or small town major educational
> problems arise in rapidly growing conurbations"[21].

The previous discussion has shown how important is this concept of
problems to Holmes. An appropriate urban education policy would then be
the hypothetical solution most likely to succeed in the piecemeal
amelioration of the problem.

> "In short, if the newcomers are to fit into indus-
> trial life they need a formal education appropriate
> to the demands, both technical and psychological,
> made upon them by modern automated industry"[22].

In a later paper Holmes makes explicit the way in which demographic
change is central to his problem-solving approach to urban education:

> "Problems experienced in a particular part of
> selected urban areas should be intellectualised
> by reference
> 1. to total numbers and rates of flow, into and
>   out of the area,
> 2. to important non-change features (variables)
>   in the area,
> 3. to the characteristics of in-migrants and out-
>   migrants and those who remain.
> Alternative solutions should be considered in the
> light of their anticipated outcomes in the area"[23].

It is important to note the stress that analysis should concentrate
on a part of an urban area rather than on the whole city. This is
coherent with Holmes' preferred models of urban growth which stress
the variations between different sectors of zones of cities and move-
ments of people within and between them. It is possible to see then
how the notion of asynchronous change and the techniques of the problem
approach provide a methodology appropriate to urban education. Before

going on to discuss the adequacy of this model it is possible, by
continuing this examination of Holmes' essay, to begin to understand
what the appropriate subject matter of urban educational study would
be within his theory. If urban education as a policy activity is the
designing of possible solutions to problems arising from demographic
shift, differences in values and lack of institutional response, then
urban education as a field of study would concentrate on such policies
and attempt to assess the extent of their success or otherwise in the
light of a carefully detailed location and description of the original
problem. What aspects of education does Holmes perceive to be
relevant to these concerns?

As a preliminary it is necessary to note that Holmes has more
questions than answers about the role of education in the city. Whilst
the traditional value systems of many countries remain largely unquestioned,
they seem to be increasingly remote from the often harsh circumstances
of urban life. Whether schools should concentrate on transmitting
these traditional values even to immigrant populations to whom they are
unfamiliar or whether the task of developing new, more appropriate and
more generally acceptable values is one in which the school should
play a leading part is a question which Holmes leaves open:

> "A more determined search for new normative
> theories of the 'good and just' society may well
> arise from the present confusion of thought. The
> new theories will have to make sense not of rural
> societies or even the nineteenth century industrial
> societies but of the sophisticated machine age
> megalopolis of the twenty-first century. Until
> such theories emerge the role which education can
> and should play will remain obscure"[24].

With this reservation Holmes goes on to focus on "educational
problems". Many of the issues that he raises will be considered at
greater length in chapter three: here the concern is principally with
Holmes' formulation of the subject matter of urban education within

the comparative approach. Considering major educational policy
decisions he categorises them as including "finance, administration,
the structure of the school system, curriculum, out-of-school education
and teacher preparation"[25]. This list is similar to the taxonomy he
later developed for his IBE book and which provides a framework for
chapter three. The first problem he mentions is overcrowding but this
is related directly to the financial difficulties so frequently facing
urban schools as "the finance to meet current and capital costs can
rarely be raised in heavily populated areas of the old city or peripheral
shanty towns".[26] His idea of demographic shift is then refined by
including not only the nature and numbers of groups moving into urban
areas but also the volatile movements within cities and the peregrinations
of both teachers and pupils in urban schools. The impermanence generated
by the sum of these movements can have a deleterious destabilising effect
on city schools.

> "Yet to stabilise the slum school would mean to
> deny, to many who want to use it, a stepping stone
> to a better life. Those who move out of the slum
> are the most energetic and no doubt the ones who
> can take most advantage of what the slum school
> has to offer"[27].

He locates here a fundamental dilemma which has beset urban
educators in their attempts to clarify their aims. Should the urban
school attempt to equip its children with the knowledge, skills and
certification needed to escape the inner city slum or peripheral shanty
town? or should it rather provide them with the skills and solidarity
to survive within the city and actually to attempt to improve the social
and material conditions of their groups? In Hall's terms[28] should the
urban school's concentration be on creating vertical or horizontal links?
Or is it possible for these aims to be combined? Considering all these
dilemmas Holmes then makes a major, generalising, descriptive statement
which informs the whole essay:

> "it is possible that in the past the main features
> of the rural and small town school system have
> been retained in the cities. The size of these
> schools has grown enormously and their socio-
> economic context is no longer rural in spite of
> the fact that many of the in-migrants carry with
> them rural attitudes. The apparent viability of
> a rural school system in a suburban environment
> may frequently disguise the fact that radically
> different institutions are needed in the cities"[29].

Given the essay's context as "Introduction" to The World Yearbook of
Education 1970 this is a very far-reaching generalisation. It points
to a feature of urban education which Holmes perceives in many different
countries, despite extreme variations in their size, climate, economic
development, political superstructure, culture and demographic patterns.
As such it represents a high degree of generalised conceptualisation
to which many of the other essays in the book lend support and which
requires backing in the details of other instances. By comparison the
generalisations attempted in ensuing chapters are by no means so broad
as their focus is confined to the urban areas of only the U.K and the
U.S.A. Holmes' generalised statement informs all this ensuing discussion
of administration, finance, curriculum and policy.

Holmes seems marginally to favour large structures, such as the
Inner London Education Authority, as administrative units for urban
schools. He acknowledges that there seems to be a need for some form of
local participation in schools, but he suggests that this does not
necessitate small administrative units. Furthermore, such participation
may encroach on teachers' professional independence and status.

> "The argument for smaller units seems vague. It
> is often held that the participation of members
> of the community served by the schools is vital
> to the solution of problems facing city schools.
> But why? Can local enthusiasm replace profes-
> sional expertise? And how can local effort make
> itself effective?"[30]

This high regard for local participation is indeed one of the features
of "the rural school" which local groups attempt to transfer, perhaps
inappropriately, into the urban setting. Drawing on Parsons' pattern

variables[31] Holmes specifies that:

> "Many attitudes of these middle class, successful parents may be particularistic, affective, and ascriptive in their orientation as far as the school and several features of their environment are concerned"[32].

Although these values may have a higher chance of successful implementation in the schools of richer suburban areas than in the inner city or shanty town, they are actually inappropriate in both cases:

> "middle class professionals may think the solution to urban problems lies in policies which in fact perpetuate rural institutions whereas the evolution of significantly new-type schools is needed"[33].

As an example of such a new-type school Holmes mentions the educational plazas described elsewhere in the same volume.[34] The basis on which local participation is urged as a solution to problems of urban schools is often that of attitudes:

> "appropriate to the rural or folk society in which homogeneity of outlook, together with a strong sense of group loyalty are based on informal but accepted status and traditional, spontaneous and uncritical modes of behaviour"[35].

Probably Holmes has in mind here the proposals of community school protagonists such as Dewey[36] in the U.S.A and Morris[37] in the U.K, for they have generated movements in both countries where protagonists have attempted to engage local participation and support in urban schools.[38] Holmes sees as vital "the creation of city institutions which facilitate such participation"[39] but his exhortation is by no means pointed exclusively in the direction of community schooling as he shares a concern about lay participation impairing professional authority.[40]

In discussing finance, Holmes pays particular attention to disadvantaged groups and to equalisation of funds as a policy solution. Wealthy suburbs and small towns are able to finance more prosperous schools with more and better teachers and facilities than those of the

inner city or shanty town, unless there is some national government policy to equalise provision, "to ensure that the amount spent per capita on education throughout the country is roughly the same"[41]. Holmes cites the U.K as a country in which this policy is carried out but in 1983 this is no longer the case.[42] Holmes mentions the lack of funding in many countries, but overlooks the lavish funding sometimes provided for private schools for the children of the privileged. Holmes acknowledges the aims of the movement towards the common school:

> "Since 1945 on the grounds of justice and
> equality there has been pressure in many coun-
> tries to establish common or comprehensive
> schools at the second stage of education. The
> social purpose has been to improve social
> mobility and reduce sharp social divisions"[43].

However, he questions whether comprehensivisation is the one correct way to achieve these aims. The geographical separation and segregation of groups which leads to problems in the unequal funding of schools also means that comprehensive schools are likely to draw their children predominantly from one segment of the city's population. Consequently, "many comprehensive schools are schools for the disadvantaged"[44]. Though Holmes himself does not stress the point it is important to note that space itself is a crucial element in urban education here. It is with regard to such spatial influences on education that in chapter two it is found to be essential to retain space as a necessary element both in the understanding of urban areas and in any adequate approach to urban education.[45] Holmes points out that geographical stratification may be intensified where racial segregation is superimposed on that of class:

> "Frequently members of the disadvantaged group
> have not only an inferior socio-economic status
> but come from foreign countries or from different
> ethnic or cultural backgrounds"[46].

If the existence of geographical stratification is not to bbviate the

high ideals of comprehensivisation how is integration to be achieved
between children of different races and classes who are located in
widely separate parts of the urban area? "Should policies of forced
integration of schools be followed?"[47] Transporting children to schools
outside their areas has been essayed in the U.S and has been attempted
in Ealing in the U.K.[48] In both countries it has been regarded as a
highly contentious policy both by the groups whose children are bussed
and by the groups whose children previously attended the schools where
the integration is implemented. On these grounds Holmes is able to
retain his reservations about comprehensivisation as an ideal or final
policy solution in urban areas:

> "policies of comprehensivisation should be seen
> in the light of housing policies and the attitudes
> of minority groups. The ways in which comprehen-
> sive schools can solve city educational problems
> better than other forms of school organisation
> should be carefully considered. The answers are
> not at all clear"[49].

Nor have answers become much clearer over the ensuing decade: compre-
hensivisation in the U.K, for instance, has yet to fulfil the aim of
enhancing social equality. However, it may still be a struc-
tural step in the direction of the ideal aims which Holmes cites: it
is difficult to contest that it is better able to move this way than,
say, the superseded tripartite system.[50]

Holmes' discussion of vocational schools and polytechnical
education is an example of the way in which a comparative approach and
range of reference is appropriate to discussion of urban educational
problems. He illuminates this aspect of the curriculum by drawing on
the policy experiences of two contrasting countries, India and the USSR.
The question is whether children should be taught specific skills which
seem to be relevant to the needs of the local economy but which may
become redundant due to industrial change or whether they should learn

more generalised intellectual skills which are difficult to organise

and which might lack the appeal of direct relevance:

> "If they are strictly vocational in providing
> young people with the skills of a trade they
> are felt to restrict opportunities. If the
> education they provide is based upon general
> principles - from science and technology - it
> is frequently thought by pupils to be irrelevant"[51].

Gandhi's Wardha scheme, which was implemented in India as Basic Education

is seen by Holmes as an example of a restrictingly technical curriculum

which proved to be inappropriate to the country's needs following the

independent government's policy of industrialisation.

> Could an education devised for a rural-
> subsistence economy adequately serve the needs
> of an industrial society in the throes of
> urbanisation? The thesis advanced here is
> that such a system of basic education was
> unlikely to transform the folkways and mores
> of a rural people to those in harmony with
> urbanised industrial living"[52].

Holmes' reservations concerning basic education are as enduring a

feature of his work as is his interest in polytechnical education. He

describes as "excellent proposals" those of Soviet theoreticians who

follow "Marxian doctrine":

> "A satisfactory education for today's indus-
> trial life should involve changes in the
> outlook of young people towards production
> and their fellow workers. The age old
> dichotomy between manual training and intel-
> lectual education should be broken down"[53].

However, in practice these aims meet difficulties through lack of

training or commitment on the part of teachers: industrial workers

might commensurately lack pedagogical skills, leading to trivialisation

of higher studies. The aims of polytechnical education are, nevertheless,

an instructive corrective to the urban curricula of many countries

which remain fixed in essentialist or encyclopaedic straightjackets.[54]

> "Too often the content of education and the
> conceptual frame of reference which determines
> the way in which it is treated do little to

> prepare young people to cope with industrial
> city life. The intellectualism of European
> education is based upon neo-classical views of
> society, individuality and ways of knowing
> which originated in pre-industrial societies"[55].

Holmes tentatively suggests the possibility of differential curricula, "perhaps an updated liberal arts curriculum might serve a minority of children and vocational training might meet the needs of the masses,"[56] but he has the realism to recognise that such a proposal is no longer likely to be politically acceptable in some countries.

Pragmatic methods in the urban curriculum and pedagogy might be expected to appeal to Holmes in that their attempt to "help individuals to solve their problems collectively through the exercise of intelligence"[57] is derived from the philosophy and practice of Dewey which is related to Holmes' own preferred methodology. Indeed the pragmatic approach with its stress on problem-solving might provide those flexible, generalised skills, mentioned in the preceding paragraph, which seem to be essential for qualifying children for the changing nature of urban life.

> "Activity methods, learning from experience,
> projects, problem-solving curricula and the
> like, were the practical solutions proposed by
> a succession of progressive educationists in
> the USA. Both progressive child-centred and
> social-centred approaches attempted to help
> young people make sense of and adapt to the
> changing world of the twentieth century"[58].

However, in the USA this approach was not detached from that romanticism which continued to perceive the urban school as an institution in which rural values were appropriate. The pragmatic approach there tended to stress "the spirit of the frontier" and "the virtues of a society in which individualism operated in small communities"[59]. Nevertheless, Holmes emphasises pragmatism, at the level of theory, as specifically designed to locate problems due to change and to facilitate the elaboration and evaluation of solutions.

> "Pragmatism seems to provide a theoretical
> basis on which to build educational theories
> because it accepts change as one of the
> striking features of urbanisation and implies
> that problems faced by young people in their
> environment should constitute the core of
> general education"[60].

As such pragmatism would seem to provide an appropriate organising
principle for the urban curriculum and to provide the pedagogy
appropriate to developing ideals and practices relevant to industrial
societies.

> "It suggests that in theory proposed solutions
> should be tested in practice. Finally it
> maintains that men through the collective
> exercise of intelligence can anticipate problems
> and cope with them more successfully"[61].

But in the USA enthusiasm for pragmatic methods seems to have waned
due to, among other things, concern about the academic progress of
'gifted children', especially in view of international competition in
the areas of science and defence technology. In the past decade moves
towards achievement-based teaching, programmed learning, specific
skills and educational standards has further undermined the principle
of pragmatism as the foundation of U.S education.[62] Holmes states a
basic tenet of the study of urban education when he asserts that "The
sources of hope and the seeds of educational frustration in the U.S.A
deserve careful comparative study" because "in no country have the
problems of the city been studied more intensively" and "nowhere else
is there available a widely accepted theory of education which would
make it possible to organise schoolwork round the problems of city
life"[63]. Pragmatism is the unifying philosophy through which the
Holmesian methodology for comparative (and urban) education has a
parallel within the school curriculum. However, his emphasis on the
reactionary potential of a pragmatism yoked to the ideals of the rural
or small-town life (as in Dewey) is salutory.

Holmes' discussion of the broader implications for policy formu-

lators and planners begins by considering the policies of some countries attempting to limit urban growth and reduce or prevent immigration from rural areas. If such policies were to succeed then there would be little or no change and so no specific technical problems (in Holmes' sense) would face the urban educational policy maker or, for that matter, the student of urban education. However, many such policies, as in the successive attempts to limit the size of Moscow,[64] have proved unsuccessful and, as Holmes notes, they inevitably "raise extremely contentiouus moral issues"[65]. Urban education in many countries then is likely to be an important process as part of the adaptation to change and some realistic assessment of "the limited functions the school can play in the rehabilitation of the city"[66] is required. Again drawing on Parsons' pattern variables Holmes specified "two major needs" which are related to his over-arching generalisation that urban schools need to abandon their rural models, practices and values.

> "First the attitudes appropriate to the non-affective, specific, universalistic and achieving city should be known in detail if schools are to contribute to their acceptance by city youth. Related to the achievement of this task are techniques of changing rural into urban attitudes. The other major difficulty is to devise appropriate new institutions"[67].

Holmes' own recommendations are overt at this point and he returns to the theme of an urban curriculum founded firmly on the pragmatic approach:

> "A curriculum geared directly to the specific problems of urban living - in the areas of earning a living, keeping healthy, bringing up a family, participating in civic affairs, and spending leisure time profitable - is probably one of the most urgent reforms"[68].

The succeeding decade has brought a greatly increased concentration on the urban curriculum in the U.S and the U.K, yet the objectives

specified in this sentence remain elusive in both countries. Holmes'
pessimistic conclusion, then, that "archaic solutions are often offered
to modern problems",[69] would seem to need only modest qualification in
view of subsequent experience. Whether schools themselves remain
"basically rural institutions" could still be persuasively argued and
there is little evidence to show much change in the phenomenon "that
the values which receive the support of many educationists are also
those appropriate to a rural community".[70]

It is now perhaps possible to summarise some of the important
aspects of the comparative approach to urban education as found in the
work of Holmes and as outlined in the article exmained in detail above. (To
do this is effectively to examine the academic subject of urban
education as it has been developed and taught at the London University
Institute of Education. Although the purpose here is not to examine
specific university syllabuses, reading lists or course outlines, an
interesting comparison between the U.S and the U.K could be made on
the basis of such documentation. Such a comparison might also point
to differences between institutions in the same country and to the
levels at which urban education is taught in various colleges and
universities.[71] The Open University's course E 361 would provide a
wealth of documentation against which other courses could be assessed.[72])
However, the intention here is not to examine the teaching of the
academic discipline of urban education but to investigate the practices
and literature on which the subject is based. By concentrating on the
approaches to urban education it is hoped to discover what is approp-
riate to its individual and discrete subject matter and to its specific
theories.

Holmes' approach, then, may be summarised by making three broad
points and by using it to analyse in more depth one exemplary problem,

that of the demand for Islamic schooling. The first point about Holmes'
approach to urban education is the obvious one that it is comparative.
It draws on a range of reference from cities in all parts of the world
with large differences in their economic, social and political structures
and in their patterns of growth. This enables Holmes to point to
meaningful contrasts, to avoid generalisations about cities that
actually apply only to North America and/or Europe, and to attempt
ideal typical generalisations about urban areas that do have credibly
wide application. Secondly, Holmes adopts a problem-solving approach
to education in urban areas. Although this involves careful location
and description of specific problems, it is not really concerned to
determine the causes of these problems. Rather it attempts to formulate
and assess hypothetical and actual policy solutions. Problems are
located by isolating elements of change against a background of no
change. The problems of urban areas are largely, but not exclusively,
analysed in terms of the change element of vast and rapid demographic
shift. Hence the careful and accurate description of which groups are
moving into which areas of a city at what rate and which groups are
moving out of which areas at what rates is a crucial part of this
approach to urban studies. This in turn means that such an analysis
of urban areas is one which considers space to be an indispensable
category of description and understanding.[73] The no-change element is
largely institutional in that the educational processes and institutions
fail to adapt or adapt too slowly or in the wrong direction in response
to changing circumstances and populations. However, it is important
also to bear in mind that, for Holmes, people's norms are exceedingly
resistant to change, except insofar as immigrant groups bring with
them different sets of values. The essay "Education in Cities"
contains little specific reference to the aims of education, although

it follows the other headings of the typology Holmes subsequently developed for the IBE.[74] However, the essay does have a central concern with values and these are closely related to the aims of education. The adaptation of educational structures and institutions (or the lack of it) could then be studied within the categories of aims, administration, finance, structure, curriculum and teacher education.[75] So, thirdly, the Holmesian approach is concerned with hypothesising solutions to problems which occur in education in urban areas considered within the categories of this typology. Within this approach, then, the subject of urban education would be likely to be used to examine policy solutions which have been attempted in cities, to assess relative successes and failures (bearing in mind differences in specific initial conditions), to suggest possible policy alternatives and also to hypothesise new policy options and to attempt to evaluate their chances of solving specific problems.

Reservations about this approach are discussed below but it seems to provide a preliminary basis on which to found the subject of urban education. However, one obvious difficulty occurs immediately: to adapt Pickvance's comment on Castells[76] is not Holmes in danger of equating urban education with education per se? Demographic shift occurs in rural and suburban areas, both by the migration of the rural poor to the cities and by the flight of the more prosperous urbanites into the suburbs. Problems occur in educational and other institutions in some areas spatially far removed from the inner city ghetto or the barrio. What is the advantage of studying such problems with a specifically, spatially located, urban context?

At one time urban education was perhaps little more than a euphemism for the education of black people, or the children of immigrant groups and its subject still seems to be largely the education of

poor people. Yet, as Barnes and Lucas have shown for the U.K at least,[77] poor people are by no means always concentrated in easily identifiable urban areas. Following Popper,[78] it seems better to eschew semantic questions - such as "what exactly is a city?" as being futile and inevitably leading to an endless regress.

The justification for studying education in urban areas is that a range of problems are more visible there. Certainly such problems are not confined to cities, but they are found there in more extreme forms, in greater numbers and in denser concentrations. For this reason policy solutions are also more likely to emerge in cities. Both the theorists and policy managers have, then, concentrated on problems in urban areas. Thus, the investigation of specific problems and solutions may be seen as a valid method for determining the subject matter of urban education both as the practice of administrators and teachers and as the topic of academic study.

Having outlined Holmes' approach it is possible to return to the example of demands for Islamic schooling in London in order briefly to see how the approach might be applied in one instance. The problem analysis would draw attention to the changed nature of the population of some areas of inner London and in particular to the different religious beliefs of the recently immigrant groups and their children. The lack of change in educational institutions would highlight the continuation of voluntary aided Christian schools and Christian or secular religious education and services. In specifying initial conditions it would be appropriate to describe, rather than attempt to explain, the full situation. The questions which would need to be answered would include, with regard to the change element: how large are Moslem groups in London? in which areas do they live? how densely are they concentrated? where did they come from and when? what are

their normative patterns and mental states? with what institutions
are they familiar? Appropriate questions with regard to the no change
element might include: how is the educational policy which denies
Moslem children separate provision formulated, adopted and implemented?
how may it be changed?

Questions less likely to be asked within Holmes' approach might
seem to penetrate into politically more delicate areas: what groups
control the processes whereby such provision is denied? what are the
normative patterns and mental states of these groups? do they have
institutional (for example, self-preservatory) reasons for their
decisions? by what processes do such groups obtain and retain control
over education? who benefits and loses as a result of this control?
It is in order to be able to ask and attempt to answer some of this
latter category of questions that, as elaborated below, other approaches
from those of Holmes need to be considered.

Within the Holmes approach, after analysing the problem it could
then be hypothesised that a possible policy solution would be the
establishment of Islamic schools in those areas of London where there
are high concentrations of Moslem families. The prediction of likely
outcomes might be that, although the immediate problem of aspirations
and demands might be partially solved, other, new problems would be
likely to arise due to the new change made in the institutional pattern
by the separate provision. These might include: fresh demands by
Islamic groups for, example, more Koranic studies to be included on the
curricula of universities, resentment on the part of other groups
(such as, in London, Sikhs, Greek Orthodox, Hindu and Buddhist) at the
apparently preferential provision being made for Moslems; potentially
strong hostility on the part of some groups,for example feminists,
whose norms could be deeply offended by some aspects of Islamic

education. These predicted outcomes could then be compared with the observable events in a city where a policy of special Islamic educational provision had been implemented. Or indeed, if such a city proved difficult to locate (and certainly no urban education authority in the U.K has yet implemented such a policy), or if the specific initial conditions were so fundamentally different from those operant in London (as they would probably be, for instance, in those countries where the majority of the population are Moslems) it might be possible to make a comparison with the demands on the part of Jewish groups in London for separate provision earlier in this century. That these demands were eventually met by the formation of the Jewish schools which are now a successful and well-integrated feature of London's educational provision, might suggest that the long-term future for the suggested policy solution of separate Islamic provision might make its implementation a reasonable experiment.

Since the publication of the World Yearbook in 1970 there have been significant developments both in the practice of urban education and in the subjects of urban studies. In the U.K a different pattern of immigration and outmigration occurred during the 1970s: the population of inner London, for instance, continued to decline and the new wave of immigration resulted in the second language in the schools of the ILEA becoming Bengali by 1979.[79] In the U.S the pattern of 'white flight' has altered with many skilled workers moving to the developing urban areas of the sunbelt[80] whilst the immigration is now mostly of Puerto Ricans to the Eastern seaboard cities and Mexicans into the cities of California and Texas. The changes introduced by the arrival of these groups in urban areas in the U.S.A and the U.K have resulted in a different range of problems. The Puerto Ricans and Mexicans are largely Spanish speaking, unlike the rural blacks who formed the previous wave

of immigrants into the U.S cities: schools are thus faced again with
the problem of linguistic diversity and whether the previously
successful integrationist policy of the 'melting pot'[81] will prove
adequate in today's cities remains doubtful.

The Bengali population is largely Moslem and they and other such
religious groups from the Indian subcontinent present the urban educa-
tional authorities of the U.K with difficulties due to religious
difference as well as to intense linguistic heterogeneity. Falling
rolls in the U.K and financial cutbacks have led to an atmosphere in
which innovation is much less likely to be encouraged. The heavily
financed and publicised developments begun in the 1960s, such as
educational priority areas and compensatory education have had their
effectiveness severely questioned.[82] At the same time the broad public
consensus which was previously taken to support the growth of educational
institutions has been jeopardised by media representations of classroom
disruption, falling standards and the 'crisis' of the urban school[83] and
by theorists criticising the role of education. Jencks' research[84]
seemed to reduce schools to the status of marginal institutions; Illich
questioned the widely held view of the beneficial effects of the global
classroom;[85] schools were seen by radical and Marxist writers to be
agencies of social control[86] or the dominant aspect of the ideological
state apparatus.[87] During the 1970s in the U.K and the U.S.A the
subject of urban education was developed as its theorists catalogued
and commented on the way free-schoolers, de-schoolers, community
schoolers, private-schoolers and supplementary-schoolers all served to
undermine consensus and confidence in the mainstream system. At the
same time wider urban studies and theories mushroomed: studies by
geographers, sociologists and economists[88] aimed at practitioners and
students of urban management in its many aspects - administration,

finance, planning, housing, environment, social services, recreation, health and welfare, and education - initiated theoretical developments and a cross-fertilisation of ideas. Much of this urban social theory drew its inspiration from Weber and/or Marx. In taking Holmes' approach to outlining the subjects of urban education, then, it is necessary to make the reservation that new problems have risen to prominence since 1970. These could be studied using the analytic framework which he has established. However, there are limitations to Holmes' approach to urban education. These may emerge partially from a brief discussion of those theorists on whom Holmes based much of his work, Dewey and Popper.

1.4 Holmes' use of the work of Dewey and Popper

Holmes' use of Dewey seems to be at least threefold. Firstly, he uses Dewey's work as an ideal typical manifestation of or concerning wo/man, knowledge and society in the U.S.A. Dewey's work provides a source for pragmatism, reflective thinking, democracy, the community education response to urbanism and for "those values that were part of the frontier spirit of rural America".[89] Secondly, the pedagogy recommended by Dewey, particularly in How We Think,[90] being based on activity methods, with the aim of encouraging and developing reflective thinking, is one which, on the whole, Holmes seems prepared to defend. Thirdly, and with regard to wider areas of application, Holmes seems to consider reflective thinking and the problem-solving methodology as being both the substantiating epistemology and the single appropriate methodology for enquiry into the social sciences. The constituents of his own problem-solving approach relate very clearly to Dewey's "five phases or aspects of reflective thinking" namely "the first phase, suggestion ... the second phase, intellectualisation ... the third phase, the guiding idea, hypothesis ... the fourth phase, reasoning

(in the narrower sense) ... the fifth phase, testing the hypothesis by action".[91]

It is important to remember that How We Think was a book written primarily for teachers and that, for all its epistemological importance, its focus is largely on the appropriateness of problem-solving in pedagogy in the classroom. Furthermore, Dewey calls this book "our survey of how we think and how we should think"[92] that is, there is a certain overlap throughout the work between psychological description of the actual processes of mentation and epistemological advocation and prescription of the most effective ways in which knowledge can be discovered, organised and generated. To expand Dewey's recommended pedagogy into part of the framework for a social science methodology would be to risk a confusion between one particular approach (and that taken out of its limited classroom context), the perceived normal functioning of the human mind, and a prescribed approach to studying social problems. The relationship between pedagogy, psychology and epistemology is that they are all covered by the description problem-solving: but is this unity anything more than nominal? Dewey does not attempt to elaborate the articulations between them except insofar as he perceived thinking and reflection to be activities which are directed exclusively towards the solution of problems:

> "Demand for the solution of a perplexity is the
> steadying and guiding factor in the entire
> process of reflection. ...The nature of the
> problem fixes the end of thought and the end
> controls the process of thinking".[93]

Dewey defined thinking in this way and Holmes effects the transfer which makes it the central method of comparative education and indeed of much social science enquiry.

Whilst, as has been discussed above in the case of urban education, such an approach has much to recommend it and may, when utilising the

stages of reflective thinking, provide a useful methodology, it is
necessary to note at this stage two provisional reservations, neither
of which are unintentional. Firstly, given the stress on prediction,
this approach is likely to neglect antecedents; its orientation towards
the future may make it unmindful of history. Secondly, by concentrating
on limited 'problems', this approach is likely to be technical and
partial: holistic explanations and even solutions are likely to be
eschewed. These two limitations mean that there is some risk that wider
social or structural elements operating on any given 'problem' will be
neglected.[94]

Because Dewey limited the implications of problem-solving to a
pedagogical or specifically scientific device and avoided apotheosising
the method into a total, generalised epistemological validation, his
own works[95] manage always to include those wider elements which are
acting on his particular concern. This points to a slight difference
of emphasis between Holmes and Dewey: for the latter reflective thinking
is a flexible individual process, at its best it has been accommodated
as a procedure and become an activity of imagination:

> "Scientific observation, however, does not
> merely replace observation that is enjoyed
> for its own sake. The latter, sharpened by
> a process of contributing to an art like
> writing, painting, singing, becomes truly
> aesthetic, and the persons who enjoy singing
> and hearing will be the best observers".[96]

By contrast, for Holmes the concentration on the formation of models
and the perfection of methodology borders almost on rigidity and for-
malism and sometimes seems to lack the delight of actually using procedures
with regard to a specific object, then seeing how the investigation both
clarifies the object and helps modify the procedure. This discussion
of Dewey then points to the need for an approach to urban education
which, whilst sharing some of the virtues of that of Holmes, also has

the flexibility to take account of historical considerations and the
breadth of vision to be able to include wider social processes and
not necessarily be immediately limited to a focus on a specific,
identifiable problem. These two requirements are susceptible to further
elaboration through a brief discussion of Popper's influence on Holmes.

Popper's influence on Holmes' methodology and on the general
direction of the comparativist's writing has been profound. They
share an intense commitment to science, the philosophy of science,
scientific method (which they perceive to be exclusively that of
hypothetico-deduction or problem-solving) and to the demonstration of
the relevance of this approach to the social sciences. Popper's stages
in scientific method (as paraphrased by Magee) would seem to be even
more clearly influential on Holmes than Dewey's stages of reflective
thinking:

> "1. problem (usually rebuff to existing
>   theory or expectation);
> 2. proposed solution, in other words a
>   new theory;
> 3. deduction of testable propositions from
>   the new theory;
> 4. tests, i.e attempted refutations by, among
>   other things (but only among other things)
>   observation and experiment;
> 5. preference established between competing
>   theories".[97]

There is indeed a remarkable similarity between Popper and Dewey in
this respect. Within the theory of critical rationalism developed by
Popper,[98] however, the fifth stage is unlikely ever to be final. In
science it would represent a new theory, or in social sciences a policy
solution's actual outcomes. In either case it would represent a stage
in a feedback process, as the new theory would be open to previously
unforeseen refutations and tests and the social policy would be likely
to result in unforeseen outcomes.[99] In both cases there would then be
new problems and the beginning of a new cycle:

> "Every solution of a problem raises new
> unsolved problems; the more so the deeper the

> original problem and the bolder its
> solution. The more we learn about the
> world, and the deeper our learning, the
> more conscious, specific and articulate
> will be new knowledge of what we do not
> know, our knowledge of our ignorance".[100]

In Popper's theory the stress on deduction and solutions is linked to severe criticism of inductive method.[101] The crucial criterion for all theories is not the amount of evidence on which they are based, but whether or not they advance predictions which may be tested and falsified. These predictions must be able to be subjected to observational test, then if the theories are not falsified they are valid thus far:

> "Besides, we do not prefer every non-
> falsified theory - only one which, in the
> light of criticism appears to be better than
> its competitors: which solves our problems,
> which is well tested, and of which we think,
> or rather conjecture a hope (considering other
> provisionally accepted theories), that it will
> stand up to further tests".[102]

Kuhn, attempting to discover the methods actually historically used by scientists, suggests that Popper's theory of science does not hold for the processes which led to scientific discoveries:

> "Failure to achieve a solution discredits
> only the scientist and not the theory".[103]

He suggests rather that science should be studied as a social activity and that scientific knowledge is the produce of social interactions:

> "What one must understand, however, is the
> manner in which a particular set of shared
> values interacts with the particular exper-
> iences shared by a community of specialists
> to ensure that most members of the group will
> ultimately find one set of arguments rather
> than another decisive".[104]

It is unnecessary here to elaborate Kuhn's theory[105] and it would be inappropriate to attempt to resolve or arbitrate such matters. (The thesis is examining approaches to urban education not attempting to synthesise them or arbitrate between them.) The point simply is that Popper's methodology is by no means ubiquitously accepted as the one uniquely appropriate to the physical sciences. In this respect Popper has been particularly sharply criticised by Feyerabend who advocates

a totally pluralistic approach to science:

> "Ideas which today form the very basis of
> science exist only because there were such
> things as prejudice, conceit, passion;
> because these things opposed reason, and
> because they were permitted to have their
> way. We have to conclude then, that even
> within science reason cannot and should not
> be allowed to be comprehensive and that it
> must be over-ruled, or eliminated, in favour
> of other agencies. There is not a single rule
> that remains valid under all circumstances
> and not a single agency to which appeal can
> always be made". [106]

In discussing Popper's consideration of social sciences methodology and policy and Holmes' utilisation of this approach with regard to education, it is appropriate to remember that critical rationalism and the demarcation between science and non-science have not been immune from attempts at criticism, adaptation and refutation.

In Popper's extensive argument concerning the social sciences it is possible to isolate two important steps. Firstly, he affirms that the methodology which he considers appropriate to the physical sciences is also appropriate and apparently without any modification to the social sciences. In The Poverty of Historicism this step is stylishly accomplished by reversing the procedure and pointing to those social scientists who have indeed attempted to emulate (in largely positivistic terms) the methods of science:

> "It was, for instance, a conscious attempt to
> copy the experimental method of physics which
> led, in the generation of Wundt, to a reform
> in psychology; and since J. S. Mill, repeated
> attempts have been made to reform on somewhat
> similar lines the method of the social sciences". [107]

At the outset this assumption is stated and generalised. Even were it correct, would it not need to be demonstrated on a range of social science studies and analyses, perhaps even those more recent then J. S. Mill? Popper gives little consideration to those social scientific methods which are not attempting to emulate the physical sciences. [108] To make this step on an assertion rather than on a demonstration of some substantive depth is to assume that refutation is confined to the

epistemological and thereby to forgo any kind of social scientific discussion. Popper (and to a certain extent Holmes) tends to concentrate rather exclusively on methodology. Indeed Popper says of his study of historicism that it "is seriously examined only in so far as it is a doctrine of method".[109] It is perhaps a paradox that Popper rejects much social science as unscientific,[110] when much work done in these areas abounds with facts, statistics and a continual reference to the substance of social practices, whilst in his own work he disdains to focus on the topics of their arguments and discusses a strangely small amount of social evidence.

Popper's second crucial step is from suggesting an appropriate social scientific methodology to applying this to politics and social policy. What is appropriate to the study of the subjects is, by this step, seen as being appropriate to actual policies for social progress. This step is discussed later in this chapter in the consideration of Holmes' advocacy of piecemeal social engineering. These two steps taken together move from Popper's ideal method of science to the appropriate nature of social intervention. This explains how Popper can utilise his principle of demarcation between science and non-science to reject social policies apparently not based on his methodology as "unscientific" as if this were the crucial criterion. He can then go on to advocate "scientific method" in politics:

> "Scientific method in politics means that the
> great art of convincing ourselves that we
> have not made any mistakes, of ignoring them,
> is replaced by the greater art of accepting
> responsibility for them, of trying to learn
> from them, and of applying this knowledge so
> that we may avoid them in the future".[111]

Whilst the sentiments expressed here may provoke general agreement, it must be noted that "scientific method" is in danger of being apotheosised and transformed into an exclusive 'one best way'. Feyerabend's

epistemological anarchy provides a corrective if not an alternative:[112]

> "Finally, let me repeat that for me the
> chauvinism of science is a much greater problem
> than the problem of intellectual pollution. It
> may even be one of its major causes. Scien-
> tists are not content with running their own
> playpens in accordance with what they regard as
> the rules of scientific method, they want to
> universalise these rules, they want them to
> become part of society at large and they use
> every means at their disposal - argument, propa-
> ganda, pressure tactics, intimidation, lobbying -
> to achieve their aims".[113]

The decision to attempt to examine other approaches to urban education

than that of Holmes may then be taken as parallel to a reluctance unques-

tioningly to follow Popper in these two crucial steps. Other approaches

to urban education are examined in chapters two and four. At this stage

it is worth examining how conflict, and particularly Marxist theories,

might approach some of the issues raised in this chapter.

1.5 A Critique of the Comparative Approach

Within Marx' social theory the important level at which to look

for change would be that of the industrial base rather than that of

population movement:

> "The bourgeoisie cannot exist without constantly
> revolutionising the instruments of production,
> and with them the whole relations of society".[114]

Changes in the ownership and management of the means of production and

in the social and material relations of production (which, according

to neo-Marxists,[115] are today still altering with the development of

corporate and technical capitalism) are seen to be the fundamental

shifts from which other elements take their lead. Demographic shift

is then seen as a response by workers and employers to the material,

social and ideological needs of production:

> "The need of a constantly expanding market
> for its products chases the bourgeoisie
> over the whole surface of the globe. It
> must nestle everywhere, settle everywhere,

> establish connections everywhere. The
> bourgeoisie has through its exploitation
> of the world market given a cosmopolitan
> character to production and consumption
> in every country".[116]

This analysis has been made using more recent data by Castles and Kosack[117] who show how immigrant workers were brought into the industries of Western Europe, in the period after the Second World War at a time of economic growth and labour shortage, to take the least-skilled and worst-paid jobs. Often inhibited from unionising, restricted in their rights to citizenship, prevented from bringing their families to join them, housed in factory barracks or the slums of the rented sector they provided a sub-proletariat for the developing industries of Western Europe during the 1950s and 1960s. A similar case can be made for the immigration of rural blacks and Hispanic people into the cities of the U.S.A during the same period.[118] From the position of such analyses, the inadequacy of provision for these groups and their religious and/or social differences from the rest of the population only serve to benefit capitalist interests by creating and maintaining a division within the working class. Racism, an extreme expression of such division, prevents workers from uniting in interest against the owners and controllers of the means of production:

> "The three functions of prejudice are clearly in
> the interests of the ruling class. They help
> to preserve the societal status quo by, firstly,
> legitimating the exploitation of immigrants,
> secondly, diverting workers' attention from the
> true causes of their insecure position, thirdly
> splitting the labour movement and weakening
> class consciousness. Conversely these three
> functions are against the long-term interests of
> the working class".[119]

Such a brief summary of the Marxist view of asynchronous change and immigration, leads to issues and theories which would not normally be discussed within Holmes' approach. Two crucial elements within Marxist theory which are not included in Holmes' approach are the notion of

class struggle and that of the state.[120] This is not to deny that Holmes

has himself written much about Marx as a theorist of wo/man, knowledge

and society.

The central difference between Holmes' approach and that of the

Marxist perspective is his preference for "piecemeal social engineering".

Here again Holmes follows Popper, who says of his notion of "piecemeal

technology":

> "The social sciences have developed very largely
> through the criticism of proposals for social
> improvements or, more precisely, through
> attempts to find out whether or not some parti-
> cular economic or political action is likely to
> produce an expected, or desired, result. This
> approach, which might indeed be called the
> classical one, is what I have in mind when I
> refer to the technological approach to social
> science, or to "piecemeal social technology".[121]

But if there are in existence political or economic structures, through

which interested people or groups can prevent the implementation of

policies designed to improve the most severe problems, are not such

piecemeal efforts doomed to failure from the outset? Of course such

structures need to be examined before coming to such a conclusion, but

if they are shown to be in operation, then not only would Popper's

advocated policy be futile, it would also be a distraction from under-

standing and changing social processes. This argument is related to

that which Habermas uses against Luhmann:

> "This theory represents the advanced form of a
> technocratic consciousness, which today
> permits practical questions to be defined from
> the outset as technical ones, and thereby with-
> holds them from public and unconstrained dis-
> cussion".[122]

There is, further, the danger, perhaps more likely in societies

which Popper would characterise as 'open', that the people who operate

social and economic structures may delay and modify piecemeal social

technology so that it rarely becomes effective and never in a sufficiently

large degree or to a widespread extent. Given this, is it justifiable

to regard social problems as the product of asynchronous change? Are

there not social experiences of poverty, exploitation and conflict
which seem to endure outside and despite of other areas of change?
Marx and Engels view history as having one common element quite apart
from even the wider social changes or resistance to them: "All history
of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggle".[123]
As another example, poverty, or in Marxist terms exploitation, is
undeniably a problem in the everyday sense of the term, yet how can it
be located within the framework of change and no-change? Even changes
in the material means of production seem to do little to obviate the
prevalence of poverty. Exploitation is then perhaps not a problem in
Holmes' sense but it remains an issue for an understanding of which
other social, economic and political theories are required. Furthermore,
exploitation is precisely the kind of problem which is least suscep-
tible to piecemeal social improvement. As Castles and Kosack show,
increased prosperity for one group (say indigenous workers in industries
demanding a high degree of traditional skill) is often purchased at
the price of greater exploitation for another (in this case un-skilled,
non-unionised workers). Within an international context they are able
to demonstrate that the relative affluence of workers in rich industries
is dependent on the exploitation of those in poorer areas, and that
the immigrant work forces are one aspect of this: "Migration belongs
to neo-colonialism's system for exploiting the wealth of the Third
World".[124] Whether such issues as these are best conceptualised as
technical problems, and whether the gross inequalities involved can be
ameliorated through piecemeal social technology is, then, open to
doubt.[125]

Holmes' methodology is helpful to the study of urban education
in that: it points towards problems which, whilst not exclusive to
cities, are more prevalent and visible there; it directs attention to
social change and to asynchronous change; it provides sophisticated

taxonomies for classifying a wide range of data; it is orientated towards specific problems and to their possible policy solutions. However, it has been suggested above that the wide issues of urban society need some analysis through theories of social class and state power. Such theories and their relevance to the city are discussed in chapter two. These provide a possible alternative to the Holmes' approach which would allow a greater range of explanation and take account of the structural forces and processes involved in urban areas. They may,however, point to the limitations of piecemeal social engineering as a model for policy designed to improve conditions in the city and in urban schools. Chapter three examines some applications of the problem-solving approach and the Marxist approach to issues in urban education in the U.S.A and the U.K. Chapter four then examines a more general range of conflict theories and how they may be applicable to urban educational issues. This leads to a discussion of the education of children perceived to have special needs in chapter five which concentrates on conflicts between people and groups.

-oOo-

Chapter 1

FOOTNOTES

1. Lauwerys, J.A., and Scanlon, D. G., (eds.) 1970.

2. Ibid pp. 1 - 18.

3. Ibid pp. 3 - 4 .

4. An early and seminal discussion of these issues is Engels, F., 1969.

5. For a detailed description see Bater, J. H., 1980 pp. 59 - 76.

6. This is the subject of the entire specially commissioned volume, Shankland, G., et al, 1977.

7. The ensuing discussion draws on Holmes, B., 1965; 1975; 1979; 1980a; 1980b and 1981 as well as many lectures and discussions.

8. Holmes, B., 1981 p. 3.

9. See for instance Popper, K., 1972 p. 17, where real knowledge is referred to as "episteme".

10. Holmes, B., 1981 p. 81.

11. Ideal typical models are discussed in the next paragraph but one.

12. Holmes, B., 1981 p. 82.

13. See for instance Medawar, P. B., 1969.

14. Popper, K., 1972 pp. 193 - 200.

15. Holmes, B., 1981 p. 76.

16. Weber, M., 1930 explains ideal types and uses them throughout. See also Dewey, J., 1933 p. 273 "The inherent significance of generalisation is that it frees a meaning from local restrictions; generalisation is meaning so freed; it is meaning emancipated from accidental features so as to be available in new cases".

17. Holmes, B., 1981 pp. 120-126.

18. Holmes, B., 1981 p. 113.

19. Lauwerys, J. A., and Scanlon, D. G., (eds.) 1970 p. 3.

20. Ibid p. 6.

21. Ibid p. 6.

22. Ibid p. 6.

23. Holmes, B., 1975 p.139.

24. Holmes, B., 1981 p. 8.

25. Ibid p. 9.

26. Ibid p. 8.

27. Ibid p. 9.

28. For a further consideration of Hall, S., 1977 see the discussion of curriculum in chapter three.

29. Lauwerys, J. A., and Scanlon, D. G., (eds.) 1970 p. 9.

30. Ibid p. 10.

31. For a discussion of the use of these flexible and rich categories, see Parsons, T., 1960.

32. Lauwerys, J. A., and Scanlon, D. G., (eds.) 1970 p. 11.

33. Ibid p. 11.

34. Havinghurst, R. J., 1970.

35. Lauwerys, J. A., and Scanlon, D. G., (eds.) 1970 p. 11.

36. This is a strand throughout his work. It is monumentally stated in Dewey, J., 1944.

37. See for instance Morris, H., 1980.

38. The notion of community is discussed in chapter two and the proposals and practice of the community education movement in chapter three.

39. Lauwerys, J. A., and Scanlon, D. G., (eds.) 1970 p. 11.

40. The issue of community participation and professional autonomy is discussed with regard to the curriculum in chapter three.

41. Lauwerys, J. A., and Scanlon, D. G., (eds.) 1970 p. 11.

42. See the further discussion of finance in chapter three.

43. Lauwerys, J. A., and Scanlon, D. G., (eds.) 1970 p. 12.

44. Ibid p. 12.

45. See in particular the discussion of Saunders, P., 1981 in chapter two.

46. Lauwerys, J. A., and Scanlon, D. G., (eds.) 1970 p. 12.

47. Ibid p. 12.

48. See forthcoming M. Phil dissertation by Guthrie, I., at London University Institute of Education.

49. Lauwerys, J. A., and Scanlon, D. G., (eds.) 1970 p. 13.

50. See the discussion in chapter three.

51. Lauwerys, J. A., and Scanlon, D. G., (eds.) 1970 p. 13.

52. Ibid p. 13.

53. Ibid p. 14.

54. See the further discussion of curriculum in chapter three.

55. Lauwerys, J. A., and Scanlon, D. G., (eds.) 1970 p. 14.

56. Ibid p. 14.

57. Ibid p. 15.

58. Ibid p. 15.

59. Ibid p. 15.

60. Ibid p. 15.

61. Ibid p. 15.

62. For a useful overview of these developments see Miller, H. L., 1978.

63. Lauwerys, J. A., and Scanlon, D. G., (eds.) 1970, p. 16.

64. For descriptions see Bater, J. H., 1980 pp. 59 - 76 and Hall, P., 1977 pp. 150 - 177.

65. Lauwerys, J. A., and Scanlon, D. G., (eds.) 1970 p. 16.

66. Ibid p. 17.

67. Ibid p. 17.

68. Ibid p. 17.

69. Ibid p. 17.

70. Ibid p. 18.

71. Some of this work has been done for the U.K and shows a remarkable lack of training of teachers for the urban context in which many of them are likely to spend most of their working lives: see Jones, C., and Street-Porter, R. M., 1980.

72. This course was initially influenced by Holmes' approach.

73. The reason for stressing this apparently self-evident fact is to prepare for a contrast with the works of Castells and Saunders discussed in chapter two.

74. Holmes, B., 1980b.

75. These are the headings used in chapter three.

76. Pickvance, C. G., (ed.), 1976 p. 8.

77. Barnes, J., and Lucas, H., 1977.

78. Popper K., 1972 p. 28: "Words are significant only as instruments for the formulation of theories, and verbal problems should be avoided at all costs".

79. ILEA 1982. "Language Census" RS 811/82.

80. See, for instance, Hill, R. C., 1978.

81. For a detailed historical discussion see Tyack, D. B., 1974.

82. For the educational priority scheme see Barnes, J., and Lucas H., 1977. The Westinghouse evaluation of the Head Start scheme provided some of the background for Jensen, A. R., 1969 mentioned in chapter four. Recent evaluations of the scheme have been more favourable but less publicised: see Halsey, A. H., 1981.

83. A book which highlights such issues, if contributing to rather than commenting on the stridency is Thornbury, R., 1978.

84. Jencks, C., et al, 1972.

85. Illich, I., 1973 was widely read and discussed. It was followed by Illich, I., 1976 and Illich, I., and Verne, E., 1976.

86. See, for instance, Sharp, R., and Green, A., 1975.

87. Althusser, L., 1971.

88. Some of these are discussed and referenced in chapter two.

89. Holmes, B., 1981 p. 9.

90. Dewey, J., 1933.

91. Ibid pp. 107 - 113.

92. Ibid p. 280.

93. Ibid p. 15.

94. For a fuller discussion of the limitations of the notion of problems see Golding, F., 1980.

95. See, for instance, Dewey, J., 1944.

96. Dewey, J., 1933 p. 256.

97. Magee, 1973, p. 56.

98. See, for instance, Popper, K., 1972 p. 26.

99. Such outcomes were illustrated with regard to demands for Islamic education in London in the example above.

100. Popper, K., 1972 pp. 28 - 29.

101. See, for instance, Ibid pp. 33 - 59.

102. Ibid p. 56.

103. Kuhn, T. S., 1970 p. 80.

104. Ibid p. 200.

105. For a discussion between Popper, Kuhn and others see Lakatos, I., and Musgrave, A., (eds.) 1970. Particularly interesting is Lakatos' sophisticated attempt to save Popper's criterion of falsification by moderating its stringency, pp. 91 - 196.

106. Feyerabend, P., 1975 pp 179 - 180.

107. Popper, K., 1961 p. 1.

108. He does, however, give some consideration to dialectical method in Popper, K., 1972 pp. 312 - 335. Of course there have been more recent works of which Popper might disapprove.

109. Popper, K., 1961 p. 54.

110. His incautious statements are frankly dismissive: "I cannot conclude

without pointing out that to me the idea of turning for enlightenment concerning the aims of science, and its possible progress, to sociology or to psychology ... is surprising and disappointing". Lakatos, J., and Musgrave, A., (eds.) 1970 p. 57.

111. Popper, K., 1961 p. 88.

112. Once again to attempt to arbitrate between such epistemologies is beyond the present purpose. See Adorno, T. W., 1977 pp. 41 - 43.

113. Feyerabend, P., 1975 pp. 219 - 220.

114. Marx, K., and Engels, F., 1967 p. 83.

115. For a much fuller discussion of theorists who come under this rather loosely used discription see chapter two.

116. Marx, K., and Engels, F., 1967 p. 83.

117. Castles, S., and Kosack, G., 1973. See also Berger, J., and Mohr, J., 1975.

118. For the influence of industrial and business policies on the growth and decline of cities in the USA see Gordon, D. M., 1978.

119. Castles, S., and Kosack, G., 1973 p. 469.

120. These theories are explained in chapter three.

121. Popper, K., 1967, pp. 58 - 59.

122. Quoted in Frisby, D., 1977 p. xxxii. See also Habermas' essay in this volume and Habermas, J., 1976.

123. Marx, K., and Engels, F., 1967 p. 79.

124. Castles, S., and Kosack, G., 1973 p. 429.

125. For Holmes' contribution to this debate see Holmes, B., 1977.

-oOo-

Chapter 2

SOCIAL THEORY APPROACHES TO THE CITY, CLASS AND THE STATE

It is not necessary to attempt to locate separately theories of
the city, theories of class and theories of the state as these tend both
to be significant elements in many social theories. Concepts of class
and of the state seem to be closely related. The theories most likely
to be useful in understanding urban education are those which have some
specific reference to the city. On these criteria the potentially
appropriate theories may be broadly categorised[1] into five groups which
can then be considered and assessed consecutively: rural-urban theories,
theories of the development of societies, human ecology theories,
managerial theories and economic theories.

2.1 Rural-urban theories

The rigid polarities of Community and Association[2] may perhaps be
explained by the fact that it was written shortly after Tonnies' native
Schleswig-Holstein had been annexed by the Prussian Empire. Tonnies'
rigid distinction is between Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft. Gemeinschaft
is characterised by family life in which man participates with all his
sentiments; its controlling agent is the people; its predominant occu-
pation is the household economy with its tasks of creation and conservation.
From this Gemeinschaft is typified by rural village life with its folk-
ways and mores in which man participates with his mind and his heart;
its controlling agent is the commonwealth; its predominant occupation is
agriculture based on regularly repeated tasks and co-operation guided by
custom. As its widest Gemeinschaft involves town life and religion in
which man's conscience takes part; its controlling agent is the church;
its predominant occupation is art based on memories, belief and
corporate work.[3] By contrast Gesellschaft is typified by city life
based on convention and man's intentions; its predominant occupation is

trade based on deliberate calculations and contractual obligations.
Further, Gesellschaft is typified by national life again based on
calculation; its controlling agent is the state and legislation; its
predominant occupation is industry based on the profit motive, the sale
of labour and factory regulations. At its widest Gesellschaft involves
cosmopolitan life based on man's consciousness; its controlling agent
is the intellectual milieu; its predominant occupation is science, the
concepts and theories of which pass into literature and the press and
thence into public opinion.[4] The movement from Gemeinschaft to
Gesellschaft is an historical process generated by and registered in
the development of urbanisation. At one level Tonnies' theory concep-
tualised one of the enduring myths of Europeans: that contrast between
idyllic rural life - whether located historically or geographically or
both - and urban corruption and alienation. This myth with its central
legitimating concept of community[5] remains influential on urban policy
in many areas, not least education. More penetratingly Tonnies addresses
similar phenomena to those with which Marx and Engels were concerned,
such as the forces of capital and the bourgeoisie as a group, though his
terms are not those of base and superstructure[6] but of the development
of different social collectivities and their organising principles,
institutions and economies. The rigidity of Tonnies distinction between
community and association is mitigated by his recognition that with the
progress of urbanisation, the values, institutions and process of
Gesellschaft are likely to spread even into rural areas:

> "the more general the condition of Gesellschaft
> becomes in the nation or group of nations, the
> more this entire 'country' or the entire 'world'
> begins to resemble one large city".[7]

Gemainschaft and Gesellschaft then are concepts which whilst being
originally spatially and historically located, are ultimately ideal types
which can stand apart from their original specific circumstances. Later

writers such as Wirth[8] could then transform Tonnies' polarity into a rural-urban continuum. Wirth, and subsequently Redfield[9] suggested that there existed a continuum of cultures, traditions, life styles, occupations and organisations which could all be typified as moving from rural to urban. This idea is adapted by Dewey:

> "There is no such thing as an urban culture or rural culture, but only various culture contexts somewhere on the rural-urban continuum. The movement of zoot suits, jass (sic) and anti-biotics from city to country is no more a spread of urbanism than is the transfer or diffusion of blue jeans, square dancing and tomatoes to the cities a movement of ruralism to urban centres".[10]

Saunders quotes this passage as part of his main thesis that the spatiality of cities is not an important aspect of urban social theory.[11] But Dewey is elaborating the rural-urban continuum as adapted by Wirth and Redfield. That his comments are devoid of awareness of any economic dimension probably merely reflects that this was the aspect of Tonnies' work which these writers chose to ignore in their concern with human ecology. However, if the products passing from the city to the country (or centre to the periphery)[12] are advanced technology and expertise, and those from the country to the city are raw agricultural and mineral materials, then in economic terms, at least, spatiality remains a crucial element. Further, in the exchange between western centres and third world peripheries culture in the form of education,[13] media and symbolic consumption - jazz and blue jeans for that matter - is far from irrelevant.

Tonnies' other followers have been those writers who have worked on community studies. Strangely, Saunders in his rejection of spatiality neglects to discuss this body of work. Bell and Newby in their comprehensive literature review of the subject note that:

> "The conflict is between community studies as studies of communities seen as objects and community study as a method, as a way of getting at social facts".[14]

Their assessment is that:

> "They are appealing because they present in
> an easily accessible and readable way descrip-
> tions and analyses of the very stuff of socio-
> logy, the social organisation of human beings;
> and infuriating because they are so idiosyncratic
> and diverse as to steadfastly resist (sic) most
> generalisations".[15]

It would be inappropriate to discuss these studies in detail here as
they are remote from theories centrally concerned with class and the
state. Tonnies' own analysis is in many ways more substantial than
that of his followers and if seen as ideal types his concepts of
Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft may perhaps help understanding without
encouraging simplistic myths of pastoral utopia. His analysis does
take account of the important role of economic activities: however, he
neglects the way these are stratified between groups and he overlooks
the importance of the national and local state. Schleswig-Holstein
after all was overrun not by the abstracted spirit of Gesellschaft but
by the armies of Bismarck.

2.2 Theories of the development of societies

Many theorists have seen society as progressing irreversibly through
various stages, with the process of urbanisation often seen as a key
point. Among these writers are Durkheim and Marx. In The Division of
Labour in Society Durkheim outlines a theory of social change which is
largely an account of urbanisation.[16] He perceives increasing differen-
tiation of the division of labour to lead to progress from mechanical
solidarity to organic solidarity. For Durkheim increasing specialisation
and differentiation of labour functions necessarily lead to new social
organisations in which the principles which link people in peaceful
co-operation are essentially different. He charts this difference
principally in the progress of legislative systems from repressive
sanctions to restitutive sanctions. The progress towards organic

solidarity involves groups shifting their location from their natal

milieu to their occupational milieu; it involves the development of

individualism and the decline of conformity, and a shift from religious

morality to one based on the ethics of the work occupation. The

workings of a community based on a common faith are gradually replaced

by those institutionalised in the forms of justice administered by the

state. As a theory of social change Durkheim perceives human groups as

progressing from the horde to the clan to mechanical solidarity to

organic solidarity. This progress "is an historical law"[17] inevitable

and irreversible. Durkheim sees the driving force of this change to

be demographic density and naturalistic change. Increased "moral

density" involves increased varieties and numbers of interactions and

social relationships between people in a group. The growth of the

cities then is an historically crucial phase in Durkheim's theory of

social change. Saunders, in attempting to discard spatiality as an

important element in urban theory, overstates this aspect of Durkheim:

> "Urbanisation, together with the associated
> development of new means of transportation and
> communication, is the cause of the division of
> labour.... Durkheim argues that the distinction
> between the city and society as a whole in the
> modern period is no longer meaningful, that the
> society itself can now be likened to one great city..."[18]

For Durkheim the city is important as a crucial element in social change

rather than as an isolated social entity, so Saunders can quote him to

the effect that:

> "As advances are made in history, the organi-
> sation which has territorial groups as its
> base (village or city...) steadily becomes
> effaced".[19]

For Durkheim the nature of the solidarity is neither defined nor limited

by the spatial location of collectivities. Durkheim provides a theory

of change which whilst apparently appropriate because of its sophisti-

cated treatment of space and its awareness of the elaborate role of the

state is nevertheless deterministic in its stress on functionalism and in its inevitability.[20] Furthermore, although Durkheim recognises the existence of different groups in society and even stresses the importance of the workplace both as a source of occupational morality and as a potential site for collective action, he does not acknowledge that there is any necessary conflict between groups according to their position with regard to the ownership of the means of production. His theory of groups never becomes a theory of class and his concern with consensus overlooks possible conflict over production and consumption.

By contrast Marx' notion of class relations permeates his entire work and provides one of the main foundations for his theories of wo/man, knowledge and society.[21] An individual's class position, for Marx, is determined not by status, power, rank or even wealth (for it depends how it is used) but by the relation to the means of production. Under capitalism there are two broad classes; the bourgeoisie who own and control the means of production, and the proletariat who own nothing but their labour which they must sell to the capitalists. An individual's personality, skills and ability are developed through contact with the material world and particularly through experience in the productive processes.[22] However, what is generally accepted as knowledge is likely to be that sequence of beliefs which are most congenial to the ruling (bourgeois) class.[23] Marx' concept of class reveals underlying social processes which it is difficult to ignore, but subsequent commentators have grappled with its rigidity which seems to lead Marx to overlook some important group relations. Giddens for instance adapts this aspect of Marx:

> "There are three areas of exploitative rela-
> tionships ... which are not explained,
> though they may be significantly illuminated,
> either by the theory of the exploitation of
> labour or by the theory of surplus value in
> particular. There are: (a) exploitative
> relations between states, where these are
> strongly influenced by military domination:
> (b) exploitative relations between ethnic

> groups, which may or may not converge
> with the first; and (c) exploitative relations
> between the sexes, sexual exploitations. None
> of these can be reduced exhaustively to class
> exploitation, nor more particularly can they be
> derived from the theory of surplus value.
> None of them came into existence with capit-
> alism, though they have taken particular forms
> with the development of capitalist society, and
> thence there can be no presumption that they
> will inevitably disappear if and when capitalism
> does. These are major 'absences' in Marxist
> theory..."[25]

Probably it would have been more comprehensive to have included religious, language and cultural groups under point b. Nevertheless, Giddens' categories, although perhaps inspired by Marx, would seem to provide more subtle analytic resources than the simple bourgeoisie-proletariat conflict.[26] Marx' notion of the state has already been mentioned in discussing base-superstructure theory.[27] Giddens is then perhaps exaggerating the case when he notes:

> "From the late eighteenth century the state has
> played a far more significant role in the deve-
> lopment of capitalism as a form of economic
> enterprise (nationally and internationally)
> than was ever conceived of either in Marxist
> theory, or in that of its opponent, classical
> political economy".[28]

but certainly Marx' treatment of the subject of the state is far from systematic. The concepts of state and class which are central to Marxist theory, have actually been significantly developed by more recent writers working within this tradition.[29] Giddens' own position, for instance, would seem to be an attempt to synthesise Weber and Marx:

> "The monopolisation of the means of violence
> in the hands of the state went along with the
> extrusion of control of violent sanctions
> from the exploitative class relations involved
> in emergent capitalism".[30]

In locating appropriate theories of class and the state, then, it may be more useful to deal with writers who have developed Marx' ideas, rather than with Marx himself. This is reinforced by the fact that

Marx' theory of social change, although based on class struggle, is
not centrally concerned with urbanisation. His notion of the ineluctable,
irreversible progress from feudalism to capitalism to socialism is not
based on change via spatial formations. The growth of the industrial
towns, investigated by Engels[31] was only the form in which industrial
capital manifested its social domination. It is developments in the
ownership and organisation of the means of production which are the
generating forces in social change. Saunders emphasises that in Marx'
theory:

> "the struggle between proletariat and bourgeoisie
> extends across urban-rural boundaries as workers
> in town and countryside are increasingly drawn
> into the capital relation".[32]

However, Saunders ignores the geographical elements in the relations of
dependence, which Marx saw developing, in which cities play an important
role.

> "The bourgeoisie has subjected the country to
> the rule of the town. ... Just as it has made
> the country dependent on the towns, so it has
> made barbarian and semi-barbarian countries
> dependent on the civilised ones, nations of
> peasants on nations of bourgeois, the East on
> the West".[33]

Giddens takes this aspect of Marx to supply that theory of power and
the state which he takes to be otherwise lacking (though, again, he is
drawing tacitly on Weber):

> "When Marx says in The German Ideology that
> the most fundamental division of labour prior
> to capitalism is that between city and country-
> side, he makes a point that has been largely
> ignored by those interested in developing or
> elaborating his ideas. The economic differen-
> tiation between city and countryside is greater
> than within each of these taken separately: that
> is to say, while in most cities in class-divided
> societies there is a considerable division of
> labour (an artisanate, warriors, priests, etc.),
> this is an urban phenomenon, not a characteristic
> of the society as a whole... But Marx' proposition
> is far more telling if it is not construed on a
> purely economic level. The city is the generator
> of the authoritative resources out of which state

power is created and sustained... In class-
divided societies cities are crucibles of
power".[34]

Marxist writers have elaborated dependency and centre-periphery
theories[35] to analyse the processes whereby capitalist domination takes
on spatial forms and geographical relations. In the expression of this
domination and in the stages of its mutation cities are seen to play a
crucial mediating role.[36] Cities are also important within Marxist
theory, in that they provided the closeness of contact which allows the
proletariat to organise collectively. Here again Marx' argument tends
to be rather muted by Saunders:

> "The development of potentially revolutionary
> conditions is a tendency inherent within the
> development of capitalism, and the growth of
> cities is a contingent condition influencing
> whether and how such conditions come to be
> acted upon by the working class. The city is
> only of secondary significance in Marx'
> analysis of capitalism and the transition to
> socialism".[37]

Certainly urbanisation is not the major social force for Marx, but
cities do provide the context within which the contradictions of
capitalism are most visible, most exacerbated and most likely to give
rise to collective political action.

2.3 Human ecology theories

It would be inappropriate to analyse in detail the writings of the Chicago
School[38] as it is precisely because their work lacks theories of class and
the state that it is often criticised.[39] Park and his colleagues, and
later Wirth, developed a theory of the social organisation of cities
based on an analogy with ecological balance. Burgess, for instance,
developed a dynamic model of urban growth in terms of extension, succession
and concentration.[40] Saunders observes that these processes are not
unique to cities:

> "What was specific to human ecology was not,
> therefore, its concern with the physical

> human community but rather its interest is a
> particular process; that of the adaptation of
> human populations by means of functional
> differentiation".[41]

More fundamentally, the human ecology approach ignores the importance of
elements such as political and economic power in the shaping of urban
space. The whole ecology metaphor tends to conceal important decisions
being made by active human agents and to place far too much importance
on the influence of the environment: Castells summarises his critique of
the Chicago School,

> "1. That there is no cultural system linked to
> a given form of spatial organisation;
> 2. that the social history of humanity is not
> determined by the type of development of the
> territorial collectivities;
> 3. that the spatial environment is not the root
> of a specificity of behaviour and representation".[42]

Pahl applies this criticism also to Wirth's notion of urbanism as a way
of life:

> "Any attempt to tie particular patterns of social
> relationships to specific geographical milieux
> is a singularly fruitless exercise".[43]

This, however, disregards the fact that Wirth had himself made a similar
reservation:

> "It is important to note that the urban and rural
> modes of life are not necessarily confined to
> rural and urban settlements".[44]

That is, urbanism as a way of life may be considered as an ideal typical
model which is not exclusively applicable to cities.

But Wirth's work on social patterns and spatiality is not restricted
to elaboration of the rural-urban continuum. He developed the zone-model
of Burgess into a more nationally and internationally located description
of urban process:

> "Meanwhile the city as a community resolves itself
> into a series of tenuous segmented relationships
> superimposed upon a territorial base with a defi-
> nite centre but without a definite periphery, and
> upon a division of labour which far transcends the
> immediate locality and is world-wide in scope".[45]

Investigation of that international division of labour might have led
Wirth towards theories of class and of the role of nation states. However,
he prefers to use the theories of human ecology:

> "The general question for purposes of analysis
> should lead us to ask how numbers, density and
> heterogeneity affect the relations between men
> (sic)".[46]

Certainly the city provides a site for the analysis of such elements

which have their influence on the social and spatial pattern: the

importance of demographic change per se, for instance, has previously

been stressed.[47] However Wirth's approach and that of the Chicago

School does not provide a theory which goes beyond those utilised by

Holmes to investigate class and the state: Saunders comments on these

limitations:

> "What is basically at fault with the theories
> of Simmel, Wirth, Redfield and other similar
> writers is not that they choose to focus
> their attention on, say, the question of how
> size affects the pattern of social relationships,
> but that they failed to recognise the very
> limited scope of such an approach and in conse-
> quence attempted to explain a wide range of
> culturally variable phenomenon through an ille-
> gitimate physical reduction".[48]

2.4. Managerial theories.

Weber's book The City[49] is more concerned with the economic influences on

the development of cities at certain historical epochs than with theories

of class and the state. However, such theories are to be found elsewhere

in his work and they have been utilised by more recent writers on urban

issues. Saunders' view of The City is, again, rather overstated:

> "That the city is not itself a problem to be
> studied in its own right and that there appears
> to be little point in trying to develop a theory
> of the city per se ".[50]

In fact Weber did attempt to develop just such a theory using his own

methodology of ideal types:[51]

> "To constitute a full urban community a settle-
> ment must display a relative predominance of
> trade-commercial relations with the settlement
> as a whole displaying the following features:
> 1. a fortification; 2. a market; 3. a court of
> its own and at least partially autonomous law;
> 4. a related form of association; and 5. at
> least partial autonomy and autocephaly, thus
> also an administration by authorities in the
> election of whom the burghers participated".[52]

Many elements of Weber's   theoretical position are implicit in this
model, such as the importance of control over the means of violence
which may be independent of economic control. Saunders claims that
because this is an ideal type it "cannot therefore be taken as a defi-
nition of the city at all times and in all places". [53] But the point
of ideal types is precisely that they do not purport to be definitions.
Weber provides a structure within which it is possible to describe and
analyse a wide range of historically and geographically separated cities.
Far from claiming that they are all the same and can be covered by one
"definition", he elaborates the ideal type so as better to be able to
understand and analyse the differences. Weber's notion of status and
power groups as distinct from (if sometimes overlapping with) economic
classes and the stress he places on military and legal power as distinct
from control of wealth or the means of production might be seen as
providing theoretical substance to widen some of Marx' concepts.
Giddens[54] has attempted some of this synthesis and the results point
towards an adequate theory of class. Other writers have taken up Weber's
theories on power, bureaucracy and the state in a specifically urban
context.

Rex and Moore isolated the operation of the urban housing markets
as an area in which the social inequalities of the city could be under-
stood and analysed.[55] They suggested a stratification of "housing
classes" according to the differential access that different groups have to
various forms of housing.

> "We distinguish the following types of housing
> situation:
> 1. that of outright owner of a whole house;
> 2. that of the owner of a mortgaged whole house;
> 3. that of the council tenant -
>   a. in a house with a long life;
>   b. in a house awaiting demolition;
> 4. that of the tenant of a whole house owned by
>   a private landlord;
> 5. that of the owner of a house bought with
>   short-term loans who is compelled to let
>   rooms in order to meet his repayment obli-
>   gations;

> 6. that of the tenant of rooms in a lodging-
> house ".56

It has been claimed of this analysis that:

> "The housing market represents, analytically,
> a point at which the social organisation and
> the spatial structure of the city interact". 57

Rex and Moore themselves generalised from their Sparkbrook study to

attempt to establish a neo-Weberian form of urban sociology:

> "This brings us to a point which appears to be
> central to a sociology of the city. Put simply,
> it is that there is a class struggle over the
> use of houses and that this class struggle is
> the central process of the city as a social
> unit. In saying this we follow Max Weber who
> saw that class struggle was apt to emerge wherever
> people in a market situation enjoyed differential
> access to property and that such class struggles
> might therefore arise not merely around the use
> of the means of industrial production, but around
> the control of domestic property. Of course, it
> may be argued that a man's (sic) market situation
> in the housing market depends in part upon his
> income and therefore on his situation in the
> labour market, but it is also the case that men
> (sic) in the same labour situation may come to
> have differential degrees of access to housing
> and it is this which immediately determines the
> class conflicts of the city as distinct from those
> of the workplace". 58

The suggestion here is that urban sociology could escape from the uniform

concept of class developed by Marx. Rex and Moore's investigation of

Sparkbrook had shown that race was a differentiating circumstance

whereby men (and, presumably, women)"in the same labour situation ... have

differential degrees of access to housing". They do not, however, take

up the suggestion that racial stratification is itself a development

of the class system, serving to fractionalise the working class to the

benefit of capitalist interests.59

Much of Pahl's work has focussed on the many elements of collective

consumption (not simply housing), the differential access to them of

various groups and the managers or gatekeepers who control this access.60

He sees the study of such differentiations as having specifically

urban and spatial aspects as no two people can occupy the same location

in relation to the provision of a facility:

> "(a) There are fundamental spatial constraints
> on access to scarce urban resources and
> facilities. Such constraints are generally
> expressed in time/cost distance. (b) There are
> fundamental social constraints on access to
> scarce urban facilities. These reflect the
> distribution of power in society and are illus-
> trated by: bureaucratic rules and procedures;
> ... social gatekeepers who help to distribute
> and control urban resources. (c) ... The
> situation which is structured out of (a) and
> (b) may be called a socio-spatial or socio-
> ecological system. Populations limited in
> this access to scarce urban resources and
> facilities are the dependent variables; those
> controlling access, the managers of the system,
> would be the independent variable. (d) Conflict
> in the urban system is inevitable". [61]

Education as an item of collective consumption may be included in such

an analysis. It is arguable as to whether it remains, in the U.K and

the USA, "a scarce urban resource" but its importance in the determination

of individual life chances and in the reproduction of differentially

privileged groups makes it an important urban facility. Since Rex and

Moore offer a theory of urban class division and since Pahl's theory

whilst developing this also includes elements of bureaucracy and power,

then these neo-Weberian writers may be seen to offer those notions of

class and the state necessary to complement Holmes' approach in order to

develop a wider consideration of urban education. However, Saunders

has three major arguments against these writers. [62] Firstly, with regard

to housing classes, he suggests that it is facile to equate the houses

in which people actually live with the housing to which they have poli-

tical access. Secondly, he cites later work by Rex and Tomlinson to

show that people have substantially different value systems with regard

to the type of housing they desire. [63] He suggests that a fuller

economic, cultural and status analysis - albeit on Weberian lines -

would be more appropriate to reveal the dynamics of urban stratification

and that this would inevitably lead to a widening of focus away from an

exclusive concentration on the city. Thirdly, then, he suggests that it

is necessary to theorise the importance of differentials of consumption

to social stratification and that this would lead to a theory of class

relations rather than to any specific theoretical position for urban

sociology. He summarises:

> "In all three cases, therefore, we see that what
> appears to be the concern of urban sociology
> with housing class conflict is in fact the
> concern of a sociology of stratification, and
> that urban research premised upon this concept
> collapses into analysis of questions of class
> structure, the relation between ethnicity and
> class, and the problem of consumption divisions
> and ideology."[64]

Saunders' own concern is to de-spatialise urban social theory,[65] however

his criticism of neo-Weberian writers suggests that a full understanding

of class and power in only likely to be derived from a position which

takes account of Marxist theory.

2.5. Economic theories.

The literature review below considers many writers, most of whom are

working within a Marxist framework. However, not all may be referred to

as Marxists, rather they have used Marx' writings and those of other

theorists within this tradition as a starting point for their own

analysis.[66] This is a considerable body of literature and one which is

growing rapidly through the work of theorists in many different countries.

The focus here then will be rather exclusively on theories of social

change which have a specifically urban context, whether or not this be

seen in spatial terms, and which pay particular attention to notions of

class and the state. Whilst no one writer is selected as satisfactory

in all these aspects, it is seen to be possible to derive an adequate

theory from a synthesis of certain dimensions of the work of among

others, Castells, Poulantzas, Giddens and Habermas.

In Social Justice and the City, Harvey charts his progress from

liberal formulations to socialist formulations within economic geography.[67]

Beginning with a concern to elaborate the possibility for a more just

distribution of wealth in cities, he considers differential access to

"externalities". By this he means not only the facilities of collective

consumption but all the amenities and luxuries of urban life - such as

pleasant views or clean air - which vary according to the geographical

location of home and/or workplace. His ensuing Marxist analysis of

the appropriation and concentration of the surplus product is highly

deterministic:

> "Urbanism necessarily arises with the emergence of
> a market exchange mode of economic integration
> with its concomitants - social stratification
> and differential access to the means of production". [68]

Harvey does not suggest that this involves only one type of spatial

organisation, rather he asserts that whatever the geographical complexity

it will largely be controlled by the movement of the social surplus

product:

> "If there is no geographic concentration of
> the socially designated surplus product there
> is no urbanism. Wherever urbanism is manifest,
> the only legitimate explanation of it lies in
> an analysis of the processes which create,
> mobilise, concentrate and manipulate that
> social surplus product". [69]

Whilst acknowledging that this adds a crucial dimension to urban social

theory which was lacking in most of the literature mentioned above, it

is difficult to accept that the manipulation of the social surplus is

the only legitimate explanation of urbanism. Are political and cultural

dimensions to demographic shift or state policy to be entirely ignored?

or to be regarded as superstructural phenomena entirely dependent on

the impersonal social surplus? Even in Marxist terms this seems an

excessively deterministic explanation. Surprisingly, Saunders' critique

of Harvey[70] does not address itself to the question of space.[71] Instead

he criticises Harvey's determinism and, from a wider Marxist position,

the fact that class-conflict is almost entirely omitted from his expla-

nation:

> "From such a perspective the crisis of capitalism
> is largely self-engendered; the working class
> stands by on the sidelines of history and at
> most plays a reactive role, while capital
> inflicts its own wounds as a result of the
> incessant drive to accumulate".[72]

Later Saunders suggests that Harvey's work provides the basis for a

spatially concerned urban economics but that little of his writing is

concerned with urban sociology. This attempt to restrict the member-

ship of the club of urban sociology is misguided in that it rejects,

with Harvey, many other writers, such as Castells, who are concerned

with the influence of economic forces mediated by the state, on class-

situated and geographically located groups in urban areas. What

Harvey's early writing did lack was any empirical investigation or

specific point of reference. However, it helped provide a framework for

such investigations into the interactions of groups and institutions

within given political and economic contexts, and such enquiries are

surely a traditional aspect of urban sociology.

Some of these studies[73] may be mentioned as a way of illustrating

the distinction, between instrumental theories and those which posit

relative autonomy, which is essential to understanding various Marxist

notions of the state. Tabb, however, seems to see the state as of little

importance either way as the forces generated by the capitalist quest

for profits determines the shaping of space without any state mediation:

> "What happens to the way space is consumed is
> essentially the same as what happens in other
> areas of a market economy: production is
> dominated by profit seeking firms".[74]

For example, in the U.S in the 1930s, General Motors bought up trolley

car companies and closed them down whilst selling the franchises to

whoever would promise to operate them using General Motors motorbuses:

> "The bus is poor competition for the trolley,
> so this process served to drive Americans to
> the automobiles; and there too G. M stands to
> profit. To a very significant extent, then,
> the very structure of the modern American
> metropolis has been shaped by one company's
> relentless search for profits".[75]

Similarly, and more recently, multi-national companies are able to
play off different cities and even different national governments in
terms of what facilities, tax concessions and labour control they are
offering, before deciding where to make large scale industrial or
 commercial investment. In his study of the New York fiscal crisis
Tabb does acknowledge the importance of the state which he sees here
as being directly manoeuvred by capitalist interests: indeed his instru-
mentalism is close to conspiracy theory. He shows how the New York
banks not only brought about the city's fiscal crisis but profited from
its resolution. For example, wih regard to the tax-exempt World Trade
Centre, the New York taxpayers were:

> "1. paying interest to the banks for the money
>   lent to build the structure,
> 2. paying off its operating deficit,
> 3. paying higher taxes to the state, which are
>   turned over to the World Trade Centre for
>   the high cost office facilities, and
> 4. making up the tax reductions granted to other
>   office buildings with vacant space, due to
>   offices moving to the World Trade Centre".[76]

The instrumentalist approach to the state adopted by Tabb and
others emphasises the influence of corporate capitalism on the decisions
of democratically elected governments. Following Marx, these theorists
suggest that the state is the political instrument used by the privi-
leged strata to facilitate the establishment and continuation of their
essentially economic domination. At its crudest this domination is
visible in (and partly reproduced by) the class background of senior
administrators and politicians and in the power of large corporations
mentioned and illustrated above. In a more structural way the survival
of the state is perceived to be dependent upon the continuing accumu-
lation of capital: its own revenues rely on the existence and
expansion of the capitalist mode of production, so it is hardly

surprising that its administrators seek to support and further this
mode. Those theorists, by contrast, who adopt the concept of relative
autonomy[77] see democratically elected governments and national and
local level as being able to act independently of capitalist interests -
at least in the short-term. As Saunders explains it,

> "Relative autonomy is the concept whereby Castells
> seeks to retain an analysis of structural determi-
> nation while at the same time recognising that men
> (sic) (to some extent) make their own history, and
> to retain an emphasis on the primacy of the
> economy while recognising that the state (again to
> some extent) may act in the short run against the
> immediate economic interests of the capitalist
> class and its dominant fraction (monopoly capital)".[78]

The concept of relative autonomy, adopted here, has become central to
recent Marxist thinking on the state and state institutions (often
referred to as apparatuses), of which education is an important instance.

Poulantzas is a major Marxist theorist of social class and the
state and his writings have been highly influential on urban theorists
such as Castells. Poulantzas follows Marx' notion of class, but he insists
on the importance of the political and the ideological as against the
purely economic. His theory of class is sophisticated in its details,
but the broad concept of the nature of social classes in Marxist theory
is clear:

> "They are groupings of social agents, defined
> principally but not exclusively by their place
> in the production process, i.e in the economic
> sphere. The economic place of the social
> agents has a principal role in determining
> social classes. Marxism states that the
> economy does indeed have the determinant role
> in a mode of production of a social formation;
> but the political and ideological (the super-
> structure) also have a very important role".[79]

Classes are not seen to exist in the abstract; they are not, for

instance, defined purely by income: they are defined by the position

of groups relative to the control of the means of production and to

struggle over this control:

> "For Marxism, social classes involve in one
> and the same process both class contradictions
> and class struggle; social classes do not firstly
> exist as such, and only then enter into a class
> struggle. Social classes coincide with class
> practices, i.e the class struggle, and are only
> defined in their mutual opposition... Classes
> only exist in the class struggle".[80]

Whilst acknowledging the importance of superstructural elements in

social class formation, however, Poulantzas explicitly rejects Weber's

theory of status and cultural groups existing in parallel with those

formed of economic interests:

> "This is one of the particular and basic points
> of difference between the Marxist theory and
> the various ideologies of social stratification
> that dominate present-day sociology. According
> to these, social classes - whose existence all
> contemporary sociologists admit - would only
> be one form of classification, a partial and
> regional one (bearing in particular on the eco-
> nomic level alone) within a more general strati-
> fication. This stratification would give rise,
> in political and ideological relations, to social
> groups parallel and external to classes, to which
> they were superimposed. Max Weber already showed
> the way in this, and the various currents of
> political 'elite theory' need only be mentioned
> here".[81]

The rigidities of Marx' concept of class have been mentioned.[82]

Poulantzas allows for more flexibility and succeeds in making Marx

concepts relevant for contemporary conditions. However, in rejecting

Weber is Poulantzas not also ignoring conflicts over gender and race

(or language and religion) which cannot easily be subsumed within his

general theory of class? Poulantzas' theory accommodates Giddens'

first criterion of accounting for exploitative relations between

states[83] but it does not seem to pay attention to his other two points,

namely exploitative relations between ethnic groups and exploitative

relations between the sexes. In order to establish that these are a

necessary constituent of a theory of social class appropriate to

analysing problems in urban areas, it is perhaps worth re-asserting

Giddens' position on the importance of race and gender:

> "(Do not make the mistake of supposing that
> racism is an artefact of capitalism, however.
> There are clear evidences of its pervasiveness
> in ancient Sumer.) 'Internally', one can show how
> ethnic discrimination serves to create minority
> ethnic 'underclasses', whose economic circum-
> stances are markedly inferior to those of the
> majority of the population. The creation of
> 'everyday life' in capitalist time-space, with
> its characteristic separation of home and work-
> place, together with other aspects of the commo-
> dification of social relations, have decisively
> influenced the relations between the sexes, and
> at least in certain respects served to intensify
> the exploitation of women. Feminism is, in my
> judgement, potentially more radical in its impli-
> cations for a critical theory of contemporary
> society (capitalist and state socialist) than
> Marxism is, however much each may help feed in
> to the other".[84]

Poulantzas' theory of the state and state apparatuses is inseparably

linked to his concept of social class. In this respect political and

ideological elements are essential to class formation:

> "Social classes and their reproduction only
> exist by way of the relationship linking them
> to the state and economic apparatuses: these
> apparatuses are not simply 'added on' to the
> class struggle as appendices, but play a
> constitutive role in it. In particular,
> whenever we go on to analyse politico-ideological
> relations, from the division between manual and
> mental labour to the bureaucratisation of certain
> work processes and the despotism of the factory,
> we shall be concretely examining the apparatuses.
> It remains nonetheless true that it is the
> class struggle that plays the primary and basic
> role in the complex relationship between class
> struggles and apparatuses, and this is a decisive
> point to note ... The apparatuses are never any-
> thing other than the materialisation and conden-
> sation of class relations".[85]

Poulantzas' notion of the state, at this stage, has only a limited place

for the concept of relative autonomy. He sees class relations and the

activities of the state apparatuses to be inextricably linked:

> "We can thus define both the relationship and
> the distinction between state power and state
> apparatuses. State apparatuses do not possess
> a 'power' of their own, but materialise and
> concentrate class relations, relations which
> are precisely what is embraced by the concept
> 'power'. The state is not an 'entity' with
> an intrinsic instrumental essence, but it is
> itself a relation, more precisely the conden-
> sation of a class relation".[86]

Once again Poulantzas is rejecting Weber and again this leads him

towards rigidity. What "precisely" does "condensation" mean in this

context? The processes, personnel and institutions which link the state

with class relations cannot simply be relegated from analysis by the use

of this metaphor. Poulantzas here seems to combine the deterministic

and teleological aspects of both functionalism and structuralism. A

central aspect of this structural functionalism is his widely used and

highly influential concept of reproduction:'[87]

> "A mode of production can only exist in social
> formations if it reproduces itself. In the
> last analysis, this reproduction is nothing
> other than the extended reproduction of its
> social relations: it is the class struggle that is
> the motor of history. Thus Marx says that in the
> end, what capitalism produces is simply the
> bourgeoisie and the proletariat; capitalism simply
> produces its own reproduction".[88]

Giddens, however, criticises the latent functionalism in Poulantzas'

concept of reproduction:

> "Like so much contemporary Marxist writing on
> the state, however, it contains a thinly veiled
> functionalism. The state is 'derived' from an
> analysis of the 'requirements' that capitalism
> has for its continued reproduction. Among these
> writers, as well as Poulantzas and those influ-
> enced by him, the word 'reproduction' is waved
> as a magic wand, as though it had an explanatory
> content".[89]

This is perhaps a criticism of clumsy use of the concept rather than of

the concept itself. To conclude, Poulantzas' theory of class would prove

adequate to assisting analysis of problems in urban education, were it not

that it lacks Giddens' stress on the importance of racial and sexual

exploitation. The economic nature of the latter two categories remain

largely unexplored by Poulantzas. Poulantzas' theory of the state is also important, particularly his concepts of relative autonomy and reproduction. However, there is some functionalist rigidity in his approach to the state and furthermore, his discussion does not have a specifically urban context (this is also true of his treatment of class). In turning to the work of Castells then what is sought is a theory which incorporates a wider concept of social class, provides an urban focus and offers a less teleological approach to the state.

In Castells' work[90] there is not a clear development of a single thesis, rather an interchange between theory and empirical research and data with each illuminating the other. Castells' approach is to establish theoretical parameters, examine the data within them, assess how the data necessitate theoretical change, revise the theory accordingly and use it to examine further data, and so on. Both City, Class and Power[91] and The Urban Question[92] begin from the position that the notion of an urban problem is at best misleading and at worst a way of concealing the actual dilemmas and social conflicts endemic to advanced capitalism. Castells uses the notion of contradictions to apply to conflicts (of both interest and action) between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat or between different factions within each class. Castells stresses that urban contradictions are a spatial intensification of the consequences of the socio-political structure commensurate with the capitalist mode of production. The process which underlies the shaping of cities is the reproduction of labour power, the maintenance of a large, mobile, skilled workforce and a vast consumer market:

> "in advanced capitalist societies the process
> which structures space is that which concerns
> the simple and extended reproduction of
> labour power: the ensemble of the so-called
> urban practices connotes the articulation of
> the process with the social structure as a whole".[93]

Castells utilises Poulantzas' concept of reproduction as a way of
explaining the nature of urban growth. Castells is concerned mainly
with the large industrialised cities of the west and he does not
utilise the wide historical and geographical references characteristic
of, say, Harvey. His strength is rather in the detail of his reference
and the way he utilises this to inform his theory.

Castells' condemnation of ecology applies as much to the human
ecology theories of the Chicago School as to contemporary environmental
movements. Castells own theories emerge from his critique of the Chicago
School.

> "Specific urban milieux must therefore be
> understood as social products and the space/
> society link must be established as a proble-
> matic, as an object of research rather than as
> an interpretive axis of the diversity of social
> life, contrary to an ancient tradition in urban
> sociology."[94]

He condemns ecological theorists and activists who attempt to reduce
social and economic injustices to an urban problem:

> "The consequence of this way of approaching
> the question is that the solution to the
> conflicts and contradictions implied becomes
> technical not political. Planning (rational,
> neutral and scientific) should replace social
> and political debate about the decisions which
> are the basis of the concrete manifestations of
> the problems. In reality this approach has
> corresponded throughout history to the ideo-
> logical practice of the dominant classes".[95]

Within this perspective all social improvements are seen as the marginal
concessions granted by the capitalist state either to avoid radical
social conflict or to improve the long-term reproduction of labour power
and hence of profitability. However, the state does have relative
autonomy and the concessions granted are often significant:[96]

> "Although reforms are always imposed by the
> class struggle and, therefore, from outside
> the state apparatus, they are no less real
> for that: their aim is to preserve and extend
> the existing context, thus consolidating the
> long-term interests of the dominant classes,
> even if it involves infringing their privileges
> to some extent in a particular conjuncture".[97]

There is perhaps some inconsistency here between Castells' enthusiasm for urban political movements, which he sees as offering potential for a new link between the proletariat and the petty bourgeoisie,[98] and his theory that the capitalist state will make reformist adaptations in order partially to satisfy the demands of just such groups and thereby keep them divided and impotent.[99]

Central to Castells' concept of the relatively autonomous state is his elaboration of its role in funding many facilities of collective consumption. He may perhaps be seen as synthesising Harvey's concept of externalities and Pahl's collective consumption:

> "Indeed, in so far as an indirect salary ...
> increases in importance, both relatively and
> absolutely, and at the same time as the
> conditions of life for the individual become
> objectively interdependent by socialisation and
> technological concentration (both economic and
> organisational) of product and consumption, it
> seems that the traditional inequality in terms
> of incomes, which is interest in capitalism, is
> expressed in new social cleavages related to
> the accessibility and use of certain collective
> services, from housing conditions to working
> hours, passing through the type and level of
> health, educational and cultural facilities."[100]

But for Castells the importance of collective consumption is that, through large scale investment, it is the main area of state interference in the urban system. State investment relieves private capital of the need to make expenditure on both the urban macrostructure (roads, ports) and on the reproduction of labour power (housing, schools):

> "it assumes the necessary reproduction of the
> labour power at a minimum level, it lessens the
> cost of direct salaries ... while at the same
> time easing demand... By investing 'at a loss'
> the general rate of profit of the private sector
> holds steady or increases in spite of lowering
> of profit relative to social capital as a whole.
> In this sense 'social' expenditures of the state
> not only thus favour big capital, but they are
> also indispensable to the survival of the system".[101]

But state investment means that the level of urban collective consumption

becomes a political issue and an area of potential conflict. When such conflict occurs it is likely to be directed against the state rather than against specific capitalist interests. In Western cities politicised urban collective consumption has led to inflationary public expenditure. At this point, when the state attempts to withdraw from expenditure on collective consumption - along the basis of contemporary government policy in both the U.S and the U.K - then, for Castells, the new urban crisis becomes compounded:

> "The socialisation of the costs and the privatisation of the profit have structural limits which the monopoly capitalist state has not been able to overcome without producing uncontrollable inflation. The integrative reforms without qualitative transformation of production relations have reached the limit in their capacity to integrate the masses and have been overwhelmed by their consequences".[102]

The attempt by the state to withdraw from expenditure on collective consumption Castells calls destatisation, which leads to:

> "the crisis of state intervention on the crisis of the reproduction of the labour force".[103]

The proponents of destatisation can easily adapt to the rhetoric of contemporary environmentalism.[104]

Saunders follows Pickvance[105] in criticising Castells' stress on urban social movements; he condemns what he calls the 'urban fallacy':

> "This fallacy relates to the argument that urban crisis is the crucial condition for a broadening of the class struggle against monopoly capital since it affects all the 'popular' classes and thus enables new class alliances".[106]

Saunders discusses this "blinkered optimism"[107] and attempts to link his condemnation to Castells' whole concept of limited autonomy:

> "If we are to take Castells' critique of structural determinism seriously, then this means reintroducing the notion of actors engaging in purposeful strategies in response to their definitions of an (increasingly worsening) objective situation. Because Castells refuses to adopt such a mode of analysis, his notion of relative autonomy serves only to obscure a deter-

ministic theory which gives rise to implausible
political conclusions".[108]

This seems to ignore entirely Castells' stress on the importance of an

interchange between theory and empirical investigation. If Castells'

theories of collective consumption,reproduction of labour power,

relative autonomy and destatisation are regarded as ideal types,[109] as

Saunders himself suggests,[110] may they not escape Saunders' aspersion

of teleology? That Castells' concepts share some elements of determinism

with the Marxist tradition from which they emanate does not prevent them

being used - again as Saunders indicates - within a non-deterministic

analysis. However, Saunders further suggests that, since Castells'

arguments allow no counterfactual, they are ultimately tautological:

> "the only thing that the state could do that
> would be against the long-term interests of
> monopoly capital is to abolish monopoly
> capitalism. Thus if monopoly capitalism
> continues (in one form or another), it follows
> that the state must still be acting in the long-
> term interests of the dominant class. We then
> find ourselves back into tautology again".[111]

There is perhaps some disingenuousness here: even the parody of Castells'

argument, that because the state does not abolish capitalism it is

ultimately working in its interest, whilst it might argue backwards from

the existing state of affairs, is surely not a tautology. It may be

that Castells' analysis would benefit from the inclusion of some

consideration of socialist cities[112] and a comparative treatment of the

intrusions of the various state apparatuses, but there is no necessity

for him to hypothesise on what might happen in some utopian non-

capitalist city.

In order fully to understand Saunders' criticism of Castells and to

attempt to vindicate Castells' theory of the state for further use, it

is necessary to refer to Lojkine, another Marxist urban theorist. Lojkine,[113]

enquires into the actual origins of the profits gained by domestic and

industrial property speculators given Marx' theory of labour value and

surplus value. Further he asks what part the industrial superstructures of transport and communication links play in the creation of value since they are usually financed by the state and not by the capitalist enterprises which make a profit from their use. Saunders' analysis of Lojkine[114] places him as a crude instrumentalist:

> "Lojkine ... argues that the provision of urban amenities is not simply a response on the part of the capitalist state to the problems encountered by capital in reproducing labour power effectively, but it also contributes an attempt to provide the facilities necessary for the process of production itself - ie. for the economic reproduction of capitalist production relations - which cannot profitably be provided by private capital".[115]

It is possible that there is a different usage of the term 'collective consumption' between Lojkine and Castells but to concentrate on this is to miss the point which Castells reiterates in his Afterword to The Urban Question[116] that collective consumption is only one element - albeit the one in which the state may be seen to be most active - in the reproduction of labour power which is the structuring process - but by no means the only process - of urban space. With these qualifications Saunders' final and central criticism of Castells may be examined:

> "the process of consumption is not confined to spatially delimited units, nor are all consumption provisions organised in and through a spatial context".[117]

Castells does not suggest that collective consumption is spatially restricted. But if it is not "organised in a spatial context" where exactly can it be organised? Collective consumption is an element in the reproduction of labour power which is the process which, for Castells, structures space. This is a central weakness in Saunders' thesis for it is on the basis of this critique that he proposes his non-spatial urban sociology:

> "The implication of this ... conclusion is that the 'urban question' should be specified in terms of a theoretically significant process (consumption) and cannot be equated with any

> particular 'concrete' object (the city).
> To label such an analysis as 'urban'
> therefore becomes merely a question of
> convention, for space has dropped out of
> the analysis except in the sense that the
> study of any social process must take
> account of spatial and temporal dimensions".[118]

It is on the basis of this misinterpretation of Castells and with that apparently self-contradictory saving final clause that Saunders initiates his own theory.[119]

The main constituents of Castells' theory of the state may be briefly restated: in advanced capitalist cities the process which structures space is the reproduction of labour power; the state intervenes in this process through the provision of collective consumption and through the repressive and ideological apparatuses; the state has relative autonomy from the dominant group, its relation is not necessarily instrumental; due to its intervention crises of collective consumption may become crises of the state. This provides, at least provisionally, the necessary constituents of a theory of the state. To this may be added a theory of class based on Poulantzas, but cogniscent of Giddens' critique. This would include: class is determined by the position of groups relative to the control of the mode of production; political and ideological elements are also important in determining class; classes only exist in class conflict; social classes exist and are reproduced through the economic and state apparatuses, education being the crucial state apparatus; exploitative relations between ethnic groups and between sexes may be independent of yet equally important as class relations.

The analysis in the next chapter uses both the problem approach and an approach from Marxist social theory to consider general issues of urban education in the U.K and the U.S.A. This is an attempt to

demonstrate the uses of these approaches and not necessarily an

attempt to evaluate them. It is certainly not an attempt to synthesise

them.

-oOo-

Chapter 2

FOOTNOTES

1. There are many different attempts to provide categorisation
   for this body of literature. See, in particular, Saunders, P.,
   1981. This chapter makes extensive reference to this work which
   has as its central assertion that urban sociology need not be
   spatially located in cities:" ... Pahl's concern with the role of
   urban managers and Castells' concern with the provision of
   collective consumption may both be retained as elements of a
   distinctive problem for sociological analysis provided that such
   an analysis is severed from the very different theoretical question
   of space. To term such a sociology 'urban' is, of course, merely
   a matter of convention, the application of a convenient label to
   designate certain specific theoretical problems that have no
   necessary relation to the empirical analysis of cities".P. 258.

2. Tonnies, F. , 1955.

3. See Tonnies own summary, Ibid p. 270.

4. Ibid p. 271.

5. See the discussion of community as ideology in Plant, R., 1974.
   This work is particularly relevant to education given current
   concerns with community education, the school as community and
   community participation. Plant suggests that the word community has
   two distinct ranges of meaning, one descriptive and the other evalu-
   ative, and that these become confused. The word community contains

normative overtones of the kind of social organisation people would prefer and this confuses the already complex task of description. It is not possible to formulate a scientific, non-contested descriptive meaning of community because the 'historical career' of the concept structures our understanding of it. The extent to which the concept of community has degenerated into ideology, Plant asserts, is seen most clearly in its fallacious connection with mental health. By way of contesting this connection Plant cites MacIntyre, "I cannot look to human nature as a neutral standard, asking which forms of social and moral life would give to it the most adequate expression. For each form of life carries with it its own picture of human nature. The choice of a form of life and the choice of a view of human nature go together " (p. 83). Plant then warns, "The ideological dimension to the meaning of community and the way in which the concept enters into the specification of particular practices and activities is ubiquitous " (p. 84).

6. See discussion in chapter 1.

7. Tonnies, F., 1955 p. 265.

8. Reiss, A. J., 1964.

9. Redfield, R., 1947.

10. Quoted in Saunders, P., 1981 p. 65.

11. See footnote 4 above.

12. For an introduction to centre-periphery theory and some of its educational implications see Carnoy, M., 1974.

13. See also Altbach, P. G., and Kelly, G. P., (eds.) 1978.

14. Bell, C., and Newby, H., 1971 p. 251.

15. Ibid p. 250.

16. Durkheim, E., 1947. An account with extensive readings from Durkheim is available in Bellah, R. N., 1973.

17. Ibid p. 63.

18. Saunders, P., 1981 p. 46.

19. Quoted in Ibid p. 46.

20. See the discussion in Giddens,A., 1981 pp. 157-160.

21. See Holmes, B., 1981 p. 125 and pp. 162-175.

22. For an account of Marxist psychology see Simon, B., 1971 pp. 125 - 263.

23. See the discussion in The German Ideology, especially Marx, K., in McLellan, D., (ed.), 1977 p. 176.

24. See, for example, The Communist Manifesto, especially Marx, K., and Engels, F., 1967, pp. 79 - 94.

25. Giddens, A., 1981 p. 242.

26. A further discussion of the concept of class follows below under Economic Theories.

27. See chapter 1.

28. Giddens, A. , 1981 p. 12.

29. See subsequent discussion under Economic Theories.

30. Giddens, A., 1981 p. 180.

31. Engels, F., 1967.

32. Saunders, P., 1981 p. 21.

33. Marx, K., 1977 p. 225.

34. Giddens, A., 1981 p. 145.

35. See for instance Lenin, V. I., 1947 pp. 630 - 725.

36. See for example Cohen, B. R. , in Dear, M., and Scott, A. J., 1981.

37. Saunders, P., 1981 p. 24.

38. For a discussion see Saunders, P., 1981 pp. 48 - 79.

39. See, for example, Castells, M., 1976 pp. 73 - 112.

40. Burgess, E. W., in Raynor, J., and Harris, E. , 1977.

41. Saunders, P., 1981 p. 67.

42. Castells, M., 1976 p. 111.

43. Quoted in Saunders, P., 1981 p. 105.

44. Reiss, A. J., 1964 p. 225.

45. Ibid p. 83.

46. Ibid p. 224

47. See Chapter one.

48. Saunders, P., 1981 p. 108.

49. Weber, M., 1958.

50. Saunders, P., 1981 p. 32.

51. For discussion of ideal types see chapter 1.

52. Weber, M., 1958 pp. 80 - 81.

53. Saunders, P., 1981 p. 32.

54. See the discussion of Marx under Theories of the Development of Societies, above.

55. See Rex, J., and Moore, R., 1967.

56. Ibid p. 274.

57. Haddon quoted in Saunders, P., 1981 p. 115.

58. Rex, J., and Moore, R., 1967 pp. 273 - 4.

59. Whether racial groups and racial struggle are independent of class division and struggle is a highly contentious issue. Castles, S., and Kosack, G., 1973 suggest that racial conflict is exacerbated to divide the working classes of many European countries and thereby to further capitalist exploitation. This issue is discussed with specific reference to education in, for example, Mullard, C., 1980. A similar and perhaps parallel debate is taking place with regard to class and gender. Whether patriarchy is a separate and preceding element of domination or merely a further fractionalising aspect of capitalist hegemony is discussed in Barrett, M., 1980.

60. Though Pahl also provided an early literature review and development of urban sociology which helped introduce the subject to the U.K: see Pahl, R. E., (ed.) 1968. His more recent work is concerned with the rise of informal employment and work activity commensurate with the decline in formal employment: see his essay in Harloe, M., and Lebas,E(eds.) 1981 pp. 143 - 163.

61. Pahl, R. E., 1975 p. 201.

62. Paradoxically, it is tempting to classify Saunders himself as a neo-Weberian as he does seem to utilise many of Weber's structures and concepts.

63 See Saunders, P., 1981 pp. 142 - 3. In this later study of Handsworth, Rex and Tomlinson widen their analysis of inequality "from an exclusive focus on access to housing to one that encompasses education and employment" p. 142.

64. Ibid p. 147.

65. See footnote 1.

66. They therefore tend to be called rather indiscriminately Marxist, neo-Marxist, Marxian and, as Giddens would have it, post-Marxian. It is to this tradition that the term Marxist alludes in the rest of the chapter.

67. Harvey, D., 1973.

68. Ibid p. 239.

69. Ibid p. 240.

70. This was written with John Lloyd.

71. Harvey's theory, after all, does provide a model of the city which is firmly located in space and which highlights the importance of geographical location to any analysis of urban externalities.

72. Saunders, P., 1981 p. 231.

73. See, for example, the studies in Tabb, W. K., and Sawers, L., (eds.) 1978 and in Dear, M., and Scott, A. J., (eds.) 1981. Saunders does not discuss these empirical studies. As is the case with the community studies mentioned above he is able to ignore many urban sociologists whose work is spatially located in specific cities and areas of cities.

74. Tabb, W. K., and Sawers, L., (eds.) 1978 p. 14.

75. Ibid pp. 14 - 15.

76. Ibid p. 256.

77. See the discussion of Poulantzas and Castells below.

78. Saunders, P., 1981 pp. 200 - 201.

79. Ibid p. 14.

80. Ibid p. 14.

81. Ibid p. 24.

82. See discussion under Theories of the Development of Societies, and in particular the critique of Marx by Giddens.

83. See Poulantzas, N., 1974 pp. 42 - 88.

84. Giddens, A. , 1981 p. 243. See also footnote 59.

85. Poulantzas, N., 1974 p. 25.

86. Ibid p. 26. For his concept of relative autonomy see further. Poulantzas, N., 1973. It is discussed below with reference to Castells.

87. This concept has been particularly used to discuss education. See for instance the references to Bourdieu in subsequent chapters.

88. Poulantzas, N., 1974 p. 27.

89. Giddens, A., 1981 p. 215.

90. References here are mainly to Castells, M., 1977 and Castells, M., 1978, but see also Castells, M., 1980 and Pickvance, C. G., (ed.) 1976.

 There is a valuable discussion of the importance of Castells' work to the study of urban sociology in Golding, F., 1980.

91. Ibid.

92. Ibid.

93. Castells, M., 1977 p. 237.

94. Ibid p. 108. See also the discussion of the Chicago School under Human ecology theories above.

95. Castells, M., 1978 p. 6. This criticism might also be applied to Popper's concept of piecemeal social engineering: see footnote 122 to chapter 1.

96. In educational terms the question bluntly is whether the lavishness of state educational provision in the U.S and the U.K can be adequately explained either as a grudging concession to avoid revolutionary conflict or as the minimum expenditure necessary to reproduce an adequately skilled and socialised labour force. This issue is discussed in subsequent chapters.

97. Castells, M., 1977 p. 208.

98. Pahl has complained about Castells' writing on these movements: "Descriptions of modest little protests here and there were puffed up in an arbitrary and cavalier way into grandiose theories of political or social change". Harloe, M., and Lebas, E.,(eds.) 1981 pp. 140 - 145.

99. In Castells, M., 1980 his concept of relative autonomy has become more pessimistic and limited, his analysis having shifted more towards instrumentalism.

100. Castells, M., 1978 pp. 15 - 16.

101. Ibid pp. 18 - 19.

102. Ibid p. 59.

103. Ibid p. 60.

104. Education, which Castells sees as "the essential instrument of the reproduction of inequality" (Castells, M., 1977 p. 210), may be taken as an example of collective consumption. Castells emphasises the importance of spatial stratification for the financing of facilities in urban areas; so that the inferior educational possibilities of a poor district cannot be improved because of lack of (local) public finance, whilst the more prosperous areas purchase better schools for the higher socio-economic suburban groups thereby helping to

perpetuate their privileged position. Education fits Castells' analysis fairly exactly: mass education is essential to the reproduction of labour power but it is not an enterprise from which profit can normally be extracted. To escape this contradiction (whilst in fact exacerbating it) the state finances education whilst capitalist interests reap benefits in terms of their skilled and socialised workforce. (Ideological reproduction and social control are discussed with regard to Althusser and Grace in chapter 3.) As mentioned in footnote 101 above this does not seem to explain fully the lavishness of educational expenditure in the U.S and the U.K.

105. See Pickvance, C., (ed.) 1976 pp. 3 - 10.

106. Saunders, P., 1981 p. 203.

107. Ibid p. 204.

108. Ibid p. 204.

109. See the discussion of ideal types with reference to Weber and Holmes in chapter 1.

110. Saunders, P., 1981 p. 215.

111. Ibid p. 208.

112. See, however, Castells' discussion of Santiago in Castells, M., 1977 pp. 360 - 375.

113. Lojkine, J., in Pickvance, C., (ed.) 1976 pp. 119 - 146.

114. See his earlier book Saunders, P., 1979.

115. Ibid p. 115.

116. Castells, M., 1977 pp. 437 - 471.

117. Saunders, P., 1981 p. 218.

118. Ibid p. 218.

119. The central concern of this chapter is with theories of class and the state rather than with Saunders' thesis (see footnote 4). However, since extensive reference has been made to his work some concluding comments are offered here. Saunders' position is

exclusively the product of his exhaustive literature review, and, in contrast to his previous work, it is not illuminated by or developed in any specific instance or empirical investigation. When he attempts to demonstrate a split in Marxist theory - "On the one hand we derive from Castells a theoretical concern with collective consumption; on the other we derive from Lefebvre, Harvey and others a theoretical concern with the function of space in the process of capital accumulation"(Saunders, P., 1981 p. 256) - he is misinterpreting both the nature and the topic of Castells' concern. His argument is based on a duality which does not exist in the literature: "we are confronted with a choice between sociological non-urban theories and urban non-sociological theories" (Ibid p. 257). Castells' theory is both urban and as concerned with economics as that of Harvey: and how far a theory such as Harvey's which concerns the economic forces which shape urban space can be separated from sociology is hard to imagine as groups and institutions are inevitably involved at all stages of the process. Saunders redefines the matter of urban sociology as: "a specific theoretical and empirical concern with the related processes of social consumption, political competition and local administration within the context of the tensions between private sector profitability and social needs, strategic planning and democratic accountability and centralised direction and local autonomy"(Ibid p. 267). The three main elements are social consumption, competitive political struggles and local government policy making. Tensions over profitability and social needs, however, are surely spatially contextualised. In avoiding relative autonomy theory Saunders tends towards a pluralistic position and suggests a dualistic view of the state. He explains that social investment policies are usually decided at the national level in consultation with capitalist interests, while

social consumption policies are relatively responsive to local popular pressures exerted via local government agencies. Given that the state itself is ultimately dependent on private sector accumulation, Saunders acknowledges that social investment policy will normally be more influential than social consumption policy and national government more powerful than local. The advantage of this subtle position is that it helps explain the lavishness of some social consumption provision (see footnote 101) without recourse either to Weberian theory of self-aggrandising institutions or to relative autonomy theory. However, as suggested in the main text, Saunders' arguments for relinquishing relative autonomy theory do not seem sufficiently substantiated.

-oOo-

Chapter 3

URBAN EDUCATION IN THE U.S AND THE U.K: THE WIDER ISSUES

It has been suggested that one approach to urban education might be to consider educational problems most visible in urban areas, and that another would stress the importance of the state and social class to central urban processes. It is now possible to examine some of the wider issues of urban education and in so doing to investigate the extent of the usefulness and accuracy of these approaches. Lest this seem too general it will lead to a more detailed consideration from a conflict perspective of a specific aspect of urban education, the education of children perceived to have special needs.

These issues are examined within a framework developed for The International Yearbook of Education Volume XXXII[1] in order to describe different national educational systems. The taxonomy developed for this specific purpose is in many ways separate from the more general conceptual approach developed by Holmes.[2] Using the headings: aims, administration and finance, structure, curriculum, and teacher and higher education, it is a taxonomy which does not imply causal relationships or explanations. Nevertheless, it may be asked how useful is a taxonomy developed for comparative education to urban education. Although the concern here is with the education systems of two countries, the perspective is not primarily comparative. The headings of the IBE taxonomy provide useful starting points for discussion without pre-determining its subsequent course: they ensure at least that no major elements of an education system may be over-looked. Some items, such as the curriculum, may seem to be more appropriate to the concerns of urban education than others, such as

teacher education, so discussion of some elements will tend to be more protracted than that of others. Whilst using this taxonomy then there is no intention that the discussion of urban educational issues should be constrained by it.

It is necessary to make a distinction between aims and the other elements of the IBE taxonomy, since discussion of aims will be concerned with normative statements and conflict over these, whereas discussion of administration, finance, structure, curriculum or teacher education will be concerned with institutional practices and tangible conflicts within them.[3] At the level of the formulation of aims the state has considerable power as it does in their adoption into legislative programmes. However, at the level of institutional practice, for instance the curriculum taught in a specific urban school, the state's authority may be limited by the hostile or unco-operative attitudes of teachers and administrators or by their lack of understanding of the proposals or inability to carry them out.[4]

3.1 Aims.

The IBE yearbook succinctly summarises the aims of education in the U.S.A as:

> "to provide free public schooling through to
> the second level, and to create respect for
> learning and opportunities for American youth.
> The basis of the approach is opportunity for
> both boys and girls and for all minority
> groups, as well as nurturing intellectually
> gifted students who will continue to achieve
> prominence among the world's literary,
> scientific, social and political leaders.
> Education reflects the values and priorities
> of American society with emphasis on the
> enduring national commitment to democracy and
> individual freedom".[5]

The same source summarises the case for the U.K even more briefly:

> "The over-riding aim of education is to provide
> for the well-being and progress of individual
> pupils".[6]

These summaries would seem to give an accurate description of the aims of the two educational systems, yet these aims do not seem to be reflected in the practices of urban schooling. There is indeed a discrepancy between these aims and the practice of urban educational institutions. It may be doubted for instance that boys and girls have equality of opportunity with regard to obtaining scientific or technical education in America's prestigious higher education academies. Do black pupils in the schools of Haarlem or Hispanic pupils in Watts feel their opportunities are equal with those of their affluent, white, suburban peers? Do West Indian parents in Lewisham or Brixton acknowledge that local schools are doing their best for the well-being and progress of their children? How may this incongruence between objectives and outcome be explained?

Use of the problem-approach at this point would tend to be particularistic. The incongruence would be perceived in terms of asynchronous change so that each specific problem could be separately identified in order to hypothesise policy solutions. However, it is necessary also to understand the roles which social class and the state might play in the creation of this incongruence. Marx asserts that a given social system's legal, cultural, institutional and religious patterns are manifestations of its economic practices and particularly of the ownership of the means of production:

> "The totality of these relationships of
> production constitutes the economic structure
> of society, the real foundation, on which arises
> a legal and political superstructure and to which
> correspond definite forms of social conscious-
> ness. The mode of production of material life
> conditions the general process of social, poli-
> tical and intellectual life. It is not the
> consciousness of men that determines existence,
> but their social existence which determines their

> consciousness ... Changes in the economic
> foundation sooner or later lead to the
> transformation of the whole immense super-
> structure. In studying such transformations
> it is always necessary to distinguish between
> the material transformation of the economic
> conditions of production, which can be
> determined with the precision of material
> science, and the legal, political, religious,
> artistic or philosophic - in short, ideolo-
> gical forms in which men become conscious
> of conflict ... and fight it out". [7]

There is debate about whether Marx and Engels suggested that all

superstructural phenomenon were directly caused by the economic base [8]

but Marx' analysis does stress only one element at the expense of all

other possibilities. [9] With regard to education correspondence, theorists such as

Bowles & Gintis have developed base-superstructure theory to suggest that schools are

dominated by economic forces and reflect the existing social divisions

of labour and industrial social relations:

> "The educational system helps integrate youth
> into the economic system ... through a struc-
> tural correspondence between its social
> relations and those of production. The struc-
> ture of social relations in education not only
> inures the student to the discipline of the
> workplace, but develops the types of personal
> demeanour, modes of self-presentation, self-
> image and social class identifications which are
> the crucial ingredients of job adequacy. Speci-
> fically, the social relationships of education -
> the relationships between administrators and
> teachers, teachers and students, students and
> students, and students and their work - replicate
> the hierarchical division of labour. Hierarchical
> relations are reflected in the vertical authority
> lines from administrators to teachers to students.
> Alienated labour is reflected in the students'
> lack of control over his or her education, the
> alienation of the student from the curriculum
> content, and the motivation of school work
> through a system of grades and other external
> rewards rather than the students' integration
> with either the process (learning) or the outcome
> (knowledge) of the educational 'production process'.
> Fragmentation in work is reflected in the insti-
> tutionalised and often destructive competition
> among students through continual and ostensibly
> meritocratic ranking and evaluation. By attuning
> young people to a set of social relationships
> similar to those of the work place, schooling
> attempts to gear the development of personal needs
> to its requirements". [10]

Because of education's pivotal role in the induction and training of youth it not only reflects the social divisions of the workplace but reproduces and perpetuates them. In the contemporary USA and U.K, specifically, the education systems may be seen as one of the adaptive mechanisms of capitalism, functioning simultaneously to conceal and to reproduce the social contradictions:

> "The educational system is an integral
> element in the reproduction of the prevailing
> class structure of society".[11]

Once the element of social class is included within the analysis it may be that to accept the stated aims of an educational system is naively to neglect the function of education in capitalist countries.

Whilst correspondence theory offers some explanation of the divergence between aims and practice, it perhaps operates at too generalised a level to give a meaningful insight into how the daily processes of schooling are transformed into inequitable results.[12] Bowles and Gintis, however, do point to the professedly meritocratic nature of the American school system which accounts for and, to some extent, conceals this divergence. Meritocracy is not identified as a stated aim by the IBE summary. Within both the U.S and the U.K educational systems, educational failure (and commensurately reduced employment opportunities) tend to be attributed to lack of ability or effort on the part of the children concerned. Some data are available to test the rather ready assumption that education plays a crucial role in employment and social stratification. If correspondence theory is to be useful, then can it be shown that educational qualifications and courses determine people's future life and employment prospects? The study by Jencks et al seemed to indicate, for the U.S at least, that the effects of schooling and certification on people's earnings and status were marginal.[13] Halsey et al's results would indicate that in this respect education has a more crucial role in the U.K.[14]

Bowles & Gintis dispute Jencks' conclusions and insist that the effects of schooling are difficult to isolate precisely because the education system is the mechanism through which children achieve, in general, equal earnings and status to that of their parents. In this process, according to Bowles & Gintis, class is a more important prediction element than measured IQ:

> "The intergenerational transmission of
> social and economic status operates primarily
> via non-cognitive mechanisms, despite the
> fact that the school system rewards higher
> IQ, an attribute significantly associated
> with higher socio-economic background".[15]

Bowles and Gintis' analysis here perhaps attempts to assert too much since, as Poulantzas clarifies, if hierarchy is reproduced in the next generation it need not involve the same families. Poulantzas writes,

> "the basic aspect of the reproduction of
> social relations (social classes) is not
> that of the agents, but rather the repro-
> duction of the places of these classes. If,
> on a totally absurd hypothesis, all children
> of the bourgeoisie were to become workers and
> vice versa, or any similar such wholesale
> movement between classes took place, the
> class structure of the capitalist formation
> would not change in any fundamental way. The
> places of capital, of the working class,
> and of the petty pourgeoisie would still be
> there".[16]

Whilst this is certainly a correct statement of class theory, Halsey's evidence does seem to suggest that in the U.K - but not the U.S - social relations are reproduced largely through "agents" and that education is the crucial mediating mechanism in this process:

> "school inequalities of opportunity have been
> remarkably stable over the forty years which
> our study covers. Throughout, the service
> class has had roughly three times the chance of
> the working class of getting some kind of
> selective secondary schooling. Only at 16
> has there been any significant reduction
> in relative class chances, but even here the
> absolute gains have been greater for the
> service class. If the 'hereditary curse upon
> English education is its organisation upon
> lines of social class'. that would seem to be
> as true in the 1960s as it was in 1931 when
> Tawney wrote".[17]

Within the perspective of correspondence theory, apparently
consensual aims may themselves be problematic. But correspondence
theory does not seem to offer any interpretation which might be applied
to the summaries of agreed aims in the U.S and the U.K quoted above.
Such an interpretation might be begun by considering the similarities
between the two statements. Two phrases from the description of
American aims "equality of opportunity" and "individual freedom" may be
seen to have some overlap with the British emphasis on "the progress of
individual pupils". The stress in both cases is on the individual child
rather than on national development or group cohesion. The aims for
both systems would seem to imply that individuals are seen as being
different and unequal in their abilities and talents. The educational
aims are accordingly formulated as developing the full but unequal
potential of each individual. Once this is revealed Bowles' and Gintis'
analysis may again be helpful. The manpower needs of both the U.S and
U.K economies[18] are served by a harsh classification and segmentation
of the workforce; managers and professionals, skilled technicians,
unskilled labourers and operatives:

> "the ostensibly objective and meritocratic
> selection and reward system of U.S education
> corresponds not to be some abstract notion of
> efficiency, rationality and equity, but the
> legitimation of economic inequality and the
> smooth staffing of unequal work roles".[19]

In consumption as well as production individual tasks and talents with
regard to highly differentiated oommodities and activities are important
to maintain the stimulation of high levels of demand. The stress on
individual development and equality of opportunity may conceal the
ethos of meritocracy and its mechanisms of competition. It is in
competitive schoolwork, games and exams that children signify the level
of their (institutionally recognised) abilities and skills. Competition

has a corresponding importance in the economic life of the U.S and
the U.K (and other countries too of course). People compete for jobs
often on the basis of educational certification. In a hierarchically
stratified social division of labour the competition with one's age
peers is often a process which lasts throughout life. Those who will
be unsuccessful have been made to come to terms with their destiny whilst
still at school where their comparative inadequacies have repeatedly
been made glaringly clear:

> "Through competition, success, and defeat in
> the classroom, students are reconciled to
> their social positions".[20]

Competition at school is part of a wider framework in which business
competes with business, nation with nation. The stress on the free
individual is linked to that on free enterprise within the over-arching
framework of a capitalist economy where flamboyant personal consumption
is both a mechanism for market stimulation and an emblem of personal
success. The inequalities of the western city are disguised in the
rhetoric of democratic egalitarianism and the apparently boundless
freedom of the individual to pursue happiness through consumption. In
this perspective the high ideals of educational aims can be used for
"the legitimation of inequality through an ostensibly meritocratic
and rational mechanism for allocating individuals to economic positions".[21]
Within a perspective that perceives the aims of education in the U.S
and the U.K to be problematic they may be revealed as legitimations for
the inequalities which education reproduces in the social and economic
structure.

So far the analysis has treated educational aims as if they were
achieved products, whereas in fact they are policy formulations open to
discussion and conflict at the normative level. In asking how a
nation's aims of education come to be agreed and determined it is useful
to recall Poulantzas' stress on the political and ideological (cultural)

aspects of social class as well as the purely economic.[22] This
framework allows the questions to be elaborated specifically: who has
the authority to define the aims of education? who can determine their
implementation? whose culture delineates the perimeters within which
these aims are enclosed? The aims quoted above for the U.K and the
U.S are constructs derived from national governments either from
constitutions or from legislation on education. Poulantzas' concept
of class helps the recognition that other groups besides those of class
have assisted in the determination of educational aims in the past and
still do so in many countries: religious groups and their workings
through formal organisations would be an example.[23]

In the U.S the parochial schools and in the U.K the voluntary-
aided schools are institutions in which the government's monopoly on power
in education is significantly infringed. The public schools in the U.K
and privately endowed or fee-paying schools in both countries provide
facilities where the aims of education are more likely to be defined by
professionals and parents than by either local or national governments.
The influence of cultural groups on the aims of education might be
inferred from some curriculum practices. That French, for instance,
should be the first foreign language taught in London schools where a
majority or large minority of the pupils may be fluent Bengali or
Punjabi speakers might indicate the influence of some cultural groups.[24]
In this case it may be seen as the commitment of some individuals and
groups to the culture of the generation in which they themselves were
educated. There is, however, little evidence of cohesive action on the
part of such a hypothesised cultural group, so contrary to Weber, it is
necessary to assert that the existence of such groups cannot be fragmented
from wider class struggle which in this case has a racial, linguistic and
religious dimension. Already London schools are planning
for Bengali at G.C.E level whilst Puerto Rican children in New York

or the children of Mexican immigrants in Los Angeles may actually be educated in their mother tongue.

When religion rather than language is considered as an aspect of culture more identifiable cohesively organised groups may be seen to be attempting to influence the formulation of the aims of education. In Boston and Chicago the parochial schools prove more attractive to parents than the secular city schools. In East London schools where over ninety per cent of the pupils are Muslims, they nevertheless still have the daily benefit of a Christian assembly.[25] Jewish groups in U.K cities eventually won the freedom to establish their own religious schools, but the dominant religious groups, often with racist local supporters, have so far prevented the development of separate Islamic schools.[26] The issue of whether such struggles are best seen in racial or class terms[27] is perhaps less important than to clarify the role of the so-far neglected element of the state.[28] In this context an understanding would be required not only of the correspondence between the aims of education and the means of material production, but also of the nature of the state's power to influence such aims and of the interference in its power of social class conflict in terms of group cultural attitudes.

In this respect Gramsci's writings on education help to clarify some of these relationships:

> "But democracy by definition cannot mean
> merely that an unskilled worker can become
> skilled. It must mean that every 'citizen'
> can 'govern' and that society places him even
> if only abstractly in a general condition to
> achieve this. Political democracy tends
> towards a coincidence of the rulers and the
> ruled (in the sense of government with the
> consent of the governed) ensuring for each non-
> ruler a free training in the skills and general
> technical preparation necessary to that end".[29]

If education has the aim of enabling every citizen to participate in the process of power, then it may facilitate change in the very nature of the state. Gramsci seems to indicate that in this way the super-

structural apparatus may retrospectively influence the economic base:[30]
gradualism and voluntarism then become possibilities within a Marxist
programme and education becomes a crucial context. This developing
cycle of power may be expressed as a dynamic model:

$$\text{Power} \longrightarrow \text{Aims of education} \longrightarrow \text{Education} \longrightarrow \text{Power2} \longrightarrow \text{Aims 2 etc.}$$

This contrasts with a more orthodox Marxist model:

which could only be broken by revolutionary change which would effect
the base. Gramsci's notion of hegemony represents those non-economic
processes through which the social relations of power mediated by the
state are maintained and reproduced. It consists of all the modes and
products of intellectual, cultural and educational activity which tend
to assist the continuation of the state and of the dominant group within
it. By introducing this concept into the base - superstructure dichotomy
Gramsci asserts the importance of political and hegemonic processes in
the reproduction of class relations. The aims of education may be taken
as an aspect of hegemony,[31] important to the intergenerational trans-
mission of social and political relations and as such they are central
areas of class conflict in their formulation, adoption and implementation:

> "Every relationship of 'hegemony' is
> necessarily an educational relationship
> and occurs not only within a nation, between
> the various forces of which the nation is
> composed, but in the inter-national and
> world-wide field, between complexes of
> national and continental civilisations".[32]

This notion of hegemony is facilitated by a conception of the state as
relatively autonomous as suggested by Castells[33] and may perhaps be
reconciled with Poulantzas' theory of social class. Indeed Poulantzas
seems to be attempting to reconcile this aspect of Gramsci (and Althusser)

with a more orthodox Marxist position when he writes:

> "it is not the existence of an educational
> system forming proletarians and new petty
> bourgeois which determines the existence
> and reproduction (increase, decrease, certain
> forms of categorisation, etc.) of the working
> class and the new petty bourgeois, on the
> contrary, it is the production process in its
> articulation with the political and ideolo-
> gical relations, and thus the economic,
> political and ideological class struggle, which
> has the existing educational system as its
> effect".34

The aims of education probably constitute the kind of high ideals

which are unlikely ever to be fully achieved in practice. As the

completion of some aims becomes a possibility, other more remote aims

are already likely to be in the process of formulation. Even government

legislation, such as the 1944 Education Act, may operate for many years

with some of its clauses being merely educational aims, until the

necessary financial and administrative arrangements are provided to meet

the stated intentions. But in both the U.K and the U.S national

educational aims seem not only to be falling short of but actually to

be in conflict with the practices and outcomes of urban education systems.

It has been suggested that the formulation, adoption and implementation

of educational aims are problematic processes and ones bound up with the

functioning of the state and conflicts between social classes. To

proceed to consider some aspects of organisation and finance will provide

some insight into the specific arrangements through which high ideals

are transformed into the realities of urban classrooms. Shifting from

the normative to the institutional level of analysis it may be possible

to identify more specific problems and consider some of the potential

policy solutions.

3.2. Organisation and Finance.

This discussion of the organisation and finance of urban education

in the U.S and the U.K will concentrate on New York and London. Whilst

each city is illustrative of its country, neither is actually typical
or representative. It is difficult to assume that any city would be
truly typical, but in both London and New York problems in education are
certainly highly visible. Despite the abundance of data on the two cities
the generalisations from these two instances need to be made with caution.
The ILEA, for example, is unique both in its size and in its financing
arrangements whereby it levies a precept on its constituent local
authorities, but is not itself directly answerable to the electorate.
Similarly New York city spreads into three states and is served by a city
education board (NYCEB) rather than being answerable to the federal
capital of any one state. Both cities could be described within the
Burgess ideal typical model of concentric zones[35] with a poorer area
round the centre and richer suburbs outside stretching into distant
exurban nuclei from which people commute daily to work.[36] In both cities
the central business districts contain internationally dominant financial
centres, consumer markets and cultural institutions. Areas of gentri-
fication such as Camden and Greenwich Village break down the schematism
suggested by the Burgess model. Likewise both cities, but because of its
history London in particular, may be regarded as multi-nuclei cities.
The Burgess model, nevertheless, does help to perceive these cities as
constituting highly prestigious centres surrounded by inner zones of
working class people. surrounded in turn by outer suburbs and satellites
which are more prosperous and middle class.[37]

Considering the social geography of the cities, the financing of
education in both cases might, at first sight, seem perverse. In both
London and New York education is the responsibility of many different
authorities. Both have the pattern of one large education authority
(ILEA, NYCEB) surrounded by a host of much smaller, fragmented autho-
rities (the lea s of the outer London boroughs and fringe counties, the
school board districts). In New York much of the educational revenue

is collected from specific local taxation with some assistance from the states and an injection of federal funds which is steadily diminishing. In addition industry and business also funds specific schools and programmes.[38] In London education is financed as one component of a general rate levied by the local authorities with considerable but differential assistance from the national government in the form of block grant.

The populations of the inner city areas are, on the whole, poorer than those who live in the suburbs or in the ex-urban fringe.[39] In both cities this central area contains many old people, single parent families, first generation immigrants and unemployed people as well as the less prosperous and mobile section of the working class. Yet the geographical segregation of educational administration and finance means that these populations are in separate districts (the NYCEB and the ILEA plus Barking and Newham) and so their populations must finance their education systems without the assistance of the richer outer suburbs. To a certain extent this is offset by rates or property tax levied on the commercial enterprises which still occupy sites in central London and New York: (the prestigious financial and retail businesses remain intact even after industry has moved to the fringe of the cities or to the Sunbelt[40]). Nevertheless, the central areas of London and New York, as well as financing their education systems, are also likely to be placing relatively higher demands on other types of locally funded expenditure such as social, medical and housing services (and, in New York, welfare payments).[41] In addition they often have to subsidise or maintain the roads and railways used by the distant prosperous commuters to travel to and from work. They may even contribute disproportionately to those cultural services of the central area (the Royal Opera House, the Lincoln Centre) which are actually more likely to be used by the international dominant groups.

In New York local school boards have been established to serve low

density professional middle class areas where parents are prepared to pay to establish facilities for their children. Not only do they make no contribution to the education of the poor inner city inhabitant (except perhaps via federal taxation) but often the motivation to move may be precisely to separate their children from those of the frequently ethnically as well as socially distinct inner city dwellers.[42] In London too the move to the edge of the green belt or to the satellite towns beyond may be partly motivated by the apparently superior educational opportunities to be found there.[43] Despite the (reluctant) inclusion of prosperous inner city areas like Westminster and The City, the ILEA rests on an impoverished and precarious rate base. In New York where the black ghetto, white flight and housing areas unofficially segregated by colour, reveal the racial dimension of social stratification the small and geographically remote school boards of exurbia provide an opportunity for middle class parents to secrete their children away from the consequences of bussing.[44] The Burgess model reveals cities divided geographically along the lines of social class reinforced by race. In both London and New York the financial arrangements help ensure that educational stratification follows the same geographical pattern.

This pattern of finance is of course modified by national government in London and state and federal government in New York. In London extra financial assistance comes from central government via the Department of the Environment whilst what central supervision and inspection there is comes from the Department of Education and Science. The growing educational budget of the Department of Employment via the Manpower Services Commission is making it an increasingly important source of funds for the post sixteen age group. In New York federal money for compensatory education increased as the Great Society programme followed the National Defence Education Act. This money was channelled through the Department of Health Education and Welfare which subsequently became the separate Department of Education. A host of New York special programmes such as the Head Start scheme received funding in this way.

President Reagan's cuts in the Department's budget and his adminis-
tration's intention of abolishing it altogether and with it nearly all
federal funding on education, have severe implications for education at
many levels in New York. Similar policies of financial stringency in
the U.K have resulted in the Department of the Environment attempting
to limit all local authority spending. Reductions in block grants
have been accompanied by severe penalty clauses which have cut back
central financing even further to those authorities which the Secretary
of State deems to be overspending.[45]

In some respects this has served to exacerbate the inequalities
of financing in London's education system.[46] The ILEA, as a result of
its high level of expenditure received no block grant whatsoever
between 1981 and 1983 and will receive none for the financial year 1983
to 1984. The ILEAs own claims to be a special case in terms of its
needs for "nursery education, primary and secondary schools, 16 - 19
year olds, special schools, non-advanced further education, adult
education, youth service, careers, young employed, population change"[47]
may be a little overstated. However, the ILEA covers the poorest area
of central London, the area with a high number of immigrant children
speaking 131 languages[48] and from a variety of cultural backgrounds,
also its building stock is very old and in need of repair or replacement,
so it may have some claim on additional funding especially as its rate
base is not rich. Whilst government funds raised from taxation (including
that raised from parents whose children attend ILEA schools) go to
assist education in the prosperous suburban areas of the city, none at
all goes to the large area in the centre of the city with its concen-
tration of poverty and problems. The financing of education in
New York and London, and especially that of the ILEA, must be seen
as examples of regressive taxation. However, in terms of the amount
spent on education, children in ILEA schools must be regarded as the
most fortunate in the U.K. Geographical differentials in educa-

tional spending are very high in the U.K[49] and the ILEA is the
highest spender on secondary education and the second highest on
primary.[50]

In attempting to locate problems in the finance and organisation
in London and New York schools, the difficulty is in trying to isolate
the change element. To point to recent cutbacks in the Reagan-
Thatcher era as a significant change is to ignore the fact that these
stringencies only accentuate pre-existing patterns of inequality.
Following the Burgess model of dynamic outward movement, "extension,
succession and concentration,"[51] it would be the impoverishment of
the inner city which was regarded as the change. But this ignores
the fact that the central areas of these two cities have included
areas of severe poverty for centuries as they have been major points
of arrival for rural and overseas immigrants.[52] Nevertheless, demo-
graphic movement may still be regarded as the major change element:
the drift to the suburbs, white flight, new waves of rural immigrants,
the relentlessly declining density of inner areas and the trend towards
an older population are all elements which separately or in conjunction
lead to problems concerning the collecting of educational revenues,
the organisation of institutions and the equitable distribution of
such resources as are available.

The change element then could be isolated in terms of the
incomes of people moving into and out of the city. The no-change
element might be the system of financing urban educational institutions.
A possible solution would be in terms of a more appropriate system
of financing.

The policies which have been attempted however have been more in

terms of compensatory education. Although these programmes have involved extra funds being made available to urban schools, they have not necessitated a change in the system which would be indicated by the possible Holmesian analysis. Such compensatory education pro- grammes have been essayed in the two cities over the last twenty years. Recent research[53] suggests that perhaps the Westinghouse evaluation of the Head Start project was a too precipitate dismissal of compensatory education, but confidence in such initiatives remains impaired. In London research highlighted the way in which the money made available by the educational priority area scheme did not reach many impoverished children and in no way remedied the inequalities of provision (let alone achievement) in urban schools. A similar case has been made in a more general way for the expenditure of Title 1 money in U.S cities.[54]

Those theorists deeply committed to ideas of class and the state would find nothing surprising in the apparent failure of such initi- atives to equalise the financing of urban education. Such reforms within their perspective would be likely to be merely cosmetic and tokenistic. The concept of the state tends to include the functions of national, regional and local governments and the declared policies of all major political parties. The political parties in both London and New York are seen to differ more in their rhetoric and in the interest groups they sponsor and are sponsored by than in their funda- mental policies. The state, in capitalist cities, being the instrument of the dominant class, is seen to be the collective guarantor of production and reproduction relations:[55]

> "On the one hand the state continually
> seeks to facilitate accumulation by
> attempting to ensure national allocation
> and distribution of resources.   On the
> other hand it intervenes in matters of
> housing, education, medical care, social
> work and so on".[56]

The state attempts to legitimate the existing order through ideology

but will use coercion when the balance of commodity-producing society

is threatened. Although the state is responsible for social control

it can rarely use this power autonomously or arbitrarily. The

state is constrained by the structure of the society it controls:

it cannot reorganise the foundations of society. Its function is

rather to maintain those foundations while engaging in technical,

remedial (piecemeal social engineering) reforms which leave the main

structure of society intact. However the actions of the capitalist

state in cities such as New York and London which are ordered by

democratic and market institutions, cannot be explained in purely

instrumental or conspiracy theory terms:

> "This does not mean, however, that
> the state in capitalism is somehow
> perfectly neutral and unbiased. Simply
> by maintaining the existing social
> order, the state simultaneously
> maintains existing relations of
> authority and subordination in capital".[57]

The concept of relative autonomy is necessary to understand the

limits of the freedom of the state relative to the capitalist owner-

ship and organisation of the means of production.[58] Within this

theory, then, piecemeal social engineering such as marginal technical

improvements in the equity of urban educational financing is seen as

cosmetic technical reform which cannot influence the fundamental social

contradictions.

Castells insists that even these reforms are precarious. The statisation of the means of social reproduction - housing, welfare, transport, health, education, leisure - that has occurred in London and New York during this century is likely to lead to further contradictions and crises.[59] The tendency of the rate of profit to fall has ensured that Western cities can no longer afford to maintain lavish expenditure on these facilities whilst private capital is reluctant or unable to assist, yet at the same time public demand for precisely these services and commodities is dramatically increasing.[60] However, Castells' assertion that such stringencies will lead to an exacerbation of the urban crisis remains to be proved.[61]

Althusser[62] discusses the function of education within the workings of the capitalist state and his analysis may then be considered at this stage, though it is referred to at several subsequent points. He fully acknowledged the importance of the material base but goes on to incorporate the concept of ideology:

> "the reproduction of labour power requires
> not only a reproduction of its skills,
> but also at the same time a reproduction
> of submission to the rules of the estab-
> lished order, i.e a reproduction of submission
> to the ruling ideology for ther workers,
> and a reproduction of the ability to
> manipulate the ruling ideology correctly
> for the agents of exploitation and
> repression".[63]

He suggests a new distinction in Marxist theory of the state:

> "In order to advance the theory of the
> state it is indispensable to take into
> account not only the distinction
> between State power and State

> apparatus but also another reality which is
> clearly on the side of the (repressive)
> State apparatus, but must not be confused
> with it. I shall call this reality by its
> concept: the ideological State apparatus."[64]

Althusser suggests eight such apparatuses, the religious, the family,

the educational, the political, the trade union, the communications

and the cultural. He then asserts:

> "that the ideological State apparatus which
> has been installed in the dominant position
> in mature capitalist social formations as a
> result of a violent political and ideological
> class struggle against the old dominant ideo-
> logical State apparatus, is the educational
> ideological apparatus."[65]

The schools provide an apprenticeship in the relations of production,

the relations of exploited to exploiter:

> "The mechanisms which produce this vital result
> for the capitalist regime are naturally covered
> up and concealed by a universally reigning
> ideology of the school, universally reigning
> because it is one of the essential forms of the
> ruling bourgeois ideology, an ideology which
> represents the school as a neutral environment
> purged of ideology (because it is ... lay),
> where teachers respectful of the 'conscience'
> and 'freedom' of the children who are entrusted
> to them (in complete confidence) by their 'parents'
> (who are free, too, i.e the owners of their
> children) open up for them the path to the
> freedom, morality and responsibility of adults by
> their own example, by knowledge, literature and
> their 'liberating' virtues".[66]

Whilst this theory explains the importance of education to the state

at a level much more vital than that of cosmetic technical reform, it is

unfortunately not examined by Althusser in the specific educa-

tional   practices of any country.[67] Although the theory gives an

insight into state involvement in education it does not explain the

lavishness of provision which exists in the schools and colleges of New

York and London. To do this might necessitate a further elaboration of

the theory of relative autonomy. Just as the state has relative autonomy

from capitalist interests, so educational institutions perhaps have some

autonomy relative to the state. This autonomy is based on the extent of

their financing and the degree of local control over it. But Althusser, with his patronising and voluntaristic reference to heroism,[68] does not substantiate his theoretical clarity by an examination of the processes of education and the articulations between these and the dominant political and economic systems.[69] Such an examination would be unlikely to be able to retain a theory as holistic as Althusser's, but it might utilise the concept of 'double' relative autonomy.[70] It could, furthermore, be asked why, if education provides the essential function ascribed to it by Althusser, it is suffering financial cutbacks in both London and New York, and that at the hands of politicians strongly committed to the perpetuation of the capitalist system. Castells' concept of destatisation seems to offer a more appropriate explanation of this issue[71] though this does not fundamentally undermine Althusser's basic notion of the important ideological function performed by educational institutions.

3.3. Structure.

A striking aspect of the educational structures in both the U.K and the USA[72] is their wide variety of different forms. These forms may be loosely listed within the overlapping categories of private, religious, state, special and alternative. Some of these forms of structure are much more prevalent in U.K and U.S cities than others, but each may be worth examining as their very profusion and the significant differences between them may provide insight into the critical issues of urban education. It will then be appropriate to ask whether those problems particularly visible in urban schools are connected with asynchronous change within educational structures or to this very variety of forms or to the fundamental differences which exist within this variety.

Private, fee-paying institutions exist in the cities of both countries from pre-school through to postgraduate level. The main qualifi-

cation for entrance is the ability to pay, though examinations are
often also set or qualifications demanded. Such provision may also be
designed to serve a particular religious, social or ethnic group.
Private institutions are by no means a uniquely urban phenomenon though
long-established high status institutions thrive in the cities of the U.K,
and in the U.S they have developed in many cities to prevent rich white
children being exposed to the rigours of integration. Private educa-
tional institutions may not be an exclusive concern of urban education,
but when people in the senior political and administrative echelons of
urban state education systems, such as the ILEA, send their own children
to private schools, then some tenuous relevance of such schooling to
that of the mass of city dwellers may be suspected. Private education
is an extreme example of the division of educational structures and it
tends to reproduce and replicate social stratifications.[73] The whole-
hearted commitment on the part of the dominant group to achieving
educational equality may be doubted when their own children are educated
very largely outside the system they administer and extol. As cuts
deepen into state education on both sides of the Atlantic, the existence
of private education may not only create a differentiation in the quality
of education a child receives but also in its quantity. Local authority
cuts to nursery education and the drying up of money for headstart
programmes mean that less children in the cities can receive pre-school
education unless they are prepared to pay for it.

Religious schools offer a specific form of educational structure
which may be private or state aided in both the U.K and, more obliquely,
in the USA. Given the importance of demographic change in the generation
of educational problems and the centrality of class to an approach to
urban problems two issues concerning religious schools, both of parti-
cular relevance to the U.K, may be mentioned, the specific religions
tolerated and the divisive nature of sectarian schooling. New immigrant

groups often have difficulty establishing schools particular to their
beliefs.[74] In the U.K a small private Islamic school has been created
in Newham.[75] It is, however, having difficulties with premises as
Newham's finance and general purposes sub-committee has refused to sell
them their present building which used to be a local authority infant
school. Most Koranic teaching in U.K cities is done in supplementary
schools, some of which receive minimal grants from local education
authorities. In the U.K the further structural variable of single-sex
or co-educational schools has been utilised by some religious and ethnic
groups. The influx of Islamic people from Bangladesh into Tower
Hamlets, for instance, has led to the increasing popularity of single
sex schools. The opposition to Islamic schools may not be exclusively
a matter of racism. There may be opposition between the likely teaching
in such schools and the deeply held or developing values of the wider
society. Liberal enthusiasts for tolerating Islamic education, for
instance, might be dubious about the role of women or the concept of
justice likely to be taught in Islamic schools. Yet how can a state
committed to pluralistic tolerance encourage Catholic, Protestant and
Jewish schools and not those of the latest immigrant group's religion?
Certainly many Moslem parents are critical of the values their children
acquire in English city schools:

> "Muslim children who have been through English
> schools are lost. They don't know where they
> belong".[76]

The problem-approach might indicate that the new religious group
constitutes a change element and institutional traditionalism the no-
change. The possible solutions would be either to encourage Islamic
schooling, or, more radically to ban all forms of religious education in
schools so that no one group is seen to be unfairly treated. Belfast
provides an example of a city where the education system is schematically
divided along religious grounds. Such a system would seem hardly to

encourage mutual tolerance or a cohesive society.

The introduction of comprehensivisation in the U.K and racial integration and bussing in the U.S led to some parents feeling dissatisfied with either the quality of education they thought their children likely to achieve or with the social origins or skin colour of the peers with whom they were likely to mix. In both countries religious education provided a possible alternative structure. The high academic and discipline standards attributed to Catholic schools has made them particularly attractive. This has meant that religious schools can be choosy about the children they admit and in this way a self-fulfilling prophecy can develop.[77] Given the falling rolls in many urban schools and the necessary re-organisation for contraction, local authorities, especially in London, are faced with the alternative of closing popular reasonably successful voluntary-aided schools (though to do this they need the co-operation of the diocesan authorities) or the apparently less attractive state schools. Some West Indian children do attend voluntary-aided schools in U.K cities but few Islamic children are likely to attend them if they have a choice.[78] The religious schools may operate divisively, then, along the lines of race and ability as well as o f religion. Picton asserts that some voluntary schools in London in no way conform to the ILEA's "formulas for balanced intakes, top up their entry in the second and third years, and in some cases give the impression of practising racial selection as well".[79] It may even be argued that a bi-partite secondary school system is being re-established in the ILEA.[80] Again it is possible to utilise problem analysis here, though the demographic change and the introduction of not universally popular integrative school structures provide two virtually simultaneous change elements. Solutions again include stricter control or, in this case, the rather nebulous recommendation to attempt to change parental attitudes. It may be noted, however, that admission to religious

schools may depend as much on class, race or ability as an apostolic commitment.

The structures of the state systems are themselves varied, surprisingly more so in the U.K than the USA. In U.S cities there is some variable provision of pre-school education due to the difficulties of federal funding, but otherwise the structures are fairly unitary at least until after senior high school. Even the innovative urban schools such as Metro or Parkway[81] follow the grades and evaluation pattern of the other state schools belonging to the same system. Magnet schools[82] concentrating on specific areas of the curriculum and designed to attract children from all racial backgrounds and thereby facilitate integration, are also similar in most other ways to more traditional high schools. In U.K cities there are differences of provision at nursery level between local authorities. Some authorities have opted for a first, middle and secondary school structure, some others for community colleges and a few even retain some vestigial selective grammar schools. There are co-educational or single sex schools available within authorities. Like much else in U.K education[83] the type of school structure available may depend very much upon place of residence. Given the reasonably comprehensive entry to schools at the levels between elementary/primary and senior high/fifth form, the location would seem to be the only gate-keeping element with regard to entry to state schools, though several groups of parents may have chosen not to send their children to such schools. In fact to contrast U.K variety with the more universal U.S structures is probably to conceal the more important point that in both countries there is a vast amount of division and variety within individual schools. Such divisions do not develop until a point in secondary education and this point may, to a certain extent, be progressively delayed. However, once this point is reached children are likely to be separated into groups, and these separations are likely to be

cumulative and enduring in their effects. Tracking in the U.S and
streaming/banding in the U.K separate children into differential
curricula[84] according to their imputed ability or stated interests. The
gatekeeping elements at this stage are the pupil's previous academic
record, teacher opinion, the advice of counsellors or pastoral staff and
parental pressure.[85] These mechanisms of separation and stratification
play an important part in the reproduction of class formations. To what
extent do they represent a problem? Within the context of the individual-
orientated aims in the U.K and the U.S they may not be construed as a
problem or constitute a problem in the technical sense, particularly as
a change element is difficult to identify. The change may be discerned
as rising aspirations, or as a growing recognition of the importance of
educational sponsorship and certification in terms of future individual
life chances and group class formation. The no-change element being
the number of children leaving school without any significant qualifications,
apparently, in the U.K at least, having failed their eleven years of
schooling. To this problem the U.S pattern of wider graduation might
offer a possible policy solution. But can technical changes in the
structure of educational institutions be expected to ameliorate urban
class inequalities which ultimately derive from the organisation of the
means of production?[86] Comprehensivisation in the U.K and racial
integration in the U.S may be regarded as attempts to do this using
piecemeal social engineering methods: the success of these structural
changes is still subject to debate.[87]

Special education[88] in the U.K represents the most severe form of
segregation and one to which urban children are most vulnerable. Whilst
the segregation of the most successful pupils into grammar schools is
gradually being phased out in U.K cities, the separating out of the
least successful continues. In the U.S PL 94 142 and subsequent
practice provide a possible alternative policy. The gatekeeping elements

to special education consist of the specific procedures of professionals, in particular the psychometric assessments of educational psychologists.

In both the U.S and the U.K alternative, or free schools have had a popularity which seems now to be waning. Libertarian critiques of schooling[89] inspired the formation of small schools often in the centre of cities where attempts were made to develop an egalitarian pedagogy and a less traditional curriculum.[90] The only gatekeeping elements are local availability plus, in some cases, a small fee. The combination of young idealistic teachers with working class children in informal settings with limited material resources produced a different educational experience but one which could only have had limited attractions for parents. Supplementary schools, by contrast, are highly popular with urban parents in the U.K. Working in the evenings or at weekends, these schools for children from racial or religious minority groups provide language instruction in English and/or the mother tongue and, sometimes, religious teaching. In some cases they also provide auxiliary instruction on subjects from the mainstream school curriculum or simply an opportunity to do homework.[91]

The post-secondary careers of children in U.K cities tend to become increasingly fixed between the ages of sixteen and eighteen. Options at sixteen include unemployment, youth opportunities programmes,[92] further education college courses, sixth form, and paid employment with the possibility of training and day release. At eighteen there are the further alternatives, for some, of specialised or academic training at colleges, polytechnics or universities. The universities remain firmly at the top of this hierarchy and their admission, despite the post-Robbins expansion, still contain disproportionately small numbers of working class students, blacks and girls.[93] In the U.S the point of segregation is probably even later and the possibilities range from

dropping out, through graduation followed by employment, to community college or university. The apex of the hierarchy here is represented by specialised postgraduate institutions and departments. The hierarchy between community college and university has been examined[94] as has the variable importance of academic and social influences on students' post-secondary success.[95]

This selective, descriptive summary of educational structures indicates the variety of forms and suggests the ways in which these differences correspond to social class divisions. Whilst in U.K cities the slope of the hierarchical pyramid might be steeper - from centuries old public schools with access to Oxford and Cambridge colleges to inner city ESN(M) schools - a similar though perhaps shallower slope may be observed, provided locational and organisational elements are taken into account, in U.S cities. The U.S may not have so many layers in the geology of its educational structure nor are the mechanisms of selection there so overt nor applied so eagerly as in the U.K secondary education, with its streamed and setted subject teaching leading to a tripartite examination system.[96] The structural arrangements of education function to reproduce the different levels of skills and rewards at the workplace and of prestige in society in the cities of both countries. This is the fulfilment of the educational aims of individualism, personal difference and competition.[97] Any ideological function of schools may then be of secondary importance to their continued supply of a workforce stratified in terms of skills. Industrialists may complain that children leaving schools lack the relevant skills[98] but they are aware of their place within the system of stratification. Such 'awareness' may be more important to the continuation of the capitalist mode of production than more specific skills.

A problem analysis of school structures need not focus exclusively

on demography as the change element. Problems might arise from
comprehensivisation in the U.K, for instance, or the implementation of
PL 94 142 in the U.S. In these cases the change element would be
institutional, perhaps inappropriate pedagogy, curriculum or organi-
sation. Indeed the no-change element may be teachers' skills and atti-
tudes, exacerbated by lack of change in teacher-training institutions.[99]
As well as change at this level, possible policy solutions might include
in-service training. Nevertheless, the stress on stratification and
class in the above analysis suggests that piecemeal social engineering
policies might result in little progress towards equity. Comprehensi-
visation, racial integration, reformed curricula and exams are piecemeal
policies, the results of which seem to have been not to abolish educa-
tional stratification but to delay it and to disguise and mystify its
processes. Special schools provide a contrast where apparently well-
intentioned social improvement policies have actually served to extend
educational stratification, institute it at an early stage and make it
more visible.[100]

3.4. Curriculum .

Consideration of the urban curriculum needs to examine proposals
and innovations as well as everyday practice. Holmes suggests four
headings within which the curricula of various education systems may be
categorised, essentialist, encyclopaedic, pragmatic (or problem-solving)
and polytechnic.[101] This typology is useful in allowing a consideration
of which of the four ideal types would be suited to the needs of people
living in urban areas.

The essentialist curriculum may be typified as that still largely
found in the U.K, especially at secondary level. Its legitimators[102]
insist that there is an enduring knowledge which men should ideally
acquire; an élite, often historically orientated, culture which must be

passed on to the able and privileged of succeeding generations. This curriculum is based on the (largely taken for granted) theory that knowledge is divided into specific disciplines: the appropriate curriculum may be drawn from these to make a selection of the most important.[103] Within each discipline the concentration is on 'the best that has been thought and said' or 'the great tradition'. In many urban schools much of this curriculum may seem to be remote from everyday life and realistic opportunities, and teachers may be drawn into increasingly gimmicky or instrumentalist presentations in order to try to gain their pupils' interest and motivation. It may, furthermore, seem to be the imposition of dominant knowledge and standards for the purpose of assimilating children to a range of beliefs and behaviours which may strongly vary from those of their families in terms of any combination of language, class, culture, race or religion.[104] In the essentialist curriculum knowledge is organised hierarchically and this may be seen to be linked to the commensurate structural relationships discussed above. Stratified knowledge reflects a stratified society: the (psychological) stratification of children in schools then serves to reproduce this social and epistemological stratification into the next generation.

The encyclopaedic curriculum may be typified as that still largely found in France. An example of a legitimating statement is Condorcet's educational proposal made to the post-revolutionary Assembly.[105] Although from this position all knowledge is perceived to be equally important, there has, in educational practice, actually been a stress on science, technology and modern languages. All children are ideally offered the same curriculum; there is no second-class option and so choices of 'remedial' subjects are severely restricted. In France this equality is largely mitigated by intensely meritocratic exam competition. As in essentialism knowledge is divided into subject disciplines. The preponderance of economically relevant subjects tends to reproduce labour

power effectively and hierarchically, which suits the needs of a tech-
nical and managerial organisation of the means of production. This,
further, tends to reproduce the existing pattern of stratification, and
gives existing dominant groups an advantage in reproducing their
position by apparently validating their epistemological legitimations
of intelligence, technical skill and high culture.[106] Within the
structures through which this is operationalised, it is assumed that
children from all geographic areas, if confronted with the same body of
knowledge, will have equal opportunities for academic success. Finally,
within the encyclopaedic tradition there is, as in essentialism, a
stress on the disciplines of reified knowledge.

The pragmatic curriculum may be typified as that of the USA. However,
with the current trend towards highly assessed, performance-based
teaching and 'back to basics' it may be doubted whether this is still
so prevalently the case.[107] The pragmatic pedagogy and curriculum
developed and advocated by Dewey may now be better represented by some
U.K primary schools than by the highly detailed, mass-produced packages and
multiple-choice assessments to be found in the USA. However, as Bennett
has shown[108] the methodologies advocated by Plowden[109] are far from
general in U.K primary schools. Where they do exist their effectiveness
has been seriously questioned.[110] Dewey's theoretical endeavour to
retain rural interactions and values in downtown Chicago has been repli-
cated in some English urban schools by Midwinter and others involved in
the educational priority area schemes.[111] In the pragmatic curriculum
knowledge is not divided up into subject disciplines, though it is
likely to include a wide range of practical, employment-related themes,
often as a series of topics or electives. More important than subjects
is the emphasis on the way in which knowledge is acquired and the
development of generalised problem-solving skills which the pupils can
subsequently utilise in discovering and developing knowledge for them-
selves.[112] To facilitate this process access would be provided not

only to school-based practical projects but also to the resources of
the locality in terms of the environment, the workplace and skilled
personnel. This ideal typical concept of the pragmatic curriculum
covers one trend in U.S education and in U.K primary schools and also
perhaps the community school movement in both countries.

The most radical examples of the community school initiative[113]
have come close to Dewey's ideal of making the actual workplace inter-
actions of the city into crucial educative experiences for young people.
This ideal of the community as a school is rather different from that
of the school as a community or as a community focus which lies behind
many projects in the U.K. The instigators of these have followed the
rural model of Morris's Cambridgeshire village colleges.[114] The appro-
priateness of the schemes of Morris and Dewey to rapidly changing,
heterogenous urban areas is questionable. The stress on community
which tends to evoke a rural Gemeinschaft experience[115] does not seem
obviously relevant to the education of children in contemporary inner
city areas. Indeed it may even be seen as a flight from the unpleasant-
ness of the urban present into a romanticised pastoral version of the
rural or small town past.[116] Midwinter's attempts to generate an
appropriate urban curriculum escape some of this idyllic pastoralism,
as do other aspects of the educational priority projects and those
community schools[117] committed to making school knowledge "useful,
interesting, understandable, first-hand and developmental"[118] for the
urban child. This urban version of the pragmatic curriculum, however,
has three inter-related disadvantages.[119] Firstly, it risks an embattled
localism whereby the children's eyes are rarely raised above the limi-
tations of their own areas, with which they may already be numbingly
familiar. Secondly, when isolated from the curriculum of more privi-
leged areas, the pragmatic urban curriculum, in practice, may be
perceived to be inferior: a stratified curriculum may develop in which

urban children learn community studies and social skills whilst in the
suburbs their contemporaries study subjects more likely to be efficacious
for university entry and job opportunities. Thirdly, unless elements of
polytechnicalism can be incorporated within it the urban pragmatic
curriculum may remain remote from the means of production.

The polytechnical curriculum may be typified in its industrial form
as that of the USSR or the DDR. Its theory rests on an early lecture by
Marx[120] plus some (surprisingly rare) hints about education in his later
writing. Marx' ideas were developed and experimented with by Krupskaya
when the post-revolutionary government first attempted to implement
polytechnical education.[121] The polytechnical curriculum is not made
up of a range of subject disciplines, much less is polytechnicalism a
subject option in itself.[122] Rather polytechnicalism represents an
attempt to facilitate an interpenetration between education and the
processes of material production. The aims of its theorists and practi-
tioners include the minimisation of the division between mental and
manual labour and the elimination of the hierarchical stratification of
knowledge and of jobs. Ideally children learn about production by
participating in it; the relevance of knowledge learned in schools to
the processes of production are invariably stressed; children become
familiar with the essential knowledge, that of the material, social
and ideological relations of production. In attempting to develop a
curriculum appropriate to urban schools it might be suggested that poly-
technicalism is not irreconcilable with many of the ideas and practices
of Dewey or Midwinter. Krupskaya herself was an advocate of progressive
(problem-solving) pedagogy, but this was not institutionalised and her
ideas were increasingly ignored as polytechnicalism was abandoned in the
USSR during the late 1920s and 1930s.[123] Contemporary polytechnicalism
(it was re-introduced in the USSR by Khruschev) still faces practical
limitations for three reasons. Firstly, schools and housing areas may

be located a long way from any major zones of industry. Secondly, workers and managers may find the pressure on time and space exerted by the presence of pupils actually inhibits their own productive potential.[124] Thirdly, teachers may not be adequately informed about or, indeed, committed to Marxist theory or the elaborately detailed practice of polytechnicalism: such residual attitudes often form a no-change element in problems concerned with the effectiveness of educational change.[125] Polytechnicalism is an aspect of Marxist-Leninist theory in which it is accepted that the progress of society is more important than the autonomous development of the individual.[126] Ideally, the implementation of such a curriculum would assist in the erosion of social, epistemological and psychological hierarchies. Although polytechnicalism does not offer a complete prescription for the urban curriculum, like pragmatism, it would seem to be a necessary element in it, or better, an appropriate aspect of it.

None of these four curriculum types would seem uniquely suited to provide a framework for the educational requirements of children living in urban areas. It is perhaps surprising that the many variations in curriculum practice can be classified into so few types. If Holmes' taxonomy is related to the practice of the world's education systems - and it is difficult to point to a curriculum which cannot be placed within these ideal typical categories - then how is it that the organisations of school knowledge can be classified under so few headings? Do these four types represent epistemologically pure structures for organising human knowledge gradually perfected over the centuries? Given the influence of school knowledge, its boundaries, classification and framing, on the thought processes of individuals and the intellectual strategies of groups this possibility is not altogether to be discounted.[127] Nevertheless, school curricula would seem to be strangely slow to change in response to developments in knowledge such as say,

relativity theory or the development of ethnomethodology. If school

curricula were vitally connected to the wider developments of knowledge

would not change occur more quickly and adaptively? That school know-

ledge so frequently seems to have ossified might seem to verify the

base-superstructure argument that accepted thought is the epistemolo-

gical reflection of the material power of the dominant group within a

system:

> "The ideas of the ruling class are in every
> epoch the ruling ideas, i.e the class which
> is the ruling material force of society is at
> the same time its ruling intellectual force.
> The class which has the means of material
> production at its disposal, has control at the
> same time over the means of mental production,
> so that thereby, generally speaking, the ideas
> of those who lack the means of mental produc-
> tion are subject to it. The ruling ideas are
> nothing more than the ideal expression of the
> dominant material relationships ..."[128].

Whilst such an account may help explain the restrictions on accepted

knowledge, it hardly explains the differences between essentialist,

encyclopaedic and pragmatic curricula which exist in countries all follo-

wing a capitalist organisation of the means of production.[129] Changes

in the curriculum may relate to changes in the means of production,

but they may also reflect political and ideological concerns[130] or even

changes in other aspects of the education system such as exams or

teacher training. Indeed one partial explanation for the restriction of

curricula to four types is the effect of colonialism and neo-colonialism

in which the enterprise of comparative education has itself played a

part.[131]

An appropriate urban curriculum might not represent a fifth type

but rather a selection of elements from the other four.[132] The

problem-solving pedagogy of pragmatism and the understanding of and

relationships with the workplace stressed in polytechnical each represent

important elements of relevance in urban areas, though perhaps neither

place sufficient emphasis on co-operative group work between children.

Unlike essentialism the skills and domains of knowledge would need to be stressed as inter-related and non-hierarchical. The equality of labour, skill and knowledge would need to be brought into practice in the social relations of the school, its curriculum and its contact with the parents and workpeople of the locality. A stress on gender equality and on the potential for rich exchange within multicultural urban areas would need to be infused through the entire learning process. Racism and sexism would be directly addressed. The evaluation of children within such a framework would need to eschew the fine gradations of competitive hierarchy: perhaps a common leaving certificate would simply indicate the studies completed, and all children would be expected eventually to obtain this qualification. The exams could not then constrain either the academic studies or the social relations of the school. These suggestions are neither new nor revolutionary:[133] most of them are already being practiced in a partial fashion in some urban schools in both the U.S and the U.K. They do, however, beg the question of whether the curriculum of urban areas should be distinct from that of the suburbs or rural areas, or whether a compulsory curriculum (or compulsory core) should be drawn up, in which the issues suggested above would be addressed by all children not only those in the inner city. What are the relative merits of national curriculum as against one which is specifically urban and local?

National curricula (whether centrally determined or led by exams or attainment tests) tend to be subject and discipline dominated, whereas pragmatic and polytechnical possibilities might be more likely to be instrumentalised within a specifically urban curriculum where local energies and resources could be utilised. Even within national systems which are ostensibly pragmatic or polytechnical there is a tendency for the radical aspects of the curriculum to ossify into a once or twice a week lesson on polytechnicalism or problem-solving[134] in the midst of an otherwise essentialist of encyclopaedic timetable.

The professed ideal does not necessarily inform the organisation of the curriculum or the pedagogy. The national curriculum would seem to have the disadvantage of not allowing for consultation with all interested parties, though this depends on what is meant by consultation, and who are considered to be interested parties.[135] Industrialists and businessmen in both the U.S and the U.K have claimed to have a say in what is taught in schools on the basis that the children coming to them at sixteen or eighteen need to be able to perform a range of specific tasks.[136] In the U.K the Taylor Report[137] highlighted the lack of control that parents had over what their children were taught. The community education movement on both sides of the Atlantic has claimed that a (rather loosely defined) community has the right to a part in determining what is taught in local schools. The urban curriculum, as perhaps presently institutionalised in some community schools would seem to have the advantage of greater accountability to a wider range of constituents.[138] But the question of the nature and extent of consultation remains. Miller has described the collapse of the community education movement in New York as increasingly sectional and remote interest groups struggled for control of the schools.[139] Jones' discussion of the committee management of Sydney Stringer in Coventry indicates that similar difficulties are beginning to emerge in the U.K.[140] If no notice is taken of the stated opinions of interested parties this may lead to disappointment and alienation. Furthermore, if these stated opinions are to the effect that the curriculum should be changed back to traditional maths and the rote learning of the capes and bays of England, then teachers may find such views in conflict with their deeply held professional opinions.

National curricula tend to emphasise mainstream culture and, accordingly, are liable to be élitist.[141] There are more possibilities within a specifically urban curriculum to include non-dominant culture

and multilingualism and multiculturalism.[142] The multicultural curri-
culum, at its best, draws on the resources of children and of groups in
the locality in a reciprocally informative dialogue which can penetrate
many dimensions of schooling.[143] However, if the population of the
nation state is multicultural, then should this aspect of the curriculum
be confined to urban schools? Should not the multicultural dimension of
the curriculum be as essential in Beverley Hills as it is in Watts? The
alternative may be that rural and suburban children may not learn about
an important positive aspect of their own society and multiculturalism
may be seen as a cosmetic response only appropriate in certain areas.[144]
The criticism that urban children are offered an inferior curriculum of
the history of colonialism and steel bands[145] would in such a case be
valid. The lack of mother-tongue teaching in London schools is partly
the product of the large number of languages spoken by children even in
one classroom:

> "One child in seven in the Authority's schools
> is bilingual ... Between them they can under-
> stand 131 languages and they represent a
> reservoir of linguistic skill and knowledge
> unequalled anywhere else in Britain and
> perhaps in the world".[146]

By contrast, in New York and Los Angeles, Spanish speaking children from
Puerto Rican or Mexican families can take almost their entire education
in Spanish. But, unless they learn efficient English, there is a strong
risk that these children may be seriously disadvantaged on the employment
market. The national curriculum, unlike the specifically urban, may
tend to be assimilationist with the aim of adapting young people to the
host culture and society. The urban curriculum is more pluralistic and
aims to change society to appreciate the diversity of culture represented
within its population.[147] The urban curriculum may be criticised for
being inbred and for restricting children to their own backyards but the
progress from Stepney Words to the internationalist World in a classroom
indicates that for one urban teacher at least this trend was not inevitable.[148]

The advocates of a national curriculum might suggest that it offers equality of opportunity. Coleman's work in the U.S suggested that this criterion was not adequate and that it should be replaced by equality of outcome.[149] The concept of equality of educational opportunity can conceal the reproduction of social and racial stratification and of gender roles through educational processes. Separate but equal might describe the provision but not the results. The radical urban response to this[150] is to suggest that city children should ignore the possibility of individual social mobility; successful urban pupils ought to direct their energies to changing the society in which they are situated rather than trying to escape it to the university and the professions. This proposal is somewhat utopian in that it neglects self-interest as well as concentrating on local rather than national needs. A national curriculum might ideally be seen to meet national economic and technical needs in supplying an appropriately skilled workforce. This would seem to be more likely within an encyclopaedic than an essentialist framework. It has been argued that, however much the economic system may be opposed, it is nevertheless unfair to children not to prepare them as well as possible for obtaining a job.[151] Nevertheless, national exam systems can allow examining bodies to exert a covert and potentially stultifying control over the curriculum. The urban alternative to this might allow for greater flexibility and an adaptive utilisation of local resources and available teacher skills. The situational analysis promulgated by Skilbeck would be more possible,[152] whereas at present it is constrained by the demands of national exams.

An advantage of a national curriculum would be that in the process of its implementation there might take place an equalisation of provision between various areas and the elimination of some injustices.[153] Furthermore, a national curriculum would provide an incontestable benefit to urban children in terms of continuity. Schools which have highly specialised and distinct curricula are based on the assumption that

children will stay in the same place for their entire school careers. Since urban families tend to be highly transitory between areas, cities and even countries this assumption is seriously unrealistic. Children may attend many schools in the course of their educational careers and they may be seriously disadvantaged if, after every change, they find themselves in the midst of an unfamiliar curriculum. In these two respects it is a national curriculum which might actually be of most benefit to urban children.

In the urban curriculum it is likely to be the teachers who determine what is school knowledge. It is reasonable to ask by what right teachers are mandated for this task, or by what qualifications they are fitted to it.[154] Replacing the teachers by the community may only lead to the problems of constitution discussed above. By contrast a national curriculum could ideally be drawn up by the government, which would mean that it would be subject to electoral sanction. Military and economic matters might, of course, be more prominent in the minds of electors than issues concerning the school curriculum. It is likely that the process of formulating alternative policies would be left to senior bureaucrats or academics who would seem to have as little popular mandate as teachers and probably less awareness of the diurnal circumstances of urban children.

The conclusion, rather unsatisfactorily, is that both urban and national curricula have their advantages and disadvantages, particularly within the constraints of evaluation and the need to institutionalise pluralism. Hall suggests that urban schools provide vertical and horizontal links. Vertical links are with the economic needs and cultural repertoire of the wider national society. Horizontal limits are those providing familiarity and solidarity with the locality, its people and activities and also an awareness of class or social history and culture:

> "In this sense, the local urban school is
> a paradigm case: an institution which in its
> global meaning and vertical networks can clearly
> be seen, in however complex a way, to be a
> dominant institution, the institution of a
> dominant culture: but which, in its horizontal
> connections, in its local and neighbourhood
> context, was at the same time part of a nego-
> tiated class culture. This mismatch between
> where these schools stood, and what they stood
> for, was always a glaring one - part of a large
> contradiction: one in which the very nature of
> the institution, and its cross ties to locality
> and to society, forced on the minority the
> classic choice between individual advancement
> and community solidarity".[155]

Hall indicates an enduring pattern, yet it is possible to isolate change

elements in the U.S and the U.K and these more tangible than rising

aspirations. Comprehensivisation in the U.K and integration in the U.S

may be seen as changes in the direction of educational and social equality,

an attempt in some measure to reconcile vertical and horizontal connec-

tions. The no-change element which has been stressed above is that of

the examination and evaluation systems which impose the hierarchies of

the workplace upon institutions which the state has actually attempted

to make less hierarchical. The logical hypothesis of needed policy

change might be that recommended for the U.K by Hargreaves, that "there

should be no public examination at sixteen plus".[156] Hargreaves further

adopts the currently fashionable plan for a common core curriculum in a

way which might allow the advantages of both the national and urban

curriculum to be exploited:

> "My main proposal is that all secondary schools
> should have a central, core curriculum, for
> pupils between the ages of eleven and fourteen
> or fifteen, which should be organised around
> community studies and the expressive arts".[157]

The focus on the weak concept of community rather than on, say, education

for a multicultural society is perhaps disappointing. It remains to be

proved whether a common curriculum could help generate local understanding,

meet national economic needs and allow a range of equally valued options

to address many areas of knowledge. Certainly if this success were to be

achieved it would need a firmer conceptual basis than Hargreaves' community.[158]

The analysis so far has attempted to illustrate the importance of the concepts of state and class to understanding problems of the school curriculum in urban areas. Curriculum and particularly examinations have been seen to be elements of no-change against state attempts to move education in the direction of social equality and against the wider background of rapid demographic change in cities in the U.K and the U.S. It has further been suggested that curriculum change is resistant to changes in areas of knowledge and as such school knowledge may be perversely resistant to national economic needs in terms of technological progress. In order to examine this apparent mismatch between the curriculum and the requirements of the need of production it is necessary to examine the social and political functions of existing school knowledge.[159]

As castigated by Midwinter existing school knowledge is often irrelevant, uninteresting and downright misleading.[160] Rather than giving children insight into the social and economic practices they will encounter as adults, it may seem actually to distract their attention away from these areas. Further, the enduring content of the curriculum remains ethnocentric in both the U.S and the U.K. In its covert form this involves teaching history as if it had only taken place on one continent, or only begun on another after Columbus 'discovered' it. More obviously it involves racial stereotyping in textbooks, readers and even reading schemes.[161] In London ILEA policy documents suggest that racism be confronted directly in the school curriculum[162] but few London schools include multiculturalism, let alone the social and economic functions of racism, as part of their defined knowledge.[163] Gender stereotyping is perpetuated in both countries through curriculum material[164] and the distribution of school subjects.[165] While some attempts are being made to address this issue, the structure and content of the school

curriculum remain major forces in the reproduction of patriarchy. The
hierarchical distribution of the curriculum is reflected in the fact
that some subjects are considered to be of more value not only on the
employment market but intrinsically. Some subjects simply do not appear
on the curriculum. There is an élite knowledge - albeit now scientific
as well as cultural - which is the necessary possession of those who are
to be academically and professionally successful.

This cultural capital is a crucial element in the hegemony of the
dominant group.[166] The culture and the hegemony are reproduced simul-
taneously through the school curriculum. It has been suggested that
present hierarchies of knowledge are artificial, having reference to the
culture of the dominant group rather than to specific economic or
social needs. The no-change element of the school curriculum then assists
the maintenance and reproduction of this dominant group:[167]

> "One might speculate that it is not that
> particular skills and competences are
> associated with highly-valued occupations because
> some occupations 'need' recruits with knowledge
> defined and assessed in this way. Rather it is
> suggested that any very different cultural choices,
> or the granting of equal status to sets of
> cultural choices that reflect variations
> in terms of the suggested characteristics, would
> involve a massive redistribution of the labels
> 'educational', 'success' and 'failure', and thus
> also a parallel redistribution of rewards in
> terms of wealth, prestige and power"[168]

Within the context of this debate it is not surprising to find an
advocacy of total cultural relativism: one contributor claims that
his analysis of traditional African religious systems:

> "has cast doubt on most of the well-worn dicho-
> tomies used to conceptualise the difference
> between scientific and traditional religious
> thought. Intellectual versus emotional,
> rational versus mystical; reality-oriented
> versus supernaturally oriented; empirical
> versus non-empirical; abstract versus con-
> crete, analytical versus non-analytical; all
> of these are shown to be more or less inapp-
> ropriate".[169]

Can any area of knowledge then be impartially included in or excluded

from the school curriculum? It has even been suggested that the skills

of literacy and numeracy are no longer essential and serve only   to

perpetuate the oppression of those initiated.[170] It has further been

pointed out that the techniques and methodologies of science as taught

in the U.K and the U.S may emphasise technical, partial, reformist

thinking which accepts status quo within which the industrial, commercial

and military uses of science are located.[171]

The phenomenological critique of the school curricula seemed

almost to extend to the reversal of base-superstructure theory and the

suggestion that a radical change in school knowledge might lead to social

or industrial change.[172] This "idealism" has been challenged by writers

working within the same critical paradigm:

> "The overemphasis on the notion that reality is
> socially constructed seems to have led to a
> neglect of the consideration of how and why
> reality comes to be constructed in parti-
> cular ways, and how and why particular
> constructions of reality seem to have the
> power to resist subversion".[173]

The concentration has shifted to how teachers and pupils can generate

and instrument new and more radical forms of school knowledge.[174] The

development from Marx' concept of knowledge[175] has been to suggest that

the definition of knowledge and of the school curriculum, whilst

certainly operating to the advantage of the bourgeois, is nevertheless

an area for conflict and class struggle.

The distribution of school knowledge is based on competition.

Competition legitimates and instrumentalises the simultaneous stratifi-

cation of children and subjects: "there is a powerful connection between

a reified view of intellectual status ... and the reification of

school knowledge".[176] The effects of tracking and streaming are that

by the age of fourteen pupils in both the U.S and the U.K are likely to
be experiencing differential curricula (subjects, teaching methods,
level of difficulty) according to teacher perceptions of their previous
school achievement. The U.K essentialist system provides an extreme
whereby the majority of students effectively fail their eleven years of
schooling at the age of sixteen by not obtaining any significant
certification. The U.S system in which most students are expected to
graduate (despite the actually very high drop out and failure rates in
urban areas such as New York) seems more equable and avoids the impos-
sibly fine gradations of success and failure. But in the U.S counselling
and guidance personnel channel pupils into differential curricula on the
basis of the perceived achievement.[177] Overt competition is deferred till
eighteen but thereafter there is a clear hierarchy of educational insti-
tutions and curricula.[178] The lesson that competition is necessary
and fair is then part of the hidden curriculum in both the U.S and the
U.K:

> "Schools make legitimate the role of such
> technical and positivistic knowledge as well.
> They, thereby, can employ it as a set of
> supposedly neutral procedures, ones based on
> 'ultimately right principles', to stratify
> students according to their contribution to
> its maximization and to economic needs.
> Cultural forms, hence, residing at the very
> bottom of our brains, working in tandem with
> the nexus of relations the school has to the
> economic arena, help recreate the ideological
> and structural hegemony of the powerful."[179]

With regard to the evaluation of school knowledge competitive exams are
crucial to the creation and reproduction of élites.[180] The competition of
school also serves to instil and legitimate the ethic of economic
competition in the free market of commodities and commodified labour
power.[181] Competitiveness itself is legitimated by the preponderant
rhetoric of individualism in the aims of education.[182]

   With regard to the school curriculum of the U.S and the U.K it
does seem to be possible to use an approach which focusses on problems due

to asynchronous change but also incorporates the elements of social class and the state. The two components of the approach at this stage do not seem to be irreconcilable. Policy options may range from Hargreaves' community (utopian) core curriculum to the back to basics and vocational training currently being adopted and implemented in both countries. The latter policy is an attempt to make the curriculum correspond more directly and overtly with the needs of the workplace. The former formulation like those of Apple, Whitty, and Young discussed above rest on the basis that the school curriculum rather than structure and organisation is the point at which significant radical change can be initiated. The (rather hopeful) expectation is that if the school curriculum were to be radically changed and knowledge revised, problematised, integrated with the wider conflicts of the city, then educational and ultimately economic and political structures might eventually change in accordance. If knowledge ceases to be organised hierarchically is it likely that institutions, the organisation of production and society as a whole may shift accordingly? The posing of such a question makes the school curriculum a site of class conflict, of domination and resistance. If the mode of the music changes will the walls of the city fall?

3.5. Teacher education.

For a person working within the problem-solving approach issues of teacher education might include actual or projected changes in curriculum and the development of knowledge, in educational institutional structure, or in the pedagogy and social organisation of schools, seen against a background of an unchanging teacher workforce in terms of skills and attitudes if not of personnel. Hypothesised policy solutions might include in-service training to develop attitudes and skills, and revised initial training to make new teachers better prepared for the changed conditions of education. By contrast an approach which included the elements of the state and social class might be used to analyse the (apparently

sinister) processes whereby prospective and practising teachers are trained and socialised into the techniques and ideology of class domination. Grace's historical account has something of this quality.[183] In attempting to combine these approaches it is necessary to take account of both the pre-service and in-service dimensions of teacher education.[184]

Pre-service training in the U.K remains tripartite (soon to become bipartite as the B. Ed increasingly replaces the Certificate) in contrast to the more comprehensive pattern in the U.S. In both countries there is an assumption that students who have good degrees in a discipline subject are more likely to teach at the upper age levels. Perhaps the most important consideration concerning pre-service education is that it exists at all. Education in both countries has become the monopolistic prerogative of the certificated.[185] Legislation in both countries now enforces this monopoly through the stipulation that only those with an approved qualification in specifically educational studies may begin teaching in schools. In the U.S this is reinforced by the requirement that prospective teachers hold a degree. This insistence on certification is part of the professionalisation of the teaching force, hence the enthusiasm of U.K trade unions for an all-graduate profession is perhaps not surprising. Certification and the aura of professionalism would seem to increase the status of teachers and their potential earning power. Whether these processes of initial certification and developing professionalisation are actually to the benefit of the education of children in cities is at least open to doubt. Recent data from U.S cities indicates that many teachers lack even the most basic skills themselves.[186]

One of the effects of certification is to exclude from the teaching force all those who are not perceived to be professionals. Parents, local tradesmen, craftsmen and experts, politicians, leaders of trade

unions and industry are seen in the U.K and the U.S to have only a tangentialrole in education. The range of resources open to urban children in terms of contact and curriculum is thus severely limited. When uncertificated personnel do work in classrooms they have comparatively lower remuneration and status and their contribution is often limited to mixing paints or setting up chemistry apparatus. Any attempt to encourage these "ancillaries" to participate in the educative process is likely to meet the firm disapproval of entrenched teacher interests and the trade unions. This in turn can lead children to consider knowledge as exclusively that possessed by teachers and transmitted in schools. The knowledge of their own family and social circle is likely to be depreciated in comparison with that of the school.[187] Yet when education authorities in London and other cities in both the U.K and the U.S have sought the collaboration of parents in teaching young children to read, the schemes have been extremely successful despite the frequent objections of teachers.[188] Furthermore, in the course of such schemes, the parents' literacy and interest in reading has increased. The pedagogy of Paulo Freire[189] with his insistence on dialogue and mutual explanation and education would seem, in many ways, to be the opposite of narrow, certificated professionalism. In U.K cities the supplementary schools for children from non-indigenous linguistic, religious or cultural backgrounds have often relied on teachers who are not qualified, yet they are frequently more successful and popular than the monolithic state system.[190] Initial training may then function to limit the definition of knowledge and the right to distribute and assess it to an artificially small group.

The question is whether or not this small group represents a specific class. Ethnomethodological studies from U.S cities have shown how the expectations of teachers are often derived from their own socio-economic location in the aspirant lower middle or upper working class. Even in reception class they tend to give more approval and reward to children

whom they discern to be from similar origins.[191] Hargreaves has pointed
to similar processes in operation in schools in the U.K.[192] Whilst
rarely themselves part of the group which is dominant with regard to the
ownership and control of the means of production, teachers nevertheless
often subscribe to the values which help uphold this class and overtly
and covertly promulgate its hegemonic values and culture in schools.
This promulgation plays an important role in the reproduction of the
dominant value system and the group it maintains.[193] Grace has examined
London teachers' and heads' concepts of 'the good teacher' and has
revealed these mediating and supporting roles as typifying even osten-
sibly radical urban teachers.[194] The ideologies and practices of urban
teachers are in part developed and reproduced through initial training
with its certification and stress on professionalism. Such ideologies
include blaming the victim, selective piecemeal policies to equalise the
chances of urban children, and other fundamentally conservative initia-
tives.[195]

With regard to the changing urban population and its educational
needs the importance of in-service education for practising teachers
was recognised in the U.K by James.[196] Financial cutbacks in both coun-
tries has been a major constraint on this facility, but so too have been
the desires and expectations of teachers. Teachers' preference for
courses which offer some palpable certification may be due to the fact
that this carries a financial reward, or it may be part of the profession's
more general concern with certification. Teachers are a large occu-
pational group taking Open University degrees in U.K and they are attracted
to Masters courses in both countries. This results in in-service
training remaining largely located within the specialised institutions
of higher education. Local, collaborative in-service initiatives remain
rare, though the ILEA's induction and inset courses supply an innovative
example. It may be doubted whether the syllabuses of certificated
courses are always relevant to teaching in urban schools. Many courses on

child development, educational psychology, educational administration

and subject teaching would seem to do little more than perpetuate many

of the ideologies and practices criticised in preceding sections.

Courses on urban education per se are much more common in the U.S than

in the U.K where they and indeed any course concerning the education of

disadvantaged children are very rare.[197] If the class-bias of the

profession and practice of teaching is to be eroded then there would

seem to be a need for many more such courses. However they, and indeed

the compulsory inclusion of racial minority and special needs elements in

in-service training, could hardly, on their own, represent policy

solutions to the educational inequalities outlined in this chapter.

-oOo-

Chapter 3

FOOTNOTES

1. Holmes, B., 1980.

2. This is outlined and discussed in chapter 1.

3. See Holmes, B., 1981 pp. 80 - 83.

4. See Holmes, B., 1981 pp. 85 - 86.

5. Holmes, B., 1980 p. 219.

6. Holmes, B., 1980 p. 210.

7. Quoted in Harvey, D., 1973 p. 197.

8. See Ibid pp. 197 - 199.

9. By contrast Weber suggests that a society's material and non-
   material manifestations are determined not only by the class structure but
   also by cultural distribution and by access to power: see the
   discussion which follows.

10. Bowles, S., and Gintis, H., 1976 p. 131.

11. Ibid pp. 125 - 126.

12. See Bowles' and Gintis' own revision of their theory where they pay
    much more attention to sites of resistance, Barton, L., et al (eds.), 1980
    pp.51 - 65.

13. See Jencks, C., et al 1972.

14. See Halsey, A. H., et al 1980 for instance p. 211: "Primary schooling
    may not matter, but secondary schooling does".

15. Bowles, S ., and Gintis, H., 1976 p. 121.

16. Poulantzas, N., 1978 p. 284.

17. Halsey, A. H., et al 1980 p. 205.

18. Bowles and Gintis draw on the notions of separation of skills and
    deskilling developed in Braverman, H., 1974. In this context see

also Wood, S., (ed.) 1982.

19. Bowles, S., and Gintis, H., 1976 p. 108. Occupational stratification is discussed further later in the chapter under Structure.

20. Ibid p. 106.

21. Ibid p. 101.

22. See, for example, Poulantzas, N., 1978 p. 14, also the discussion in Chapter 2. This position is slightly different from that of Weber who perceives social groups to be distinguishable on three distinct axes - economic class, cultural, educational or religious groups, groups based on power or status - which may overlap but which do not do so necessarily.

23. Again a Weberian perspective would allow for a similar pluralism: see, on this issue, Vaughan, M., and Archer, M. S., 1971.

24. See ILEA 2321.

25. Consider, for instance, this statement which appeared in an advertisement for the headship of a Whitechapel school in ILEA Contact 15.10.82, "The roll is largely Muslim. Strong Church of England links and a regular communicant preferred".

26. Such schools have been vigorously opposed in, for example, Barking and Ealing. However, plans for an Islamic school in Bradford are now advanced.

27. See, for example, Gilroy, P., 1982 pp. 276 - 314.

28. In Vaughan, M., and Archer, M. S., 1971, the authors acknowledge that a Weberian analysis may be less appropriate to present day education systems where government is the dominant power and groups (dominant and assertive) struggle for control of the state rather than of education per se: "when an education system becomes integrated with the state, it is irrelevant to discuss domination and assertion since both activities become subsumed under a broader model of changes in political power of different groups and parties" p. 23.

29. Gramsci, A., 1971 pp. 40 - 41.

30. Althusser attempts to reconcile this position with the more generally held Marxist view: see Cosin, B. R., (ed.) 1972 pp. 247 - 248, also the discussion of ideology later in this chapter.

31. Bourdieu's theory of cultural capital, mentioned below, may be seen as a development of the concept of hegemony specifically in relation to education.

32. Gramsci, A., 1971 p. 350.

33. See discussion in chapter 2.

34. Poulantzas, N., 1978 p. 29.

35. See Burgess, E. W., 1925.

36. On the geography of New York see Hall, P., 1977 pp. 178 - 218. On London see Ibid pp. 23 - 52 and also Department of the Environment 1977 and Shepherd, J., et al 1974.

37. Using Burgess as a simplified model of social geography is not to endorse his theory of the processes which structure space: see the discussion in Chapter 2.

38. See, for instance, New York Coalition 1978 pp. 14 - 19.

39. For data and analysis on New York see the contributions of Ashton, J., and Stone, M. E., to Tabb, W. K., and Sawers, L., (eds.) 1978 pp. 90 - 110 and 179 - 207: for London see the contribution of Rose, D., to Dear, M., and Scott, A. J.,(eds.) 1981 pp. 339 - 382 and Shepherd, J., et al 1974.

40. See the contribution of Hill, R. C., in Tabb, W. K., and Sawers, L., (eds.) 1978 pp. 213 - 240.

41. In the case of New York see Miller, H. L., 1978 p. 118.

42. See Ibid pp. 97 - 104.

43. See people's stated replies as to why they wished to leave Stockwell in Department of the Environment 1977.

44. Though see Miller, H. L., 1978 pp. 334 - 336.

45. For a full anslysis of the consequences of this in 1981-82 see Travers, T., 1981.

46. This is a source of persistent complaint by the ILEA: see for instance, ILEA Contact 14.1.83, pp. 1 - 2.

47. Ibid pp. 1 - 2. The list is of headings used.

48. ILEA 2321.

49. See the contribution by B. E. Coates et al to Blowers, A., et al (eds.) 1982 pp. 122 - 130.

50. Ibid p. 127. In the U.K there may actually be further inequalities, however, in the way in which money is allocated to various groups within a local education authority. A study of such inequalities in the case of Sunderland has been made by Williamson, W., and Byrne, D. S.: see Raggatt, P., and Evans, M., (eds.) 1977 pp. 216 - 241.

51. Raynor, J., and Harris, E., (eds.) 1977 p. 37.

52. In the case of London see Bermont, C., 1975; for New York see the contribution by D. M. Gordon to Tabb, W. K., and Sawers, L., (eds.) 1978 pp. 25 - 63.

53. See A. H. Halsey's article in Swann, W., (ed.) 1981.

54. For London see J. Barnes' and H. Lucas' article in Raggatt, P., and Evans, M., (eds.) 1977, pp. 78 - 106.   For U.S cities see Brown, F., 1982 pp. 124 - 142.

55. This elaboration of theories of the state discussed in Chapter 2 draws heavily on Dear, M., and Scott, A. J., (eds.) 1981.

56. Ibid p. 8.

57. Ibid p. 8.

58. This concept is discussed in chapter 2.

59. See Castells, M., 1978 pp. 18 - 19.

60. Ibid pp. 19 - 20.

61. The influence of the economic recession on rioting in British cities during the summer of 1981 is still being debated. For the case of London see Home Office 1981 (The Scarman Report).

62. Althusser was highly influential on both Poulantzas (his discussion

of education quoted above is an adaptation of Althusser and uses
the same terminology) and Castells, and thus subsequent urban social
theory. The epistemology which Castells offers at the beginning of
The Urban Question (Castells, M., 1977 pp. 1 - 6) is based on
Althusser's theoretical work.

63. Althusser, L., in Cosin, B. R., (ed.) 1972 pp. 245 - 246.

64. Ibid p. 252.

65. Ibid p. 258. "The old dominant ideological state apparatus" refers
    to the apparatus of religion. Althusser here gives a Marxist inter-
    pretation of that struggle which the writers mentioned in footnotes
    23 and 28 interpreted in Weberian terms.

66. Althusser, L., in Cosin, B. R., (ed.) 1972 p. 261.

67. Althusser's notion of the state apparatus has been widely criticised
    and adapted by both Marxist and non-Marxist writers. For examples
    "his version of Marxism neglects the problem of the unity of theory
    and practice" (Sarup, M., 1978 p. 152), or more concretely, "The
    pseudo-apology to trapped heroes is a gross insult to the reflective
    and critical consciousness of many, many English teachers who throw
    enormous energy into winning spaces in Bleak House, where honest
    dialogue can happen and communicative power be extended" (Rosen, H.,
    1981 p. 16).

68. Althusser, L., in Cosin, B. R., (ed.) 1972 p. 261.

69. Such an examination was subsequently attempted: see Bowles, S., and
    Gintis, H., 1976, discussed above.

70. This notion of 'double' relative autonomy is utilised below. In
    examining financial and other issues, there is no reason why such a
    concept of the role of the state in educational affairs should not
    be utilised alongside Holmes' model of local, regional and national
    institutions concerned with educational policy formulation, adoption
    and implementation. See Holmes, B., 1981 pp. 97 - 101. Such a frame-

work would avoid the holistic structuralism of Althusser's approach. Such a synthesised approach to urban educational issues would then be able to concentrate on both specific 'problems' and on the wider issues without losing sight of either.

71. An alternative explanation would perhaps be that President Reagan and Mrs. Thatcher are acting contrary to their class interests because they have not read their Althusser!

72. These are summarised systematically in Holmes, B., 1980 pp. 210 - 217: 219 - 223.

73. See the discussion of Halsey, A. H., et al 1980 above. In the U.S this aspect of educational structure may be of growing importance: "Attendance at non-Catholic private schools has risen from 700,000 in 1960 to 1.7 million today" (Wilc, H., 1983 p. 21).

74. See the discussion of aims above.

75. See The Times Educational Supplement, 29.1.82, p.9.

76. Ahmad, H. I., quoted in Ibid p. 9.

77. "Some of them [politicians] certainly know about the voluntary primary school in Dulwich which boasts that 90% of its pupils go on to the private sector and, at public expense, virtually acts as a preparatory school. They cannot be unaware of the county school head in Plumstead who recommends middle class parents to go to the church school round the corner which can provide the right sort of atmosphere for their children ..." Picton, D., 1981 no page numbers.

78. See in this context, though, footnote 25 above.

79. Picton, D., 1981 no page numbers.

80. Ibid. For similar structures in U.S cities see Hummle, C., & Nagle, J. M., 1973, pp. 93 - 96.

81. For details see Farrington et al in Raynor, J., and Harden, J., (eds.) 1973, pp. 189 - 203.

82. For details see Grant, M. A., 1982.

83. See the discussion of finance above.

84. See below.

85. For a discussion of how apparently open access systems of education are reconciled with differential achievement see Karabel's discussion of the role of counsellors in U.S schools in Karabel, J., and Halsey, A.H., (eds.) 1977 pp. 232 - 254.

86. This question relates back to base-superstructure theory and it has been asked and answered (usually in the negative) many times before: see, for example, Bernstein, B., 1973 or Bowles, S., and Gintis, H., 1976 pp. 264 - 288.

87. This is further discussed in the closing paragraphs of this section.

88. Since the education of children perceived to have special needs in both countries is the subject of chapter 4 only a brief introduction is given at this stage.

89. See, for example, Illich, I., 1973 and Illich, I., and Verne, E., 1976.

90. In the case of London see, for a highly publicised example, ILEA 8543 (1978) on the White Lion Street Free School. For New York see Dennison, G., 1972.

91. For further details see Stone, M., 1981 pp. 175 - 190.

92. The differential pattern of educational structures in the U.K has recently been further complicated by the intervention of the Department of Employment in the form of the Manpower Services Commission. This body is already involved in the funding of sixteen to eighteen courses such as YOPs and there are indications that it may play a part in the education of children in the final years of compulsory schooling.

93. See Mortimer, J., and Blackstone, T. , 1982.

94. See Karabel, J.'s paper in Karabel, J., and Halsey, A. H., (eds.) 1977 pp. 232 - 254.

95. See the paper by Sewell, W. H., and Shah, V. P., ibid pp. 197 - 215.

96. The three alternatives being to take no exams at all, to take
CSEs or to take GCEs.

97. Under the old tripartite system in the U.K the structures seem so
specifically to have been designed fdor this purpose that the voca-
bulary of functionalism seems unnecessary: the reproduction seems
to have been their intended purpose.

98. See, for instance, Weinstock, A., 1976.

99. See below.

100. It could be asked whether educational stratification and its repro-
duction through school structures are actually problems. In the
sense to which they are not attributable to asynchronous change they
may not be a problem in the technical sense. There is, however,
a risk here of adapting a tautologous usage of the concept problem.

101. Holmes, B., 1981 pp. 105 - 107. See also Holmes, B., 1981b,
pp. 299 - 300.

102. These include many sources from Aristotle, through Eliot and Leavis
to R. S. Peters. See, for example, Leavis, F. R., 1962 pp. 9 - 38.

103. See, for example, Peters, R. S., 1970 pp. 23 - 88.

104. See the chapter on 'internal colonialism' in Carnoy, M., 1974.

105. See the discussion of Condorcet in Vaughan, M., and Archer, M. S., 1971.

106. For a discussion of the importance of concepts of knowledge and
'cultural capital' for reproduction in French education, see Bourdieu,
P., and Passeron, J. C., 1977.

107. For recent developments in the curriculum in the USA see Cowen, R.,
1981. See also the discussion of Dewey in Chapter 1.

108. Bennett, N., 1976.

109. Central Advisory Council for Education (England) (1967).

110. See, not only Bennett, whose research procedures were not as reliable
as the publicity given to his 'results' was strident, (discussed in
Radical Statistics Group 1982 pp. 16 - 18) but also Sharpe, R., and
Green, A., 1975.

111. For descriptions of the aims and practices of these schemes see Halsey, A.H., 1972.

112. See the discussion of scientific and problem-solving methodology in Chapter 1.

113. Such as the Philadelphia Parkway, for a discussion of which see the paper by Farrington, P., et al in Raynor, J., and Harden, J., (eds.) 1973.

114. See the article by Morris, H., in Fletcher, C., and Thompson, N., (eds.) 1980 pp. 11 - 19.

115. See the discussion of Tonnies in Chapter 2.

116. See footnote 8 to Chapter 2.

117. See Jones' essay (Fletcher, C., and Thompson, N., (eds.) 1982 pp. 79 - 85. for an English example, and Williams' and Robin's contribution to the same collection(pp. 55 - 62) for the U.S.

118. These are the criterion developed by Midwinter, E., in his contribution to Raynor, J., and Harris, E., 1977 pp. 110 - 117.

119. The relative advantages of a national as against a local urban curriculum are discussed in more detail later in this section.

120. For a discussion of the implications of Marx' writing on education for polytechnicalism see Castles, S., and Wustenberg, W., 1979 pp. 32 - 41.

121. Krupskaya's influence on the theory and practice of polytechnical education in the USSR is discussed in ibid pp. 47 - 53.

122. However, this is apparently the way in which it is being practiced in the DDR: see ibid pp. 78 - 100.

123. Ibid pp. 43 - 77.

124. The problems of the movements of young people and workers' preferences for their own remunerative activities over that of teaching may prove to place limitations on projects such as Parkway or Metro.

125. Polytechnicalism is not, however, restricted to urban areas. Cuba's

rural schools are an attempt both at large scale social engineering and at adapting the polytechnical curriculum to the needs of an agricultural economy. For details see the paper by Carnoy, M., and Werthein, J., in Karabel, J., and Halsey, A. H.,(eds.) 1977 pp.573-589.

126. By contrast see the discussion of Aims above for the importance of individualism within the education systems of the U.S and the U.K.

127. For a discussion of changes in infant school curriculum procedures in the U.K and the way these link with practices of fragments of the middle class, see Bernstein, B., "Class and Pedagogies Visible and Invisible" in Karabel, J., and Halsey, A. H., (eds.) 1977. In this article Bernstein elaborates on his use of the terms 'frame' and 'classification'.

128. Marx, K., 1977 p. 176.

129. This matter relates back to the discussions of Bowles and Gintis and Althusser earlier in the chapter: it is discussed with regard to the curriculum at greater length later in the chapter.

130. In some U.S cities the bitter debates about which theories of creation and evolution to teach in schools reflects these aspects.

131. For the educational dimension of colonialism see Carnoy, M., 1974 and Altbach, P. G., and Kelly, G. P., (eds.) 1978.

132. The concept of appropriate here is not meant to conceal that the drawing up of ideal curricula represents normative decisions: see the refutation of Hirst and Peters in Mathews, M. R., 1980, especially pp. 172 - 174.

133. In their totality, however, they may perhaps be utopian. A recent detailed attempt to consider an ideal curriculum for U.K secondary schools, which has relevance for the U.S is Hargreaves, D. H., 1982. Hargreaves' stress on the community is at variance with the discussion in Chapter 2 above but it provides an opportunity for a specifically urban focus.

134. See footnote 122 above.

135. For a discussion of the educational policy making process in the U.K see Jennings, R. E., 1977.

136. For the U.K see, for example, Weinstock, A., 1976; for the U.S see the discussion in Reed, R. J., 1982 pp. 17 - 20.

137. DES and Welsh Office, 1977.

138. See the discussion of the Pragmatic Curriculum above.

139. Miller, H. L., 1978 pp. 372 - 374.

140. Jones, A., in Fletcher, C., and Thompson (eds.) 1982 pp. 79 - 85.

141. See, for instance, Boyson, R., 1982.

142. The relevance of rather vague notions of working class culture to the curriculum of urban schools in the U.K is presently being investigated by Mooney, T., for an M.A thesis at the University of London Institute of Education.

143. For an example of good practice see Wasp, D., 1980.

144. See Mullard, C., 1980, especially pp. 18 - 19.

145. Stone, M., 1981.

146. ILEA 2321 1982 p. 1.

147. For a discussion of assimilation, integration and pluralism in the U.S see Banks, A. J., 1982; for the U.K see Street-Porter, R., 1978.

148. Searle, C., 1973; Searle, C., 1977.

149. For a brief statement of his views see Coleman, J., "The concept of equality of educational opportunity" in Raggatt, P., and Evans, M., (eds.) 1977 pp. 50 - 65.

150. This is discussed in the article by Hall, S., in Raynor, J., and Harris, E., (eds.) 1977 pp. 7 - 17.

151. See, for example, Field, F., (ed.) 1977 pp. 1 - 12.

152. Skilbeck, M., in Raynor, J., and Harris, E., (eds.) 1977 pp. 100 - 109.

153. See the discussion of Organisation above.

154. This question is asked in White, J. P., 1973.

155. Hall, S., 1977 "Education and the crisis of the urban school" in Raynor, J., and Harris, E., (eds.) 1977 p. 13.

156. Hargreaves, D.H., 1982 p. 128.

157. Ibid p. 128.

158. See, for example, ibid p. 130: "A community education which loses sight of the nation as a whole as a community is not worthy of its name and can justifiably be condemned as parochial".

159. This issue was touched upon in discussing Marx' notion of knowledge, above.

160. Midwinter, E., 1977 "Teaching with the urban environment", in Raynor, J., and Harris, E., (eds.) 1977 pp. 110 - 117.

161. For guidelines on criteria see Jones, C., and Klein, G., 1980.

162. ILEA 1977; ILEA 1979.

163. In a survey of the curricula of 173 London schools it was found that only 23 (17%) mentioned multicultural education: see Weeks, I., 1982.

164. See, for instance, Burgess, C., 1981.

165. See, for example, the chapter on Education in Barrett, M., 1980.

166. For cultural capital and reproduction see Bourdieu, P., and Passeron, J.C., 1977. The point is that the culture imparted by the school is that identified with the dominant group; "Those whose culture (in the ethnologists' sense) is the academic culture conveyed by the school have a system of categories of perception, language thought and appreciation that sets them apart from those whose only training has been through their work and social contracts with people of their own kind" Bourdieu, P., 1971 "Cognitive styles in comparative perspective" in Young, M. F. D., (ed.) 1971 p. 200.

167. In this context it is important that the term dominant group should not become separated from the concept of class. By dominant group is meant the bourgeoisie in Poulantzas' sense.

168. Young, M. F. D., in ibid pp. 38 - 39.

169. Horton, R., in ibid p. 228.

170. See Postman, N., 1973 in Keddie, N., (ed.) 1973 pp. 86 - 95.

171. See, for instance, Apple, M., 1979 p. 79.

172. See Young, M. F. D., quoted above.

173. Whitty, G., in Young, M., and Whitty G., (eds.) 1977, p. 43.

174. See the contributors to Whitty, G., and Young, M. (eds.) 1976.

175. See the quotation from Marx above.

176. Esland, G. M., in Young, M. F. D., (ed.) 1971 p. 92.

177. See Cicourel, A. V., and Kitsue, J. I., 1977 in Karabel, J., and Halsey, A. H., (eds.) 1977 pp. 282 - 292.

178. See Karabel, J., 1977 on community colleges and social stratification in ibid pp. 232 - 254.

179. Apple, M., 1979 p. 79.

180. This is analysed from a comparative perspective in Dore, R., 1976.

181. See the discussion of Bowles' and Gintis' correspondence theory above.

182. See the discussion of Aims above.

183. See Grace, G., 1978 pp. 9 - 50 which is discussed briefly below.

184. An exhaustive study of teacher education might be faced with the necessity of re-treading the grounds of aims, organisation and finance, structure, perhaps concluding with the education of the teacher trainers. The purpose here is to illuminate briefly the combined theoretical approach so this inward spiral can be avoided.

185. For a discussion of the dangers of the certificated teachers' monopoly on schooling see Illich, I., 1973.

186. See Reed, R. J., 1982 pp. 13 - 16.

187. For views of young people in the East End of London on this process see Doyle, P., et al 1972 pp. 38 - 48.

188. For London and the U.K see Hagedorn, J., 1983. For U.S developments leading to practice in the U.K see Heggarty, S., et al 1981 pp. 505 - 506.

189. See, for example, Freire, P., 1972.

190. Stone, M., 1981 pp. 175 - 190.

191. See Becker, H. S., 1971 "Social class variations in the teacher pupil relationship" in Cosin, B. R. , et al (eds.) 1971 pp. 107 - 113.

192. See Hargreaves, D. H., 1967; 1972 and 1975.

193. See the discussion of Curriculum above.

194. See Grace, G., 1978 pp. 109 - 169.

195. Ibid pp. 65 - 86. These ideologies are discussed further in chapter 4.

196. D.E.S 1972.

197. See Jones, C., and Street-Porter, R., 1980 pp. 63 - 68.

-oOo-

Chapter 4

TOWARDS A CONFLICT FRAMEWORK

4.1 Conflicts and urban education

The examination of some wider educational issues in the preceding

chapter indicates that each of the approaches examined in the first two chapters

- namely Holmes' problem (-solving) approach and an approach derived

from Marxist social theory - are helpful methods of analysis. Both

approaches provide access to rigorous and sustained explication.

However, although there may be areas of overlap between the two approaches,

it has not been found to be possible to synthesise them. Each approach

leads to a different, and potentially oppositional, type of analysis. It

seems that any attempt to synthesise the two approaches would be con-

fronted by a network of puzzles and paradoxes which could not be easily

resolved. Rather than attempt such a synthesis, this chapter suggests

a conflict framework as a mode of analysis which has some of the strengths

of both approaches.

The two approaches have very different angles of vision: the

problem approach focusses attention on the specific and small scale;

the approach based on theories of social class uses a wider angle to

picture the totality of the urban system. The insights gained from one may

indeed occasionally complement those from the other. However, at the

general level of specifying an approach to urban education the conflict

between particularism and holism is likely to be especially difficult to

reconcile. Both approaches draw attention to a common theme (though at

different levels) in that both may be used to examine conflict in urban

education. This generalisation is to a certain extent confirmed by the

analysis of the preceding chapter and the framework of conflict is

accordingly examined in the first part of this chapter and exemplified
in the second part. However, the elaboration of this potentially
common framework must not be allowed to disguise the essential
differences between the two approaches. Whilst an analysis may attempt
to draw on the considerable strengths of each approach and exemplify
these in a discussion of wider issues, it may be that in moving towards
a more detailed consideration of a specific issue in urban education
it will be necessary to select one particular approach and use it. In
this more detailed analysis the constant widening and narrowing of the
angle of view may lead to inconsistencies. The following chapter
attempts to deal with the issue of the education of children perceived
to have special needs in the U.S.A and the U.K. A choice between the
two approaches must, then, be made in order to make a detailed
analysis which is not beset by puzzles and paradoxes derived from
differences between the two approaches. At this stage, however, it
is worth examining the extent to which a conflict framework does
provide an area of common ground - although limited - between the two
approaches.

Rex outlines a conflict model for the analysis of social systems
in Key Problems of Sociological Theory[1]. Rex's model is not intended to
be used only in terms of macro-analysis of societies: he emphasises
that,

> "it is by no means without relevance to
> the design of research into problems of
> particular institutions and social segments.
> There are ... always conflicts or potential
> conflicts between those exercising authority
> and those over whom it is exercised whatever
> the institutional context, and whenever such
> conflicts occur the model suggested is
> relevant for at least a partial analysis
> of the problems and institutions concerned".[2]

Rex summarises his model into seven points. Before considering these though it is necessary to emphasise that he is attempting to construct a framework

> "in terms of which many important contem-
> porary social situations might be analysed.
> The classification of basic conflict
> situations, the study of the emergence and
> structure conflict groups (sic), the
> problem of the legitimation of power, the
> study of the agencies of indoctrination and
> socialisation, the problem of the ideolo-
> gical conflicts in post-revolutionary
> situations and in situations of compromise
> and truce, the study of the relations between
> norms and systems of power - all these have
> their place within it".[3]

Certainly many of these issues overlap with the wider themes of urban education as examined in chapter three: conflicts between groups, the use of educational knowledge for political and economic legitimation, the use of educational institutions for socialisation if not indoc- trination, the relationship between normative aims of education and the power system in urban areas. Rex's framework is appropriate, then, to the issues of urban education, but how does it relate to the approaches examined in chapters one and two?

At this point it is possible to examine some of Rex's seven point summary. The first three of these seem to be the ones best able to be applied to both macro- and micro-situations. The succeeding four points would seem to be more exclusively appropriate to wider social conflicts or even revolution.[4] Rex's first point clarifies the nature of conflict theory and the range of institutions with which it is concerned:

> "1. Instead of being organised around a
>   consensus of values, social systems may
>   be thought of as involving conflict
>   situations at central points. Such conflict
>   situations may be anywhere between the
>   extremes of peaceful bargaining in the
>   market place and open revolution".[5]

Rex's second point emphasises that his framework can only be understood

in terms of classes. These classes coalesce around issues of conflict,

Rex here has a similar position to that of Poulantzas, that a class

only has existence when it is in conflict with another class.[6] Rex

in his second point is close to this Marxist perspective:

> "2. The existence of such a situation tends to
>   produce not a unitary but a plural society,in
>   which there are two or more classes, each of
>   which provides a relatively self-contained
>   social system for its members. The activities
>   of the members take on a sociological meaning
>   and must be explained by reference to the
>   group's interests in all the conflict situation.
>   Relations between groups are defined at first
>   solely in terms of the conflict situation".[7]

However, Rex's class conflict, unlike that of Marx and Poulantzas, is

not predicated upon the economic system. His third point seems to

indicate that conflict is more likely in the social and political arenas:

> "3. In most cases the conflict situation will be
>   marked by an unequal balance of power so
>   that one of the classes emerges as the
>   ruling class. Such a class will continually
>   seek to gain recognition of the legitimacy
>   of its position among the members of the
>   subject class and the leaders of the subject
>   class will seek to deny this claim and to
>   organise activities which demonstrate that
>   it is denied (e.g passive resistance)".[8]

To the extent to which Rex suggests that his conflict framework

can be used to illuminate small-scale issues then there is some overlap

with the problem approach of Holmes. However, Rex does not see asyn-

chronous change as the most useful way of locating problems.[9] Although

Holmes' approach may well lead to the study of conflict over the location

and solution of small-scale social problems, then, it cannot be completely

incorporated within the conflict framework as outlined as Rex.

In some ways Rex's framework might be considered to have more in

common with a Marxist approach. (Indeed Marxist theory itself might be

seen as a major conflict framework). However, Rex at no point emphasises

the pre-eminence of economic activities, that is of the ownership and

control of the means of production, nor does he endorse base-

superstructure theory[10] with its assumption that political and cultural

activities and institutions are predicated on the relations of material

production. Following this his concern with class groups is not

constrained by exclusively economic terms. He explicitly rejects this

position:

> "The conflict may ... be only indirectly
> concerned with access to the means of life.
> Very often the conflict may be over the
> control of legitimate power or it may be
> over the control of ideas. Thus in the
> history of many countries the great popular
> political movements have centred not around
> the question of employment, but around the
> question of religion and education. But in
> any case the consequence of the basic conflict
> situation is the emergence of conflict groups
> the activities of whose members contribute
> to the attainment of the group's aims".[11]

In terms of his conception of class groups, then, Rex may be seen as

being more similar to Weber than to Poulantzas.[12] The conflict framework,

as presented by Rex, although it has areas of overlap with the Marxist

approach as with Holmes' approach, cannot be entirely identified with

either.

With regard to specific issues of urban education, however, a

conflict frame of reference (not necessarily exclusively identical to

that of Rex) might provide some of the strengths of both the problem

approach and that derived from Marxist social theory. On the issue of

special education, for instance, which is considered in the next

chapter, the approach derived from Marxist social theory might well

enable an analysis to point to articulations between conflict over the

nature of special educational provision and conflicts over the ownership

and control of the means of production. However, it might not provide

the flexibility to examine the various groups which are in conflict at

the micro-level in terms of their interests, ideologies and methods
of operation. The conflict between clients and professionals is
certainly worth examining but it could not be conceptualised
in terms which are exclusively related to economic class. The
interests of professionals, for instance, may be more clearly related
to the preservation of their remuneration and status than to the needs
of their clients. Conflicts may occur between groups of professionals
and between people of similar economic class.

Similarly, the problem approach may enable an analysis to locate
various change and no-change elements in special education, but it would
be unlikely to provide articulations between these and class conflicts
within the larger structures of society. The 1981 Education Act or
PL 94-142 (the federal legislation in the U.S.A which enforced main-
streaming in all states[13]) for instance, might be seen as change elements
against which it would be useful to locate elements of no-change.
Such an analysis, however, might not point to the link between changing
and expanding special school provision and the wider social and
economic class structure with its emerging divisions and contradictions.

This is not to suggest that a conflict framework can reconcile
the two approaches considered in the first two chapters. It may still
be necessary for an investigator to choose between them at some point.
In chapter four this thesis uses the approach derived from Marxist
urban social theory. However, with regard to a specific issue in urban
education it is possible that a conflict framework may allow the
analysis to draw on some of the strengths of each approach. The
conflict framework is perhaps particularly helpful, whatever approach
is adopted, to the study of special education since in this area
there are conflicts between a range of groups both within and outside
institutions and between local and national levels. To some extent

the selection of an appropriate approach to a topic may depend on the nature of the topic and the way in which it is formed. However, as emphasised above, the difference between particularistic and holistic approaches may ultimately necessitate a choice on the part of the investigator which may be as much based on the predilections of each particular investigator as on the nature of the topic under discussion.

Within urban education there are myriads of cross-cutting viewpoints and conflicts. These conflicts may in many cases relate to the division between capital and labour but they cannot all be explained in this way. These terms might be helpful in understanding conflict between political parties over education, conflicts between ideologies of individualism and of collectivism, between policies of stratification and equality, between state provision and that made by free enterprise. However, these terms can less easily encompass conflicts between groups at national, regional and local levels, conflicts between providers and clients, conflicts between groups who ostensible share the same limited objectives but who differ as to how these may be achieved.

The groups involved in these conflicts may be politicians or civil servants of central government, local education authority members or officers, national or local inspectors, headteachers, teachers, parents, pupils, specialists, local and national employers, teachers' trade unions, local community groups or trade associations. Conflicts may be between members of the same group over an ideological or policy issue or between different groups over access to rewards, status, resources or control. Individual people may fall into more than one identified group and, in conflict situations, may experience divided loyalties.

Given the wide range of issues over which conflicts arise in

urban education and the large number of groups likely to be involved,
the intention here is not to apply the conflict framework to urban
education as a whole. As mentioned above this framework - like Holmes'
problem approach - may be particularly helpful when applied to a more
specific issue. It remains then to specify the abstract constituents
of conflicts which arise over the education of children perceived to
have special needs. These abstract constituents are then embodied in
the detailed discussion of chapter five.

Chapter five examines the recent moves towards integrated education
for children perceived to have special needs in the U.S.A and England
and Wales. The struggle over this issue should not, however, be regarded
as the only or even the major conflict in special education. Rather all
the processes of special education may be seen as areas of conflict.
In chapter five these processes are listed as referral, assessments,
formulation, intervention and evaluation. The conflict over integration
and segregation is only the political tip of the iceberg of conflict
and is anyway concerned principally with only two of these processes,
those of assessment and intervention. The remainder of this chapter
will briefly introduce the theme of conflict within these five processes
and identify some of the ideologies to which the conflicting parties
make reference. This is done not to pre-empt the discussion of chapter
five but rather to identify the constituent groups for conflict over
this one issue in urban education.

4.2 Conflicts in special education

Conflicts over referral are based upon decisions in mainstream
schools whereby the head and/or teachers presume that they would be
better off without a particular child or group of children. The reasons
for such a decision may be based on the fact that the appearance,
performance and behaviour of the child or group of children is not

perceived to fit in with the standards expected in the school. The head and/or teachers may even be concerned to act in what they perceive to be as the best interests of the pupil(s) they wish to reject "meeting the child's needs" (though this may be a post-hoc rationalisation). Once the impulse to refer a pupil on the part of a mainstream school is operationalised, three potential areas of conflict may emerge, each with slightly different constituent groups. Firstly, the pupil and his/her parents may not wish for him/her to leave the mainstream school and enter segregated provision. Secondly, the authority responsible for providing (often expensive) segregated schooling may object either to the principle or to the suitability of a specific referral. Finally, "expert" opinion may differ as to the appropriateness of referral to segregated provision. In the first instance this may lead to conflict in the mainstream school, but when other professionals, particularly educational psychologists and those teachers in charge of segregated provision, are involved then the conflict can potentially widen. These three types of conflict are not distinct: they may all occur on a particular case. When this happens the conflicting parties may seek allies: the educational psychologist, for instance, may seek the support of the parents. These alliances are not easy to predict as different constituent parties may group together over each different case. It is because of these various conflicts and alliances that referral is seen, in chapter five, as a political process.

In the process of assessment the criteria of referral are or are not institutionalised. At this stage conflicts may be ideological and technical as well as political. The issue of conflict shifts to whether the basis of referral was correct. Technical conflict occurs when parties disagree about whether or not a pupil has special educational needs. Ideological conflict might occur if anyone of the parties

completely rejected the notion of special needs and suggested it was simply a pretext for, for instance, stigmatising and segregating black pupils.[14] Conflicts need to be emphasised at the stage of assessment since the process can so easily seem neutral and technical with a variety of professionals trying to discover the special needs of a child. Conflict may only emerge when, say, the child's parents are approached and it is discovered that none of the professionals have consulted them and that they disagree with the "expert" assessment of their child's needs.[15] A frequent pattern of conflict at this stage involves disputes between the parents and the teachers of the mainstream school, with experts - often educational psychologists - attempting to mediate. Strangely, pupils themselves are rarely seen as participants in assessment, they remin merely its object. Their conflict is more likely to be experienced over referral, then, than assessment.

Since formulation is the stage at which some agreement needs to be reached with regard to how to proceed with the referral, it is the process in which conflict is likely to be most visible. Appeal procedures have been established whereby parents who disagree with the final formulation on their child may have recourse to a higher (political) authority.[16] However, after the consultations and even after appeals up to the level of national government someone must finally make a decision. In England and Wales, despite the 1980 Education Act, this final authority does not lie with the parents. After appeal to a review body, the final decision rests with the Secretary of State. Local and national government institutions may then ultimately be involved in conflicts over formulation.

Once a placement decision has been made conflicts over individual pupils are usually suspended. The only way they can be renewed is if

one of the parties succeeds in obtaining a review. Otherwise conflicts

over intervention are more general, concerning the most appropriate

way of meeting the special educational needs of pupils. This conflict

is currently being described in terms of integration and segregation.

Although this terminology is adopted in chapter five it should not be

seen as the only one. Within either segregated or integrated provision

there may be conflict over the best organisation of educational

resources. Parents, mainstream teachers and specialist teachers may

conflict over the best type of provision. In some cases they will be

represented in these more general conflicts by interest groups of trade

unions. Some dimensions of this conflict will be based on different

perceptions of how best to meet a common objective, some will be based

on self-interest.

Since systematic evaluation of the effectiveness of special school

provision is rarely conducted, it can scarcely be a process in which

there is much conflict. However, recent legislation in both the USA

and England and Wales has insisted that each case should have a regular

formal review.[17] Conflicts along similar lines to those outlined for

assessment are now likely to occur though with the special school

replacing the mainstream school.

The five processes outlined above are subject to a different type

of conflict from the larger social conflicts between classes or

groups. Following Rex, it is possible to study conflict in small-

scale institutional processes as well as in society as a whole. This

should not, however, lead to confusion between conflict and disagree-

ment. In all small-scale social and institutional interactions there

will be the possibility for disagreement, difference and dissent.

This is as true for the processes associated with special education as

it is for any area of institutional activity. But this is not what
is intended by use of the conflict framework. Disagreement between
individuals or even small groups may be based on personality clashes
or loyalty to a friend or to a small clique. In which case it would
not be part of a conflict as used within this framework. Conflict occurs
not because of personal differences between individuals or groups but
because they are in opposed structural positions. They desire
different and oppositional ends and their differences must be arbit-
rated through institutional processes. It is not that the headteachers
of large secondary schools in an urban area do not like the educational
psychologists working in their schools (they may or may not, it is
beside the point) rather they have conflicting interests from them
which result from their different positions. The heads, say, wish to
exclude large numbers of children from their schools because of their
poor academic performance and/or their tendency to engage in disruptive
activity. The psychologists simply do not have sufficient segregated
places for all the children the heads refer. Connected with this
there may be differences of approach between the heads and the psycho-
logists which accentuate the conflict. The heads may think it is the
psychologists' business to serve the schools and that they can best
do this by responding immediately to all referrals in the way the
heads suggest. The psychologists may perceive the large number of
referrals as itself an indication of the lack of effectiveness of the
schools, they may consider that the heads would be better using their
energies to improve the curriculum, pedagogy, and organisation of
their schools rather than plaguing the schools psychological service with
futile referrals. There may then be disagreement between the heads
and the psychologists, but in this case it is based upon their con-
flicting positions. The two groups have different interests and

objects: connected with this they may have different philosophies or ideologies. The conflict is associated with their opposed structural positions, not with any rancour or animosity which may result.

Another important feature of micro-conflicts serve to distinguish them from simple disagreement. They are often linked to more large scale social conflict. Thus teachers in a special school, for instance, may oppose a local authority's moves towards integrated provision. They may claim that their school provides a better education for children perceived to have special needs than can be found in the local mainstream schools. Behind this claim, however, they may have anxieties about losing their jobs or being forced to work in less congenial conditions. They may group together with other teachers in special schools in the authority to bring pressure to bear. In this they may seek the help of national trade unions. The National Union of Teachers, for instance, while persistently claiming to be in favour of integration has insisted that this cannot go ahead without additional resources.[18] In practice this means that the union would not wish any of its members to lose their jobs or to be working in worse conditions as a result of integrative policies. Further, the union would be pleased to see integrative schemes which led to more teacher jobs or more scale points.[19] The conflict at local level then is linked with the wider struggle for jobs, pay and conditions on the part of teacher groups. (This example is discussed in greater detail in the next chapter.) Similarly, conflicts between parents and teachers as to whether or not children should be placed in segregated provision may be linked to the ways in which educational institutions tend to work to the advantage of some groups and to the disadvantage of others. Why are black and working class children over-represented in the segregated special schools in urban areas? These issues are addressed

in some detail in chapter five.

The ideologies to which parties in conflict over the education of children perceived to have special needs refer may be divided into two categories, those associated with deficit and those associated with egalitarianism. In no sense can this division be seen as a right-left polarity. Deficit ideologies tend to concentrate on the pupil or his/her family as the explanation for the generation of special needs. They may appeal to notions of intelligence, normality or appropriate behaviour. These ideologies are examined in chapter five. Egalitarian ideologies may appear to be left wing when they appeal to integrative policies as an extension of the comprehensive ideal. However, they may also appeal to parents' rights to justify integration, and this theme has not always been the prerogative of the left.[20] Ideologies are important as they often provide the terms within which conflicts occur. For instance teachers would be unlikely to succeed with a referral in which they stated that they did not get on well with a particular pupil, that s/he was different from the other pupils in the class and that they would prefer to be without him/her. A referral which stated that the pupil was disruptive possibly due to an unsettled family life, that s/he was having difficulty making positive relationships with peers, and that his/her special education needs could be better met in a small class, would be much more likely to succeed. The ideologies tend to make clear the links between conflict over a particular case and wider social conflict: ascriptions about the family patterns or intelligence of certain class or social groups may reveal the connection to wider conflict between groups.

The constituents of conflict over the education of children perceived to have special needs in urban areas may be individuals or groups. They include heads and teachers in mainstream schools, heads

and teachers in special   schools, special education teachers

working in mainstream schools, educational psychologists, doctors,

para-medical staff, educational and local authority social workers,

parents, pupils (both referred and non-referred), adult handicapped

people, pressure groups for the handicapped and for education, teachers'

organisations and unions, the politicians, inspectors and officers of

local and central government. The stages at which many of these groups

come into conflict over the processes of special education is presented

diagramatically in Figure 6.A This figure shows the main constituent

parties of the conflicts over the micro-social processes of special

education. The nature of these conflicts and the ways in which they

articulate with conflicts in the larger structures of society form the

theme of the next chapter.

Figure 6.A The Main Parties in Conflict for each of
the Stages of Special Education

	Pupil	Mainstream school	Parent	Special school	Local authority	Special education "expert"	National govt.
Referral	X	(X)	X		X	X	
Assessment		X	X			(X)	
Formulation			X		X	X	X
Intervention	X	X		(X)			
Evaluation			X	X		X	

Key

X = may come into conflict with other parties

(X) = may experience internal conflict

Chapter 4

FOOTNOTES

1. Rex, J. (1961).

2. Ibid. p. 131.

3. Ibid. p. 130.

4. Rex is popularly perceived as a Weberian (see chapter two).
   Interestingly, the analysis of change in the educational system
   of England and Frnace made by Vaughan and Archer (see chapter three
   footnote 28) could be seen as using the last four as well as the
   first three of Rex's points. However, this is due to the fact that
   the changes they are concerned with are large-scale, once and for
   all developments of the link between education and the state.

5. Rex, J. (1961) p. 129.

6. See chapter two.

7. Rex, J. (1961) p. 129.

8. Ibid, p. 29.

9. Rex is however concerned to generate hypotheses which may be tested.
   see ibid. pp. 18 - 23.

10. See chapter two.

11. Rex, J. (1961), p. 123

12. See chapter two.

13. See chapter five for a detailed account.

14. See the discussion of IQ tests in chapter five and in particular
    Judge Peckham's ruling in the Supreme Court of California.

15. See the case studies in Swann, W. (ed), 1981.

16. In England and Wales these are set out in Circular 1/83.

17. See chapter five for details of Individual Education Programmes and
    Formal Assessments.

18. National Union of Teachers 1984a.

19. An example would be the NUT's opposition to parents' plans for integration in the London Borough of Newham in 1984.

20. See Birmingham Contemporary Cultural Studies Centre, 1981.

-oOo-

Chapter 5

THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN PERCEIVED TO HAVE SPECIAL NEEDS
IN THE U.K AND THE U.K.

5.1 Children with special needs in urban areas

The Warnock Report used research evidence to indicate that a wide

range of special educational needs was concentrated among children

living in urban areas:

> "A study carried out in 1970 to compare the rates
> of 'behavioural deviance' and psychiatric disorder
> in 10 year old children living in an inner London
> borough with those of the same age living in the
> Isle of Wight found that they were twice as high in
> the former as in the latter. ... The comparative
> study ... also found that the roles of general reading
> backwardness ... and specific reading retardation
> were over twice as high in the inner London borough
> as on the Isle of Wight. A study extending over the
> whole of Inner London conducted by the Inner London
> Education Authority Research Unit using the same
> questionnaire found that the high rate of 'behavioural
> deviance' was not specific to the one borough in
> the other survey. The average rate was found to be
> 19% with rates in different parts of inner London
> ranging from 14.2% to 25.3%. The comparative study
> of children in the inner London borough and on the
> Isle of Wight also found that the rates of general
> reading backwardness (that is 28 months or more
> backward in either accuracy or comprehension) and
> specific reading retardation were over twice as high
> in the inner London borough as on the Isle of Wight:
> 19.0% compared with 8.3% and 9.9% compared with 3.9%
> respectively".[1]

If London is taken to be representative of other cities then we may say

that there is a concentration of children perceived to have special

needs in urban areas. Franks discusses a similar concentration in the

urban areas of the U.S.A.[2]

Given that minority group and working class children are concentrated

in urban areas and that they are the ones more frequently perceived to

have special needs this concentration is perhaps not surprising. Data

from both countries show the differential class and race distribution of

those children perceived to have special needs. To take class first,

in a small scale study of children referred in London as being

maladjusted or disruptive Ford, J., et al concluded that:

> "The most striking feature about the social
> class distribution within the few [special]
> schools was its absence. There was, effec-
> tively, little or no distribution in the
> sense that the overwhelming majority of the
> pupils came from categories IV and V 'semi-
> skilled' and 'unskilled'. There were only
> seven identifiable cases of non-manual work
> [out of one hundred and sixty three cases
> surveyed], and some of these require the
> benefit of the doubt ... It is a most remarkable
> and interesting piece of information that, in
> these areas at least, middle- and upper-class
> children do not become maladjusted".[3]

In a study of black pupils referred to ESN(M) schools in Birmingham,

Tomlinson found that out of a total of forty children, their social

class was as follows: professional/managerial 0; intermediate 2;

skilled non-manual 2; skilled manual 13; semi-skilled 10; unskilled 10;

residual 3.[4] As indicated below Tomlinson is more concerned with the

racial imbalance in groups of children referred to ESN(M) school, but

the class imbalance is quite clear. Given the overlap in many urban

areas between the categories of race and class[5] it is, of course,

difficult entirely to separate the two patterns.

In the U.S.A researchers have tended to examine not class

differentials in referral for special education but differences between

whites, blacks and Hispanics. In the case of perceived mental retar-

dation this data may be summarised, following Rowitz and Gunn in

table form. See table 5.A

Table 5.A. <u>Summary of research on the distribution of perceived</u>
<u>mental retardation among children in the U.S.A[6]</u>

		% Total school population	% Special educ. population	% Mentally retarded population
San Francisco	black	27.8		53.3
St. Louis	black	63.5	76.0	
	Anglo	36.4	24.0	
California	black	8.0		25.0/27.1
	Anglo	72.4		50.0/43.1
	Spanish surname	15.2		23.0/28.2
Midwestern city	black	23.0	38.2	63.9
	Anglo	63.2	49.1	27.4
	Hispanic	12.5	11.7	8.7

The authors' conclusions from their own research would seem then to be reasonably representative:

> "It was that: 1. racial minorities (black) were over-represented in special educational classes; 2. Hispanics were not over-represented in special educational classes; 3. majority students (white) were under-represented in special educational classes; 4. racial minorities (black) were over-represented in classes for the educable mentally retarded; 5. ethnic minorities (Hispanic) were over-represented in classes for the educable mentally retarded; 6. majority students (white) were under-represented in classes for the educable mentally retarded and 7. representation in classes for the trainable mentally retarded were approximately equal for all racial and ethnic groups"[7].

In the U.K the 'ethnic records' of schoolchildren have not been kept nationally since 1972. This is the last year which can be used to compare special education referrals between racial groups. See table 5.B.

Table 5.B Numbers of different racial groups in special schools in England and Wales in 1972.[8]

	All children	"Non-immigrant" children	All "immig-rants"	West Indians	Indians	Pakistanis
Total school population	8,486,629	8,206,757	279,872	101,898	56,193	30,620
Total special school population	122,283	115,628	6,655	4,397	658	443
ESN(M) schools	60,045	56,139	3,906	2,972	284	169
%age of group attending ESN(M) school	0.7	0.68	1.3	2.9	0.5	0.5

The figures indicate a particular concentration of black children in particularly ESN(M) schools. The small-scale study of Ford, J., et al also indicates that West Indian children were over-represented in maladjusted schools in London:

> "The available information from the four special schools identified the ethnic origins of 58 pupils, other than those of mixed, Irish or British parentage. This was 39 per cent of the sample of 163 files and means that, in effect, at least two out of five pupils in the schools came from ethnic minority back-grounds. This is possibly a slight under-estimate because of unidentified cases ... West Indian pupils formed a notable proportion of that two-fifths, and, again ignoring mixed parentage, pupils of West Indian backgrounds represented at least 30 per cent of the sample. Nationally, the latest available figures show that... there were four times as many West Indian pupils in schools for the maladjusted than base figures for the whole population would lead us to expect".[9]

Before going on to discuss conflicts in special education in the U.K and the U.S.A, three broad conclusions can be drawn from national data and small scale studies in the former country and from local data and small scale studies in the latter. Firstly, there are high concen-

trations of pupils perceived to have special needs in urban areas.
Secondly, children perceived to have special needs are disproportionately
and predominantly working class. Thirdly, in both countries, black
children are dramatically over-represented among those perceived to
have special needs. Further information about those pupils perceived
to have special needs can be obtained by considering the way they are
categorised.

Until recently provision in both countries for children considered
to have special educational needs tended to be separate from the main-
stream. In 1977 in England and Wales there were, according to the
D.E.S., 177,117 "pupils ascertained as handicapped and attending
special schools or classes awaiting placement".[10] According to D.E.S
categorisation the children were divided into the following groups:
blind 1,221, partially-sighted 2,456, deaf 4,267, partially hearing
6,006, physically handicapped 16,138, delicate 6,272, maladjusted 20,995,
educationally subnormal medium 81,011, educationally subnormal severe
34,137, epileptic 1,332, speech defect 2,308, autistic 974. However,
as another D.E.S source makes clear, this is far from the total extent
of the provision:

> "Any estimate of the extent of the need for
> special education has also to take into account
> the children who spend at least part of their
> time in special classes set up on the initiative
> of individual schools. In 1976 classes of this
> kind were attached to 10,845 maintained schools
> in England and Wales - nearly 40 per cent of all
> maintained primary, middle and secondary schools.
> They made provision for varying periods of time
> each week, for 494,248 pupils, of whom 458,087
> (4.7 per cent of the school population) had
> difficulties in learning or problems of an emotional
> or behavioural nature, or both. The great majority
> (82 per cent of the 458,087) spent less than half,
> and 12 per cent spent more than three quarters of
> their time in these special classes".[11]

The figure of 177,117 represents almost 2 per cent of the total school

population of England and Wales which was nine millions in 1977.
If this is added to the 4.7 per cent in other special provision then
about 6.7 of the school population at any one time is in contact with
some form of special educational provision. Probably an appreciably
larger number of children come into contact with this provision at
some point in their school lives.

The categories of handicap were abolished when the 1981 Act came
into force in 1983. However, the labels are still widely used in
England and Wales. The Warnock terminology of children with mild
learning difficulties and children with severe learning difficulties
are coming to replace ESN(M) and ESN(S) respectively. Since there
seems to be little here beyond cosmetic change - the abbreviations MLD
and SLD already becoming current - this dissertation retains the old
terminology to avoid confusion.

The majority of the children are grouped in those categories where
definitions are the least clinical and most susceptible to social
construction of administrative convenience. The so-called maladjusted
and ESN(M) children represent more than half of those "ascertained as
handicapped" and those who fall into the exceedingly loose category of
having "difficulties in learning, or problems of an emotional
or   behavioural nature or both" represent nearly all those in non-
ascertained forms of special provision. Furthermore, it is in these
categories, with their loose criteria of assessment, that the greatest
recent growth is taking place. In the U.S.A there has been a rapid
expansion in the number of children diagnosed as hyperactive.[12] In
the U.K there has been a mushrooming of the variously named disruptive
units.[13] It is with this vast majority of children in contact with
special education - namely, in U.K terms, those designated as mal-
adjusted, ESN(M) and those in special classes or units - that this

chapter will be principally concerned. It is this group of children,
rather than those falling into more clinical categories, which is more
likely to be concentrated in urban areas.[14] However it is necessary
to refer also to children in other categories of handicap as the
segregation and stigmatisation to which they are subjected may indicate
the apparently arbitrary limitations of the mainstream school system
and may illuminate the wider social implications of the categorisation
of mental and physical handicap.

Education in special schools is a growing provision likely to
be made available particularly to children living in urban areas. Until
recently separate special education has been perceived to be a matter
of benevolently making the best provision for children who are in
some way 'handicapped'. The number of children in ESN(M) schools
in England and Wales rose from 15,173 to 55,698 between 1950 and 1977;[15]
in the same period the number in so-called schools for the maladjusted
rose from 587 to 13,687.[16] This dramatic expansion of separate special
educational provision has been almost ubiquitously regarded as a solid
improvement in the conditions of the least fortunate. Studies of
special education have tended to focus on the best way of helping
those perceived to have special needs. It seemed to be taken for
granted that they could best be helped together and away from children
in mainstream schools. Such studies have often been psychological or
medical.

An approach to urban education which adopted the conflict frame-
work set out in the previous chapter might lead to a less constricted
analysis of special education. By analysing the conflicts outlined in
the previous chapter it might be possible to avoid concentration on
the differences and imputed deficits of children perceived to have
special needs. This might lead to a consideration of those elements in

mainstream education which make it necessary for a wide range of children to be educated outside them. In what ways are the curricula, pedagogy, organisation and physical fabric of mainstream schools unsuited to so many children with special needs? Can these elements in mainstream schools not be adjusted to accommodate such children without the necessity to segregate them into an entirely separate system? Further, by incorporating the concepts of social class and the state into the analysis, it might be possible to consider the role of such segregation to the reproduction of social stratification and to the expansion of dominant ideologies concerning individualism, intelligence, behaviour, health and normality.

The racial and class inequalities involved in placement in segregated special schooling have given rise to criticism in both the U.S.A and the U.S.[17] In both the U.S and the U.K new policy initiatives are now being implemented. Public Law 94-142 has made it federal policy that children must be educated in the least restrictive environment. In England and Wales The Warnock Report and the ensuing 1981 Education Act have taken a more cautious move in this direction.

These reforms were the result of conflict over and dissatisfaction with the previous pattern of provision. Groups representing the adult handicapped, black parents and special educational interest groups were successful in opposing the previous form of segregation. It is worth looking at the more general criticisms made by these groups before returning to the racial and class aspects. These general criticisms include the arbitrariness of the segregative procedures, their tendency to be determined by the existing provision, and the fact that they were dominated by professionals.

Taking these three points in order, the arbitrariness of the procedures is considered first. As well as reflecting the wider urban

patterns the inequalities of special educational provision indicate

an apparent arbitrariness in classification:

> "In one London borough ten times as many
> children were ascertained as maladjusted
> as in another. Some differences reflect the
> variations in educational problems between
> boroughs, others the way problems are per-
> ceived and handled by teachers and other
> professionals while still others merely
> reflect the fact that the number of children
> identified generally corresponds to the number
> of places available".[19]

Maladjusted, then, despite the fact that its retention as a category

was recommended by Warnock[20] is not a classification with definite

unchanging identity: it is rather a loose label attached to children

according to the tolerance, orientation and training and groups of

professionals and to the extent of provision within a specific local

education authority. Tomlinson has likewise shown the criteria by which

children are ascertained as ESN(M), far from being exclusively those

of intelligence and performance, to be actually primarily those

concerning the appropriateness of a child's behaviour to the school

setting as judged by the headteachers and teachers and endorsed by

educational psychologists.[21] As a final example of categorisation in

England and Wales take the case of Downs syndrome children. Many of

these score on intelligence tests well within the accepted range of

ESN(M), yet they are frequently sent to ESN(S) schools. This seems to

be largely for cosmetic reasons. Such children often look different

and heads of ESN(M) schools may fear that their presence could undermine

the appearance of normality which often helps make their schools

acceptable to pupils and parents. These three illustrations of the

looseness of categorisation are all taken from areas of special

education where a full ascertainment procedure is required. How much

more arbitrary is the process likely to be for those nearly half a

million children placed in remedial classes, disruptive units, oppor-

tunity groups and other forms of segregated 'in school' provision?
It is not being denied that some children behave differently from
others in school or seriously underperform academically, nor, at this
stage, is an explanation being offered for the genesis of these
differences, rather the way in which these differences are categorised
(and consequently provided for) is being analysed as an arbitrary,
differential and socially defined and conflicted process which may have
a profound influence on the life patterns and opportunities of large
numbers of children.

The second issue is that of resources. A benevolent local
authority which has spent a great deal of money building, equipping
and staffing a new special school for a particular category of handicap
is unlikely to discover that there are no children of this designation
in its area. Once the provision is made, pupils are likely to be
categorised to use it. Certainly, some preliminary research may have
been carried out before the decision to open such a school is taken,
but after, say, five years, even with a different population of children
it is likely that the very existence of the provision will have a
significant influence on the numbers of children ascertained. By
contrast, a small isolated rural school, distant from the various special
facilities, may present little alternative but to integrate children
with different special needs. It may indeed be possible for teachers
in the school to undertake this task with flair and success without
dislocating the children from their locality.[22]

Thirdly, the different levels of tolerance on the part of
professionals, heads and teachers may severely influence the process
of categorisation. It has become a truism for instance that what to
one teacher seems like classroom disruption may to another represent
a peak teaching period. It is on these relative levels of tolerance

that the original decision whether or not to refer will depend.
Likewise, educational psychologists have different criteria, often
reflecting widely different and even oppositional theoretical orien-
tations, as, say, between Kleinian analytical and Skinnerian behaviourist
traditions. Some psychologists may invariably use an intelligence
test and be guided by the results, whereas others may be entirely
opposed to their use.[23] These differences may substantially affect
the number and identity of children categorised into various types of
handicap. The processes of ascertainment and categorisation, then, may
well depend upon such relative and subjective influences as whether
a child is liked in school, whether his/her temper tantrums occur in
the playground or in the headteacher's office, whether the educational
psychologist who sees him/her (if one does, because this procedure
is not obligatory unless a formal special school provision is being
made) was converted to Freudianism in a therapy group at college or
has recently read a hard-hitting critique of IQ tests.

To return to the topic of differential placement along lines of
race and class, it may be possible to see these national patterns as
the results of small scale conflict over the processes of special
education. In the case of Boston Weatherley has shown how middle
class parents can exploit even an apparently egalitarian system to ensure
that their children obtain the most expensive and least stigmatising
form of provision.[24] Acceptable appearance, manners and accent and the
possibility of articulate parental opposition may weigh heavily in
the subjective process of ascertainment. If they do not prove sufficient
then middle class parents retain the option of an alternative education
outside the state system. The children who are sent to the segregated
types of provision are generally those from the least affluent social
groups, whom aspirant middle class teachers are all too ready to

stigmatise.[25] The parents of these children are likely to be the
people who have least access to the knowledge, processes and institutions
which could be utilised in conflicts over ascertainment and placement.
The process of ascertainment is a social one, conducted by usually
white, middle class professional doctors, teachers and educational
psychologists on often black working class children. The identification
of a child as potentially eligible for ascertainment depends on the
judgement and expectations of teachers which are essentially constrained
by social class.

> "Professionals depend on their environing
> society to provide them with clients who
> meet the standards of their image of the
> ideal client. Social class cultures, among
> other factors, may operate to produce many
> clients who, in one way or another, fail to
> meet their specifications and therefore
> aggravate one or another of the basic
> problems of the worker-client relation".[26]

5.2 The changing pattern of special educational provision in the United States and England and Wales

During the 1970s conflict over the nature of special educational
provision spread to national and local legislative debates in both
the U.S.A and the U.K and eventually led to some limitations being
placed on the expansion of separate special education. In the U.K
the hurriedly inserted amendment (Section 10) to the 1976 Education
Act pre-empted The Warnock Report and, in the event, exceeded its
recommendations. Public Law 94-142 (The Education for All Handi-
capped Children Act of 1975) was prefigured by legislation at state

level right across the U.S.A.[27] For instance, the Tennessee Code

Annotated, Section 23, Chapter 839, 1972 states,

> "To the maximum extent practicable,
> handicapped children shall be educated
> along with children who do not have handi-
> caps and shall attend regular classes. ...
> Special classes, separate schooling or
> other removal of handicapped children from
> the regular educational environment, shall
> occur only when, and to the extent that
> the nature or severity of the handicap is
> such that education in regular classes,
> even with the use of supplementary aids
> and services cannot be accomplished satis-
> factorily".[28]

In the U.S.A the national policy   of Public Law 94-142 was

made statutory in 1975. In the U.K The Warnock Report of 1978 was

followed by the 1981 Education Act which was implemented in England

and Wales in 1983.

The issue is not simply separate special school provision as

against what is called mainstreaming in the U.S.A and integration

in the U.K. Little would be served by integrating children with

special needs into the mainstream if they are to be taught there a less

appropriate   curriculum with inferior resources and if their

presence is going to lead to fiercer stigmatisation and

stereotyping from their teachers and fellow

pupils. The integration of children with special needs will necessitate fundamental changes in mainstream schools. Heggarty emphasises this aspect of the procedure:

> "The everyday reality of the ordinary school
> is not necessarily one that is conducive
> to the education of pupils with special
> needs, and it behoves those who advocate
> integration to remember this. Again the
> danger of seeing integration in placement
> terms is highlighted: it is not a matter
> of transferring pupils from special to
> ordinary schools, but of remodelling ordinary
> schools so that they can provide for a wider
> range. ... If these pupils are to be
> re-introduced to the mainstream, the ordinary
> school system must change. It must become
> more differentiated, and take on a range of
> functions that it has previously rejected or
> that were not assigned to it". [29]

It may be preferable to see integration as a process rather than an end state:

> "Integration is not simply a new form of
> provision, another option as it were. It
> is a process rather whereby the education
> offered by ordinary schools becomes more
> differentiated and geared to meeting a wider
> range of pupil needs". [30]

In many ways both integration and mainstreaming are part of the yet uncompleted progress towards the common school. If the ideal of comprehensive education is that children from all groups should be educated together regardless of their class, race or performance then children with perceived handicaps may not, with consistency, be excluded from the institutions.[31]

But, as Heggarty suggests, the process of integration will demand fundamental changes in mainstream schools. Adjusting buildings to accommodate wheelchairs, building braille workrooms and purchasing the requisite sound technology for partially hearing pupils are the relatively simple dimensions of this change process. Changing the curriculum

so that it is suited to a wider range of children, and so that it
acknowledges the presence of handicapped people in society with
perceptions neither fetishistic nor paternalistic, may prove a more
radical and difficult task. Adapting pedagogy and school organisation
so as to minimise the possibilities for behaviour incommensurate with
teaching and learning and to maximise the possibilities for level-
appropriate success will also be a prerequisite which will not be
easily achieved.   If the curriculum and pedagogy are to be signifi-
cantly shifted - that is, if Public Law 94-142 and the 1981 Education
Act are to be successfully implemented - there will need to be a
change in the skills and attitudes of teachers who often remain attached
to deficit theories.   This change in skills and attitudes is seen
in this section to be the essential accompaniment of legal and insti-
tutional change if Public Law 94-142 and the 1981 Education Act are to
provide the bases for adequate policy solutions.   The Warnock
Committee emphasised that:

> "It is imperative that every teacher should
> understand that up to one child in five is
> likely to require some form of special
> educational help at some time during his
> school career and that this may be provided
> not only in separate schools or classes but
> also, with suitable support, in the regular
> classes of ordinary schools. ... They must
> also be aware of the importance of working
> closely with parents and with other profes-
> sionals, and non-professionals concerned with
> helping those children who have special needs.
> The positive attitudes required of teachers
> in recognising and securing help for children
> with special educational needs, and the
> necessary skills, must be acquired in the
> course of training". 33

Changes in inservice as well as initial training will certainly be
required. It will be necessary for training courses to seek to help
teachers to understand and criticise deficit theories and related
approaches rather than, as many still do, simply to perpetuate them. It
will be necessary to increase knowledge and experience at all levels
in order to breakdown the prejudice whereby handicapped pupils are
regarded with a mixture of suspicion and pity.

It is important to stress that if integration or mainstreaming were to be successfully established it would benefit far more than those children with a perceived handicap. If so-called normal children are able to learn about handicap and to carry on their everyday school interactions in the presence of other children with a range of perceived handicaps, then their education will surely be considerably extended. The awareness and understanding of diversity necessary in heterogeneous urban society may be considerably increased. People's current prurient fascinations with and repulsion from sickness[34] may well, in the long term, be substantially reduced. The issue then is not primarily that of integration but rather than of an adaptation of mainstream education (particularly in terms of teachers' skills and attitudes) to accommodate a wider diversity of pupils and to make this diversity a positive feature of the educational process. It is probably institutionalised separate special education that has previously been an inhibition on such adaptation. The policy solution would be not simply the integration of all children with special needs back into mainstream schools, but an aspect of that wider adjustment of apparently fossilised educational institutions to meet the many diversities of urban society.

In proposing integration and mainstreaming as processes which could have positive effects on the education of all children it is necessary to consider the differences between legislative frameworks established in the US and those in the UK. Public Law 94-142 established a context within which the various states could establish the facilities whereby children with special needs could be educated in the least restrictive environment and their individual education programmes be drawn up, instrumented and reviewed. Many states, such as Tennessee and Massachusetts, had already established similar legislation and were developing provision. Presented with a rare instance

of enforcable federal legislation on education which called for
increases in expenditure, redistribution of personnel and the initiation
of new proceedings, the states responded with varying degrees of speed
and success. The law was soon tested in the courts[35] and a differential
pattern of provision is now emerging.[36] That this change in institu-
tional provision has brought with it an associated set of diffi-
culties is made clear, in the case of Boston's implementation of
Massachusetts Chapter 766, by Weatherley.[36a]

In England and Wales the recommendations of the Warnock Committee
were more guarded and measured than Section 10 of the 1976 Education
Act, to the replacement of which by the 1981 Education Act they were
eventually to lead. Whilst the Report was perceived to be progressively
in favour of integration, the actual recommendations are far from giving
a firm, unambiguous direction:

> "We propose that special educational
> provision for the children with whom we are
> concerned should, therefore, be understood
> in terms of one or more of three criteria:-
>
> i. effective access on a full or part-time
>   basis to teachers with appropriate qualifi-
>   cations or substantial experience or both;
>
> ii. effective access on a full or part-time
>   basis to other professionals with appro-
>   priate training; and
>
> iii. an educational and physical environment
>   with the necessary aids, equipment and
>   resources appropriate to the child's
>   special needs".[37]

Despite these acknowledgements of the importance of special
education teaching staff, the response of the profession, as mani-
fested both in the position of the unions[38] and in journal articles[39]
was directly conflictual.[40] In fact the Warnock Committee did not
recommend that the existing system be replaced but only that it be
widened. This was to be achieved, in a large measure, by including
those pupils in informal units or receiving remedial education within

the new rubric of children with special educational needs:

> "Thus we are proposing a general framework of
> special education which is much wider than the
> present statutory concept, and within that,
> though an integral part of it, the means of
> safeguarding the interests of the minority of
> pupils whose needs cannot be met within the
> resources generally available in ordinary
> schools. This framework is intended to
> establish once and for all the idea of special
> educational provision, wherever it is made,
> as additional or supplementary rather than, as
> in the past, separate or alternative provision"[41].

In the light of this the provisions of the 1981 Act would seem

to be more far-reaching:

> "Where a local education authority arrange
> special educational provision for a child
> for whom they maintain a statement ... it
> shall be the duty of the authority, if the
> conditions mentioned in subsection(3) below
> are satisfied, to secure that he is educated
> in an ordinary school".[42]

Subsection 3, however, does allow three large qualifications whereby

the continuation of separate special provision may be permitted.

Educating a child in an ordinary school must be compatible with

> "a. his receiving the special educational
>   provision that he requires;
>
> b. the provision of efficient education
>   for the children with whom he will be
>   educated; and
>
> c. the efficient use of resources".[43]

Condition (a) appears to be tautologous and like condition (b) allows

considerable freedom of interpretation. Condition (c) restricts

intervention programs by subordinating their priority to that of saving

public money. Nevertheless, considerable optimism has been expressed

about the potential which the 1981 Act and the subsequent 1983 Circular [44]

offer for change:

> "Our legal system is based on case law -
> the idea that cases which are similar in
> essential respects can be compared. If we
> can point to an example where one group of
> handicapped children is educated effectively
> in ordinary schools by one authority we
> cannot then assert, legitimately, that
> similar children in similar circumstances

> cannot be so educated by another authority
> if it is to remain within the law. Actual
> examples of the practice of integration may
> play an important part in understanding the
> legal implications of the 1981 Act".[45]

However, another opinion,[46] based on an examination of the country's largest urban education authority, the ILEA, points to the inadequacy of the response to the Act and also suggests that a protracted period of litigations may be necessary before it is effectively implemented.

In both the U.S.A and England and Wales evidence seems to be growing that the effects of the two pieces of legislation might be to increase the numbers of children segregated and/or stigmatised rather than to reduce them. Carrier has indicated the growth of special provision in the U.S.A

> "In the 1957-8 school year 2.4 per cent
> of primary and secondary school pupils
> were receiving special education. By
> 1967-8 this was about 4.5 per cent, rising
> to 7.4 per cent in 1970-1 and 8.2 per cent
> in 1978".[47]

Carrier goes on to point out that Public Law 94-142 makes 12 per cent of the student population its limit for those eligible for special education. He suggests that this may lead to a further degree of segregation[48] though here he is surely underestimating the amount of integration now taking place under the terms of the act. In England and Wales too there has been a tendency for apparently integrationist policies to result in increased segregation. This has been shown in the cases of Sheffield,[49] ILEA and Avon.[50] The study by Swann[51] indicates that despite the 1981 Education Act, the numbers of children in segregated special provision actually increased between 1978 and 1982 as compared to the numbers in mainstream schools. Over this four year period, although there were significant reductions in all the clinical categories of handicap except autistic and physically handi-capped, ESN(M) numbers rose by 13.5%, ESN(S) by 8.5% and maladjusted

by 10%.[52] These figures were compiled before the implementation of the act, and it is possible that the trend may ultimately be reversed. However, the Warnock report and the drafting of the act obviously did not serve to inhibit local education authorities from continuing to expand their segregated special provision.

5.3 Conflict over the processes of special education

Having indicated the changes brought about in special education in England and Wales and the U.S.A as a result of large scale political conflict, it is now possible to return to those small scale conflicts within the processes of special education, the participants and issues in which were briefly suggested in the last chapter. The five stage model of referral, assesment, formulation, intervention and evaluation provides a framework within which the principal conflicts in special education, whether integrated or segregated, may be highlighted and questioned. This process model indicates the political and conflictual nature of the decision making procedure at each stage. It is necessary to remember that these five stages are by no means clear cut; in practice they tend chronologically to overlap. For example, an intervention designed to help a child overcome specific reading difficulties, may involve a great deal of re-assessment at various stages of the process which help to make more accurate and up-to-date formulations and thereby to modify the programme.

5.3.1 Referral

There are several crucial questions concerning the procedure of referral and such questions are political as well as technical.[53] Who has the power to refer whom to where?

What is the technical and political derivation of this power? A
frequent course of events is for a teacher to notice difficulties with
a pupil in terms of behaviour or learning progress. The teacher might
then mention these difficulties to a head teacher or someone in
authority with specific responsibility for these matters. If the
actual aim of the teacher is the removal of the child from some or all
lessons either in the interests of the   child, the teacher or the
rest of the class (these are often rationalised as being identical)
then this may involve a further referral outside the school, or a
discussion of a possible placement within the school's own facilities
such as remedial, opportunity or disruptive classes or units which may
be on- or off-site. At this stage there is the possibility for
conflict between those with technical and those with political power
and between either or both of these parties and the person making
the referral. For example a subject or class teacher and the head
might both wish to place a child in the remedial group but the remedial
specialist may object, without necessarily seeing the child, on the
basis that the remedial class is full at the moment. (This, in turn,
might be part of a bid to gain extra staffing, resources or prestige.)
Quite often referrals are made by teachers because they would like to
be relieved of a difficulty in the classroom. Pressure of this sort
from teachers is likely to be opposed by specialists in the school and
by those in authority if they either oppose the practice of removing
children or doubt the impartial wisdom of particular teachers or their
neutrality with regard to a specific child.

    Parents may also refer children and this is more likely to occur
with the various physical handicaps. In these cases the referral is
likely to be, in the first instance, to the family's general practitioner.
However, children with partial hearing loss or with a speech 'defect'

are often not actually referred until they come into contact with the screening processes many local authorities (such as the ILEA) have instituted at reception level. In the case of parental referral to general practitioners or referrals to them as a result of screening investigations then there is a high likelihood, in the UK, that formal special educational procedures may be instituted. In the USA the more flexible and less segregating individual education programme may be called for. Some forms of less formal special provision accept and encourage referrals from older children themselves. Truancy centres in some urban areas, for instance, may locate some of their client children simply as the ones who walk in off the streets and ask to attend because they "can't stand school".[53a] Finally, referral to special provision may come from the police, the courts or social services.[54]

When a child is referred to a specific person this is usually for the purpose of assessment. If the projected placement is within the school, this may be a specialist teacher or counsellor. If the projected placement involves separate special education then referral is likely to be to an educational psychologist or, more rarely, a schools medical officer. The decisions concerning referral then can largely determine the outcome of the assessment process, often irrespective of the ascribed needs of the child. The decision whether or not to make a referral and if so to whom is usually taken by those with technical and political authority within schools. Their decisions are likely to be influenced as much by political as by technical considerations. Questions they might consider could include: are the parents likely to co-operate well with a special education referral or an individual education programme, to ignore it, or to oppose it actively? are teachers likely to organise collective complaints if a certain child, whose behaviour, performance or appearance is considered grossly

inappropriate, is not removed from school? Where a referral is made by a court or by a specially convened case conference there may be conflicts and competitions of interest between the various professions and institutions represented (social services, education, health, juvenile bureau) each either attempting to take control of a child's case or to pass it on to someone else.[55] A child's whole future educational career and hence subsequent life opportunities may depend on political decisions concerning who refers him/her to whom or what. In many cases this is further complicated and made more arbitrary by the pattern of special educational facilities available within an area of the city. Both Swann and Woolfe have shown, in the case of England and Wales, how the pattern of local provision restricts and dictates the types of referral that are possible within a specific area.[56] In other ways too a child's educational career may be determined by fortuitous events: for instance, in the USA, a child manifesting behaviour which the authorities take to be confrontational may find himself classified as a delinquent if this is first manifested to the police, as "hyperactive" if it is brought to the attention of a medical practitioner by his/her parents or teachers, or in need of an individual education programme if a schools counsellor, teacher or psychologist is the first to take notice. A child who cannot hear very well in one school or classroom may be asked to sit near the front, in another a referral may be made which will eventually lead him/her to spend two-thirds of his/her school career in a specialist unit twenty miles away from home.

This arbitrariness of placement due to the processes of referral is a feature which may be ameliorated by the recent legislation in both countries. The concept of special educational need and the institution of individual education programmes may lead to greater flexibility in referral and to a more precise consideration of pupils'

individual needs as against the orientation of professionals or the inclination to utilise existing provision.

5.3.2. Assessment.

Assessment then may take place after the important decisions have already been made or when their range has been severely restricted. Seminal questions concern who has the power to administer assessment and who has the right to consent or dissent. In the UK, for instance, only educational psychologists are allowed to administer IQ tests and this has become the basis both for their academic training, now usually certified at masters level, and for the powerful and lucrative professional position they have developed in local education authorities over the last fifty years.[57] Neither the academic legitimations nor the high pay and status are divorced from the socially pivotal procedures they administer and their function as social gatekeepers:

> "For if the human wreckage produced by the
> way society is organised can be discreetly
> removed, processed and returned in re-usable
> form by these social garbage workers, then
> not only will the service avoid producing
> disruption itself: it will prevent the
> disturbance which might result if the evidence
> of the political system's failure to meet
> human needs were felt in our midst".[58]

The role of psychologists is not so pivotal in the USA where, in many states, IQ tests have been effectively banned. Questions as to the impartiality of the instruments were removed from the technical profes-sionals to the legal authority of the Supreme Court of California.[59] The overlap between technical and political authority, vested in educational psychologists in the UK, is no longer replicated in the USA. Exclusive use of IQ tests by educational psychologists in the UK has become more entrenched as medical practitioners are dissuaded from and become more reluctant to use them. The technical and political dimensions of the

educational psychologists' authority has actually been reinforced by
the 1981 Act. Where a local education authority has no adviser and
the summary and recommendation part of the new procedure is left to
educational psychologists their power has become formidable. The
methodologies and instruments of assessment may be discussed in five
main groups; clinical procedures, consultations, observation, ques-
tionnaires and tests. It may be helpful briefly to enumerate them in
order to attempt to demonstrate that they are far from totally neutral
and objective. Indeed much of this sub-section could be seen as a demon-
stration of the way in which political power in a conflict situation
serves to legitimate technical authority which might otherwise be
palpably questionable.

Medical methods of assessment would include hearing and sight
tests as well as those more specifically clinical. One risk with such
methods is that the results and possible subsequent categorisations[60]
may appear to be endorsed by the science and status of the medical
profession. Batemen suggests that such endorsement is little help in
educating a child:

> Medical classifications such as MDB are as
> irrelevant to educational practice as educa-
> tional classifications are to medical
> practice. To ask which educational methods,
> materials or techniques are most appro-
> priate to children with MBD is analogous
> to asking which medications are best for
> children in the fastest arithmetic group or
> which **dental** techniques are best for
> children with auditory memory problems".[61]

Consultations simply denote conversations which the assessor might
have with heads, teachers, parents or children to elicit descriptions
of behaviour or learning patterns and histories. Evidence from case
studies[62] would seem to indicate the relative weight given by assessors
in favour of professional opinion as against the accounts of parents.
Assessors need to be skilled in separating information from prejudice.

A technique which is apparently more impartial and which has grown

in popularity on both sides of the Atlantic is classroom observation procedure.[63] Here the assessor - often an educational psychologist - attempts to observe the referred child in interaction with the teacher and other children in the classroom. Attempting not to draw attention to him/herself the assessor may use a range of observational schedules and various criteria (for example, time spent on- or off-task, time spent out of seat, number of questions directed to teacher or other pupils) in observing a class over a length of time which may be as little as one lesson or may extend beyond a week. It may be claimed that the resulting data are objective and that they have the positivistic virtue of being measurable, and therefore of providing a baseline against which subsequent replications of the observation procedures may be used to ascertain any change in behaviour or performance. However, the presence of the observer in the classroom may prove to have an inhibiting or exciting effect on the child or group so that the performances so meticulously recorded are far from representative. For this reason a more sophisticated version of this assessment technique consists in instructing the class teacher or teachers in the methods of classroom observation. Some specific and timed observation then becomes part of their teaching repertoire.[64] Here assessment has some overlap with intervention as in the process of observation the teachers' perceptions of the classroom situation may alter. The teachers may then conclude either that a child is less of a problem than they had originally considered or that there are a range of things which they could easily do in the course of lessons which would considerably improve the behaviour or performance.

Apart from IQ tests there is a wide range of tests, questionnaires, grids and scales which may be used in the assessment process. Achievement tests may be used, to confirm a teacher's impression of a child's

academic process, by comparing the pupil's performance in specific

subjects with national norms. In the USA and the UK reading tests in

particular are used to show how a child's performance compares with

that of others, and this is usually expressed as a reading age.[65]

Other questionnaires may be used to try to provide some measure of the

child's classroom behaviour. Two such questionnaires widely used in

the UK are the British Social Adjustment Guide and the Rutter B Scale.[66]

Such instruments are usually completed by the teacher or teachers and

hence they give not a measure of the child's behaviour but rather a

measure of particular teachers perception of this behaviour within the

selective context in which they have come into contact with it. Tests

and questionnaires which actually purport to give some indication of a

child's personality include the Children's Apperception Test, the

Rorschasch ink-blots and the Junior Eysenck Personality Questionnaire.[67]

The categories of such instruments are often loose and subjective:

either too much is left to the interpretation of the assessor or

indeed to the theories of the person who compiled the questions.

Although the use of these instruments is in practice largely confined to

educational psychologists, they are nevertheless, nearly all available

for use by teachers. Indeed a knowledge and experience of such

instruments may well be a large part of the claim to professional

expertise on the part of a remedial specialist or schools counsellor.

This expertise then may be founded on a somewhat unquestioning accep-

tance of their usefulness, validity and impartiality. It may, further-

more, lead to a confusion of completing instruments with measuring

children.

There is already an extensive literature criticising the concepts

and uses of IQ tests.[68] Many of the objections may be summed up in Judge

Peckham's ruling of October 1979 against the Californian education

authorities:

> "defendents have utilised standardised
> intelligence tests that are racially
> and culturally biased, have a discrimi-
> natory impact against black children,
> and have not been validated for the
> purpose of essentially permanent place-
> ments of black children into educationally
> dead-end, isolated and stigmatising
> classes for the so-called educable
> mentally retarded".[69]

The judge addresses the issue of general intelligence and suggests that

it is impossible to measure it. Prevalently used tests have in no way

succeeded in eliminating cultural bias,

> "Rather, the experts have from the
> beginning been willing to tolerate or
> even encourage tests that portray
> minorities, especially blacks, as
> intellectually inferior".[70]

He places the IQ testing movement within its historical and social

context:

> "We must recognise from the outset that
> the history of the IQ tests, and of
> special education classes built on IQ
> testing, is not the history of neutral
> scientific discoveries translated into
> educational reform. It is, at least in
> the early years, a history of racial
> prejudice, of Social Darwinism, and of
> the use of a scientific 'mystique' to
> legitimate such prejudices".[71]

There are at least four major areas of criticism of IQ tests:

these concern the concept of general intelligence, the statistical

methodology of the scoring, the cultural bias of the questions, and

the social uses to which the results of the tests are put. It is

difficult any longer to accept that any function of general intelligence (g)

may be clinically related to the working of the human brain. Evans

and Waites assert that

> "The most compelling evidence comes from
> clinical case studies where localised
> brain damage has been shown to lead to the

> loss of certain cognitive skills, while
> others remain intact. If IQ tests are
> given to these patients the typical finding
> is that there is abnormally poor performance
> for certain types of test questions, but
> normal performance for the remainder. Damage
> in different regions of the brain has selec-
> tive effects on different IQ subtests, but
> there does not appear to be any area which
> can be regarded as a location for g. Damage
> to such an area would have to have a similar
> deleterious effect on all test items having
> a high 'g loading', but it now seems unlikely
> that any such area exists". [72]

The argument that the presence of a g factor is indicated by the high

degree of internal validity between the various subtest scores of IQ

tests and the overall scores overlooks the fact that the tests have

been designed, developed and refined specifically and expressly to

exhibit this validity. This reflects the aims of the test constructers

not the nature of human intelligence. It may be more helpful to concep-

tualise human beings as possessing a range of different capacities and

skills rather than a general intelligence factor.

Statistical objections to IQ tests concern the self-fulfilling

nature of the distribution of scores. To claim that IQ scores are

spread on a normal distribution curve which therefore relates them to

various human physical attributes is to ignore the fact that they have

been adjusted and refined precisely so that scores should fall on this

curve. Furthermore,

> "Galton's most basic numerical assumption -
> that the normal curve of frequency
> applied to psychological variables - has
> never been adequately shown to be true.
> Without this assumption, ordinal scales
> could not be converted to equal intervals,
> nor mental tests scaled in terms of stan-
> dard deviations or some fraction thereof,
> nor intelligence be conceived of as a
> quantity to be measured against a norm". [73]

The most widely used tests in the USA and UK are the Stanford-

Binet and the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children. Cultural bias

would seem to be evident from a simple examination of the questions on these tests:

> "For example, the vocabulary subtests ask
> the meaning of words such as catacomb,
> vesper, chattel, traduce, perfunctory,
> casuistry and parterre. The information
> subtests ask, among other things, what is a
> hieroglyphic, what is a lein, and who
> discovered the South Pole. It is difficult
> to believe that the inventors of these tests
> really thought that they were fair to
> children and adults of all social classes,
> that they would all have been equally likely
> to come across the information required to
> answer them correctly. Some even more
> extraordinary examples occur in the
> 'comprehension' subtests, which include the
> following questions: Why is it good to put
> money in the bank? Why is it generally
> better to give money to an organised charity
> than to a street beggar?"[74]

The intelligence which the tests purport to measure is socially and racially biased being defined in terms of the knowledge of the dominant group and ultimately in terms of the economic organisation on which their position rests.[75] That these instruments should have been used in the culturally and linguistically heterogeneous cities of the UK and the US is a vivid example of the institutionalisation of ethno-centric and indeed racist procedures. Since these instruments and the theory from which they derive have been widely used to determine general educational policy,[76] to make decisions concerning groups of children and even to support eugenics legislation[77] they must be regarded as crucial procedures and legitimationsin both countries for social and economic stratification along racial lines.[78] The tests and the concept of intelligence are crucial dimensions of the over-arching ideology of individualism[79] and form part of the everyday constraints within which reality is familiarly constructed in the UK and the USA. Yet alternative perceptions are available:

> "Many aspects of human intelligence, such
> as writing a poem, designing an experiment,

> solving a mathematical equation, or
> preparing a balance sheet can be regarded
> as both the work of an individual (or
> sometimes a group of individuals, or even
> a computer) and as a product of a cultural
> tradition. Looked at in this way the
> construction of a culture fair test of
> intelligence, and also the implicit assump-
> tion that intelligence is a measurable
> property of individuals, may be simply a
> vanity on the part of psychometricians".[80]

The wider uses to which IQ tests have been put have been criticised
by Kamin.[81] With regard to education they have been criticised by
Simon[82] for their use in the UK where they became one of the pillars
of the 11+ selection exams whereby almost the entire secondary education system
was stratified for decades. IQ tests were used for a form of selection
which, in addition to being socially divisive and having an inhibiting
influence on the primary curriculum, also carried a large risk of self-
fulfilling prophecy. The potentiality for labelling may still be seen
in the use to which these and similar tests are put for streaming in
the UK and tracking in the USA. With specific regard to special
education, the results of IQ tests remain the major assessment element
in the placement of children in the largest special school category
[ESN(M)] in the UK.[83] This use of testing seems to have increased as
its use for secondary school selection has decreased:

> "over the past thirty years sociologists
> have devoted much time and energy to
> demonstrating the inequalities of selec-
> tion by 'brightness' in education while
> ignoring the progressive removal of more
> and more children for special education
> on the grounds of defect, dullness, handicap
> or special need".[84]

5.3.3. Formulation.

The process of formulation is perhaps parallel to diagnosis in
medical practice. It implies that after assessment has taken place
there is a process of reflection and possibly discussion in which
assessment findings are correlated and possible intervention and

placement strategies are considered in the light of how far they match
the specific individual special needs of the child in question. That
this process has not taken place with any reliable regularity is
indicative of the degree of faith, which those responsible for decisions
with regard to special education have placed in their assessment
techniques and instruments. In the past if a black Creole-speaking
eleven year old scored 69 on the Full Scale of the Wechsler Intelligence
Scale for Children there was all too little discussion or consideration,
in cities such as London, before s/he was sent to an ESN(M) school.
Recent legislation in both the US and the UK has sought to structure
and improve the processes of consultation and formulation.

The detailed consultation processes laid down in Public Law 94-142
are a substantial guarantee that the formulation process will not be
neglected in the ascertainment of special needs in the US. However,
the consultation and multi-disciplinary assessments which are required
by the law may lead to conflicts in case conferences between professionals
of different orientations, rather than to the formulation of an agreed
consensus. In such conflicts the decision will ultimately rest not
with the person who has the most detailed knowledge of the child under
consideration or the one who has the most detailed perception of his/her
special needs, it will rest with the representative of the professional
group which has the institutionalised power of making firm recommen-
dations for provision or placement. (In the UK educational psycholo-
gists have gradually been assuming this power and they are now confirmed
in it by the 1981 Education Act.[85]) In the US, however, no specific
professional group has this power, and, more importantly, the parents
must be consulted at the stage of formulation. Indeed in the US it
might seem to be the parents who have the ultimate decision making
authority. However, as Weatherley has shown, financial constraints and

the practices of street-level bureaucrats have limited the authority
given to parents under Public Law 94-142.

> "Thus pressure to conserve resources and
> maintain predictability and control of
> the work environment contribute to a
> domination of the parent's (sic) planning
> role, the ascendancy of those who administer
> and interpret tests, and the channelling
> of children into predetermined service
> categories".[86]

In the UK the 1981 Act has brought parents into the formulation
process. They are to be consulted by professionals, they are to have
access to files and materials written about their children[87] as well
as to the 'statement' of special needs and they have rights of appeal
both to the local authority and ultimately to the Secretary of State
for Education against decisions with which they disagree. There is
some chance then that this may lead to professionals collaborating with
parents in the process of formulation rather than seeking to mani-
pulate them. With access to professional records parents may be able
to play an important part in the decision making process which affects
their own child. However, Weatherley's account of experience in the
USA should provide a note of caution. Furthermore, neither the 1981
Act nor the 1983 Circular remove the power of local education authorities
to enforce attendance at special schools,[88] so parental wishes may
still be ultimately overruled.

5.3.4. <u>Intervention</u>. Within the medical model the stage of inter-
vention may be known as treatment or therapy. Its orientation may be
educational, social work, medical, psychiatric, psychological or
psychodynamic. Segregated provision may be categorised according to
four criteria: residential or non-residential, full-time or part-
time, temporary (that is with a date of return to mainstream agreed in
advance) or permanent, within the building and institutional framework

or outside it. In many ways the whole debate of this chapter concerning mainstreaming and integration refers to intervention. To avoid repetition then two examples are chosen (community homes with education in the UK and behaviour modification in both countries) to illustrate current practice. [89] Due to the implementation of recent legislation practice in both countries is changing rapidly. [90]

In the UK young offenders may be sent for custodial sentences to Community Homes with Education (C.H.E.s). Many such institutions now consider themselves to be therapeutic[91] and education is seen to be an important aspect of the treatment they offer. C.H.E.s provide education on-site for the incarcerated children and adolescents who therefore rarely attend local schools. The curriculum in such institutions is not comparable to that of the mainstream due to limitations of resources and staff skills. The children spend their school hours with the same judicially deemed deviant peer group with whom they are living. Since many C.H.E.s are situated in remote rural areas, urban children sentenced to attend them, deprived of contact via the neighbourhood schools, often meet few people and acquire little familiarity with the local environment. Their remedial and thera- peutic curriculum, likely to include subjects such as animal husbandry, horticulture and pottery, may be of dubious relevance to them when they are returned to the city. The purpose of magistrates and social workers in deciding to send children to C.H.E.s is presumably not punitive.[92] Children are sent to C.H.E.s for periods of up to several years at a time to 'help' them to become people who do not break the law. Yet when they are sent to this highly expensive provision they are also being sentenced to an inferior education, a deficient curriculum, a restricted peer group and a commensurate constraint on

life chances. Perhaps few such children would have succeeded in mainstream school, but their opportunities there would not have been restricted as a consequence of decisions by juvenile magistrates. In considering the high rates of recidivism it might not be inappropriate to recall that these children have been deprived of even the chance of educational and commensurate job success through the accepted channels. Placement in C.H.E., may be seen as a sentence to inferior education.

Whereas C.H.E. placement represents the negative aspect of segregated educational provision, behaviour modification might offer some of the techniques necessary to enable children with special needs to succeed in mainstream schools. Behaviour modification has become a contentious issue in special education and in a much wider social context. It has been claimed that techniques have been developed to resolve, or at least ameliorate a wide range of learning and behaviour difficulties. If it can be shown that its success is as great as its adherents claim it presents teachers and educationists with a dilemma which is ethical rather than technical. Is it acceptable to alter children's behaviour to a pattern which is different from what they would wish? Does this not interfere with cherished freedoms of the individual? But if a child's choices are going to lead to an ESN(M) school or a junior borstal does it not seem to be justifiable to usurp the child's freedom of choice at one stage so that s/he may have a vastly increased repertoire of choices at a later stage? If a behaviour modification programme or a programmed learning scheme with contingent positive reinforcement can help to keep a child in touch with his/her peers and with the mainstream curriculum then surely in the long run it actually gives him/her a freedom of choice over a range of options that s/he would not otherwise have had. In fact many of the behaviour programmes used in schools,

particularly with adolescents, are actually consentual. They are based on contracts which are often signed by the child, the programme designer and another party such as a head teacher or parent. Of course it is still possible to assert that a child may be pressurised into this choice, but the success of the programmes depends on the motivation of the child so coercion would be counterproductive.

Behaviour modification is an important issue for two reasons. Firstly, the libertarian position with its antagonism to behaviourism and behaviour modification may actually be self-defeating in that its efforts may serve to restrict the range of interventions available to children with special needs. Such a restriction could well encourage the existence of a great deal of custodial and residential provision. Secondly, the interventions advocated by behaviourists are in many ways particularly suited to mainstream schools. Purists might have difficulty in acknowledging such strategies to be part of a scientifically oriented behaviour modification[96] but they do represent a series of positive techniques which are readily available to class and subject teachers in mainstream schools to help children with a variety of special needs. Indeed it could be argued that many of the techniques of behaviour modification in the classroom actually represent little more than good pedagogical practice which has always stressed a positive approach, rewards, structured progress and careful ongoing assessment. Perhaps indeed if these skills were more prevalent among mainstream teachers in the UK and the US, not as an emergency kit for dealing with designated problems, but as part of their everyday teaching repertoire, then more children would be likely to have greater success both in their academic and social development. Such skills, ironically, would probably obviate the need for more formal behaviour programmes of the Berger type[97] and for the more segregated forms of intervention for children with special needs.

5.3.5 <u>Evaluation</u>

Evaluation may refer to both the case of an individual child and to the effectiveness of various types of provision. Public Law 94-142 calls for a regular review of each pupil's case. There are no such safeguards in the U.K except where they have been insisted upon by individual local education authorities, headteachers or teachers-in-charge. The 1981 Act makes no demand for 'statements' once made to be regularly reviewed.[98] In order for a child to return to mainstream schooling it will still be necessary for someone to demand that the statement be revised and an alternative placement attempted. When teachers in a mainstream school are attempting to have a child removed there is some pressure on this process which normally causes it to retain its momentum. Whether there is often such forceful pressure to return a child to a mainstream school is more doubtful. Parents and children may not always be aware of the possibility of reversing the process and the professionals concerned may have no interest in initiating it. Heads of special schools are unlikely to see their schools as restricting environments which are affecting children adversely, so they will rarely initiate this process. The educational psychologist is likely to lose all contact with the child once placement has been achieved and conflict thereby apparently resolved: indeed this may be perceived to be the end of intervention and involvement.[99] Where a local education authority appoints an adviser or advisers in response to the 1981 Act and where, as is likely, they take the responsibility of being the "named person"[100] then it is possible that an advocate will exist who could insist on regular reviews of statements. This will depend on financial and administrative constraints in specific areas and crucially on the interpretation of the clauses in the 1981 Act which enforce integrated provision.[101] The central questions once again, are not only technical

but concern power. By what level of success against what criteria may
a child be returned from special to mainstream school? In practice
this often means who has the authority to decide whether a child
should return to mainstream school.

Whereas, at referral, the loose procedures of remedial classes
and off-site units were seen to be likely to place a child at a dis-
advantage, at the stage of evaluation and reintegration, this very laxity
may prove advantageous. Where no formal procedures are necessary and
there are closer contacts with the teachers in the mainstream (as there
are for a remedial department, say, as against an ESN(M) school) it is
often possible to experiment and to adopt methods of re-integration. A
child may be tried back with his peers for some subjects initially;
this may then be increased to more time and the speed of re-integration
slowed or hastened according to the results. Any sort of part-time,
local provision is likely to have advantages in this respect over full-
time and/or distant interventions. Under the 1981 Act children within
such provisions are likely to have been made subjects of statements and
there is some risk that this may result in a decrease in flexibility.

But evaluation should be applied not merely to the children but
to the various types of special education. Do special schools actually
work? Of course it is almost impossible to agree the criteria by
which this question could be answered. But it is reasonable to ask:
are the benefits which a child receives from a special school greater
than those which would accrue from individualised assistance in the
mainstream? and are the social restrictions placed on a child by atten-
dance at a special school more tolerable than the risks of a child being
seen to be different in the mainstream? Some criteria may be agreed
here such as increase in reading age scores or on achievement tests,
improvement of teacher ratings on behaviour scales or differences, as
measured by questionnaires, in social skills or self-esteem.[102] Given

the quantity of educational research the lack of data on these evaluative issues is surprising.[103] If a child of eleven has a reading age of seven is his/her reading likely to improve most in the next two years by leaving him/her in his/her normal class without special help? by providing some help in specific lessons? by withdrawing him/her part-time to a remedial class? by full-time placement in a remedial class? by attendance at an ESN(M) school? by psychotherapy? by social work with his/her family? by involving the parents in a reading and listening scheme? In the case of each intervention how long would progress be maintained after its cessation? Even if the answers to these questions were known there would be many other considerations before making a decision on a child's future, but some data on which to base a prediction would be helpful.

Were such information available this is not to say that decision makers would invariably be aware of it or take notice of it. It is many years since Tizard's evaluation demonstrated the ineffectiveness of child guidance clinics (to take a different but related provision) to help referred children,[104] yet this has hardly inhibited their contin- uation and even growth: professional interests may have some importance in determining the existence of a provision whether or not it is successful in actually assisting those to whom it is ostensibly addressed.

5.4. The Generation and Perception of Special Educational Needs.

The discussion of the processes of special education has focussed on the individual child, yet it has been repeatedly emphasised that such a concentration may have its limitations. Furthermore, it has been anticipated that if integration and mainstreaming were to become effectively implemented policies this would necessitate wide changes in the curriculum, pedagogy and organisation of mainstream schools. Such changes might ultimately

benefit the education of all children. Perhaps it might be possible

at this point to achieve two things; to provide a

perspective on the perception and generation of special educational

needs, and, at the same time, provide some indication of those changes

which may well be necessitated in mainstream schools.[105] Implicit in this

perspective is the notion that a large part of the generation of

special needs actually takes place within school, and that those

handicaps which children bring to schools become more or less important

according to the way in which they are perceived in the school setting.[106]

However, at this point it is necessary to narrow the frame slightly by

taking as examples for discussion only what Tomlinson calls the "non-

normative" categories of special needs, that is "mild educational

subnormality, slow learners, maladjusted or disruptive".[107] As far as

the UK, at least, is concerned this includes the vast majority of those

pupils likely to be perceived to have special needs.[108] The elements

operant on the generation of special educational needs may be grouped

into two categories, those within school, and those outside.

5.4.1. School Elements.

In the school setting there are four elements potentially involved

and each of these could provide a possible focus for change: the child,

the class group, the teacher/s and the organisation of the school as a

whole. Individual pupils have different progress rates in different

subjects, but that with regard to reading can be crucial to their

academic success and may well influence the pattern of their behaviour

in school. Often children who fail at schoolwork, particularly at

learning to read and write, become involved in a cycle of frustration

which may lead to them being categorised as maladjusted.[109] Developments

which assist the successful teaching of reading to all children, such

as the growth of school-sponsored parent-child reading schemes,[110]

may well have the further beneficial effect of reducing the numbers of
pupils ultimately to be perceived as having special educational needs.

The class or peer group of a child can set him/her up to disturb
or reject lessons, can give esteem for disruption or low achievement
and can generate group attitudes which it is difficult for teachers to
counteract.[111]   Children who underachieve or whose behaviour is consi-
dered disruptive are recognised as failing to make positive or balanced
relationships with ther teachers, but often too they have failed to make
friends with their peers and have become the isolate, the victim, the
clown or the bully. Changes in schools might not be able to prevent the
development of pupil "counter-cultures"[112] and indeed this may not be
desirable. What is necessary is that there should be points of contact
between the pupil's peer group life and the organisation of the school.
Reynolds has shown how mutual tolerance between staff and pupil groups
seems to be an essential ingredient of a successful school.[113]

There are ways in which an unskilled teacher can generate educational
failure and/or disruptive classroom behaviour.[114]   The teacher may
concentrate on an inappropriate, uninteresting or frustrating curriculum,
may be unaware of individual learning and behaviour differences or
fail to respond to them in a differential way, or may lack a
sympathetic classroom manner or the ability to communicate with and
listen to pupils. The long term effects of such teaching on class
groups and individual children is to increase the likelihood of
learning and behaviour difficulties even in lessons which are more
successfully presented and managed. Change in teachers' styles, skills
and curriculum presentation is possible within schools in the USA and
UK. The techniques already exist and are being used in some schools
which can probably help to reduce the number of children who come to
be considered to have special educational needs.[115]

That school organisations can have a differential influence on the generation of special educational needs is shown by the differential roles of referral and by research into relative school success.[116] The way in which class groups are organised within a school is important: rigid streaming is likely to lead to labelling, and low expectations in the less academic classes or groups.[117] Timetabling too frequent movements between classrooms or sites is likely to encourage restlessness and provide opportunities for undesired behaviour. Constraints on the curriculum[118] may make the teachers' task more difficult. Anonymous peripheral care systems which are actually geared to enforcing structure and discipline can also contribute to the generation of difficulties as can a negative school "ethos".[119] Support from senior and more · experienced colleagues can often help younger teachers through difficulties, but unfortunately such help is still often unavailable.[120] Recommendations for changes in school organisations to provide a more successful education for a wider spectrum of children are not lacking on either side of the Atlantic.[121]

5.4.2. <u>Out of School Elements.</u>

In briefly discussing the elements outside the school which are operant on the generation of this group of special needs it is necessary to bear in mind that a too precipitate use of this range of explanation is likely to prove unhelpful.[122] Indeed, this is one of those areas where deficit theories have proliferated. It has been suggested that lack of consistency in parental authority, a punitive approach to undesirable behaviour, family separation or bereavement can all establish a predisposition in a child towards learning and/or behaviour difficulties.[123] It is not easy for educational methods to be used to improve this element but the possibility of contacting a child's parents and seeking their collaboration is raised. Nevertheless it

should be remembered that it is events and attitudes in schools which are usually responsible for precipitating a predisposition into a referral.

The inner city area itself may perhaps be seen as an element in the generation of special educational needs. The environment of poverty and decay, poor housing, busy roads, street crime and limited employment opportunities have been seen to produce stress on pupils and teachers.[124] The inner city is the point, in the U.K and the U.S.A, at which the crises of capitalism have their sharpest effects. All parties in urban schools operate under national socio-economic and political structures. These structures influence the schools directly through legislation and financial constrainst as well as indirectly through their effects on the inhabitants of the inner city. At this point considerations of social class and the state[125] can again be included in the analysis.

5.6 An example of conflict in special education: The attitude of the NUT to integration in England and Wales

This section looks in some detail at one particular conflict within special education. It is concerned with the attitude taken by the National Union of Teachers to the integration of children perceived to have special needs in England and Wales. In addition to press statements it draws on three main documents published between 1977 and 1984.[126] These documents are well presented glossy publications which are issued not only to union representatives, but are made available to the general public. They are usually given a good deal of coverage in the educational press.

The presentation of the publications is not that of a partial, trade unionist case (though the two later ones are subtitled "a union guide") but rather of a contribution to a public debate. The impli-

cation is that the union is commenting as a neutral, informed, academic voice on an issue of educational concern. The union purports to be presenting a professional argument and not defending the sectarian interests of its members. The union is claiming a degree of impartiality, a degree of concern for the education of children perceived to have special needs which is somehow detached from the interests of its members. Thus, although the 1977 document does not conceal its lack of enthusiasm for Section 10 of the 1976 Education Act,[127] its main concern appears to be for the quality of children's education:

> "The Union firmly believes however that
> unless sufficient care and attention are
> taken, Section 10 could mark not a progress,
> but a decline in the provision of special
> education, and a subsequent deterioration
> of educational opportunities for handicapped
> children. It is not sufficient to claim
> that a handicapped child can cope with an
> integrated environment. Before special
> educational provision is increased in ordinary
> schools, it must be established that the
> children involved will do at least as well,
> if not better, than in a segregated special
> school. It is essential that decisions on
> placement and provision shall be based on
> the needs of individuals rather than on
> categories of handicap".[128]

The detached stance adopted by the union conceals the fact that changes from segregation to integration would undoubtedly affect the real interests of many of its members.

If these documents are indicative of a conflict then what interests might the NUT be seen to be representing? It is fairly obvious that they will be concerned to defend those teachers who are members of the union, but how are their interests involved in the shift from segregation to integration proposed by Section 10 and again, less strongly, by the 1981 Education Act? There are two aspects to this, concerning those teachers in special schools and those working in the mainstream.

Teachers in special schools have a preferential salary structure which includes a special school allowance; they usually work shorter hours than teachers in the mainstream; they have smaller teaching groups; in many cases they have better budgeting levels, preferable working conditions and a greater degree of ancillary help; they may have better access to forms of in-service training and particularly secondments as well as greater support from inspectors and advisers outside the school. These benefits for teachers in segregated special schools have been fought for by the NUT and they are certainly ones which it would need to defend, if it were to retain the support of its many members in this sector. The NUT might also be seen as wishing to defend those teachers in mainstream schools who consider that their professional duties are made unacceptably arduous by the behaviour or performance of certain children. Such teachers would see the possibility of the integration of handicapped pupils as presenting them with a whole range of difficulties with which they did not feel competent to cope. They would see the smooth running of their classrooms and schools as under threat. (This attitude may in fact be strengthened by clear anti-handicap prejudice.)

Behind the NUT's air of detachment, it is these two sets of interests which its publications set out to defend and further. The 1977 document gives this assessment of segregated special education:

> "The Union is of the opinion that the majority
> of children at present in special schools are
> receiving the best attention possible, suited
> to their educational and physical needs. The
> Union is further aware that special schools
> are currently making every effort to integrate
> the child as fully as possible into the larger
> community. Even in a residential school there are
> frequent weekend visits home, close contact
> with the parents at all times, and many oppor-
> tunities for outside visits. Many special
> schools try to promote social integration by
> having guide and scout parks which are also
> attended by local children, and by planning

> other shared activities, and the Union is
> very much in favour of such schemes.
> Special schools devote most of the time-
> table of the older children to such things
> as work experience courses, health education
> and practical subjects to help prepare them
> for an independent existence, and there may
> also be opportunities for them to share
> certain lessons or facilities with an
> ordinary school nearby". [129]

Weekend visits home and the local scout and guide groups make the
desperate level of the special pleading here fairly obvious. In
defending the position of teachers in mainstream schools the union's
language is even more overt. Again, the 1977 document is clear:

> "Legislation cannot ensure that teachers in
> ordinary schools are emotionally, tempera-
> mentally, socially or practically equipped
> to care properly for a range of handicapped
> children. Many capable and gifted teachers
> may not be suited to this work, and may
> even feel repulsed at the handicapped child,
> especially for examply the dribbly or smelly
> child". [130]

It might be wondered if the NUT would so readily rush to defend a
teacher who was "repulsed" by a black child: the anti-handicap
prejudice in these statements belies the NUT's attempt to present a
stance of neutral detachment. The later documents are not as offensive
as this one and they claim, at least at the level of rhetoric, a
greater commitment to integration. However, they also are mainly
concerned with defending the two interest groups identified here. Not
surprisingly the 1977 document concludes that: "The Union regrets
that it therefore may appear reluctant to accept the idea of integ-
ration". [131] Subsequent statements seem to have been designed to
conceal this appearance in a commitment to the "idea" of integration,
whilst trying to prevent the development of the reality.

Having identified the NUT as one party in a conflict over the
education of children perceived to have special needs, two questions
follow: with what other group or groups are they in conflict? and what

is the precise object of the conflict? Following Rex's conflict

framework (outlined in Chapter four) groups are seen as coming into

existence through conflict. The issue of the conflict will then, to

a certain extent, generate the groups. Therefore the issue of the

conflict will be dealt with first.

The issue seems to be simply that of integration or segregation,

with the union responding to various acts of government, Section 10

of the 1976 Act, the setting up of the Warnock Committee, the 1981 Act,

Circular 1/83. Unfortunately on this simple issue the NUT seems to

want to have it both ways: as an impartial, progressive commentator

it wants to be in favour of integration; as defender of the interest of

its members it wants to oppose it. As has been indicated above this

latter tendency is the most prominent, particularly in the 1977 document.

In terms of the processes of special education outlined above, the issue

in conflict would appear, then, to be primarily the nature of inter-

vention. However, in the 1984 document the union also recognises the

importance of the assessment process. It advocates that teachers play

a prominent role in "influencing the content of statements": [132]

> "Teachers have an opportunity, and indeed
> a responsibility, to make recommendations
> about the provision of specialist teaching
> support, ancillary assistance, special
> teaching materials and equipment, teaching
> group sizes, special curriculum arrangements
> and adaptations to buildings. The Union
> believes that it is important for the teacher
> member of the multi-professional team
> assessing the child to take full advantage
> of this opportunity". [133]

The reason for the union's strong support of statements, however, are

not in terms of a detailed assessment of individual special needs, they

are rather in terms of putting pressure on local education authorities

to make expenditure on provision:

> "... the authority has a legal obligation
> to make available the special provision
> which appears in the statement. This is
> its real importance because it makes it

more difficult for the LEAs to withdraw
the provision".[134]

The issue of the conflict is then not quite as simple as it
seemed. What looks like a conflict over the procedures of assessment
and intervention, is actually something rather less technical. These
are the overt terms which the NUT wants to be seen to be adopting.
However, behind these terms the real issue of conflict can be discerned
to be resources, level of provision and whether or not special schools
as relatively comfortable working environments for teachers are to
survive. In the union's reference to the 1981 Act this is particularly
evident in the continual references to resources. Thus at the 1982
Conference of the NUT a resolution was passed which detailed the areas
of spending which the union thought should accompany the implementation
of the 1981 Act. The tone of this resolution can be gathered from its
preamble:

> "Conference deplores the Government's
> selective implementation of the recommen-
> dations in the Warnock Report, and in parti-
> cular its failure to implement those
> relating to the provision of resources
> which the Warnock Committee considered to
> be vital... . Conference believes that
> legislation which seeks to promote prin-
> ciples of integration must also include
> guarantees of adequate human and material
> resource provision".[135]

Certainly this sounds rather more sophisticated and less obviously
self-serving than the defence of special schools in the 1977 document.[136]
The conflict issue then takes place at two levels: at the level of
rhetoric the NUT is dispassionately analysing proposed changes in the
processes of assessment and intervention; beneath this the actual
conflict concerns increases in the amount of resources and staffing
which the NUT thinks should accompany these changes. The particularly
vital issue concerns the provision of additional teachers. This would

help the members of the union by tending to reduce the size of classes.
It would also, of course, help the NUT itself: more teachers would
mean more members for the union. More members would bring increased
revenue and power to the NUT.

It is now perhaps possible to answer the question concerning
whom the conflict is with. Since, as has been suggested, the NUT's
statements are in response to government initiatives or legislation,
it might seem that the conflict is with the government, specifically
with the D.E.S. However, this appearance is deceptive. In setting up
the Warnock Committee, passing Section 10 of the 1976 Act and the 1981
Act the government was not particularly seeking conflict with teachers.
It was responding to demands from other groups, particularly from
pressure groups representing either the parents of handicapped children
or handicapped adults. In opposing the integrative policies cautiously
adopted by government, then, the NUT is opposing the aspirations and
intentions of these groups for the role of handicapped people in
society. However, the NUT could hardly oppose these groups directly:
this would hardly be a stance likely to lead to public support or even
support from its members. It is much more convenient to be seen to be
opposing the government. (This also explains the lip-service which
the NUT has found it necessary to pay to the principle of integration
since 1977.) The apparent conflict with the government conceals the
actual conflict with groups representing the handicapped or their
parents. Beyond this it conceals the conflict between on the one hand
the interests of special school teachers and the preference of main-
stream teachers not to teach some pupils (apparently based to a
degree on anti-handicap prejudice) and on the other, the rights and
aspirations of handicapped people and their parents. It is a conflict
between teachers and pupils or between teachers and parents which can

actually be discerned beneath the NUT's rhetoric of criticism of government.

In analysing the role of the NUT in conflicts over special education reform in England and Wales two important points may be made. Firstly, that the stance of the NUT as an impartial, academic commentator on educational events is spurious. Secondly, that the overt conflict between the NUT and the DES or LEAs is representative at a macro-level of the conflicts at a micro-level which have been illustrated earlier in this chapter within the processes of special education. The conflict at the macro-level between the larger union and national and/or local government is a conglomeration as it were, of the micro-conflicts, within the processes of special education, between teachers on the one hand and pupils and parents on the other.

Having applied the conflict framework to this one small aspect of special educational policy it is possible to make a preliminary assessment of its efficacy. The framework is analytical rather than predictive. Even if many more aspects of the conflicts in special education were considered, all that would be gained would be a more thorough understanding of the processes; it would not lead to an ability necessarily to be able to predict the outcomes of the conflicts. However, the framework does have at least two advantages. Firstly, it makes it possible to get beneath the rhetoric and to analyse the real interests of individuals or groups. Secondly, it allows links to be made between the micro- and macro-levels of analysis. The framework draws attention to micro-conflict, macro-conflict and also to the links between these. This point is developed in more detail in the concluding chapter.

5.7. Considerations of social class and the state

In the cities of the U.K and the U.S.A special

education forms an aspect of the reproduction of social

stratification in accordance with the division of labour

associated with capitalist ownership and organisation of the

means of production.[137] State provision and enforcement of

special education (Poulantzas' political element[138])

achieves this both by the reproduction of stratified labour

power (Poulantzas' crucial economic element) and by the

reproduction and legitimation of the accepted notions of

normality, intelligence and competition (Poulantzas'

ideological element). Taking the issue of labour

power before that of ideology,[139] in both the U.S.A and

the U.K social stratification in terms of class is compli-

cated by racial stratification.[140] The competitive

hierarchies of the education system are crystallised in

the process of certification to lead to subsequent social

stratification largely dependent on the length and success

of a person's educational career. At the top of this

system are the elite universities, graduate schools

and institutions of technology which give access either to the controlling positions in the means of production, distribution and exchange or to the professions which help to legitimate, enforce and reproduce the existing social, political and economic arrangements. At the bottom of this system are those who fail dramatically at schoolwork, those whose behaviour offends the values of teachers and those physically unable to compete successfully in the free world of competitive individualism.[141] These children not only fail academically, they often acquire stigmatising labels which they themselves are socialised into half accepting. Instead of being given access by education to the knowledge and institutions which lead to wealth and power, they endure an inferior curriculum in the company of their deemed deviant peers. Their place in the labour market will be at the bottom, unskilled, poorly paid jobs with little security and poor status. In times of recession they will help to produce the labour reserve army of the unemployed.

Tomlinson points out that the subsequent employment of children with special needs has always been a predominant concern of those ostensibly interested in their welfare, least they be unemployable and thus constitute a drain on the resources of the state:

> "In Protestant England the value placed
> on productive work has tended to dominate
> the treatment of the handicapped. The
> 1601 Elizabethan Poor Law provided 'the
> necessary relief of the lame, impotent, old,
> blind and such others' only if they could not
> work, and disabled children were, if
> possible, put out to be apprentices. Mill-
> owners in the 1800s took quotas of idiot
> children among pauper children supplied for
> their mills by the workhouses ... and the
> brief of the Warnock Report was not only to
> review educational provision for handicapped,
> but also to consider arrangements to prepare
> them for employment".[142]

Given the complication of the class structure in the cities of the USA and the UK by the divisions of race, people from specific groups find their children over-represented in the various forms of special

educational provision. As was shown earlier in this chapter an
unduly large group of black children are prepared by the ascertain-
ment and separation processes of special education for their place
at the bottom of the hierarchy of the labour force.[143]

To turn to the reproduction of the accepted notions and legiti-
mations of normality, intelligence[144] and competition,[145] children
with special needs are likely to be the victims of these notions.
They suffer from judgements based on them, at the outset in the
case of physical handicap, and increasingly, through the accretion
of institutional procedures in the case of the non-normative cate-
gories. As well as the influence of these ideologies on children
ascertained as having special needs, it is necessary to consider
their impact on non-ascertained children. Placement of some children
in segregated special education might serve pour encourages les autres:
if children see their peers whose progress or behaviour has been
repeatedly criticised by mainstream teachers, removed summarily to
a special class or unit, then this is likely both to give them the
impression that the teachers' comments are based on justificable
criteria which can be reified into institutional placement and to
motivate them to conform to accepted educational standards of progress
and behaviour.

The one aspect of ideology mentioned as being reproduced by the
practices of special education which has not been discussed above is
that concerning health and normality. The concept of health has
been criticised as making absolute what can only be a relative pheno-
menon.[146] Notions of mental health and illness are even more relative
and subject to social construction.[147] Nevertheless, physical fitness
and beauty and firm mindedness continue to receive esteem and adulation.
The increasing status of the medical profession has been accompanied

by a morbid concern with health and by the medicalisation of a whole range of social problems. The separate education of children with special needs serves further to legitimate, for both the hale and the halt, the inferiority of the latter. The notion of radical difference and apparently intolerable peculiarities is reproduced. Integration and mainstreaming offer the opportunity for children to learn, through being educated together, less morbid attitudes towards individual differences, and skills of tolerance and co-operation which might eventually provide considerable assets both to themselves and to society.

The conflict framework outlined in Chapter four and referred to in this chapter has the advantage of linking small scale institutional procedures to wider social patterns. It allows for the identification of participants and ideologies in small scale political conflicts within special educational processes. It also makes possible connections between these and wider political, ideological and economic conflicts.

-oOo-

Chapter 5

FOOTNOTES

1. Warnock, H. M., et al 1978 p.39. The study referred to is that by
   Rutter, M., et al 1975. The results of this research as some of the
   authors have pointed out, are not entirely unambiguous. "Amongst
   other things they asked the parents and teachers of over 2,000 children
   in the age range 10-11 years to complete a checklist indicative
   of behavioural and emotional problems. Those children who had more than
   a certain number of items checked ... were then interviewed ...
   It was finally decided that 118 (5.4 per cent) of the children could be
   considered as having a behavioural or neurotic disorder (or both).
   Of these, teachers and parents had identified about the same number of
   children but by and large they had selected different children, ...
   as Rutter concludes, the situation ... "was a major factor in the
   'disorder'" (Gillham, B., 1981 p. 2.)

2. Ford, J., et al 1982 p. 136.

3. Tomlinson, S., 1981 p. 256.

5. See Chapter two.

6. Adapted from Rowitz, L., and Gunn, J. E., 1984, p. 168.

7. Ibid p. 164.

8. Adapted from Tomlinson, S., 1981 p. 79.

9. Ford, J., et al 1982 p. 135.

10 Booth, T., 1982 p. 7. All the statistics in this paragraph are derived
   from this source, particularly pp. 8-9. In this context it is
   actually more correct to refer to England and Wales than to the U.K
   generally as different arrangements exist in both Scotland and Northern
   Ireland. The data here are meant to illustrate the range and types
   of provision rather than to be exhaustive. For some parallel data
   on the expansion of special provision in the U.S.A see, for instance,
   Topping, K. J., 1982, p. 5.

11. Quoted in Booth, T., 1982 p. 9.

12. See Schrag, P., and Divoky, D., 1981 pp. 63-93. This category over-
    laps, with differently named U.K categories: "'Maladjustment in the

UK is defined in the same terms as hyperactivity' in the US: unmanageable, defiant, disobedient, aggressive, lying, truant, unable to concentrate, violent, overactive, etc " Ingleby, D., 1984 p.1

13. This growth is charted in H.M.I., 1977. One authority's plans for further expansion are contained in ILEA 8058. Children who attend these units do not have the rights to formal assessment which are guaranteed by the special education referral procedure. Rampton saw this as a cause for serious concern especially with regard to the education of West Indian children: "The D.E.S., should consider the legal position of units serving more than one school ... [and] issuing guidance to LEAs on how to meet the needs of disruptive pupils in mainstream schools" (D.E.S., 1981 p. 51). Indeed it is possible that this piecemeal, temporary and, usually part-time provision was often created precisely in order to circumvent the costly, time-consuming special education procedure which allows some minimum rights to children and parents. Likewise this form of provision avoids the necessity to pay special school allowances to teachers, to pay headteacher salaries or to provide a reasonable measure of welfare assistance. For the administrative convenience of disruptive units over special schools, see Tattum, D., 1982 pp. 181-228.

14. See Rutter, M., et al 1975.

15. Booth, T., 1982 p. 25.

16. Ibid p. 27.

17. These critics, such as Tomlinson, are referred to later in this chapter.

18. For urban social and geographical stratification see Chapter two and for the educational implications, the Administration and Finance section of Chapter three.

19. Booth, T., 1982 pp. 8-9. Booth here is simply summarising The Warnock Report: see Warnock, H. M., et al 1979 pp. 37-38.

20. "We think that the term 'maladjusted' also remains a serviceable form of description and should be retained ..." (Ibid p. 44).

21. See Tomlinson, S., 1981 pp. 314-318 and Booth, T., 1982a p. 36.

22. See, for instance, the account by Tuckwell, P., 1982 of Peartree School in Oxfordshire in Booth, T., and Statham J., (eds.) 1982 pp. 300-305.

23. See Potts, P., and Statham J., 1982 in Ibid pp. 167-175.

24. See Weatherley, R. A., 1979 pp. 18-19.

25. See Becker, H. S., 1971 in Cosin, B. R., et al (eds.) 1971 pp. 107-113.

26. Ibid p. 113.

27. For an account see Abeson, A., and Zettel, J., 1981 in Swann, W., (ed.), 1981 pp. 359-377.

28. Quoted in Ibid p. 366.

29. Heggarty, S., 1982 p. 19.

30. Heggarty, S., and Pocklington, K., 1981 p.1.

31. This important point constitutes a major theme of a forthcoming post-experience Open University course which will form part of their new diploma in education and special needs.

32. There is, however, in both the U.S.A and the U.K, an encouraging trend in what has been called 'systems theory' towards examining ways in which changes in school and classroom organisation can minimise incidents of disruptive behaviour. For the U.K see Davies, J., 1981; Topping, K. J., 1982; 1983; Gillham, B., (ed.) 1981 (especially pp. 9-59). For the U.S.A see Wolfgang, C. H., and Glickman, C. D., 1980; Madsen, C. H., and Madsen, C. K., 1970.

33. Warnock, H. M., et al 1978 p. 226.

34. These are described, for instance, in Illich, I., 1977 pp. 47-130.

35. See Weatherley, R. A., 1979.

36. This is described in Pocklington, K., 1980; Booth, T., 1982 pp. 20-41 and, for the case of California in Franks, M. E., 1976.

36a. Weatherley, R. A., 1979.

37. Warnock, H. M., et al 1978 p. 47.

38. See, for instance, NUT 1977.

39. See Association of Therapeutic Education 1979; Association of Workers with Maladjusted Children 1979; Cook, J., 1979; Mitchell, D., 1979; Heggarty, S., 1979.

40. The teachers and their organisations might have been reassured had they known that "In 1976 Mary Warnock remarked in an interview reported in The Times Educational Supplement: "People do not take on board the severely handicapped. It is grotesque to think they could all be educated in ordinary schools." (Cited in Booth, T., 1982a p. 46) or that, "The parents of children of an ESN(M) school in Oxfordshire protested about its threatened closure, and it was reprieved after the personal intervention of Mary Warnock" (Ibid p. 49). Although Warnock must be seen as a policy formulater rather than an implementer, these snippets perhaps provide some insight into the attitudes (mental states) of someone generally considered to be an integrationist. It is apparently easier to bring about legislative change than to change attitudes (including one's own).

41. Warnock, H. M., et al 1978 p. 49.

42. Education Act 1981 p. 2.

43. Ibid.

44. D.E.S., 1983. Circular 1/83.

45. Booth, T., et al 1982 p. 8.

46. Newell, P., 1983.

47. Carrier, J. G., 1984 p. 36.

48. Ibid p. 57.

49. Goodwin, C., 1983 p. 163.

50. Potts, P., 1983 p. 211.

51. Swann, W., 1985.

52. Ibid pp. 6 - 7.

53. For previous discussions which raise the issues examined in this
    section see Potts, P., 1982; Sutton, A., 1982; Tomlinson, S.,
    1981; 1982.

53a. The example of the Intermediate Education Centres in ILEA's Division
     5 is discussed in Golby, M., and Fleming, A., 1978 pp. 61-74.

54. Although the issue of young offenders is slightly tangential here,
    there is some overlap between detention centres of community homes
    with education and residential maladjusted schools. Juvenile
    magistrates may prefer the maladjusted provision as more positive,
    particularly if the child is already in a special school or is in
    the process of being ascertained.

55. There is an illuminating discussion of the way in which such
    practices became particularly manifest in the course of case confer-
    ences in Potts, P., 1982 E 241 Cassette 2, Sida A, Open University.

56. See Swann, W., 1982a p. 71.

57. For a contentious discussion of the role and status of educational
    psychologists see Swann, W., 1982b pp. 6-8. This forms part of the
    Open University's course E 241 and became the focus for many
    criticisms of it. These criticisms were themselves subsequently
    incorporated into the course.

58. Ingleby, D., 1977 in Dale, R., et al (eds.) 1977 p. 155. See also
    Ingleby, D., (ed.) 1981.

59. See the discussion of intelligence which follows.

60. See Potts, P., 1982 pp. 22-30.

61. Quoted in Ibid p. 37. MBD signifies minimal brain damage.

62. See, for instance, those in Booth, T., and Statham, J., (eds.) 1982 especially pp. 71-133.

63. For detailed descriptions and examples see Morrison, A., and McIntyre, D., (eds.) 1972 and Leach, D. J., and Raybould, E. C., 1979.

64. See the work in London schools described in Berger, M., et al 1980.

65. Non-verbal tests such as Goodenough or Raven's Matrices, which purport to give a guide to a child's general ability of developmental stage are now given rather less credence.

66. See Stott, D. H., 1974.

67. Again these are not now widely used. Their use is largely confined to clinical or child-guidance settings where practitioners hold to a specific model of human personality.

68. See, in particular, Kamin, L. J., 1974 and also Evans, B., and Waites, B., 1981; Billig, M., 1979; Sedgwick, P., 1982; Simon, B., 1971.

69. Quoted in Evans, B., and Waites, B., 1981 p. 10.

70. Ibid p. 11.

71. Ibid p. 10.

72. Ibid p. 121.

73. Ibid p. 43.

74. Ibid pp. 130-131.

75. This relates back to Marx' theory of knowledge discussed under curriculum in Chapter 3.

76. The evidence of testers such as Burt was influential on the report of the Haddow Committee and thus on the 1944 Education Act and the tripartite system which was established in England and Wales as a result of it: see Simon, B., 1971 pp. 213-218.

77. The connection between the eugenics movement and the mental testing movement in the USA in the first part of this century has been described by Kamin, L. J., 1974 pp 5-15.

78. The thesis of Jensen, A., 1969 which suggests that some racial groups are inferior to others in terms of intelligence has been mentioned at several points above. In the course of refuting this Kamin exposed the fraudulent nature of Burt's data on identical twins and made the case that the totally environmentally determined nature of intelligence was yet to be disproved. Hernstein and Eysenck have subsequently attacked Kamin's position. A recent summary of the whole debate is provided in Stott, D. H., 1983. Stott confesses himself more persuaded towards the hereditarian position yet, after analysing the contributions to the debate, concludes that Kamin's original position has not been refuted.

79. See the discussion of Aims in Chapter 3.

80. Evans, B., and Waites, B., 1981 pp. 134-5. Alternative conceptions of human mental skills have been developed by Marxist psychologists: see, for instance, Simon, B., 1971 pp 139-150. For an introduction to Soviet psychology and the influential work of Vygotsky consult Sutton, A., 1982 Open University E 241 Cassette 3 Side A.

81. Kamin, L. J., 1974 pp. 5-29.

82. Simon, B., 1971 pp. 29-121.

83. See the discussion compiled by Potts, P., and Statham, J., 1982 in Booth, T., and Statham, J., (eds.) 1982 pp. 167-175.

84. Tomlinson, S., 1982 p. 9.

85. See Schedule 1 Part 1.

86. Weatherley, R.A., 1979 p. 72.

87. This concession seems to have been granted by Circular 1/83

(D.E.S., 1983). It has not yet been tested in the courts.

88. D.E.S., 1981 pp. 11-12.

89. Recent literature on intervention has shown a trend away from the psychological: in addition to the references cited in these footnotes see Barton, L., and Tomlinson, S., (eds.), 1982.

90. A detailed account of an integration project in London, where a team of thirteen teachers helped colleagues in primary and secondary schools to develop strategies for educating children considered to be disruptive, was made in Coulby, D., 1981. For a series of accounts of integrating children with a wide range of handicaps in schools in the UK see Heggarty, S., et al 1981; Heggarty, S., et al 1982.

91. Balbernie, R., 1973; 1974; unpublished; Docker-Drysdale, B., 1973; Wills, W. D., 1971.

92. This is to leave aside the recent 'short, sharp, shock' treatment advocated for some Detention Centres.

93. For a general textbook on behaviour modification see Bandura, A., 1970.

94. The wider social implications of behaviourism are spelt out in Skinner, B. F., 1973.

95. For manuals of techniques relevant to education see Lane, D., 1978a; 1978b; Leach, D. J., and Raybould, E. C., 1979. For examples of more specific case studies see Coulby, D., and Harper, T., 1982; Winter, S., 1980; Appleton, C., 1978; Gregory, R.P., 1978.

96. See Berger, M., 1979.

97. Ibid.

98. Parents may however appeal against the statement: see D.E.S., 1981 pp. 3-8.

99. Although there is likely to be contact between special schools and psychologists this may involve a different person or even a different education authority.

100. D.E.S., 1981 p. 7.

101. See Ibid pp. 2-3 and the discussion under Policy Solutions above.

102. The questions raised in this paragraph are based on an attempt at evaluating the effectiveness of the provision mentioned in footnote 117. See Coulby, D., and Harper, T., 1981.

103. For a discussion of the practice of educational research in special education see Pocklington, K., and Potts, P., 1982.

104. See Tizard, J., 1973.

105. This involves a development of an earlier model of classroom disruption (see Coulby, D., 1981 pp. 17-19) into a model of the perception and generation of special educational needs.

106. For a discussion of this notion see Ibid pp. 14-17.

107. Tomlinson, S., 1982 p. 2.

108. See the data presented earlier in this chapter under The Urban Nature of Special Education.

109. See the contribution by Mortimore, P., 1980 to Upton, G., and Gabell, A., (eds.) 1980; also Little, A. N., 1977 in Rayner, J., and Harris, E., (eds.) 1977.

110. The Portage project developed in the USA is an elaborate version of such schemes: see Heggarty, S., et al 1981 pp. 505-506. In London great claims are now being made for the success of less formal types of collaboration with parents in the teaching of reading: see Torrent, G., 1982 for an example.

111. These effects have been noted in ethnographic studies of adolescents in urban schools in the UK: see Corrigan, P., 1979; Willis, P., 1978. The implications of the latter of these studies, however, stretch far beyond the classroom context.

112. This concept is used in Ibid.

113. See for example, Reynolds, D., and Sullivan, M., 1981 in Gillham, B., (ed.) 1981; Reynolds, D., 1976 in Hammersley, M., and Woods, P., (eds.) 1976.

114. See for example, Werthman, C., 1977 in Cosin, B. R., et al (eds.) 1977; Rosser, E., and Harré, R., in Hammersley, M., and Woods, P., (eds.) 1976.

115. See the discussion of Intervention above and the associated references for the concepts and techniques of behaviourism as applied to teaching.

116. See Rutter, M., et al 1979; Rutter, M., 1983; Power, M., et al 1967; 1972; the papers cited in footnote 143 and Reynolds, D., and Sullivan, M., 1980 in Barton, L., et al (eds.) 1980.

117. For the USA see Rist, R.C., 1978; for the UK see Hargreaves, D. H., 1967; 1972; 1975.

118. These constraints may, to some degree, result from the pressures of national examinations or achievement tests rather than from the organisation of the school.

119. For the way in which authoritarian care systems can generate learning and behaviour difficulties see Davies, J., 1981.

120. See Lawrence, J., et al 1981.

121. Such recommendations are often associated with the community school movement in both the USA and the UK. A recent example, which recommends many of the changes which would simultaneously help accommodate children with special needs and improve the education for the majority of children is Hargreaves, D. H., 1982. However the changes which this author advocates spread outside the school and would seem to be impossible without changes in the examination system and the processes of certification.

122. Brevity of the discussion at this point does not indicate that the subject has not been thoroughly investigated and analysed. Rather the concentration here is on educational processes and institutions.

123. For reviews of the literature within this approach see Rutter, M., 1975 pp. 138-186 or Laslett, R., 1977 pp. 1-19.

124. See for example, Kellmer Pringle, M., 1973; Patrick, J., 1973; Boyle, J., 1977.

125. See Chapter two.

126. These are NUT 1977, NUT 1984a and NUT 1984b.

127. See section 5.2 above.

128. NUT 1977 p. 5.

129. Ibid p. 9.

130. Ibid p. 15.

131. Ibid p. 18.

132. NUT 1984b p. 8.

133. Ibid p. 9.

134. Ibid p. 10.

135. NUT 1984a p. 10.

136. See NUT 1977 p. 7.

137. See Tomlinson, S., 1982.

138. See Chapter two for this discussion of Poulantzas to which this refers.

139. This chapter so far has, in a way, been examining the political element by discussing state provision.

140. This complication of the class structure is discussed with reference to Giddens in Chapter two.

141. See the discussion of individualism in Chapter three.

142. Tomlinson, S., 1982 p. 28. It is perhaps not necessary to detect anything sinister in such concentration on the employment of handi- capped people. No one would want, surely, to deny them the dignity and financial rewards of labour.

143. For further evidence on the U.K see also Coard, B., 1977 in
     Raynor, J., and Harris, E., (eds.) 1977 and Tomlinson, S.,
     1981 pp. 282-311. For comparable data on the U.S.A see Miller,
     H. L., 1978 pp. 211-242.

144. See the discussion under Assessment in this chapter.

145. See the discussion under Aims in Chapter three.

146. See Office of Health Economics 1975; Illich, I., 1977.

147. See in particular Szasz, T. S., 1972. For the way in which the
     socially constructed notion of mental illness affects black
     people living in U.K cities see Littlewood, R., and Lipsedge,
     M., 1982. See also Ingleby, D., (ed.) 1981. For the medicalisation
     of the behaviour of children in the U.S.A see Schrag, P., and
     Divoky, D., 1981.

-oOo-

Chapter 6

CONCLUDING DISCUSSION

6.1 Approaches to urban education

Chapters one and two outlined two possible approaches to urban

education: the first based on Holmes' problem-solving methodology; the

second derived from Marxist social theorists. The advantages of each

cannot unfortunately, be reconciled or synthesised into a single approach.

The conflict framework described in Chapter four, and referred to again

in this chapter, is not an attempt at such a synthesis. It is rather a

framework which allows us to draw on some of the strengths of each

approach.

The problem-solving approach described in Chapter one and illustrated

in Chapter three has at least three related advantages: it has a sound

theoretical basis derived from Popper's epistemology[1]; it contains

analysis and action within workable models which allow generalised and

holistic statements and policies to be avoided; it is practical in that

it is directly linked to the hypothesis of viable, non-utopian policies.

Holmes' development of this approach and his typologies and ideal typical

models have provided a generative framework for many studies in both

comparative and urban education.[2] By concentrating on specific problems

the approach limits and focusses analysis to provide detail and depth.

This means that subsequent proposals will be founded on detailed analysis

and that they will have reference to specific piecemeal policy solutions.

In this way the approach is likely to appeal to those who formulate and

adopt educational policies in that it provides them with a method for

making well-substantiated proposals with regard to ameliorating specific

problems which are of concern. The entire focus of the approach, because

of its limiting and policy oriented aspects, is eminently practical.

Approaches derived from Marxist urban social theory have at least
two advantages with regard to analysis of urban education: they have
a firm, social science theoretical basis; they offer explanations of
and insights into a wide range of social and educational processes and
their relations to one another.[3] By adopting this approach it would be
possible to link theories of education with those of the city. At a
theoretical level this would provide a specifically urban orientation.
For instance Castells offers an understanding o f urbanisation in terms
of the reproduction of labour power and this could be linked with those
educational theorists, such as Althusser,[4] who have concentrated on the
importance of education as an instrument in the reproduction of social
stratification. This link has not yet been successfully made by urban
educationists, and it is an important point for further theoretical and
research work in the area.

The width of the Marxist approach contrasts clearly with the
limits deliberately set within the problem solving approach. Marxist
writers tend to concern themselves with the vast processes of western
society, with the social, political and ideological relations which stem
from the capitalist ownership and organisation of the means of production.
Such an approach is appealing as it aspires to offer wide macro-level
explanations. However, this is often associated with an unwillingness
to accept the importance of any social changes which do not radically
overturn the ownership and control of the means of production. Any
progressive reforms within education, for instance, are likely to be
seen merely as adaptations of capitalism. In contrast with the
problem approach these writers offer no small scale solutions. Althusser
presents educational institutions as unchangeable, monadic entities
apparently beyond the reach of human intervention.[5] The analysis is
largely disconnected from the formulation of policies which might begin

to ameliorate the situation described. In short, whilst one approach
tends to be particularistic at the cost of being unable to describe or
ultimately to change the total social fabric, the other is holistic
and rarely suggests any improvements which are not by definition post-
revolutionary.

6.2 The conflict framework

As a way of retaining some of the strengths of the two approaches,
a conflict framework was outlined in Chapter four and utilised and
exemplified in Chapter five. One of the advantages of this framework
was seen to be that it offered approaches to both micro- and macro-
issues. Furthermore, it was indicated in both Chapters four and five
that this framework also provided a way of understanding limits between
micro- and macro levels. For instance, in Chapter four it was suggested
that conflicts between teachers and parents over placement of pupils
in segregated special provision was linked to the ways in which
educational institutions tend to work to the advantage of some groups
and to the disadvantage of others. In Chapter five it was illustrated
that conflict at the macro-level between the N.U.T and central government
was linked to small scale conflicts within the various processes of
special education.

Can this link between macro- and micro-levels, made within the
conflict framework, help understand progressive educational reforms
and the apparent lavishness of urban educational provision in capitalist
cities which was noted in Chapter three? How can the link between macro-
and micro-levels be explained if the Marxist theory of a capitalist
state is accepted? The concept of relative autonomy was suggested in
Chapter two, but what is the relationship of educational institutions
to the relatively autonomous state? Poulantzas suggests the complexity
of conflicting interests within and between the various institutions

ostensibly controlled by the state leads to a situation in which these

institutions have a second level of relative autonomy both from the

whole and from each other:

> "However, through the reproduction of the social
> division of labour within the State, its structure
> as the condensation of class relations is
> concretised, together with its internal contra-
> dictions, in an intricate decision-making
> structure of relatively autonomous bureaucracies,
> each of which has its specific field of compe-
> tence, its own clientele and perception of
> problems".[6]

Within these relatively autonomous bureaucracies, urban education

authorities, for example, or, for that matter urban schools, individuals

and groups may come into conflict. The results of these conflicts

cannot be automatically determined by the nature of the state. The

state is itself the product of many of these conflicts. There is then

freedom for individuals and groups to experiment with policies which

might be regarded as contrary to the interests of those groups which

control the State:

> "In most cases the resulting political elaboration
> excludes discourse on the basic social relations,
> and even on the precise class character of the
> various tactics of the administration. It takes
> the form of multi-level bargaining among adminis-
> trative pressure groups and representatives of
> diverse interests - a process characterised by
> ad hoc bureaucratic muddling through in the mode
> of negative co-ordination with the 'status quo'".[7];

The 'multi-level bargaining' which Poulantzas describes here is very

similar to the overlapping conflicts at the micro-level illustrated

in Chapter four.

This theory may be applied to urban education. Just as the state

has a large but ultimately limited area of autonomy relative to

capitalist interests, so state provision of urban resources[8] such as

education have a distinct area of autonomy relative to each other and to

the (still basically bourgeois) state. Conflict and change within

the institutions of state provision, among which urban schools are an important element, may then actually form part of changes, developing through these and other conflicts, in the class structure and in the state itself.

This notion,which might be called 'double relative autonomy' allows some understanding of how, when in both the U.S and the U.K capitalist interests seem to have a firm control over the state and are using it to limit public expenditure on urban services which are not directly to their benefit[9], lavish resources in urban schools in both countries persist: the luxurious computer classrooms and sports facilities of the schools of Milwaukee, peripatetic teachers of dance in Manchester, a team of musicians instructing primary school children in the East End of London to play the violin. These might be seen as, in turn, providing relevant skills for capitalist industry, reinforcing the ethic of competition or imposing an alien dominant culture. Expenditures such as these are vulnerable to cutbacks emanating from the central government, but they surely represent an aspect of relative autonomy within urban educational institutions. Within this area of relative autonomy there are resources and opportunities with which teachers can work freely.

Relative to the constraints of the state, teachers as individuals or groups have a freedom to influence the education and future oppor- tunities of urban children through organisation, curriculum and pedagogic style[10]. Teachers in the cities of both countries have developed schools, projects and curricula which contradict through practice Althusser's generalisations about the futility of radical teaching. Such inde- pendence may operate also at a level wider than the single school or classroom. ILEA's policies on multicultural and anti-racist teaching[11] or Judge Peckham's ruling against IQ tests in California[12] represent

attempts to ameliorate in a substantial way the education and opportunities of the least privileged children in the U.S and the U.K.

Within the conflict framework it is possible to see not only how developments in urban education are the product of conflicts at the micro-level but also how the developments are themselves aspects of a larger conflict which takes place at the macro-level of the state.

-oOo-

Chapter 6

FOOTNOTES

1. See Chapter one for a more detailed account of issues discussed
   in this paragraph.

2. For a discussion of Holmes' position within the field of comparative
   education, see Jones, P.E. 1971 pp. 92 - 117.

3. See the discussion in Chapter two to which this paragraph refers.

4. See the discussion of Althusser in Chapter three.

5. The more recent work of writers such as Bowles and Gintis, Willis
   and Apple have concentrated on the notion of resistance in education.
   See, for instance, Apple, M., 1982, the contributions to Barton,
   L., et al (eds.), 1980 and to Barton, L., and Walker, S., (eds.),
   1982.

6. Poulantzas, N., 1978, p. 194.

7. Ibid p. 194.

8. In Castells' terms this is the statisation of the instruments and
   processes of the reproduction of labour power.

9. In Castells' terms this represents the crisis of destatisation as
   discussed in Chapter three.

10. This is a familiar assertion and is given some empirical support
    by the work of, for example, Rutter, M., et al, 1979. The point
    here is not the rediscovery of the obvious, but the explanation of
    the limits of autonomy of schools and teachers, and the assertion
    of the part they can play.

11. See ILEA 1977;1979, 1983a; 1983b; 1983c; 1983d; 1983e.

12. See the discussion in Chapter five.

-oOo-

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ADORNO, T. W., et al (1977) The Positivist Dispute in German Sociology, London, Heinemann.

ALTBACH, P. G., and KELLY, G. P., (eds.) (1978) Education and Colonialism, London, Longman.

ALTHUSSER, L., (1971) "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses", Cosin, B.R., (ed.) 1972, op. cit.

APPLE, M. W., (1979) Ideology and Curriculum, London, Routledge Kegan Paul.

- (1982) Education and Power, London, Routledge Kegan Paul.

- (ed.) (1982) Cultural and Economic Reproduction in Education, London, Routledge Kegan Paul.

APPLETON, C., (1978) "Contingent Management of Academic Output in the Normal Classroom - Justifying the Application of Extrinsic Reinforcement", Newsletter of ABMC, Vol. 2, No. 3, pp. 13-16.

ASSOCIATION OF THERAPEUTIC EDUCATION, (1979) "Preliminary Consideration of Some Implications of the Warnock Report", Therapeutic Education, 7, 1.

ASSOCIATION OF WORKERS WITH MALADJUSTED CHILDREN, (1979) "The Implications of the Warnock Report", Therapeutic Education, 7, 1.

BALBERNIE, R., (1973) "The Management of an Evolving Care System", Ainsworth, A., and Hunter, B., (eds.) 1973 Residential Establishments, University of Dundee, pp. 11-83.

- (1974) "Unintegration, Integration and Level of Ego Functioning as the Determinants of Planned 'Cover Therapy' of Unit Tasks and of Placement", JAWMC, Vol. 2, pp. 6-46.

- "A Statement of the Developing Aims and Objectives of the Cotswold Community", unpublished.

- BANDURA, A., (1970) Principles of Behaviour Modification, London, Holt International.

BANKS, J. A., (1982)"Educating Minority Youths: An Inventory of Current Theory", Education in Urban Society, 15, 1, pp. 88-89.

BARNES, J., and Lucas, H., (1977) "Positive discrimination in education, individual groups and institutions" Raggatt, P., and Evans, M., (eds.) 1977, op. cit.

BARRETT, M., (1980) Women's Oppression Today, London, Verso.

BARTON, L., and TOMLINSON, S., (eds.) (1981) Special Education: Policy, Practices and Social Issues, London, Harper and Row.

BARTON, L., and WALKER, S., (eds.) (1983) Race, Class and Education, London, Croom Helm.

BARTON, L., et al (1980) Schooling, Ideology and the Curriculum, Lewes, Falmer Press.

BATER, J. H., (1980) The Soviet City, London, Edward Arnold.

BELL, C., and NEWBY, H., (1971) Community Studies, London, George Allen and Unwin.

BELLAH, R. N., (1973) Emile Durkheim on Morality and Society, London, University of Chicago Press.

BERGER, J., and MOHR, J., (1975) A Seventh Man, Harmondsworth, Penguin.

BERGER, M., (1979) "Behaviour Modification in Education and Professional Practice: The Dangers of Mindless Technology" Bulletin of the British Psychology Society, 32, Nov. 1979, pp. 418-419.

BERGER, M., et al (1980) "Intervening in the Classroom", ILEA Contact, 9, 13, p. 4.

BERMONT, C., (1975) A Point of Arrival, London, Heinemann.

BERNSTEIN, B., (1973) "Education Cannot Compensate for Society" Raynor, J., and Harden, J., (eds.) 1973, op. cit.

BENNETT, N., (1976) Teaching Styles and Pupil Progress, London, Open Books.

BILLIG, M., (1979) Psychology, Racism and Fascism, Birmingham, AF and R.

BLOWERS, A., et al (eds.) (1982) Urban Change and Conflict: An Interdisciplinary Reader, London, Harper and Row.

BOOKBINDER, G., (1984) "Ambiguities and Contradictions in the 1981 Education Act (England & Wales)" Swann, W., et al 1984.

BOOTH, T., (1982) Special Biographies, Milton Keynes, Open University.

BOOTH, T., and POTTS, P., (eds.) (1983) Integrating Special Education, Oxford, Blackwell.

BOOTH, T., and STATHAM, J., (eds.) (1982) The Nature of Special Education: People, Places and Change, London, Croom Helm.

BOOTH, T., et al (1982) An Alternative System: A Special Imagination, Milton Keynes, Open University.

BOURDIEU, P., and PASSERON, J. C., (1977) Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture, London, Sage.

BOWLBY, J., (1953) Child Care and the Growth of Love, Harmondsworth, Penguin.

BOWLES, S., and GINTIS, H., (1976) Schooling in Capitalist America, London, Routledge Kegan Paul.

BOYLE, J., (1977) A Sense of Freedom, London, Pan.

BOYSON, R., (1982) Extract from a speech to the Loughborough Conservative Annual Dinner, 5.2.82.

BRAVERMAN, H., (1974) Labour and Monopoly Capital, New York, Monthly Review Press.

BROWN, F., (1982) "Improving Schooling Through Title 1: A Model for Change", Education in Urban Schools, 15, 1, pp. 125-140.

BURGESS, C., (1981) "Breakthrough to Sexism", TLK, No. 17, pp. 8-10.

CARNOY, M., (1974) Education as Cultural Imperialism, New York, David McKay.

CASTELLS, M., (1976)"Theory and Ideology in Urban Sociology" Pickvance, C.G., (ed.) 1976 op. cit.

CASTELLS, M., (1976) "Is there an urban sociology?" Pickvance, C. G., (ed.) 1976 op. cit.

- (1976) "Theoretical propositions for an experimental study of urban social movements" Pickvance, C. G., (ed.) 1976 op. cit.

- (1977) The Urban Question: A Marxist Approach, London, Edward Arnold.

- (1978) City, Class and Power, London, Macmillan.

- (1980) The Economic Crisis and American Society, Oxford, Blackwell.

- (1983) The City and the Grassroots, London, Edward Arnold.

CASTLES, S., and KOSACK, G., (1973) Immigrant Workers and Class Structure in Western Europe, London, Oxford University Press.

CASTLES, S., and WUSTENBERG, W., (1979) The Education of the Future, London, Pluto Press.

CENTRAL ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR EDUCATION (ENGLAND) (1967), Children and Their Primary Schools: A Report (2 volumes) The Plowden Report, London, HMSO.

COOK, J., (1979) "Warnock and the Education of Maladjusted Children" Therapeutic Education, 7, 1.

CORRIGAN, P., (1979) Schooling the Smash Street Kids, London, Macmillan.

COSIN, B. R., (ed.) (1972) Education Structure and Society, Harmondsworth, Penguin.

COSIN, B. R., et al (eds.) (1971) School and Society, Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

COULBY, D., (1981) Disruption in the Urban Classroom: A Model and a Long Term Evaluation of an Innovatory Response, M.A Thesis, University of London Institute of Education.

COULBY, D., and HARPER, T., (1982) "Support in the Disrupted Classroom", JABAC, 5, 2, pp. 22-27.

COWEN, R., (1981) "Curriculum Issues 1970-1990 - Contents, Policies and Practices in the USA", Compare, 11, 1, pp. 45-57.

DALE, R., et al (eds.) (1977) Schooling and Capitalism, Milton Keynes, The Open University.

DAVIES, J., (1981) Disruption in Schools: The Impact of Organisational Factors on Coping Strategies, M.A thesis, University of London Institute of Education.

DEAR, M., and SCOTT, A. J., (1981) Urbanisation and Urban Planning in Capitalist Society, London, Methuen.

DENNISON, G., (1972) Lives of Children, Harmondsworth, Penguin.

D.E.S., (1972) Teacher Education and Training, London, HMSO (The James Report).

- (1981) The Education Act 1981, London, HMSO.

- (1981) West Indian Children in Our Schools. Interim Report of the Committee of Enquiry into the Education of Children from Ethnic Minority Groups. Cmnd. 8273, London, HMSO (The Rampton Report).

- (1983) Assessments and Statements of Special Educational Needs, Circular 1/83.

D.E.S and Welsh Office (1977) A New Partnership for Our Schools (The Taylor Report) London, HMSO.

Department of Environment (1977) Inner Area Studies: Liverpool, Birmingham and Lambeth: Summaries of Consultants Final Reports, London, HMSO.

DEWEY, J., How We Think, Boston, D.C., Heath & Co.

- (1944) Democracy and Education, New York, Free Press.

DOCKAR-DRYSDALE, B., (1973) Consultations in Child Care, London, Longman.

DORE, R., (1976) The Diploma Disease, London, George Allen & Unwin.

DOYLE, P., et al (1972) The Paint House: Words from an East End Gang, Harmondsworth, Penguin.

DURKHEIM, E., (1947) The Division of Labour in Society, New York, Free Press.

ENGELS, F., (1969) The Condition of the Working Class in England, London, Granada.

EVANS, B., and WAITES, B., (1981) IQ and Mental Testing, London, Macmillan.

FEYERABEND, P., (1975) "Popper's Objective Knowledge", Inquiry, 17, pp. 475-507.

- (1978) Against Method, London, Verso.

- (1978) Science in a Free Society, London, Verso.

FIELD, F., (ed.) (1977) Education and the Urban Crisis, London, Routledge Kegan Paul.

FLETCHER, C., and THOMPSON, N., (eds.) (1980) Issues in Community Education, London, Falmer.

FORD, J., et al (1982) Special Education and Social Control: Invisible Disasters, London, Routledge Kegan Paul.

FRANKS, M. E., (1976) The Evolving Administration and Structure of Special Education in California, England and Wales, M. Phil thesis, University of London Institute of Education.

FREIRE, P., (1972) Pedagogy of the Oppressed, Harmondsworth, Penguin.

FRISBY, D., (1977) "Introduction to the English Translation" of Adorno, T.W., et al (1977) op. cit.

GIDDENS, A., (1981) A Contemporary Critique of Historical Materialism, London, Macmillan.

GILLHAM, B., (ed.) (1981) Problem Behaviour in the Secondary School: A Systems Approach, London, Croom Helm.

GILROY, P., (1982) "Steppin' out of Babylon - Race, Class and Autonomy" in Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies 1982 The Empire Strikes Back, London, Hutchinson.

GLAZER, N., and MOYNIHAN, D.P., (1975) Ethnicity: Theory and Experience, London, Harvard University Press.

GOLBY, M., and FLEMING, A., (1978) Urban Schooling, Milton Keynes, The Open University Press.

GOLDING, F.P., (1980) Urbanism and Education: Some Contested Problematics, M.A thesis, University of London Institute of Education.

GORDON, D. M., (1978) "Capitalist Development and the History of American Cities" in Tabb, W. K., and Sawers, L., (eds.) (1978) op. cit.

GRACE, G., (1978) Teachers, Ideology and Control: A Study in Urban Education, London, Routledge Kegan Paul.

GRAMSCI, A., (1971) Selections from the Prison Notebooks, London, Lawrence and Wishart.

GRANT, M. A., (1982) "How to Desegregate and Like It", PDK, 63, 8, p. 539.

GREGORY, R. P., (1978) "Impossible Child? Failed Behaviour Modification? Or Impossible Environment! A Case Study", Newsletter ABMC, 2, 4, pp. 5-14.

GRIMWOOD, H. D., (1983) The Integration of Handicapped Children into Ordinary Schools: A Comparative Study of England and the USA, University of London Institute of Education, M.A thesis.

HABERMAS, J., (1971) Towards a Rational Society, London, Heinemann.

- (1976) Legitimation Crisis, London, Heinemann,

HAGEDORN, J., (1983) "All Quiet on the Home Front", Times Educational Supplement 3480 (11.3.83) p. 20.

HALL, P., (1977) The World Cities, London, Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

HALL, S., (1977) "Education and the Crisis of the Urban School" Raynor, J., and Harris, E., 1977 (ed.) op. cit.

HALSEY, A. H., (1972) Educational Priority Volume 1: EPA Problems and Policies, London, HMSO.

- (1981) "Education can compensate", Swann, W., 1981 op. cit.

HALSEY, A. H., et al (1980) Origins and Destinations, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

HAMMSERLEY, M., and WOODS, P., (eds.) (1976) The Process of Schooling, The Milton Keynes Open University Press.

HARGREAVES, D. H., (1967) Social Relations in a Secondary School, London, Routledge Kegan Paul.

- (1972) Interpersonal Relations and Education, London, Routledge Kegan Paul.

- (1975) Deviance in Classrooms, London, Routledge Kegan Paul.

- (1982) The Challenge for the Comprehensive School: Culture, Curriculum and Community, London, Routledge Kegan Paul.

HARLOE, M., and LEBAS, E., (eds.) (1981) City, Class and Capital, London, Edward Arnold.

HARVEY, D., (1973) Social Justice and the City, London, Edward Arnold.

HAVINGHURST, R. J., (1970) "Chicago: Educational Development in a Metropolitan Area" Lauwerys, J. A., and Scanlon, D. G., (eds.) 1970 pp. 149-165.

HEGARTY, S., (1980) "Integration - Some Questions to Ask", Special Education, 7, 1, pp. 8-10.

HEGARTY, S., and POCKLINGTON, K., (1981)"A Junior Resource Area for the Visually Impaired" Swann, W., 1981 op. cit.

HEGARTY, S., et al (1981) Educating Pupils with Special Needs in the Ordinary School, Windsor, NFER-Nelson.

- (1982) Integration in Action: Case Studies in the Integration of Pupils with Special Needs, Windsor, NFER-Nelson.

HMI, (1977) Behavioural Units, London, HMSO.

HILL, R.C., (1978) "Fiscal Collapse and Political Struggle in Decaying Central Cities in the United States" Tabb, W.K., and Sawers, L., (eds.) 1978, pp. 213-240.

HOLMES, B., (1965) Problems in Education: A Comparative Approach, London, Routledge Kegan Paul.

- (1975) Some Consideration of Method in Comparative Education, Department of Comparative Education, University of London Institute of Education.

- (1977) "The Positivist Debate in Comparative Education - An Anglo Saxon Perspective" Comparative Education, 13, 2, pp. 115-132.

- (1979) Ivory Towers, the Glass Bead Game and Open Societies: The Social Functions of Comparative Education, University of London Institute of Education.

- (ed.) (1980a) Diversity and Unity in Education, London, George Allen and Unwin.

- (1980b) International Yearbook of Education, Vol. XXXII, Paris, UNESCO.

- (1981a) Comparative Education: Some Considerations of Method, London, George Allen and Unwin.

- (1981b) "Curriculum Development" The Review of Education, 8, 2, pp. 299-304.

HOME OFFICE, (1981) The Brixton Disorders (The Scarman Report), London, HMSO.

HUMMEL, R. C., and NAGLE, J. N., (1973) Urban Education in America: Problems and Prospects, New York, Oxford University Press.

ILLICH, I., (1973) Deschooling Society, Harmondsworth, Penguin.

- (1976) After Deschooling What? London, Writers and Readers.

- (1976) Limits to Medicine: Medical Nemesis: The Expropriation of Health, Harmondsworth, Penguin.

ILLICH, I., and VERNE, E., (1976) Imprisoned in the Global Classroom, London, Writers and Readers.

INGLEBY, D., (ed.) (1981) Critical Psychiatry, Harmondsworth, Penguin.

- (1984) "Killing with Kindness" New Internationalist, No. 132, pp. 14-15.

ILEA (1977) "Multiethnic Education"

- (1979) "Multiethnic Education - Progress Report".

- (1983a) Race, Sex and Class I Achievement in Schools, London.

- (1983b) Race, Sex and Class 2 Multiethnic Education in Schools, London.

- (1983c) Race, Sex and Class 3 A Policy for Equality: Race, London.

- (1983d) Race, Sex and Class 4 Anti-Racist Statement and Guidelines, London.

- (1983e) Race, Sex and Class 5 Multi-Ethnic Education in Further, Higher and Community Education.

- 2321 (1982) Bilingualism in the ILEA. The Educational Implications of the 1981 Language Census, London.

- 8058 "Disruptive Pupils", 20.1.78.

- 8543 (1978) White Lion Street Free School Application for Grant Aid.

JENCKS, C., et al (1972) Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America, New York, Basic Books.

JENSEN, A. R., (1969) "How Much Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement?", Harvard Educational Review, 39.

JONES, C., and KLEIN, G., (1980) Assessing Children's Books for a Multi-Ethnic Society, London, ILEA.

JONES, C., and STREET PORTER, R. M., (1980) Educational Disadvantage: Implications for the Initial and In-Service Education of Teachers, Manchester, CED.

- (1983) "Anti-racist teaching and teacher education", Multicultural Teaching, 1, 3, pp. 9-12.

JONES, P.E., (1971) Comparative Education: Purpose and Method, St. Lucia, University of Queensland Press.

KAMIN, L. J., (1974) The Science and Politics of IQ, New York, John Wiley.

KARABEL, J., and HALSEY, A. H., (eds.) (1977) Power and Ideology in Education, New York, Oxford University Press.

KEDDIE, N., (1973) Tinker Tailor: The Myth of Cultural Deprivation, Harmondsworth, Penguin.

KELLMER PRINGLE, M., (1973) "The Roots of Violence and Vandalism", Therapeutic Education, 1, 1, pp. 3-11.

KUHN, T. S., (1970) The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, London, University of Chicago Press.

LAKATOS, I., and MUSGRAVE, A., (eds.) (1970) Criticism and the Growth

of Knowledge, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

LANE, D., (1978a; 1978b) The Impossible Child, Volumes 1 and 2, London, ILEA.

LASLETT, R., (1977) Educating Maladjusted Children, London, Crosby Lockwood Staples.

LAUWERYS, J. A., and SCANLON, D. G., (eds.) (1970) Education in Cities, (The World Year Book of Education 1970), London, Evans.

LAWRENCE, J., et al (1981) Dialogue on Disruptive Behaviour, Croydon, PJD Press.

LEACH, D. J., and RAYBOULD, E.C., (1979) Learning and Behaviour Difficulties in School, London, Open Books.

LEAVIS, F. R., (1962) The Great Tradition, Harmondsworth, Penguin.

LENIN, V.I., (1947) "Impreialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism", V. I. Lenin (1947) Selected Works Volume I, London, Lawrence and Wishart.

LINDSAY, G. A., (1984) "An Educational Psychologist's Report" Swann, W., et al 1984 op. cit.

LITTLEWOOD, R., and LIPSEDGE, M., (1982) Aliens and Alienists: Ethnic Minorities and Psychiatry, Harmondsworth, Penguin.

LUKACS, G., (1980) The Destruction of Reason, London, Merlin.

McLELLAN, D., (ed.) (1977) Karl Marx: Selected Writings, London, Oxford University Press.

MADSEN, C. H., and MADSEN, C. K., (1970) Teaching and Discipline: A Positive Approach for Educational Development, Boston, Alleyn and Bacon.

MAGEE, B., (1973) Popper, Glasgow, Fontana.

MARX, K., and ENGELS, F., (1967) The Communist Manifesto, Harmondsworth, Penguin.

MATHEWS, M. R., (1980) The Marxist Theory of Schooling: A Study of

Epistemology and Education, Sussex, Harvester Press.

MEDAWAR, P. B., (1969) Induction and Intuition in Scientific Thought,
London, Methuen.

MILLER, H. L., (1978) Social Foundations of Education, New York, HRW.

MITCHELL, D., (1979) "The Integration of Children with Speciel Needs:
Policies, Options and Strategies" Therapeutic Education, Autumn 1979,
pp. 14-24.

MORRIS, H., (1980) "Architecture, Humanism and the Local Community",
Fletcher, C., and Thompson, N., (eds.) 1980 op. cit., pp. 11-21.

MORRISON, A., and McINTYRE, D., (eds.) (1972) The Social Psychology of
Teaching, Harmondsworth, Penguin.

MORTIMORE, J., and BLACKSTONE, T., (1982) Disadvantage and Education,
London, Heinemann.

MULLARD, C., (1980) Racism in Society and Schools: History, Policy
and Practice, University of London Institute of Education.

N.U.T., (1977) Special Education in Ordinary Schools, London, NUT.

NEWELL, P., (1983) "Richard's Handicap Race" New Society, 17.3.83,
pp. 419-420.

NEW YORK URBAN COALITION (1978) 1978 Annual Report, 1979-1980 Program Plan,
New York, NYUC.

OFFICE OF HEALTH ECONOMICS (1975) The Health Care Dilemma or Am I
Kronken Doctor?, London.

PAHL, R. E., (ed.) (1968) Readings in Urban Sociology, London, Pergamon.

-   (1975) Whose City? Harmondsworth, Penguin.

PARSONS, T., (1960) "Pattern Variables Revisited: A Response to Robert
Dubin", American Sociological Review, 25, pp. 467-483.

PATRICK, J., (1973) A Glasgow Gang Observed, London, Eyre Methuen.

PAVLOU, E., (1983) A Comparative Study of Education Policy for Linguistic
Minorities in the USA and England, University of London Institute of

Education, M.A thesis.

PETERS, R. S., (1970) Ethics and Education, London, George Allen & Unwin.

PICKVANCE, C. G., (ed.) (1976) Urban Sociology: Critical Essays,
Tavistock, London.

PICTON, D., (1981) "Dual System: Keeping up the Pressure", TLK, No. 17,
no page numbers.

PLANT, R., (1974) Community and Ideology: An Essay in Applied Social
Philosophy, London, Routledge Kegan Paul.

POCKLINGTON, K., (1980) "Integration: A Lesson from America", Special
Education, 7, 3, pp. 22-24.

POCKLINGTON, K., and POTTS, P., (1982) Research in Special Education,
Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

POPPER, K. R., (1961) The Poverty of Historicism, London, Routledge Kegan
Paul.

- (1966a) The Open Society and Its Enemies: Volume 1 The Spell of Plato,
London, Routledge Kegan Paul.

- (1966b) The Open Society and Its Enemies: Volume 2 The High Tide of
Prophecy, Hegel, Marx and the Aftermath, London, Routledge Kegan Paul.

- (1972) Conjectures and Refutations: The Growth of Scientific Knowledge,
London, Routledge Kegan Paul.

POTTS, P., (1982) Biology and Handicap, Milton Keynes, Open University
Press.

POULANTZAS, N., (1973) Political Power and Social Classes, London,
New Left Books.

- (1978) Classes in Contemporary Capitalism, London, Verso.

- (1978) State, Power, Socialism, London, Verso.

POWER, M., et al (1967) "Delinquent Schools?", New Society, 19.10.67.

- (1972) "Neighbourhood Schools and Juveniles before the Court",
British Journal of Criminology, 12, III, p. 132.

RADICAL STATISTICS EDUCATION GROUP (1982) <u>Reading between the Numbers:</u>
<u>A Critical Guide to Educational Research</u>, London, BSSRS.

RAGGATT, P., and EVANS, M., (eds.)(1977) <u>The Political Context</u>, London, Ward Lock

RAYNOR, J., (1983) "Race and Education: Interpreting British Policies
in the 1960s and 1970s", Gumbert, E. B., (ed.) 1983 <u>Different People</u>,
Atlanta, Georgia State University.

RAYNOR, J., and HARDEN, J., (eds.) (1973) <u>Cities, Communities and the</u>
<u>Young</u>, London, Routledge Kegan Paul.

- (1973) <u>Equality and City Schools</u>, London, Routledge Kegan Paul.

RAYNOR, J., and HARRIS, E., (eds.) (1977) <u>Schooling in the City</u>, London,
Ward Lock.

- (1977) <u>The City Experience</u>, London, Ward Lock.

REDFIELD, R., (1947) "The Folk Society", <u>American Journal of Sociology</u>
52, p. 293.

REED, R. J., (1982) "Urban Secondary School Leadership: Contemporary
Challenges", <u>Education in Urban Society</u>, 15, 1, p. 6-25.

REISS, A. J., (1964) <u>Louis Wirth on Cities and Social Life</u>, London,
University of Chicago Press.

REX, J., and MOORE, R., (1967) <u>Race, Community and Conflict: A Study of</u>
<u>Sparkbrook</u>, London, Oxford University Press.

ROSE, A., (1944) <u>The Negro in America</u>, New York, Harper and Brothers.
N.B.: Condensed from Myrdal, G., 1944 <u>An American Dilemma</u>.

ROSEN, H., (1981) <u>Neither Bleak House nor Liberty Hall: English in the</u>
<u>Curriculum</u>, University of London Institute of Education.

RUTTER, M., (1972) <u>Maternal Deprivation Re-assessed</u>, Harmondsworth,
Penguin.

- (1975) <u>Helping Troubled Children</u>, Harmondsworth, Penguin.

- (1983) "Growing up in the Inner City", <u>ILEA Contact</u>, 11, 27, pp. 10-11.

RUTTER, M., et al (1975) "Attainment and Adjustment in Two Geographical Areas: The Prevalence of Psychiatric Disorder", British Journal of Psychoatry, 126, pp. 493-509.

- (1979) Fifteen Thousand Hours, London, Open Books.

RIST, R. C., (1978) The Urban School: A Factory for Failure, Cambridge, MIT Press.

SARUP, M., (1978) Marxism and Education, London, Routledge Kegan Paul.

SAUNDERS, P., (1981) Social Theory and the Urban Question, London, Hutchinson.

SCHRAG, P., and DIVOKY, D., (1981) The Myth of the Hyperactive Child: And Other Means of Child Control, Harmondsworth, Penguin.

SEARLE, C., (1973) Stepney Words I and II, London, Reality Press.

- (1977) The World in a Classroom, London, Writers and Readers.

SEDGWICK, P., (1982) Psycho Politics, London, Pluto Press.

SHANKLAND, G., et al (1977) Inner London: Policies for Dispersal and Balance, London, HMSO.

SHARP, R., and GREEN, A., (1975) Education and Social Control: A Study in Progressive Primary Education, London, Routledge Kegan Paul.

SHEPHERD, J., et al (1974) A Social Atlas of London, Oxford, Clarendon.

SICKLE CELL SOCIETY (1981) Sickle Cell Anaemia, Sickle Cell Trait, Harlden.

SIMON, B., (1971) Intelligence, Psychology and Education: A Marxist Critique, London, Lawrence and Wishart.

SKINNER, B. F., (1973) Beyond Freedom and Dignity, Harmondsworth, Penguin.

STONE, M., (1981) The Education of the Black Child in Britain: The Myth of Multicultural Education, Glasgow, Fontana.

STOTT, D. H., (1974) The Bristol Social Adjustment Guide: Manual, London, Hodder and Stoughton.

- (1983) Issues in the Intelligence Debate, Windsor, NFER-Nelson.

STREET PORTER, R., (1978) Race, Children and Cities, Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

SUTTON, A., (1982) The Powers That Be, Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

SWANN, W., (ed.) (1981) The Practice of Special Education, London, Blackwell.

- (1982a) A Special Curriculum? Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

- (1982b) Psychology and Special Education, Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

SZASZ, T. S., (1972) The Myth of Mental Illness, St. Albans, Paladin.

TABB, W. K., and SAWERS, L., (eds.) (1978) Marxism and the Metropolis, New York, Oxford University Press.

TARRENT, G., (1982) "Method for Problem Readers", ILEA Contact, 25.6.82.

TATTUM, D. P., (1982) Disruptive Pupils in Schools and Units, Chichester, John Wiley.

THORNBURY, R., (1978) The Changing Urban School, London, Methuen.

TIZARD, J., (1973) "Maladjusted Children and the Child Guidance Service", London Educational Review, Summer 1973.

TOMLINSON, S., (1981) Educational Subnormality - A Study in Decision Making, London, Routledge Kegan Paul.

- (1982) A Sociology of Special Education, London, Routledge Kegan Paul.

TONNIES, F., (1955) Community and Association, London, Routledge Kegan

TOPPING, K. J., (1982) Educational Systems for Disruptive Adolescents, Calderdale.

TRAVERS, T., (1981) Block Grant Distribution in 1981-1982, Working Papers on Institutions, No. 21, London, NELP.

TYACK, D. B., (1974) The One Best System, London, Harvard University Press.

US CONGRESS (1975) The Education of all Handicapped Children Act, Public Law 94-142.

UPTON, G., and GOBELL, A., (1980) Behaviour Problems in the Comprehensive School, Cardiff, University College Faculty of Education.

VAUGHAN, M., and ARCHER, M. S., (1971) Social Conflict and Educational Change in England and France, 1789-1848, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

WARNOCK, H. M., et al (1978) Special Educational Needs, London, HMSO.

WASP, D., (1980) "A Course in Integrated Studies", Special Education, 7, I, pp. 23-26.

WEATHERLEY, R. A., (1979) Reforming Special Education: Policy Implementation from State Level to Street Level, London, MIT Press.

WEBER, M., (1930) The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, London, George Allen and Unwin.

- (1958) The City, London, Macmillan.

WEEKS, I., (1982) "The Conservative Curriculum", Times Educational Supplement, 21.5.82, p. 23.

WEINSTOCK, A., (1976) "I Blame the Teachers", Times Educational Supplement, 23.1.76, p. 2.

WEST, D. J., (1967) The Young Offender, Harmondsworth, Penguin.

WOLFGANG, C. H., and GLICKMAN, C. D., (1980) Solving Discipline Problems, Boston, Alleyn and Bacon.

WOOD, S., (ed.) (1982) The Degradation of Work? Skill, Deskilling and the Labour Process, London, Hutchinson.

WHITE, J. P., (1973) Towards a Compulsory Curriculum, London, Routledge Kegan Paul.

WHITTY, G., and YOUNG, M., (eds.) (1976) Explorations in the Politics of School Knowledge, Driffield, Nafferton.

WILCE, H., (1983) "Standards and Equality Slip Away", Times Educational Supplement, No. 3478, 25.2.83, p. 21.

WILLIS, P. E., (1977) Learning to Labour, Farnborough, Saxon House.

- (1978) <u>Profane Culture</u>, London, Routledge Kegan Paul.

WILLS, W. D., (1971) <u>Spare the Child</u>, Harmondsworth, Penguin.

WINTER, S., (1980) "Treatment of Aggression in a Four Year Old", <u>ABMC</u>, 4, 2, pp. 5-10.

YOUNG, M. F. D,(ed)(1971) <u>Knowledge and Control</u>, Collier and MacMillan.

-oOo-

Bibliography Addendum

Barton, L., and Tomlinson, S. (eds.) 1984 <u>Special Education and Social Interests</u>, London, Croom Helm.

Carrier, J.G. 1984 "Comparative special education: ideology, differentiation and allocation in England and the U.S" in Barton, L., and Tomlinson, S. (eds.) 1984.

Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies 1981 <u>Unpopular education; Schooling and Social Democracy in England since 1944</u>, London, Hutchinson.

Rex, J., 1961 <u>Key Problems of Sociological Theory</u> London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

N.U.T (1977) <u>Special Education in Ordinary Schools</u>,London, N.U.T.

N.U.T 1984 <u>Meeting Special Needs in Ordinary Schools</u>, London, N.U.T.

N.U.T 1984 <u>The Education Act 1981: A Union Guide (Revised Edition)</u> London, N.U.T.

Rowitz, L., and J.Gunn, J.E., 1984 "The labelling of educable mentally-retarded children" in Barton, L., and Tomlinson, S., (eds.) 1984.

Swann, W., (1985) "Is the integration of children with special needs happening? an analysis of recent statistics of pupils in special schools" <u>Oxford Review of Education,</u> Vol. 11, No. 1.