

This item is held in Loughborough University's Institutional Repository (<https://dspace.lboro.ac.uk/>) and was harvested from the British Library's EThOS service (<http://www.ethos.bl.uk/>). It is made available under the following Creative Commons Licence conditions.



creative
commons
C O M M O N S D E E D

Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 2.5

You are free:

- to copy, distribute, display, and perform the work

Under the following conditions:

 **BY:** **Attribution.** You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author or licensor.

 **Noncommercial.** You may not use this work for commercial purposes.

 **No Derivative Works.** You may not alter, transform, or build upon this work.

- For any reuse or distribution, you must make clear to others the license terms of this work.
- Any of these conditions can be waived if you get permission from the copyright holder.

Your fair use and other rights are in no way affected by the above.

This is a human-readable summary of the [Legal Code \(the full license\)](#).

[Disclaimer](#) 

For the full text of this licence, please go to:
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/2.5/>

The New Right and Physical Education: A Critical Analysis

(Volume One and Volume Two)

by

William Lawrence Kay

A Doctoral Thesis

**Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the award of
Doctor of Philosophy of Loughborough University**

November 1997

© by William Lawrence Kay 1997

The New Right and Physical Education: A Critical Analysis

(Volume One)

by

William Lawrence Kay

A Doctoral Thesis

**Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the award of
Doctor of Philosophy of Loughborough University**

November 1997

© by William Lawrence Kay 1997

Abstract

My thesis argues that the New Right (NR) sought to manipulate state education as a mechanism of both social transformation and social control in the UK between 1979 and 1992. This is investigated by employing a 'critical realist' perspective which is located within a wider 'neo-Marxist' conceptual frame. The links between the NR and the Radical Right (RR) Conservative governments during this period are investigated through an analysis of the origins, intentions and ascendancy of NR ideology. It is suggested that the NR/RR's political intent was a 'hegemonic project' to shift underlying moral values from 'social democracy' to the 'social market'. This depended on the successful transmission, through education, of a definition of 'citizenship' grounded in competitive, 'selfish individualism', with the inequalities of the 'social market' accepted as 'common-sense'. My data reveal how the NR/RR conjoined symbolic and material rules and resources to draw power and authority to 'the centre' on the grounds that there was a crisis in national stability and security. Education is identified as a central mechanism in the NR/RR's 'hegemonic project'. It is shown how the RR gained control of the form, content and method of educational provision through a series of initiatives which gradually altered the structure of education and shifted provision progressively from the periphery to the centre, centralising control over curriculum and resources while devolving responsibility and accountability to schools. The argument central to my thesis is that the NR/RR sought to use physical education as a pivotal component of its 'hegemonic project'. This is revealed most clearly in the privileging of the definition of physical education as 'sport and games' in NR/RR discourse. This discourse sought to imbue pupils with values of competition, tradition, reward, meritocracy and individual responsibility: the moral values central to the 'social market'. My data outline how the NR/RR endeavoured to 'control' the 'form', 'structure', 'content' and 'methods' of physical education provision in state schools by delineating the discursive framework and text of the national curriculum physical education (NCPE), and raise critical issues relating to the relationship between policy, power and autonomy within the education system.

Key Words

Ideology, Hegemony, Social Control, Critical Realism, Social Reality, Structure, Agency

Acknowledgements

I thank professor John Evans of Loughborough University for his excellent supervision and thorough, although at times painfully honest, critique of my work throughout the period of research, writing-up and submission of this thesis. It was his empathy towards any problems which I faced (either academic or personal), his confidence in my abilities (when I had none of my own), and his constant encouragement which kept me going and enabled me to reach the point where my work was ready for examination. I also thank my mother-in-law Sara Barrett for having the trust in me to assist me financially, without question, at a period when it was needed most. I thank all my family and friends for the support and encouragement they gave me, even at the times when they could understand neither 'what' I was doing, nor 'why' I was doing it. Most of all I thank my wife Kate for supporting me throughout. I will never fully know how she was able to cope with the financial hardship and emotional stress which this research placed on us both. It was as much her 'staying power', as my own, which got me through this project.

<u>Contents</u>	<u>Page</u>
Abbreviations	8
<u>Chapter One : Introduction</u>	10
Introduction	11
Background	12
Developments in Education 1979 to 1992	13
Developments in Physical Education from 1979 to 1992	17
Summary	21
Research Motivation	22
Biography and ‘Likely’ Bias	23
My Perception of ‘Educationally Worthwhile’ Physical Education	26
The Research Questions and Methods of Generating Data	27
Questions	27
Methodology	28
Developments, Initial Findings, Analysis and Increasing Complexity	29
Summary	31
Presentation of Chapters	32
<u>Chapter Two : Methodology</u>	36
Introduction	37
Paradigm Location	38
Procedure	40
Research Design and Preparation	42
Methods	44
Documents	44
Interviews	47
The Consequences of Context	52
Context, Researching Elites	52

Social Status, Elites and Research Implications	55
Theory	57
Analysis	59
The Context of Responses	61
Language	63
Validity and Bias	64
Ethics	67
Problems	69
Summary	71
<u>Chapter Three : A Critical Realist Perspective</u>	73
Introduction	74
The Origins of my Critical Realist Perspective	77
The Concepts Underpinning My Critical Realist Perspective	79
Realism	79
The UK's 'A Priori' Capitalist Structures	80
A 'Dominant Group' Perspective	82
The RR as the Dominant Group	85
Mechanisms of Domination	86
The Market Mechanism	86
Symbolic and Material Rules and Resources: Tools of...	
...Capitalist Reproduction	87
Turning Dominant Ideology into Social Reality through Hegemony	88
Perception of the 'Self' Within 'A Priori' SPEC Arrangements	90
Knowledge, Language and Discourse as 'Tools' of Domination	91
The Ascendancy and Domination of Discourse	92
The Institutionalisation of the Dominant Group's...	
...Discourse as Text	94
Domination and Subjugation Through Structured Agency	94
The Critical Perspective	96
Policy as a Material Rule and Resource	96

Critiquing ‘Pluralism’ as an Interpretive Perspective	96
The Critical Realist Interpretation of Educational...	
...Provision and Reform	99
Education’s Role in Ideological Hegemony	100
Educational and Social Division	102
Educational Knowledge	106
Educational Discourse and Texts, and the ‘Pedagogic Device’	106
Physical Education Provision in the SPEC Context	108
A Sporting Tradition	109
Summary	111
Critical Realist Aims	112
Theoretical Reservations and Developments	113
Education	114
<u>Chapter Four : 1979 to 1992: The New Right / Radical Right</u>	
<u>as the Dominant Social, Political, Economic and Cultural Group</u>	116
Introduction	117
The Origins, Ideology and Ascendancy of the SPEC...	
...Dominant Group	117
Origins	117
NR / RR Ideology and Discourse	119
Citizenship	120
Tradition	120
The Market System and Competition	121
Individualism and the Family	123
Nationalism	125
Ascendancy Within the Party and Government	126
Conservatism and the Tory Party	126
Leadership and Appointments to Cabinet and the Civil Service	129
Symbolic Rules and Resources: ...	
...The Hegemonic Project, A Moral Imperative	131

A Capitalist Market Morality, the Repudiation of Guilt	134
Freedom and Responsibility	136
RR Attack, Crisis and Solutions	138
Material Rules and Resources	141
RR Economics	142
Vilifying the ‘Opposition’	143
Vilifying the Welfare State	144
Undermining the Unions	145
Disempowering Local Government	146
Policy Implementation	148
Summary: A Critical Realist Interpretation	150
<u>Chapter Five : New Right / Radical Right Education Reforms</u>	153
Introduction	154
The Origins of NR/RR Educational Policy	155
The Intent of NR/RR Education Policy	158
Seeking to Establish The RR’s Educational Discourse...	
...as Common-Sense	161
Gaining Control of Education	164
Chronology of Intent	166
Pre 1979	166
1979 to 1983	168
1984 to 1986	173
1987	177
1988 to 1989	180
1990 to 1992	183
A Critical Realist Interpretation of RR Reforms	187
The ERA, NC and NT	188
The Effects of NR/RR Reforms	190
Conclusion	193

<u>Chapter Six : New Right / Radical Right Aims and Physical</u>	
<u>Education</u>	196
Introduction	197
Physical Education's History as a Mechanism of Socialisation	198
NR/RR Aims through 'Physical Education'	198
Progressive Developments in Physical Education	200
RR Attack on Progressivism: The Ideological Redefinition of...	
 ...Physical Education	204
Chronology	205
1979 to 1983	205
1984 to 1986	206
1986 to 1987	209
1988 to 1992	215
A Critical Realist Interpretation	221
The RR's Justification for Compulsory Traditional...	
 ...Competitive Games	224
A Critical Realist Interpretation	231
Conclusion	234
<u>Chapter Seven : New Right / Radical Right 'Control' of Physical</u>	
<u>Education's 'Form', 'Structure', Content' and 'Methods'</u>	237
Introduction	238
Constraining Consultation About the Purpose of Physical Education	239
The Findings of the First Reports on 'Sport in Schools'	240
A Need for Consultation	241
The Physical Education WG's Perspective	242
'Consultation' over the NCPE	245
The RR's Sources of 'Expertise' in Physical Education	246
The ESASC Report	248

RR Members' Vilification of the Evidence Given to ESASC	250
Opportunities to 'Bridge the Gap'	252
RR 'Control' of the NCPE Development Process	254
An 'Ideological Mind-Set'	256
A Critical Realist Interpretation of RR 'Misunderstanding'	259
The NCPE: The RR's Endeavour to Control the 'Content' of...	
...Physical Education Provision	261
The Interim Report (IR): The WG's Theory of Physical Education	262
The RR's 'Influence' as the IR became the FR	263
RR 'Influences' as the FR became the Statutory Orders (SO)...	
...through the NCC	264
RR Constraints on Discourse and Resources	268
The Effect of the NC Policy on Physical Education Provision	269
Higher Education's (HE) Aims in ITE: The Development...	
...of Professionalism	270
Conflict Between HE and the RR	271
The RR Attack on HE and ITE	272
RR Policy on ITE and INSET	276
Summary	278

**Chapter Eight : Conclusion: Critical Self Reflection on the Critical
Realist Perspective**

Introduction	280
The Intent and Findings of my Research	283
The 'Policy Flow': A Cyclical Process	284
Theoretical and Methodological Reservations	286
The NR/RR Endeavour to 'Control' the Policy Process	289
'Controlling' the Construction of Policy	289
'Controlling' the Implementation of Policy	291
'Controlling' the Evaluation and Revision of Policy	293
The Effect of RR Control over the Policy Process	295

A Critical Realist (Neo-Marxist) Interpretation	296
The Contribution of my Research to Understanding...	
...the Policy Process	297
Issues of 'Agency and Structure' and 'Power and Control'	298
The Issue of Micro Agency	299
My Theoretical Analysis: Structured, Framed...	
...and Constrained Agency	299
The Contribution of the Critical Realist Perspective	303
End Note	306
<u>Bibliography</u>	307
Conservative Party, "Politics Today" (PT)	
Conservative Research Department	308
DES Circulars	309
DES News / Press Releases	311
Education Science and Arts Select Committee (1991) Fourth Report	
'Sport in Schools' (ESASC), London, HMSO	311
Hansard - Official Reports of the House of Commons Debates	312
Newspaper References	312
Main Bibliography	313

Abbreviations

ACSET	Accreditation Council for the Selection and Education of Teachers
APS	Assisted Places Scheme
APU	Assessment of Performance Unit
AT	Attainment Target
ASI	Adam Smith Institute
BAALPE	British Association of Advisors and Lecturers in Physical Education
BBC	British Broadcasting Corporation
BCPE	British Council of Physical Education
BPs	Black Papers
CATE	Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education
CBEC	Conservative Backbench Education Committee
CBI	Confederation of British Industry
CBSC	Conservative Backbench Sports Committee
CCCS	Centre for Contemporary Curriculum Studies
CCPR	Central Council for Physical Recreation
CCT	Compulsory Competitive Tendering
CDoS	Collins Dictionary of Sociology
CPC	Conservative Political Centre
CPG	Conservative Philosophy Group
CPS	Centre for Policy Studies
CRS	Conservative Research Centre
CS	Civil Servant
CTC	City Technology College
DES	Department of Education and Science
DG	Dominant Group
DSPU	Downing Street Policy Unit
EKSS	End of Key Stage Statement
ESASC	Education, Science and Arts Select Committee
ERA	Education Reform Bill
ERB	Education Reform Act
ESG	Education Support Grant
FR	Final Report (NCPE WG)
GMS	Grant Maintained Status
HE	Higher Education
HG	Hillgate Group
HMI	Her Majesty's Inspectorate
HoC	House of Commons
HRE	Health Related Exercise
HRF	Health Related Fitness
IEA	Institute of Economic Affairs
ILEA	Inner London Education Authority
INSET	In-Service Education for Teachers
IR	Interim Report (NCPE WG)
ITE (T)	Initial Teacher Education (Training)
KS	Key Stage

LEA	Local Education Authority
LMS	Local Management of Schools
MfE	Minister for Education
MfS	Minister for Sport
MP	Member of Parliament
MSC	Manpower Services Commission
NA	National Assessment
NC	National Curriculum
NCC	National Curriculum Council
NCF	National Coaching Foundation
NCPE	National Curriculum Physical Education
NGB	National Governing Body
NPFA	National Playing Fields Association
NR	New Right
NT	National Testing
NTBG	No Turning Back Group
OE	Open Enrolment
ONG	One Nation Group
OSA	Official Secrets Act
PCF	Per Capita Funding
PE	Physical Education
PEA	Physical Education Association
PM	Prime Minister
PoS	Programme of Study
PT	Politics Today
RoA	Record of Achievement
RR	Radical Right (Governments 1979-1992)
SCAA	Schools Curriculum and Assessment Authority
SCDC	Schools Curriculum Development Council
SCOPE	Standing Conference on Physical Education
SD	Social Democracy / Social Democratic
SEAC	Schools Examination and Assessment Council
SEC	Schools Examination Council
SO	Statutory Orders (Physical Education)
SO and SO	Social Order and Social Ordering
SoS	Secretary of State
SPEC	Social, Political, Economic and Cultural Factors
SR	Salisbury Review
SSF	School Sports Forum
TCTG	Traditional Competitive Team Games
TGAT	Task Group on Assessment and Testing
TGFU	Teaching Games for Understanding
TEI	Teacher Education Institutions
TWS	Two Way Shift (from the LEAs)
TVEI	Technical and Vocational Education Initiative
UK	United Kingdom
US	United States of America
WG	Working Group
WS	Welfare State

Chapter One

Introduction

Introduction

1979 saw the election of a New Right (NR)¹ Conservative government in the UK. They held power for eighteen years. Although the NR remained in government until May 1997, my investigation is demarcated by the dates 1979 to 1992. These dates are significant as the National Curriculum in Physical Education (NCPE) was introduced in state schools in England and Wales in 1992. My research seeks to ‘make sense’ of the development of the NCPE through the theoretical analysis of empirical data.

The apparently clearly structured, linear progression of the presentation belies the complexity of the mix of biography, data, theory and methodology that occurred in the research process. The process was not one of simple stages of linear development. Rather, it was one of back-tracking, refocusing, and, at times, soul-searching, frustration and insecurity. This introduction, as Chapter One, discusses the origins, progressions, and processes of researching the development of the NCPE. This was a complex and disordered undertaking because the processes involved in the making of the NCPE were a complex business which did not lend themselves easily to critical investigation. This chapter forms the first part of a section (Chapters One and Two) which shows the connections between research motivation and methodology. The nature of this research project is one which leads to complexities in both research ‘practicalities’ (process) and ‘subjectivities’ (theorising), both independently and in links between the two. The interlinking of Chapters One and Two denotes the complexity of this research process by showing both how the ‘practicalities’ and ‘subjectivities’ are tangled together, and the subsequent difficulties experienced in untangling this complexity.

Chapters One and Two broach the complexity of both the ‘practicalities’ and ‘subjectivities’ in terms of uncertainty and unpredictability. It is made clear that none of the research progressions discussed below are independent of each other. Rather, it is explained how all interact, overlap and are inter-dependent upon one-another in a

¹ It is noted that this thesis contains a large number of abbreviations. However, this merely reflects recognised forms of abbreviation in education, education policy and educational research concerning the National Curriculum. It is acknowledged that such a large number of abbreviations can, at first, be confusing. It is hoped that the initial task of learning abbreviated meanings does not prove too great an inconvenience for the reader.

continual process of refocusing and refinement. This introduction outlines the development of the research focus by setting the 'what', 'why' and 'how' of physical education developments within the wider social, political, economic and cultural (SPEC) context of the period. Having, above, outlined the subjective nature of the research, the issues of motivation and biographical bias are addressed as part of this introduction. This indicates to the reader that biography, as it forms a central part of this research process, must be kept in mind throughout the presentation. The presentation outlines a progressive understanding of both data and process, and how they are inextricably linked. It is acknowledged further that the presentation is a subjectively constructed explanation of events. However, it is stressed that greater understanding of the interaction between the topic and process of the research, and their influence on each other, was a progressive and ongoing development. This was heightened further as the concepts drawn from the data and the concepts drawn from social theory came 'face-to-face'.

Crucially, the nature of this project changed with the election of the 'New Labour' government in 1997. My research began in 1993 when the NR was at the height of its political power and the NCPE was beginning to take effect in schools. The change of government came at a point when the 'writing-up' of the research was coming to an end. What had been a critical reflection of the political intent of an incumbent government became a retrospective investigation of history. Thus, the deductions made concerning political domination and its possible effects may, in hindsight, appear over-determined. However, this research is not an investigation of the success of the NR's political project. It is, rather, an investigation of the ideological underpinnings behind it. My argument throughout this thesis is not that the NR's SPEC intentions were achieved, but that they influenced the development and implementation of policy.

Background

The post-war social democratic consensus in UK politics came under severe strain in the mid to late 1970s due to the global economic crisis caused by the 'oil crisis' earlier in the decade. This economic crisis ran parallel to a long-running right-wing

attack on the welfare-state, unions and the ‘permissive society’ as the causes of a moral crisis in the UK. Crucially, this attack was a central component of a right-wing ‘political project’². (The ideological underpinnings of the right-wing attack are investigated in greater depth in chapter four). The economic crisis led to the ‘Winter of Discontent’ in 1978/9 which shifted the political initiative to the Right. Prior to 1979 the political terrain was becoming increasingly ideological and polarised. This was to be developed to an even greater extent with the election of the Conservative government in 1979. With Thatcher and Joseph leading the Conservative Party, a New Right (NR)³ hegemony ascended in government which was influential in policy making across the SPEC spectrum. The methods of policy implementation were ‘radical’ compared to previous Conservative administrations, and the Thatcherites termed themselves the ‘Radical Right’ (RR) (stated by former MfE Robert Dunn during interview). ‘Thatcherism’ was a politics of conviction, not consultation, consensus or compromise (see Thatcher 1993). The RR political project was to construct a ‘citizenship’ based on ‘social market values’ and the rights of ‘property’, rather than ‘social democratic values’ and the rights of ‘people’⁴. In brief, 1979 to 1992 was a period of increasing centralisation at the cost of local government with a massive increase in legislation, central constraints and directives over resource collection and spending, privatisation at the cost of nationalisation, increasing market mechanisms in social services, nationalism, populism, right-wing moral ‘authority’, union restructuring and welfare state reorganisation.

Developments in Education 1979 to 1992

The wider right-wing attack on the ‘failings’ of social democracy and the welfare-state found a focus in education, which was claimed to be both in crisis and the cause of the wider crisis in national stability and security. The NR discourse attacked education provision as incongruous to the UK’s economic requirements. The cause

² For a fuller discussion of the ‘hegemonic project’ see Jessop Bonnett, Bromely and Ling 1984 and 1985, Ball 1994b and 1995, Evans and Davies 1990, Evans and Penney 1993, Evans, Penney and Bryant 1993d, Jones 1989, Gilmour 1992, Dunleavy 1990a, Hall 1985, Durham 1991 - see also chapter four.

³ The New Right was a loose coalition of right-wing think-tanks, interests groups and members of parliament who shared similar social, political, economic and cultural interests and who favoured free market principles within strong government (see chapter four).

⁴ See Tebbit 1985 and 1986, Thatcher 1993, Lawson 1982 and 1988, Howe 1982 and 1988, Harris 1989, Lilley 1989, Biffin 1986, see also Conservative Party Manifestos 1979 to 1992

was claimed to be ideologically motivated left-wing Local Education Authorities (LEAs) and teacher's unions. The Right advocated the need for improved standards and value for money through vocational relevance. The 'solutions' included increased responsibility and accountability for schools, with power taken away from politicised LEAs and unions through both centralisation and devolution to the local level (schools). The Left were prompted to act and prime minister Callaghan's 1976 'Ruskin' speech incorporated many aspects of the right-wing's concerns. Ruskin called for a 'great debate' about the nature and purpose of education provision⁵. The right-wing attack, with its access to the media (Gamble 1990b, Knight 1990) set the context and the agenda of the debate, defining 'problems' and giving 'solutions'. Centrally, the Right were determined to reverse the '1976 Comprehensive Reorganisation Act', and undo the devolution of autonomy central to the 1944 Education Act and subsequent social democratic policies in education (see *Politics Today* 1979 to 1993, *Black Papers*, *Salisbury Review* 1983 to 1993, *Hansard* debates of the period - Fifth Series Vols. 967 to 1000 and Sixth Series Vols. 1 to 216).

The election of the Conservative Party saw a mass of legislation concerning education post 1979. Centrally, there were main Education Acts in 1980, 1981, 1984, 1986, 1987 and 1988 (ERA), highly influential DES White Papers in 1983 (*Teaching Quality*) and 1985 (*Better Schools*), curriculum consultation documents in 1980 (*A Framework for the Curriculum*) and 1987 (the *National Curriculum Consultation Document*), with a mass of central directives through Education Circulars from the DES (see Tomlinson 1993). Crucially for the Right, education provision encompassed both curriculum content and teaching methods. Policies included, to highlight but a few initiatives, resource cuts, identification of 'priority areas'⁶ for teaching and resourcing, Education Support Grants directed to priority areas, parental choice, open enrolment, per capita funding, a market between schools, formula funding, the Assisted Places Scheme to private schools, the publishing of information and examination results, changes to school government, the Technical and Vocational

⁵ For an in-depth narrative of post-war developments in education prior to 1979 see CCCS 1981, Simon 1991.

⁶ Priority areas were identified by SoS Joseph as management, vocational studies, maths and science (DES Circular 3/83, *Hansard* Vol. 2 'Industry and the School Curriculum' debate). Priority subjects were identified as English, maths, religious education, languages and science (*Hansard* Vol. 33, wa 139, see also *Politics Today* 1981, No. 18: p342, 1984, No. 18: p329, 1985. No. 3: p50)

Educational Initiative through the Manpower Services Commission, changes to school inspections, and changes to teacher education through the Accreditation Council for the Selection and Education of Teachers (ACSET) and the Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (CATE). Primarily, education was to become an industry with parents and pupils as consumers. The 1988 Education Reform Act introduced not only the National Curriculum and benchmark national testing, but also Local Management of Schools, Grant Maintained Status, City Technology Colleges and school league tables.

However, more than just content and method, the Right were, pivotally, concerned with the structure and form of education provision. Centralisation undermined the previous partnership between the DES, LEAs and teaching unions over educational matters. The largely autonomous Schools' Council, staffed mainly with teachers and LEA representatives, and concerned with the development of curriculum and testing initiatives, was removed by Joseph and replaced with two appointed bodies to separate the two functions: the Schools' Examination Council and the Schools' Curriculum Development Council. With the ERA, these bodies were replaced by the National Curriculum Council and the Schools' Examination and Assessment Council. These were later replaced with the Schools' Curriculum and Assessment Authority which once again combined the aspects of curriculum and assessment. All these bodies were appointed directly by the SoS. As with the Schools' Council, bodies which opposed right-wing policies were abolished, such as the Inner London Education Authority and Metropolitan Councils.

Policy initiatives followed a 'step-by-step' implementation as each new initiative built upon the possibilities created by previous initiatives (see Ball 1990, Demaine 1989 and 1993). The endeavour was to soften-up, undermine and suppress opposition, to allow the replacement of social democratic values and mechanisms with social market values and mechanisms. There were three clearly identifiable 'steps' or 'stages'. 1979 to 1986 encompassed emergence of the right-wing discourse and ideological attack which vilified education provision as 'left-wing' and the cause of national crises. The Right sought to influence public expectations and demands. The advocacy of 'traditional' form, content and method over 'progressive'

developments led to polarisation between the RR and many educationalists. 1986 to 1988 saw the restructuring of the educational partnerships and the reduced autonomy of LEAs and teaching unions. Conflict over pay and conditions led to strikes, 'justifying' the Right's call for tighter controls. The Burnham Committee⁷ was abolished and replaced with the Interim Advisory Committee on teachers pay. Pay increases were to be conditional on teachers accepting contracts which laid down 'duties and responsibilities'. Further changes were made to teacher education. 1988 to 1992, post ERA, saw the reform of educational form, content, method and structure as right-wing policies were implemented with little collective or organised opposition. The ERA was an historic change in education provision in the UK. It laid down by Law, firstly, a framework for content and testing through the National Curriculum with its Attainment Targets, Programmes of Study, and benchmark testing at Key Stages (ages, 7, 11, 14 and 16), and, secondly, both the centralisation of policy and resources, and the devolution of responsibility and accountability in a 'two way shift' of power away from the LEAs and teaching unions. The ERA also legislated that subject Working Groups would advise the government on the content and objectives of the NC within a remit set by the SoS.

Overall, between 1979 to 1992 the RR gained control of education through the combination of ideological and legislative measures. A new power structure developed with the centre privileged in policy development and resource allocation, but with schools made responsible and accountable⁸. In short, the RR set in place a framework of constraints and controls over education. Former Minister for Education (MfE) Rhodes Boyson certainly felt that the RR's project to gain control over education had proved successful;

Over the last twelve years, the Government have tried to get to grips with education problems; yet somehow, the education establishment has constantly eluded us. For the first time, we have now brutally taken the whip hand to ensure that what we want done will indeed be done (Boyson, 1991, Hansard, Vol. 195, Col. 683-4).

⁷ The Burnham Committee was made up of representatives from the educational 'partners' with teacher's unions having the majority voice.

⁸ See Ball 1994a and 1994b, Bowe and Ball with Gold 1992, Chitty 1993a and 1994, Evans 1992, Evans and Davies 1990, Evans and Davies 1993, Evans and Penney 1995b, Frater 1994b, Gamble 1990b, Graham and Tytler 1993.

However, educationalists argued that one hundred and fifty years of educational developments had been crippled by eleven years of RR government (Tomlinson 1993).

Developments in Physical Education from 1979 to 1992

Prior to 1979 physical education had seen one hundred and fifty years of development through, mainly, internal change (i.e. within the physical education 'profession') based on conflict and compromise (see MacIntosh 1986, Mangan 1981, Kirk 1992a). The post-war years saw the gradual and always contested development of a 'new' physical education which, in seeking to put the child at the centre of the physical education rationale, challenged the 'traditional' male centred focus, purpose and methods of the curriculum (Almond 1982, 1987 and 1989c, Kirk 1992a, Evans 1986, 1988 and 1990, Thorpe and Bunker 1989). To highlight the influence of the right-wing on developments in physical education post 1979 it is helpful to set it within the three chronological 'stages' identified above, firstly, 1979 to 1986. When a Bristol primary school decided to hold a non-competitive sports day the internal debate about the nature and purpose of physical education became public (Pollard 1988). For the Right, such 'progressive' developments were purely ideologically motivated rather than educational. It was advocated that they were a danger to the nation's moral, political and economic well-being and, therefore, central contributors to a wider SPEC crisis⁹. Physical education was defined by the Right as competitive sport and games. The latter were seen as of central importance in promoting excellence, discipline and moral fortitude (see Politics Today, Hansard debates). The Right, it seemed, were seeking to influence public expectation and demand through the symbolic representation of physical education as competitive sport.

However, physical education was being subjected to more than symbolic attacks, it was also suffering the consequences of the Right's wider educational policies. With schools encouraged to sell-off playing fields to generate badly needed

⁹ The attack was prominent in the Times, Telegraph, Observer, Daily Mail, BBC TV (Panorama 1987) and the Listener March 1987. See 'newspaper references' in bibliography.

finances (DES Admin. Memo. 1/82 and DES Statutory Order 909) physical education was struggling to maintain its already fragile status in schools. Competition between schools (the result of the introduction of market forces to education) was exacerbating the market within schools as subjects competed for resources (Evans, Penney and Bryant 1993a, 1993b, 1993c and 1993d). The identification of 'priority areas', which did not include physical education, and the allocation of Education Support Grants (ESGs) directly to them exacerbated this situation. Both the quality of provision and possibilities for professional autonomy were seriously affected (PEA 1987, Murdoch 1987, SSF 1988). This fuelled the right-wing attack on physical educationalists as incompetent. Despite rhetoric announcing its importance, in reality, physical education was suffering systematically under RR policies up to and after 1988 (Penney and Evans 1991a and 1995b).

Between 1986 to 1988 the content and methods in physical education were being publicly vilified by the right-wing, government, sport and the media (BBC Panorama March 1987). Physical education was blamed for national failings in sport, the economy, discipline and moral standards (see Evans 1988, Evans 1990, see BJPE of period). The government commissioned a Desk Study (Murdoch 1987) and established the Schools Sports Forum within the Sports Council. They were to investigate the 'state' of physical education in schools, both under the title of 'Sport in Schools'. Delimiting the definition of physical education as 'sport' has, clearly, a significant representational function: seeking to influence public attitudes, expectations and demands. It is significant that the attack took place prior to the 1988 ERA and the subsequent development of the NC and NCPE. More than just representing and vilifying what the Right saw as wrong with State secondary education (see Evans 1990: p158), the attack also had much deeper political and hegemonic significance (Kirk 1992a and 1992b) (This is the focus of chapter six). The government rhetoric about the need for 'sport' and 'games' in schools appeared to undermine the notion of 'physical education'. It sought, seemingly, to legitimate a narrow right-wing definition of physical education as 'sport' by constructing a myth of 'sport in schools' as the tradition. The government could then claim that this tradition was in crisis due to left-wing ideology. This would, in turn, 'justify' measures to protect this tradition. The freedom of physical educationalists to

undertake curricular developments was an autonomy which was not in the Right's wider SPEC interests and which needed to be curtailed. The determination, it appeared, was to replace 'expensive' physical education (in SPEC terms) with 'economic' 'traditional sport' as the common-sense expectation and demand. Prior to 1988 physical education's autonomy was successfully undermined through the combination of ideological attack and resource starvation.

Between 1988 and 1992 physical education was suffering heavily in resource provision through LMS and 'formula funding' in the newly created market in education (Evans and Penney 1993, 1994 and 1995b, Penney 1994, Penney and Evans 1991, 1994). With its late arrival in the staggered implementation of the NC, physical education's status was reduced still further. The NCPE (DES April 1992) arrived in schools in August 1992 as a compulsory curriculum, made law by the 1988 Education Reform Act (ERA). While a physical education teacher I discussed the NCPE informally with members of staff from other schools. There was a degree of frustration and hostility as teachers felt they had no input into curriculum development. They were dismayed at the selection of some of the members of the Physical Education Working Group (WG) set up to formulate the NCPE. There were serious concerns voiced about the assumed level of WG members' knowledge and understanding of physical 'education'. The chair was head of a prestigious boys public school and other members came from areas such as banking, industry, professional sport, and university departments of geography and medicine (DES 1991a). There was, seemingly, little representation from the world of physical education and teaching. Further, teachers had little understanding of the processes which led to the development and the implementation of the NCPE. There was mixed understanding of the source and purpose of the document. Further, there had been no In-Service Education for Teachers (INSET) to assist with interpretation and implementation of the NCPE. Most significantly of all, the NCPE (DES April 1992) arrived with no educational rationale. It was a Statutory Order outlining what physical education ought to be and would be, and what pupils ought and would be able to do by certain ages. There was no educational basis for 'why' this should be so. This was contradictory to developments in physical education which were seeking to expand the range of possibilities available to all pupils (see Almond 1989, Evans 1986 and

1988, Thorpe and Bunker 1989). The appearance, therefore, was of a NCPE which seemed to ignore years of research and development into learning and teaching in physical education.

Detailed research has shown that the WG was appointed by the government and that its workings were constrained not only by the initial remit and lack of time, but also by severe pressures placed on the members by the then SoS Clarke and MfS Atkins 'behind the scenes' (Evans and Penney 1991a and 1994, see Appendix H: p91¹⁰). Further, the WG's recommendations were undermined by the SoS (made possible due to the secrecy enforced on the group's discussions) and subsequently manipulated by the NCC (Murdoch 1994, Talbot 1993, Tomlinson 1993, Graham and Tytler 1993, Frater 1994, Beer 1992) (This claim was supported by civil servants directly involved in the process who were interviewed 'unofficially'). The WG's task was 'framed' politically, institutionally, economically and ideologically (Penney 1994). This resulted in the privileging of the right-wing discourse of 'traditional games and sports' and cultural restoration over a more 'progressive' child centred input (Evans and Davies 1993b, Evans and Penney 1995a, Penney 1994, Penney and Evans 1994 and 1995). The NCPE is a highly significant document which will effect the teaching of physical education in state schools for many years to come (Evans, Penney and Bryant 1993d). However, rather than improve the standard of physical education in schools, as claimed by the Right, available evidence suggests that the NCPE may exacerbate educational and social disadvantages (see Evans, Penney and Bryant 1993b: p27). Seemingly, through political manipulation, the NCPE is both imbued with and promotes a right-wing agenda which suppresses 'progressive' input. This culminated with the focus of the 1995 document 'Sport: Raising the Game' (DNH 1995) as physical education in state schools (see Kay 1996).

¹⁰ This thesis includes a large number of Appendices which contain a great deal of information. This information, which attenuates the arguments made in related chapters, has been included as appendices because the main body of the text was already slightly beyond the word length stipulated for a doctoral thesis. It must be noted that the appendices are themselves fairly long. Therefore, on the basis of selectivity, many of the educational initiatives introduced by the New Right Conservative government, such as the Assisted Places Scheme and the central role of assessment in the development of the National Curriculum, are discussed only briefly (see Appendix F: p43 and p48 respectively).

Summary

1979 to 1992 saw the complex interlinking of symbolic and material rules and resources by the RR in their endeavour to control education to make it serve their SPEC interests. The change in the balance of power in education was a socio-political process (Evans, Penney and Bryant 1993a, 1993b, 1993c, 1993d, Penney 1994) where the RR sought to shift social thought to the Right by constructing a 'crisis' in education. They portrayed their opponents as causing the crisis. They then attacked and undermined their opponents in seeking to remove them. This resulted in the emergence of 'real' opposition to right-wing policies within education, leading to conflict and industrial action which itself justified further attack and controls over education. Collective opposition was divided through legislation, reduced resources and market forces and parents and pupils became individual consumers in competition for places in 'good schools'. The NC, with its associated national testing was intended not only to restructure the form and content of education, it set benchmarks which provided market information for employers, consumers and voters, and restricted educational provision within a framework which constrained teachers' actions. However, although the above suggests a project of political intent at the macro level, there was no simple correspondence between the right-wing rhetoric and what was provided locally as a physical education in schools (see Ball 1994b, Bowe, Ball and Gold 1992). This disjuncture, the gap between political rhetoric, policy and the actions of teachers is explored in chapters five to seven. At the level of implementation there are various hierarchical sites of possible opposition and resistance, and so deconstruction and reconstruction of texts: sites such as the HMI, LEAs and teachers. These sites needed to be constrained, regulated or removed to allow the RR to implement policies which served its SPEC interests (see Appendix F: p39-41).

My thesis suggests that physical education between 1979 and 1992 was not only a microcosm of the RR's hegemonic project, but that it was a central mechanism within it. In my perspective, the RR sought to construct a form of 'citizenship' which served its interests by constraining individuals through self-imposed moral boundaries rather than through coercion (this is the focus of chapters five and six). This

perspective developed into questions about the origins and intentions of the NCPE implementation in state schools in England in Wales in 1992. In essence, the motivation behind this research was to find out what happened, why it happened and how it happened.

Research Motivation

My motivation to research originated as an educational critique of the NCPE while a physical education teacher. Teaching physical education led to greater understanding of the possible role of physical education in either promoting or undermining pupils physical and mental health. My professional development and teaching experience led to my questioning whether the aims espoused by the RR, both 'for and from' physical education, could be met through their policy initiatives. This led me to believe that the rhetorical aims espoused by central government (future participation in physical activity and sport), which were purportedly to be achieved through the prescribed content and methods of physical education and games in schools, would not only not be achieved but, more likely, have the opposite effect (avoidance of participation). Such apprehension led me to question the apparent lack of consultation with the profession in the development of the NCPE, and, further, led to stupefaction at the open and aggressive hostility displayed by the RR towards teachers and educationalists. I felt that the political and media attack on physical education, and the juxtaposition of 'sport' and 'games' for physical education, was an attempt to manipulate public understanding about the purpose of physical 'activity' in schools and how it *ought* to be. The NCPE appeared to be an imposition of increasingly questioned form, content and method, which either ignored or vilified research developments. If anything, I considered that the 'progressive', child centred developments that had occurred in physical education over the previous twenty years (Evans 1990) would have been more suited to the government rhetoric, in both content and method, and possible effect. This led to my questioning why the NCPE was developed. I considered that the reasons behind the imposition of such a curriculum were for ulterior political ends rather than 'individual' educational development. Far from being educational, the NCPE, when viewed in the wider social, political, economic and cultural (SPEC) context, appeared (to me) to be driven

by the RR's ulterior concern for 'social control'. However, making such an argument raises issues of my biographical frame of reference and my perception of what is defined as 'educationally worthwhile' physical education. I will deal with biographical issues first.

Biography and 'Likely' Bias

Everything which follows in this presentation develops from biography and therefore is laid open to likely bias. Issues of 'likely biographical bias' form part of the introduction to the thesis because it is important to outline how biography affects not only the *research process*, but also the developing understanding of the *process of research*. Greater understanding of the process of research brought an awareness of the necessity to acknowledge and address my own biography and subsequent biases and values, and how they would, were and had already affected all aspects of the research process. The conceptual links made between themes uncovered in the data, and understanding about the influence of my own role within the context of the research, developed in a concomitant and concurrent manner. As such, theory, practice and values all effected each other in my research. However, my argument is that personal values are central to the research process and, to expose the values of others influential in the making of the NCPE, one must expose one's own values (see Ranson 1995: p443).

With the 'key areas' of my research selected on the basis of 'values', my initial motivation to undertake research needs to be addressed with acknowledgement of 'interest', bias and possible manipulation. Dilthy (1992) claims that;

...society is the result of conscious human intention ... the interrelationships among what is being investigated and the investigator are impossible to separate. For all people, lay people and social scientists alike, what actually exists in the social world is what people think exists. There is no objective reality as such, which is divorced from the people who participate in and interpret that reality (cited in Sparkes 1992: p25).

This made me aware that biography played a central role in effecting my epistemological position. I had to acknowledge that "...researchers need to monitor

their own activities not only to understand the research process but to deepen their own understanding of the relationship between research questions and analysis, for data are derived and shaped....” (Burgess 1993: p51). I realise not only that I am located in a particular SPEC context which leads to my particular SPEC perspective, but that I am part of the pedagogic discourse and practices that I critique subjectively as part of this research.

My awareness developed that, in common with those social actors and structures being researched, I am a product of society’s history of constructs, boundaries and practices. I have been born into and positioned within the context of a previously constructed time-space social hierarchy. These historical underpinnings which create the contemporary social reality pre-exist me and are beyond my control. They led to a socialisation and enculturation which constructed my beliefs, attitudes and values, and, therefore, my motivation to research. My research orientation is, necessarily, based within my interests and concerns. This ‘frame of reference’ (Allan 1991: p179) is based on my interpretation, understanding and views of the world. I needed to acknowledge my own frame of reference before interpreting the actions, values, beliefs and understandings of others. This meant that I had to address my own ‘cultural reflexivity’¹¹, both within and upon the research process (Hammersley and Atkinson 1992: p178). Clearly, my background brought ‘subjective’ perspectives to the research. Thus, my frame of reference required detailed investigation as I needed to question my ‘taken-for-granted’ interpretations and reflect upon my own reflexivity. However, I was conscious of not losing my motivation for the research, as “...clearly all data collection requires some presuppositions. In social science, just as in other disciplines, ‘facts’ do not stand alone but are theoretically informed” (Allan 1991: p182). This theoretical standpoint acknowledges that my research is ‘theory driven’. Immediately there is the appearance of contradiction as I claim to be able to see and question the parameters of structural constraints, when ‘reflexivity’ suggests

¹¹ My definition of *reflexive* delineated throughout this thesis refers to a practice where individuals accept ‘taken for granted’ knowledge without critical analysis which leads to the SPEC status quo being reproduced without question. This is not the same as ‘*reflexive character*’ within the social sciences where the researcher understands his/her effect on data (see Hammersley and Atkinson 1992: p14). My definition of *reflective* delineated throughout this thesis refers to a practice where individuals analyse ‘taken for granted’ knowledge critically and, therefore, question the SPEC status quo.

this is not possible. This dichotomy needs to be addressed, and can be addressed through reference to biography.

It is important that I outline my Scottish background and consequent biography, biases, values, priorities, interpretations and perspectives which have developed in the context of a highly political environment of critical opposition to the Radical Right Conservative 'value agenda'. My predisposition to react unconsciously and act consciously has been established through habitus and hierarchically constructed experiences. Born into these existing structures, codes and values, my interpretations are undoubtedly value 'loaded' and certainly not value free. These values are acknowledged and addressed. However, they are not dismissed as they are the original motivation and focus of the research. My framework of understanding 'a' social reality existed prior to undertaking this research project. Furthermore, my professional development took place within a framework of Initial Teacher Education (ITE) and teaching which were both in opposition to the RR discourse and its subsequent policies, a position towards which I was already sympathetic, both consciously and unconsciously.

Coming from a Scottish background to teach in the English education system gave rise to what Atkinson (1985: p12) refers to as experience of an 'insider-outsider' situation: a 'partly detached' position which "...gives rise to the heightened perception of symbolic boundaries and membranes which create the universe of the 'we' relationship of inclusion and exclusion...and...it makes one sensitive to the lines of internal stress and cleavage". This can give reflective distance to issues of cultural transmission, symbolic rituals and taboos, and mechanisms of reproduction and control. Such experience can develop a 'biographical consciousness' which can be highly influential in the research process. As Atkinson (1985: p12) suggests "The role of personal experience in the genesis and elaboration of sociological theory is not something we are always conscious of. Yet its influences can be profound". In this way, I find myself both as an 'insider' educationally within the context of the research, and as an 'outsider' in terms of socialisation into 'English' cultural values. As such, my biography can be seen to be vital in the research process and is acknowledged as such. I acknowledge, unashamedly, that my biographical bias is

concerned with individual autonomy from structural constraints of inequality, exploitation, oppression and domination. It is an emancipatory view which expresses “...a concern with the social and cultural hierarchies of power that are transmitted in and through the curriculum of schooling and physical education within it” (Evans and Davies 1993c: p235). My rationale is for justice and equality in life chances, both in terms of ‘freedom to’ self-actualisation through autonomous reflection, and ‘freedom from’ oppressive reflexivity. This, therefore, is the underlying intent of this research. Nonetheless, I am aware that I am both researching the context and a part of its content, and that I am located within the ‘social totality’. By locating myself in the context of the work, I am aware of the dangers of elitism about my own part in the construction of knowledge about knowledge. It is necessary to be aware of and acknowledge the constructed nature of the thesis, and that data collection and analysis is subjective interpretation. This ‘self-critique’ of my location within the research is the conceptualisation of my origins, interests, intentions and discourse. Critical self-reflection of my own part in this research process is, therefore, central to it. This is argued to be a strength not a weakness.

My Perception of ‘Educationally Worthwhile’ Physical Education

Biography and bias have played their part in constructing my beliefs about what physical education ought to be. It is important therefore to discuss my perception of physical education. That perception, drawn from the discourses of initial professional development and consolidated by my teaching experience, concentrates on the view that physical education ought to be ‘child centred’¹². This ‘educational rationale’ is based on the notion that every child should develop a knowledge and understanding of the ‘why’, ‘what’ and ‘how’ of physical activity. Physical education is thus not seen as an activity centred subject where children are *coached* in traditional competitive team games or other any other ‘activities’. Neither is it seen to be about measuring

¹² This perspective has developed from the interpretation of widespread reading and from teaching experience (see Almond 1989c, Biddle and Fox 1988, Colquhoun 1989, Cowell 1973, Armstrong and Sparkes 1991, Dick 1986, Evans 1986, Evans 1988, Fox 1988, Hargreaves 1982, Hirst 1979, Hughes 1979, Khripkova 1980, Kirk 1986b, Laws 1990, Mangan 1973b, Meakin 1986, Murdoch 1986, McNamee 1992b, Pain 1986, PEA 1986, Saunders 1986, Skinsley 1987, Sparkes 1989, Thomas 1988, Thorpe and Bunker 1989, Williams 1986). It is brought to the surface to inform the reader of the perspective which interprets the development of the NCPE. Nonetheless, this does not make my perception ‘correct’ or necessarily more valid than others’ perceptions.

children against predetermined standards or norms of ability. Rather, my understanding of educational objectives is that physical education is just that: education. It is an understanding that education is about the fullest development of every child's ability, knowledge and understanding, where excellence is based on individual achievement through worthwhile learning experiences for all, regardless of ability. Excellence for the minority is valued, but not at the expense of the majority. Thus, professionalism, in my view, involves knowledge and understanding not only of both children's physical and psychological development, but also that many pupils do not enjoy traditional forms of physical activity, regardless of how major a part they form in our national cultural heritage. My experience is that far from finding participation in certain activities educationally worthwhile, many children find them tortuous, both physically and emotionally. As a result, such children, far from being encouraged into lifelong participation, adopted avoidance techniques from the earliest opportunity. These 'informed' views form the theoretical stance of the educational critique adopted to analyse the development of the NCPE. However, they are recognised to be a product of my biography, and, therefore, central in the motivation to research, the questions asked and the methodology adopted. In order to bring a clear focus and purpose to the research, specific questions needed to be asked and answered.

The Research Questions and Methods of Generating Data

Questions

The aim is to 'make sense' of the NCPE development in the context of time-space periodisation of 1979 to 1992. The contention is that the NCPE was not about educational development but about social control. With this motivation as the focus, the research needed to be refined into questions which both encapsulated the educational concerns and located the NCPE within the wider SPEC context. The primary research question thus centred on the issue of the motivation and purposes behind the introduction of the NCPE in state schools in England and Wales in 1992. Centrally, the question asked 'why was the NCPE implemented?'. From this beginning, secondary questions developed about 'who' decided what the aims of the

NCPE should be, and who decided WG membership?. The question asked 'who' was dominant in the process, 'why' were they dominant, 'how' did they dominate, 'how' did they become dominant and 'what' was their motivation? Further questions developed about what research was undertaken in NCPE development, who was involved in the process, why were they involved, who was not involved and why not? These questions form the basis of analysis of the 'what', 'why' and 'how' of NCPE development. The questions about the NCPE form an educational critique centred on the three central factors of provision - form, content and method - and, thus, pupils' experience. These specific questions required specific information to lead to reasoned answers. The focus of the research question therefore acted to generate the information required which subsequently, and concomitantly, determined both the sources of information and methods of its collection.

Methodology

The methods selected to gather data were conditioned by the information required to answer the research questions of 'what', 'why', 'who' and 'how'. The question of 'who was prominent in the making of the NCPE' led to seeking access to those involved both directly and indirectly; the question 'how' sought information about selection, preparation, guidelines and implementation; the question 'why' sought answers addressing the motivation and intentions behind the NCPE in relation to those prominent in its making; and the question 'what' sought information about the processes involved in NCPE development and implementation. The issue of educational critique required contact and discussion with those in prominent positions in the world of physical education. Locating the NCPE development within the SPEC context centred on reading more widely than physical education to understand the political climate of the period. Thus, data collection involved background reading of the policy documents concerned with educational change; the wider political intentions of the Conservative governments and how education policies tied into those; as well as general educational evaluations and critiques of the governments' wider educational reforms (methodological issues are the focus of chapter two). It was at this point of initial data collection where the problematic complexity of both the research process and the analysis of information first became apparent. This

concerned the links discovered not only between themes and concepts in the data, but also between the different areas of the research process itself.

Developments, Initial Findings, Analysis and Increasing Complexity

This research involved not only the collection and analysis of data but, also, learning about the process of research itself. These, especially in a subjective-interpretive research process, cannot be treated independently. They are inseparable in terms of how they influence each other and how the research develops. The 'practicalities' of research (the selection of methods) were heavily influenced by subjective biographical bias, either consciously or unconsciously, and by the continual refinement of the theoretical perspective. Coming to terms with the complexity of research was as central an issue as coming to terms with the complexity of the topic.

As the research focus was known prior to data collection, initial analysis began immediately. Theorising occurred once the collection of evidence was believed to be concluded. The concepts and themes drawn from the data through this initial analysis were thought to come through a process near to 'grounded' theory. However, this was found to be a simplistic view of the process of data analysis. A greater understanding both of the research area and research developed as both empirical and theoretical data was collected. Background reading, both about physical education's view of physical education and theories about education's social role, brought to the surface themes and concepts surrounding both an educational critique of the NCPE and a social critique about the ERA and NC more widely. The work of Evans and Penney (1994, 1995b), Evans, Penney and Bryant (1993) and Penney and Evans (1994) shed light on the complexity of the NCPE 'policy process'. The work of Apple (1993) and Dale (1989) highlighted the wider complexities of the 'social whole' and education's place within it. Analysis of those issues centred on uncovering links between the concepts and themes identified in the initial analysis of data. Theory came, initially, from wider educational and social critiques of the period (Ball 1994, Chitty 1993, Dunleavy 1990). The deeper understanding of biography and bias indicated that analysis through 'unadulterated' grounded theory was not possible (see chapter two: p58). Therefore, the initial interpretation of data proved to be little more than a process of coding,

classification and further selection as the research became more focused and more refined. This process happened more than once. Further, it became understood that the data collected was a specific selection and that its analysis related to the initial research question. The application of selective theoretical and conceptual tools meant that initial analysis, findings and conclusions needed to be problematised.

This project was not initially thought of as a theoretically based study but as a descriptive analysis and explanation of a series of events in the 'real world'. However, it became increasingly apparent that descriptions are not 'theory free', and it is acknowledged we need to both make our own 'theories' apparent in the analysis of data, as well as engaging with 'other' social theory if we are to begin to understand the subjective viewpoints which we research. For this reason it was necessary to develop an empathy with, but not sympathy for, RR beliefs (see chapter four: p116). It became clear that the research process is more than understanding and describing educational processes. Rather, it is an analysis of those processes in the context of time and space, through the adoption of a more sophisticated theoretical analysis. It became understood that what is required is a refined understanding of how these findings connect with physical education, and the specific complexities they present both within and upon physical education. The theoretical analysis thus involved a critical review of academic theories in relation to the research context. As the research developed, theoretical understanding was refined and data analysis became clearer. However, this increased understanding did more to confuse the research process and the linking of concepts than to clarify them. Not only was the research process found to be a messy complexity, so too was the employment of greater theoretical sophistication. I term the theoretical perspective constructed to analyse the development of the NCPE as 'critical realism' (see chapter three). This is a perspective which questions and critiques the motivation, concepts and methods of the RR. The theoretical application of 'critical realism' is intended to explain what was seen in the development of the NCPE and how this fits into the wider SPEC context of the period.

Summary

This thesis is a critique which focuses on the development, legitimation and transmission of knowledge by the RR. It is an analysis of why the development of the NCPE, a 'social event', took place between 1979 and 1992. An ultimate ideal of research *may* be impartial neutrality, certainly to positivists. However, it is asserted that 'that' is not the case in this research. The argument made here is that, with a biography of subjective bias, there is no possibility of complete neutrality. If there was total neutrality in the social processes there would be no reason to question social reality and no motivation to research. The necessity therefore has been to acknowledge my undoubtedly value laden interpretations and to address them to develop a critique based on theory rather than opinion and opposition. The inferences drawn are acknowledged to be no more than theories, no more than subjective interpretations, which themselves are open to subjective interpretation. The theories, concepts, meanings and understandings are themselves socially constructed representations of reality, a reflection on cause. As such they are open to challenge and debate. They can never be more than a partial explanation and therefore are vulnerable to critique and contestation.

The defence of this thesis and the inferences drawn is that the analysis, based in educational critique, is a view informed by the development of research which is intrinsically and critically 'self-aware'. In this way, 'critical self-awareness' is argued to add to the validity and the strength of the work. It is argued that this is a reasoned selection, informed by some luck, of the possible information available, from people and documents, and that the interpretation of that information is based on theoretical underpinnings and informed understanding, rather than values and opinions based on personal biography and ideology. It is acknowledged that a different selection of sources could have been made and that a different research perspective could have been taken. Different researchers may have drawn different inferences from the same data, depending on their motivational or theoretical underpinnings. It is also suggested that others with a similarly informed perspective to mine would reach similar conclusions, but this is by no means certain.

Presentation of Chapters

Chapter Two discusses methodology. It outlines both my procedures and their complexity. The discussion centres on how the technical practicalities (the research design, preparation and the methods selected) and the conceptual subjectivities (increased understanding of research, motivation, theory and topic) inter-link and influence each other in a circular process of continual re-focusing and refinement. Issues of validity, bias and ethics on the part of both researcher and researched are brought to the fore. The chapter also highlights the difficulties of interviewing 'elites' on their territory, especially when the information desired links directly to their 'part' in the construction and development of policy. As well as discussing practical problems, such as gaining access or failing recording equipment, this section on methodology also begins to discuss problems with the theoretical perspective adopted for the purposes of data collection and analysis. This is the focus of the following chapter.

Chapters Three and Four form the second, theoretical, section of this thesis. Chapter Three highlights the complexity of selecting a theoretical perspective which best describes physical education policy in the period of 1979 to 1992. The chapter discusses how my understanding of theory developed throughout the process and how theoretical refinement assisted me to both understand what I was seeing in the data and to construct a framework for presenting my work. A wide reading of established theoretical perspectives soon established that no one perspective adequately described the conceptual links generated through the analysis of my data. I argue therefore that it was necessary to construct a theoretical perspective which adopted and adapted concepts from several perspectives in order to convey what was seen in my data. This chapter outlines the underpinning concepts of this perspective which I have called 'critical realism' and which is located within a wider Neo-Marxist conceptual frame. This chapter discusses the role of education and physical education as mechanisms of social reproduction, social change and social control. These conceptual underpinnings form the basis of the analysis and presentation of data in the following chapters.

Chapter Four identifies the origins, intentions and ascendancy of the New Right (NR) pressure groups and the Radical Right (RR) politicians in the UK. It highlights the links between the NR and RR, and the influence of the NR on Conservative policy from 1979 to 1992. This chapter argues that the political intent of the RR was a SPEC 'hegemonic project' which endeavoured to shift the underlying moral values of the UK from 'social democracy' to the 'social market'. Pivotal to this involved the construction of a particularly conservative definition of 'citizenship' as 'common-sense'. This was founded on competitive, 'selfish individualism', and the portrayal of inequality as both neutral and natural, the product of an individual's 'effort and ability'. Acceptance of the effects of the 'social market' was sought through moral self-regulation (conformity) rather than overt coercion. The chapter focuses on the RR's use of both symbolic and material rules and resources to draw power and authority to 'the centre' on the grounds that there was a crisis in national stability and security.

Chapters Five, Six and Seven form the third, substantive / empirical, section of this thesis. Chapter Five argues that education was a central mechanism in the Right's 'hegemonic project' to narrow the definition of acceptable 'citizenship' and, as such, needed to be tightly controlled. The chapter highlights the methods employed by the RR in their attempt to gain control over the educational form, content, method and provision in England and Wales. It is discussed how the structure of educational provision shifted progressively from the periphery to the centre between 1979 and 1988 with the removal of 'opposition', LEAs, unions and independent educational bodies; the centralising of control over the curriculum and resource allocation; and the devolution of responsibility and accountability to schools.

Chapter Six focuses on the place and role of physical education within the right-wing's 'hegemonic project'. It suggests that the Right sought to use physical education to imbue pupils with the moral values inherent in a citizenship which advocated competitive individualism, selfishness, hierarchical inequality, patriarchy and the repudiation of guilt towards the less able or less fortunate. These are identified as the moral values central for the successful working of the 'social market'. It is argued that, in seeking to achieve this, the RR constructed a myth of the 'tradition' of

physical education in state schools as ‘competitive team games’, claiming that this tradition was in crisis due to dangerous ‘progressive child centred developments’: a ‘crisis’ which had to be reversed for the nation’s economic, moral and cultural well-being. This chapter suggests that the Right used the combination of symbolic and material resources to vilify, undermine and weaken the autonomy of physical educationalists, and to ‘legitimate’ its definition of physical education, ultimately leading to the constraining framework of the NCPE. It is argued that physical education was a central mechanism in the right-wing’s endeavour to secure its SPEC interests through cultural restoration.

Chapter Seven investigates the RR’s endeavour to ‘control’ the ‘form’, ‘structure’, ‘content’ and ‘methods’ of physical education provision in state schools. This chapter, through the presentation of empirical data, analyses the methods the RR used to ‘constrain’ the process of the development of the NCPE. It discusses the RR’s attempt to constrain the process of consultation both about the definition of physical education and the development of the NCPE in its bid to have its definition of physical education as ‘sport and games’ privileged in the text of the NCPE. It also briefly discusses the RR’s measures to control the implementation of the NCPE through the control of ITE and INSET.

Chapter Eight, as the concluding chapter, questions the inferences I have drawn from the data using a ‘critical realist’ perspective. It problematises the concepts employed within the context of my original motivation and intent, and focuses on the weakness of my position. I engage in a ‘critical self-reflection’ on the research process and the part I have played in the construction of knowledge about knowledge. Once again I locate myself in the context of the research question, the methods adopted to collect data, the theoretical perspective constructed to analyse that data and the presentation of material. I also addresses the fact that the reader is unaware of the material which has been ignored or deselected, either consciously or unconsciously, in the endeavour to present a thesis and remain within the stipulated word limit. This again emphasises the subjectivity of the work and the realisation that my interpretations are open to critical debate. However, through ‘critical self-reflection’

this chapter seeks to add to the validity of the research and lend strength to the deductions made.

Chapter Two

Methodology

Introduction

This chapter discusses the methods employed in the process of researching the development of the NCPE, why these methods were adopted, problems that arose and changes which were made. It identifies the different aspects of the research process as a messy mix which neither occurred in isolation nor in clearly defined stages. The aspects of motivation, focus, question formulation, identification of data and its sources (both documents and persons), collection methods, analysis and presentation of inferences did not follow a linear path with clear application but, instead, proved to be a 'mish-mash' of progress and back-tracking which led to conceptual confusion. As research progressed, my understanding of the topic, of theoretical perspectives and of the research process, all increased and I developed greater understanding of the appropriateness and validity of methodologies and an awareness of ethical considerations. This chapter discusses how the initial complexities were tackled and refined to give the research a definition, direction and course of action; how a precise rationale both brought a focus and gave significance to researching the nature of the connections between SPEC arrangements and the NCPE; and how the focus identified the central research question and helped to structure data selection, collection, analysis, interpretation and presentation. This indicates that the 'practicalities' and the 'subjectivities' of the research process influence each other and cannot be divorced from one another¹³.

It is discussed how a refined theoretical understanding developed an awareness that no one aspect of the social world sits in isolation, and that understanding contemporary developments in education requires an understanding of the wider SPEC arrangements. It is also discussed that to understand the development and implementation of the NCPE necessitated uncovering the motivations of those responsible for it. This focus led the research into an investigation of political interests and intent. The study, thus, became a theoretical, qualitative interpretation of the

¹³ Although this chapter deals with the practical side of methodology it is a false dichotomy to divide the practical aspects of research from the subjective aspects. There is a complex dynamic between the two and it is not possible to separate method (practice) and theory (motivation). It is indicated that, where initial motivation influenced focus, question formulation, the subsequent information required, data sources, data collection methods and analysis, the 'subjectivities' (motivation) affected the 'practicalities' (methods) of the research. For this reason the practical developments are discussed in relation to the subjective developments. Neither aspect is theory free.

developments in physical education policy between 1979 and 1992. As such, it is political in nature and open to challenges of bias. Nevertheless, it is highlighted that my growing awareness that research does not sit in isolation from the social aspects which affect my daily life, illuminated the possible 'misuse' of research depending on epistemological and theoretical viewpoints¹⁴. This alerts the reader to issues of methodological mistakes and bias. Further, the qualitative-interpretive nature of my research may suggest that it is limited in process, interpretation, explanation and so effectiveness. However, although this chapter identifies the methodological and theoretical weaknesses in this research, it argues that acknowledging and addressing these adds both strength and validity to the inferences drawn.

As well as discussing the virtues of the methodology adopted, issues of validity, bias and concomitant ethical considerations, and subsequent theoretical developments in data analysis, this chapter also discusses issues unique to this project, such as the ethics adopted in interviewing elites and overcoming practical and personal problems.

Paradigm Location

As a subjective interpretation of the motives behind the NCPE, my research is a qualitative study. It seeks to understand and explain the right-wing's political intent based on its philosophical, ideological and epistemological assumptions about the world, which create its definitions of 'social reality' (see Bryman 1992a: p45). This addresses issues of the environment, the Right's perception of the 'self' within it and its definition of 'citizenship' for others. It highlights the concept of others' 'reflectivity' or 'reflexivity' towards that right-wing definition. This qualitative approach also highlights my interpretation of social reality and compares it with that of the Right. As such, there are concerns surrounding issues of validity, reliability and bias in all aspects of my methodology. This can be argued to be a weakness of the qualitative paradigm. However, my argument is that by locating the whole process within the social context being research, acknowledgement of subjectivity in

¹⁴ An individual's thinking and actions depend on one's perception of 'self' in the social context which is developed through socialisation and enculturation (see Bourdieu 1995b, Kirk 1993). It is acknowledged that this influences the research process.

qualitative methodology is a strength rather than a weakness. It propounds 'reflectivity' rather than 'reflexivity' towards policy¹⁵. Locating research in its wider social and historical context locates its practicalities and subjectivities in their wider social context. It is thus pointed out to the reader that data collection, analysis, interpretation and discussion come within this conceptual framework, and that the thesis is a subjective viewpoint (This issue is returned to in the discussion of validity and bias).

Despite the emphasis on biography, subjectivity and theoretical development alluded to above, the process of research itself is subject to historical structures and conventions, ethical codes and moral considerations which structure and constrain action. These act to bring authority to the process. Ideally, research begins with comprehensive boundaries of conceptual clarity within a theoretical framework. However, the conditions for, and of, researching the NCPE proved to be anything but ideal. I began data collection, analysis and initial theorising without an established conceptual framework. This developed as the research developed. My research, therefore, was not based within a theoretical position and was, to a great extent, a 'grounded' procedure. As much as understanding the data, research proved to be about understanding research. It proved to be about addressing my own prior beliefs and assumptions about social reality and my unconscious motivation within the SPEC context, as much as addressing those of others. Self-reflection developed as my understanding of social reality developed. This highlights how my research is both deductive, based on prior motivation, and inductive as theoretical concepts developed. It is argued that this awareness led to greater strength in analysis and explanation.

Despite the advice in much research literature to read accounts of experienced researchers (Burgess 1993, Cohen and Manion 1992, Hammersley and Atkinson 1992), I feel that doing so did little to help with addressing my practical difficulties. Indeed, I feel that they actually hindered my approach. I found that accounts explained encounters, mostly, at one or other end of the quantitative-qualitative continuum. Qualitative accounts were mainly concerned with ethnography. Nothing was specific

¹⁵ I aim to be reflective *of* policy intent rather than reflective *within* policy. The second would be tantamount to reflexivity.

to my needs. Further, talking to other researchers about their experiences made me more, rather than less apprehensive, particularly as I was to be interviewing powerful people on their ‘territory’. Paradigms and established theoretical positions act as perspectives which seek to create understanding. However, they can also influence the research by creating or reducing the possibilities and concepts available. I found that restriction to a single theoretical position could not fully explain the complexities of the RR’s project and methods. I soon realised that every researcher, every interview and every research project is uniquely placed and requires unique input.

Procedures

All aspects of my research intertwined and influenced each other. There was no straightforward technical procedure and the steps were both backwards and forwards. There was as much coming to terms with the research process as with developing knowledge in the selected area. I had to ‘sort-out’ my confusion between theory and method, and understand the conceptual contradictions which developed with increased understanding of the ‘social whole’. Conceptualisation proved to be a highly personal development where experience met theory ‘head-on’, and where theory and method were inextricable. It was a social process involving methods and concepts which overlapped and influenced each other. The ability to research others depended on my understanding that I am all aspects of the research project.

Theorising, at what ever level (discussed below), led to a complex interaction of technical aspects (practicalities) and conceptualisation (subjectivities). An example of where my research topic influenced access to information about itself was when access to information about power and policy in our democracy was subject to the Official Secrets Act (OSA)¹⁶, leading to denial of access to civil servants on the NCPE Working Group. This “...alerts us to the ways that things which at first sight appear obvious and ‘natural’ are actually the result of social action, social power or social tradition” (O’Brien 1993: p3). It also highlights how the actions and choices of researchers are limited by rituals of behaviour which are portrayed as ‘common-

¹⁶ This raises questions concerning contradictions between ‘democracy’ and decision making about state education being classed as ‘secret’.

sense', regardless of their 'sensibility', and how our thoughts, understandings and actions are related to the production of 'knowledge'. This highlights that much information is lost or is inaccessible in the process of research and that what is taken-for-granted as 'truth' must be questioned. The construction of knowledge and social reality as either internal (conceptualisation) or external (generalisations) to the individual must be analysed in terms of the power and authority of some to construct and constrain experience and understanding for others¹⁷. Thus, although research should be set in a context where inferences can be verified to prevent the presentation becoming journalism (i.e. the presentation of 'facts' without critical analysis of them), difficulties in accessing information or scepticism about the validity of information means that inferences can be no more than interpretations. This context must be understood by the reader. This is certainly true of the 'critical-realist' perspective constructed to theorise the development of the NCPE (see chapter three). It is acknowledged to be, initially, no more than a starting point from which to build an interpretation of the period.

I became increasingly aware of the context of SPEC 'arrangements', my place within them and how my actions both influenced and were influenced by the research topic. I needed to develop self-critical awareness. It was neither a case of 'looking-in' or 'looking-out', it was more a case of 'looking-around'. My research therefore involves both reflective and reflexive issues. The discussion of issues of biography in chapter one has outlined where I locate myself in this context. However, without some notion of cultural reflexivity for both researcher and reader alike, concepts, descriptions, analysis and interpretations would be abstract and meaningless (discussed below). This necessitated the development of an analytical framework to narrow and so clarify the focus to specific collection, analysis and interpretation of data. Identifying the research topic and concepts within it "...provides a potentially convenient way of organising a great deal of cultural information into a relatively coherent ordering of a few categories" (Hammersley and Atkinson 1992: p224). However, this understanding developed as the research progressed. It was not known

¹⁷ This internal conceptualisation and external generalisations to the individual is not the same as the 'internal' or 'external' nature of a theoretical perspective. The 'critical realist' perspective expounded in chapter three is 'internal' to the study of the NCPE development. Nonetheless, chapter three discusses that it is not limited to this context and may, with development, be applicable as an 'external', general sociological theory.

a priori. I began data collection before theoretical refinement, thus initial analysis was based on motivation and intent. The information collected acted to confirm my bias rather than challenge it. It was the increasing conceptual complexity in the data which led to the need for theoretical refinement. The research design was therefore undertaken as the process progressed, on the understanding of the need to challenge my pre-held views and to reinterpret the data.

Research Design and Preparation

Ideally, the research design should set out the research perspective, the theory which will construct the key concepts, explain what data is required and why particular methods are adopted, discuss methodological problems, such as resource costs, time and access, and suggest solutions. This planning should set out the rationale for the research and outline the objectives which guide the preparation required to undertake the process. This creates a structure of boundaries which highlights that the specific research focus sets the criteria for data selection, and that collection is not random (see Burgess 1991, 1993, Gilbert 1993a, May 1993). Planning, therefore, is clearly a critical aspect of the research process and it is advisable to plan as thoroughly as possible before data collection begins. However, my experience showed that researching is not so straightforward and planning does not only take place at the start of the process but continues throughout and becomes more refined. Progressive focusing and data selection develop to increase quality, but are constantly influenced by interests and interpretive analysis as purpose influences priorities. In theoretical terms my planning was naive.

My planning centred initially on developing an overall structure and orientation to create a framework for data collection and analysis. This developed from identification of the topic and refinement of objectives into research questions. The orientation predetermined the focus which created the framework of data, method and analysis. However, this framework developed over time as the complexity of the links between concepts emerging from the data began to grow. My research lacked theoretical underpinning. There was no defining of concepts and so no frame to work within to guide data selection or analysis. With no pre-defined theoretical approach,

making sense of the data was both extremely difficult and a matter of opinion rather than theoretical analysis. As my research developed it became clear that a focus beyond my initial motivation was required. The move from biography to more structured planning was necessitated. This awareness of the need to adopt theoretical refinement acknowledges the ties between motivation and planning in my research. My motivation was to investigate the apparent contradiction between RR 'facts' (rhetoric) and 'practice' (reality), and to question the definition of simplified assumptions and 'norms' as natural. This meant uncovering links between subjective political decisions and right-wing ideology. A theory was required with which to link these emerging concepts. Despite the initially immature interpretation of data, it is clear that, due to the ill defined nature of both my research topic and process, analysis was increasingly influenced by the developing 'critical-realist' perspective.

Background reading was critical as part of my preparation. Knowing the topic required reading widely around existing research. It was vital to know and understand the topic and set it within the wider social context to be able to analyse and evaluate interview responses and probe more deeply. In terms of researching policy development, I needed to know the background of both the topic and the people selected for interview. This involved both reading work respondents had published and learning the position they held and role they played in NCPE development. I needed to understand the complexity of the topic to research those with, apparently, greater knowledge of it. I found that it was important at the outset of interviews to show a seeming lack of knowledge to get people to speak freely, but not to show ignorance for fear of appearing uninterested and making people feel they were wasting their time. This was critical in terms of interviewing elites (discussed later).

My aim was to access the best possible information, both persons and documents. I selected people as sources according to their role in NCPE development, centrally MPs, Civil Servants, Working Group members and educationalists. This objective met with varying degrees of success, plus some luck. Documents proved easiest to access, however, there were too many sources and time constraints necessitated selective reading. Moreover, sources such as Hansard and Education Acts were difficult to read. Documents were selected for both primary data and cross

reference purposes, and to access information otherwise not possible. For example, the death of former SoS Keith Joseph and the excuse of excessive workload by present MPs meant that relevant policy and personal documents needed to be identified. This highlights the need to overcome problems as the research progresses, for instance, the reliability and validity of data when those selected, the 'right' people, cannot be accessed. It also shows that my planning developed in combination with other aspects of the research to ensure the best possible quality of data, to avoid errors and overcome unforeseeable circumstances. However, my methodology was never erratic.

Methods

A cross-method approach using documents and interviews, rather than a multi-method approach, was adopted to bring strength to my subjective-interpretive work. However, it is recognised that data can never be claimed to be more than partially accurate.

Documents

Documentary sources were both primary and secondary. Primary sources were, firstly, those concerning the policy process (NCPE and National Curriculum documents, Education Acts, DES Circulars, National Curriculum Council publications, Hansard, White Papers and the 'Schools Education and Assessment Council' publications) and, secondly, sources of right-wing philosophy (MPs auto/biographies, NR think tank publications, private publications and Conservative Party publications). Primary documents, in terms of educational critique, included publications of research and development in physical education, learning and teaching (PE journals, Higher Education, the Sports Council, National Coaching Foundation and Central Council for Physical Recreation) and publications by WG members. Secondary sources ranged from political and educational critiques of RR policy to contemporary research of the NCPE¹⁸. They covered a wide range of topics within both education and politics. A

¹⁸ Access to research concerning the development and effects of the Conservative government's physical education policies centred on the work undertaken by John Evans and associates (see bibliography). Evans was at the forefront of researching the effects of the 1988 ERA on physical education in state schools in England and Wales.

third and fourth body of documentary sources also developed as the research became more refined, those of research methodology and social theory.

Reading widely was necessary to develop background knowledge and understanding of the NCPE. The first undertaking was a literature review of the topic, based on initial motivation, to assist with focus refinement and identify contemporary research publications. This involved a search of the CD-ROM and Library computerised catalogue to identify titles, authors and research topics through 'key-word' searches. The literature review began with secondary source documents which critiqued the effect of the NCPE on physical education in schools (Evans, Penney and Bryant 1993a, 1993b and 1993c). It assisted with the identification of which persons from both politics and education should be interviewed.

The first undertaking was to locate the place of physical education within the NR/RR's overall philosophy. Firstly, this involved researching the NR/RR Conservatives' political convictions to gain an empathy with their interests and motives. This set the RR's SPEC policies within both the wider, global time-space context and the time-space of national culture. Secondly, it involved developing an understanding of the RR's philosophy of the purpose of education and its subsequent form, content and method. This set education within the wider political context. Thirdly, it sought to uncover the RR's views about physical education's purpose, form, content and method. This set physical education within wider educational and political contexts. My background reading encompassed all areas of documentary sources. As a source of views on policy, Hansard was central to data collection. I spent two days a week, for fifteen months, reading through debates on education, education and training, physical education and sport from 1979 to 1994 contained in some 300 journals each of several thousand pages, where each journal covered two weeks of oral debate and written communication. This was a fascinating process which read like a complete history of the period. Nevertheless it was tedious and reading became highly selective, given consideration of time constraint and focus.

Although documents are a central source of information it is understood that they cannot be read uncritically. It is clear that secondary sources and personal

publications may be biased on the basis of background prejudice. This can also be the case for 'official' publications. It cannot be taken for granted that government documents are 'neutral facts'. Such documents must be placed in their historical and SPEC context, as all documents are socially produced. They may not be intended as propaganda but "...they are produced on the basis of certain ideas, theories or commonly accepted, taken-for-granted principles..." (McDonald and Tipton 1993: p188). They are constructed on the basis of the selective bias of particular viewpoints and there is little opportunity to review what has been left out and why. Consequently, they need critique on the basis of whose interpretation of social reality was privileged in their construction. Setting the document in its social context assists in uncovering the privileged definitions and the underlying meanings and signals in the text. Social rules and structures can be embodied in the text but understanding those depends on the reader's ability to interpret them. (These issues of discourse and hierarchy of knowledge are discussed in chapter three: p90). For text to have effect, the reader must understand aspects of its purpose, form and content through shared meanings and representation. This is made possible "...by a socially situated author and audience who are necessary for the text to have any meaning at all" (McDonald and Tipton 1993: p198). Thus, for the reader or researcher "...meaning derives from the context and if the context is imperfectly understood, the meaning of the sources may be distorted" (Calvert 1991a: p122). It is understood that the same holds true for my presentation.

Issues of constructed social reality and underlying purpose raise questions about the validity and reliability of personal documents. Interpretation and evaluation has to be based on questions of authenticity (fact), credibility (purpose), representativeness (selection) and meaning (explicit or implicit). It is essential to address issues of distortion and misrepresentation with reference to SPEC privilege, purpose and intent. Personal documents, especially autobiographies, must be critiqued as selective, retrospective reconstructions (Burgess 1991), intended to 'set the record straight'. Mrs Thatcher's 'Downing Street Years' reads like a recap of policies as if they were planned to have exactly the effects they did. (It is understood that my presentation must be viewed in a similar light). I was well aware that inferences drawn from interpretation of such sources could affect future analysis and

conceptualisation. However, bearing these concerns in mind, such documents do give an account of events and do inform us about the author's 'perspectives and presuppositions' (Hammersley and Atkinson 1992: p131). In terms of reaching an empathy with particular view of how social reality 'ought to be', personal documents can give an accurate picture of how people view themselves, their environment, their place within it and their power to alter it.

With documentary sources as central to my study, it is recognised that what is accessed greatly influences the direction of all aspects of the research. Access to certain 'official' documents is impossible under the OSA or other official rules (see Ozga and Gewirtz 1995), therefore the whole 'truth' **cannot** be told. Nevertheless, documents, however biased or inaccurate, may be the only source of access to views and opinions. Centrally, documents of personal RR philosophy were read in comparison with 'official' documents to locate RR 'interests' in legislation. This was fundamental in uncovering the RR's definition of physical education and locating the NCPE within the wider, contemporary political context. Secondary source documents are acknowledge to be interpretations of events based on theory, motivation, or bias. It is noted that my reading of secondary sources entails a further subjective interpretation of subjective interpretations of subjective viewpoints. However, they were viewed as a kick start to the research to prevent replication and identify 'gaps' in explanations. They also led to an initial understanding of others' interpretations of educational policy and its effects since 1979.

Interviews

Interviewing was the method most suited to gathering qualitative data. Documentary sources, plus general knowledge, identified key individuals prominent in the NCPE's development. Interviews were a resource for uncovering key individuals' definitions of physical education and their interpretations of what the NCPE should be and why. I sought to uncover their attitudes, beliefs, opinions and the subsequent motivations behind their actions, non-action, selection and non-selection of the content of physical education policy. By comparing their perspectives with the content of legislation I sought to highlight their influence in the making of the NCPE. Interviews, therefore,

endeavoured to uncover what was either included in, or left out of, policy and why, on the basis of interests and intent.

Qualitative interviewing allows depth of information, but it is open to accusations of subjective bias as interviewers can mislead, misrepresent or reconstruct responses. Further, interviews are social interactions which are effected by both the researched and the researcher. The researcher must understand the part he/she plays. The interaction leads to a level of rapport which is central to the degree of formality the situation creates. Rapport is more than an issue of dress and of cultural norms, expectations and demands of behaviour and action. It is not only presence and personality which effect the process, there are also 'non-rational' (Cohen and Manion 1992: p311) factors at play. These concern 'latent identities' (Hammersley and Atkinson 1992: p120) of gender, race, age, social status and so on, which are brought by both sides. This includes issues of body language, cultural codes and etiquette, expected behaviours, judgements on character, trust, confidence and control, as a relationship for interaction is established. Body language can expose falsehood. However, for the inexperienced interviewer, this is especially difficult to interpret. Conversely, it might be especially easy for the respondent to pick-up on the researcher's inexperience. This proved to be highly important when interviewing members of powerful elites (discussed below).

The setting for the interview is itself a power context. I discovered that where the interview was conducted influenced the degree of formality, subsequent interaction and shape. The political elite members who I interviewed operated within their formal setting and maintained their formal status. It was essential for me to understand the 'context', the interests and authority of elites, and to understand how they perceived my social status and role. I was, after all, entering their world (see Hunter 1995). However I realised that undue deference would get me nowhere and that I held an element of power. My endeavour was to be as unselfconscious and frank as possible, without being either deferential or condescending to party rhetoric, avoiding eliciting spontaneous responses which disclosed my underlying attitudes. Interviews proved to be highly individual social moments and, as such there, were few set procedural guidelines to follow. It was a course in pragmatism.

The process of interaction between interviewer and interviewee in qualitative interviewing is considered to be more or less 'unstructured' in nature with doubts about the accuracy and validity of data (see Burgess 1991, Bryman 1992a, Bryman 1992b, Moser and Kalton 1992). However, I found that an 'unstructured' exchange was not a true reflection of my undertaking¹⁹. My intention was to access desired information, prevent the respondent 'rambling' and to leave with quality rather than quantity. It was therefore essential for me to retain control to keep focus. My interviews were not non-directive. I found that the most effective way to conduct the interview was to use a schedule which allowed for both probing and refocusing, according to individual respondents expertise. Prior background knowledge of the topic, through documentary sources, allowed me to evaluate answers immediately and probe more deeply where required. The schedule comprised a list of the main topics of interest in the form of area headings (see Appendix A). Questions could be added or dropped according to the time available. The most controversial questions were left to the end. This guided the focus with 'structured flexibility' and allowed for subjective responses. Although the format of area headings outlined in Appendix A was established after the first few interviews, the schedule was adapted from interview to interview as both theory and knowledge developed. Areas were either refined, expanded or dropped altogether. It was also amended according to who was being interviewed. For example, politicians knew different information from educationalists and civil servants. With 'structured flexibility' I soon realised that the responses were in no particular order, with topics in the schedule often mixed together in a single response. It was vital to ensure that I remembered to ask the most important questions in each area. I found the trick was to keep the interview conversational, follow the direction of answers, mentally tick-off what had been addressed and probe when appropriate. However, this skill was never totally mastered. No amount of pilots or practice prepared me totally for what arose, but they did improve my confidence and technique.

I acknowledge that the final focus of this thesis upon a right-wing project using physical education as a mechanism to construct a citizenship based on moral-

¹⁹ See Hammersley and Atkinson (1992: p112) for a discussion on ethnographic interviewing.

self regulation and the subjugation to hierarchical 'place' and 'role' did not emerge until I had developed and employed a more sophisticated theoretical perspective in a second analysis of data. Critically this was not the focus of the original interview schedule. If the field work was to be re-done, the interview schedule would focus on the right-wing's perceptions of physical education as a mechanism for the construction of citizenship. Questions about a 'right-wing project' to shift moral values to the right would have formed the final, controversial part of the interview. However, due to constraints on time and finances, and the difficulties of gaining access to politicians it was not possible to undertake data collection for a second time. Further, some of the meetings with politicians were thoroughly unpleasant encounters which I would not wish to go through again. The inferences drawn are therefore taken from the initial data. Hindsight has highlighted the difficulties encountered between increasing focus, theoretical refinement and the subsequent reciprocity of initial data. This is identified as a limitation of this work, nevertheless the inferences drawn are reasoned deductions based on the data gathered.

The very first task was to find out how much time I had for each interview. This dictated the questions I asked. I found that if a politician had not already told me how long I had, they asked how long I needed, then they told me how long I was going to get. This indicated that they were used to being listened to without interruption while voicing interests which effect others. It appeared to be their way of controlling the interaction. As outlined above, I needed to have some level of control to get to the data required. With often only ten minutes afforded there was no time to 'pussyfoot' around. 'Rambling' needed to be addressed. I viewed it as a tactic employed to avoid further questions. As such, I needed to challenge the expectations of the 'power-subordination' relationship and interrupt to refocus the interview. Each interview situation required unique methods to stop rambling. Many approaches were adopted (from friend, third person, speculation to confrontation), with varying degrees of success, according to the perceived rapport. Questions were used to probe, clarify and review in a 'cat and mouse' process. My aim was to keep the topic focus continual, while pushing as far as possible for information, attitudes, perceptions and 'slip-ups' based on 'mood'. It was clearly a 'directing' and 'guiding' of the conversation. My aim was to get the information which had cost me often

considerable amounts of time, money and emotion. My interviews were not 'non-directive'.

Some suggestions in the literature were found to be unhelpful. Fielding (1993: p140) indicates that "...the probe should be as neutral as possible. It should not incline the respondent to a particular response", claiming that direction can lead to bias. Fielding further suggests that the interviewers should not expose extreme views. I disagree, and argue that when I felt I was getting information which contradicted that collected earlier, this was a pointless position to adopt. This was especially true when I considered that MPs were 'dissembling', for example, when I knew, through Hansard, that they had debated an issue in Parliament, yet denied knowledge of it. There was also the problem of 'short sharp' answers with no intention of expanding the discussion. I considered these occasions an appropriate time to voice my own views to motivate the respondent. Burgess (1991: p108) suggests that the interviewer must listen to the respondent and let them answer on their own terms. Again, I challenge this when interviewing politicians and responses are no more than party rhetoric or organisational procedure. Confrontational methods which challenged answers proved to be a useful tactic in 'hotting-up' the interaction. On occasions it led to outbursts of right-wing opinion which seemed, possibly, to reveal the underlying political intent behind policy decisions. It relied upon a 'gut feeling' as to how to proceed, and highlighted how vital it was to know the subject background thoroughly. Analysis proved to be a constant process, with instant evaluation of the relationships between responses, concepts and theory.

My rapport with MPs, Civil Servants and educationalists were all completely different. MPs are clearly used to 'trial by TV' with more accomplished interviewers than myself. The initial contact was usually a good signal of the respondent's disposition. The kind of rapport adopted was based on first impressions. I estimated how cunning I would have to be. I needed to assess which questions to add or drop and whether to avoid controversial issues to get what information I could before the interview ended, or was ended. Dilemmas arose as whether to 'get what I could', or 'get thrown out'. The second outcome was sometimes more revealing than the first. I tested and stretched expected social roles as far I could using 'tactics' which

developed with experience. Interviews with educationalist were far more informal, and generally as long as I required. They became a sharing of similar views which made me more of a participant in the process than a researcher of it. However, I was aware that educationalists were as capable as politicians of voicing personal interests or political agendas. Issues of bias and validity again rise to the surface and are acknowledged. Crucially, interviews with Civil Servants never 'officially' took place.

The Consequences of Context

My aim was to investigate subjective interpretations of the role of physical education in the production and maintenance of wider SPEC arrangements. Each interview situation needed to be set in context. The context affected methodology and introduced issues of ethics and bias. I wanted to tape record all the conversations but I was worried that if this intention was known before hand it may have led to no interview at all. I found it more comfortable to ask at the time. It sometimes 'broke the ice' as respondents marvelled at 'how small technology was making things these days'. Out of over fifty interviews only a handful of respondents voiced concern, and only on one occasion was there a flat refusal. This refusal led to detailed note taking. I always took rough notes regardless and developed a rough version of shorthand (This proved vital on the occasions when the recorder failed to work - see discussion below on 'problems'). However, as a collection tool, note taking took time, missed pieces of information and lost non-verbal communication. Recording verbatim proved impossible. Issues therefore arose about my opportunity to manipulate, interpret or misquote either when taking notes or filling in gaps later. As interviewing elites was central to my research, I felt that, in terms of respondents' social status, accuracy was an astute consideration. I thus sent a transcript to respondents for verification. It was interesting to see how much they either wished to change or deny.

Context, Researching Elites

Individuals were identified and valued because of their roles either in the development or critique of the NCPE. Those selected were in, what is termed, 'elite positions', either as MPs (SoS, Ministers, ESASC members, Civil Servants), WG members, HE

educationalists (central to innovations within physical education) or researchers. They were central as holders of the required information. Such prestigious social status placed me in the position of subordinate and had consequences for the type and quality of interaction, centrally in issues of power and control. These perceived social roles were highly pertinent to researching 'elites' with considerable power and authority, and experience of being both 'interviewees' and 'interviewers'. They were experienced in dealing with more tricky questions and situations than an inexperienced, nervous research student could present. Their perceived prestige of being elites also contributed to the relationship which developed in interview interactions.

Issues of self-perception went beyond how I presented myself at interview, which was different with different people from all areas. This was a tangled combination of what I thought of respondents, what I thought they thought of me and, crucially, what I thought of myself. This centred on my perception of the authority of those in power and of my social status. Although subjective concerns, they were highly influential in the practicalities of interaction. It became clear that the perceptions of both the researcher and researched were inseparable from practical and subjective issues in both theory and method, especially when, as outlined above, biographical motivation does not allow for detached objectivity. Instant evaluation of the situation and person gave an indication of how to proceed. It was clear that the issue of 'latent identity' was evident as both sides 'checked each other out'. It brought into play set, internalised assumptions for both respondent and interviewer, based on individual socialisation, enculturation and learning of place. These influenced first impressions which clearly affected my approach and subsequent interaction. I was conscious of interacting in 'their world' and that I was unsure of social and political controls and implications. For example, I did not know how to address 'Dame' Angela Rumbold. The context, therefore, was vital.

Issues of status, and perception of power and control were determined, simply, by who decided the interview date, time and setting. With MPs deciding the date and place there was little opportunity to fit interviews into the appropriate 'place' in my research. This led to problems with my knowledge of the background and subsequent

lack of confidence to challenge ambiguous responses. The setting led to problems of access, approach and manner, and gave the elites the opportunity to manipulate the interaction. It acted either to create or constrain interaction of certain kinds. Environments were often not suitable for interviews. When interviews were carried out in the public lobby or the busy tea-room of the Houses of Parliament, or in local council chambers, the asking of certain controversial questions was inhibited and the chance of interruption was increased. I later decided that this was the deliberate, skilled choice of MPs to establish a setting not conducive to interviewing. My lack of experience was not helped by such environments, which acted to give MPs greater control of the interaction. It appeared that MPs seemed to think they would give me ten minutes to tell 'how it was', 'ought to be' or 'would be'. They did not often seem prepared to be interviewed. They appeared to want to get their point across then go. When questions arose they seemed inconvenienced, but then stimulated at a bit of a challenge. This realisation developed with the first few exchanges. It became evident that all the contexts of data collection were relevant and determined the quality of the data.

With mounting costs I realised that I could not afford to waste time. With later interviews I attempted, not always successfully, to move to a more conducive location. Even then, interruptions occurred, either by telephone or other means, which ate into the time the respondent had allocated for interview. If respondents allowed constant interruption it indicated how important they thought the interview was. I believed that what I was doing was vital but became aware that respondents often viewed it as low down in their immediate order of priorities. After all, the topic had an historical slant and was not an 'interest in hand' for politicians with new responsibilities. It seemed that some politicians felt they were doing me a favour by giving their time to address retrospective issues. On occasion I was told as much. I soon realised that although personal confidence was crucial in these interactions, it was difficult to establish. I was also careful not to appear arrogant and realised these were not times to have my say, but to 'put-up', accept the circumstance and gather what data I could.

Social Status, Elites and Research Implications

To keep the encounter worthwhile and prevent the interview from becoming a 'top-down' interaction I had to find techniques to close the social distance between myself and the respondents. However, Lasswell suggests that;

Knowledge and power are intimately related. Differences in the distribution of knowledge are a source of power, and power may be used to generate and maintain differences in the distribution of knowledge. Knowledge, then, is a scarce resource" where "...elites are those who have more of whatever scarce values there are in society, while the rest, who get less, are the masses. To be ignorant is to be powerless (cited in Hunter 1995: p151).

In this perspective, social position, power and control (discussed in detail throughout chapter three) influence methodology. This is central in terms of the conceptual repertoire available to the researcher during data analysis. There is little doubt, therefore, that research of this nature is political. The question here is of the power of elites to impose their definitions of structural and symbolic norms on others, to construct a certain knowledge of society and a 'shared' meaning of social order based in beliefs and values of place and role in society which are portrayed as 'traditional'. Social interaction is arguably based on those shared 'understandings' of hierarchical authority and symbolic prestige. It sets a perception of self-status and social context for both the researcher and the researched. Thus;

...conceptualised prestige as symbolic social power and advantage [gives] rise to structured relationships of deference, acceptance, and derogation. Prestige as a form of power manifests itself in several modes: it creates favourable presumptions, it is a basis for exerting influence and it confers the ability to determine standards, tastes, and styles of life (Aldridge 1995: p116).

Perceptions of prestige form the relationship between the researcher and the respondent in terms of expected deference and role. Perception of one's self in the social context, one's social reality, is central in this type of research.

The stance I adopt is that "...we are a society that is highly bureaucratized, highly centralised and highly manipulated..." (Spencer 1991: p23), where central political elites are selected, sifted and socialised into a particular SPEC orientation, and those elites are 'entrusted' to organise and manage society through control of its

resources (symbolic and material). Individuals have knowledge of both structural norms (economic arrangements) and symbolic norms (cultural arrangements) which are interwoven into daily life. I therefore view society as a system of formal and informal 'norms', of hierarchical positions, rules and relations, which are the means to construct a 'consensus' favouring elite interests. I am, as a researcher of it, still part of a traditional, universally shared meaning and understanding of 'consensus', which defines hierarchical power as 'social stability'. From this 'consensus' comes an expected 'acceptance of' and 'deference to' the authority of elites. This has to be challenged by the researcher.

To understand the nature of our social environment and our subsequent behaviours it is important to reflect upon and view our social position as external controls imposed upon our daily lives. This helps us to understand social relationships and the actions of elites. However, as discussed above, both the researcher and the respondent have power in interactions. Despite this, few people study elites because "...elites are by their very nature difficult to penetrate. Elites establish barriers that set their members apart from the rest of society" (Hertz and Imber 1995: pviii). The history of hierarchical status means that elites are used to social distance. In terms of research this means that;

Elites are used to being in charge, and they are used to having others defer to them. They are also used to being asked what they think and having what they think matter in other people's lives. These social facts can result in the researcher being too deferential and overly concerned about establishing positive rapport. They can also result in the researcher over estimating the importance of what elites have to say, assuming, for example, that they necessarily know and better what is going on... (Ostrander 1995: p142)

There is, therefore, the danger of seeing individuals as too important in the process of policy development. Ball (1995: p8) indicates that 'personalisation' can lead to individuals being credited with too much importance and that what is required is an analysis of that person's importance and power to set the agenda, rather than straightforward acceptance of it. I found on several occasions that deference was what was expected and demanded. These situations became confrontational. Challenging an elite member's views or explanations led to immediate upsetting of the 'normal' social positions. It was a difficult approach to adopt at first but I realised that it

sometimes resulted in responses based on 'opinion' which often got closer to deeper values and beliefs than those portrayed as 'common-sense' justifications in party rhetoric.

These issues are subjective but they affected research practicalities. For example, elite respondents had the ultimate sanction of ending the interview. In other words, the perceived control and authority bestowed by power was a factor which influenced researching actual power. I considered this an important issue which affected the opportunity to access the reasoning behind policy decisions, especially when elites in government are entrusted with the control of resource distribution and management of institutions which means they have the potential for great power over society. These 'given', or adopted responsibilities are central in decision making and the construction and implementation of policy. As theoretical understanding developed, it became clear that the focus of my research was to uncover how elite interests and intentions are translated into physical education policy. In essence, adopting Hertz and Imber's (1995: pviii) perhaps arrogant view, my aim was to "...expose the reach of power in the hope of clarifying it for those who are subject to it". The aim was to expose the intentions of elites through explaining the actions taken and decisions made and by questioning the democratic authority to serve the interests of all or the power to serve the interests of some at the expense of others. Theoretical refinement was required.

Theory

Burgess (1991: p108) indicates that "...no matter what perspective is adopted by the researcher, it is vital to develop a conceptual framework that can be modified and used throughout the research process". However, my work had no such theoretical foundation prior to initial data collection and analysis. Rather, my theoretical perspective developed with that collection and analysis. This served to make an already complex undertaking much more confusing. Chapter one highlighted my hypothesis that the NCPE was located in social control. Danger lay in the temptation to set out to find evidence which did no more than confirm this point of view. I acknowledge that this was how I proceeded initially. Data was selected and analysed

within this narrow perspective. However, with no prior leanings towards formal functionalist, structuralist, Marxist or feminist academic paradigms, it is argued that this approach actually added strength to my research. Rather than setting prior boundaries and concepts it allowed concepts to develop from the data. I realise that my initial motivation was not based on a 'formal' theory but was an interpretive perspective of social reality. Thus, rather than agree with O'Brien's (1993: p11) claim that all research is based on 'theoretical scaffolding', it seems more accurate to see to mine as 'motivational scaffolding' which underpinned the drive to understand connections between social actions, experiences and change. Theory thus developed during rather than before the process as concepts developed and understanding was refined. It assisted in giving meaning to different perspectives and so actions, experiences and change.

This highlights how the relationship between theory and data developed with interpretive conceptualisation. The links between methods, analysis, data and theory are evident, in my view adding to the validity of the explanations and conclusions. It indicates how there is a clear relationship between data and theory and an active integration of theory and method which is refined throughout the process. This indicates that the two shaped each other in a grounded manner. It is suggested that there is no such thing as 'unadulterated' grounded theory. In my case, concepts developed from the data in the generation of a theory, however naive, that began to develop links and relationships between emergent categories and themes. Theory was not being tested, it was developing, which in turn influenced methods and so data, and vice versa. This links the relationships between concepts in the data to theories of links and relationships in the wider SPEC context (for example power, control and political intent). Aspects of recognised formal social theories were adopted and adapted in the construction of the 'critical-realist' perspective employed to test the concepts in the data. This perspective was constructed in the endeavour to clarify, but not to over-simplify, the complexity of the relationship between physical education and the RR's SPEC project.

Critical investigation of formal theory²⁰, brought to light that my research takes place at the macro level of social systems, controls, power, legislation, discourse and political intent. It therefore locates the interests and intentions of those involved in NCPE development within the SPEC context. This interpretive approach endeavours to increase understanding of the complex links between politics, power, education, legislation and reasons for change, through critical investigation of social 'norms'. Concepts which emerge from the data are defined, described and explained through 'analytical induction' (Bryman 1992a: p81, Burgess 1993: p180). This grounded approach seeks to draw categories from the data, refine them until relevant and clear, then explain the links between them. My presentation is therefore both descriptive and analytical. Thus, I argue that, while biography is acknowledged and addressed, it cannot be removed as this is both the focus and the social context of the research.

Analysis

Analysis began at the outset of data collection and developed from vague motivational bias rather than from established social theory. The selecting, coding, categorising and editing of data which took place in the first few months proved to be a central part of analysis and development. This processing of information led to conceptualising and theorising over the rest of the first year. Concepts with complex relationships emerged from the data. It became evident that rather than simply describing the relationships, it was necessary to understand and explain them. To show the complexity and significance of these relationships I needed to locate and refine my initial theorising. My second year brought to light the development of the practical and theoretical aspects of the research and the connections between them. Further, they were entangled with analysis which influenced future processing as the grounded focus became clearer. My analysis proved to be both theory driven (motivation) and theory development (refinement). There was an interplay of 'grounded' and 'ungrounded'

²⁰ Such as Althusser (Barrett 1995) and Gramsci (Bellamy 1995) - see Apple 1982, 1988, 1989, 1990 and 1993, Archer 1984 and 1988, Bernstein 1971, 1977 and 1990, Bourdieu 1995a and 1995b, Bowles and Gintis 1976 and 1988a, CCCS 1981, Cohen 1981 Dale 1982 and 1989, Giddens 1979, 1982, 1995a and 1995b, Giroux 1984, Habermas 1979, 1995a and 1995b, Larrain 1979 and 1989, Meiskins Wood 1988, Miliband 1983 and 1985, Mouzelis 1995, Open University 1994, Scott 1995, Weber 1994 and Young 1971

theory. I had to acknowledge and understand the developmental nature of research, that the initial 'grounded' analysis was an important learning stage from which to progress and that interpretation and reinterpretation are important in bringing focus and clarity to the process. This 'analytical induction' occurred over the third year as concepts emerged and boundaries were clarified through increasing theoretical sophistication. Clearer conceptualisation of key issues came with more refined coding and categorising. The reverse was also true. Concepts which evolved from the data were defined, and links were made between categories to produce theoretical relationships. It was then easier to arrange the data into a theoretical framework for presentation. Nevertheless, the critical realist perspective is not claimed to be a 'finished article'.

My aim is to link the concepts in the data in clear theoretical terms which explain the connections between the Right's definition *of* physical education, a wider SPEC project and the development of the NCPE, and the reality *in* physical education. However, the development of a critical realist perspective brought to light that to undertake a critical investigation of others' social reality requires one to be critical of one's own. I needed to understand my views of the world as subjective understanding and acknowledge my predispositions to react and act in certain situations. I developed awareness that the data was interpreted according to my philosophical outlook which was not neutral. This is returned to in chapter eight which problematises the inferences drawn by critical realism. I needed to clarify and make known my underlying attitudes and intentions to both be able to interpret those of others and make the process valid (see chapter one: p22).

I have argued that my biography *is* the research. My analysis is, therefore, outlined as a process of subjective interpretation. It is not an endeavour to quantify what has been conceptualised. Crucially;

....the aim is not to gather 'pure' data that are free from potential bias. *There is no such thing*. Rather, the goal must be to discover the correct manner of interpreting what ever data we have. (Hammersley and Atkinson 1992: p112, my emphasis)

Critical realism was developed and is offered as the frame to interpret the data I collected. It is impossible therefore to claim that my explanations are 'truths'. I had to take account of practical issues of validity and reliability. Issues such as a respondent's failing memory or their intent to mislead, whether those I interviewed were significant enough to have had an important role in NCPE development, if they had told the 'truth', attempted to mislead me, simply told me what I wanted to hear, or selected their highlights to enhance or hide their role in proceedings. In other words, I had to view all responses with critical scepticism. Further, the concepts selected for evaluation could clearly have had different meanings to different people, according to their understanding based on their discursive repertoire. The concepts which developed were central to the interview schedule. The difference between respondent perceptions and understanding and my perceptions and understanding of the questions asked and answers given was a central part of my research (discussed shortly).

With the lack of an initial theoretical underpinning it is no surprise that the selection and analysis of information based on bias motivation confirmed my opinions. Social theory was avoided initially because I envisaged my research as a straightforward investigation of RR policy. I thought theory would 'get in the way' of a practical investigation. However, trying to make sense of, and explain what was uncovered, required closer connection with theoretical investigation. This development was part of the wider reading and understanding (see chapter three: p76). Nonetheless, the selection of people and documents involved a careful identification of those prominent in the NCPE development. I did not access all those who I wished to, but those interviewed were very important people, central to the process. They proved to be the best possible access I could gain (see Appendix B). It was important to locate those actors in context to analyse their responses.

The Context of Responses

Hammersley and Atkinson (1992: p107) explain that "...accounts are not simply representations of the world; they are part of the world they describe and are thus shaped by the contexts in which they occur". Responses, as a result, may be based in technical rationality or political rhetoric according to the situation, rather than on

belief or emotion. Ball (1995: p7) indicates that giving individuals too much credit (in the construction of discourse) can lead to misrepresentation of their role and power, and that persons must be located in context because it is "...the interplay between figure and landscape that is important theoretically and empirically"²¹. This can illustrate how policy decisions are made in relation to 'acceptable' solutions and how "... 'possibilities' are framed and articulated in relation to specific areas of policy" (Ball 1995: p12). Coming to understand respondent's roles involved ascertaining where they positioned themselves in context. This increased my awareness of the respondent's importance, their access to information in terms of 'knowledge' of NCPE development and their motivations and purpose for co-operation. This was important in trying to establish both what had been left out of NCPE policy and why; and how much political interest and intention was espoused in rhetoric as common-sense 'knowledge'. Responses are viewed merely as perspectives of content or context, which can be seen to represent particular views. An understanding of the responses is also based on perspectives and views. Further, respondent's and researchers (and readers) attitudes towards and understandings of an issue, whether similar or not, do not sit in isolation from the influences of other issues. Attitudes and understandings are created by multidimensional experiences.

The above stance is taken on the basis that all 'knowledge' is constructed in a social and structural context. It is viewed here that the individuals who construct 'knowledge' are located in a context of time and place and are involved in constructing 'common-sense' understandings to construct consensus. It must be considered that what is 'left out' may be of more importance than the actual content of the NCPE. What is 'left out' may never be known and the context of time and space may be lost over time. The understanding of the selection of particular language with specific meanings is, therefore, central to my analysis. Central is the role of language and discourse in forging social organisation, reality and action. Language is taken to

²¹ Ball (1995: p3) indicates that actors' interpretations come through the effect of 'polyvocal' discourses, where actors are within discourses. Thus, individuals and discourses 'frame' each other on the basis of habitus and socialisation. It became evident that I was researching particular 'discourses', rather than 'individuals' who were subject to many discourses which they brought to the process of the NCPE development. This proved to be a constraint on individuals' empathy towards alternative discourses. Further, the focus of the discourse shifted with time as the several changes of SoS brought new priorities to the NC. Nonetheless, in terms of the development of the NCPE, they continued to work within the wider right-wing discourse.

be a central medium of socialisation of cultural norms through institutional transmission of values into all aspects of social life. It is viewed as a tool of cultural description through symbolic representation which is functional at all social levels, the perceptions of which “...are not the kind of ‘rules’ or norms of behaviour which we consciously articulate, or on which we routinely reflect. Instead, they inhabit the very weave of social life, and thereby become invisible and unnoticeable” (Woofit 1993: p289). This is why representation of policy decisions as ‘common-sense’ justifications must be questioned.

Language

Although language and discourse (introduced here and revisited in chapter three) is identified as a central part of any analysis, however interesting or appropriate, space does not allow their investigation in terms of linguistics, speech formation and so on. Responses can be caged in language which is specifically selective or misleading. Analysis of language use is central in understanding explicit or implicit meaning. Language is, after all, the method of cultural communication and comprehension. In terms of elites, language is used to transmit knowledge which reinforces status and power where understanding depends on the receiver’s interpretation of meaning. Bryman (1992b: p222-3) outlines that language is used for social organisational purposes by elites where “...discursive repertoires are tailored to convey a sense of their expertise and authority on decision-making...” and where there is;

...the capacity for leaders to use language as a resource for ‘framing’ the ways in which issues that they see as important are conveyed. People who wish to contest leaders’ ideas must respond in the leaders’ own terms, so that the tone and the agenda of the issues have been set in advance.

Discourses of interests are constructed on the basis of exclusion which creates an understanding based on selected definitions. Thus, ‘consensus’ for control depends on the notion of shared understanding of the meaning of social place and role. Attitudes and actions are formed within the language of discourse but are constrained by existing social structures, even for elites.

In this perspective, the language used to construct the text of discourses is selected on the basis of interests, beliefs and intentions. As representations of the world are constructed selectively, discourses portray social reality in a particular and purposive way. This is used to develop an understanding of a particular 'social purpose' definition of physical education as practical 'common-sense'. Transmission of this particular 'common-sense' value depends on privileging its definitions in policy discourse. The transmission of selected definitions to construct a shared understanding thus leads to the justification of a 'recognised' form of physical education on the basis of SPEC value and purpose. This leads to rhetorical justification for a 'required' level of resourcing, which either creates or constrains provision possibilities, and so educational experience and effect. The actions of elites become intelligible and accountable to others through limited understandings within elite definitions. Woofit (1993: p289) indicates that;

As a consequence of these developments, it is now untenable to retain conceptions of language as a merely neutral medium for the transmission of information, values, and beliefs about a world 'out there'

Rather, it can be argued that "...descriptions are designed not merely to *represent* the world, but to do specific tasks *in* the world" (Woofit 1993: p297). Face value language may hide deeper meanings of text. The construction of policy text may be intended to create levels of interpretation depending on the receivers' discursive repertoire. It is vital to acknowledge that "...there is no privilege...as to what constitutes an 'objective' or 'accurate' version of the world, simply because any state of affairs can be described in a series of different ways" (Woofit 1993: p304) and can be representation rather than analysis. This is also true for my presentation. There is no neutral presentation as writing uses selective language to report, which creates another 'text' and another 'truth'. This raises issues of validity, bias and ethical considerations.

Validity and Bias

Central to the subjective research process are questions of validity. This encompasses accuracy, reliability and consistency not only in data collection, but in all areas of the

process, both practical and subjective. The issue for me was one of access to significant persons and documents, and then assessing how much of that information was relevant. For example, I wondered how valid non-attributable quotes were to a third party. The information needed to be checked in the context of time and space to verify the intentions of the respondents. It was necessary to assess the respondent's mental state²², social status and reasons for 'co-operating'. However, it was not possible to gauge fully if respondents were intending to help or 'hurt' me, or others. Even if their intentions were honourable there was still the issue of failing memories or purposive altering of the facts. Building the complexity of the 'whole' was based on the combination of documentary sources and interview sources to reduce the possibility of bias in the interviews conducted. This was especially crucial as my project was based at the macro level where arguments are 'political', complex and controversial. These were issues over which I had some degree of control. However, in other aspects, such as latent identity or respondents intentions, I had little or no control. Fielding (1993: p145) indicates that respondents may simply say what they think interviewers want to hear, where "...Socially acceptable responses are particularly likely to represent convenient ways of dealing with interviewers rather than expressing the respondent's actual view". These give some indication about the respondents intent to discuss 'problematic' issues. Such responses can also indicate that the respondent views the topic as a low priority or, in fact, knows little about it. Alternatively it may signal that a topic is too 'sensitive' to allow in-depth investigation. In these cases the information needs to be problematised retrospectively. It is claimed that 'leading questions' should be avoided due to the possibility of bias and the confirmation of expectations (see Burgess 1991 and 1993). However, when time was short, answers were ambiguous or, I felt, based on previous data, that misrepresentation was taking place, I considered there to be a difference between '*leading*' questions and '*misleading*' questions. They also formed a good way to challenge elite views and probe beyond 'socially acceptable' responses.

Setting myself in the context of the research, both as effected by it and effecting it, goes some way to addressing issues of validity. Not only did I gain

²² This did not mean a psychological assessment. It meant simply trying to assess if the respondent was angry, remorseful, inattentive, upset and so on.

critical understanding of others' understandings and perspectives of the world and so their beliefs and opinions, I also had to come to terms with my own prejudices. This led to deeper understanding of my social location, and subsequent possibilities and constraints placed upon me both as an individual and as a researcher. I also developed an understanding of my 'self' "...as a complex mixture of biological instincts and internalised social constraints" (Bryman 1992a: p54). Understanding biography led me to question my personal assumptions, and shifted my self-perception in the research context from 'neutral objectivity' to 'inclusive subjectivity' (see Hertz and Imber 1995: pviii). As a researcher I cannot be neutral from the social world as I am both a part and product of it. I realise the need to be reflective on social reflexivity. My perspectives are influenced by my conception and understanding of the social world. This, in turn, influenced both the 'knowledge' I chose to question and how I did so, in short, to examine my epistemology. This awareness also led to an understanding of the political dimension of the power to impose 'certain' definitions and understandings of social context. My presentation is no more than an account which synthesises data with theoretical interpretation. It is a subjective way of seeing the world where my views, beliefs and intentions are compared with others' on the basis of categorised concepts. It is an interpretation of social reality based on constructs, theories and understandings personal to myself, through my access to discourses which explain my environment and experiences within the social boundaries set in time and space by powerful others. It is the endeavour to understand those social boundaries and the intent and actions of powerful others in the construction of knowledge and social relationships and interdependencies. My explanations of power and structure therefore come within themselves and must use the discursive repertoire available to me.

For these reasons, it has to be accepted that claims of a naive position of neutrality are unreal, as bias, either as internal or external perceptions, cannot always be recognised. It is acknowledged that, as motivation and context are inextricable, there can be ulterior motives for research. My argument is that interests and values inevitably influence all aspects of the research process, that the researcher is influenced by the research, and that all research is 'political' (see Hammersley 1993: p40). It is assessed that validity cannot be a central pre-requisite, as researchers can

never be completely sure of the reliability or 'truth' of information. Nonetheless, as indicated above in the discussion about 'misleading comments', there is 'truth' about the development of the NCPE to be accessed and analysed. However, subjective interpretation does not seek to claim 'truths', rather it seeks to question them. My explanations are no more than constructs of subjective analysis and thus open to challenges of bias and exploitation. This, therefore, leads into the consideration of ethics.

Ethics

Burgess (1993: p51) stresses that data cannot be presented as 'fact' because all data is derived and shaped. Research is clearly a process which requires self-conscious appraisal and critical reflection. As personal perspective (motivation and theories) leads to the choice of analytical theory it is central to the whole process and has to be made explicit from the start in order to evaluate if the process is value driven. A research project which aims to critique policy decisions and implementation as the basis of social transformation, must address its relationship to the views of policy makers; its own political intent; subsequent biased selectivity of information and interpretation; plus the misrepresentation or exploitation of data. These issues are pertinent to all research contexts and proved central to my interaction with elites²³.

Ethical ideas as to how to proceed were again reliant upon 'gut feeling', according to initial impressions. I 'played it by ear' according to how I felt things would go. I had to assess how to approach those with political office, either exposing the real, 'critical' motivation behind my research, or trying to develop a 'cosy' environment to prevent hostility. Whyte (1992: p111) exhorts that researchers should not argue and avoid judgmental reaction to responses, and that they should "...accept statements which violate ...ethical, political, or other standards without showing ...disapproval in any way". This is a point with which I disagree in terms of interviewing politicians, or other elite members, in 'hostile' interaction and who

²³ Importantly, all those who were interviewed were 'elite' in their own field. They ranged from MPs, Civil Servants, professors of education and physical education, heads of departments to researchers. This meant that hierarchical expectations of social roles, even if they were more lax at times, were always relevant.

afford only a few minutes for interview. When I had travelled hundreds of miles and was allocated ten minutes, there was, I argue, a legitimate incentive on my part to 'get down to business'.

I agree with Spencer's (1991: p28) claim that "...hostility and mutual suspicion ...are conditions where consensus methodologies are not appropriate. The usual reciprocal alliances between researcher and the researched do not exist". I was not in a position of control. Getting to information with potential political and social implications was not a time for deference to political rhetoric. Ostrander (1995: p149) suggests that;

...researchers need not be so overly concerned about rapport that challenging questions are avoided. Being able to ask pointed questions is an issue especially when studying elites because they may wish to protect their position and have the power to do so.

Finally, ethical issues concern the part personal motivation may play in unintended bias, or worse, in purposeful manipulation of data. There are very real issues of exploitation of 'good-will', confidences, people or secrecy. Central to this is the issue of potential 'pain' for the respondent. These are issues that have to be dealt with personally by the researcher as they wrestle with their conscious. I again agree with Spencer (1991: p29) that "...it is legitimate, under certain conditions, when dealing with powerful bureaucracies, to mask one's true purpose of seeking facts rather than the perpetuation of myths, in order to obtain the information essential to sustain a free society". I found that pretending to support the views of an MP or advisor often led to them 'opening-up' and exposing more political interests and intentions. Although they often changed the text when they returned transcripts, I decided to stick with their original responses. Of course there are limits to the conclusions which can be drawn from one interview and cross referencing is important. However, conclusion have to be drawn from the information which is available and accessed.

Problems

The discussion above has outlined some of the complex practical and subjective methodological problems which I encountered in my research. The following section discusses some of the more basic practical and personal problems I encountered. Nonetheless, these still played a critical, if not central role in influencing the overall process of research. It is stressed that practical problems and personal problems cannot be extricated from one another, where both take an emotional toll. Three areas have been identified for discussion; practical, theoretical and personal problems

Basic practical problems centred around the question of access. Due to my lack of understanding of the process of research I did not plan interview dates to correspond to my developed understanding of the topic. I contacted prominent people as soon as I could, with the result that I gained access to them too soon. I found myself interviewing past MfEs within three months of beginning the PhD. I also discovered that gaining access depended on who wanted to talk or who 'could' talk. For example, I only gained access to the educationalists on the WG. The other members did not want to be interviewed. The Civil Servants to the WG explained that they were prohibited to talk because of the OSA²⁴. There was a total mix of areas as dates came back. This was good in some ways as I collected contradictory opinions and beliefs from educationalists, Civil Servants and MPs which gave me a better grounding and supplied 'ammunition' for future questions. However, my lack of knowledge, combined with my lack of experience, led to a lack of assertiveness during interviews. Initially I was either easily side-tracked by respondents answers or found myself thinking of the next question rather than listening to responses. I was also obsessed with possible problems of equipment failure after my initial interview had seen the tape recorder break without my knowledge. I arrived home to find the tape blank and had to make sense of what had been discussed from the sparse notes I had made. As my knowledge increased I identified a second batch of interviewees and 'grouped' meetings according to location and context. There was also an element of

²⁴ I received a telephone message from the civil service, via the head of the university department, which informed me that those civil servants involved with the WG would not be available for interview.

luck in gaining access to Civil Servants who could not talk in an official capacity but who spoke freely in a non-official and non-attributable context.

In emotional terms, analysing a complex mess of interconnecting information with no theoretical base and so no clear direction led to mental turmoil. The conceptual complexity resulted in coding based on bias. Theoretically my explanations were a mess of confirmation and contradiction. Explanation rather than description was needed to bring significance to the links and relationships between the concepts which were identified. Connection with social theory identified issues of power and control and so on, and began to explain the concepts which I saw in my data. However, single theories appeared to be too specific or limited to cover the complexity of the concepts in my data. They appeared to be theories to explain specific issues. Debatably, I argue that the lack of theoretical underpinning added strength to my research. Despite biographical bias, I argue that collecting data with no recognised theoretical underpinning allowed me to avoid paradigmatic boundaries. Lack of theoretical planning was a strength as I had no idea what information would be collected, what I was going to find or what concepts would emerge. This could be neither planned for nor designed. This 'grounded' type of approach allowed theoretical development as analysis took place. Analysis became a process of discovering theoretical explanations for social complexity. This led to the development of the critical realist perspective.

Personal problems also played a large part in my research methodology. Certain problems were beyond my control. Centrally, the university department in which I was located closed. This resulted in my supervision changing four times in two years as I was transferred around university departments, with each supervisor wishing to bring his/her influence and interpretation of events to bear. This eventually led to my transfer of university to Loughborough, which itself required a settling-in period. This period formed the third year of the process. It saw theoretical refinement and the reworking of the data. Secondly, being married brought additional difficulties to the undertaking. My wife and I lived apart for the duration of the research which caused emotional problems of its own. This was compounded by the fact that I was working while researching full time and days taken off for interviewing resulted in

lost holidays, days which my wife expected to be spent with her. The time taken up by the PhD was itself demanding on a relationship. Thirdly, the financial burden was a severe implication, not only in terms of research costs but also in terms of subsistence when mortgage payments required to be met. The usual problems of isolation and lack of discussion for the PhD student were also prominent. I had little opportunity to discuss my topic with others, both to hear their views and to clarify it in my own mind. Further, I realised that researchers must prepare for the worst possible scenario and be adaptable enough to respond to practical and emotional difficulties, such as transferring universities, changing supervisors, moving house and the 1994 rail strike throwing interview arrangements into complete disarray. Bearing in mind all the problems discussed above, I came to agree with Bryman (1992: p162) that, in reality, “...much research entails an attempt to maximise ‘damage limitation’”.

Summary

This chapter has highlighted both the qualitative nature of my research and the acknowledgement of ‘problems’ with subjective interpretation. It outlines how the project is a subjective analysis of the historical and structural contexts which have contributed to political motivation and choices in the development of the NCPE: structures such as beliefs systems, value positions and assumptions of how the world ‘ought’ to be. The research is an analysis of constraint on action and choice, of social interaction, of perceptions of symbolic rituals and the construction of ‘knowledge’, of experiences, difference and behaviours which create and recreate society. It is an analytical evaluation of the generation of social difference, interaction and relations through the operation of social organisations and institutions, and the subsequent practices and processes which develop. However, these explanations are acknowledged to be no more than interpretations based on the information accessed. I concede that there is masses of information of which I am either totally unaware or did not have time to investigate thoroughly. Information was thus ‘selected-out’ due focus and time constraints. With the subjective nature of this research it would have been possible to make tenuous links with many areas of political or social theory. To maintain significance and validity my research needed to remain focused. Others may disagree with the selection, however that is their prerogative.

It is acknowledged that, through possible selection, manipulation and misrepresentation of data based on bias, there is the danger of my telling the story how I want it to be. This is especially true with research which is, arguably, focused on objects as political as the RR project (see chapter four: p149). My bibliography and selection of respondents offers the reader reference points from which to 'check' the inferences drawn. There is also space for accusations of an esoteric study which has too much breadth and not enough depth. My defence is that this highlights the complexity and breadth of the RR project, and the place of the RR's definition of physical education within it. Further, it brings to light the incredible complexity of the research area, the RR project, the emerging concepts and the relationships and links between the policy process, social reality, social structure and power, and so on. It gives some idea of the magnitude and complexity of the undertaking and indicates my coming to terms with it.

Researching the development of the NCPE was as much about coming to terms with my own value position, interpretation of social reality and perception of the purpose (so form, content and method) of physical education, as those of 'significant others'. It was the developmental awareness of motivation and bias, the conscious or unconscious manipulation of data based on both my political intent in terms of the production of knowledge about the NCPE, and the construction of my version of the 'truth'. The research design was discussed as assisting with focus but little more as I had no idea of what was to come. Concepts were uncovered, links were made, theory was introduced and explanations developed with analysis. The lack of depth, in terms of physical education, is acknowledge not as a weakness but argued as a necessity in explaining the inter-related SPEC influences which impinge on physical education. In seeking to untangle the SPEC complexity to make sense of the NCPE developments in context, I am acutely aware that I have neither uncovered all the SPEC influences nor fully investigating those identified. This presentation undoubtedly leaves gaps for others to identify and fill.

Chapter Three

A Critical Realist Perspective

Introduction

This chapter outlines the concepts which inform the perspective I have employed to interpret the development of the NCPE between 1979 to 1992. These concepts were adopted from established social theories and adapted to construct a framework with which to analyse the data collected and offer explanations for the existence of the NCPE²⁵. This framework both brings focus to the research and locates the theoretical perspective within the context of general theories of the social world. It makes my arguments and the inferences drawn clearer to the reader. The genesis of the ‘critical realist’ perspective discussed below came through the initial, ‘formal’ theory-free, analysis of data. It evolved with the increased understanding of the values and perspectives of ‘formal’ social theory. A clearer picture developed of the concepts emerging from my data. Although ‘critical realism’ was, simply, a theoretical perspective constructed to interpret the development of the NCPE, it does, however, connect with aspects of neo-Marxist thinking. Thus, although it emerged from a ‘grounded’ analysis of my data (see chapter two: p58), critical realism is not an over-specific set of conceptual clarifications, restricted to the context of the time-space focus of the political intent and influence of the NR/RR from 1979 to 1992. Rather, it engages with aspects of the whole social domain and is, I argue, an appropriate theoretical perspective with which to analyse wider social contexts. Nonetheless, the perspective is embryonic and does not claim to reduce the complexity of the world to a single social theory. There is clearly a complex history to the development of social theory. At the time of writing post-modern perspectives of the world predominate (see Ball 1994, Evans and Davies 1993c). These interpretations are useful in locating the political intent of the NR/RR but do not form the basis of critical realism.

The NR was a complex interlinking of, and apparent contradiction between, the ‘old’ neo-Conservative (an opposition to globalisation and the intention to rejuvenate ‘traditional’ capitalist hierarchical structures*²⁶ within the UK ‘nation’ state) and the ‘new’ neo-Liberal (the promotion of post-Fordian / post-modern

²⁵ This is not to say that established ‘formal’ theories are explanations of ‘truths’ of how the world ‘really is’. They are acknowledged to be no more than subjective interpretations.

²⁶ To save space and verbosity the primary concepts central to critical realism are outlined and discussed in Appendix E. Concepts found in this appendix are identified by the * sign.

industrial conditions and the development of a highly skilled but flexible workforce) right-wing factions. However, both wanted to remove the welfare state and reverse social democracy, and saw the extension of consumerism and individualism in the market as the 'solution'. Thus, neo-Liberal 'market freedoms' depended on the social constraints put in place by neo-Conservative 'traditions'²⁷. Chapter four highlights the complex relationship between the NR and RR and how they worked in the interests of capital over labour and social democracy. It indicates how their complex make-up was based on issues of habitus* which resulted in reactionary, ideological predispositions. Centrally this concerned issues of 'capital' and the NR/RR's attempt to control both resource use and policy to favour their interests. The right-wing 'project' has been outlined by others (Barnett 1992, Dunleavy, Gamble and Peele 1990, Hall 1985, Jessop, Bonnett, Bromley and Ling 1984, 1985 and 1987, Rustin 1989, Rhodes and Marsh 1992, Skidelsky 1988). Some have discussed education's role (Apple 1993, Chitty 1993 and 1994, Dale 1989, Demaine 1989, Jones 1989, Lawton 1989, Lauder 1990) and the effects of education policy on physical education (Evans 1992, Evans and Penney 1995b, Evans, Penney and Bryant 1993, Evans and Davies 1990, Penney 1994). My thesis investigates the Right's political intent and how it sought to achieve it through education reform. Education reform is viewed as a 'mechanism' central to the Right's 'project'. My argument is that the Right sought to construct a form of citizenship which served its interests by imbuing a consensus of moral self-regulation within the requirements of capital. Physical education reform is located firmly within this right-wing project. By constructing a conceptual framework, this chapter locates my argument within a theoretical context. Thus, chapters three and four inter-link to highlight the specific context of the critical realist perspective, both locating and giving meaning to the concepts employed²⁸.

Crucially, my critical realist perspective does not claim that the world is a simple place, reducible to a direct relationship between political intent and educational provision. Rather, there are clearly a multitude of influences in social development. The contemporary relationships between labour and capital are acknowledged as

²⁷ This indicates that the NR project, under Thatcherism, was a complex undertaking where the 'old was built into the new' as much as the 'new was built into the old' (see chapter four).

²⁸ It may be appropriate for the reader to read chapter four first then return to read chapter three. The reader should also refer back to the Introduction to reference the 'stages' of policy development and implementation between 1979 and 1992.

highly complex and problematic, with policy established as the result of a national and global history of conflict, compromise, evolution and revolution. Education is clearly a mechanism for cultural reproduction (Apple 1993, Archer 1984). However it is also a place for, and production of, resistance to cultural domination (Giroux 1983, Illich 1976, Larrain 1989). My critical realist perspective does not claim that ‘this is how the world is’. Rather, it is a perspective which argues ‘that is how the NR/RR wanted it to be’. It is the combination of my biography and educational experience with established social theories. This constructed an interpretation of SPEC arrangements. The reader is reminded that data selection, collection and analysis are situated within this perspective.

My critical realist perspective is set in opposition to other perspectives, specifically ‘pluralism’. It is formed of two parts. Firstly it is a ‘realist’ view of ‘a priori’ social structures and constraints²⁹. These are both symbolic* (ideological) and material* (institutional), which form each other through ‘duality’ (see Giddens 1979). Secondly it is a ‘critical’ approach which views policy as constructed to serve these ‘structures’. Clearly, therefore, critical realism is a perspective constructed from my interpretation of my ‘self’* within my understanding of the world and ‘social reality’* within it. It is therefore, arguably, as structured and constrained as the structures and constraints it seeks to highlight³⁰. I am, accordingly, critically self-aware about my role in the construction of knowledge about knowledge (see chapter one: p26). The following discussion of the concepts adopted to construct a theoretical framework, seeks to give both focus and validity to my explanation of the NR/RR’s political intent in the last two decades of the 20th century. The debates over education, both political and academic, are on-going. My thesis seeks to address what has not been said, particularly, the deeper political intent and the role of physical education in the NR/RR’s endeavour to construct a citizenship imbued with right-wing moral values.

²⁹ ‘A priori’ in this critical realist context does not refer to Kantian explanations of ‘truth’. Neither does it refer to concepts of ways of thinking and psyche that are ‘foundational’ and immutable. (If this was the case we would still be living in caves). It refers instead to ‘chronological’ development, to received social structures (institutional and figurational) and discourses (ideologies) into which individuals are born, but which are reformed by actors over time. My definition of ‘realism’ is discussed later in this chapter.

³⁰ The discussion of biography in chapter one sought to indicate that my Scottish background resulted in an ‘insider-outsider’ perspective of English SPEC arrangements.

The Origins of my Critical Realist Perspective

Through the interrogation of social theory it was found that no one academic theoretical perspective adequately explained what was being seen in my research. My 'critical realist' perspective has, therefore, evolved through the combination of my data analysis and by drawing on the subjective interpretation of various academic theories about the social world. Its point of contact is with the theoretical ideas of Althusser, Apple, Archer, Bernstein, Giroux, Mouzelis and Gramsci. Critical realism could therefore, arguably, be viewed in the light of Ranson's (1995) discussion about perspectives adopted to theorise educational policy. Ranson questions the adequacy of pluralist, neo-pluralist and neo-Marxist perspectives in analysing NR/RR policy. In respect of his discussion, critical realism connects with the neo-Marxism perspective. Neo-Marxism views technical rationality as a mechanism to 'steer' crisis, be it real or constructed, with education at the centre of strategies to control SPEC reproduction. Increased centralisation is viewed to question a pluralist perspective. Policy texts are not viewed as negotiable, but concerned with division and constraint where macro structures set the possibilities for micro action. Neo-Marxist interpretations register an ideological hegemony* of structural domination and authority.

My initial, 'formal' theory free, data analysis brought to light the methods employed by the RR in the implementation of education policy (outlined briefly in chapter one: p13). It suggested that education was central to the right-wing 'project'. The NR/RR rhetoric was of a crisis in education causing a wider SPEC crisis. The discourse was of centralisation and increasing technocratic rationalisation as 'solutions'. Plural input was reduced and texts became prescribed and non-negotiable (this, along with policy construction and implementation, is discussed further in chapters five and six). Education and physical education appeared to be concerned with the (re)construction of 'citizenship'. This suggested that education was being used by the NR/RR as a central mechanism in SPEC (re)production. Policy seemed more concerned with social division than educational development. The RR, it appeared, were manipulating 'a priori' symbolic and material macro structures to reconstruct and constrain micro agency*, with the intent of rejuvenating hierarchical domination through ideological hegemony in the interests of capital (see chapter four: p130). Centrally, the concepts identified by neo-Marxism connected with what I saw

in my data in terms of the intent and methods employed by the NR/RR between 1979 and 1992 in constructing the NCPE. These concepts³¹ underpin critical realism and form the basis of the theoretical framework employed to analyse the development of the NCPE. This chapter refines these concepts to locate both critical realism and the NCPE in the context of the 'social whole' (Mouzelis 1995). It argues that critical realism is a theoretical perspective which endeavours to tie the methods employed by the RR, and subsequently the NCPE, to the interests of the NR and capital. Ranson (1995: p429) argues that public policy must be analysed to uncover the values and interests which inform it, the purposes it was constructed for and the methods used for its implementation because "...the values and chosen purposes decide the nature of educational tasks, as well as the appropriate allocation of responsibility and distribution of authority". He argues further that policy analysis should critique the determining values of educational policy and compare them with alternative values, centrally those that the researcher believes should inform educational policy. Accepting that this is the central motivation behind my research acknowledges that my critical realist critique is political.

In terms of viewing education as a mechanism central to the NR/RR intent of SPEC (re)production in the interests of capital, my critical realist perspective finds areas of Bowles and Gintis' (1976) work valuable in critiquing education reform in the UK between 1979 and 1992. However, it is not a branch of their 'correspondence theory'. It is discussed later in this chapter that, like correspondence theory's explanation of 'schooling' in the US, critical realism views education provision in the UK as part of the state apparatus which is intended to infuse the forms of consciousness necessary to reproduce capitalist arrangements. However, although critical realism views education as the compulsory, institutionalised initiation into capitalist arrangements through the formation of consciousness and personality, it

³¹ Neo-Marxist concepts are central to my critical realist interpretation of the development of the NCPE. In terms of a 'realist view' they are of ideological hegemony; the manipulation of macro structures of domination and authority by macro actors to constrain micro actors in the interests of division and constraint; a constructed and steered crisis to allow centralisation; with a discourse of technocratic-rationality leading to non-negotiable policy texts. Education is seen as a central mechanism of SPEC (re)production. The 'critical view' advocates the need to investigate the purpose of the construction of policy in terms of the values and interests of those that construct it, and the methods they use to implement it in seeking to ensure it continues to serve their interests. Centrally, critical realism critiques the values and purpose of policy in the context of the interests of the NR/RR between 1979 and 1992.

does not view this in terms of correspondence theory's crude economic determinism. As we shall see, neither economic nor technological rationality are seen as the prime movers. Rather, the social, political, economic and cultural requirements of the capitalist 'whole' are seen as central (see Bailey 1995, Cole 1988a).

My research, therefore, operates at the macro level, seeking to get beneath the rhetoric of representation in NR/RR's discourse to expose the reality of political intent behind it³². It seeks to show that analysis of educational reform must investigate the macro level political intent to construct and constrain 'knowledge'. It does not, therefore, operate at the micro level of implementation and effect. It contends, rather, that both symbolic and material macro structures have dominance over micro practices and agency. However this is not seen as absolute. Thus, my critical realist perspective endeavours to both outline how the RR constructed, legitimated and implemented policy decisions at the macro level, and to uncover the NR representation and interests behind education and physical education policies which may, on the surface, appear neutral and natural.

The Concepts Underpinning My Critical Realist Perspective

Realism

Critical realism combines an historical perspective with experiential reflection. It is, firstly, a 'realist' perspective. However, this not a 'philosophical realism' of 'ontology'. It is, rather, a 'social realism' that 'social, political, economic and cultural' structures exist, are 'real' and influence the relations and interactions between individuals³³. Realism, in this context, holds that capitalist 'social, political, economic and cultural' arrangements and relations (structure and substructures) constructed by

³² This is not to suggest that I am proffering an alternative but correct 'reality' of how the world is. My research does not seek to 'confirm' an alternative view. Rather, it endeavours to highlight contradictions between claims made in the NR/RR's discourse about 'reality' and empirical evidence. It is more than simply a discursive theory. It is an investigation of practice, of what is actual and experienced (in physical education). It does not therefore proffer this alternative view as right. It does, however, suggest that it is a more 'complete' way to view the world and what is 'real' within it.

³³ This is not to claim however that all individuals experience the same 'reality'. In a social system of hierarchical inequality based on class, race, gender etc., inequity is inevitable. For example, in the UK, there are inequalities between white middle class males and black working class females in gaining access to material resources such as education, employment or impartiality under the law (see Hutton 1996).

historically dominant ideological interests (which constrain knowledge, consciousness, and subsequent action) exist 'a priori' as the 'central structural mechanism' (May 1993: p6) of contemporary British society (Collins Dictionary of Sociology (CDoS)). In this perspective, individuals are born into an existing historical, but chronological, social structure which is mediated and changed by multiform discourses. However, 'change' depends on the values and interests of the contemporary dominant discourse and the resources available for progress. Change is thus constrained by the frames put in place by historical symbolic and material rules and resources. The 'actual' reality experienced by individuals is only one part of the 'possible' reality. With a different framing of symbolic and material rules and resources a different 'reality' would be experienced by individuals. Nonetheless, it would still be only one of infinite possibilities. In the UK, this 'reality' is an environment where individual agency is hierarchical, structured, measured and accountable within the cultural and ideological boundaries of the capitalist framework. Critical realism is, therefore, a perspective where a contemporary, capitalist 'dominant group'* has the political authority to use 'a priori' structures of power, control and inequality in its endeavour to construct a 'reality' which suits its interests while constraining the lives of subordinates. My investigation of the NR/RR suggests that hierarchical social structures and concomitant constraints over individuals' agency are 'real'.

The UK's 'A Priori' Capitalist Structures

States develop their own identity and direction based on the historical SPEC relations between competing groups. British society has developed a unique brand of capitalism* based on Anglo-Saxon individualism and selfishness (Handy 1994: p140). It is ingrained with aspects of elitism and power, manipulation of symbolic and material rules and resources (discussed below), myth*, nationalism*, parliamentary democracy, elite culture* and prestige, and a tradition of hierarchical domination, inequality and subordination. Capitalism has come to dominate the UK's 'central structural mechanism' by successfully subordinating the interests, principally, of labour and women. Nonetheless, these, and other forces (such as race, religion, social democracy, communism and other ideologies) have mediated, and continue to mediate, capitalist

domination. Since 1979 the RR have sought to considerably reduce these influences in the interests of capital (see chapter four: p116).

I argue that there are two levels of structure. Firstly, there is a 'deep' structure of historical capitalist arrangements, where an established dominant group operates 'a priori' (such as the monarchy, nation state, social hierarchy, tradition and ritual). Historian E Thompson, writing in 1978, stated that;

...the ruling group within the State in Britain has a kind of arrogance about it which may be historically unique. It has a settled habit of power, a composure, inherited from generations of rule, renewed by imperial authority, and refreshed perennially from the springs of the best Public Schools. It is a group which does not bother, or need to bother, to get itself elected. It knows what 'British interests' are and defends these thoroughly in every change of political weather...It rules, unobtrusively from within (cited in Nairn 1979: p61).³⁴

Secondly, there are 'surface' structures of social institutions and systems (such as 'electoral democracy', religion, the judiciary and education). These are viewed to be both 'symbolic' (a system of 'consensus') and 'material' (a system of 'coercion') cultural norms and practices which function to (re)produce the 'deep structure' status quo. They are viewed to work in an inextricably interlinked, complex relationship in the process of constructing, legitimating and reproducing hierarchical structures of domination. Where 'surface' structures are used to control policy, and society more widely, they are argued to link dominant politics to dominant capitalist interests. These arrangements thus constitute the 'state', which both forms the 'a priori' context for contemporary struggles, and allocates, or denies, resources to groups engaged in struggle. State institutions are perceived to function to serve the interests of the elite minority dominant in British society by endeavouring to reproduce the capitalist status quo. Human consciousness is argued to be constructed and constrained by existing SPEC arrangements which serve the interests of the dominant (macro) group at the expense of subordinates (micro). Actors and structures appear at both the micro and macro levels, but the 'a priori' structures create hierarchical positions of power. Macro

³⁴ In terms of the relationship between capital and 'control', Thompson was writing about the 'aristocracy' during the early part of the twentieth century. However, this relationship is symbiotic and ever changing. At the end of the twentieth century the aristocracy may be little more than a faction of the 'ruling group'. With the complex relations inherent in corporate capital the relationship is less clear. It is arguable that the upper-middle class can now be identified with the 'ruling group'.

position bestow the authority to both reform and utilise these structures for the reproduction of domination. This history of structured power and control is crucial in understanding the concept of SPEC ties between the interests of private capital and the RR, the dominant political group in the UK from 1979 (discussed below).

During the 1960s and 1970s progressive social developments, which endeavoured to benefit all, began to question and change the traditional capitalist arrangements. Alternatives were offered to the established social structures of hierarchy and inequality of opportunity (domination and subordination). Crucially, the dominant group had problems dealing with these developments because, as an ancient power block, it is accustomed to privilege, it cannot easily change and, more pertinently, does not want to (see Nairn 1979: p62). My research is a critical investigation of the policies adopted by the RR, as the dominant political group, in their endeavour to restore the pre-1960s social and economic hierarchies. The critical realist perspective may appear over-determined, perceiving the relationship between capital, the State and SPEC arrangements in the UK as too simplistic. Therefore, as I have identified the NR/RR as the dominant group in the development of the NCPE, it is necessary that I qualify the 'dominant group perspective': the perspective which is pivotal to my analysis of the period of 1979 to 1992.

A 'Dominant Group' Perspective

Critical realism holds that there is a complex relationship between the UK's dominant capitalist class and SPEC arrangements, so much so, that 'deep' structural arrangements influence the 'surface' structural institutions such as government. In this perspective, a history of struggles over the adoption of ideological beliefs and obligations has led to the formation of hierarchical groups. Such a social hierarchy both constitutes and allocates identities of SPEC position and power (domination and subordination). The 'dominant group' is viewed as a collection of private groups or individuals with an interlinking socialisation*, common habitus and ideological orientation, which unite to form a dominant, but fragile, SPEC coalition. This dominant coalition / group has the ability to secure its interests at the expense of others'. Several authors argue that the formidable concentration of SPEC power and

control with a dominant group *does* exist (Giroux 1983: p73, Jessop, Bonnett, Bromely and Ling 1987: p106, Miliband 1985: p15)³⁵. This gives control of state resources to a nucleus which uses them to sustain its position, further its ideological interests and prevent an effective challenge to its power. Dunleavy and O'Leary (1993: p70) claim that;

...capitalists, state bureaucrats and political leaders are unified into a single cohesive group by their common social origin, similar lifestyles and values, and by the existence of numerous networks and forums where co-ordinated strategies for public policy are hammered out.

Thus, the dominant economic class ties with the dominant political class to form a policy network (Skocpol 1993: p87-88). However, domination rests on the hegemony of a complex interrelationship of moral, intellectual, economic and political leadership. If SPEC arrangements are to continue to serve its interests, the dominant group needs to secure and maintain hierarchical inequality. Capitalism is therefore self-preservationist. Nevertheless, control of social practices and institutions has to be fought over as different groups seek to dominate society.

The dominant group endeavours to remain dominant with as little SPEC cost as possible. The political authority to control both symbolic and material state 'apparatus' is gained 'democratically' through government. This gives the dominant group, legitimated by the authority of an 'electoral mandate', the 'democratic' role as the political leader of subordinate groups. It then endeavours to acquire intellectual and moral leadership over subordinates (see Apple 1993: p22). Control of government bestows the legal authority and power of 'legitimate force' to constrain and manipulate state institutions as a framework to define issues, set and infuse an interest-serving policy agenda, limit the effectiveness of opposition through legislation, and engineer consent to shape society to provide the contexts which reproduce capitalist requirements (see Apple 1989: p113, CCCS 1981: p32, Dale 1989: p29, McPherson and Raab 1988: p24, Miliband 1983: p62, Miliband 1985: p15, Therborn 1983: p39). The dominant group seeks to both protect its position by gaining legitimation and support for continued capital accumulation, and to legitimate

³⁵ This does of course not mean that this perspective *is* correct. It does however tie in with what was seen in my data of the connections between the interests and intentions of the NR and RR.

social inequalities and instability by hiding the contradiction between rhetorical representations in its discourse and the reality experienced by individuals. In this perspective, capitalism's hierarchical stratification both causes and resolves conflicts and contradictions. The dominant group's legitimate authority and power allows it to structure relations between subordinate groups, and between subordinate groups and itself. It thus maintains the ability to constrain the actions of others, oppose demands and transform social structures (Skocpol 1993: p97). This enables it to regulate interaction, limit autonomy and maintain hierarchical domination. By controlling legislation and resource distribution, the dominant group attempts to constrain alternative hegemonies (Dale 1989: p47). This suggests both a top-down determinism in policy implementation and the dominance of structures over agency (returned to below). It also suggests that "...there are indeed serious connections between culture, ideology and consciousness and economic processes" (Apple 1982: p2).

In this perspective, collectives act as a threat to the dominant group's position by forming sites of opposition and power. Keeping subordinates divided and in competition is, therefore, an important aspect of the capitalist state. This is central to the dominant group maintaining power, and policies aim to reproduce social division and subordination. In short, 'divide and rule'. Control over access to resources is the key to political power and control and is central in structuring inequality within society (Adler and Asquith 1993: p399, Deleging and Colebatch 1993: p358, Elmore 1993: p337, Ham 1993: p186, Hogwood and Gunn 1993: p239, McLennan 1993: p66). Capitalist arrangements and relationships of hierarchical inequality are "...dialectically interwoven so that economic power and control are interconnected with cultural power and control" (Apple 1990: p64). This allows the dominant group to saturate all aspects of social life with its 'rationality'. Its authority to control resource allocation means that dominated groups are dependent. This results in competition, class conflict and division between subordinate groups. Where groups cannot secure resources they may become reactionary, which can lead to ideological alienation, class and other forms of conflict³⁶. They can thus be targeted by the dominant group as ideologically motivated and subversive opposition. Opposition can then be dissolved through the 'legitimate'

³⁶ This neo-Marxist perspective views that a 'capital(ist) class' endeavours to subordinate labour and dominate other social groups (gender, race, wealth etc.)

removal of its resources, based on 'active consent' (Apple 1982: p12). 'Government' therefore gives the dominant group both control of state resources and the ability to infuse its ideology into the 'compromises' of 'negotiation'. (As we see in chapter four, this was a tactic of the NR/RR in government.)

Society's cultural apparatus is organised in such a way as to hide how it operates (Apple 1990: p1). The dominant group constructs a discourse which seeks to define what is valuable. This endeavours to construct and constrain what is possible, legitimate the differentiated distribution of resources, hide socio-cultural conflicts and define unequal social outcomes as 'neutral' and 'natural'. The construction of a myth of structural inequality as cultural 'tradition' is functional in the dominant group's endeavour to reproduce its position of hierarchical privilege. This is a perspective where hierarchical structures both construct and condition self-perception and agency, and where the 'social whole' is viewed as the 'steering capacity' of the dominant group, employed in the endeavour to socialise subordinates through reflexivity in perception and practices. This suggests that 'common-sense' is socially constructed in relation to the interests of the dominant group. The intention is to remove opportunities for critical independence for the dominated groups to keep them subordinate. Nonetheless, domination requires intense ideological pressure and enactment of legislative rules (discussed below).

The RR as the Dominant Group

In terms of securing the political authority to have power and control over state apparatus, the RR has been identified as the 'dominant group' from 1979 (see chapter one: p12). It is intimated that they had connections with, and worked in, the interests of capital³⁷. The following theoretical conceptualisations are argued to be central to its period of government. They seek to contextualise the NR/RR's interests and intent, and explain the methods the NR/RR employed in their endeavour to gain and maintain domination. Centrally, critical realism is a theory of a NR/RR 'hegemonic project' to reproduce capitalist domination in a process of constraint and suppression of dominated groups through ideological hegemony. The intent, I argue, was to constrain and suppress

³⁷ See chapter four for all references to the NR/RR in this section.

counter hegemonies through symbolic and material control on the basis of a discourse which regulated possibilities (symbolic control being the power to construct and constrain language and discourse which sought in to turn constructed expectation and demand into policy, material control being that policy). My argument in the following chapters is that the NR/RR's intention was to imbue a 'capitalist moral character' (citizenship) in the population for the purpose of 'social order' (discipline) and 'social ordering' (hierarchy) through 'consent' (conformity) rather than through 'coercion'. Their endeavour was to introduce the social market into many aspects of British SPEC life and to 'legitimate' its effects.

Mechanisms of Domination

The Market Mechanism

As a means and an end, Ball (1994b: p147) indicates that the market is a powerful hegemonic tool;

The rhetoric and disciplines of [market] responsiveness are part of a process of 'cultural engineering', of social and political change; part of the assertion of the individualist credo; part of the destruction of the communal ethic. Responsiveness is a smokescreen for self-gratification, for the ethic of consumption for social distancing, closure and class advantage. It is the acceptable face of the 'culture of self-interests'.

Capitalism, which functions on the self-interest of profit and competitive access to resources, can only exist in a market economy. If it is to survive it is essential that market arrangements continue to function. The market operates on differentiation and individual survival. However, choice is detached from practical ability as the opportunity to secure resources depends on the historical accumulation of SPEC 'wealth'. Wealth and so access to resources is unequal. In this perspective, a 'social market' develops where individual survival depends on playing by market rules. This results in a complex hierarchical framework of structure, division, power and control. Nonetheless, as subjective social concerns cannot be measured objectively they are repudiated, and 'efficiency' is represented as economic 'requirements' not as social 'needs' (McLennan 1993: p65). Despite a representation of a 'free' market

mechanism, the rhetoric of technical efficiency inevitably leads to measurable objectives which control resource provision and, subsequently, constrain subordinates' opportunities and agency. The representation of free choice coerces individual responsibility and actions become conservative within a context of 'social Darwinism'. The market mechanism is, thus, central in the establishment and continuance of social division through competitive individualism³⁸. The market is viewed, therefore, both as a source of social division and social control where individuals become resources to be consumed and exploited by capitalist requirements. It is not 'free'. It means that the dominant group can shape and constrain the opportunities for subordinates outside the bounds of formal bureaucracies³⁹. This is material coercion. Nevertheless, capitalism is inherently unstable, conflict is constant and outcomes uncertain. It is shown in chapter four that the 'market' was both the 'means' employed by the RR and the intended 'ends' (the continuance of the interests of a privileged SPEC elite within a capitalist status quo).

Symbolic and Material Rules and Resources: Tools of Capitalist Reproduction

My perspective argues that structured hierarchical inequality is constructed and reproduced through the dominant group's ability to control both symbolic and material rules and resources. Symbolic rules and resources are viewed as the shared social constructs of moral values which lead to agreement over practices and behaviours, which, as a result, constrain action through *consensus*. Domination requires gaining control over symbolic resources to define the 'common-sense' SPEC arrangements, which leads to legitimate control over the material resources of government and state apparatus. The material rules and resources are viewed to be when subjective symbolic representation (ideology) becomes reified, 'objectified' and institutionalised as 'surface' SPEC arrangements, organisation, policies, laws and

³⁸ Part of this division is the organisation, deskilling or semi-skilling of labour, where individuals' develop a 'capital value' based on mental or manual 'ability' within production requirements. Where democratic citizenship is devalued, the individual is reduced to a commodity to be consumed. The threat of unemployment divides dominated groups as individuals or collectives (unions) fend for themselves.

³⁹ Mouzelis (1995: p142) claims that;

In market hierarchies the limits and opportunities that high participants create for lower participants do not have the formal, legalistic character of bureaucratically organised hierarchies, but they may be equally if not more effective in decisively shaping lower-level games.

practices to form SPEC 'norms', which constrain action through *coercion*. These are manipulated to vindicate symbolic claims, which become policy initiatives through the construction of expectation and demand within a constructed and constraining social reality. Thus, in this perspective, the dominant groups have developed 'mechanisms of reproduction' (Therborn 1983: p39) in an endeavour either to prevent or transform social change. These can be used as 'tools' (systems, measures or sanctions) for coercion, social domination or division in the (re)production of capitalist arrangements.

Turning Dominant Ideology into Social Reality through Hegemony

My critical realist perspective views British capitalism as bound together by a network of social relationships and interactions between groups. These relational interactions become 'codes' which determine individuals' positions in the SPEC hierarchy. Bernstein (1990: p13-14) indicates that codes are 'regulative, selected, integrative and acquired', which both have and create meaning, realisations and context. This defines the experienced 'social reality'. The contemporary dominant group aims to renovate the UK's 'traditional' SPEC arrangements to suit its interests through 'conscious subordination' (Hirschkop 1986: p109)⁴⁰. In seeking to ensure that the arrangements of authority and power serve its interests, the dominant group strives to redefine social reality within its ideological boundaries. Thompson (1995) explains ideology as either 'neutral' or 'negative'. Chapter four highlights that my critical realist perspective interprets the NR/RR's ideology as highly selective, polemic, symbolic and contextual. It is thus viewed as 'negative'.

However, there are problems in the struggle for ideological ascendancy as ideological discourses have no boundaries and overlap. For an ideology to retain its intent there requires to be control over the discourse which defines what is possible, thinkable, sayable and doable. The contemporary dominant group endeavours to absorb individuals into its discourse through manipulating subconscious fears and concerns. It seeks, more simply, to appeal to a variety of interests and values at the

⁴⁰ Essentially this meant transforming SPEC arrangements to suit the contemporary period to allow hierarchy and domination by an elite socio-political group to continue.

secondary level. By attacking and undermining the existing dominant social reality, and giving its meanings and solutions to 'crisis' while vilifying and suppressing others, it seeks to institutionalise its discourse as the only voice heard in 'surface' state institutions through policy texts*. The intent is to imbue state institutions with its ideology and have them reproduce it through their practices and distribution of 'knowledge'. The aim is to have people's lives both organised by and interpreted through its ideological framework. Alternative ideologies still exist, but their access to resources is constrained within the structural arrangements. Ascendancy of an ideology has thus to develop 'stage by stage' as each development builds upon the possibilities created by the last.

In this perspective, a group's ideology becomes ascendant when opposition has been 'softened-up' until society's common-sense practices and values have been transformed to suit its interests. As it becomes the new dominant group, its value agenda (discourse) becomes the 'surface' common-sense 'behavioural norms', the measure of acceptable behaviour and practices. The aim is to have moral order infused subconsciously, with alternative behaviour defined as abnormal, or subversive, to the 'given' common-sense. The intent is to constrain action unconsciously within an 'accepted' framework of 'objective rationality', rather than through force. The endeavour is to socialise individuals as agents *within* this ideology, having them react to its boundaries in a 'reflexive' manner, rather than actors who related *to* these boundaries in a 'reflective' manner. The aim is that agents come to adopt the kind of ideological behaviour which supports the new ideological framework and leads to its reproduction. This ideological transformation is intended to appear as evolution rather than revolution. When there is minimal dispute or resistance to this ideology, hegemony exists. However, no 'hegemonic project' (Jessop, Bonnett, Bromely and Ling 1988: p41) is ever totally successful, and all require constant revitalisation and reinforcement. The following chapters show that with the RR, this centred on an endeavour to construct and constrain individuals' perceptions of 'citizenship' (the 'self') within a conservative definition of SPEC arrangements.

Perception of the 'Self' Within 'A Priori' SPEC Arrangements

Most social theories consider that people are born into an existing social reality which is external to themselves, whatever their hierarchical position. Critical realism considers further that the dominant group endeavours to secure the power and authority to alter the symbolic and material preconditions of structural and institutional arrangements, and to redefine social reality to favour its interests⁴¹. In this perspective, subordinates' experiences are interpreted in a context where social reality is constructed and conditioned within the dominant group's ideology (see Sparkes 1992: p39). SPEC domination allows the setting of contexts and parameters which constrain critical investigation by dominated groups. The dominant group seeks to institutionalise subjugation and isolate opposition through vilification while veiling control (see Therborn 1983 p54). Thus, macro (dominant) structural experiences and interpretations are brought together with micro (dominated) experiences and understandings, where structure and agency are implicit in each other. With interpretation dependent on differentiated access to 'dominant knowledge', 'self-concept' can contribute to the 'self-fulfilling prophecy' of habitus.

Hegemonic inculcation is sought through the infusion of ideology into structural relationships, where dominant interests have been institutionalised (see McPherson and Raab 1988: p20). It does however require considerable ideological work and the struggle for control of the symbolic and material social terrain uses material and symbolic rules and resources in combination. The power of the dominant hegemony depends on its ability to divide and rule subordinates. This suggests a central paradox if the dominant group's hegemony is to be successful. Firstly, it needs to divide opposing collectives, then, secondly, unite them in a constructed consensus within its ideology. This perspective involves links between repressive leadership and an endeavour to engineer consensus towards a 'false consciousness' of SPEC arrangements. In seeking to reify its definition of social reality, the dominant group endeavours to legitimate and rationalise its definition of SPEC arrangements. By concealing divisional interests and intentions it seeks to hide social tensions, negate

⁴¹ This is not to over-simplify a history of struggle to control the social order. Communism is a prime example of how difficult a task this is to achieve.

conflicts over inequality and integrate opposition groups into its project while neutralising their interests.

The volatility in capitalist SPEC arrangements leads to fluctuations between periods of prosperity and austerity. Prosperity leads to SPEC gains by the dominated groups as more resources are available for their endeavour to secure their interests. This was the situation in the UK throughout the 1950s and 1960s, which led to social democratic policies. Social gains caused dominated groups to question the myth of the dominant group's 'right to rule'⁴². This led to crisis for the dominant group's continued domination. It undermined their position of elite authority and control, and endangered the privileges they accrued from that position. If their 'right to rule' was to be restored, their position of dominance would have to be re-legitimated and the threats to their dominant position tempered. Further, austerity also leads to anxiety for the dominant group. The requirement is for tighter controls over the allocation of resources which 'cuts-into' the resources distributed to dominated groups. This leads to conflict. This was the position in the UK throughout the 1970s. Reform to the existing SPEC arrangements was imperative as they were no longer exclusively serving the interests of capital. As we will see, the NR/RR's aim was to restore, and legitimate, the accord between the dominant capitalist interests and the dominant political group. This was to be achieved through the aspects of 'knowledge, language and discourse'.

Knowledge, Language and Discourse as 'Tools' of Domination

The following chapters will attempt to show, in my critical realist perspective, that knowledge*, language* and discourse* played a major role in the NR/RR's attempt at SPEC domination. These three aspects were combined to construct an 'ideological hegemony' which was intended to transform the SPEC arrangements to serve dominant interests. Kirk, McKay and George (1986: p171) argue that ideological hegemony results when;

⁴² This took the form of advances in the rights, and collective strength of unions, women and blacks, and increasing religious diversity.

... subordinate groups acquiesce or consent, albeit unconsciously, to their own domination by unflexibly accepting and reproducing the values of the superordinate group.

In this perspective, the RR's political authority permitted it to construct a discourse imbued with language which defined its definitions of social reality as knowledge. According to Bernstein (1990: p191), discourse occurs within fields of production; the 'primary' field is the production of the discourse and text*; the 'secondary' field is the reproduction of the discourse and text; and the 'recontextualising' field is the relocation of the discourse and text. Critical realism views the NR/RR definition of capitalism as a 'meta-narrative'. It is therefore concerned with the NR/RR's macro intent at the 'primary' field of the construction of their discourse, and with the methods used in their endeavour to both reproduce it and prevent its micro 'recontextualisation'.

The Ascendancy and Domination of Discourse

The discourses of capital and labour (or other interest groups), struggle to gain hegemonic domination for their meanings, interpretations and understandings of social experiences. Groups strive to have their discourse construed as neutral 'knowledge', with alternative discourses marginalised as 'ideology'. Larrain (1979: p136) indicates that there are stages in a discourse becoming dominant. Firstly, at their 'origin' the message is turned into written or spoken text. Secondly, there is 'normalisation' where the text is made 'objective' and functional. Thirdly, the text is 'constructed' into the dominant model. In this perspective, the dominant group has the power to 'displace' the conflicts and contradictions in its discourse and conceal hierarchical inequality which favours its interests; to 'isolate', vilify and discredit opposing discourses; and to imbue 'submission' of the right of institutions to control society, for example law and education (see Therborn 1993: p45-47). This sets the moral tone, where representations become 'norms' and the opportunity to draw on alternative discourses is reduced. As people adopt and fulfil social roles and tasks, the dominant framework reproduces itself and constructed expectations become demands. Thus, in a simplistic reading, dominant group policies can be espoused as those demanded by the dominated groups.

'Morality' is therefore viewed to be a powerful construction, functional for social control through submission rather than coercion. However, the moral values espoused in the dominant discourse can only be adhered to if they are the ideological values of the receivers. The dominant group thus endeavours to make its representations the unquestioned and unquestionable 'common-sense'. It strives to socialise and subjugate dominated groups into cultural and ideological regimentation, so that dominant practices and experiences come to be reproduced subconsciously (see Giroux 1983: p73). By successfully entering its meanings at the earliest stages of a debate, it sets a 'discursive platform' within its parameters (Tomlinson A. 1993: p86). It can thus set the agenda and provide both the interpretative framework and the symbolic solutions to SPEC conflicts and contradictions.

By creating a theoretical framework of selected concepts, the dominant group seeks to interpose its 'discourse' into the foundations of the political and economic system (see Giroux 1983: p171-172). With its ability to constrain SPEC practices through resource distribution, it seeks to suppress challenge and neutralise opposition from below by incorporating aspects of the dominated groups' discourses to appease them politically. It endeavours to utilise institutions of power to imbue a 'submission' of its 'right to rule', and use this 'legitimate', monopolised political authority and power to portray how society and individuals within it 'should' be. Through the manipulation of symbolic and material rules and resources, it attempts to construct and constrain the boundaries of 'self-perception' to shape conscious and unconscious social patterns, and therefore shape agency and action. This indicates that its power base necessitates hierarchical relationships of inequality between groups, and that social structures are used to marginalise other groups. In this way, it seeks to engineer opinion to create consent about its 'explanations' of contradictions, and mediate social relationships between individuals or groups. When social practices result in conflict or contradiction, it seeks to establish social cohesion by situating individuals within its discourse of moral authority which endeavours to construct and constrain consciousness.

The Institutionalisation of the Dominant Group's Discourse as Text

Policy texts both define and legitimate the institutions of power in society. Those institutions of power in turn legitimate the policy texts. The dominant group's aim is that crucial institutions voice only its 'rationality' as the 'official discourse', with alternative discourses marginalised as deviant from the 'norm'. The dominant definitions of 'knowledge', 'fact' and 'truth' are intended to become institutionalised and act as a level of constraint over communication. As the dominated groups are to have little or no official access to alternative discourses, their understanding of society is to be filtered through the concepts and definitions, the 'truths', given by the dominant group through the institutions which structure society. Individual interpretation and understanding are, in this perspective, based on an orientation constrained by socialisation and habitus. We discuss below critical realism's view of education as the central social structure which functions to transmit, legitimate and reproduce dominant 'knowledge', and so, reproduce the capitalist SPEC status quo in the interests of the socially powerful (see Sparkes 1992: p40). This is the focus of chapter five.

Domination and Subjugation Through Structured Agency

For the dominant group to be able to manipulate symbolic and material structures (the economic, political, ideological and institutional state apparatuses) as a controlling mechanism to constrain SPEC relations and practices, it needs to set boundaries for social and economic development and change. It seeks to use state institutions to transmit its interests, norms, rationality and definition of social reality. This necessitates embedding its discourse as institutional 'rules'. These are intended to define the socialisation and sensitisation of subordinate actors. The aim is to both construct and constrain action, possibility and opportunity for subordinates, and confirm their status as such. This requires legitimating and reproducing social hierarchical inequality through the socialisation of status, place and role. The endeavour is to manipulate social and cultural systems to construct and constrain a conscious and unconscious disposition towards status relationships between dominant

(macro) and subordinate (micro) positions. This includes defining boundaries of interaction, practice, acceptability and possibility in hierarchical relationships.

By aiming to limit individuals' perceptions of status, the dominant group seeks to constrain thought, action, experience and understanding leading to 'relative autonomy'. If successful, interaction and negotiation are constrained by SPEC structures. Agency is thus 'structured'. However, it is not controlled. The endeavour is to constrain the opportunities for subordinates to either recontextualise the dominant group's definition of 'social reality' or reflect upon their perceptions of their own 'free-will'* and the 'self'* within it. The dominant group seeks to prevent reflection and confine agency to reflexive action within its discourse. Nonetheless, to be accepted, this discourse must appear as the common interests of all members of society. This requires mechanisms of transmission, specifically the educational (see Archer 1988: p55). Subordinates need to be socialised into a constructed and constrained 'social reality', where their understanding of social experiences and their construction of the 'self' is limited by structural boundaries. Social reality, and 'free-will', need to be understood through 'facts' defined by the dominant discourse. The aim is to embed dominant knowledge, symbols, interpretations and practices as 'common-sense'. As we see in chapter four, this was the NR/RR's intent.

This perspective views macro actors as being in the position of political authority to make the rules for micro actors. The contention here is that macro actors have the privilege of unequal power and control to restrict the interests of subordinate groups. Clearly there is resistance to the reproduction of this privilege, which does suggest a level of agency. However, I argue that agency and so autonomy are relative to hierarchical status. Thus, although alternative views are not necessarily controlled by the privileged discourse, they have, almost invariably, to be voiced within the pre-existing codes and structures, and use the language and meanings of the dominant discourse⁴³. Opposition is therefore constrained. This results in a 'hierarchical authority of interests'. Social organisation and interaction are, thus, seen to be based on social hierarchies which both have and allocate hierarchical roles. In this

⁴³ The argument made here is that although resistance and (demand for) change could never be enclosed or prevented, they could be framed or constrained.

perspective, macro actors are more producers of the social world, with subordinates, as micro agents, more products of it (see Mouzelis 1995: p142). The dominant group has the wherewithal to influence both symbolic and material resources and rewards. Centrally this involves the ability to dominate the production and implementation of policy.

The Critical Perspective

Secondly, but centrally, critical realism is a critical perspective. This views policy construction and the methods of its implementation as manipulated by the dominant group to serve its interests (its macro political intent), often at the others' expense. Critical realism contends, therefore, that the RR used policy as a material (coercive) rule and resource.

Policy as a Material Rule and Resource

Critiquing 'Pluralism' as an Interpretive Perspective

Capitalism is a system of structured inequality of power, access and ownership, where decision making and life chances are undemocratic (see McLennan 1993: p66). Smith and May (1993: p201) indicate that policy is a conservative, reactionary process which is "...thought to favour the interests of the most powerful and systematically to under-represent the interests of the underprivileged and politically unorganised". Critical realism views the lack of attention to macro issues as a weakness of pluralist and micro analyses⁴⁴. McLennan (1993: p60) suggests that pluralism acts to cloud the importance of interest groups by ignoring the organisation of power, control and access to resources in society. Indeed, pluralism may well be a system ensuring that some groups have domination over others. In a democratic society 'pluralism' might be considered a political tool, a means to make political intention and action appear democratic. For these reasons, issues of democracy, pluralism and rationality need to

⁴⁴ Micro analysis in this context refers to research undertaken, for example, in schools. My critical realist argument is that micro-level research may operate *within* the dominant discourse (whatever its ideological values) rather than being *of* it. It may, therefore, serve to reflexively endorse and reproduce the dominant discourse, rather than analysing it with a critical and reflective perspective.

be questioned with on the understanding that policy making is a political process based on power and control, where;

In order to understand the policy process it is necessary to relate it to the power structure of a society as a whole. Policy is the product of the exercise of political influence, determining and setting limits to what the state does. Any detailed attention to the policy process, including policy implementation, needs to be set in this wider context (Hill 1993: p47).

Understanding policy thus entails an analysis of the relationships between the SPEC base and the state, for "... 'what governments do' embraces the whole of the economic, social and political life" (Minogue 1993: p10). However, power and control are not the same. One can have power without having control and the opposite is also true. Nevertheless, the two facilitate each other where power is political authority and control is political dominance.

The dominant group needs to gain power and control over the structures which construct experience, understanding and 'reality'. Through the UK's parliamentary system, authority and dominance are contested, validated and confirmed usually every four to five years. The dominant group therefore operates within a legal framework which sets disciplinary 'rules' of a hierarchy of control and obedience to the law (see Weber 1993: p105). However, more than just having a practical role, this legal framework also had a symbolic role. It can influence individuals' conscious and unconscious morals and beliefs, and become 'legitimated' as the cultural norm (see Handy 1994: p107). This, it is perceived, bestows the dominant group with both power over, and control through the legal system. Its discourse thus leads the formation of policy texts. Ball (1994b: p15) suggests that 'policy as discourse' and 'policy as text' are implicit in each other, and that the dominant discourse creates texts and policies within which people 'take-up' the positions constructed for them. Texts are thus laden with the dominant group's political intent. They are however inevitably interpreted by recipients according to their biography and social position (*habitus*) which condition their relationship to the text. This can result in either acceptance or rejection of the 'message'. The influence of *habitus* can, therefore, result in the (re)production of the 'reality' (hierarchical experiences) desired by the dominant group. The ideological elements within the discourse thus seek to hide its underlying

intentions (see Larrain 1979: p133). However, with the RR's attack on opposition leading to polarisation between political groups, the underlying ideological intent of policy has become more visible since 1979 than previously.

Through government, the structural and institutional arrangements of the state act as legal apparatus providing a framework for the dominant group to implement policies which serve its interests despite opposition (Hill 1993: p103). In other-words, the apparent autonomy of the 'state' is false when government policy does not reflect the needs of all social groups (Skocpol 1993: p86). The state, even when acting as the neutral arbiter between pluralist conflicts, makes policy decisions in favour of capital (Dunleavy and O'Leary 1993: p72). Policy is the mechanism used to control structures and constrain individual agency within them. It is both political intent and the method of structuring and shaping authority (Deleging and Colebatch 1993: p356). Through unequal access to information about resources, the dominant group promote their interests as 'common-sense' imperatives which influence policy decisions (Lukes 1993: p50). In this perspective, policy takes place within boundaries and parameters based on the political intention of dominant interests. The nature, scope and focus of macro policy decisions are thus determined by narrow ideology, which aims to subordinate dominated groups' interests and social concerns while implementing policy serving capitalist interests.

Pluralist explanations and micro-analysis of the policy process are viewed to under-emphasise the power of macro forces to control micro autonomy, both directly and indirectly. My critical realist perspective argues that dominant SPEC interests underpin macro policy decisions, and that micro processes are constrained within macro boundaries. It suggests that the bargaining power between groups is unequal, and that some groups have the power to prevent others being heard. Policy implementation is, thus, the exercise of dominant political power where decisions are based on ideology, interests and intent, rather than on plural social concerns. Pluralism, therefore, is seen as a concept constructed to pacify subordinates through a false reality of democracy. Sabatier (1993: p279) argues that failure to identify SPEC interests fails to question the rules of the game. I add that it also fails to question both who makes the rules and, critically, who is refereeing. In my view, a satisfactory

analysis of policy should investigate the political intent behind it and uncover 'who' controls 'what', 'why' and 'how'. It should also investigate both the methods used to achieve consensus over policy objectives (such as discourse), and the means of achieving them (such as resources). Therefore, I critique RR policy within the context of capitalist SPEC arrangements, situating it within macro-level ideological intent.

This critique would, ideally, strip away the rhetoric of the political rationale to expose the reality of political intent behind claims of objectivity and neutrality, uncovering the structures, processes and relationships of power (see Minogue 1993: p13-14). However, in actuality:

Policy analysis is not an exact science. It involves trying to understand and explain events in situations in which we never have complete information about what happened and why it happened, and our interpretations are influenced by our frames of reference and our ideologies (Hill 1993: p155).

Like policy, my critical realist critique must be set within the SPEC context, and my biography is acknowledged as influential in its construction (see chapter one: p22). Explanations can thus never be more than partial, reasoned analysis, based on the information and conceptual understandings available. My perspective establishes a framework to explain links between macro political intent and methods which endeavour to set constraining parameters over micro autonomy. This centres on capitalist rationalisation, decision making based on selective knowledge and information, policy implementation structures and the market as both the means and the ends of RR intent. The focus of this critique is educational reform and physical education policy within it.

The Critical Realist Interpretation of Educational Provision and Reform

Critical realism views that capitalist ideology* has become institutionalised in the UK and that education is central in the process of ideological hegemony. In this perspective, capitalist requirements influence decision making in educational policy, which leads to cultural suppression, constraint, conformity and constructed expectation. The values transmitted through education seek to develop a personality and consciousness based on competition, authority, subordination, property, privilege

and aspiration through merit. The aim is to integrate future generations into capitalist arrangements through the manipulation of personal development (Husen 1979, Apple 1990, Dale 1989). Schooling is perceived as a prime instrument of the state's ideological apparatus (see Apple 1990), central in the transmission of the dominant discourse, the construction of social reality and the reproduction or transformation of the status quo as technology evolves and capitalist requirements change (see Husen 1979). Thus, technological change necessitates educational reform. The reproduction or transformation of capitalist arrangements comes through the psychological manipulation of institutionalised values which influence physical, social, intellectual, emotional and spiritual development. Reform is deemed to be possible through the linking of symbolic and material rules and resources in a process of domination which asserts ideological, moral and SPEC leadership. Chapters four and five consider the links between the RR's political intent to transform and reproduce 'social reality', and their reforms to educational form, content and methods. The argument made is that education was employed as a tool by the RR in its attempt to socialise children into its definition of 'citizenship'. As we will see, my data suggests that the RR selected 'knowledge' from which it constructed an educational discourse to be presented as 'common-sense' and transmitted institutionally.

Education's Role in Ideological Hegemony

Bernstein (1971: p47) argues that "...how society selects, classifies, distributes, transmits and evaluates the educational knowledge it considers to be public, reflects both the distribution of power and the principles of social control", and that "...educational knowledge is a major regulator of the structure of experience". Numerous writers, stressing the culturally reproductive processes of schooling, have argued that schools function to reproduce the social order of structured inequality for the purpose of securing domination and social control⁴⁵. In a similar vein, critical realism views the education system as a social construct based in the context of 'a priori' social structures and interaction. Rather than promoting individual educational

⁴⁵ See Apple 1990, Archer 1984, Bash and Coulby 1989, Carnoy 1982, CCCS 1981, Dale 1989, Giroux 1983, Illich 1976, Kelly 1990, Lawton 1980, McPherson and Raab 1988, Tomlinson 1993. Some of these authors have stressed that schooling also offers a platform for cultural and social 'production' and 'resistance'.

development, schools, as state institutions, are seen as mechanisms which function to 'socialise' pupils within the imperatives of capitalist arrangements. Education cannot therefore be removed from the wider ideological interests of capital. It exists within the contexts of dominant social structures where political power leads to the ability to influence the form and content of compulsory schooling to serve the interests of the contemporary dominant group. However, schooling also shapes and provides space for contestation and opposition. Schools do not always straightforwardly reflect the interests of the dominant group. Nonetheless, where conflict or opposition occurs, control over resources is viewed as the material control to both constrain and weaken unity.

In Apple's (1989: p1) view, education is used to transmit the 'desired' values and "...is not a neutral set of instructions but is inextricably connected to the forms of domination and subordination in society". Further,

The control of schools, knowledge and everyday life can be, and is, more subtle for it takes in even seemingly inconsequential moments. The control is vested in the constitutive principles, codes and especially the common sense consciousness and the practices underlying our lives, as well as by overt economic division and manipulation (Apple 1990: p4).

Education, thus, acts as a mechanism to both hide the conflicts of control and legitimate structural outcomes through specific educational experiences and interpretations (Archer 1987: p45). It, rather than religion, has become the crucial mechanism in the transmission of cultural values, based on dominant SPEC requirements⁴⁶. In this view the school has become the central instrument of social control. Thus, education not only serves to secure social control, it also serves to legitimate that control through the perpetuation of dominant cultural practices, beliefs and understandings, based on the constructed myth of a common history. In this way schools transmit the dominant ideology as 'social reality' through institutionalised practices. Although this does not guarantee that it will be accepted unconditionally by

⁴⁶ Illich (1972: p37) argues that;

The school system today performs the threefold functions common to powerful churches throughout history....It is simultaneously the responsibility of society's myths, the institutionalisation of that myth's contradictions, and the locus of rituals which reproduces and veils the disparities between myth and reality.

all pupils. The dominant group aims therefore to construct and constrain reflexive socialisation within its discourse, with children socialised into a social reality constructed by capitalist requirements. Its ideological hegemony seeks to transform the values of the dominated groups into its value agenda (discourse) and to prevent the possibility of alternative hegemonies having a voice through education. It endeavours to reconstruct education to how it wants it to be. Lawrence (1992: p133) indicates that change in society will be reflected in education and that education furthers what has been initiated. However, more pertinently, Lawrence suggests that once change has occurred in education, change in society occurs much more quickly. My argument is that this was the RR's intention. However, change in education and change in society would take time and considerable ideological work.

Giroux (1983: p197) highlights that in education;

Hegemony does not simply refer to the content found, for instance, in the formal curriculum of schools. It is that and much more; it also refers to the way such knowledge is constructed. In addition, it refers to the routines and practices embedded in different social relationships; finally, it points to the notion of social structures as natural configurations which both embody and sustain forms of ideological hegemony.

In this perspective, ideological hegemony works at the level of unconscious reproduction of structural relations and acts as the prime contributor to the process of cultural reproduction. The dominant group's aim, through education, is to create the type of citizen who, imbued with capitalist attributes, contributes to capital accumulation. Individuals are 'controlled' through a process of schooling which endeavours to instil dominant values through the transmission of 'official knowledge' (see Abercrombie, Hill and Turner 1983).

Educational and Social Division

For schooling to serve dominant group requirements it has to both instil the dominant moral discourse, and stratify (sift and sort) school leavers in terms of capitalist utility. The dominant group seeks to transmit its discourse to create hegemonic consent for its domination. This hegemony seeks to instil the historical rules of division through

institutionalising the criteria which divide society academically and so socially. Schools are sites where 'ideological saturation' (Apple 1990: p40) takes place and where dominant definitions of cultural 'norms' are transmitted. This transmission is both overt through the official curriculum and covert through the 'hidden curriculum'. The 'hidden curriculum' seeks to socialise pupils into capitalist rules, regulations and disciplines, concerned with social control rather than educational development (see Giroux 1983: p48). As such, the hidden curriculum works to establish SPEC expectations. Apple (1990: p130) refers to this as 'consensus ideology' where expectation leads to labelling, differentiated teaching, the self-fulfilling prophecy and unequal outcome. Labelling can thus be viewed as intentional and purposive in terms of stratification through the subordination of aspiration. It is intended to instil a moral acceptance of positional inequality as 'natural', where individuals 'seek-out' SPEC slots into which they fit. In this interpretation schools do not produce equality but reproduce hierarchy through simplistic measurement which acts to 'rank' all pupils. Assessment and certification through stratified measures, central to the NC, can be viewed as vital both for the (re)production of hierarchical positions and to reinforce them. Subordination through the ideology of technocratic-meritocracy is based on the apparent agency of 'effort and ability'. Apparently meritorious results achieved through competition hide structural inequalities of differentiation, where certification of 'effort and ability' measures the accumulation of the dominant discourse. This hegemony, it is viewed, is intended to permeate consciousness and limit the control that individuals have over decision making and social outcomes. The institutionalisation of such values is an endeavour to construct both capacities and preferences for individuals, with choice coming from a pre-given selection of options which is intended not to leave psychological and moral development to chance (see Bowles and Gintis 1988: p230).

The role of education in legitimating the concept of accumulation is essential in the process of structuring society (Apple 1984: p4). Giroux (1983: p188) suggests that schools function to institutionalise capitalist modes and values through their content and objectives. Education form is therefore structured differentially to support structural relations and create roles for individuals in the capitalist hierarchy. Education content is selected with the intent of creating submission to the dominant

ideology and to respond to capitalist requirements. By defining educational value in terms of neutral technical measurements, and inequality of outcome as 'natural', capitalist hegemony endeavours to both create and legitimate 'social Darwinism'. Manipulation of the need for accumulation of education as 'capital' becomes a mechanism both to conceal inequality and to legitimate hierarchical power (Larrain 1979: p204).

The dominant group, through government, distributes resources differentially through selection. Selection does not act to increase democracy but instead to produce 'leaders' and 'followers'. It constrains personal development through constructed experiences which are differentiated institutionally to fragment society hierarchically (Archer 1988). In this perspective, society is divided through differential access to forms of knowledge. Differentiated transmission of knowledge gives different groups 'cultural capital value' in terms of social stratification and structural relationships. Measurement acts to stratify employment possibilities through the indication of utility, and, as such, becomes both public expectation and demand. The hegemony is of 'value'. Education has a capital value and becomes a commodity to be consumed and accumulated. Accumulation of educational capital divides society as educational value leads to social stratification which either enhances or constrains opportunity. This is seen to promote relationships of social distance between superiors and subordinates on the basis of 'cultural values'. These are viewed to be social and cultural (symbolic) in the short-term, and political and economic (material) in the long-term. Archer (1984: p110-3) argues that the dominant group creates education structures which protect their own interests, where the prime concern is the social distribution of power. Therefore, with dominant group control of government, education policy is based on political decisions which suit capitalist requirements. As such, change in capitalist requirements will be reflected in educational policy and provision. Educational reforms seek either to accommodate change within the existing social structural arrangements, or, when there are 'surface' SPEC shifts away from the 'traditional' structural arrangements, education is used to invigorate these traditions. The dominant group seeks to use 'state' resources to make education both produce the SPEC arrangements which best serve its requirements, and to hide that function.

Social democratic policy in the UK from the 1950s to the 1970s sought to dismantle such practices. My thesis is that the RR sought to re-establish them for the purpose of reinstating social division and hierarchy in the context of globally changing capitalist arrangements which did not suit their SPEC interests. With technological advances pressurising the 'traditional' SPEC status quo, RR educational reforms are viewed as mechanisms which endeavoured to serve technological developments within the UK's 'traditional' capitalist arrangements⁴⁷. Chapter five shows how this was based on a rhetoric of 'parental choice and power', as the NR/RR's ideological attack vilified the 'value' of state education and exalted the value of private education.

The danger of this perspective, obviously, is one of over-simplification and determinism, a reduction of the complexities in the way in which consciousness is constructed. With bodies such as the HMI, DES, parents and teachers mediating the policy process, the imposition of the dominant discourse on others is neither simple nor straightforward. The process is clearly highly complex and requires sophisticated theoretical articulation. Carnoy (1982: p82) highlights that;

... any study of the educational system cannot be separated from some explicit or implicit analysis of the purpose and function of the government sector. Since power is expressed at least in part through a society's political system, any attempt to develop a model of educational change should have behind it a carefully thought out theory of the functioning of government

If the social arrangements for policy making create frames which shape and constrain the understanding of experiences and possibilities within the values of the dominant ideology, it is important to uncover the intentions behind framing to understand which and whose interests are served by cultural domination, what those interests are and how domination serves them (see Penney 1994). It is for these reasons that this thesis investigates the SPEC interests of the NR/RR in seeking to understand the reform of education provision in the UK from 1979.

⁴⁷ This is shown in the following chapters to be particular forms of liberal technological advance and conservative social control. This again highlights the complex but concomitant dialectic between the neo-Liberal and neo-Conservative factions that formed the NR.

Educational Knowledge

The knowledge which is selected for transmission by the dominant group is inseparable from its ideological interests. It is not politically neutral and symbolises aspects of social and cultural control (Apple 1990, Apple 1993). This is intended to become the 'official knowledge' to disseminate the dominant discourse. The dominant group endeavours to transport its ideological definitions into educational discourse as democratic and popular by transforming the definitions of competing discourses (see Apple 1988: p120-5, Freeman-Moir, Scott and Lauder 1988: p210). In the UK, capitalist requirements are to subordinate then shape social demands

Critical realism argues that what the dominant group counts as ideologically worthwhile and functionally vital for dissemination, both constructs and legitimates the curriculum. Selecting or eliminating certain content at the point of construction of texts defines educational possibilities from the earliest point. Where knowledge can be either culturally empowering or disempowering, what is not to be taught in state schools can be more important than what is to be taught⁴⁸. This delineates the knowledge to be taught in the 'official curriculum', which is defined as 'neutral'. The intent is that, by defining educational purpose and content, this becomes the 'official text' which, in turn, by shaping teachers actions, becomes the 'official pedagogic practice' (discussed below). This 'official knowledge' is transmitted at educational sites (schools) and is intended to be read and understood, and either accepted or rejected (i.e. to construct opposition) in relation to individuals' status and socialisation (habitus). I argue in the coming chapters that these were the underpinning aims of the RR's centralisation of education from 1979.

Educational Discourse and Texts, and the 'Pedagogic Device'

A 'discursive formation' (Tomlinson A 1993: p86) sets the agenda, provides the interpretive framework, language and terms within which a policy or text is understood. An individual's perception of 'pedagogic practice' and their autonomy

⁴⁸ Giroux (1983: p21) argues that the construction and transmission of 'legitimate knowledge' can do more to distort the truth of social reality, or create a false reality, than to illuminate it.

within the 'pedagogic text' depends on their position within it and relationship to it. Bernstein (1990: p179-185) refers to this as 'official pedagogic practice', which is governed by 'distribution' rules where access to knowledge is differentiated; 'recontextualising' rules where different pedagogic discourses come together but are governed by what is considered 'thinkable'; and 'evaluative' rules at the point of transmission. Bernstein (1990: p189) claims that this "...'pedagogic device' is thus a symbolic ruler of consciousness in its selective creation, positioning, and oppositioning of pedagogic subjects. It is the condition for the production, reproduction and transformation of culture...", where 'internal consciousness' determines what is thinkable and 'external consciousness' gives legitimation through control. In this way the dominant discourse becomes a syllabus of possibilities and definitions which acts as symbolic control in the production and reproduction of educational policy and text. In attempting to control thinking and what is thinkable, and to legitimating its discourse, the dominant group must control the 'pedagogic device' as it regulates the distribution of power and control which determine the means, context, distribution, possibilities and social relations of physical and discursive resources⁴⁹. Bernstein (1990: p205) expands this by illustrating that "...the pedagogic device is essentially a device for translating power relations into discourses of symbolic control and for translating discourses of symbolic control into power relations". Pedagogic discourse evolves from wider economic and cultural practices where schooling serves the political function of social control. My argument, which unfolds in the following chapters, concurs with Evans and Penney's (1995b) view that the NR/RR sought control of the 'pedagogic device' through the manipulation of both symbolic resources (for submission) and material resources (for coercion), the aim of which was to displace the interests of teachers and pupils.

⁴⁹ Bernstein (1990: p198) argues that;

The dominant principles are regulated by the distribution of power and the principles of control which determine the means, context, distribution, possibilities and social relations of physical and discursive practices.

Physical Education Provision in the SPEC Context

To begin to understand how society and physical education shape each other, physical education needs to be located in its SPEC context as part of the fabric of the social structure of UK society. The body has been a very powerful tool of socialisation, contributing to both social order and ordering (MacIntosh 1986, Mangan 1983, Saunders 1982: p12). How it is perceived in society depends on the meanings and definitions given to it, and its uses, through the education system. History shows that physical education in state schools has always been used for utilitarian purposes by both Right and Left. It has had a role both in contributing to wider social 'change' and as a mechanism of social control (MacIntosh 1986, Mangan 1981). The activities and experiences to which children are exposed shape understandings and attitudes, which, in turn, constructs a sense of the 'self' (McNamee 1992b: p14). This development of a conscious understanding of the 'self', develops an individual's sense of place and purpose in the social hierarchy. In this perspective, physical experiences can influence an individual's awareness of 'social reality'. Socialisation cannot, therefore, be left to chance (see Saunders 1982: p4-10). Physical education has a succession of constructed experiences which act explicitly through the 'formal curriculum' and implicitly through the 'hidden curriculum', to both reproduce and legitimate the status quo of hierarchical inequality (Evans and Davies 1986: p17). Physical education is, thus, viewed as an important tool of ideological hegemony by critical realism.

Critical realism considers that the form and content of physical education depend on the power of the dominant SPEC group to 'control' the discursive (symbolic) and economic (material) resources which determine educational possibilities. Education and physical education texts are, thus, seen to be driven by political intent, which privileges a particular form and content imbued with the dominant discourse. As such, the curriculum reflects, albeit imperfectly, the wider dominant SPEC values, practices and interests, and serves capitalist requirements of 'social order' and 'social ordering'⁵⁰. In this perspective, the knowledge and understanding of the 'physical self' is socially constructed and imbued with the

⁵⁰ It is, of course, not only capitalism which requires 'social order' and 'social ordering'. However, it is the particular form of 'social order' and 'social ordering' required by the RR's definition of capitalism which concerns this thesis.

dominant discourse. Control of the curriculum, *if achieved by the dominant group*, may lead to the construction of limited experiences which, with given meanings and interpretations, are culturally powerful in the transmission of the dominant group's discourse at a subconscious level. This, if internalised, acts to reproduce both hierarchical structures and subordination to dominant power and control. As such, the form and content of physical education is "...crucial, functionally and symbolically, to the maintenance of social order and to supporting the legitimating hegemony" (Kirk 1992b: p169). In the UK this has been a form and content which promotes nationalism and competition through sport and games.

A Sporting Tradition

Competitive sports and team games have a long, established history in the UK. Team games were introduced into the Victorian and Edwardian public schools due to the need for social order. They were used as a "...highly effective means of inculcating valuable instrumental and impressive educational goals: physical and moral courage, loyalty and co-operation, the capacity to act fairly and take defeat well, the ability to both command and obey" (Mangan 1981: p9)⁵¹. This 'games ethic' imbued 'middle class values' and nationalism, and was quickly established as a 'tradition' (Mangan 1983). Physical education in state schools evolved with 'moments' of influence and innovation within permissive legislation and resource allocation (MacIntosh 1986). Provision was, initially, more concerned with the health of the nation than with the public school values of 'games'. Developments were often fragmented and conflicting. The 'games tradition' was adopted, much later, in the development of a physical education curriculum in state schools, where 'games' were pre-selected tools which aimed to imbue conservative values (see MacIntosh 1986). Thus, a variety of internal and external forces have defined, shaped and given meaning to physical education, making it a vibrant community but also a site of visible conflict and contradiction (see chapter six: p199). This was the context in which the development of the NCPE arose (see chapter seven: p238).

⁵¹ The values of the 'games ethic' are clearly very close to Mrs Thatcher's 'vigorous virtues' and 'Victorian values' (see chapter four: p122).

This 'sporting tradition' is part of a symbolism where sporting activities not only transmit cultural values, they become cultural values (Almond 1989: p1). Through the ritual* representation of a 'cultural heritage', and by promoting national identity and unity, sport and games act as mechanisms of social and cultural cement: the notion of 'empire building and the playing fields of Eton' is taken for granted (Mangan 1973: p87). As such, sport and games become a significant part of a 'cultural heritage' which is fixed as unchanging and unchangeable (Almond 1989: p13). This narrow and elitist definition acts to perpetuate a 'common-sense' about the traditional role and purpose of sport and games in society, and, therefore, the role of competitive excellence. Powerful expectations and demands are created over what the form and content of physical education 'should be', which, in turn, constrains innovation and progression in physical education which question the traditional 'common-sense' values of sport and games. Because of this, team games survive as a prominent part of the school physical education curriculum. In this perspective, sport and games are not seen to be included because they cater for individual educational needs. Rather, that "...physical education as with the educational process more generally, ...makes both friends and enemies of those subjected to it, it inspires and alienates, it conditions and reconditions class and power structures" (Evans and Davies 1986: p15).

As we see in chapters six and seven, in my perspective, the RR's definition of physical education as 'sport and games' was intended to saturate public perception and understanding, and, therefore, create expectation and demand for sport and games in school. As these values and intentions were based in a rhetoric which portrayed an 'unquestionable tradition' and 'cultural heritage' as 'common-sense', contestation or critical evaluation was 'irrational'. Any other more educational, liberal or progressive view was vilified and subordinated. We will see that by evoking 'tradition' in physical education, the RR were able to influence the definitions of form, content and method, which were intended to 'legitimate' both the allocation of resources and the direction for their use. Critical realism argues, therefore, that physical education's form and content were central in the NR/RR's attempt at cultural [re]production through socialisation and enculturation. It argues that 'games', as defined by the Right, were mechanisms intended to achieve social order and social ordering, for learning one's place, and for assimilating the predispositions (attitudes, beliefs and values) of a

‘capitalist moral character’: the moral base required for the functioning of a ‘free’ market economy (see chapter six: p197).

Summary

Crucially, my critical realist perspective is not a theory of simple Marxist economic determinism. Rather, in a neo-Marxist epistemology, it views the UK’s contemporary ‘social whole’ to be the totality of capitalist SPEC arrangements. The focus therefore is on hegemony as the basis of social [re]production. Critical realism seeks to uncover and understand how the RR as macro actors were able to manipulate the complex workings of, and links between, SPEC macro-micro* structures and interactions. It is, therefore, a theory of the ‘SPEC whole’ which investigates macro SPEC political intent. This allows the asking of the question ‘**who controlled what, why and how?**’ The interaction of SPEC arrangements is investigated in terms of macro-micro domination and subjugation. It is an analysis of how power and control legitimised domination; the exclusion of subordinates access to opportunities for independent conscious development; whose interests were privileged and how this was justified; and how control over rules and resources acted to influence social norms and processes. Macro actors’ power, in whatever form, is argued to come through unequal access to SPEC resources, and is seen as crucial in the construction, reform or reproduction of the social whole and social reality within it. My argument is that pluralist theory and micro analysis focus on the actors that implement policies and the effects of them, not on the policies and the intent of the actors who make them. Further, that if we concentrate only on ‘face-to-face’ interaction at the micro level, we are likely to end up with a critique *within* dominant discourse, rather than a critique *of* it.

Conversely, critical realism views that state institutions (both figurational and material) act to structure social division and power in society. They are viewed as ‘a priori’ mechanisms central in the transmission of the dominant group’s ideology as it seeks to reproduce or transform subordinate actors’ social reality. This, it is argued, results in hierarchical levels, and understandings, of agency. The intent of the dominant group is to construct a common-sense where the macro dominates the

micro: a social reality where 'thought and will' are structured, neither are 'free', and where people are socialised into positions of privilege or subordination. The 'self' is intended to be socialised into structures of 'hierarchical aspiration' which reproduce capitalist arrangements reflexively. Therefore, critical realism questions the rhetoric of 'normative' domination and 'rationality', and seeks to investigate the methods of power and control employed by the dominant group (the NR/RR) in the creation of a 'false social reality' and the placing of the 'self' within it (between 1979 and 1992 (1997)).

Critical Realist Aims

Critical realism, thus, sceptically challenges the dominant group's definition of 'norms' to uncover the intention behind the construction and scope of policy. It goes deeper than surface representation to focus on the ideological intentions of the dominant group's discourse, tracing links between SPEC arrangements and dominant interests. It seeks to expose the contradictions between dominant group representations of 'reality' and the 'reality' experienced by individuals, and to highlight the methods employed by the dominant group in seeking to hide these contradictions. The perspective aims to expose the symbolic and material 'forces' of social reproduction, which are seen as central to explain the policy system in operation in Britain from 1979 to 1992⁵². However, it does not claim to be proffering the 'correct' way to see the world. It argues instead that a more effective way to view 'reality' may be to analyse actual experiences in the social world critically. Critical realism is therefore the macro-analytical interpretation of the relationship between the social construction of policy and the reproduction or transformation of SPEC arrangements. Policy analysis would, ideally, involve the mammoth task of analysing the whole process, from cause, decision making and implementation, to evaluation and revision. However, this thesis concentrates specifically on the political intent behind policy and the controlling methods used in the attempt to achieve desired ends. It is not ultimately concerned with the success or otherwise of NR/RR policy, which is

⁵² In terms of physical education policy, critical realism seeks to clarify; ...the way that organisations [SPEC arrangements] operate as media of control and how (in facilitating the control which some exercise over others) organisations contribute to the maintenance of existing modes of domination and reproduce prevailing differences of power and advantage within a society (Deleging and Colebatch 1993: p353)

being undertaken by other researchers (Evans and Penney 1993, 1994, 1995a, 1995b)⁵³.

Theoretical Reservations and Developments

Critical realism concentrates on the macro aspect of political intent, not on the micro aspect of the effectiveness of policy. However, it is not a determinist theory. It is, rather, a theory of political determinism which views social organisations and structures as “...systems of order which reflect and create established relations of power and social advantage within society” (Deleging and Colebatch 1993: p53). As it views policy as a ‘purposive instrument’ of the dominant group, critical realism is, arguably, identified as a neo-Marxist macro analysis of the policy process. Importantly, the weaknesses of my perspective are acknowledged and laid bare (see chapters one: p23, chapter two: p41). Centrally they involve issues of personal bias and values in the selection and interpretation of data. My biography is acknowledge as central in *my* perception of how physical education, education and society ‘ought’ to be⁵⁴. However, biography neither determines nor under-determines my theoretical perspective. Nonetheless, it does influence it. It is the motivation which ‘steers’ my theoretical perspective, the decisions made and the interpretation of data analysis (either consciously or unconsciously). This research is therefore a subjective interpretation of the making of the NCPE. This makes clear that my interpretations are ‘second order constructs’ as they theorise about the social world using my interpretations of social and political theories based on my ‘first order constructs’ of the world. Nonetheless, these are underpinned by the theoretical concepts discussed throughout this chapter. I am also acutely aware of my part in the production of knowledge about knowledge, crucially, an understanding developed of the importance

⁵³ Minogue (1993: p11) reminds us that:

The ‘system’ cannot be understood without reference to particular areas of policy; areas of policy cannot be understood without reference to specific decisions and actions; specific decisions and actions may be interesting in themselves but have no meaning beyond themselves except that they contribute to understanding of the policy area within which they are located, and to the general policy system which provides the context for both decision and policy.

⁵⁴ My view that physical education should encompass every child knowing and understanding - firstly, ‘why’ physical activity is important through out life for both physical and psychological health, secondly, ‘what’ to do to achieve this, and thirdly, through experiential learning, ‘how’ to do it - comes not only from theory but also from experience.

of 'critical self-awareness' and the necessity to apply it throughout the research process. Thus, the central paradox of the critical realist perspective is argued to be its underpinning strength. Critique of the theory recognised its simplistic over-determined nature. This critical self reflection led to both a wider understanding of the social world and the inadequacy of critical realism to explain it fully. 'Critical self-awareness' is therefore a fundamental component of the critical realist perspective. Its strength lies in the fact that not only is the analysis undertaken on the basis of social theory rather than opinion, but the interpretations and conclusions drawn are substantiated by empirical evidence. This uncomplicated critical realist perspective thus endeavours to outline the intent of social control at the macro level, and possibility of social control at the micro level by the dominant group (NR/RR). Yet, it is understood as only the first step in a learning process about the complex nature of the social world.

Education

The critical realist perspective views UK capitalism as a unique phenomena, within which the intent and methods of the NR/RR from 1979 are viewed as an epiphenomenon. Thus, the educational reforms of the period are viewed as the reflection of dominant interests within a specific time-space context. Compulsory state education is viewed as the apparatus manipulated to transmit the RR's ideology and, therefore, the central mechanism of the intended social transformation. It is accepted that reproduction of the RR's discourse was nonetheless imperfect as schools are sites of opposition and resistance as well as sites of reproduction (Apple 1988: p116). However, my perspective concentrates on political intent at the macro level⁵⁵. It is not an explanation of education provision within the simple economic determinism of correspondence theory. Critical realism, rather, argues that complex cultural issues are central in political decisions over education provision, which need to be placed both in the context of capitalist SPEC arrangements and relations and a theory of hegemony.

⁵⁵ This is not to suggest however that there is no contestation or struggle at this level. On the contrary, it may be more likely that there will be more conflict at the macro than the micro level

Physical education is seen as central in the transmission of NR/RR cultural values, with a unique and direct application in the construction of a 'capitalist moral character'. Its role in the socialisation and enculturation of individuals is viewed as the manipulation of personality, consciousness and expectation in the right-wing endeavour to construct a citizenship imbued with moral 'self-regulation' (conformity). Critical realism suggests that it is necessary to interpret the development of the NCPE within a discussion which links the NR/RR ideology with the SPEC power and control to turn dominant political interests into policy. It is argued that the political intent behind physical education policy between 1979 to 1992 was to cause conflict and contradiction, and provide the 'justification' for central control and prescription of 'certain' definitions which fitted wider right-wing SPEC interests. Centrally, the conflicts with professionals over the effects of physical education reforms are viewed as mechanisms intended to allow suppression, with the underlying intent of deskilling the profession to prevent its critique of right-wing input (see Evans 1995a and 1995b). These points become clear in forthcoming chapters with the exposure of the RR's hidden agenda within their 'common-sense' definition of 'games' and 'sport' as physical *education*.

Chapter Four

1979 to 1992: The New Right / Radical Right as the Dominant Social, Political, Economic and Cultural Group

Introduction

My critical realist perspective outlines a theory of a SPEC dominant group with the political intent, power and authority to manipulate 'a priori' SPEC structures to serve its interests, regardless of the 'cost' to subordinate groups. By investigating the nature, origin and ascendancy of the right-wing within the Conservative Party in the UK between 1979 to 1992, this chapter identifies the 'dominant group' as the 'Radical Right'. It uncovers the ideological origins, interests and political intentions of the RR, subsequent policy initiatives, who is served by them and the methods employed to implement them. There is neither the space nor the requirement to investigate specific policies and their effects in detail. All this chapter can do is identify the major areas underpinning RR ideology to begin to suggest how the development of the NCPE was both influenced by and intended to contribute to right-wing interests. I will not outline a chronological development of RR ideology between 1979 to 1992, but, rather, highlight general themes, suggesting that as the RR gained strength and power they were able to voice their interest and intentions more overtly. The aspects discussed individually are components of a complex whole which, at times, is difficult to untangle and comprehend. My aim here is to clarify this political project to outline macro political intent.

The Origins, Ideology and Ascendancy of the RR as the SPEC Dominant Group

Origins

The oil crisis of the early 1970s led to global economic austerity. The social democratic (SD) policies pursued in the UK throughout the 1960s and 1970s were no longer economically viable. The 1978-1979 'Winter of Discontent' saw the re-emergence of social divisions and tensions between capital and labour. This created an opening for ideological and electoral alternatives. The time was right for radical 'solutions' to the failing socialist project (see Hutton 1996: p52). There was a shift in public opinion to the right which allowed the political initiative to pass to the 'New Right' Conservatives. The 'New Right' (NR) describes a set of right-wing political discourses. It was not a unified group but comprised various political 'think-tanks',

business representatives and right-wing pressure groups which had overlapping membership based on close personal links (Thompson 1990: p1). Their interests were more than economic (Gamble 1990a).

There were two disparate NR groups within the Conservative Party; the neo-Conservatives who favoured social authoritarianism, and the neo-Liberals who favoured liberal economics and the free market (see Kavanagh 1989). For the neo-Conservatives, the security of the capitalist 'nation state' and social and political concerns within it were more important than the market economy. They were concerned with tradition, order, authority and national wealth in the form of private property which was advocated as freedom and liberty. The family was the focus of rights and obligations. Citizens were expected to make sacrifices to the nation state as 'duty', have allegiance to the social order and fixed expectation of position and place. 'Social' policy was to strengthen the rights of property, the stability of the family, and coerce diversity into 'acceptable' uniformity. It had no responsibility for fairness and justice. Neo-Conservatives wanted a strong, authoritarian state with centralised power to enforce their agenda and to secure the political dominance of the market as a source of SPEC discipline, not of SPEC freedom. The neo-Liberals believed a competitive market would guarantee political freedoms and liberties. However, this needed the guarantee of the neo-Conservatives' political authority (see Thompson 1990: p35). Nonetheless, the eclectic and seemingly conflicting range of Anglo-Saxon interests were held together by the philosophy of the 'market' as the alternative to SD. As we see below, the objectives of the two factions were in fact very similar.

During the 1970s the NR began to fill places in the financial press (i.e. the 'Times' and 'Telegraph') and Conservative political research departments (Knight 1990). Both attacked weaknesses in SD. The NR were also establishing themselves within the Conservative Party, finding a political platform through Thatcherism (Thompson 1990: p2). The Centre for Policy Studies (CPS) was set up by Margaret Thatcher and Keith Joseph in 1974 as a 'think tank' for right-wing political initiatives. 'Thatcherism' was able to unite the NR strands through the rhetoric of a strong state and traditional government. The return of 'authority' and the free market were combined to mobilise a right-wing political offensive. As at any time in history,

voters were 'up-for-grabs' and became a commodity to be bought ideologically in the political market place. The Conservative Party in opposition provided a rallying point for wider right-wing sectional interests. The way was open for the NR radical response to SD and no alternative was forthcoming to challenge its policies.

NR / RR Ideology and Discourse

Many of the ideas of the NR can be traced back to Von Hayek's writings of the 1950s and 1960s⁵⁶. These appealed to the far right of the Conservative Party and were developed before Thatcher and Joseph took control. Thatcherism adopted these and brought them together with a political direction. The NR's focus was explained by Professor John Tomlinson of Warwick University during interview;

JT The fact is that it [NR policy] is both [neo-con and neo-lib]. There is an underlying philosophy that goes back to the think tanks of the 1960s and 1970s in the right wing. That is Von Hayek and the CPS. All these groups which had very certain, clear, broad political aims - reduce producer domination and increase consumer control, introduce market forces, deregulate the government. Those are the liberal right wing philosophies. All that was coherent and uttered. It was written about, people were saying "This is what we believe. This is what we intend to do"

NR policies espoused both market economics and the need for social order. They covered economic, social, foreign and cultural policy, and reforms in public management and administration. It was made clear that what they wanted to achieve was a reversal of the ways in which British society had been developing since 1945 (Dunleavy 1990: p7). The radicalism in the right-wing of the Conservative Party was the methods it chose to implement its policies⁵⁷. Centrally, this revolved around the definition of citizenship and the duties, responsibilities and rights associated with it.

⁵⁶ Mrs Thatcher (1993) indicates that she was influenced politically by Von Hayek's 'Constitutional Liberty' and 'The Road to Serfdom'.

⁵⁷ To simplify identification between the ideological and the political factions of the NR in my research, the lobby groups and 'think tanks' are identified as the NR and the governments and politicians as the 'radical right' (RR).

Citizenship

With no written constitution, UK citizenship tends to be transient, ever influenced by the dominant group according to the requirements of capital. In the Conservative view (Scruton 1980, Allison 1984), including the NR/RR (Redwood 1991, Tebbit 1985, Thatcher 1993), community and the citizen are interlinked. Centrally, the aim is to construct a belief that the individual has a role in the community, and to establish a definition of citizenship that can be used as a tool of social control. The endeavour is to shift peoples' attitudes to the Right through an exaggeration of, and play on, genuine fears of insecurity, seeking to turn them into reactionary attitudes. For example, the intent to nurture the moral of 'self-interest' was grounded in the vilification of the Welfare State and exaltation of private provision in the 'free' market (for example health care and education). Aspects of NR citizenship encompassed cultural traditions, beliefs and practices, nationalism, community and the SPEC arrangements of individuals' hierarchical places and roles.

Tradition

The NR/RR Conservative outlook was, and is, to the past, to a particular version of 'tradition' (see Halpin 1997) and a 'natural order' of their right to 'rule', based on a right-wing, middle-class moral foundation. Harris⁵⁸ (1989: p5-7) described 'Conservatism' as a coherent set of values and beliefs based on the traditions of the family, inheritance and continuity, the nation and the community (which required stability and security and thus loyalty, patriotism, order and duties before rights). History was the key to the politics of preservation. The NR's definition of 'traditional Conservatism' gave it a certain adaptability;

Tradition is not just the way we do things, or the way that they have always been done. It is rather an experience of continuity and association; of community, family, group or church. And just as it is constantly drawing on the roots of the past, so it is constantly responding to new experiences and adapting and changing itself to circumstances (Moore 1983: p4-5).

⁵⁸ Lord Harris of High Cross was the Director of the Institute of Economic Affairs, a contributor to the Salisbury Review, the Black Papers, the CPS and the Conservative Political Centre.

The middle class morals of Victorian England (family, patriarchy, a narrowly defined education content, public order, racial division, religion, morality and democracy), required due to the alleged threat to national security and stability from subversive forces, were to be imposed as forms of 'social control'. Social gains achieved by collectives were to be incorporated into the RR's discourse to render them harmless. The discourse was of individuals within the community, the 'nation', not within societies which formed 'exclusive' collectives. Further, for national security, individuals had to fill their SPEC roles obediently (Cronin 1983: p33). Part of the endeavour to maintain traditional hierarchical structures rested on defending 'freedom' and private 'property rights' while attacking democratic 'person rights', both through the rhetoric of a market system. 'Rights' were defined by Tebbit (1986: p3) as 'freedom from' State imposition and 'freedom to' choose how to live life: that freedom depended on individual choice. However, such freedom was not intended to be absolute as we shall see below.

The Market System and Competition

The market system created social division and hierarchies which enabled dominant groups to govern subordinates more easily through the control of capital accumulation, exchange and distribution, and the institutions of the state (see chapter three: p85). SD and the WS constituted collective social practices, thought and action which were an anathema to the interests of the RR. For capitalism to flourish in the UK it was essential that the market economy functioned to maintain social hierarchies and keep subordinate groups divided. I argue that the RR's objective was, firstly, to justify the 'naturalness' and 'neutrality' of the 'free' market system and establish the belief of its necessity for national stability; secondly, to attack SD policies as unnatural and politically motivated by forces determined to undermine the 'freedom' ensured by capitalists; then, thirdly, to dismantle SD policies. SD policies were depicted as too costly and therefore impossible to maintain in a time of 'economic crisis'⁵⁹. The RR based its economic policy on the supply side of the market system, with the state providing the legal framework to allow the market to function.

⁵⁹ For references see bibliography sections for 'Politics Today' and Hansard.

The NR's discourse justified the market system;

Firstly, genuine welfare, including adequate help for those who may from time to time need it, depends absolutely and entirely on economic progress and national prosperity. This in turn requires hard work and enterprising attitudes on the part of the population and the constant revivification of a dynamic enterprise culture. *Anything* which hinders economic progress, threatens national prosperity, or stifles enterprise is an impediment to genuine welfare (Marsland 1990: p13).

In this view individual welfare is founded on individual effort (the 'work ethic'), unequal outcomes are the product of natural ability and effort, and 'genuine welfare' for 'deserving' individuals is dependent on the creation of national wealth. At the same time, state welfare is decried as a drain on national prosperity, individual responsibility and competitive enterprise for individual survival.

Competition was extolled by the NR;

Competition is an extraordinarily efficient mechanism. It ensures that goods and services preferred by the consumer are delivered at the lowest economic cost. It responds constantly to changes in consumer preferences. It does not require politicians or civil servants to make it (Moore 1983: p14).

Moore (1983: p15) furthered this argument by indicating that competition, and so efficiency, could only be achieved if industry was in private hands. The aim was to replace 'public government' with 'private' ownership, and to distribute 'enough' information to fuel the market to create public choice. Dunwich (1993) points out that the market system can only exist if the consumer has information about what is available. He stresses that the information released has to be regulated and confined to that of the product itself and the market condition. Releasing total information is too expensive in the context of 'social' and 'political' costs. It may expose that limited resources are distributed differentially by the dominant group to generate competition between subordinate groups. Competition is thus vital to keep society divided and maintain the structural status quo.

Individualism and the Family

Thatcher's infamous statement that "There is no such thing as society, only individuals and families" is important in relation to the RR's desire to break social collectives which threatened traditional structures of hierarchical inequality. In a society based on free market principles the notion of 'collectives' had to be dispelled and replaced with a culture of 'selfish individualism' (*selfism*). Thatcher (1993: p626-629) asserted that society comprised, firstly, of individuals with responsibility and accountability for their own actions, then, secondly, the family, made up of individuals. Self-help was claimed to create self-esteem, while welfare created an underclass of dependants. 'Rolling back' the welfare state meant that individuals and families were to be responsible for their own well-being in the 'social market'. They could no longer depend on the state.

Thatcher outlined her ideal of individualism (see Letwin 1992: p38). She identified 'vigorous virtues' as being upright, self-sufficient, energetic, adventurous, independently minded, loyal to friends and robust against enemies. In contrast, kindness, humility, gentleness, sympathy and cheerfulness were identified as 'secondary virtues'. Thatcherites recognised that the two value systems could work together, but they wanted vigorous virtues to dominate, claiming that they allowed society to work productively and cohesively by emphasising the rule of law and discouraging dependency. Thatcher's ideal of 'Victorian values' and 'vigorous virtues' before 'secondary virtues' formed key elements in the development of moral 'individualism' and 'citizenship'. Their appeal to Thatcherites was that they allowed the identification of the 'deserving' and the 'undeserving' poor. They became the embryo of Conservative Party policy and were expressed as political objectives in the 1979 Conservative Manifesto (p7);

We want to work with the grain of human nature, helping people to help themselves - and others. This is the way to restore self-reliance and self-confidence which are the basis of personal responsibility and national success.

The rhetoric of individual responsibility and an 'undeserving' class was part of the construction of a moral repudiation of guilt towards those less fortunate or less

able to help themselves. The NR claimed that equality was not a natural state and that social justice was a left-wing attempt at social engineering that interfered with the natural outcomes of the market (Harris 1989). Self-sufficiency would develop the 'moral character', while welfare caused 'moral decay'. Welfare was argued to lead to a moral crisis, and individual responsibility and accountability were stressed as imperatives;

The watch words we need instead [of welfare] are initiative and self-reliance. These are the only secure foundations of social policies appropriate to a free society, the only principles capable of restoring that essentially moral dimension to social policy...before it is too late (Marsland 1990: p15).

The market was to treat everyone as a selfish individual and the accumulation of property was to create individual responsibility. However, individualism had to be checked if 'freedom', as defined by the RR, was to prosper. Tebbit (1986: p4) claimed that 'freedom' occurs when citizens respect property rights and personal responsibility becomes a duty that brings order to society. He insisted that;

It is bringing back personal responsibility (through ownership), security (through law and order) and stability (through strengthening the sense of personal obligations most noticeably with families) that our freedom can do most good... (Tebbit 1984: p11).

The advocacy of families as independent units in society was a crucial component of this message. This highlighted the ideological underpinnings of 'property', 'social order' and 'social ordering'. 'Ownership' aimed to create attitudes of responsibility, saving, family and heritage (Moore 1986). These sentiments formed part of the Conservative Party's 1987 Manifesto;

In this way One Nation is finally reached - not by a single people conscripted into an organised socialist programme but by millions of people building their own lives in their own way.

The RR, thus, sought to tie individualism with moral responsibility and duty to the nation, community and family. It endeavoured to redefine 'society' as community and citizenship as consumerism.

Nationalism⁶⁰

The RR, fearing the erosion of capitalist SPEC structures, endeavoured to construct a platform for social control through submission (conformity) rather than coercion by reinforcing a sense of belonging and 'pride'. The 1983 Conservative Manifesto (p6) claimed that "All Britons are linked by a common belief in freedom, and in Britain's greatness. All are aware of their own responsibility to contribute to both". The RR sought to achieve this, firstly, through exaggerating the external threat of a mythical foreign power - specifically communism - as a force determined to undermine the superiority of the UK's traditional cultural values and practices, and remove the population's rights of 'freedom' and 'property' (see Coleman 1992, Grey 1983, Lewis 1985, Regan 1987, Thatcher 1993). Secondly, through constructing an internal threat of 'immigration' as undermining national and cultural identity to the point of disintegration. With the RR at the helm the Conservatives advanced as a 'little England' party, often showing contempt for foreign intervention of any kind (see Letwin 1992: p22). The NR and RR ideology played on conscious and subconscious fears and aspirations. The 'crisis', created by the NR/RR, could only be solved through the resurrection of traditional cultural moral values and identity, NR/RR 'solutions' (Durham 1991: p16-17). The RR would be the defender of national interests, and guardians of its resources. Its discourse of 'nationalism' seemed at times to be thinly disguised racism, which simultaneously denied cultural diversity and sought to prevent concessions to it (see Ashworth 1983: p10, Greenway 1979 [Hansard Vol. 982, Col. 689] and Crowther 1984: p11). Thus, not only were some social groups marginalised, but further, narrow political interests were to be achieved at their expense. 'English' nationalism, family and God were central to the endeavour to establish the behaviour of 'good' citizens, which should not have proved to be difficult given the conservative hegemony at the root of British society (see Hutton 1996).

Mrs Thatcher sought to tap in to this hegemony directly;

⁶⁰ Nationalism is established as a collective emotion through the development of myths and legends which bind together a 'community'. It constructs both cultural identity and social arrangements, and has long been used as a tool by the SPEC dominant group to protect its position (see Appendix E: p19).

In the age of materialism we stand for value. In an age of selfishness we believe in service. In an age of sectional interests we still uphold the flag of patriotism, honour, family, courage, integrity and self-sacrifice. We do not equate permissiveness with civilised behaviour. We will neither permit ourselves, nor encourage others, to overstep the boundaries of consciousness, morality and the law. It is because we are the party of freedom that we are also the party of law (cited in Ellis-Jones 1985: p45).

This statement, made by Thatcher while in opposition in 1978, encompassed the gamut of the RR's ideological underpinnings and intentions. It outlined market individualism and supply side economics; the role of the family; social order through moral regulation or the force of law; an attack on social progress; and a call for nationalism to control cultural diversity. There is little doubt that the NR and RR Tories were ideologues with a 'project' which cut across right-wing factions (Paxman 1991). The ideological work undertaken by the CPS allowed Thatcher and Joseph to dominate the Tory Party and in 1979 the political climate was right for the ideology of 'market Darwinism' and individualism.

These themes are repeated consistently throughout NR/RR publications and are identified as crucial in the RR's hegemonic project (discussed below). They are inextricably interlinked and underpin the control and constraint that appear throughout NR/RR rhetoric and SPEC policies.

Ascendancy Within the Party and Government

To identify the ascendancy of the right-wing within the Conservative Party pre and post 1979, it is important to investigate the background of traditional Tory beliefs to outline how the RR came to dominate Party policy.

Conservatism and the Tory Party

Conservative writer and educational advisor Lincoln Allison (1984: p10-15), indicates that Conservative thought derives from four fundamental precepts. Society is seen as '*Organic*' in nature, where individuals exist in a specific social context of community, place and duty. These give the individual's life purpose and meaning. '*Cosmology*' is the belief in an ordered society where everyone has their place and corresponding

duties. The '*Nation*' gives structure and order, creating loyalty and belonging. '*Marketism*' is the notion of the individual as autonomous from society and responsible for their own interests. Individuals, as consumers, are judged by their position within the market with no account taken of social circumstances. Social outcome is an individual's moral obligation which rests upon self-responsibility and self-help. The rights of individuals are not tied to social groups. They are, instead, the rights and responsibilities of individuals and families within the nation. Conservatism is thus patriotic, traditional and resistant to change.

Conservatism's primary outlook is to maintain the existing capitalist SPEC arrangements (Allison 1984: p8-10). These are essential for the dominant group to defend its position.

For the Conservatives, hierarchies in society are inevitable; they represent the results of historical and present day struggles, with the more able generally achieving positions of advantage. However, hierarchies are not simply inevitable features of society, but are also desirable in that they allow the most able to gain positions of authority (Henry 1993: p31).

Conservatives, therefore, regard it as a political imperative to resist developments which threaten existing arrangements. Policy is thus reactionary. Developments in social theory or practice are castigated in favour of institutionalised practices and experiences. Allison (1984: p22) points out that Tory initiatives are driven by the concern to maintain the social structure;

...the most logical reaction is to build on those social phenomena which can never quickly change: the family, the nation, trade and exchange; the long strands of cultural memory which link people to their past. And to attack, always, the overweening and overarching nonsense which lies at the foundation of humanism.

During interview, Allison expressed, passionately, his view of what the Party stands for;

LA One thing I would like to stress, is the history of Conservatism. If you look at this history of Conservatism, what is it for Christ's sake!. It is a reaction, all the way along the line it is a reaction, and I speak from inside and as a supporter ... If you say "What is an extreme Tory?" or "What is an extreme Right Winger?"...What was the New Right? The free market and minimal government, those are associated with the New Right and they are part of...You can say that the Thatcherite Conservative Party that finally emerged in 1979 is the old Liberal Party, where are the Tories? They have got people going on about classless societies and so on. What are they talking about? The Tories do not believe in classless society, they believe in "The rich man in his castle, the poor man at his gate, God made them high and lowly, and ordered their estate." That is what is real, or at least nineteenth century Tories believed it. So, what I am trying to get at, you are quite right, that those ideas are associated but not in any coherent or unanimous or easy way.⁶¹

Conservatism, in this view, is an ideology of 'selfishness'. Nevertheless, Allison maintained that the Tory Party has no ideology and that its policies are neutral. Similarly, the NR claimed that their policies were based in tradition and that ideology was the preserve of opposition parties (Levy 1985: p15, Nyiri 1986 p4-6). Traditions, it was claimed, transmit strong convictions that things are 'right' and must remain as they are: traditions such as strong and stable societal structures and social order. Rationality was defined as an acceptance of these traditions, in as much that tradition allows a measure of 'rational' and so 'irrational' behaviour. Therefore, with tradition come the conventions of social rules and the customs of regulation and duty. In other words, tradition requires neither rationally 'autonomous' minds nor actions. In short, this definition of tradition can be interpreted as a symbolic constraint on individual agency, where 'rational structures' locate people either in positions of power and control or positions of subordination.

This 'rationality' forms a feature of the construction and working of the Conservative Party which made it easier for the RR to take control. In Gamble's (1990a) view Conservative Party membership forms two bodies; the 'doctrinal', who are imbued with will, loyalty, conviction and commitment, and the 'positional', who react to situations and are flexible on policy matters. Mrs Thatcher was able to appeal to both these bodies. The ideological shift in policy was possible because "...the Conservative Party is a party of unity, consent not consensus...[it is] a unitary party"

⁶¹ LA's statement highlights a crucial point. It indicates the way that discourses, not only within but also about the Conservative Party, are embedded, contradicted and interpreted. It is a point that can be attributed to my own interpretation of the period and as such must be kept in mind.

(Kreiger 1986: p67). The RR leadership therefore had little cause or necessity to share governance or to consult over policy initiatives. Although the RR claimed that these policy initiatives were radical, as has been shown, they developed from pre-NR origins. They were little more than the rejuvenation and reconstruction of traditional Tory ideals in a contemporary period. NR values were bound with Victorian values into a coherent political programme to reinvent 'Britain'. However, the means of implementing its discourse was 'radical' when compared to the previous efforts of SD Conservatism.

Leadership and Appointments to Cabinet and the Civil Service

Despite the election of Thatcher as Conservative leader in 1974 social democrats were still influential, and control over the Party developed slowly. The NR and RR had an overlapping membership which shared a similar, elite habitus, based on a social network of interconnecting positions of power and influence (Paxman 1991, Hutton 1996, Dunleavy 1993). They were determined to make NR policy Conservative Party policy. The first aim was to gain and consolidate control of the Party by establishing a base of popular support and links with powerful individuals and organisations which were against the social democratic Tories, termed as 'wets' (Gilmour 1993). The second aim was then to develop policy. Mrs Thatcher and other RR politicians routinely associated with the NR philosophers and she was an invited guest to the 'secret' meetings of the Conservative Philosophy Group (CPG) (Knight 1990). This was a group of right-wing intellectuals drawn from the Party, media, press, business and academia. The Salisbury Review (SR) became a platform for this philosophy, taking its lead from the Black Papers (see chapter five: p165). The RR set out to define the requirements of Conservatism in a contemporary age.

The period of 1979 to 1981 saw the 'softening-up' of opposition within the party through 'ideological transition' (Barnett 1982: p55). This was through coercion not consensus. Thatcher stated that "...what is needed is not consensus, not compromise, but conviction, action, persistence, until the job is well and truly finished" (cited in Barnett 1982: p63). The rhetoric of 'conviction' was used as justification for not consulting either within the Party or with the electorate over

policy. There was no need for consultation, consensus or compromise. This resulted in the radical restructuring of a party which *claimed* to be void of ideology into one with a distinct, ideologically based policy agenda. Nonetheless, they continued to portray themselves publicly as the Party for the people and against ideology. From 1982 onwards the Tory Party's RR agenda began to unfold in earnest.

The lack of a written constitution to define the duties and responsibilities of the British prime minister gives him or her a free hand in controlling government (Kavanagh 1989). To control policy, Mrs Thatcher had to control her government. She readily admits that this was one of her main achievements;

Choosing a Cabinet is undoubtedly one of the most important ways in which a prime minister can exercise power over the whole conduct of government (p15)...I made sure that the key economic ministers would be true believers in our economic strategy...(p26) (Thatcher 1993)

The 'core executive' (the cabinet, committees and co-ordinating departments) was appointed by Thatcher and she controlled the agenda. Such dominance allowed the RR to pursue the ideological policies devised by the PM's private office. This 'prime ministerial clique', containing private advisors and non-elected cabinet ministers, centralised high politics and withdrew from national interests. Where RR ideology was imperative, Cabinet was hardly used at all to determine policy (Kavanagh 1989: p236, Gilmour 1993: p32). The isolation of the executive from external interests or corporatist arrangements meant there was centralisation within centralisation. Local government issues were moved to central government and central government issues were moved to the ministerial clique. In this way, the RR controlled the process of government with little dissension or critical evaluation of policy. Although parliament is not unitary, it is as a matter of course returned as a one party majority (Kavanagh 1989). The commons was, in effect, controlled by non-elected advisors. There was little effective regulation of policy through the democratic parliamentary process. This was justified in the rhetoric of an 'electoral mandate' and the 'will of the people' (see Kavanagh 1989, Kreiger 1986, Crewe 1988, King 1988).

The role of the Civil Service is to point out the flaws of government policy and advise on the implications of ministerial initiatives. For its ideology to become

policy, the RR needed a civil service that would be of assistance, not an obstacle. Mrs Thatcher does not readily admit that this was her aim. She wrote instead “I took a close interest in senior appointments in the civil service from the first, because they could affect the morale and efficiency of whole departments” (Thatcher 1993: p46). It seems that she was prepared to interfere in departmental matters more than many of her predecessors and play a central role in the appointment of top civil servants according to political loyalty, the ‘right’ ideological beliefs and pliability. This assertion is denied. Thatcher (1993: p46) wrote that “In all of these decisions, however, ability, drive and enthusiasm were what mattered; political allegiance was not something I took into account”. However, taking account of Wilson’s (1992: p62) claim that Margaret Thatcher was strongly disposed to be seriously misleading with the truth, in conjunction with the knowledge of the way she appointed cabinet ministers, it is not difficult to read between the lines of the appointment of her former private secretaries to the heads of civil service departments, especially when she wrote that she was “...enormously impressed by the ability and energy of the members of (her) private office...[who had]...lively minds and a commitment to good administration” (Thatcher 1993: p46). The power shifts and reorganisation of the state under Thatcher were laying the foundations for a wider hegemonic project.

Symbolic Rules and Resources: The Hegemonic Project, A Moral Imperative

Much of the Thatcher governments’ policies came from the NR think tanks, groups of RR MPs and right-wing pressure groups (especially those involved with ‘moral crusades’)⁶², all with press and media contacts. They were influenced more by right-wing ideological interests and capitalist prejudices than by intellectual conviction (Jessop Bonnett Bromley and Ling 1988: p17-19). The intent was to replace ‘collective interests’ with market ‘public choice’ founded on property ownership in the ‘social market’. With no public responsibility towards private provision, social costs could be ignored (Dunleavy 1993: p150). This necessitated leadership across the whole SPEC spectrum, with the centre (macro) dominant over the periphery (micro). The determination, therefore, was to disempower intermediate levels of policy

⁶² NR think tanks included the Adam Smith Institute, Institute of Economic Affairs, Centre for Policy Studies, Conservative Political Centre, and the No. 10 Policy Unit. Groups of RR MPs included the No Turning Back Group, Hillgate Group, Salisbury Review and Conservative Philosophy Group.

implementation to allow direct contact between the government and the population (Dunleavy 1990: p100-106, Gilmour 1992: p198). This required a shift in the perception of 'social ethics'. Rather than admitting that this was a 'hegemonic project', Letwin (1992: p38) refers to it as a 'paradigm shift'.

The IEA was at the centre of the market rhetoric (Thompson 1990). 'Market competition' was seen as 'perfect', founded on autonomous, individual self-interest. It was 'justified' on the grounds that SD government intervention had damaged this 'perfect' mechanism. Conversely, self-interest was defined as 'rational' and efficient. Private rather than public provision was a better means of securing economic and social amelioration. Tebbit (1984) and Thatcher (1993) drew on the theories of Von Hayek as ideological preparation for the market. Von Hayek argued that the rule of law was required to allow markets to function. This meant that a macro framework would restrict individuals' decisions and actions but not determine them. In reality, however, the market mechanism was to undermine the building blocks of the social fabric and construct an incontrovertible hegemonic position sustaining the status quo (Hutton 1996).

Ian Gilmour (1992: p109), a member of Thatcher's first Cabinet, explained that "...social engineering of an unusual sort was high on the Thatcherite agenda. Few, if any, aspects of the nation's life were to be permitted to escape the ideological footprints of Thatcherism". Indeed, the SPEC hegemonic project was made clear by Thatcher's (1993: p627) sentiments that the 'basis of her intellectual approach' was provided by Novak, where "...democratic capitalism was a moral and social, not just an economic system...it encouraged a range of virtues and...depended upon co-operation not just going it alone". Thus, the RR hegemonic project centred around changing the nation's morals to create the conditions for a social market system to sustain the capitalist status quo. My critical realist perspective concurs with Wilson (1992: p43) that;

The ambitions of Margaret Thatcher were much higher than those specifically economic and political goals. Nothing less was required than the creation in the country of a wholly new attitude of individualism. Ultimately it was not a matter of economics but a matter of morality

Centrally, the objective was to establish, transmit and imbue individuals (citizens) with a 'capitalist moral character' which would lead to acceptance of SPEC arrangements of 'social order' and 'social ordering'. My interpretation is that the RR's primary imperatives were to take the 'moral high ground' and develop the 'capitalist moral character'. However, right-wing policies could not be implemented in full in 1979. The Conservative Philosophy Group (CPG) knew that achieving a shift from 'social democratic values' to 'social market values' required evolution not revolution (Knight 1990: p177). The RR needed to gain moral superiority and leadership to create a socio-political climate in which their interests would become dominant. A period of 'softening-up' of opposition was required before policies could be implemented in earnest. In seeking to achieve this, the CPG claimed that NR capitalism was a 'socially responsible capitalism' based on religion and morals which would "...enable all children to develop their talents to the full for their own good and that of society, and to enable them to share and participate in the nation's cultural and moral values" (CPG 'Values 1978', cited in Knight 1990: p118). Education, therefore, was intended to be a central platform in the intent to imbue the population with NR/RR values.

For the 'free' market to operate according to the principles of social Darwinism, people were required to accept their subordination to a right-wing 'market morality' (see Ball 1994: p129). The RR needed to create a moral framework with which to control society and establish an order which suited its right-wing imperatives. 'Subjective' values of social welfare needed to be changed to 'objective' values of economic efficiency. The intent was to both transmit and imbue right-wing definitions of society, religion, moral boundaries and individual responsibilities: a definition of 'citizenship'. The hegemonic project took the form of a 'moral crusade' where the values of obedience and loyalty, necessary for the development of a 'moral character', were articulated as 'virtues'. The Salisbury Review was central in the endeavour to shape a 'capitalist moral character'. Marsland (1991: p12) argued that;

...these fundamental values define the moral order of free societies...In their absence neither reliable economic progress, nor effective democratic political institutions, nor freedom...are feasible...Their role is to shape individual character such that in large numbers of men and women are capable of that prudent, self reliant action and moral choice which freedom simultaneously permits and demands.

In other words, the basis of NR/RR 'freedom', which sought to create social order, was moral subjugation. The SR claimed that social and political stability were at the top of the Conservative agenda and achievable through the market (Ellis-Jones 1985: p42). Indeed, Crowther (1984: p11) outlined that "...the permanent restoration of those Victorian virtues which conservatives prize will depend upon whether economic ends can be joined in a community of moral purpose". Further, such morals had to be "...transmitted early and powerfully..." if the 'right' moral order was to be created and reproduced (Marsland 1992: p12). Giving individuals' a sense of place and role in society would be achieved through moral subjugation rather than coercion. Further, they would also give an individual a 'moral capital' value both within, and to, capitalist society. Education was the focus. The rhetoric espoused by the RR tied closely to the philosophical underpinnings of the SR. The moralist MPs of the RR (Pawsey, Greenway and Boyson), gave a parliamentary voice to the philosophy developed through the CPG and meetings with Scruton of the Salisbury Review (Durham 1991).

A Capitalist Market Morality: the Repudiation of Guilt

Thatcher (1992: p627) admitted that RR Capitalism was more than 'economics'. The entrepreneurial ethos was to replace 'social rights' with 'consumer rights'. Individuals would be consumers rather than citizens and behave like 'market forces' in competition for limited resources. Self-responsibility in the market place would reduce the capital costs of the 'nanny' state and reduce taxation. It was understood that all individuals had to accept the workings of the market to survive (Mishan 1983: p42). As individuals became competitive in the market place they could be treated differently and 'used' in the interests of capitalism. Differentiation of place and role would reinforce the basis of capitalist SPEC structures. As Ball (1994: p123) explains,

the "...market provides the mechanism for the reinvention and legitimisation of hierarchy and differentiation via the ideology of diversity, competition and choice". The market would be sustained through conscious acceptance of unequal outcomes as neutral and natural, or by the rule of law. Inequality was a social standard to be accepted as a traditional 'moral circumstance'. The free market was to run on greed and selfish individualism, combined with the repudiation of guilt towards inequality.

Neither guilt nor socio-economic inequality were moral underpinnings of NR or RR thought;

A new generation of leaders has come into prominence in politics and industry alike. A generation whose economic ideas were not moulded by the wartime paradigm of beneficent State control and whose thinking has not been deformed by the debilitating guilt of inherited wealth. A generation that is even prepared to accept the moral legitimacy of profit (Lawson 1982).

Gruner (1990: p19) claimed that Conservative philosophy placed personal morality and responsibility with the individual, not in collectives, and that it was not immoral for Conservatives not to feel guilt towards others' irresponsibility. This would be central in the NR/RR's identification of individuals or groups 'undeserving' of resource allocation, regardless if social outcomes depended more on existing place and status within the social hierarchy and subsequent access to SPEC capital than on 'individual irresponsibility', where existing hierarchical place and status were a prerequisite of the capitalist SPEC structure. Guilt, collective sensibilities and responsibilities to others, were to be replaced with attitudes of 'selfish individualism' and the ability (desire) to take advantage of market opportunities. In reality, the repudiation of guilt towards unequal social and economic outcomes would reduce government responsibility for the less well off. Conservative MP Chris Patten (1985 Hansard Vol. 91, Col. 651), emphasised that "...young people...should not reckon that future options are constrained by anything other than their determination and ability". This discourse thereby excluded all references to social context and the level of opportunity afforded to individuals by virtue of their SPEC circumstances. Responsibility, and so accountability, was individual. Nonetheless, the intent was to restrain individual 'freedom' (Tebbit 1986: p4).

Freedom and Responsibility

The RR needed to revive economic freedom if capitalist social structures were to be maintained. However, 'freedom' to accumulate private property, intended to create both economic and moral responsibility, had to be constrained within the desired moral framework if it was not to disintegrate into anarchy. This needed the construction of a right-wing 'social ethic' (Thompson 1990: p27). Social order and social ordering had to be maintained through cultural (symbolic) and institutional (material) 'rules'. Ellis-Jones (1986: p47) noted that;

...You cannot have 'freedom' without 'order', and to achieve the freedom of the market is also to advocate, however indirectly, the traditional order that makes the market - as it makes every genuine freedom - possible.

Order within society thus required to be held together by a 'moral infrastructure' (Mishan 1983: p42) which would create the 'moral circumstances' for the market to operate. The absence of such circumstances would;

...allow the moral infrastructure, along with the standards of probity, personal rectitude and mutual trust which it supplies, to disintegrate and freedom in the economic sphere, as much as in any other, soon becomes both inoperable and intolerable (Crowther 1989: p6).

These sentiments were echoed by Tory MP Norman Tebbit;

It is to the free society that we are committed. This is a society in which the unavoidable derogations of individual liberty are minimised and take place only under the rule of law" - "...at the front of the campaign for a return to traditional values of decency and order will be the Conservative Party: for we understand as does no other party that the defence of freedom involves a defence of the values which make freedom possible without its degeneration into licence. (Tebbit 1984: p5 and p15)

Freedom was a responsibility not a right.

The notion of independent family groups with individual responsibility was intended to attenuate the perception of 'worse off' families as 'undeserving'. It would, also, help to divide society and inhibit social collectives which could form a base for

socialism. The RR's aim was to reduce welfare to create a framework of family responsibility to 'encourage' families to stay together (see Thatcher 1992: p629). The family was not only to hand on property as a base of social stability and responsibility, but also the virtues of self-sufficiency, discipline and tradition. MfE Boyson (1980 Hansard Vol. 4, Col. 128) outlined that these were based, firstly, on the responsibility of the family to provide a secure home, and secondly, on property rights as an extension of the family. These would prevent children from being "...blown off course by every change of fashion" and establish roots and 'values' to make society more secure in the future. Boyson (1980 Hansard, Vol. 4, Col. 129), thus, indicated that the family had the responsibility for maintaining social order and stability. He argued that neither social nor economic circumstances effected these responsibilities, conveniently disregarding that capital accumulation was the basis of stability and responsibility within the 'community'.

The Conservative Party Manifesto of 1983 (p24) reiterated these responsibilities, stating that "...Freedom and responsibility go together. The Conservative Party believes in encouraging people to take responsibility for their own decisions, we shall continue to return more choice to the individual and their families". John Patten (1990 Hansard Vol. 162, Col. 328), a future SoS for Education, asserted that responsibilities were to come before property rights, and were 'duties' which created a stable and strong society within the structure of the Law;

Firstly, rights and responsibilities go together, but the order should be responsibilities and rights. Secondly, we think that all citizens should share the same rights and responsibilities, and that there are no special cases for anyone in our society - there is no opting out of the duties of being a British citizen. Thirdly, rights and responsibilities are there for all of us under the law, as made in this place

A hierarchy of 'responsibilities' over 'rights' would act as structural constraints over individual agency to prevent the collapse of the 'free market';

A free society depends, more than most, on a network of relationships and institutions incorporating not only reciprocal duties and obligations, but respect for legislative authority, be it intellectual or moral, within the family or school, between children and adults, or within companies and universities. If, therefore, the pursuit of liberty and pleasure is not voluntarily restrained by

respect for social and family ties, moral standards, and natural hierarchies, society outside the state collapses and bureaucratic despotism becomes the only alternative to anarchy (Vander Elst SR 1991: p35-6).

The rhetoric of citizenship, nation and community was, therefore, constructed by the RR as 'traditional British behaviour', and manipulated as a discursive tool to construct a form of 'moral capital' suited to NR/RR SPEC requirements. Both consensus and coercion were central to the RR's hegemonic project.

In its attempt to establish a base of moral and political leadership, the RR situated representative rhetoric in the symbolic domain to appeal to 'popular' personal interests and experiences. Thatcherism unified various policy initiatives within popular understanding, hiding complex and often controversial issues behind simple morals and electoral slogans. A right-wing agenda was justified by a rhetoric which tapped into small 'c' conservative reactionary traditions. These were espoused as fixed values and beliefs in the endeavour to hide social conflict, doubt and inequality (Ball 1994: p16). The meaning of *egalitarianism* was to change from collective rights to individualism, and 'democracy' would allow an elite group to determine the distribution of resources. Both would result in division. *Efficiency* would be secured at the cost of *equity*, and *opportunity* at the cost of *equality* (Thompson 1990: p29). SD practices and institutions came under a liberal attack which, in ideological and political strategy, was very sophisticated (Henry 1993: p57, Lauder 1990: p47).

RR Attack, Crisis and Solutions

The RR sought to both set a moral agenda and divert responsibility for social outcomes away from the government. This required a focus for attack, which involved the identification, ideological distancing from, and derision of opposition to construct a context of 'them and us' (Apple 1989: p9). This was based on a mythical tradition of cultural unity, social order and 'place' (Jones 1989: p5). Sections of society which opposed the RR were targeted through ideological rhetoric as undermining the 'traditional' social fabric and cohesion, creating SPEC 'crises'. SD, the WS and nationalised industries were attacked by the RR as institutionalised socialism, requiring high taxation which was draining the wealth of the nation and causing

inflation. Inflation was claimed to cause a crisis in social stability and individual freedom;

The inflationary process is directly destructive of the four 'Middle class' values: self-reliance, thrift, education and Rule of Law. Those values are of course the basis of any democratic society, and the stability and justice of society will depend on their preservation (Atkinson SR 1984: p4).

These 'middle class values' formed the moral basis of the RR hegemony where direct links were made between economic circumstances and moral self-regulation. The theme of a 'wealth creating' private sector drained by the 'wealth consuming' public sector was a favourite of RR rhetoric (see Thatcher 1993). However, this argument obfuscates that taxation is the redistribution of capital away from the dominant group to the disadvantaged, and the means of developing collective identity and responsibility amongst subordinate groups.

The construction and use of 'crisis' as a political tool was a central tenet of RR rhetoric. Statements, such as those of RR MP Harry Greenway (1979: Hansard, Vol. 982, Col. 686), which both identified the source of the crisis and the solution to it, show that the creation of 'crisis' aimed to play on genuine fears and aspirations;

I believe and fear that a vacuum is being created. Who wants it? Of course, the Marxists want it. If there is no teaching of values from Christian, or other religious points of view, a vacuum is created into which the Marxists are only too ready to dive, as we all know.

This discourse inextricably linked morality and religion. It meant that the RR's moral requirements could be articulated through religion, which was repeatedly 'encouraged' to deliver a particular Right wing version of Christianity⁶³.

The inextricable interlinking of crisis and right-wing policy solutions depended on binding 'morality' to RR ideology. The RR's ideological hegemony thus involved the interlinking of morality to market economics as the basis for protecting

⁶³ Christianity was at the centre of the RR's attempted 'paradigm shift' (see Harris 1989, Tebbit 1986: p4, Vander Elst 1991: p35-36, Paxman 1990, Stokes 1989 [Hansard Vol. 147, Col. 32-33], Moore 1984: p5, Lewis 1985: p10, Gray 1983: p11). Christianity had a vital role to play in the RR hegemony of structure and subjugation, clearly an uphill task given that the UK is a largely secular society.

the traditional cultural heritage of the British 'nation state'. It sought to embed the notion that its solutions to crisis were 'common-sense', and that alternatives were ideological, subversive and the cause of 'crisis'. The policy to 'roll back the state' was to end expensive socialist 'producer capture' of services, to create greater competition, choice and quality. The provision of public 'goods', health and education, was seen as necessary for the cultural and moral benefits of citizenship, as the RR sought to constrain agency through hegemonic integration into the structure of popular culture (Apple 1993: p8). Nonetheless, as well as moving 'wealth' from the public sector to the private sector, policy was aimed to break social collectives and create competition between individuals (Gilmour 1992: p107, Green 1987, Kavanagh 1989: p117).

The disorganisation of the opposition⁶⁴ allowed the NR to develop its policies within and through the structures, relations and practices of the state, and through the use of specific and powerful channels, specifically financial ones. The traditional capitalist structures and institutions which the RR wished to maintain (such as education and health), were used as 'apparatus' in a complex inter-working to constrain SPEC contradictions, support capitalist SPEC arrangements and ensure their own survival. Control developed in clear stages as RR powers increased. Firstly, the reduction of the roles of local authorities and parliament⁶⁵; secondly, the shift of political functions to sub-parliamentary committees with less accountability and with power to implement policies without the need for consultation - those bodies that did not conform with RR initiatives were disbanded and replaced with those that did; and thirdly, the centralisation of power over resource allocation to contain opposition within RR policy (Jessop, Bonnett, Bromely and Ling 1987: p116-117). The attack on state institutions which were not entirely sympathetic with the RR hegemony and their vilification and subsequent restructuring to suit it were features of the functioning of the RR in government. All of these issues were important in the educational context and are discussed in following chapters.

⁶⁴ The Labour and Liberal Parties at the macro level, as well as unions and local government at the micro level.

⁶⁵ This consisted of local government powers being centralised through legislative measures, while the parliamentary process was manipulated by Thatcher and the RR.

Material Rules and Resources

The RR's 'conviction politics' was to put political and social reform into action, to shift the dominant hegemony from 'social concerns' to technocratic rationality, authoritarianism, and individualism, and to establish the 'virtues' of private ownership, moral responsibility and accountability in a competitive 'British social market' (Biffin 1986, Lawson 1988). This required the prevention of collective action and the suppression of dissension (Gilmour 1992: p223). Howell (1983: p14) explained that the RR intended to reform social and economic institutions and attitudes established through SD. 'Rolling back the state', in reality, meant rolling back social democracy, which was claimed to stifle economic growth because it preferred quantity to quality, equality to excellence and regimentation to freedom (see Thatcher 1993). Freedom was linked to technocratic, scientific rationality in the assertion that scientific progress was the basis of economic development through both economic and theoretical competition (Radnitzky 1990: p36). Nonetheless, it is not enough simply to have a set of policies based on ideology. Ideologies must be disseminated, received, perceived and adopted. This meant that the RR had to remain in power. My argument is that they sought, initially, to achieve this through symbolic 'appeal' rather than through material coercion (imposing policy). In terms of overcoming opposition, and the need to 'shift' values rather than 'impose' them, Boyson (1981 Hansard Vol. 6 Col. 425) indicated that;

The idea is that we do not want to wait for a utopian society, but progress step by step. I commend to the House the Government's attitude, which is completely within that philosophy. We must not go too far in the beginning. We must not put at risk the advances that we are making. We must create a climate of opinion which takes us further.

The intent was to manipulate symbolic rules and resources to gain consent for the government's policies and to manipulate material rules and resources (policy) as a means of coercion towards central initiatives⁶⁶.

⁶⁶ Later policy was to exercise greater constraints and controls, for example the 1988 Education Reform Act

Mrs Thatcher, in true entrepreneurial spirit, sold her policies to the electorate on a wave of 'authoritarian populism': authoritarian change from above combined with populist support from below (Hall 1983: p117, JBBL 1988). The alleged breakdown of authority and responsibility opened the way for a wide range of concerns and fears to gather around the RR's 'populist' solutions (Rustin 1989: p61). However, rather than incorporate potentially disruptive social groups (e.g. academics and unions) through consultation and consensus, RR policies sought to reward their favoured sectional interests and were detrimental towards opponents. They exacerbated competition for limited resources between the favoured and disfavoured groups. This widened the gap between the wages and welfare of the 'two nation state'. 'Populism' and economic incentives were combined in social policy to 'buy' votes. The appeal of the 1979 Manifesto was the sale of council houses. This tied buyers into the RR values of property rights and responsibilities and further fragmented areas of traditional Labour support. The 1983 Manifesto promised to curb spending and ensure strong policing. Manifesto 1987 promised tax benefits on private welfare and pensions, share ownership and privatisation of industry in the public sector. As such, 'authoritarian populism' saw a fundamental shift in hegemony from SD to RR capitalism, through coercion. The RR claimed that politicians had to take decisions based on political issues not on public interests (Harris 1986: p8). This resulted in a centralisation of powers which allowed the RR to use the state's distributive and disciplinary mechanisms to entrench itself in power (Rustin 1989: p63).

RR Economics

Economic policy was a limb of the RR's hegemonic project. Authoritarian populism was combined with economic populism in an endeavour to undo SD 'social engineering', and to replace the 'welfare ethic' with 'common sense' values of enterprise, the free market, capital accumulation and the repudiation of guilt. Economic savings were to be achieved by scrapping 'socialist nationalisation' which was claimed to drain wealth. This would allow tax cuts and increase the freedom for private ownership and profit (1979 Manifesto p14). 'Economic rationality' was, therefore, used as a mechanism for capitalist 'ideological discharge', seeking to penetrate and restructure morals and practices to manipulate social inclination (see

Habermas 1979). 'Monetarism', the ill fated policy of controlling the amount and direction of money in the economy, is interpreted as the intention to control resource distribution, justify differentiation and targeting, and constrain alternatives and collective actions which were beyond the RR's hegemonic boundaries (see JBBL 1988: p157).

Rather than provide welfare, taxes were to be cut in the bid to make work 'attractive' (NTBG 1985). Conservative Manifesto 1987 stated that cutting inflation by spending less national income on the public sector was the RR's first objective. However, tax relief for the middle classes was at great cost for those on social welfare. Cutting welfare would make the requirement of employment a necessity in a time of rapidly growing unemployment, and therefore act as a form of social control. The ideology of 'individual responsibility' was espoused as the requirement for 'housewives thrift' (Thatcher 1993). Consumerism was being utilised against mass welfare to attack social collectives. Thus, by reducing life to 'consumerism', and with the market working to change collective behaviour into disorganised, competitive individualism, the intent was to reduce individual identity to reflexive actions favourable to capital. The purpose was to remove collective threats to capital accumulation and authority, and to give private capital access to potential markets in health, education and other social provision (Rustin 1989: p61-62). Not only was the 'public' welfare state to be removed, it was to be replaced by the 'private' state for the purpose of accumulating profits. The RR vilified its opposition in earnest.

Vilifying the 'Opposition'

Social democracy was attacked as promoting the 'permissive society'. 'Permissiveness' was portrayed as left-wing, 'counter culture' ideology, which sought to eliminate traditional values of 'freedom' from the individual's consciousness (Belhoradsky SR 1983: p13). It had caused a crisis in authority and morals which threatened national stability and security, and resulted in the extreme regulation of economic affairs (Tebbit 1986: p4). The attack sought to undermine social advances made in issues such as gender, race, homosexuality, abortion and divorce. These were

accused of causing the break-up of religious moral values, the family and law and order. In a rhetoric tantamount to 'scare-mongering', Tebbit (1985: p6) claimed that;

...our ills ...have been dramatically worsened by the onset of the politics of the permissive society. Far from encouraging the greater self-discipline and responsibility...permissiveness compounded by the economic failure and the personal irresponsibility engendered by the socialist state leads inevitably to the violent society.

Social democracy was also vilified as an ideologically motivated, self-serving, socialist plan to prevent market spontaneity and freedom (Scruton 1984: p2, NTBG 1985). Socialism was thus linked directly to moral decline which, within a rhetoric of the 'good of nation', needed to be reversed (Belhoradsky 1983: p11). Socialism, it was claimed, led to bureaucratic corruption which, because the preconceived plan allegedly required no individual moral principles, removed individual self-responsibility. Significantly, Thatcher sought to destroy all aspects of socialism, depicted as communism, which, she insisted, reduced choice and increased dependency (Thatcher 1993). The imperative was to re-assert traditional capitalist 'social order and social ordering' and remove 'relative humanist measurement' and SD 'rights' (Marsland SR 1991: p10).

Vilifying the Welfare State

The Welfare State was the pinnacle of SD development. It was a site for collective action and the redistribution of wealth to the dominated groups. The RR, therefore, needed to change public attitudes towards welfare (Howell 1983: p14). However, to alter the differentiated distribution of resources, change had firstly to be legitimated. Thus, the WS was attacked as suffering from 'producer domination' and wasting resources on needless bureaucracy. It required high public expenditure which necessitated high taxation. This led to inflation which was damaging to the nation's wealth, and so to 'freedom' and 'democracy' (NTBG 1985). Welfare was claimed not only to damage those it was supposed to help by creating 'dependants', but to positively encourage families to neglect their moral duties and responsibilities towards their own welfare (Harris 1986: p8, Marsland 1990: p14).

A 'two nation', 'them and us' strategy of social division was employed to attack the welfare state. 'Us' were those with 'Victorian middle class moral values' and 'vigorous virtues', while 'them' were those draining capital wealth through welfare state dependency. They were the 'enemies within'. It was claimed that the population knew that 'welfare' made them 'soft' in a tough world. Instead they preferred "...self-reliance and self-help to state hand outs" (Marsland 1990: p14). By claiming to represent the people's interests, the RR could vilify opposition to their solutions as undemocratic and ideologically motivated. Thus, by turning its interests into 'populist demands', the RR was operating through a system of 'plebicitary ventriloquism' (see JBBL 1984: p46). The 'solution' to welfare dependency was to control inflation and set targets for spending and growth (NTBG 1985). Market forces would create personal and family responsibility through self interest, and welfare would be a private, moral responsibility, not a collective public concern (Marsland 1988: p5). With the removal of welfare provision, self interest would be grounded in the realm of competitive survival in the 'social market'. However, within state institutions and nationalised industries, unions were the most powerful site of organised collective opposition to the RR's aims. Unionism represented all that the RR disliked and wanted to dismantle.

Undermining the Unions

The unions were a powerful concentration of collective opposition to RR policy (Gilmour 1992). The fact that union strength brought the RR to power in 1979 was not lost to Mrs Thatcher. She openly admitted that reducing it was the RR's first task (Thatcher 1992: p97-98). The aim was to divide collective opposition (and erode Labour party support) by breaking-up the institutional strongholds in welfare and nationalised industry which provided a traditional left wing base (Harris 1988: p36). Unions were portrayed as 'uncontrollable' seats of communist subversion, charged with eroding middle class values, causing inflation and creating crises in economic and national stability (Anderson 1987: p66, Atkinson 1984). Pushing them beyond the realms of respectability allowed the government to pursue 'popular' policies which restructured membership and changed 'rights' to duties'. From the mid-1980s the unions were no longer a threat to the RR (Gilmour 1992). However, the reform of the

unions was only the first stage in the 'softening-up' process. The next seat of opposition was local government.

Disempowering Local Government

The RR's intention was to reward its supporters while penalising its opponents. It had little time for consultation with local government over policy. However, the polarisation of party politics by the RR was inevitably to lead to ideological conflict. Local government's level of autonomy was therefore a cause of concern for the RR. Nevertheless, it was determined to impose its will from the centre, even if this meant restructuring local government's role to little more than an agent of implementation. The decisive objective was to specify accountable duties for local government allowing it no fiscal policy making role of its own. This was to result in a direct attack to discredit and weaken Labour controlled local government.

The attack on Labour controlled local government played on the fear of a crisis in national security, stability and identity. It was depicted as a stronghold of, and platform for, socialists and socialism, which was spending public money in the implementation of socialist political ideology (Forsyth 1984: p63). The RR alleged that Labour's concern for 'social issues' was in fact an attempt at communist infiltration and subversion which sought to destabilise and overthrow the whole political system of government in favour of the Soviets (Regan 1987: p23). Labour was portrayed publicly as the 'Loony Left' which threatened national democracy. However, privately, the RR acknowledged that the Left were not 'Loony', but intelligent and hard working at the local level (Marks 1987: p27). The juxtaposition of local government with incompetent, overspending socialists bent on social engineering, was a rhetorical attack (a symbolic measure) aimed to justify the dissolving of local government autonomy (a material measure). Thatcher (1993: p39) wrote "We would, finally, curb what were often the corrupt and wasteful activities of local government direct labour organisations (usually socialist controlled)". This brings to light the combination of the attack on the unions and local government to undermine resistance to RR policies.

The individual was progressively 'encouraged' to be 'free from' collective provision, and to pursue self-interest in social and economic matters. For the 'free individual' living in the market place, information about choices, that *have* to be made, is a critical issue. With the dissemination and manipulation of information through the media, the RR aimed to 'educate' individuals to 'inform' them what choices they wanted and when. The media was the "...most important means of communication between politicians and the electorate, as well as the most important arena for ideological argument and the construction and dissemination of dominant ideas." (Gamble 1990b: p342). The support of the right wing media, through CPG and New Right connections, allowed the RR to manipulate information, print misleading statistics, discredit alternative social democratic policies and disseminate its own⁶⁷. 'Misconceptions' and deliberate falsehoods were propagated about the state of Britain before and after 1979 (Wilson 1992: p68).

Manipulating statistics and changing predicted targets reflected badly on local government (JBBL 1988). This 'legitimated' the call for increased local accountability and central redress which focused on controls over the collecting and spending of revenue. With no consultation over local needs, policy developed from the right wing 'think tanks' and Whitehall decided local spending 'norms' (Gilmour 1992: p216). Manifesto 1983 (1983: p37) introduced 'rate capping' as "...legislation to curb excessive and irresponsible rate increases by irresponsible councils". This resulted in the 'capping' of local spending, the allocation of set Grants, and the refusal to allow local authorities to borrow money. Labour authorities' credibility and autonomy was the target. Manifesto 1987 (1987: p62) targeted socialist local government as the root of financial problems, indicating that "We will reform local government finance to strengthen local democracy and accountability". The Rate Support Grant was reduced by almost 50%, seriously undermining local government's *statutory* duty to provide services. Interference in local government revenue proved very effective in undermining local initiatives. Lack of central money drove local authorities to take the unpopular action of raising the 'rates', which 'justified' 'capping' by the centre. This culminated in the introduction of the ill fated Poll Tax,

⁶⁷ For example, by 1990 twenty two changes had been made to the definition of unemployment by the Department of Employment. By 1996 it had been changed more than thirty times (see Thompson 1990: p57, Hutton 1996: p35, Wilson 1992: p96).

which effectively took financial matters away from local government (Gilmour 1992). Strong sites of local opposition, such as the Greater London Council or the Metropolitan Councils were simply abolished. Centralisation of controls and privatisation of services were rationalised, respectively, as an attempt to reduce socialist bureaucracy and create competition to improve standards. 'Compulsory Competitive Tendering', made more simple through the weakening of the unions, devolved the provision of services to the market. The parliamentary superiority of the Conservatives provided the legitimation to impose such policy based on a 'populist' vote. However, they ultimately benefited the 'favoured groups' in society.

The RR's aim was not to reform local government but to destroy it. More than forty Acts in the 1980s introduced incremental change which increased central control at the expense of local autonomy. Market forces fragmented support and collective local opposition to central implementation. An intermediary body between the centre (macro) and the periphery (micro) was reshaped through interventionist policy, and, effectively, removed (Gamble 1990a, Stoker 1990: p143). However, to ensure the efficient day to day running and implementation of government policy, consultation and co-operation between the centre and the periphery is required. The government therefore transferred local financial powers to non-elected 'quangos' in liaison with centralised bodies in the civil service which were beyond effective parliamentary scrutiny (JBBL 1988: p176-177). The RR's actions ignored the wishes of local people, occasionally in Conservative areas, which had been expressed through local elections. The reduction in the powers of elected local government brings into focus serious implications concerning democracy and policy implementation in the UK.

Policy Implementation

There was a developmental shift in policy focus over the three terms of RR government between 1979 and 1992. The first term saw trade union reform and economic monetarism designed to erode the base of opposition power and support; the second term saw a drive for individual enterprise, responsibility and accountability and a crusade against Labour local authorities; the third term saw the reorganisation of the Welfare State. The tri-partite consensus over policy making

(involving government, capital and labour) was abandoned and consultation was avoided. Where opposition could not be avoided it was discredited and starved of resources. All this is interpreted as the 'softening up' process, starting with moderate policy changes to set the scene for 'step-by-step', progressively more radical policy as the underlying social hegemony was manipulated in favour of RR interests.

However, by disempowering local government, the RR overlooked the key interdependencies and interconnection between central and local government necessary in local implementation procedures (Rhodes 1992: p62). Thatcherite administrations adopted a 'top-down model' of government, in effect an 'elective dictatorship' (Kavanagh 1989). Rhodes and Marsh (1992: p8-9) refer to this as the 'rational model' of government, where organisations act as co-ordinated units; policy is clearly and precisely expressed; there is a shared understanding of policy; and there is hierarchical control of the implementation process. However, they go on to outline six factors which, in their opinion, cause this method of policy implementation to fail;

....ambiguous and inconsistent objectives; inadequate causal theory; failure of implementation process to win compliance because of inadequate resources or inappropriate policy instruments; the discretion of street level bureaucrats and recalcitrance of the implementing officials; lack of support from the affected interest groups and relevant government agencies; unstable and uncertain socio-economic context which undermine either political support and or causal theory...

Rhodes and Marsh (1992: p183) suggest that unless all six factors are considered, governments will face implementation problems. They argue that;

...the conservative Government of the 1980s deliberately adopted a top-down model and either failed to recognise, or chose to ignore, the known conditions for effective implementation in its determination to impose its preferred policies...[and] insisted on an inappropriate (and ill-considered) model of implementation (Marsh and Rhodes 1992: p9).

An 'implementation gap' resulted from the RR's determination to avoid or reject consultation with any other group over policy initiatives. Its policies, therefore, lacked information, competence and support, which led to shortfalls throughout the implementation process (Marsh and Rhodes 1992: p182). There were ambiguous and inconsistent objectives, inadequate causal theory, inappropriate policy instruments,

professional recalcitrance and lack of local authority support (Rhodes 1992: p63). In my perspective it was no accident that the RR assiduously avoided consultation, leading to resistance towards policy implementation. This, I perceive, was intentional to allow the further undermining of opposition, justify greater centralisation, allow initiatives based in political interests, and legitimate the imposition of RR policies. In the following chapters I argue that this was the NR/RR's intention in education and physical education provision.

Summary: A Critical Realist Interpretation

The NR/RR gained SPEC dominance through 'democratic' political authority, and worked to establish the ideological ascendancy of neo-liberal market values within a conservative framework. They sought to re-establish a capitalist status quo, in favour of a SPEC elite within the British 'nation state', at the expense of social democratic advances of the 1960s and 1970s. My assertion is that they aimed to construct SPEC circumstances which would constrain subordinates' 'autonomy'. By defining hierarchical relationships as the basis of interaction and practice, the RR endeavoured to constitute the scope for agency and interaction (see McPherson and Raab 1988: p4). They intended to establish a 'social reality' within the boundaries and requirements of their interests, which was to involve the transformation of the 'social whole'. Their intent was hidden by the rhetoric of increased personal 'freedom'. However, 'freedom' was set within the boundaries of a constructed and constrained conceptual understanding, in which individual 'will' was to exist but be neither unlicensed nor free. As 'freedom from' welfare meant increased personal responsibility and accountability, it is argued that underlying social inequalities were purposefully ignored.

The RR used its political authority to reform existing SPEC 'surface' arrangements, increasing its power and control to use the policy process to serve its interests at the expense of others. Gaining leadership across the whole SPEC spectrum necessitated having the macro (centre) dominant over the micro (periphery). This involved the complex and inextricable interlinking of discourse, policy and implementation. The over-riding aim was to control material rules and resources as a

means of implementing central initiatives. Thus, symbolic rules and resources were manipulated in seeking to gain consent for self-serving, 'top-down' policies: policies which revitalised capitalist SPEC arrangements of hierarchy, social divisions and coercion. 'Top-down' policies were justified in rhetoric as solutions necessary to constrain 'crises' inherent in the increased social fragmentation of society. The discourse of a wide SPEC crisis was generated to draw both authority and energy to the RR, to allow them to implement 'radical' solutions, legitimate certain conservative forms and content and marginalise others (see Giroux 1983: p44, Nairn 1979: p60). RR solutions involved a call for the return of 'traditional practices and stability', and 'back to basics'. They were central within the dominant discourse and acted as 'ideological discharges' (Habermas 1979: p74)⁶⁸. The intent was to remove sites of possible recontextualisation, through the destructuring and restructuring of the arrangements of policy construction and implementation. The means was the macro-level, 'step-by-step' process of centralisation. Policies became overtly prescribed and imposed, and implementation became overtly monitored and accountable. Opposition 'confirmed' ideological representations of subversion and 'justified' further constraints. At the micro-level this saw the disempowering of sites of recontextualisation between the government and schools.

With their ideology of the 'free market' within an authoritarian state the NR/RR polarised party politics post 1979. Their interests rested within, and so necessitated, the reproduction of capitalist SPEC arrangements. The 'traditional' Conservative values of a citizenship based in tradition, nationalism, self-responsibility and accountability in the 'social market', private property, and 'freedom' within the rule of law, were the basis of NR/RR ideology. These 'a priori' structures, it was claimed, 'guaranteed national stability and security'. The rhetoric of crisis in these structures was constructed in the endeavour to ensure their longevity. Opposition to the NR/RR was identified as the cause of crisis and vilified. The intent was to preserve capitalist arrangements by reproducing 'social order' and 'social ordering'

⁶⁸ Habermas (1979: p74) indicates that;

Firstly, "...the work ethic is incredibly reinforced: there is a rehabilitation of competitive behaviour, pursuit of gain, and exaltation of virtues conducive to a high mobility of labour"; secondly, in the realm of social order and stability, "...the other direction taken by this 'ideological discharge' is a revitalisation of traditional virtues and values: in the first instance those of an anti- or a-political private life..."

These 'ideological discharges' were central to the NR/RR discourse.

through conformity by consensus rather than coercion. Consensus was to mean acceptance of the SPEC place and role created for the individual as a result of the 'social market'. Specifically this was a question of consensus through moral subjugation to accept SPEC inequality as 'natural', either in terms of subordination to superior 'effort and ability', or through repudiation of guilt towards the less-well-off as 'undeserving'. The 'moral superiority' of the NR/RR encouraged a two-nation state of 'them and us' based on 'Victorian values'. The endeavour to imbue all 'citizens' with 'middle class values' and 'vigorous virtues' was social engineering through consensus, consolidated by social engineering through coercion, for example through council house sales tying people into the insecurities and responsibilities of property ownership. Pivotal to this was the construction and constraining of 'freedom' within the RR's SPEC boundaries. Agency was, therefore, structured where consensus towards right-wing ideology as 'common sense' was coerced. Central to the NR/RR hegemonic project was the construction of a 'capitalist moral character', imbued with the values and motivation which would reproduce capitalist SPEC arrangements and maintain their position as the SPEC dominant group. Education and physical education are, as we shall see, argued to be pivotal in the endeavour to construct the 'capitalist moral character'.

Chapter Five

New Right / Radical Right Education Reforms

Introduction

The RR's wider hegemonic project sought to shift 'social reality' to the Right to make it fit more closely with the contemporary requirements of capitalism. This was identified in chapter four (see p117) as the combination of the neo-Liberal and neo-Conservative interests of the NR⁶⁹. Together they facilitated the requirements for 'free-market' economics and the development of individual 'moral self-regulation' to accept the outcomes of the 'social market'. Centrally this involved the need for social order (control) and social ordering (hierarchy), and the acceptance of inequality as a 'natural' outcome of competition: a form of social Darwinism (Apple 1989: p4). This chapter identifies the neo-liberal and neo-conservative influences on education. It shows the NR/RR intent for, and through education, highlighting how education reforms were linked to the wider hegemonic project. My argument is that education was the focus of the hegemonic project, with the RR seeking to imbue capitalist values into the young through a narrowly prescribed and monitored form and content of education, specifically a 'national curriculum'. This focused on two main aspects. First, the need to 'train' pupils in vocational skills to have them serve the production of capital. Second, to imbue moral values which would both make pupils submit to the effects of capitalism as natural, and adopt capitalist values which would not only make the market thrive but also reproduce a contemporary capitalist status quo. These two aspects were not mutually exclusive. They needed to be developed together and facilitate each other if the NR/RR's hegemony was to be effective in and through education.

To be able to manipulate education to serve their interests the NR/RR needed to gain control of its form, content, delivery and assessment. From 1979 the RR employed a complex inter-working of symbolic (discursive) and material (legislative) rules and resources in a 'step-by-step' project to gain control of education (see Appendix F: p49)⁷⁰. Crucially this involved gaining control over teachers and teacher

⁶⁹ These two factions of NR ideology are often interpreted as being in conflict with each other (see Halpin 1997). However, my argument is that they were in fact concomitant to, and interdependent upon, one another.

⁷⁰ The chronological developments outlined in this chapter stress the ideological (symbolic) aspects of the RR's hegemonic project. This corresponds to the chronology in Appendix F which outlines the

education in the endeavour to reduce their professional autonomy and reflection in seeking to change them into reflexive agents delivering and assessing centrally devised policies (see Appendix G: p57). This chapter investigates the origins and intent of RR policy, and the discourse employed in seeking to instil a particular right-wing definition of 'citizenship'. It focuses on the RR's endeavour to ideologically redefine public perceptions of education's purpose in an attempt to determine specific form, content, teaching methods and subsequent outcomes. I argue that the RR endeavoured to produce citizens who would *reflexively* fit into, and reproduce, the (capitalist) arrangements necessary for a successful social market economy. This involved attacking education to identify an opposition as a focus for 'crisis' to allow the discharge of RR ideology as 'common-sense solutions'. These 'solutions' were imperative to imbue the 'values' necessary to achieve a successful shift from social democracy to the social market. Through a chronological delineation, this chapter identifies the main constituents of RR 'citizenship' - 'vocational values' based on the work ethic (for the production of capital), tradition and nationalism (to justify hierarchical inequality) and 'moral values' (to imbue self-regulation and self-responsibility) - and how they developed through a step-by-step integration of ideology and legislation.

The Origins of NR/RR Educational Policy

The Social Democratic (SD) gains of the 1960s and 1970s questioned if the traditional values of structural hierarchies were 'natural', and highlighted education as a social and political construct. This critique not only threatened the future reproduction of the capitalist status quo, but also the domination of a 'capitalist class' (dominant group) as SD policies distributed limited resources to the Welfare State⁷¹. The Right attacked social change as 'permissiveness' and progressive education as the cause of a moral and cultural 'crisis'. The SD policy of compulsory comprehensive reorganisation under the 1976 Education Act, with the *intention* of equality, was in direct opposition to capitalist requirements. For education to continue to serve capital it had to be

legislative (material) aspects of the RR's hegemonic project. The two should be read in tandem to outline the whole RR project more clearly.

⁷¹ This reduced the possibilities for the concentrated accumulation of capital by private individuals or groups.

controlled and reconstructed to remove the SD threat. However, since 1944 education had established a strong position of autonomy and so potential resistance to reforms from 'outside'. Conservative education advisor 'A1' highlighted the Right's concerns;

A1 ...The feeling that that there was something wrong with education, that it was in the hands of people that were devaluing it. The way in which British education was not good for Britain's economic position. The nearest belief in the 'free market' was that Britain could not succeed with the education it had. There was a need to have education more attuned to successful capitalism. That was more of a 'nationalistic' impulse than anything else. In a sense of constantly looking at the Germans and the Japanese and saying that the difference is the education system. It is the way that they 'train' people.

This statement indicates that the intention was for education to create the conditions favourable to national capital by 'training' rather than educating pupils. As we see below this training was not only to be 'vocational' but also 'moral'.

The ideological underpinnings of RR policy came from a complex network of relationships between right wing interests groups, think tanks, individuals and Ministers which formed a 'policy community'. Christopher Knight, historian of post-war Conservative education, identified connections between important figures who exerted influence from outside the Conservative party in the construction of RR educational philosophy. He indicated that Lord Max Beloff and Anthony Seldon were the intellectual powerhouses of the Party; that Roger Scruton (later editor of the *Salisbury Review*) initiated the Conservative Philosophy Group (CPG) in 1965 (which Mrs Thatcher attended); and that the IEA and ASI were central in policy making (interview). The IEA, through Sexton, had close links with All Souls College Oxford, and there were close links with Cambridge University through Sheila Lawlor (Knight 1990: p158). Knight also identified MPs Boyson, Pawsey, Dunn and Walden as major players devising education policy within the Conservative Party. (The first three were interviewed as part of this research, the fourth declined the invitation.)

Former senior HMI 'F1' outlined that right-wing pressure groups, often including education advisors, were able to put their case forcefully and manipulate education policy;

F1 ...Those people who kept on coming-up on different committees, different pressure groups, different letter heads, signing different letters, but they were the same people. They were people like John Maronbon, Sheila Lawlor, Stuart Sexton and so on. All of whom were political advisors....

WK You have already mentioned that the CPS...

F1 Had a hot line to Sarah Hogg at No. 10....It was a 'ginger group' but it was founded by a PM and a SoS for education with the aim of influencing policy within their own Party. The origins of the organisation show clearly what it was intended to be. It was a political pressure group within the party in effect. ...The CPS did not provide empirical evidence, it produced opinions....They were concerned with 'common-sense', not evidence. ...Pascal and Griffiths both had strong affiliations with the CPS. Both were then put to chair those two Quangos (NCC and SEAC). From that point onwards the politicisation of the NC was stunning....

The CPS was set up by Thatcher and Joseph in the mid 1970s to develop RR policy. The No. 10 Policy Unit was in the driving seat ideologically as Mrs Thatcher took a special interests in education (Knight 1990: p141, Gilmour 1992: p167). It included people like Beloff, Harris, Scruton, Letwin and Lawlor. They were prominent in the CPG and the intellectuals behind education policy. Members of the CPG were present in right wing think tanks, like the ASI, and groups of Conservative MPs, like the Hillgate Group and the No Turning Back Group (NTBG). They were also present in right wing papers like the Times and the Telegraph. Many of these right wing groups or individuals either published through the CPS, the Conservative Political Centre or through Scruton's Salisbury Review (SR). Thus, although some of the publications seem to be contradictory, they come from the same ideological roots and, in education, combine neo-Liberal and neo-Conservative NR influences into policy (see Simon 1991).

Former MfE Robert Dunn outlined that the think tanks were highly important in the formation of RR education policy;

RD In the 1960s and 1970s the Right seized the initiative, they took the lead in education and have held it ever since. All the ideas in education policy have come from the 'radical right'. Reforming education has been their initiative. The Black Papers developed a Conservative philosophy of education and have been hugely influential. They have been the cornerstone of Conservative education thought. Rhodes Boyson has been immensely influential in the forming of the education policy of the 'radical right'....The

'think tanks' have been critically important in formulating education policy. They have been the 'hub' of all policy initiatives. All initiatives in education have come from the right. Radical Conservatives are concerned with getting the things done that need to be done.

The Black Papers (BPs) developed in the 1960s as a reaction to egalitarian initiatives taken by educationalists in schools. Like the think tanks, their policies were ideological and prescriptive. The underpinning discourse was of a 'traditional common-sense' of the way things 'ought' to be (discussed below). The writers had close ties with the Conservative Party's policy machinery. Boyson developed and disseminated RR educational policy through the BPs. He translated RR ideology into Conservative education policy. Firstly at grassroots level within the Conservative Party during its 1974 to 1979 period of opposition, then nationally from 1979 with his appointment as Minister for Education (MfE) (Cox 1992: p178, Chitty 1994: p14, Knight 1990: p25).

Knight (1990: p158) outlines that policies were discussed informally between advisors, think tanks and Ministers from other 'interested' departments. The RR think tanks, rather than Ministers, were the real policy makers in education. So much so that Kenneth Baker was well aware of this when he became SoS in 1986 (Chitty 1994: p 22). Knight indicated that development of the ERA and the NC came directly from the RR pressure groups (interview). Baker (1993: p161) admitted that the education establishment was not given a part to play in policy development. The RR's education policies clearly came from an intellectual base outside the party which had its ideological underpinnings in social, political, economic and cultural concerns. A RR clique, free from scrutiny, was disseminating its ideology as Conservative policy. Indeed, as is discussed below, the vast majority of the writing of the think tanks and groups of right-wing MPs became Conservative Party education policy throughout the 1980s.

The Intent of NR/RR Education Policy

The NR/RR's wider political project was the total defeat of socialism (see chapter four: p142). Education was to be at the forefront of social and cultural change.

Nicholas Ridley (1991: p92) explained that Mrs Thatcher took a special interest in education because;

...she believed it was vitally important in creating the sort of society she wanted to see. She thought that it should encourage the enterprise culture not the dependency culture. A good educational system was essential for the future success of the nation.

Educational advisor 'A1' outlined that the RR wanted an education system which functioned to train 'useful' pupils and contain the rest;

A1 ... the aim is to run education as efficiently as possible. The wish would be to write off the uneducable. Privately that is what they say. Teachers waste an awful lot of time looking after, or coping with, people for whom education has no value. However, their parents have got a vote. If they really wanted education to achieve results they would have to concentrate all their resources on the top twenty to fifty percent of the population. The rest would be contained in whatever form in 'other types' of schools.

Ex-Minister for Education Robert Dunn left no doubt that the RR aimed to control education (the 'pedagogic device', see chapter three: p106) to allow it to set the educational rules and appoint itself as referee;

RD The education establishment was suffering from 'producer capture'. It was conservative with a small 'c' and resistant to change. It suffered from complacency. The government and the education establishment had completely opposite aims for education. They had totally opposite ideas about both the content and the method of teaching. There was a desperate need for change. The methods and content of the left-wing, 1960s and 1970s, 'education movements' had to be removed. The whole system was in desperate need of change. There was a need to end the idea of the 'secret garden'. The Radical Conservatives were determined to make that change. The education establishment had been in control for over 150 years. There was a requirement to totally remove, destroy, that establishment. To bring about the changes in education that the government wanted it had to gain control of education (interview).

Such strong comments were not voiced by other Conservative MPs. Nonetheless the theme and the intentions were similar if more carefully expressed. However, Dunn's uncompromising comments show how ruthless the RR intended to be in achieving its aims.

The NR/RR intended to create a right-wing moral outlook within a 'social market economy'. They wanted to imbue a right-wing citizenship of 'Victorian values' and 'vigorous virtues' based on competitive and accountable 'individualism' (see chapter four: p122). Their definition of citizenship advocated individuals as both 'citizens and workers': 'workers' to serve the production of capital and 'citizens' to accept their hierarchical SPEC position as natural, neutral and traditional. They wanted to re-assert a tradition of hierarchical inequality with education transmitting the 'correct' values and attitudes. Education was to be a hegemonic strategy to socialise and induct individuals into RR capitalism despite opposition (see Simon 1991: p478). It needed, therefore, to be about selection, differentiation and tradition. Clearly, 'equality' through SD education did not fit RR interests. Moreover, as well as securing 'social order' (moral self-discipline) and 'social ordering' (hierarchy), the imperative of RR policy was to prepare pupils psychologically not to expect welfare and SD (Hartley 1992: p11). The intent was to make individuals reproduce capitalist arrangements reflexively. Education was to be used to reshape values from social democracy to the social market by instilling a consumer and entrepreneurial ethic in pupils, and by imbuing values of class stratification and hierarchical interests. The RR needed, therefore, to reconstruct the educational framework to remove opposition to its policies and to marginalise 'other' inputs. More widely, the endeavour was to shift public values of education provision from a welfare service to a consumer service in a competitive market. Thus, rather than simply imposing its ideology, the RR needed to transform the public's perceptions of education's purpose. This necessitated a hegemonic shift, through an ideological redefinition of education, to establish right-wing values as common-sense.

The underpinning motive for the RR was to secure the conditions necessary for capitalist reproduction. As such, the requirements of capitalism had to become the dominant educational discourse. The contexts had to be created which not only made the public receptive to RR policies, but also expect and demand them. The public's view of the function of education had, therefore, to fall within a right-wing definition. This definition had to justify the imperatives essential for the workings of capitalism: a differentiated system of provision and selection, the incentive of competition for

reward, increased individual accountability and loyalty, and subjugation to the requirements of a traditional British nation state. It also had to legitimate limits over the allocation of resources (thus educational possibilities) on the basis of efficiency as value for money. This depended on making RR discourse dominant through controlling the information available about education.

Seeking to Establish The RR's Educational Discourse as Common-Sense

To the RR's mind schooling was about utility, not welfare. It sought to depoliticise education to create symbolic cultural controls over thoughts about education's function and value (Ball 1994: p18). Policy (from the centre) was not to be based on 'educational theory' but on neutral and natural 'common-sense'. Support for, and domination of RR ideology, would thus be gained through 'populism' (see Apple 1993: p16). The endeavour was to transpose RR ideology into educational texts to control education's form and content. However, this necessitated establishing an ideological and legislative framework within which educationalists would be required to work. Educational provision and outcome needed to be justified in terms of capitalist requirements. As we shall see, RR rhetoric advocated the needs of British industrial survival in a competitive trade world where individuals needed to appreciate the market system. The notions of education *for* the market and education *of* the market were tied together in an ideological justification of the needs of capitalism⁷². Firstly, in a wider 'justification' for parents and public of the requirements for the market. Secondly, in the transmission of 'market values' to pupils. However, it was neither required nor desired that they understood the market system. Education was then to perpetuate and reproduce this 'new common-sense'. This discourse was 'justified' by linking parental fears of contemporary 'crisis' to a past 'golden age' of standards and stability.

The RR played on parental fears in seeking to generate reactionary attitudes towards liberal educationalists (Apple 1989: p7). Former MfE Robert Dunn stated that;

⁷² The aspect of education *in* the market is discussed in Appendix F.

RD The 1960s and 1970s saw a movement towards permissiveness and liberation. There was a drive towards personal freedom of choice, the choice whether to contribute to society or not. Those that did not contribute could live off the welfare state. This created both a society which had no motivation to succeed and a 'dependency culture'. There was a sense of liberation of thought, action and sexuality. There was an introduction of these beliefs into the education system through left-wing 'education movements'. This involved the 'progressive' and 'child centred' methods of teaching and learning. Children chose whether they wanted to learn or not. We know that, given the choice, children will choose not to do anything. This created problems of truancy, many children were bored with both the content of lessons and the methods used. There were problems of in-discipline as children had no motivation to learn and as a result standards fell. Parents and teachers were becoming concerned about these issues. It was clear that these methods just simply did not work, they were non-sense (interview).

The rhetoric was of anarchy in classrooms. Parents were called upon to help resolve the situation. However, Dunn's comments indicate that the RR was more concerned with social control through education. Further, he confirmed, somewhat inadvertently, that SD's encouragement of liberation of thought and action was the real concern for the RR. SD was, in reality, creating a crisis for traditional capitalist authority by questioning the power structure and framework of domination (see Ball 1994b: p12).

For RR objectives to be achieved, sites of resistance to them within education needed to be silenced. RR discourse constructed a crisis in education and identified SD as the cause. SD policies were portrayed as a threat to national interests and vilified as left-wing and subversive. This allowed the RR to attack educationalists as opponents to 'common-sense' solutions to resolve the crisis for the good of the 'nation': solutions of family values, individual responsibility and tradition⁷³. Shifting parental beliefs to within RR 'values' would make it easier to impose duties and responsibilities on education. The rhetoric of 'parental power' became a powerful political slogan (see PT 1979 No. 1, Conservative Manifesto 1979). The needs of economic and moral stability were the rhetorical justification for controls. Former MfE Rumbold claimed that employers were the first to notice 'problems' and that something needed to be done;

⁷³ The themes of common-sense and tradition in RR policy were central to the justification for team games and sport as compulsory at all key stages in the NCPE (see chapter six: p223)

AR ...This was evidenced by the number of pupils who came out of school after the eleven statutory years at sixteen being entirely incapable of reading or writing or being able to add-up. That evidence came from the people who tried to employ them. So, it did not come from anywhere else. The employers were saying "We do not know what the hell you do with those people but you are not educating them." Then people started to say "What is it that we are doing in the schools that is wrong?" Then it was a matter of looking. ...The children were completely 'flummoxed'. ...It is in part an inheritance that we are still living with, it is why some of our schools fail. It is why some of our young people have no idea what to do with themselves and sometimes turn to crime.

Not only did Rumbold link progressive education with national decline, she also linked it directly to fears about crime in society. She indicated that the private sector achieves high standards while state education's are poor. However, she did not link these outcomes to social factors or resource allocation. For state education to be successful she indicated that it has to be controlled through traditional methods and content, and that children have to be 'told', not 'taught';

AR ...I have progressively come away from child centred education, because I think it was one of the single most destructive, destroyers of attainment...

The RR used its political authority to set symbolic definitions, limit educational discourse and limit interpretations of them. This was strengthened by legislation (material resources) (see Appendix F: p47-49). Apple (1993: p115-116) argues that;

...The Right has attempted to alter our very perception of schooling itself...the common ground of the school becomes no longer based on a set of democratic political commitments... rather, it is replaced by the idea of a competitive market place...the citizen as a political being with reciprocal rights and duties is lost. In its place is the self as a consumer. Schooling (and students) becomes a 'retail product'. Freedom in a democracy is no longer defined as participating in building the common good, but as living in an unaffected common market, with the educational system now being seen as needing to be integrated into the mechanisms of such a market.

Parents and educationalists needed to conform to the RR's discourse or be excluded (Foster 1985: p32). As we will see, control was to come through the prescription of objectives which allowed for accountability; market competition was to be regulated by moral codes and rules within the RR's discourse; the information disseminated

influenced understanding, aspiration and demand; parental choice meant parental responsibility in the market place, regardless of their social circumstances⁷⁴; and the reality was of hierarchical division through individual competition.

Gaining Control of Education

The RR needed to create the conditions which would allow their policies to be implemented with as little opposition as possible. The intent was to redress post-war developments which gave the LEAs considerable autonomy. This was part of the RR's wider aim to cripple local government (Gilmour 1992: p167, Tomlinson 1993: p152). The RR wanted to create a structure where resources and policies by-passed LEAs altogether and were implemented directly in schools. LEAs were thus attacked as sites of left-wing socialist political propaganda (Key 1988: p6, Thatcher 1993: p590). It was asserted that schools had to be able to escape their clutches. Thatcher (1993: p579) explained that;

Essentially, this would have meant unbundling of many of the LEA's power, leaving them with a monitoring and advisory role - perhaps in the long term not even that. It would have been a way to ease the State still further out of education, thus reversing the worst aspects of post war education policy.

Thatcher favoured the step-by-step approach outlined by the think tanks and RR MPs (Letwin S 1992: p244). The long term political aims were to be implemented gradually, each policy building upon the possibilities created by the last (see Demaine 1989). This necessitated a 'two-way-shift' of power and authority from the LEAs. Power was shifted to the centre while responsibility and accountability for educational provision and outcomes were shifted to the periphery (school governors) (see Appendix F: p38). The rhetoric was of devolved power over centralisation. Baker (1985 PT 14: p355) espoused that he had "... always believed that in our society more ought to be done at the rim of the wheel and less at the hub". However, control was to remain at the centre with the role of *elected* LEAs given over to *appointed* quangos

⁷⁴ Former Conservative PM Edward Heath highlighted the gap between the 'old' Right and the 'new' Right as well as the RR's manipulation in a scathing attack on prevaricatory policy. He argued that; "Parental choice in the Bill is largely a confidence trick. I say that quite openly...Parental power. It is completely unrealistic...Parental power is just a political slogan. It has no real meaning for today's educational system" (Heath 1987 Hansard Vol. 123, Col. 772).

(Tomlinson 1993). Moreover, the structure of educational provision not only changed at the local level with the appointment of school governors with specific duties and responsibilities, there were also changes of personnel at the centre. The RR and the CPS appointed Ministers⁷⁵, Civil Servants and quangos to implement policy constructed by the Downing Street Policy Unit (Knight 1990: p138, Lawrence 1992: p136, Ball 1994: p1, Gilmour 1993: p187, McPherson and Raab 1988: p18). Further, despite a parliamentary report suggesting it should be kept, the Schools' Council was abolished by SoS Joseph for being too 'political'⁷⁶ (Simon 1991: p496). Later SoS Clarke appointed Pascal from the DSPU to chair the NCC and Griffith from CPS to chair SEAC⁷⁷.

However, the ultimate aims (education *in, for* and *of* the market) were to require substantial ideological preparation through 'softening-up' both the public and the education establishment. This process is described best by Ball (1994: p7) where he explains that;

The shift might be seen as the latest stages in what I have described as a series of ratchet steps, each one based upon a firmer, more clearly defined and more clearly determined curriculum. Attempts are made to mobilise acceptance at each turn of the ratchet - a process of climate building...each turn relates to a change in what is politically possible.

The development and transmission of the RR's⁷⁸ definition of 'citizenship' were to be part of this process. The accomplishment of which, as we will see, depended on the successful conjoining of vocational values with right-wing moral values and traditions.

⁷⁵ Senior HMI 'F1' indicated that Ministers, such as MacGregor, were removed by the CPS and Tory intellectuals if they began to listen to educationalists (interview).

⁷⁶ See Joseph Hansard 1981 Vol. 22 Col. 429, Boyson Hansard 1981 Vol. 31 Col. 120.

⁷⁷ These two quangos (National Curriculum Council and Schools Examination and Assessment Council), established through the 1988 ERA, were appointed by the SoS. They replaced the Schools Examination Council and the Schools Curriculum Development Council which were appointed to replace the Schools Council (see Appendix F: p40). Previous chair of the NCC Duncan Graham (Graham and Tytler 1993: p78), stressed that the NCC was not an independent body and that it had to work within the constraints set by the SoS. Graham explains that SoS Clarke imposed his political will 'brutally' over what were essentially volunteers, and that the NCC was reduced to no more than a consultation body when it stopped following the 'party line'.

⁷⁸ See footnote 2 and footnote 53 which outline the similar origins and intentions of, and connections between, the NR and RR.

Chronology of Intent

RR educational reforms between 1979 to 1992 had two definite 'stages'. Firstly, 1979 to 1988 saw the combination of ideological attack and policies which starved education of resources. These laid the foundations for the break-up of the existing education establishment and the construction of a new power structure with the RR ascendant. Seemingly fragmented policies were tied together in the 1986 Act which highlighted an altogether more coherent intent. Secondly, 1988 to 1992 saw the implementation of policies which gave central government control over curriculum content and assessment through the ERA (see Appendix F: p49-53). The following chronology outlines the RR's ideological intent to privilege its definition of 'citizenship'. It also shows how NR ideology (grounded in vocationalism and right wing morals and traditions) became progressively more prominent in education policy between 1979 and 1992.

Pre 1979

The first stage in the ascendancy of the NR's 'citizenship' was with the reactionary writings of the Black Papers (BPs). They led both the attack on SD policies and the reassertion of traditional educational thought. Their ideological drive was a populism of cultural heritage combined with hierarchical reward (elitism) through selection. Any opposing views were vilified. Boyson (1969: p58) claimed that sociologists were undermining the schools' role of transmission of tradition and preparation for life. He was determined to undo progressive and 'permissive' developments, and see education return to traditional discipline and training to achieve right-wing ends (Boyson 1969: p62). The BPs' argument emphasised social and moral development and a reinforcement of national values. Boyson (1970: p102) asserted that the function of education was to prepare children for their adult role through the transmission of culture and history in an accepted body of knowledge. The claim was that such transfer required traditional structures, content and discipline if society was not going to go into decline. The BPs also stated that education's role was to pass on certain implied values of behaviour, discipline, authority, law, political democracy, standards, culture and Christianity (Butt 1975: p42). Christianity was to imbue 'British'

(English) nationalism and 'middle class values' on a society becoming increasingly culturally diverse. The NR sought to set a limited, narrow and functional educational discourse, and the BPs were the foundations of the RR's educational policy. Indeed, much Conservative policy between 1970 and 1974, with Thatcher as SoS, was fuelled by the NR and sought to save selection through controls over resources: a period which polarised educational issues (Simon 1991: p440).

Due to economic recession, 1975 to 1979 was an economic disaster for the Labour government and for education (Simon 1991: p445). Keith Joseph led a media attack against Labour based on 'industrial needs', 'morals' and 'tradition'. The calls for accountability forced Labour PM Callaghan to make educational issues public in his 1976 Ruskin speech and to initiate the Great Debate. However, the debate did not take place in an 'ideological vacuum'. The Hillgate Group and No Turning Back Group were central in providing the ideological rhetoric. Educational issues were polarised and consensus between the two major parties ended (see Simon 1991: p458).

The Right played directly on parent's emotions in seeking to establish support for their 'solutions' by portraying educationalists as subversive ideologues who damaged their children's prospects. Cox and Boyson (BP 1977: p93) claimed that lack of authority and moral standards in education led to social decline, and that juvenile crime was directly related to progressive education. They claimed that moral education and fostering a work ethic was common-sense. Lynn's (BP 1977: p10) 'solution' was that children should learn to work hard. The way to achieve this was through competition and reward. The way to raise standards was through excellence rather than equality. The ethos of welfare state provision and social democracy was rejected. Education was redefined from a service to a commodity, produced at the lowest cost, with the individual responsible for accumulation (see Dale 1989: p89). It had to be functional, objective and accountable to ensure economic efficiency in a recession. The ideological saturation which began with the BPs continued with the RR in government from 1979.

1979 to 1983

Education was the focus for the first parliamentary debate of the incoming RR government in 1979 (Hansard Vol. 967). Its attacks on the 1976 Education Act⁷⁹ identified its immediate concern to do away with ‘dangerous’ SD legislation which threatened the interests of capital and a ‘traditional’ status quo. The attacks also highlighted the ideological imperatives underpinning RR policies.

Warnings of threats to national stability through Left-wing political subversion were employed by SoS Carlisle to justify the importance of capitalism over SD. He endorsed excellence rather than egalitarianism, and vilified comprehensive reorganisation as social engineering (Hansard 1979 Vol. 968 Col. 1121-1122). The 1976 Act was portrayed as purely ideological, unconcerned with educational standards, and intent on creating a structure where comprehensive schools were compulsory for all. Boyson (Hansard 1979 Vol. 973, Col. 156) claimed that the 1976 Act allowed widespread socialist control where “...the ladder of mobility was knocked down by the Labour party to permit Socialist feudalism and Socialist rotten boroughs in the middle of cities...”. The 1979 Act was to “...sweep away years of rigid and inflexible authority created by socialist control” (Carlisle Hansard 1979 Vol. 973, Col. 97). Comprehensive reorganisation was, allegedly, obsessed with uniform structure rather than quality of achievement, allowing too much power at the centre which ignored parental wishes (PT 1979, No. 8, p313). Only social mobility and selection could ensure ‘success’. This was the first ‘guiding’ of parental expectations. The Right was determined to reintroduce selection to restore the pre-1976 balance. The 1979 Act removed the compulsion for comprehensive reorganisation from LEAs and allowed them to take up places in the independent sector. SoS Carlisle (1979, Hansard Vol. 967, Col. 220) argued that it would constitute “...a restoration of the situation prior to 1976”.

National economic imperatives provided the rhetoric for RR policies. Wealth creation was claimed to ensure ‘standards in a civilised society’ (Carlisle Hansard

⁷⁹ Labour’s 1976 Act legislated that it was compulsory for all LEAs to re-organise education provision on comprehensive principles.

1979 Vol. 967 Col. 227). The Government's first priority was to create the economic climate which would make Britain a rich nation (Gummer Hansard 1979 Vol. 973, Col. 125). Industry and commerce were stressed to be central to the country's "...economic future well-being..." (Hampton 1979 Hansard Vol. 967, Col. 296). That education should serve the needs of industry and commerce was 'common-sense realism' (Thornton 1979 Hansard Vol. 968, Col. 1216)⁸⁰. SoS Carlisle (Hansard 1979 Vol. 967, Col. 255) highlighted that education had to match the country's social and economic needs and establish standards and discipline. It was portrayed as an 'industry' suffering from self-serving left-wing 'producer capture' which was determined to undermine measurable standards to prevent accountability. This sought to gain public and parental consent for right-wing policies. The intent was, however, as much ideological as economic⁸¹. The rhetoric sought to change 'the nation's' view of education, displacing *equity* (issues of justice) with *equality* of opportunity founded on selection and differentiation.

A direct link was made between differentiated education and vocational training. ESASC member Greenway (1981 Hansard Vol. 2, Col. 603) asserted that pupils abilities were naturally unequal, that the 'less able' (in terms of utility) should receive a more vocationally based education, with the 'more able' selected for different hierarchical roles. The identification of priority areas and steps to make the curriculum more practically orientated for the "...lower attaining pupils..." was to 'prepare' "...all pupils for adult and working life" (Boyson 1983 Hansard Vol. 41, wa. 302). Individuals needed to be educated and trained to be responsible in the employment market (Howell CPS 1983: p21). Dunn (1983 Hansard Vol. 45, Col. 1144) asserted that the future success of the nation depended on the achievements of the most able, while low achievers still had an industrial and commercial role to play in terms of learning 'useful skills'. To assist employers assess 'useful skills', 'Records of Achievement', based on listed criteria, were introduced which informed them about pupils' character and achievements outside the academic curriculum (Joseph 1983 Hansard Vol. 49 Col. 150), or, in other words, an individual's utility. Inequality was

⁸⁰ Sir Malcolm Thornton was a member, and later chair, of the Education Science and Arts Select Committee (ESASC)

⁸¹ Although 'economic considerations' provided the rhetoric, my interpretation is that it was employed essentially as a 'device' to allow control over the distribution of resources which constrained the possibilities for 'alternative' educational initiatives.

encouraged. Joseph outlined the RR's ideological intention with his arrival at the DES in 1981. He linked education with industry, outlining its role in the production of capital, and exhorted that pupils should be educated about the 'values' of capitalism and the moral dangers of 'rival' economic systems (Hansard, Vol. 28, wa. 649)⁸². Education was to become increasingly subservient to the requirements of capital, both for its production in the short term, and to establish a capitalist hegemony in the long term.

The focus on the needs of industry and commerce linked directly to, and combined with, the rhetoric of 'moral self-discipline' and the 'work ethic'. To achieve 'moral self-discipline', pupils needed to be exposed to competitive environments and inequality of outcome. The NR claimed that the Left had been subverting education to undermine traditional cultural values and stability since the 1960s, with egalitarianism causing 'levelling down';

...the permissiveness which entered schools in the 1960s in the guise of progressive education is a disease, responsible for many evils in present-day society. The recent hooliganism and violence in the streets is surely in part a result of this breakdown of traditional authority (Cox 1981: p11)⁸³.

Neo-Conservative and neo-Liberal NR ideology were thus combined in the endeavour to develop a 'citizenship' which would reproduce capitalist arrangements of 'social order' and 'social ordering'. The moral imperative was that inequality could be justified by an individual's achievements based on 'effort and ability'⁸⁴. Competition was important to teach pupils that life was about the fight for survival and selection from birth to death (Winterton, 1979 Hansard, Vol. 968, Col. 1160). It was essential so that people had the chance to prove themselves to be unequal (Greenway 1979 Hansard Vol. 977 Col. 1160). Cox (CPC 1981: p21) defended this ideologically,

⁸² Although this was the RR's macro political intent, it did not automatically follow that this was achieved at the micro level in schools.

⁸³ This notion of progressive education causing hooliganism connects well with Boyson's claim that the alleged replacement of competitive team games with progressive alternatives in physical education was directly responsible for juvenile delinquency. This was his major justification for the imposition of traditional competitive team games for all school children. This is discussed in the following chapter.

⁸⁴ This is not to suggest that schools have not been used in the past to promote 'meritocracy'. It is to suggest, however, that the 'meritocracy' advocated by the RR was a version which ignored unequal starting points based on social circumstances.

stating that “Failure is an inevitable part of adult life, and children must learn to assess their own weaknesses and strengths. To cushion them from reality is morally indefensible”. In other words, children were to learn how to fail and to accept it. ‘Acceptance’ of failure would allow the RR to promote elitism, under the guise of excellence, while providing minimal resources for the majority. ‘Natural’ stratified inequality was thus to occur through competition, selection and differentiation.

Education was to develop the kind of adults that the RR wanted. Greenway (1979 Hansard Vol. 982, Col. 697) declared that schooling should ensure the transmission of ‘classical’ morals and virtues by teaching values which instilled high standards of work, behaviour, discipline and attendance. Ensuring the teaching of ‘morality’ and ‘cultural traditions’ in state schools would prevent teacher’s undermining RR initiatives and pushing left-wing totalitarianism (Cronin 1983: p35). ‘Morality’ and ‘cultural traditions’ were claimed to be essential as ‘bastions of freedom’. However, this did not mean giving the majority the freedom to make decisions. The free market required ordered freedom. Crowther (1983: p42) stressed that “...individual freedom and individual responsibility do not, necessarily, go hand in hand” and that;

...behind the proposal to encourage schools with a ‘clear moral base’ lies the conservative traditional solicitude for inherent moral values, and his determination to preserve them against the rust of time. Conservative freedom does not entail ‘liberating’ children from their national or religious heritage.

These statements epitomised Tebbit’s call for ‘licensed freedom’ (see chapter four: p123 and p134) and again highlighted that social control was imperative for the ‘social market economy’.

Imbuing values of British traditions were also central to the success of the NR project. The nationalist imperative was that children should be disciplined in a respect for the past. That it was not the ‘past’ or ‘tradition’ of all its recipients was rarely if ever acknowledged. Boyson (Hansard 1980 Vol. 982, Col. 699) insisted that children “...must learn that they are heirs of a great cultural tradition, which must be nurtured”. He proposed a narrowing of educational content and method, asserting that schools’ function was to transmit literacy and numeracy, and the learning of cultural values and

knowledge through specific subject content (Hansard 1980 Vol. 982, Col. 698). He (PT 1982, No. 2, p209) claimed that the Left's 'politicised social theories' were alien to, and undermining, British traditions. 'Traditional' discipline, curriculum content and Christianity were his solutions to the moral and cultural crisis caused by 'permissiveness' and progressive education. Christianity was argued to be the centre of British culture, history and unity (Boyson 1982 Hansard Vol. 21, Col. 1134-1136). As such, Boyson was outlining a role for Christianity in legitimating and securing social hierarchy, inequality and control.

Capitalism is founded on a history of order and hierarchical social structures cemented by traditional values (see Appendix E: p18). Social control depends on cultural conformity, which means mono-culturalism. Denial of multi-culturalism and imbuing traditional values and practices in all 'citizens' were, therefore, central to the NR project (see Cronin 1983: p35). Diverse cultures were to be transposed with British traditions. Boyson (1983 Hansard Vol. 35, Col. 771) emphasised that all children should "...receive an education that will equip them to lead a full and useful life in British society...be absorbed and taught as members of the same society". He insisted that 'immigrant' children be trained and taught to fit into society for their own good and for the good of the 'host' community (1983 Hansard vol. 39, Col. 712, 1983 Hansard Vol. 45, Col. 723). 'Immigrants' were to understand British history and influence and become numerate and literate in English. However, rather than benefit ethnic minority children, Troyna (interview 1994) argued that this was part of the RR's aim to hide cultural diversity and so remove the requirement to distribute resources to meet their diverse needs.

1983 was a general election year. With the re-election of the RR the NR increased its political strength and the connections between NR ideology and RR MPs' parliamentary speeches became more evident. The vocational, moral and traditional slant became more pronounced within educational rhetoric from 1983.

1984 to 1986

The SR continued to represent education as Left-wing, dominated by fashionable Marxist social theories, psychologists and sociologists bent on social engineering. Writers called for the restoration of conservative traditions of moral training and character building, and for traditional disciplines and discipline to develop the values and virtues with which schools could produce workers and citizens. The way to do this was to both alert the public to the Left's intentions and establish standards which defined educational objectives and teachers' responsibilities (see Honeyford 1983: p28, Atkinson 1984: p5, Elis Jones 1985: p45, Palmer 1986: p18). The underlying requirements of 'citizenship' were expressed in the government's wish that education foster the '3Rs', self-discipline, vocational skills and understanding of a free society and economy (Politics Today No. 18, 1984: p329-320). Evennett⁸⁵ (1984 Hansard Vol. 52, Col. 879) furthered this exhortation, stating that education "...is vital in the modern world which is subject to constant change. For society, a well-educated and adequate workforce is one of the keys to a sound and prosperous economy". Joseph (1984 Hansard Vol. 52, Col. 601) justified this hegemony of vocational differentiation as a 'common-sense' economic requirement. Selection was, thus, to act both as a method to fill different hierarchical roles and as a form of social control through transmission of differentiated values, knowledge and skills. The vocational curriculum was to be made relevant to the world of work through the Manpower Services Commission (MSC) and the Technical and Vocational Educational Initiative (TVEI) (PT No. 3, 1984: p42). RR MP Portillo (1984 Hansard Vol. 93, Col. 1157) stressed that it was essential that the MSC had autonomy from an education system which was causing the nation's economic problems by not training pupils in the right qualifications. He claimed that, post school, industry was required to do education's job of training pupils. At a time when the RR was still battling to gain control of education, the MSC's role in education meant an allocation of resources away from the DES to a body that was beyond educational scrutiny.

⁸⁵ RR MP David Evennett was Parliamentary Private Secretary to Education Minister Baroness Blatch and a member of ESASC.

The Adam Smith Institute's 1985 'Omega Report' was a highly important document which outlined NR intentions in education. It claimed that 'producer capture' allowed 'professional jargon' to hide ideological objectives. Education was defined as a 'business', the public as 'consumers'. The ASI's solution to depoliticise education was to end the role of LEAs and introduce a market in education. RR MPs began to organise and articulate NR ideology into petitions over policy. The NTBG (1985: p9) claimed that, through 'producer capture', the Left was using children to meet its political objectives to restructure society. Teachers were attacked for having 'subversive aspirations', spouting political prejudices through bogus 'peace studies' and 'anti-racism', and not having the intellectual capacity to master 'real' subjects such as history, geography, languages or mathematics. Multi-culturalism was portrayed as left-wing subversion, used to indoctrinate pupils (PT No. 3, 1985: p51). 'Egalitarianism' was an expensive 'misconception of the false prophets of the 1960s', which allegedly caused declining standards by encouraging 'spontaneous self-expression' rather than 'standards and skills' (PT No. 14, 1985: p282). To undo this 'misconception', the purpose of education was redefined from equality to excellence. Differentiated achievement was to be measured objectively, with output as the indication of economic efficiency. SoS Joseph explained that pupils were to become members of society who made free but responsible choices with awareness of cultural ideals and beliefs, and who were also prepared for employment suitable to their differentiated levels of ability and aptitude (1985 Hansard, Vol. 75, wa 49).

The ASI (1985: p269) wanted closer links between employers needs and vocational training. The RR MPs wanted the 'entrepreneurial spirit' instilled in schools to regenerate the nation's wealth (Evennett, 1985 Hansard Vol. 79 Col. 378). Dunn (1985 Hansard Vol. 80, Col. 840) was concerned that the curriculum should ensure vocational preparation by promoting "...enterprise, adaptability and the qualities and skills needed for work in a technological age". In an endeavour to change both the content of the school curriculum and teaching methods, the government allocated £250 million of the education budget to TVEI (Hansard Vol. 80, Col. 840). This massive resource allocation to the MSC was combined with measures to reduce education's autonomy to critique central government policies (see Appendix F: p43).

NR/RR views became official DES policy through the White Paper 'Better Schools' (DES 1985). It asserted that all pupils should have an "...awareness of economic matters, notably the operation of market forces, the factors governing the creation of private and public wealth and taxation...", and that the curriculum should be concerned with fundamental subjects, employment skills, morals and religion and entrepreneurialism (DES 1985: p23). It outlined the RR's intentions for wider social, political, economic and cultural change through education (DES 1985: p88). 'Better Schools' claimed that technical input into education, competitive individualism and the 'freedom' to accumulate capital were for the 'good of the nation'. However, it also outlined the RR's imperative to tie economic and social stability together through education. This would need a narrower curriculum, with a syllabus and training relevant to the requirements of industry and commerce (DES 1985, King 1985 Hansard Vol. 76 Col. 1219, Pawsey 1986 Hansard Vol. 91 Col. 667). There would need to be a standardised, national curriculum to allow for uniform testing (Hillgate Group 1986: p5, NTBG 1985: p21). Education was to be of the 'free market' but there was to be no market in discourses. Agreed 'national objectives' meant conforming to RR perspectives.

'Citizenship' meant conforming to 'traditions' of work and discipline (Mellor, 1985 Hansard Vol. 88, Col. 584). 'Better Schools' exhorted that it was a school's duty to ensure good order, and develop high standards of conduct "...within schools and beyond, in the interests both of pupils and of society" and to "...foster the shared values which underline a free society: tolerance, consideration for others, respect for truth and respect for the rule of Law". Failure to create "...good behaviour and self-discipline" would create "...wider social problems such as incidences of juvenile crime" (DES 1985: p57). 'Better Schools' can thus be seen both as a reaction towards, and a mechanism to fuel the 'moral crisis'. Its 'solutions' of right-wing values and traditions were ideological objectives.

The 1986 Education Act tied the RR's initial education policies together. The Act shifted the power base to the centre, which allowed the RR to push their policies more forcefully. Statements became more ideological. 'Progressive' input was

portrayed as idle play which undermined traditional knowledge and discipline, and failed to pass on culture and heritage. Rather, it infiltrated society with permissiveness and sociology which were ‘swamping’ traditional values (Hillgate Group 1986: p1). The Hillgate Group (1986: p10) exhorted that to stop “...grotesque political or social experiments in the name of education...” it had to be removed from the hands of the LEAs and education experts. There was to be no input of social or educational theory. These sentiments found expression in the parliamentary speeches of MfE Howarth (Hansard 1986 Vol. 90, Col. 527) who claimed that ‘hard left’ control of education led to wasted resources and poor standards due to the subordination of educational values to political purposes.

The NR re-emphasised the need for tradition. Traditions passed on things ‘as they are’ and so ensured a stable society of structure and order, where conventions, customs and social rules and regulations give authority to certain people based on merit (Nyiri 1986: p4). This was ‘common-sense’ which did not need to be reflected upon. Tradition and reason were claimed to be opposite to the autonomous mind because autonomy encouraged questioning. Acceptance of traditional values, without question, was itself ‘rationality’ as traditional practices allowed the measurement of rational and irrational behaviour (Nyiri 1986: p5). In other words, tradition led to the reflexive behaviour wanted by the RR. It was thus re-emphasised by RR MPs. The Hillgate Group (1986: p1) asserted that, because of a lack of religious consensus, education should secure “...a firm moral and spiritual basis, which will engender the values on which their [pupils’] future happiness depends: honesty, industry, charity, respect for others and the law”. This ‘citizenship’ encompassed Thatcher’s views about ‘Victorian values’ and ‘vigorous virtues’ (see chapter four: p122).

In re-asserting the RR definition of citizenship in education policy, Joseph (1986 Hansard Vol. 96, wa. 97) claimed that he was following ‘Better Schools’. However, in reality, ‘Better Schools’ was highly influenced by Joseph’s intellectual leadership. The right-wing definition of citizenship was strengthened by Baker’s arrival as SoS. Economic awareness was to be associated with the historical values and foundations of British society, and TVEI and differentiation were “...to develop the potential of all students as a preparation for adult life, including employment and

the responsibilities of citizenship” (Baker 1986 Hansard Vol. 100, wa. 540). He was determined to stop educationalist’s input into the curriculum and to ensure that a technical curriculum was suited to employers’ requirements (Baker 1993: p170)⁸⁶.

1987

1987 was a general election year and education was the 1987 Conservative Manifesto’s ‘flagship’: the aim was to get back to the ‘3Rs’ (Baker 1993: p192). NR attacks claimed that educationalists continued to defy the policies of an elected government, and that the Left were still working hard to prevent excellence and ensure that schools remained places for ideological indoctrination (Scruton 1987: p2, Marks 1987: p27). RR MPs developed this ideological attack still further. The (Hillgate Group 1987: p2) claimed that schools had been “...treated as instruments for equalising, rather than instructing children”, ‘merit, competition and self-esteem’ were devalued or repudiated, the teaching of facts had given way to the inculcation of opinions, education had become indoctrination, and disciplined study was being “...swamped by an amorphous tide of easy-going discussion and idle play”. These statements were acting to further the alleged crisis in education, attribute its source and give the solutions to it. They also highlighted that control of education was imperative in the shaping of future generations.

SoS Baker sought to limit discursive possibilities in the lead up to the 1988 ERA. He outlined that he was suspicious of ‘meriticious phrases’ in education, such as ‘problem-solving’ and ‘child-centred’, which he claimed were “...euphemisms for a much softer and less demanding approach to teaching” (Baker 1993: p203). The attack was intended to further parental concerns about education’s lack of accountability (see Biffin 1986: p11). Boyson (1987 Hansard, Vol. 118, Col 533) linked progressive ideas directly to ‘crisis’, suggesting that political interference from experts, advisors and HMI had caused a disaster in education over the previous twenty five years. He claimed that ‘parental choice’ would help bring an end to their practice

⁸⁶ In my critical realist perspective the importance of this policy is not whether it was established in the long term at the micro level, but that it was the RR’s macro intent. However, in endeavouring to establish this hegemony at the micro level it was central for the RR to successfully transmit its right-wing definition of citizenship.

in schools. Boyson not only attacked educational developments, but also undermined any progress made in knowledge and understanding about teaching and learning since the 1960s. Education was not to reflect social change required by the RR but to create it (Amos 1987 Hansard Vol. 123, Col. 227).

The NR/RR knew that each political and educational change had to be phased in 'step-by-step' until it became 'acceptable and permanent' so that it could not be changed back by an opposition government (NTBG 1986: p30, Hillgate Group 1987: p33, Sexton IEA 1987: p9-10). The RR felt that by 1987 it had shifted public attitudes far enough to the Right to take control of education (Boyson 1987 Hansard Vol. 118, Col. 552). Baker (Hansard 1987 Vol. 120, Col. 502-503) claimed that ten years of debate had resulted in widespread agreement about, and support for, the RR's educational objectives. The coming reforms, he claimed, were the basis of a good and relevant curriculum which would raise standards. The NC would set clear objectives and measurement within a framework which pupils, teachers, parents, employers and others could understand. However, rather than gaining support, the RR had laid the foundations which allowed them to impose policy from the centre. This was highlighted by Dunn during interview;

RD 1988 was the establishment of radical changes in education. The ideas had been around before then but they had remained on the desk of the Secretaries of State. They had probably not been prepared to confront the education establishment, or perhaps wanted change to occur slowly. Kenneth Baker, more radically, took the initiative and put the policies into practice. The 'tripartite' partnerships of the DES, LEAs and teacher organisations had run education since the 1940s. It was critical to break these partnerships if change was to occur.

Dunn not only implied that the intention to end co-operation and consultation was planned long-term but also that the RR knew such structural change had to be developmental and implemented carefully. The NC Consultation Document (DES 1987: p2) indicated that market reforms were not progressing quickly enough⁸⁷. Far from consulting, it stated that NC would bring to education "...policies for the school curriculum which will develop the potential for all pupils and equip them for

⁸⁷ In other words, ideological attacks, resource cuts and the imposition of the market mechanism were not proving as effective in 'reforming' education as quickly as the RR desired.

responsibilities of citizenship and for the challenges of employment in tomorrow's world". This clearly combined neo-Liberal vocationalism with neo-Conservative authoritarianism in education policy. The Consultation Document stressed that, with the ERA, the government wished to move ahead with its initiatives to equip pupils with "...the knowledge, skills and understanding that they need for adult life and employment" at a faster pace (DES 1987: p3). Thus, with no consultation with education over initiatives, Thatcher and Baker 'hammered-out' the ERB in April 1987 (Gilmour 1992: p167, Ridley 1991: p94). It was, purportedly, based on the needs of employers and industry (Baker 1993: p177). The hasty, badly researched development led to flawed education policy (Ridley 1991: p257). Input came from the NR/RR and was concerned with conformity and 'quality control' (Hillgate Group 1987: p19, Tebbit 1987 Hansard Vol. 123 Col. 810). The Hillgate Group (1987: p47) claimed that national conformity was the best way to perpetuate knowledge and preserve heritage essential to ensure the nation's 'traditional' social stability, and improve standards and input new areas of vocational competence to ensure its economic stability. The SR claimed that the history curriculum should be concerned with the transmission of British culture and nationalism because they restore the knowledge that British social conditions and political institutions emerged from a long process of strife and conciliation, and that they reinforce "...the loyalty on which survival depends" (Scruton 1987: p2).

The Hillgate Group (1987: p3-4) insisted that teachers' duty was to impart the English language, British history and national culture for the purpose of integration of all cultures into the common national culture for the purpose of political loyalty⁸⁸. This was adopted by MP Raison (1987 Hansard Vol. 121, Col. 103-104) who outlined that the NC was critical to ensure that *all* pupils were subject to the 'right' content to safeguard the "...transmission of the great things in our culture and civilisation from one generation to the next...". A backward looking 'Little England' nationalism sought to develop 'character' which would ensure a specific cultural reproduction. Learning history was, therefore, to be the assimilation of unquestionable 'facts' which dislocated pupils from an empathy of time and place. There was to be no discussion

⁸⁸ It is important to note that this 'national' curriculum was also to be taught in Welsh schools - an ideal, however, somewhat checked by the agencies in Wales and the construction of a 'Curriculum Cymreig' (see Evans, Davies, Bass and Penney 1997).

over interpretation, bias or manipulation of ‘facts’ by historians. Baker broadly agreed, asserting that the national curriculum was a way to increase social coherence and provide society with greater sense of identity (Guardian 16 September 1987, cited in Sealy 1994: p124). However, senior HMI ‘F1’ argued that reducing what people should know about their culture to a ‘general knowledge quiz’ in a nationally institutionalised system was a means of ‘forming morals’ in the preferred manner which sought to socialise pupils through the myth of ‘common experience’ (interview).

The Hillgate Group (1987: p3) set out to justify greater central controls, prescription of content and assessment, differentiation and accountability. Its claims were ‘justified’ in a rhetoric of the needs of industry and commerce, and a duty for the state to ensure that the knowledge, skills and culture upon which British society was founded were not ‘irretrievably lost’. Increasing central control, prescription and the NC’s function of ensuring the teaching of ‘priority’ subjects, was justified by Pawsey in vocational and economic terms (1987 Hansard Vol. 118, Col. 566). He outlined that the NC would both ensure that teachers’ and pupils’ time was concentrated on the important subjects to the detriment of peripheral studies, and ‘train’ pupils in subjects essential in an industrial-based society. With the passing of the ERA, and subsequently greater central controls, the RR set about defining education in terms of their SPEC requirements with greater authority⁸⁹.

1988 to 1989

Ex-MfE Robert Dunn outlined both why the NC was developed and the form it was intended to take;

RD It was important for education, and society as a whole, to go through the methods and content of the 1960s and 1970s. The experience of them made it clear that they did not work. The ‘education movements’ and ‘methods’ of those decades needed to be destroyed and totally swept away. That is why the National Curriculum was brought in. To put a stop to all that....Children need

⁸⁹ There was, previous to 1987, a NR element - including Sexton, Scruton and Cox - which disliked the idea of a NC within a totally comprehensive system. They were concerned that selection and consequent social hierarchy would no longer be possible. However, with the introduction of selection through the Assisted Places Scheme and through GMS and CTC schools introduced through the 1988 ERA, their concerns were somewhat tempered.

traditional methods of education to succeed. They need a structured, disciplined framework of the basic subjects. They need to have the competitive spirit if they are to succeed. That is their motivation (interview).

Dunn's statement clearly indicates that the RR and the progressive educationalists were at opposite ends of the utilitarian / educational spectrum. This was evident in comments made by Lawlor (1988a: p5) of the CPS that;

It is regrettable that these aims [basic knowledge and technique] appear recently to have been abandoned by those in charge of producing and implementing education policy...official committees, the DES and Her Majesty's Inspectorate no longer adhere to the belief that teachers should teach and pupils should learn a simple body of knowledge and a simple set of techniques.

The intent was to remove educationalists from curriculum development. Baker asserted that, because a specific range of knowledge and subjects was required, it was no longer possible to "...leave individual teachers, schools or local education authorities to devise the curriculum children should follow" (see Baker 1993: p192).

Butcher, Minister for Trade and Industry, outlined the necessity for both de-regulation and order and control. He advocated that education should enable pupils to "...survive and prosper economically in order to contribute usefully and productively to society", and to understand their responsibilities and be able to serve and improve society (Hansard 1988 Vol. 137, Col. 1129). He outlined that the government wanted to create a balance between utilitarian and cultural elements in education. Competition and selection were re-emphasised as important in the development of the 'work ethic' (Greenway 1988 Hansard Vol. 138, Col. 1175). Ignoring socio-economic factors, the RR thus reiterated that achievement was the responsibility of the individual, dependent upon effort and ability. Wealth creation was again linked to individuals' responsibility, accountability and duty. The work ethic was pushed as a 'moral responsibility', bound by cultural values. Education advisor Oliver Letwin (1988: p15) insisted that moral training should be a central aim of the education process. Both pupils and teachers were to be disciplined and controlled. Letwin's ideological exhortation that the 'only absolute duty of a school' was to equip pupils to live in a 'liberal democratic society' was confident and prescriptive (Letwin CPS 1988: p13).

The only rationality was that the hierarchy and values of tradition were 'as they were' because history had made them so, and they worked well (O'Hear 1988: p52). It was made clear by O'Hear that children should be immersed in a culture of responsibilities and duties without questioning. Indeed, O'Hear claimed that learning to question was dangerous when "...abstract right and good are always expressed and incarnated in particular circumstances and traditions" (1988: p53). Rational knowledge and understanding was to be derived from traditional structures, where progressive developments offered nothing but 'shallow rationalism'. In this view, 'progressive education' had nothing to offer to a form of education geared towards instilling unquestioning loyalty and obedience.

The NR was concerned to have national uniformity of education provision (Lawlor 1988b: p12, Lister 1991: p14). The intention was not to develop democratic educational possibilities, but to suppress them. To these ends, the ERA 1988 set a legal framework over the curriculum and assessment, budget delegation, opting-out, Grant Maintained Schools, City Technology Colleges, more accountability over governing bodies, teacher appraisal, League Tables, a revised Parent's Charter and changes to the HMI. However, more than this, the ERA set expectations and identification of achievement 'norms' through Attainment Targets and Programmes of Study. Most importantly, it gave the SoS the power to set both the qualifications and the syllabus permissible in schools (see Appendix F: p49). The ERA constrained educational discourse and so possibilities. The RR had achieved significant control of the 'pedagogic device' (see chapter three: p106) and was determined to use it to ensure domination and cultural reproduction. Policy could now be implemented at a much quicker pace. The document 'From Policy to Practice' (DES 1989a: 3.2) stated that the NC was intended to quicken education reform and ensure 'good curriculum practice' across the country. By setting prescriptive standards and assessment, the RR sought to further influence parental expectation and demand.

Future SoS Gillian Shephard (1989 Hansard Vol. 155, Col. 807-808) reaffirmed education's role in instilling capitalist values through closer links between education and industry. This was to come through teaching that business and wealth creation were important to society, and how industrial needs were met through the

education system. This point was made in more ideological terms by former MfE Rumbold. She stated that everyone had a role to play in the country's economic success, and that pupils should be made aware of their future role (DES News 355/89). The shift to the right had gone so far that the RR's educational discourse centred on the requirements of capitalism rather than the educational needs of the individual. Nevertheless, the attack on education continued to allow the Right to 'discharge' its ideology. O'Hear (1989: p19) claimed that progressive input was dangerous because human nature tended to be uncivilised and the only way to civilise individuals was through the traditions which made British society stable. It was thus essential to preserve traditions of thought and expression through education. It was not a matter of pure reason, immediate experience or self-exploration, but rather a matter of initiation and submission to a long spirit of tradition. The opportunity for pupils to question and evaluate such tradition was not only to be prevented, it was not required because narrow traditions were 'obviously' the only way to ensure civilisation. Baker (1993: p204) stressed that the 'right' history was important to instil the 'right' attitudes;

The teaching of history was seen as doubly important because it conditions children's attitudes to their own country and often to politics. Mrs Thatcher saw history as a pageant of glorious events and significant developments, with our small country having given the world parliamentary democracy, an independent judiciary and a tradition of incorrupt administration⁹⁰.

The purpose of schooling was to make children contribute to the community through imbuing culture and traditions, not through developing individualism (Harris 1989: p45). This suggests it was, primarily, to instil reflexivity towards 'social order' (discipline) and 'social ordering' (structural inequality).

1990 to 1992

By 1990 the RR felt that their 'step-by-step' method of gaining control of education had been successful;

⁹⁰ This is an interesting assertion in light of the allegation of 'cash for questions' levelled at a number of Conservative MPs, some government Ministers, throughout 1996 and 1997.

Over the past 12 years the Government have tried to get to grips with education problems; yet somehow, the education establishment has constantly eluded us. For the first time, we have now brutally taken the whip hand to ensure that what we want to be done will indeed be done (Boyson 1990 Hansard Vol. 195, Col. 683-684).

This statement clearly acknowledged the RR's political intentions. However, control was not just exerted over educationalists, it was also exerted over parents in a rhetoric which gave 'parental choice' and 'parental power' a hollow ring. MfE Eggar made it abundantly clear that parents had no right to withdraw their children from any part of the compulsory NC or its accompanying national testing (NT). He asserted that "...the introduction of the national curriculum does not alter the historical position; nor does the Education Reform Act contain powers that would allow parents to decide which aspects of the national curriculum their children should follow" (1990 Hansard Vol. 183, Col. 594). This was to ensure that education would prepare pupils for the technological, industrial and commercial survival of the nation (Regan 1990: p9).

Further, the RR's job of vilification was not complete. There was still considerable opposition to their policies despite control over discourse and resources. The SR claimed that education was still in the hands of Left wing subversives intent on levelling down to prevent excellence and 'natural' leadership (Radnitzky 1990: p36, Honeyford 1990: p11, Lynn 1991; p38, Deuchar 1992: p38). The writers reiterated claims that the Left was both wasting resources and creating the conditions which led to uniformity, prevented competition and stifled economic freedom and growth. Progressive input was again claimed to lower standards with many pupils leaving school unable to read or write. This led to 'an underclass, crime and cultural defeatism'. The NR claimed that it was common-sense that the motivation to achieve depended on competition and the quality of teaching. ESASC Chairman, Thornton (1990, Hansard Vol. 175, Col. 895) asserted that the RR's education initiatives were 'common-sense' and did not involve "...party dogma, systems or listening to conflicting advice from expert after expert, by which politicians of all parties have been seduced on far too many occasions". Such statements sought to remove educationalists from policy innovation or critique and affirm RR definitions of common-sense as the 'norm'.

RR statements became saturated in ideological intention. SoS MacGregor (DES News 143/90) re-emphasised both links with business to create understanding of enterprise and wealth creation, and the NC's role in the creation of a skilled and responsive workforce. City Technology Colleges (CTCs) were hailed as the instrument to create direct links between education and business and to develop a strong work ethic (MacGregor, 1990 Hansard Vol. 165, Col. 916). Preparation for the future was pronounced by Eggar (DES News 373/90) as the requirement for "...flexible and versatile young people, who are not only literate, numerate and technologically aware, but also self-aware and self-disciplined, with a positive attitude to work". The NCC was given the task of meeting these objectives. The RR message was overt in the NCC publication 'Curriculum Guidance Four - Education for Economic and Industrial Understanding'. The ideology in the document was clear. It outlined that schools were to provide a curriculum which both promoted the aims of the ERA, and helped pupils contribute to society and 'the nation's prosperity' by developing vocational and entrepreneurial skills (NCC 1990b: p1). The NCC (1990a: p1) outlined that for the objectives of the ERA to be met, instilling the duties, responsibilities, moral codes and values of citizenship were essential. The DES (DES News 251/90) indicated that to help children become citizens, they were required to learn both their duties and responsibilities and to understand that British political democracy was established through a history of organisations, structures and institutions which created laws and cultures which bind the nation together. This press release encapsulated RR ideology in a nutshell: citizenship was to mean duty and responsibility to the 'nation state' via the accumulation of capitalist cultural values of 'social Darwinism'. With the RR's redefinition of 'equity' as individual choice to work hard to achieve 'excellence', under-achievement was dismissed as the fault of the individual through lack of effort, or as 'biological' failure due to lack of ability. The moral aspect was the 'repudiation of guilt'. Self-serving 'individualism' was to encourage hard work where people were 'deserving' of rewards. Moral subjugation was not only self-discipline but also of the 'rights' of the 'more able'. Citizenship was to be based on the repudiation of inequality. It was about learning one's 'place'.

Ignoring evidence to the contrary (see Tomlinson 1991: p116), MfE Angela Rumbold argued that;

AR ... We were subjected for a very long time to the so called progressive, I think they were regressive, philosophies of education which said that competition was bad, that people should not be pushed, that children should not have a whole learning experience. All of that is patent nonsense and has resulted in nothing but...a...a...a...consecutive lowering of standards and an inability of children to relate what they are actually trying to do at school. What they are trying to do is to learn and also to find their place. Where they actually fit into society. You cannot expect people to be useful members of society if they do not have any idea where they are (interview).

This statement appears to confirm that the RR was using education for the reproduction of hierarchical social structures where ‘learning’ was to be associated with ‘place’. As such the hegemony of education was to teach pupils to actively seek out their place in society. Statements made by SoS Clarke over content in Geography (Hansard 1990 Vol. 183, wa. 370-371) and History (Hansard 1990 Vol. 183, wa. 371-372) show clearly that the RR did not want children thinking *reflectively*;

I consider that the attainment target should emphasise more strongly knowledge and understanding of aspects of geography and put less emphasis on assessment of skills, however desirable, are not particular to geography, and less emphasis on the assessment of pupil’s exploration of attitudes and values.

Pupils were to fit *reflexively* into the society desired by the RR (Clarke Hansard 1991 Vol. 190, Col. 121);

The orders set out a solid foundation of knowledge, understanding and skills which all children should have in both subjects. We are reinstating those important parts of our knowledge, life, culture and history in our schools.

This sought to subordinate alternative perspectives about historical development and geographical circumstances, and to prevent inquiry and discussion. Clarke referred to alternative views as ‘political bias’, while defending the NC as ‘sensible subjects properly tested’⁹¹. He stated that ATs would ensure that “...knowledge, understanding and skill are rigorously assessed” and that PoS would “...provide a clear framework...to be taught...” (1990 Hansard, Vol. 183, wa., 372). Education was to be

⁹¹ This claim asserts that ‘official’ interpretations of history are neutral, free from bias and misrepresentation.

the learning and testing of 'facts'. The NC set in place a framework which allowed the RR to impose its meanings and interpretations.

Although the RR had gained control of the 'pedagogic device' at the macro level, there was still considerable work to be done to control the implementation of their policies at the meso level (e.g. LEAs and NC Working Groups) and the micro level (in schools). Preventing a 'progressive' reworking of RR policies by teachers would need placing restrictions on the critical evaluation of the national curriculum. Boyson (1991 Hansard Vol. 195, Col. 684) outlined that schools' first duty was to instil discipline and the second duty was to pass on traditional civilisation. The One Nation Group (1992: p16) had also shifted further to the right, adopting the philosophy that "The motivating principles, from the earliest stages of education, must be hard work, high qualifications and readiness to be enterprising". In this way, vocationalism and the work ethic were espoused as a method of maintaining competition and, so, reproducing hierarchical positions to fill social roles. The DES defined failure to achieve as a moral issue, linking it to subsequent failure in the job market and delinquency (Circular 11/91). RR MP Portillo (CPC 1992: p7-8) claimed that educational achievement was dependent on application, rigour, discipline and competition and that the methods of the 1960s were the delusions of a progressive elite. The arguments were the same as those of a decade before. However, they were now educational text. This was the backcloth against which the NCPE was developed between 1991 and 1992.

A Critical Realist Interpretation of RR Reforms

At the macro level, the imperative for the NR/RR was the rejuvenation of capitalist 'arrangements': 'social order' and 'social ordering'. The development of a 'social market' was highly dependent on subjugation to 'traditional' moral values, with 'person rights' replaced by 'property rights' and 'collective responsibility' replaced by 'individual responsibility'. Neo-Liberal interests clearly depended upon neo-Conservative arrangements. The RR policies and practices detailed above show how education was manipulated to further NR/RR ends to construct a vocational base to serve economic ends and to imbue the values of a 'traditional' capitalist citizenship. The intent was to control the form and content of education, through the DES at the

centre, to develop a specific type of economic and social control (Ball 1990: p124, Simon 1991: p503, Prof. J Tomlinson (interview)). Ball (1994: p17) claims that;

The assertion of tradition, of morality and literary history in the face of 'declining standards', cultural heterogeneity and fragmented modernity is not simply an abstract trend. The opposition to progressivism, in art as well as in education, is a political project.

Ensuring central control necessitated changes to the structure of education which would curtail professionalism and exclude educationalist's critique. Thus, initial moves were concerned more with restructuring the institutions and administrative procedures of policy implementation than with improving the quality of education (Marsh and Rhodes 1992: p174). This led to an easier implementation of the 1988 ERA.

The ERA, NC and NT

The ERA, as 'Law', gave the RR both the power to determine centrally what would be reformed, and the opportunity to infuse educational texts with its ideology through legislation (Graham and Tytler 1993, Bowe, Ball and Gold 1992: p10, Evans, Penney and Davies 1995a: p12). Further, it linked education with industrial needs, curtailed consultation, changed the opportunity for professional input and gave the RR control over key sites of recontextualisation of policy in the education system (Ball 1994b: p10). The RR prescribed the agenda of debate (Simon 1991: p557, Ball 1994b: p15). Policy construction became a secret, framed within ideological constraints and directives (Rustin 1989: p62, Lawton 1992: p132, Penney 1994: p54).

ERA policy was constructed to serve 'traditional' capitalist needs. The 'official knowledge' which constructed the NC was constrained within the NR/RR's discursive boundaries. The NC was, thus, an 'official text' which defined the scope of content and allocation of resources, both of which were accountable through measures of efficiency. The RR were able to regulate a context which both generated and validated its capitalist hegemony, and shaped pedagogic practice. This limited the educational value of the NC and its associated testing. Prescribing a 'traditional' curriculum sought to prevent pupils from interpreting the contemporary world (see

Channan 1987: p6). The texts of NC History, Geography and Music were situated in a golden age of Empire. This 'knowledge' could not be tested against reality. The 'facts' were 'given' as 'value free' and were to be 'taken' without questioning or evaluation. Pupils were subordinated to receivers of information which cut them off from empathy of time and place. Ball (1994b: p45) terms this 'the curriculum of the dead' where "...the canon is unchallengeable. The selections are done elsewhere, at other times, they are 'handed down' by the unassailable 'judgement of generations'". The intent was not only to prevent the critical investigation of social hierarchies of inequality and differentiation, it was to justify them to perpetuate social reproduction and social control. Ball (1994b: p35) argues that;

Education and learning here are founded upon alienation, a negation of self; knowledge is valued precisely for its irrelevance, esotericism, detachment, elitism and intrinsic difficulty; learning is an act of abasement, of passivity, of deference. The learner comes to knowledge naive and innocent and leaves that which is learned untouched and unchallenged.

The NC was not only to school children towards the demands of working life, it was to ensure a national uniformity and conformity in what was taught. Mono-culturalism was a focus of this hegemonic project. It would help create and keep an 'English' society (John Tomlinson interview). Ball (1994: p21) suggested that the NC is:

...a fantasy curriculum. It is intended to conjure up and reproduce a fantasy of Englishness, of classlessness, of authority, of legitimacy, of moral order and of consensus" and that "...this is essentially a political and oppressive curriculum. The positionings, forms of thought and exclusions and insultations inscribed within its texts and practices are part of a continuing struggle over what it means to be educated.

Policy based on economic priorities leads to an education system of vocational preparation, which requires certification as a measure of an individual's functional value in capital production (Dale 1989: p137). Education thus, in this perspective, becomes a commodity with capital value to be accumulated to secure employment. This influences parental demand for accumulation and certification. Differentiation is necessary to produce hierarchical stratification. Apple (1990: p19) explains that differentiation;

...is in a large part related both to the role of the school in maximising the production of technical cultural 'commodities' and to the sorting or selecting functions of schools in allocating people to the positions 'required' by the economic sector of society.

This is fused with learning social roles. In this way, differentiation serves to divide society hierarchically as schooling is about instruction rather than learning. It seeks to instil that to make the grade certain criteria must be met (see Illich 1972: p11-12). This is not peculiar to capitalism, however the RR brought it to the fore. Differentiating knowledge and resources at various 'sites' (comprehensives, GMS and CTCs) was intended to produce different levels of 'utility'. Archer (1984: p35) describes this process as 'vertical stratification' through 'horizontal differentiation'.

The NC is a nationalised system of provision. It allows the centre considerable control over content, resourcing and teaching method. With national testing at Key Stages it facilitates selection and provides political and comparative statistics. Further, it posits that individual motivation necessitates competition for rewards while its version of egalitarianism ignores social circumstances. This consolidates 'social order' and 'social ordering' (McPherson and Raab 1988: p14). This chronology indicates that policies were based on narrow political objectives justified in 'common-sense'. Nevertheless, Ball (1990: p3) stresses that;

Policy making in a modern, complex plural society like Britain is unwieldy and complex. It is often unscientific and irrational, whatever the claims of the policy makers to the contrary. In particular the 1988 Education Act contains a number of 'shots in the dark'. Policies without pedigree.

However, there was political intent behind this.

The Effects of NR/RR Reforms

The NR/RR's definition of efficiency centred on measuring economic input (resources) against output (certification). This was based on objective, benchmark standards which facilitated accountability (Dale 1989: p13). There is evidence that this has resulted in 'teaching to the test' with little opportunity or incentive for alternative input or methods (Bowe, Ball and Gold 1992, Chitty (Ed) 1993, Golby

1992, Scott (Ed) 1994). Educational discourse emphasised consumerism, individual freedom and responsibility. However, it confused and conflated the roles of 'democratic citizen' with 'consumer' (Evans and Davies 1993b: p5). Equity changed to assessed quality, with efficiency replacing 'social justice' as the purpose changed from knowing 'why' and 'how' to instrumentality and accountability (see Apple 1989: p4, Ball 1990: p157). With universal provision legitimated in an economic crisis (Dale 1989: p103), Keith Joseph turned 'market philosophy' into an 'educational principle' (Knight 1990: p171). The basis of the discourse was the systematic selection of cultural history for the re-establishment of traditional cultural values (Ball 1994b: p20). It was, however, a 'reconstruction', rather than a 'restoration' of tradition, which sought to reverse cultural diversity. Ball (1994b: p6) outlines that the NC was created to serve this purpose;

The Mk1C and more profoundly and blatantly the Mk2C are attempts to recreate magically a mythical past of English cultural unity. Ethnic and cultural diversity are made invisible by the recomposition of Englishness within the National Curriculum. An imaginary past of national glories and civilising influences is to serve as a model and guardian for the future.

Indeed, much of the NC text was to do with constraint and social control. It sought to structure a technicist vision of the future and prevent schools from engaging in self-critique and progressive practice (see Butterfield 1993: p123). The RR's aim, in my interpretation, was not only to prevent critical evaluation but also to develop a system of accountability and information for the market.

The NR/RR discourse now underpinned educational text and formed its future (Tomlinson A 1993: p90, Evans Penney and Bryant 1993a: p329, Evans, Penney and Davies 1995: p8). Conservative constraints were reasserted over education. Ball (1990 p18) argued that "...a new discursive regime has been established and with it a new form of authority". The rhetoric of moral and social regulation and 'traditional culture' set boundaries for development of the NC. The 'hegemonic project' resulted in "...a successful translation of an economic doctrine into the language of experience, moral imperative and common-sense" (Apple 1989: p7, 1993: p22). The definitions of freedom and equality were no longer 'democratic' but 'commercial'. Access to education was as a consumer not as a citizen (Tomlinson J 1991: p113). Function,

structure and order were built into common-sense (Apple 1990: p96), where the shift was from 'licensed autonomy' to 'regulated autonomy' (Ball 1994b: p25). Ball (1994a: p20) argued that "...it is about drawing the discursive resources which constitute school knowledge more tightly inside and to the state. It is about the suppression of opposing positions". Centrally, the progressive discourse in education was sidelined and egalitarian principles inhibited (Evans and Davies 1993a: p16). The result was;

...a complex dialectic between the discourse of cultural restoration and progressivism [which] ...reveals how the latter was both circumscribed and 'regulated' by sometimes subtle, and at other times quite brutal discursive strategies (Evans and Penney 1995b: p28).

As schools endeavoured to stay viable through competition to secure resources, educational debate at the micro level (amongst teachers) was constrained *within* Right wing discourse, rather than *of* it ⁹². This was 'power', and text developed within these constraints (Bowe, Ball with Gold 1992: p15).

The RR reworked the ideological imperatives of educational language to transform its confines and set a framework of possibility, responsibility and accountability. Terms such as 'parental power and choice', 'efficiency' before 'welfare' and 'accountability' before 'social justice' were slogans to;

...intentionally simplify, reduce and thereby potentially obfuscate and distort the realities of the social world they purport to describe. Their meanings are conveniently transient and depend upon the specifics of social, political or fiscal interests which dominate the political or educational contexts of the day (Evans and Davies 1993a: p12).

Evans and Davies (1993a: p11) claimed that "...beneath the rhetoric of these popular slogans lie deeply held values and conceptions of what individuals and society are and how they ought to be". In this view, the RR used the NC to legitimate and disseminate an authoritarian vision of how society should be. If so, it is important to "...look

⁹² Nonetheless, Bernstein (1990: p174) indicates that there is some relative autonomy and agency where people are 'agents' towards context, content and process. Due to individual interests and interpretations there will be incoherence and struggle over purpose and definition at all implementation levels. However, the power relationship between bodies is still dependent upon the differentiated distribution of resources.

critically at language and ‘texts’ in order to understand the meanings, social relations and cultural practices that underlie them” (Clarke 1992: p146-147). This is important in relation to the RR’s definitions of ‘physical education’ or ‘games’ (discussed in the next chapter)⁹³.

Rather than build a more democratic and fair educational system, NR/RR education provision was concerned to rebuild a differentiated system to aid social reproduction and re-establish SPEC inequality and hierarchy (see Ball 1994b: p126, Walford 1994: p85). The ERA acted to exacerbate cultural difference and diversity;

...The 1988 Education Act...is now revealed in its consequences and in the context of previous social and educational policy as a major tool of social control. In the midst of the establishment of a uniform national curriculum there has begun the process of re-establishing the institutional segregation that existed before the move towards comprehensivisation, multi-culturalism and integration of pupils with special needs (Bash and Coulby 1989: p131).

Pivotaly, Evans argued that the imperative was to prevent reflective activity and critical evaluation of policy in schools (interview 1995). The NR/RR endeavour to imbue a reflexive citizenship was brought closer by the implementation of the ERA.

Conclusion

The NR/RR imperative was to rejuvenate ‘social Darwinism’ based on capitalist arrangements. This necessitated ‘social order’ and ‘social ordering’. My critical realist perspective views that the intent was ‘top-down determinism’ based on capitalist interests of SPEC domination and subordination. This meant shifting concepts of democracy from ‘social rights’ to ‘value for money’ through the ideological manipulation of ‘rationality’. An ideology of economic efficiency was tied into a morality of individual responsibility⁹⁴. RR education policy has been about

⁹³ Because physical education was not so readily accountable through the examination system a greater level of agency and autonomy was possible for teachers in this subject than in others. In many ways, the constraints placed on physical education in terms of language and discourse needed to be even more powerful (see chapter six).

⁹⁴ This notion of ‘ideological ethnic cleansing’ is a useful tool to employ when investigating an endeavour to establish reflexive loyalty and discipline to the nation state, the basic building block of capitalism.

controlling the process of change in seeking to secure specific functional outcomes from schooling. Selection and differentiation were intended to educate an elite and socialise the masses. A discourse legitimating competitive individualism and the limitation of resource distribution created divisions between groups within existing structures. The market in education constrained debate about that discourse as schools competed for 'clients' and so resources. Structural changes meant that central accountability was reduced while subordinates' (schools and parents) accountability increased. Prescription of input and assessment sought to turn education into a process of technical rationality, and constrain both professional input and reflection. It also sought to reduce reflection in 'citizens' in post-school life.

My perspective argues that the 'macro' (central government) intent to create a market in education was the mechanism employed in seeking to establish a divisive 'reaction' at the 'micro' (local) level. This was to fragment, divide and disorganise collective opposition through exacerbated competition for reduced resources. Decentralisation was intended to lead to local responsibility, while the control of resources remained at the centre. Thus, through its ability to control resource distribution, the centre controlled the market mechanism and the competition between schools. Social, political, economic, cultural and educational evaluation of policy was inhibited as the market system constrained educational planning. My argument is that the NC was constructed in seeking to limit educational experiences, to imbue pupils with a mono-cultural bias, create a 'capitalist moral character' and transmit values both *of* and *for* the market economy. A success of the RR project was to take New Right discourse about market forces and accountability into education, discourse that was not acceptable before 1979, and make it part of every day speech. However, RR educational policies were major transformations in limited areas. They, in effect, devolved responsibility and accountability rather than power. The former were measured against Conservative expectations and demands, within resources which severely limited the possibility of alternative educational provision and outcomes. Debate at the local (schools) level was now *within* rather than *of* educational discourse. Prescription and reduced professional autonomy had implications for the limited construction, rather than democratic development, of children's concepts of wider social reality and experience. Educational provision intended to construct a

'citizenship' by transmitting selected 'vocational, moral and traditional values'. As we see in the following chapter, the physical education curriculum was intended to play a central role in this endeavour.

Chapter Six

New Right / Radical Right Aims and Physical Education

Introduction

This chapter identifies physical education's role in the RR's hegemonic project to shift the UK's social values from 'social democracy' (justice and egalitarianism) to the 'social market' (competition and hierarchy) on the ideological grounds of 'social Darwinism': reward based on notions of meritocracy through 'effort and ability', with the 'repudiation of guilt' by the strong towards the weak. It highlights how the neo-Liberal and neo-Conservative aspects of the NR discourse were not mutually exclusive. Rather, physical education, as defined by the NR/RR, afforded a vehicle for their transmission through the values inherent in traditional games and sports. This, I argue, centred on the endeavour to construct and imbue a definition of reflexive 'citizenship' which would reproduce capitalist arrangements. Schooling was intended to produce both 'social order' and 'social ordering'. Physical education's historical function as part of the curriculum is discussed in chapter three (see p107). This chapter outlines how the RR were able to establish their discourse as the dominant discourse in physical education in state schools from 1992. It identifies the RR's aims for 'physical education', and contrasts them with other perhaps more progressive developments in educational practice advocated by educationalists. It is shown how the two were incompatible. The RR was determined to have its definition of physical education as 'sport and games' accepted as common-sense in the public's mind. It thus sought to construct, and then protect, a mythical tradition of games and sports in state schools. The RR's attempt to undermine progressive developments, through a combination of symbolic attack and material controls to constrain their dissemination and development in schools, is discussed by outlining the chronological development of legislation and rhetoric which strove to reinforce each other. The analysis highlights the increasing levels of control imposed by the RR on education in its attempt to suppress the progressive discourse. A contrast is made between the RR MP's justification for compulsory competitive team games and a critical realist interpretation of the reforms made to physical education between 1979 and 1992.

Physical Education as a Mechanism of Socialisation

There have long been ideological differences amongst professional educators and politicians over the perception of physical education's role and function. No definition of physical education is politically, socially or culturally neutral (Kirk 1992b: p25). How the words 'physical education' are defined influence pupils' experiences in schools and, thus, their socialisation (see chapter three: p103). Social and political groups, therefore, struggle to have their definitions privileged in the physical education text as 'common-sense'. Evans and Davies (1986: p15) point out that "...what passes for physical education in the school curriculum is neither arbitrary nor immutable. It is a social construct, laden with values...". It is therefore important to know "...not only about how certain activities have evolved and become established and legitimated in the PE curriculum but also to consider (and discover) those that were left out and the social, political and pedagogical reasons for their omission" (Evans and Davies 1986: p28). This is vital in understanding the connections between the RR's political intent, its definition of physical education as 'sport and games' and the development of the NCPE.

NR/RR Aims through 'Physical Education'

The NR/RR first outlined their intentions for physical education policy in the Black Papers in the 1960s and 1970s. These both attacked progressive developments in education and advocated 'traditionalism' (see chapter five: p165, and Appendix F: p36). Contributors argued that it was vital to secure competition in education to maintain the nation's economic and social stability. Sport was viewed as an important vehicle to promote competition;

..competition in sport encourages pupils to aim higher and achieve more in their physical development...The notion that everyone except 'the winner' will be either eaten up with envy or demoralised by a sense of failure does not belong in a realistic view of life (Boyson 1970: p100).

None of the Black Paper discourse referred to 'physical education'. 'Physical activity' in schools was almost always inevitably referred to as 'sport', which had to be competitive to be worthwhile. Progressivism was attacked as unrealistic and therefore

not 'common-sense' (Boyson 1969 and 1970, Editorial 1977). The Black Papers emphasised individual competition rather than collective action. Lynn (1977: p108) claimed that "...there is little doubt that individual competitiveness is a powerful motive to work, effort and achievement and that children will work harder when the situation is one of individual competition than when this motive is not called into play". He (1977: p110) argued that "It is desirable that children should work hard, and therefore it is sensible to strengthen the various forms of competitive impulses such as marks, prizes, streaming, examinations and so forth". This highlighted the notion of excellence and so the development of an acceptance of hierarchy based on 'ability and effort' which fitted the NR/RR's 'social Darwinist' discourse of individual responsibility and 'selfism' (see chapter four: p132). Lynn (1977: p111) argued that progressive developments were destroying competition which was in turn creating an economic crisis. He claimed that the UK required a competitive trading base to stabilise the economy and to develop national stability, where nationalism would play its part in ensuring that the work-force produced their best. This highlighted the NR/RR's functional view of physical activity.

Christopher Knight⁹⁵ claimed that the NR/RR saw 'sport' as central to developing the values and attitudes required by the market economy;

CK All this leads back to the implementation of the NC. Joseph was a utilitarianist. The whole thrust of the Tory policy was the 'utilitarian thrust' against the egalitarian socialism. They believe in physical education for its utilitarian benefits, competition, the nation state, serving the best needs of nation. It is nothing to do with giving children equal opportunities to be involved in activity (interview).

The NR/RR wished to manufacture a British character that would establish 'licensed individualism'. Their ideological definition of 'physical education' sought to develop a 'character' which would accept the status quo and the dominant values unquestioningly. This was confirmed by Conservative Party education advisor A1 during interview;

⁹⁵ Knight researched the Conservative Party's education policy from 1950 to 1986 (Knight 1990).

A1 Sport is a very powerful tool in disciplining pupils. There is regimented control, almost military. Nothing else in the world can achieve such a level of discipline, co-ordination and organisation.

A1 also stated that the type of education required was not a process of *educating* pupils to become independently inquisitive but of *training* them to become docile and disciplined for the good of the nation - "...winning, losing, guts, grit and determination". In his view these were the traditional values of the public school, which were to be brought into state schools.

Creating the idea that failure was due to lack of effort or ability, rather than any social, cultural or economic conditions, was central to the RR's endeavour to encourage and establish 'the repudiation of guilt' by the physically or socially 'strong' towards the 'weak' (see chapter four: p133). Physical education, as sport, was intended to instil a 'work ethic', competition, moral self-control, discipline and obedience. It was to play its part in the RR's hegemonic project to create a negative stereotype of the 'undeserving underclass' and to reconstruct a traditional (capitalist) social order and social ordering. Physical education was to be used;

...to solve an economic crisis and to sponsor or encourage the development of a particular social order or a certain attitude of mind among its citizens...the shaping of individuals through the family, the education system is the shaping of generations (Evans, Penney and Bryant 1993a: p328).

Citizenship was a central plank of the hegemonic project. The RR's moral values were to be installed as society's values, and social and cultural practices were to be transformed to become a 'new' tradition.

Progressive Developments in Physical Education

Prior to the development of the NC in 1988 there had been a near absence of serious debate and informed discussion about physical education at the national level (Parry 1988). There had never been a central controlling point for the promotion of a clear direction (Almond 1989). Post 1945 the content and methods of physical education (like those of every other subject) had evolved with little direct intervention from the

state⁹⁶. Provision depended on the resources secured for the subject inside schools. For many pupils physical education mainly encompassed an experience of 'traditional competitive team games' (TCTG), gymnastics and athletics.

Throughout the 1960s and 1970s physical educationalist's knowledge and understanding expanded with developments in both learning theories and medical research about physiological and psychological well-being (BAALPE 1989a). Some physical educationalists were beginning to question the emphasises placed on, as well as the educational value of, the experience of TCTG for the majority of children. Critique of the physical education programme originated from the principles of 'progressive' education. Progressive developments were not hostile to sport and games, but sought to change the emphasis from performance to education, and to reduce the elitism and inequality created by the performance centred model. Physical educationalists hoped to create successful, positive experiences for all, and to encourage participation by choice through increasing pupils' understanding of the requirements of physical and mental well-being, and fostering confidence in their own ability. Progressive critique aimed to move physical education away from teacher dominated instruction to pupil centred 'problem solving'. It argued that education was a process of children 'learning to learn', not a set of limited, and limiting, objectives about the end results of games and sport. The concern was to develop individual's independence and future participation through choice based on knowledge and understanding, rather than just developing games skills. However, games were still the dominant activity (see Fox 1987: p248). The focus was on teaching methods. The urge to empower all children aimed to stimulate discussion over the role and purpose of 'sport' in the curriculum. Physical education was beginning to argue that it was not a technocratic subject with fixed objectives, but a process of development where 'excellence' meant fulfilling individual potential, not technical efficiency in a limited number of activities.

⁹⁶ The 1940s to 1960s was a period where traditional competitive games dominated the physical education programme. The 1960s to 1970s saw a push for a broad and balanced curriculum. In the 1970s and 1980s this led to the development of Health Related Fitness and Teaching Games For Understanding. The 1980s saw the expansion of Health Related Exercise. It also saw the first direct central intervention with the development of the NC. The 1990s has seen the development of Sports Education and the re-emergence of 'games' as a central part of the physical education curriculum.

Higher Education (HE) and some LEAs were at the forefront of progressive developments which were disseminated through professional journals and in-service education (Evans and Clarke 1988). HE began to question taken for granted interpretations of the social and socialising role of physical education (Evans 1986: p4). A greater awareness developed of the effects of expectation, labelling and the self-fulfilling prophecy through organisational practices which led to 'socialisation' rather than education. Physical education texts were critiqued for their role in the more damaging aspects of social and cultural reproduction (Evans and Clarke 1988: p125). Teachers were encouraged to question the origins and cultural functions of curriculum content. The aim was to stimulate thinking and talking about physical *education*, construct a worthwhile curriculum for all pupils and alter teaching methods away from teacher centred direction and measurement.

By the mid 1980s physical educationalists had begun to reflect critically on the aims, form and content of physical education, and a new discourse developed (Evans and Clarke 1988: p126-130). Based on progressive ideals, it aimed to empower the individual (Kirk 1992: p160). 'Teaching Games for Understanding' (TGFU) and 'Health Related Fitness/Education' (HRE), together termed 'new PE' (Leaman 1988: p100), sought to increase pupils' knowledge and understanding. The 'new PE' developed alongside the 'traditional' content and methods of physical education but emphasised a child centred approach (Evans 1990: p160). TGFU and HRF were **not** a total rejection of competition. However, the narrow elitism of traditional games was challenged and the 'new PE' attempted to become the 'privileging text'. The new discourse challenged 'traditional' values of 'skilling' and aimed to empower pupils through both knowledge and understanding of physical activity and critical evaluation of their own bodily requirements (Almond 1989e: p15, Bailey 1989: p29, Beck 1990: p356, Casbon 1992: p6, Evans 1989: p189). Fred Hirst of BCPE outlined the philosophy of empowerment;

FH ... One of the biggest messages, maybe one of the things that I would like to feel has changed over the last twenty years, is that we have moved away from the emphasis on *physical* education to physical *education*. That we are telling children more and more what it is they are doing and why they are doing it. Our aim is give them the opportunity to discover and find out for themselves.

As such, physical activity was to be about 'learning to learn' through enquiry and understanding (Salter 1990: p305). The 'new PE' did not seek to ban competitive games but, rather, to change teachers attitudes and reduce the emphasis on activities which acted to favour some children against others. Thus, it not only aimed to empower the individual physically, it also aimed to empower them socially (Evans 1989: p189). The new discourse sought to expose how traditional methods were constructed to prevent this happening (Hardy and Sparkes 1987: p29-30). The focus on equal opportunities questioned the taken for granted, common-sense, cultural values of 'traditional content' and the creation of hierarchy and status through competitive team games. Critical reflection on the 'socialisation' of conservative values through the traditional curriculum was undertaken in the endeavour to promote egalitarian principles of equality of opportunity. This was through a widening of content and a change in teaching methods which was, in effect, a different form of socialisation. This did no more than reflect the wider social changes and did not signal that physical educators were at the forefront of 'radical' educational change.

This was a period of discovery and innovation within a rationale of child centred education. It was not a period of radical ideological change. It was, rather, a period of consolidation and stabilisation (Kirk 1992b: p13). The 'new PE' strove to become the 'official discourse' and thus the 'official pedagogic practice' (Evans 1986, Evans and Clarke 1988: p125, Kirk 1992b: p9). Physical education was moving towards a consensus over the progressive developments (Murdoch 1991: p22). However, the developments were not met with universal approval within the profession or the world of sport (George and Kirk 1986: p146, Hendry 1986: p54). Internal debate about the nature and purpose of physical education was thrust into the public eye (Leaman 1988). TGFU and HRF came under attack from powerful interest groups. In the mid 1980s the National Governing Bodies (NGBs), through the Central Council for Physical Education (CCPR), lobbied Government for a return to the 'traditional' forms of physical activity in schools. It claimed that the 'new PE' was leading to the demise of traditional team games and that a 'traditional sporting heritage' was in decline. However, others claimed that traditional competitive teams games had never been the 'popular culture' (Thomas 1989: p7). Nonetheless, the

Right placed considerable emphasis on the definition of physical education as 'sport and games'. It identified (its definition of) physical education as the guardian of the nation's health and national sporting prowess, and as occupying time for the unemployed (discussed below). There was clearly a direct conflict between the aims of NR/RR and the progressive developments in physical education.

To the NR/RR, school physical activity was there to serve the needs of a capitalist economy. The intent was to use the 'games ethic' to imbue the masses with 'appropriate' values. Compulsory competitive games were viewed as the method to assist 'socialisation'. The RR, thus, needed to create a false history of a 'games ethic' in physical education in state schools. It could then claim that progressive educators were deconstructing it for politically subversive ends. The RR, therefore, needed to attack the progressive discourse as the cause of 'crisis', and advocate a return to 'tradition' as the 'common-sense' solution. My argument is that these conflicts played a central part in the development of the NCPE (see chapter seven: p255, and Appendix I: p101).

RR Attack on Progressivism: The Ideological Redefinition of Physical Education

The NR/RR intended to use education as a means of establishing the morals associated with 'Victorian values' and 'vigorous virtues' as the norm (see chapter four: p122). However, the progressive discourse had already challenged such aims. Therefore, the RR needed to soften-up opposition to its initiatives within the education establishment and define physical education as 'sport and games' in the public's mind. My argument is that the RR used its political authority to combine control over material (economic/legislative) resources, to constrain progressive possibilities in educational provision, with symbolic (ideological/discursive) resources, to publicly vilify the progressive discourse while advocating its 'traditional' discourse as the common-sense definition of physical education. As we shall see, this involved a step-by-step undermining of physical education's status combined with the reiteration of the values of 'sports and games'.

Chronology

1979 to 1983

The Right's education policies pressed for efficiency, accountability, productivity and instrumentality based on tradition and utility. The endeavour to undo progressive developments across education had an imperative in physical education. This began as soon as the RR took office in 1979 with the undermining of physical education's status. It was outlined by MfE Boyson (Hansard 1979, Vol. 969, Col. 532) that "Manchester is distinguished by music and sport, but schools were created for academic purposes". This position of inferiority was endorsed by the government's review of the curriculum which concluded that the essential subjects were mathematics, English, sciences and a foreign language (PT, No. 18, 1981). Further, DES Admin. Memo 1/82 stated that INSET training was to be targeted towards those 'priority areas'. Reduced status adversely effected physical education's ability to secure resources and therefore develop progressive initiatives. Its status was damaged still further by DES Circular 4/82's emphasis that "...a major factor in defining the worth of a school remains that of academic performance". This was compounded when Boyson (Hansard 1981, Vol. 13, wa. 47) drew attention to the high cost of maintaining surplus playing fields and stated that schools should sell surplus land to raise capital.

This undermining of status was coupled with an endorsement of 'traditional values' which outlined the type of 'citizenship' the RR wished to develop. SoS for the Environment Munro (1979 Hansard Vol. 977, Col. 886) claimed that;

...education is valuable to the development of character and discipline. One can also develop character and discipline through team games and the discipline provided by a referee and captain...it makes one realise the importance of being taught in the correct way.

Discipline and character training were clearly not only to apply to pupils, but also to teachers as part of a controlling mechanism. Physical education was defined as sport, and the argument for its inclusion in the curriculum was outlined in narrow political

terms. Munro (Hansard 1979 Vol. 977, Col. 889-890) argued that physical education *was* sport and that to be as such the RR;

... want to see the clubs coming into the schools and the schools being in close contact with the clubs...I hope that my remarks on schools generally and on education will fall on receptive ears, because this is where we ought to start, at the base of the pyramid, if we want to have Coes and Ovetts that we have now for many years to come.

The use of 'sport' rather than 'physical education', with the 'obvious' benefits for international sporting prestige, sought to saturate the public's perspective and so expectation and demand for sport in school, rather than any other perhaps more liberal or progressive view. The type of character and morals the RR desired became explicit in parliamentary debates. Conservative MP Greenway (Hansard 1979 Vol. 982, Col. 995-696) emphasised the importance of team games in establishing the RR's moral principles;

Those [moral] values have a particular appeal to school children. A great deal is conveyed to pupils by means of team games...We should constantly stress the fact that fair play is valuable on the field, off the field and in all that one does in life. That can be taught by means of team games. I want to encourage strongly the great value of fair play in both team and individual sports. I wish to encourage give and take, because that is what life is all about...These values should be taught as long as the pupil remains in school. They should be taught every day from the moment that the school starts to the moment it ends. High standards of work, behaviour, discipline and attendance will follow upon respect for high values.

Team games were viewed to transfer 'values' to other aspects of life. They were, clearly, intended to play a vital role in RR education policy from the outset, not just with the development of the NCPE. The ideology behind this rhetoric increased as the RR gained more control over education.

1984 to 1986

By securing a second term in government the RR was gaining the upper hand, both ideologically and materially. It had the power to 'soften-up' opposition by constraining resources and marginalising alternative discourses. It was now possible

to advocate RR ideals about physical activity in schools. MfE MacFarlane (1984 Hansard, Vol. 78, Col. 867) rationalised the selling of land by equating physical education with ‘recreation’, stating that other areas of the curriculum were more important;

The Government encourage local authorities to dispose of surplus land. I am sure my colleagues will agree that that must represent sound financial management. We must all take the broad view of need. Sometimes the urgent requirements locally will be for a use other than recreation. That is inevitable. It is up to the local authority. The House will also be aware that falling school rolls inevitably mean that some schools can shed facilities. Statutory Instrument 909 prescribes minimum requirements. We should regard it as protection rather than as a threat, because for the first time ever it provides minimum requirements⁹⁷.

While encouraging the sale of land, this statement, at the same time, put the responsibility for provision directly with the LEAs. Administrative Memorandum 2/81 set minimum requirements for playing fields, which gave a ‘green light’ for schools to sell land. This was attractive to schools. It not only raised capital but also created savings in maintenance costs. Thus, despite putting a great public emphasis and demands on physical education, specific economic and educational policies did more to reduce its status within the context of the school and therefore its ability to secure resources. The emphasis of political representation was on improving the quality of provision to pupils, while in practice the quality of provision was being systematically eroded.

In a rhetoric which promoted both neo-Conservative and neo-Liberal imperatives, the RR continued to emphasise the values of ‘sport’. Conservative MP Ashby’s 1984 speech encapsulated all the aspects of the NR/RR’s discourse. He invoked history and nationalism together in seeking to inculcate a myth of past unity and co-operation;

⁹⁷ The stipulation of minimum requirements was important in terms of the resources required to provide a progressive programme compared to providing ‘games’ (see chapter seven: p267, and Appendix H: p88).

Sport is part of the national heritage and culture. We are the nation who gave the world the three major team sports of cricket, football and rugby. When our sporting representatives are successful, the whole country shares in their success, our national morale is uplifted, our world standing improves, and even our businesses feel the benefit (Hansard 1984 Vol. 63, Col. 711).

The conception of nationalism was highly pertinent to the RR in its aim to reconstruct social control based on a mono-cultural loyalty and obedience to the capitalist nation state. Ashby (1984 Hansard Vol. 63, Col. 712) continued by juxtaposing aspects of health improvement through physical activity with playing sport;

The benefits of participation in sport are numerous. It brings much needed exercise, which medical research has shown to be essential for a long and healthy life. It encourages competitiveness and achievement, which are necessary for a healthy nation.

This selective use of evidence by the RR was rhetorical justification for 'sport', however it was not the reality (see Appendix I: p96-99). It is clear that Ashby's comments about the 'health of the nation' through competition and achievement did not refer to medical health, but to the economic, political, cultural and social 'fitness' of a capitalist market economy. He claimed, "I need hardly reiterate the social value of sporting activities to an unemployed youth or to combating youth crime" (Hansard 1984 Vol. 63, Col. 712). Ashby continued, highlighting sport's function of producing a fitter 'male' workforce;

I refer to the fitness and health of our working population. ...A fit man is undoubtedly a much better worker...We need only consider by how much the national health bill would be reduced and how much more revenue there would be from greater productivity to understand the long term saving that a fiscal policy that included a sport and recreation input could bring (Hansard 1984 Vol. 63, Col. 713).

This tied 'sport' directly to the needs of capitalism / industry: the production of capital, capital savings and the reduced distribution of resources to the welfare state. Sport was also clearly outlined as a tool of 'post-school' social control. Conservative MP Brandon-Bravo (Hansard 1985 Vol. 78, Col. 853) indicated that;

In a climate of high unemployment - a social problem that will be with us for a long time - the ability to offer the people an outlet for their energies by way of sporting activities is a small but important way of easing the depressing burden of enforced idleness due to unemployment.

1986 to 1987

Popular themes were taken up by the RR in a rhetoric reflecting the wider hegemonic project. This was evident in the debate over the 1986 Education Bill. Right wing Tory MP Cash (1986 Hansard, Vol. 102, Col. 998) outlined that the determination to have traditional competitive team games included as part of the 1986 Act was "...not just about getting children on to playing fields..", it was about "...team co-operation, health, education, competition and national standards for sport.". Munro outlined the type of 'character' this would require;

Why is sport and recreation so important in education? I believe that sport and recreation and the part that games play in education are all part of the quality of education and we see the development of character and leadership through team games and individual pursuits....Team spirit may be a throw away line, but it is vital at school and in many aspects of life. It develops loyalty in every aspect. It enables the building of morale and the acceptance of discipline (Hansard 1986 Vol. 102, Col. 1001-1002).

This statement encapsulated the RR's endeavour to ensure licensed individualism in the market economy. Sport and competitive games were to function to foster the 'right' character, attitudes, values and beliefs in wider society. The RR were determined to ensure that they were prominent in a child's experiences in school. SoS for the Environment Nicholas Ridley gave 'sport' an almost monumental importance;

Sport plays a vital role in everyday life. We recognise its importance to people and in the national and international scene. At home, sporting activity provides a healthy and enjoyable leisure pursuit; sport provides civic and national pride: it can assist social and community aims; it has a significant impact on the economy. Internationally, sport can extend British influence and prestige and promote trade and stability - not least in the Commonwealth (cited in the School Sports Forum 1988: p5)

This statement again highlighted sport's utility in promoting nationalism and the nation state in the maintenance of SPEC stability.

Prior to the 1987 General election, education was central to the RR campaign. Opposition to RR policies had been softened-up both within education and more widely. The timing of the RR's most vociferous attacks on educationalists were important in relation to the public debate about physical education prior to the development of the NC. In parliamentary debates on 'sport' the deliberate creation of a moral panic over lost values, the health of the nation and the effects on national sporting success was evident. RR MPs accused the Left of aiming to remove all competition. Greenway (Hansard 1986 Vol. 90, Col 535) was prominent, stating that "...team games are being stamped out in many Labour controlled authorities because it is said that they foster a competitive instinct in children". Cash (Hansard 1986 Vol. 102, Col. 996) reiterated that the RR aimed to foster a competitive instinct in children;

My argument is about competition in schools and that part of the curriculum which covers sporting activities. It is directly related to the Government's philosophy and policy. ...I can do no better than to repeat what the SoS said shortly before 9 July when he commented; "Equality of opportunity means the achievers must be allowed to achieve. If you don't believe that, then everything will sink into grey mediocrity." The SoS added; "The world is a highly competitive place and nations which cannot compete go under." That was said not in the context of competition alone, but specifically about the absurd attempts of the Labour controlled ILEA to abolish competitive sports in schools to save losers from humiliation

Again the links with what capitalist needs were thought to be were outlined (the nation state, hierarchy through competition and defeating socialism). Further, Greenway (Hansard 1986 Vol. 102, Col. 1004) stressed that social control (this time in relation to behaviour both inside and outside school) was to be achieved through compulsory, traditional competitive team games;

Because of the lack of sport and competitive team games our schools are losing a crucial and helpful ingredient in the education of our young. If children can take part in games, particularly competitive team games, under the direction of a referee or an umpire, they can press one another to the limit, under proper rules. Children will press one another to the limit at other times if they are not allowed team games. I know from long experience that that is one reason for the type of aggression that is appearing in some schools. Children must be allowed an outlet for their physical and mental energies and their determination to compete. If that is not allowed in sport there will be

aggravation of a type we do not want....Sadly we are losing out as a nation because of the weakness of sport in schools.

Greenway's claims were based on ideological imperatives and opinion. There was no mention of the educational value of sport and games. His claims were not substantiated by research which was being disseminated in physical education journals at that time (Hendry 1986). This suggested that games still dominated the curriculum, however, for many, they resulted in failure and negative experiences which categorised pupils as inept due to the emphasis on competition and winning (Pain 1986: p5, Saunders 1986: p17). The conflict over discourses was exacerbated.

When, in 1986, it became public knowledge that a Bristol primary school decided to hold a non-competitive sports day, the Right exuded 'moral outrage' (Pollard 1988). It argued that this was evidence of a 'crisis' of 'moral decline' in education. Progressive physical education was attacked as 'fashionable' egalitarian mediocrity, based on subversive 'loony' left-wing ideology. This undermined the 'traditional' principles, values and functions of games and sports by removing competition and concentrating on equity of opportunity rather than excellence. The Right claimed that teachers worked against common-sense by enforcing a levelling down of ability by removing neutral and natural competition⁹⁸. Progressive physical education was blamed for falling standards in international sport, and for the moral, social and economic decline of the nation (see Evans and Davies 1988). The right-wing attack sought to generate a 'moral panic' about state education (Kirk 1992b: p4, Thomas 1989: p7), and physical education took a central role (Evans 1986 and 1988).

Critique of physical education came to a head with a concerted offensive by the BBC (Panorama March 1987) and the Times newspaper. Both endorsed the Right's attack on 'progressive' physical education. Sport and national stability were linked, the latter portrayed as central in the nation's economic and social stability. The aim, it seemed, was to make physical education conform to the interests of competitive sport. The media emphasised the need for tighter control over, and reform of, ITE. However, this had already begun as early as 1981 (see Appendix G: p57).

⁹⁸ See Evans 1992: p233, Evans and Clarke 1988: p128, Kirk 1992a: p219, Leaman 1988: p107, Thomas 1991: p60.

Nonetheless, this 'new' attack on teachers acted as a further justification for reforms (see chapter seven: p271). Further, the RR attack that games were being banned was misleading. Games still dominated the curriculum (Hardy and Sparkes 1987: p29).

By the time of the public debate, physical education was already suffering due to the further reductions to its status. Market competition between schools was to the fore, and 'per capita funding' effected decision making within schools. The hierarchical order of subjects was exacerbated, not only through parental choice and governors' responsibilities to attract more 'custom', but through government legislation on the provision of ESGs based on the SoS's approval. The downwards spiral of resourcing and status reinforced each other (see Evans, Penney and Bryant 1993b, Penney and Evans 1991a). The policy to fund INSET through the 'In-Service Teacher Training Grants Scheme' (DES Circular 1/86) meant that bids had to be made for resources. However, provision was only made available for the 'priority areas'. The SCDC (1987: p180) highlighted that physical education was not eligible for ESGs for INSET as it was not a 'priority'. With fifty percent of funding for INSET having to be met locally, physical education's low status meant that it was not a focus for spending. In light of this, the PEA undertook a 'Commission of Enquiry' (PEA 1987: p52) to evaluate physical education provision in schools. It found that resources were constrained, facilities were poor, teachers were over stretched and that the Advisory service had been reduced dramatically. It warned that the failure to identify physical education as a priority area for INSET was reducing the quality of provision. Cuts to in-service education had broken down the practice of considering ITE and INSET as a continuous and effective process. Most worryingly, the PEA reported that resource constraints resulted in non-specialists staff using unsatisfactory equipment, which was dangerous and a cause for concern (PEA 1987: p11).

The 'outcry' about the state of physical education led the government, through the DES and DoE, to organise a seminar to discuss the state of 'sport in schools' (see Rumbold, Hansard 1986 Vol. 106, wa. 567). It is significant that the focus was 'sport in schools' (see chapter seven: p239). A Desk Study (Murdoch 1987) was commissioned and the Schools' Sports Forum (SSF 1988) was established within the Sports Council. Both were to investigate 'Sport in Schools'. Murdoch's 'Desk Study'

outlined that resources dictated the curriculum and that physical education was an expensive subject to provide. A quality provision required adequate resourcing. The Report echoed the PEA's concerns about INSET;

The continued reduction in the strength of the Advisory Service in Physical Education is giving rise to concern. This is seen by many as a serious erosion of the structured system of support for schools as a retrogressive step when most of the evidence is calling for more coherent liaison between agencies, much can only be brought about by personnel who have a co-ordinating role (Murdoch 1987: p24).

Murdoch also indicated that the attack on physical education was full of misrepresentation. It both misinformed the public and was exploited for political capital and specific interests. The CCPR's attack on physical education was not driven by educational concerns but by its own interests in promoting competitive sport (Murdoch 1987: p39). Murdoch highlighted that by attacking the progressive input in physical education, the press, sport and MPs were at one-and-the-same time both creating a myth of a traditional physical education and bemoaning its demise. She explained that the new and emerging philosophy within physical education was **not** anti-competition. Rather, educationalists accepted that competition was a part of life and, when 'healthy', had positive outcomes. Further, due to increased professionalism, teachers adopted new methods, away from the technocratic command style to styles which encouraged learning through positive experiences of activity and competition. Thus, although the Right sought to privilege its definition of physical education through the debate, to its dismay the progressive discourse found a platform through committees established by the government to discuss the place of sport in schools (see Murdoch 1987, SSF 1988, WGIR 1991). In the eyes of the Right, physical education had become insufficiently competitive, vocational, anti-social and too educational and egalitarian (Evans, Penney and Bryant 1993a: p325). It was not the sort of preparation for life that the Right needed for its 'social market' economy.

It is highly significant that the debate over physical education was at its height in an election year when the construction of the NC was at the forefront of RR policy (see chapter seven: p239 and Appendix H: p72). The right-wing discourse was full of powerful cultural and political influences. It endeavoured to manipulate public

attitudes about the physical education profession, and to foster an expectation of, and demand for, physical education as *sport*. It was no accident that nationalism and sport were linked, or that the latter was espoused as a tool of cohesion and identity. Sport's function of bolstering national prestige would come through the concentration on elite performance. With imperative political interests, the RR vilified or ignored the mounting body of research which contradicted its discourse (see chapter seven: p249). The 1987 Conservative manifesto outlined that the Party wanted "...to encourage competitive sport through schools and clubs" and that they "...strongly oppose any attempts to ban competitive sports in schools" (p96). Its attack on the Left was a rhetorical justification for central controls to ensure competitive team games as part of the curriculum. This narrow political rhetoric was reiterated in parliamentary debates. MfS Moynihan (Hansard 1987 Vol. 113, Col. 221) argued that;

There is no greater challenge facing those of us who love sport and believe in excellence in sport and participation than that which exists in the present education system...It is exemplified by educationalists telling the parents of boys and girls - young primary school kids who wish to compete in competitive primary school football leagues on Saturdays - that they do not believe in such sport because it breeds sexist and competitive instincts. That is not only educationally damaging - this view is shared by many hon. Members - but fundamentally mitigates against every child's inherent wish to perform, participate and strive for excellence in sport. That is especially so in primary schools in which half the football teams are made up of boys and girls. The idea that this breeds sexist instincts is wrong....We must concentrate strongly on that area of education policy and attack those who think otherwise. Then, and only then, will the grass roots - the youngsters - have the ability and the opportunity to excel. Only then will we have the sports stars in the future and the international status that we have experienced and enjoyed in the past.

Moynihan (1987, Hansard, Vol. 122, Col. 532) outlined sport's utilitarian role;

Firstly we must improve the nation's health. Particularly, the United Kingdom has a relatively high death rate from heart disease. Sport and exercise help to reduce that rate and the heavy call on health resources. This will help to promote the benefits of participation in sport for individuals and for the community. Secondly, we must alleviate social deprivation. Sport can and should be used as a policy tool in areas of high unemployment and deprivation. In particular, sport and recreation each can provide a catalyst for channelling the energies of the young into constructive and satisfying activities contributing to their self-esteem and discipline. Both recreation and competitive sport can contribute to community confidence and cohesion, especially in pockets of social deprivation. Thirdly, we must help to promote excellence in sport at national and international levels. Some help is necessary

to enable prospective international competitors to meet their rivals on equivalent terms. Success in sport reflects well on both our standing in the world and on trade and morale.

Conjoining an attack on physical educationalists with the positing of the RR's discourse on 'sport and games' sought to constrain discursive possibilities in the forthcoming development of the NCPE at a time when progressive practices were being consolidated in physical education. Moynihan (Hansard 1987 Vol. 122, Col. 533) stressed sport's place in the NC when he indicated that "We have recognised the importance of proper physical education and sport provision for all children by proposing that physical education should be a foundation subject within the national curriculum".

1988 to 1992

By 1988 the government clearly changed the emphasis in its rhetoric from physical education to sport. Rumbold (Hansard, Vol. 159, wa. 215) stated that "Sport is an important element in physical education, which is a foundation subject in the national curriculum. It will therefore form part of the curriculum for every pupil aged five to 16 in a maintained schools". However, the RR's rhetoric was contradicted by the Schools Sports Forum (SSF). The SSF's 1988 report echoed Murdoch's 'Desk Study' and the PEA's concerns about resource levels for physical education. A body set up by the Government to review sport in school, concluded that physical education should be a child centred, progressive development for all, and that progress should be according to individual development not by age 'norms' (SSF 1988: p4). This signalled a clear conflict not only between the RR and physical educationalists, but also between the RR and the Sports Council.

The 1988 ERA effected physical education's status both directly and indirectly. The hierarchical implementation of the NC suggested that physical education was a 'third order' foundation subject. ESGs were to be targeted to NC priority areas (DES Circular 5/88), and LMS funding was to be based on a formula weighted by subject status (DES Circular 7/88). Competition in the internal education market was neither equal nor fair. Despite the rhetoric of fairer allocation of resources

(see Appendix F: p51), LMS was having a profound effect on physical education, crucially, in terms of resource allocation. With physical education expensive to fund, 'status' was critical in determining what could be provided. Resource distribution therefore influenced educational possibilities. However, resources covered more than just finances. Research by Evans, Penny and Bryant (1993a, 1993b, 1993c, 1993d) revealed that staffing in some schools was reduced, and the quality of physical education detrimentally effected. They found that non-specialist involvement in the physical education curriculum meant that programmes were tailored to suit their abilities rather than the needs of the pupils. Further, they found that the reduction of resources was resulting in the re-establishment of 'games' as the dominant provision to suit both the lack of facilities and the abilities of non-specialists. As a result, the educational status of physical education was being further reduced to *activity* rather than *education*. Low status, late NC implementation, a lack of NC documentation, the academic hegemony and the internal competition for resources under LMS resulted in further disadvantage for physical education in negotiations over resource allocation (Penney and Evans 1991a, Penney and Evans 1994). Further, governors' discussions about physical education increasingly revolved around the use of sport to market the school, rather than its educational value (Sparkes 1990a and 1992b, Comer and Sparkes 1992).

The progressive discourse was now endorsed in 'official' reports. However, the effects of the RR's wider educational policies (e.g. priority areas, LMS and ESGs) acted to prohibit its development in schools. Evans and Clarke (1988: p141) argued that rather than being in opposition to the RR's rhetoric, the progressive discourse of the 'new PE' also sought to foster 'individualism';

New PE ...neither heralds the end of competitive games nor a deterioration in standards or discipline, indeed they both foster and celebrate that quality - individualism - which lies at the heart of conservative ideology and which many on the Right expect schools and individuals within them to cultivate and display

However, the RR's definition of individualism was one of 'individual responsibility and accountability', not one of individual 'development' as outlined by educationalists. 'Citizenship' was based on right-wing moral values, not 'social

justice'. Leading Tory party intellectual and former education advisor Oliver Letwin (1988) referred to 'Tom Brown's Schools Days' where education was about character training and discipline, claiming that society was the better for it. He advocated that schools' function was to instil morals before education;

The instilling of moral principles and practices is a prime aim of a school, in the sense that everything done in a school, not only in the classroom but also on the sports field and in the example set by teachers should obviously encourage pupils to become better rather than worse (Letwin 1988: p15).

Not only did Letwin refer to schooling controlling pupils but also that teachers should be controlled to ensure the 'correct' implementation of the 'Right' content. Sport was clearly viewed as a mechanism to transmit these moral values more widely in society.

With sport having an ideological function in the RR's hegemonic project, it was vital that it was central to the NCPE. Despite arguments that sport and 'traditional games' were developed by elite adults for elite adults, and that they required high degrees of skill and time set aside for practice (Thorpe and Bunker 1989: p47-48)⁹⁹, the DES stated that;

Any game with a team, however small, is about co-operation as well as competition; both elements need to be stressed so that the manner of taking part depends upon skill, teamwork and acceptance of rules ('Physical Education from 5-16', DES 1989b: p12).

Rumbold's (1989 Hansard, Vol. 168, Col. 126) statements showed that the emphasis in the RR's rhetoric about the NCPE was changing from physical education to sport;

...physical education and sport are a very important part of school life. It will be a part of the national curriculum, where necessary we shall be able to improve the standard of sport in the maintained sector. I am glad that England is doing rather well in Rugby Union and Cricket.

⁹⁹ Thorpe and Bunker argued that;

School physical education experience for most children will have been limited to playing invasion games, which are without doubt the most difficult games to play. Whether it be on a scaled-down football pitch or on a small sided netball court, the skills involved in receiving the ball, controlling it and directing a pass, with an opponent, sometimes more than one, breathing down the neck, are much too demanding for all but a very few (Thorpe and Bunker 1989: p47-48).

However, they did not reject games, but questioned the traditional methods of teaching them.

Despite this change, the Sports Council (1990: p3), a body which advised the government, stressed that physical education was more than sporting activity and emphasised the relationship between physical education and sport in terms of generating future participation;

Traditionally, a number of sports have looked to schools to produce their future star performers. This is clearly not a major objective of the physical education programme. The inter-relationship of physical education and sport, however, is important. A good physical education programme provides the base line from which sporting activities can flourish and excellence emerge.

This argument was not one that the RR wanted to hear¹⁰⁰, and Rumbold's (1990 Hansard Vol. 168, Col. 126) comments were scathing;

Pupils are naturally competitive. Schools have a long tradition, which this Government believe they should sustain, of channelling this spirit and the urge to better personal performance to good effect.

She outlined, however indirectly, that the NC was as much a measure to control teachers as to instil right wing values in pupils;

We consider competitive sports to be an important part of education, but sadly teachers in charge of physical education did not always agree. I am convinced that the introduction of physical education as part of the national curriculum will dispel the non-sense about competitive sports and that youngsters will be encouraged to play sport as part of their total school curriculum.

These arguments were made prior to the publication of the Working Group Interim Report (IR) (see Appendix H: p73) and the ESASC Report on 'Sport in Schools' in 1991 (see chapter seven: p247). The RR expected both of these reports to endorse its definition of physical education (Evans and Penney 1994). However, the IR endorsed the progressive discourse (see Appendix H: p82). The ESASC report, while acknowledging the educational argument, concluded that;

¹⁰⁰ Significantly, in the early 1990s the Sports Council was reformed from a relatively autonomous, advisory body, to a body designated to developing central government initiatives.

We appreciate the strength of this argument in educational terms, but in our view school sport is not exclusively an educational matter. We believe that traditional team games have a special place in our national life, and that *schools should give every pupil an opportunity to play these games and to acquire a basic grasp of technique, tactics and strategy. Accordingly we recommend that traditional team games should form the core of pupils sporting activity until about the age of 14* (ESASC 1991: px). (Original emphasis)

The recommendation of compulsory competitive games to the age of fourteen was, ideologically, highly significant. This was despite the fact that over forty out of forty-five appendices disagreed with compulsory competitive team games. However, it was clear by this time that sport, in the form of competitive team games, was to be compulsory for all children through the NCPE on the recommendation of the NCC (DES 1991c: p7, NCC 1991b: p14). The SoS's definition of physical education in 'Physical Education for Ages 5-16' encompassed the RR views about individualism and a 'conservative' character. It stated;

We believe that physical education can provide special opportunities for the general personal development of young people. Teachers can encourage pupils to demonstrate qualities like self-reliance, self-discipline, a spirit of enterprise, a sense of social responsibility, the ability to work alone and with others, a value for and sensitivity towards individual differences, and an ability to apply knowledge in solving practical and real life problems (DES 1991b: p47).

This statement, although echoing the RR ideology, would not appear to be too political in itself. However, when taken in consideration with ESASC's conclusions, its functionalism becomes evident.

In some respects the arguments put to the ESASC by educationalists weakened the progressive position politically. It was outlined that progressive developments in ITE led to greater professionalism through critical reflection of practice, that teachers were beginning to understand the motives of the hidden curriculum, and that they encouraged pupils to be inquisitive, observant, analytical and evaluative (Peart 1991 ESASC: p180). Murdoch outlined the developments in professionalism;

Educationally we are more sound than we ever were. We understand much more about how children learn. We understand much more about how to facilitate that learning, and we understand much more about helping teachers

actually to produce in children better learning, because we have analysed, and analysed *fairly thoroughly*, the way we approach physical education. So I think in that sense we can be fairly positive. I cannot be just as positive that we are *actually getting* the opportunity to implement as we would wish... (ESASC 1991: p31)

These developments were dangerous to the RR's political intentions. The RR did not wish to have either teachers or pupils empowered with the ability to analyse and evaluate autonomously and 'fairly thoroughly'. This was especially true when analysis led to the RR's rhetorical justifications being questioned. Compulsory sport was an imperative which did not need to be questioned. MfS Atkins (DES News 52/91) claimed that;

Sport of course is an integral part of society, and it is difficult to separate the ethics of one from the ethics of the other....We in Britain should feel particularly proud of the fact that ethical conduct, fair play and sportsmanship have all become strongly associated with this country. It has passed into our consciousness in the form of everyday phrases such as "It's not cricket" or "It's not playing by the book". This heritage is something that we should not forget or undervalue.

In this perspective, games and sport are a vehicle for improving the quality of life for all. However, the morals and ethics espoused by 'fair play' and 'playing the game' are aspects of social control which 'encourage' the unquestioning acceptance of rules, self-discipline, acceptance of one's own place and respect for the place of others in society (Mangan interview). The NCPE gave the RR the opportunity to make sport compulsory in the curriculum under the guise of physical education. This was highlighted by Atkins (Hansard 1991 Vol. 183, wa. 491);

Physical education, which includes sport, will be a compulsory part of the curriculum in all maintained schools for the first time under the requirements of the national curriculum. All pupils of compulsory school age will be required to participate in a programme of physical education through all key stages in the national curriculum

Once the NCPE was implemented in schools the compulsion for all children to undertake the RR's form of physical education would mean that the RR could transmit its ideological values. However, the RR was having problems 'controlling'

the NCPE WG¹⁰¹ (see Appendix H: p91). With the NCPE to become the Statutory Orders in schools in September 1992 the RR needed to re-emphasise the values of sport. Minister for Heritage Key (1992 Hansard, Vol. 212, Col. 1249) stressed that;

...the Government believe strongly that all young children should have the opportunity to learn basic sports skills...In England and Wales, we have made physical education a compulsory part of the school curriculum for pupils aged five to 16. ...All schools, including grant-maintained schools, will make it a priority that sport is a chief aim in the rounded education of young people.

The particular value of sport to the development of the kind of individual the RR wished was only thinly disguised. Education Select Committee member Lady Olga Maitland re-emphasised that moral values were the most important aspects of competitive team games and that the transfer was obvious;

Above all, let us remember the moral aspect of sport. Team sports teach leadership, responsibility, respect for rules and fair play, and good behaviour. The expression "Be a good sport" has great value. We should not underestimate the importance of teaching manners in schools (Hansard 1992 Vol. 212, Col 1295).

The moral imperative of the NR/RR's definition of citizenship was again to the fore.

A Critical Realist Interpretation

Evans argued that the attack on physical education by central government and the media endeavoured to portray a 'crisis' in education. Physical education was used to 'represent' broader curricular and ideological trends in the State education system, and to vilify and negate progressive elements within it (Evans 1990: p158). Evans (1992: p233) argued that, at a time when the implementation of the NCPE in schools was imminent, physical education was a 'useful' vehicle to transmit RR thinking. As many people equated physical education with sport, any discussion about it would have widespread appeal. However, my argument is that physical education was not only used to transmit the RR's hegemonic project, it was central to it. Physical

¹⁰¹ Critically, Evans and Penney (1994: p6) have shown that the making of the NCPE was a socio-political process in which there was a power struggle between the WG and central government. However, the authority to control both legislation and the provision of resources gave central government dominance in the 'relationship'.

education could be used as a tool to attack and undermine the progressive discourse, and to legitimate the NR/RR/s discourse by promoting 'traditional national values' and transmitting the right-wing morals central to a 'social market economy'. The rhetoric of 'school sport' provided a means to articulate the NR/RR discourse. The intent was to evoke 'British' (English) patriotism and conservative values (Kirk 1992a: p221). The NR had saturated public thought with notions of left-wing subversion in education and the need for government intervention. 'Traditional physical education' was advocated as a symbol of patriotism, and a way to protect moral standards and social stability (Kirk 1992b: p163). However, more than protecting moral values, the RR sought to shift them to the Right. 'Traditional physical education' in the form of 'competitive team games' represented a range of values central to the NR/RR project: values such as competitiveness, controlled aggression, team spirit, a particular form of masculinity, elitism and excellence (Kirk 1992a: p221, see also Kirk 1992b). The attack sought to influence the public's expectation and demand of and from physical education, ultimately in connection with the RR's social, political, economic and cultural interests. The attack

...was not a simple matter of some misguided allegations; it was much more significantly a struggle over the symbolic terrain that team games in schools have come to occupy, a terrain littered with a range of political and cultural values that are of central importance to the workings of British society (Kirk 1992b: p12).

To drive home its ideological imperative (the need for moral subjugation in the social market economy), the RR needed to redefine physical education and instil a myth of a 'games ethic' as traditional, 'neutral' common-sense. The reproduction of NR/RR values through physical education necessitated the creation of a public perception that both legitimated and demanded 'traditional' values. If the public could be convinced that physical education was 'sport', that would go a long way to legitimating sport as the major part, if not all, of the physical education curriculum. The RR, therefore, needed to instil its definition of physical education and to establish an environment in which discourses challenging it could be discredited and suppressed. The intent was to establish NR/RR definitions as 'taken for granted', 'common-sense norms' for 'the good of the nation'. Thus, the underlying contexts of the language used in the media debate needs to be evaluated critically.

The public debate of the mid 1980s did not evoke a productive discussion about the educational values of physical education in schools. Rather, it was vilifactory and based on crude analysis which misrepresented the actions and endeavours of physical educationalists in schools (see Evans and Davies 1988: p2). The media (BBC and Newspapers¹⁰²) seemed merely to reflect the NGBs' definition of physical education as traditional sport. This may well have served to heighten the public's 'conceptual confusion' between the meanings of physical education and sport. However, it was no accident that the media's contribution to the debate was badly researched and either ill- or misinformed (Fox 1987: p248). The RR had close links with the media through the Conservative Philosophy Group (see chapter four: p128). The attack on the Bristol primary school was used for political advantage by the RR. It sought to establish a 'moral panic' over physical education to mobilise social and cultural expectations (Pollard 1988: p111). The debate not only mythologised dangers of left-wing 'social engineering', but also a tradition of physical education as competitive games. The RR attempted to privilege its discourse, and so influence the definition, form and content of the subject. It manipulated the public's identification of physical education experiences as competitive sport. The RR played on genuine fears of children's health and hooliganism, and portrayed its definition of physical education as 'functional activity and training' as 'common-sense'. The professional endeavour to improve knowledge and understanding through physical 'education' was subordinated. Kirk suggests that;

If anything can be said with certainty, it does seem that the notion of 'traditional physical education', aided and abetted by biophysical science, has received a considerable boost throughout this debate. At least, it has confirmed for the general public that physical education is mainly about competitive team games, which are excellent vehicles for fostering particular versions of masculinity and femininity, competitiveness, patriotism and so on (Kirk 1992a, p225).

This helped to establish expectations that physical education's role was to promote elite national sporting success. This was a polarisation between the egalitarian view of

¹⁰² See bibliography for newspaper references.

‘equality’ (individual excellence of all) and the elitist view of ‘quality’ (excellence for the few). This was the view advocated by RR MPs during interview.

Sir Malcolm Thornton, chair of the ESASC report ‘Sport in Schools’, justified sport in schools on the basis of ‘common-sense’;

SMT What it is, is common-sense. Sport should not be dragged down to a political level. It is common-sense that people need a balance between work and enjoyment. Sport is a specific activity that gives that balance. To debate issues over competition denies the common-sense values of sport for human development. What we have to do as politicians is remove ourselves from the debate between groups motivated by self-interest, and make decisions based on common-sense which are of the greatest benefit to the public and society...In the end it all comes down to common-sense. We must get away from the idea of different philosophies and the idea that sport is political. It is common-sense about what the function of sport is. When that is understood at a common-sense level then it is clear what the content of school sport should be and what resources are required to provide that. It is common-sense about the need for sport in school. There is no place for the narrow, self-interested, left-wing view of the ‘experts’...Common-sense tells us that we need to develop a culture of sport in the young. That process has to start as young as possible and that is why it is critical that we get more sport in the primary schools. That is where we should be directing our attention. We should be getting it right in the primary years and the rest will follow.

This is clearly a statement of political intent. Thornton’s definition of common-sense was based on ideological conviction not educational aims. He outlined that RR ‘common-sense’ specifies what the content of physical education will be, and the resources required to achieve the desired ends. ‘Common-sense’ was used by Thornton as a ‘rhetorical device’ in seeking to set the discursive frame for the development of physical education policy. With compulsory traditional competitive team games as the focus of its policy, it is important to investigate the RR’s perception of their role.

The RR’s Justification for Compulsory Traditional Competitive Games

Interviews with prominent RR MPs and Conservative Party Educational Advisors confirmed that the RR’s delineation of the role sports and games in ‘physical

education' was ideological and utilitarian rather than educational¹⁰³. Evennett outlined the ideological necessity for compulsory team sports in schools;

WK How important a part of Conservative philosophy are team games?

DE Absolutely fundamental. Absolutely fundamental. They instil the ability to work in a team, they are essential in developing a sense of community, a sense of belonging and a sense of loyalty. Everyone has their part to play and it is their responsibility to play it. That is the only way the team can be successful. There is a great deal of character building involved also...

Interview responses combined the RR's justifications for compulsory competitive team games in schools, with their role in transmitting the values inherent to the type of character and citizenship the RR wanted to construct. Sport and games were to infuse values of competition (hierarchy), tradition (conservative values), place (social ordering), discipline (social order) and a work ethic (vocationalism). This fused the apparently contradictory neo-Liberal and neo-Conservative NR values, and tied closely to Thatcher's 'Victorian values' and 'vigorous virtues' (see chapter four: p122). Not only were 'tradition' and 'national needs' used as justification for sport and games, sport and games were the vehicle to transmit these. Interviewees were dismissive of the educational values of physical education¹⁰⁴. Sir Malcolm Thornton claimed that physical education was less important than games;

SMT PE is not games. People 'play' games. What we need in games is to develop the individual. What we must do is encourage excellence. All individuals need to participate in activity but that is only the start. Games do more than PE. They develop communication skills, they are character building, they create a sense of interdependence between team members and they instil a sense of responsibility and loyalty. That is why the ESASC Report said that children should concentrate on competitive team games up to the age of fourteen.

¹⁰³ The RR MPs interviewed were selected for their prominent roles in educational matters. Rumbold was MfE at the time of the NCPE development, Thornton was chair of ESASC 1991, Greenway was an ESASC member, Evennett was PPS to Baroness Blatch and an ESASC member, Pawsey was chair of the Conservative Backbench Education Committee (CBEC), Dunn was MfE from 1983 to 1988, Boyson was MfE from 1979 to 1982 and Brandreth was chair of the NPFA and member of the CBEC. Sexton was Educational Advisor from 1979 to 1986 and 'AI' was a member of an academic advisory committee.

¹⁰⁴ To save space and prevent repetition, the RR MPs' responses denoted are those which best encapsulate the RR's ideological imperatives. My questioning may appear slightly 'leading'. However this was not intended. It was prompting rather than 'leading', and certainly not misleading. This was felt necessary due to constraints on time. See chapter two for a fuller discussion of methodology.

Sport and games were to be included because of their 'common-sense' value and because they were 'a good thing'. Pawsey stressed;

JP I favour games because they are 'a good thing'. They are essential for character building and instilling a sense of competition. There are also the factors of learning to follow rules and laws of games and learning to become leaders and take responsibility. Competition is important in the modern world. Everything in life is now competitive. Children must learn that from an early age. We are all going to take knocks in life. What we must do is pull ourselves up and get it with it. You get nowhere by not being competitive and getting on with it. That is where character building comes in to it. Have the character to get on with it. To overcome the knocks in life...That is what character building is about.

The RR sought to define 'acceptable' citizenship. Boyson suggested that physical education, as 'sport', imbued "...the civilising effect of team games and the appreciation of character that comes from them". This 'character' was to be based on individual competition. Dunn's sentiments bordered on 'social Darwinism';

RD ...Competition is very important, life is competitive so individuals need to be competitive to get on. The sooner the child learns that the world is a competitive place the better. In relation to the aspect of some children being failures in competitive team games, if they are to succeed they must try harder. It is the only way to succeed. They need to be able to see that...What matters is winning and nothing else. Children should be taught that and should understand that from 'Day One'. You get nothing for being second. The only thing that matters is winning. Being first is the only way to succeed in life. Children have got to understand that. They have got to want to be winners if society is to benefit. If people are not competitive they will not survive.

This was unquestionably an extreme view of the role of competitive team games. Dunn's statement outlined that RR wanted to encourage children to become ruthlessly competitive and uncaring, and they were to repudiate guilt towards the lack of ability or the social circumstances of others. It was to be instilled through team games that success was entirely due to effort and that second place was worthless. RR ideology allowed no place for social factors. Greenway argued that competition through games instilled competition more widely in society;

WK I was thinking about the change from the 'dependency culture' to the 'market culture' of self-responsibility. Are things like rules, competition, a referee, all part of that wider social shift?

HG Yes. A social shift back from non-competitiveness, un-competitiveness forced upon everyone by the socialist party, the Labour party, and the Liberals for that matter. A push for competitiveness in sport, in work in business in everything, yes.

This linked the policy of compulsory team games directly to the NR/RR's hegemonic project. It also embraced notions of looking back to a traditional 'golden age' of competition. Greenway outlined the utility of games as a social, political, cultural and economic tool;

HG The standing of the nation with itself and internationally, in terms of physical achievement. What a lift from games educationally, economically, socially and culturally, in every way, politically really. The brilliant performance of English rugby teams, if we had that in all sports where would we *not* be?

This outlined sport's role in inculcating the identity of the (English) 'nation state'. Notions of tradition and cultural heritage, 'Eton, Rugger and Lords', were stressed by RR MPs during interview. These were simplistic arguments about cultural identity and the 'goodness' of being British (English). This was highlighted by Gyles Brandreth;

WK How much of a role do games have in transmitting the culture of the country?

GB Well they clearly do...there is no doubt at all that some of our traditional sports, like cricket, like football, define in certain people how we are perceived, and give certain people a sense of nationhood. Both as a sort of Gung-ho, if we win the World Cup that is exciting for everyone. Also in a slightly gentler way, the idea of village green cricket is very appealing. Now all of that I like...So yes, that is good. One is of course partly defined by the sports they play. The French are defined by playing 'boule'. Boule on a Sunday morning followed by a delicious lunch is part of the charm of France. Similarly, cucumber sandwiches and a cup of tea while watching a game of cricket on the village green is part of the English idyll.

Cricket is, perhaps, the sport which is most associated with 'Englishness'. It was the sport most cited by RR MPs as being in decline and in need of restoration in State

schools (see Hawkins 1994). However, because cricket is an activity dependent on vast resources, it had its base in elite private schools, not in state schools. It was, historically, a minority activity¹⁰⁵. This was typical of the RR attempt to reconstruct history by presenting myth as 'common-sense'.

The attack to undermine egalitarianism and the aim to transmit the values of the 'games ethic' were concerned with issues of 'social ordering'. The endeavour to reproduce hierarchical stratification, defined as 'place', and imbue vocationalism, defined as the 'work ethic', were central constituents of the citizenship needed for a 'social market economy'. Rumbold defined 'place';

AR Well I know they [progressive educators] say that competition is bad. We were subjected for a very long time to the so called progressive, I think they were regressive, philosophies of education which said that competition was bad, that people should not be pushed, that children should not have a whole learning experience. All of that is patent nonsense and has resulted in nothing but...a...a...a...consecutive lowering of standards and an inability of children to relate what they are actually trying to do at school. What they are trying to do is to learn and also to find their place. Where they actually fit into society. You cannot expect people to be useful members of society if they do not have any idea where they are.

This clearly outlined the Right's view of the relationship between schooling and the reproduction of a particular capitalist social order. Rumbold stressed the role of competitive games in teaching people their place and in coming to accept it;

WK How important a part is that of the whole curriculum in physical education?

AR I think it is terribly important. I always thought it was terribly important. ... It is as much to do with self-esteem as it is to do with their esteem in finding out their own perception of themselves, finding where they sit in their own circle. Physical education plays a very, very important part in that and that is why it is very important that it is in the curriculum in the school....It acts as another face of education. ...Once you have built up an individual's self-esteem they are then able to counter some of the knocks that people get in life. The one thing that people as they grow older, like me, they understand that you cannot get through life without some knocks. It does not happen. If you are going to be educated to take those knocks you have to have

¹⁰⁵ This is not to suggest that cricket should not be played in state schools.

something to fall back on in your own personality, which is built on self esteem¹⁰⁶.

Progressive educators' arguments that many pupils encountered nothing but negative experiences and failure through compulsory competitive team games were dismissed by Thornton;

SMT The ESASC identified that there should be competitive sport in schools. We had had this 'anti-competitive culture' in education since the 1970s. That is absolute nonsense. Everyone knows that children enjoy winning. Yes, there will be losers but that is life. There will always be losers in life. That is part of life. People have to learn to cope with that and 'get on'.

'Losing' in team games was part of a socialisation, a process, in which children learned to accept their 'place', while few reaped rewards due to their ability or effort. Games comprised a system of social control promoting 'order' through 'compliance' rather than 'coercion'. Conservative education advisor 'A1' remarked;

A1 I went to a boarding school like those making policy. We were kept pretty healthy. Do not forget that everybody did it, the whole one hundred per cent. It was awful for the guy with the 'pebbled' spectacles who blundered round the rugby field twice a week, or got bowled straight away at cricket, or what ever.

WK That is what I am saying, that experience creates negative attitudes towards physical participation.

A1 It certainly did.... Not everyone can make it into the team. In a sense they accept and support. That is important in how people 'learn their place'. It is not that those that do not play do not get anything out of it.

Thus, despite acknowledgement that the experience of competition could be humiliating for many pupils, it was central to RR policy. This notion of 'place' linked to the 'work ethic': if pupils worked harder they could all achieve. Evennett explained that, through games, teachers should instil these values;

WK It seems that Conservatives put an emphasis upon the 'work ethic'. How closely is that tied into the 'games ethic'?

¹⁰⁶ This assertion that competitive sport and teams games build self-esteem is critiqued in Appendix I.

DE They are both geared towards success. Both require self-discipline, application and hard work. There are many different factors which are required to be successful not least single-minded determination. There needs to be much more of that taught in games. That needs to be instilled in people. Physical education departments do not instil self-discipline and they do not motivate pupils. It requires dedication and hard slog to be successful. That is what PE departments should encourage.

However, 'self-discipline' was concerned with more than just the 'work ethic'. It was also concerned with discipline for 'social order' (social control). Boyson highlighted that competition through team games was a central part of social control;

RB ...Team games are the basis of co-operation inside society. And, one of the problems of our society at present time is the decline of team games, and it is probably more responsible for juvenile delinquency than anything-else.

Thornton outlined a role for sport and games in disciplining pupils inside school;

WK So sport has a function of 'social control'?

SMT Absolutely. The frustrations and the aggressions of the young have to be worked out. What sport does is create a balance to the curriculum. It has to fit in with the other areas of education both to improve them and to act as a balance to remove aggression. That is why it is critically important that schools have adequate facilities to do this job.

Thus, for the RR, 'balance in the curriculum' meant 'games' to serve social rather than educational purposes. It was, therefore, essential that they form a compulsory part of the curriculum. The Left was attacked for undermining the fabric of society. Progressive developments were the culprit. Evidently Greenway and the RR felt that they knew more about educational needs and process than the professional educators;

HGThere were no more competitive sports anymore. So, you know, those of us who know that children's basic instinct is to be competitive, believe that this is best channelled through sport, began to campaign in the House for a proper return to competitive games. Team games is such a valuable way of teaching so many disciplines.

MP Evennett was dismissive when challenged with the arguments in the ESASC report about the deleterious effects of compulsory games on some pupils;

WK But surely compulsion to particular activities does more to turn children off them, rather than creating positive attitudes towards future participation?

DE There needs to be a certain amount of compulsion. Children would choose not to do anything unless there was compulsion. Children need compulsion so that their 'needs' are met. Compulsion is not what children want but it is in their best interests. This must begin at as early an age as possible. Children need to do something active. There has been too much 'child centred' education. They should be directed up to the age of fourteen. That means compulsion to games to develop the values we talked about earlier...

Further, Evennett was adamant that sport and games would be established as a compulsory component of the curriculum and that physical education departments should *train* children rather than *educate* them;

DE ... Sport is required to be both a curriculum subject and an extra-curricular subject. It is an integral part of the schools curriculum. It leads to the healthy physical development of children...What we have been seeing recently is a move to more recreational activities. These are not the 'traditional activities' and they do not train pupils and young adults. The difference is that 'PE' develops the body through physical tasks. However, it is not rigorous. That rigour comes through playing games. What we need in schools is more games. We need to see more coaching in particular sports with coaches who know what they are doing. There are the two distinct strands to sport in schools.

Clearly, in this view, physical educationalists could be dispensed with.

A Critical Realist Interpretation

The NR/RR sought to perpetuate both a 'traditional social order' and the requirements of capital by imbuing in the minds of children and young people an acceptance of structural inequality as natural, impartial and common-sense. The citizenship needed was one in which independent *reflectivity* was suppressed and dependent *reflexivity* augmented. It was not the development of an autonomous individual, empowered by a knowledge and understanding of his/her individual potential and the socio-economic and socio-cultural factors that could influence their opportunities to engage in work and leisure. Rather, it was narrow, functional and anti-educational. This necessitated

training individuals to conform to the NR/RR discourse as a moral obligation. Fitting people into their place meant suppressing their opportunity to evaluate and reflect on their experiences. Constructing a character based on conservative codes (vigorous virtues) of discipline, obedience, effort and ability was a form of 'Victorian Darwinism' (see Mangan 1981: p55). Social position was to be based on 'meritocracy' and the 'repudiation of guilt'. It was also a repudiation of 'a priori' social circumstances which structure society and influence SPEC outcomes. The 'games ethic' was a key to disseminate these moral values in society. What we have here then is a statement, a rhetoric, of right-wing intent. However, Poynton (1986: p161) reminds us that the creation of moral order through games is "...rarely actively fostered in other than an incidental way". Indeed transfer of the values of competition are just as likely to be those undesirable ones such as winning at all costs, aggression, selfishness and breaking the rules out of sight of the referee. Further, Meakin (1981: p241) highlights that games cannot initiate morality, they can only be played morally, which depends on the referee. Nonetheless, the RR endeavoured to construct a myth of games as the bastion of morality and tradition in state schools.

This creation and perpetuation of the myth of 'traditional team games' in State education allowed the RR to claim that the Left was undermining it, and thereby creating a crisis for national well-being. The imperative was therefore to restore the 'games tradition' for the good of the nation. This discourse of 'traditional physical education' and 'cultural restoration' manipulated genuine fears in the wider population about a breakdown in social order (Evans interview). Sport was to be used as a mechanism to address widespread social fragmentation and indiscipline. The nineteenth century games ethic, with its focus of order, unity, esprit d'corps and discipline, was a mechanism of and for social control (Mangan interview). Myths of a 'golden age' and a unitary cultural heritage created powerful expectations over what the form and content physical education in schools 'should' be. Because these myths were based on an 'unquestionable tradition of common-sense and heritage' they did not need critical evaluation. The RR's intent was to create a widespread demand for sport and games, and so subordinate alternative progressive discourses along with their inherent concerns with issues of class, racism, sexism and so on (Evans 1986b, 1988, 1993, Jarvie and Maguire 1994).

The imposition of the NC on the State sector but not on the Private sector, nor in full in the GMS or CTC¹⁰⁷ schools created by the RR, seemed like an endeavour to impose forms of discourse on the masses that had as their purpose not education, but control. The RR intended to socialise those in the State sector through nationalised controls over the transmission of moral, religious and cultural 'norms'. Built into this were both explicit imperatives to meet the needs of industry in the 'formal curriculum', and implicit imperatives to imbue licensed individualism through the 'hidden curriculum'. This individualism sought to subordinate a collective social consciousness and replace it with the pursuit of 'guilt free' personal gain. Compulsory traditional competitive games were to occupy a dominant place in the 1992 NCPE, thereby limiting pupil's access to other forms of activity which may have been more suited to their individual needs. The NCPE was intended as a mechanism to constrain both the development of individual self-confidence and the opportunity to reflect on the appropriateness of compulsory games on the basis of individual needs or aspirations (see Appendix I: p97-99). It was a case of ideology limiting content and teaching methods (see chapter seven: p267). Far from creating opportunities to challenge inequality, the 1992 NCPE sought to heighten it and ensure its continuation.

The political authority of the RR to define expectations of a particular type of citizenship, through ideological saturation and the vilification of alternatives, strongly framed the possibility of and for debate about the NCPE (see chapter seven: p244-247). Further, the market mechanism in education acted to constrain collective critique of centrally prescribed policy. As teachers increasingly turned their attention to survival within the education market, progressive critique about centrally imposed initiatives was stifled. Debate was structured *within* not *of* the NC. Evans (interview), perhaps over-pessimistically, argued that opportunities for teachers to engage in critical reflection were now contained by the text of the NCPE;

JE We should be having productive debates about what kind of citizen we want to produce through physical education... But, I don't think that we are

¹⁰⁷ For example the curriculum in the CTC schools was to be laid out in a contract made between the DES and the 'charitable trust' (company/industry) which partly funded the school (see Baker Hansard 1987 Vol. 112, Col. 798, Bowden 1987 Hansard Vol. 113, Col. 184).

having that debate and I don't really see where we are going to have space for that debate in the future.

Kirk (1988b: p25) argued that denying teachers the opportunity to reflect critically is the “...robbing of future generations capacities to conceptualise and think beyond the technical and the concrete” which “...threatens to dissolve democratic forms in society”. The opportunity for physical activity to bring people together by breaking down SPEC barriers was to be reduced with the expansion of moral individualism, the ascendancy of social Darwinism and ‘vigorous virtues’ over social justice and social democracy, and the augmentation of a meritocracy which repudiated the significance socio-economic circumstances.

Conclusion

My thesis is that the type of ‘physical education’ experienced by pupils in state schools was a central constituent of the NR/RR’s hegemonic project. Within the RR’s macro political intent, physical education was to function to shape educational, personal and social outcomes. Physical education reform is therefore viewed as a microcosm which identifies the Right’s wider intentions and methods.

The RR sought to have physical education serve NR interests through a complex interlinking of its potential roles in imbuing social and cultural rules and norms, and in contributing to social stratification. Through a succession of constructed explicit experiences through the ‘formal curriculum’ and implicit experiences via the ‘hidden curriculum’, physical education, as ‘compulsory traditional competitive team games’, was intended to both legitimate and reproduce the status quo of hierarchical inequality. Traditional team games would foster particular stereotypes of nationalism, masculinity, position, status and personal expectation through the practice and outcomes of competition. Compulsion would either inspire or alienate individuals, acting to divide and so reproduce the structures of social inequality and differentiation

that the capitalist social market required to function¹⁰⁸. Physical activity was intended to transpose the values of winning and losing into wider aspects of life.

Through its definition of physical education as sport and games, the RR sought to socialise pupils into moral obedience by transmitting the attitudinal and behavioural 'norms' of 'little England' and capitalist 'citizenship'. These were intended to constrain the parameters of 'common-sense' and 'deviance' within acceptable limits. Pupils were to be socialised into functional members of society through the acquisition of the narrow SPEC rules and values (cultural capital) which were thought to be inherent in traditional competitive team games. They were to reproduce the existing social structures reflexively through experiences which both constructed ways of thinking and constrained cognitive understandings. Games and sport were a fundamental strategy to create both social stratification, and unity and identity. They were to differentiate pupils through competition and create a 'natural' hierarchy based on effort and ability. By privileging National Governing Bodies' definitions of sport (in which success is ranked against measurements of excellence), the majority of pupils were to learn only what they could not do. Success was narrowly defined as 'winning', and 'failure' aimed to stereotype pupils as either less-able or irresponsible.

The progressive developments in physical education, which endeavoured to put 'child centred' education at the forefront of educational practice, ran counter to the Right's interests. They could, potentially, expose the NR's wider SPEC project. For physical education to serve the NR/RR's ideological imperatives the progressive developments needed to be curtailed. They were, therefore, made a focus for the danger of 'progressive subversion'. The Right constructed, then sought to protect, a myth of 'traditional physical education'. An expensive 'progressive' provision was to be replaced by a curriculum of 'traditional competitive team games', justified through ideological symbolism and myth, and the 'construction' of public expectation and demand. The position of the progressive developments in the curriculum were weakened through a combination of ideological attack (symbolic rules and resources)

¹⁰⁸ Evans and Davies (1986: p15) argue that "...physical education as with the educational process more generally, consequently makes both friends and enemies of those subjected to it, it inspires and alienates, it conditions and reconditions class and power structures."

and legislation (material rules and resources) which starved physical education of resources. The rhetorical representation was of physical education's importance, however the reality was of reduced status, resourcing and provision within schools from 1979. This reduced the possibilities for a progressive provision. Despite arguments that adequate resourcing was essential in the provision of an educationally worthwhile physical education programme, the ERA and the introduction of the market in education further weakened the position of physical education within schools. This highlighted the contradiction between the Right's political rhetoric and the effect of their educational policies.

My argument is that the NCPE came about directly because 'sport' was a major tool of the RR's project to shift social values to the Right. Physical education provision in schools was intended to produce and reproduce a reconstructed version of tradition which served the needs of the 'social market economy'. The tools (games) were pre-selected in an endeavour to achieve the intended outcomes. The nature of compulsory traditional competitive team games meant that 'educational' outcomes were to be founded on winning and losing. Thus, it was vital that the NCPE privileged the RR's discourse. The public debate about the purpose, form, content and methods of teaching physical education was a central influence, in a backhanded way, in constructing parameters for the NCPE WG. The following chapter investigates how the RR was able to 'influence' (control) the 'form' (through constraining consultation and influencing debate), 'content' (through its political power and authority) and 'method' (implementation by teachers) of the NCPE.

Chapter Seven

New Right / Radical Right 'Control' of Physical Education's 'Form', 'Structure', Content' and 'Methods'

Introduction

This chapter investigates how the NR/RR were able to ‘control’ the process of the development of the NCPE. Previous chapters have argued that, at the macro political level, the RR sought to develop a NCPE grounded in its ideological discourse. However, for this to be successful, the RR had to constrain the possibilities for the development of progressive discourses at both the meso and micro levels. This chapter discusses the methods employed by the NR/RR in their endeavour to ‘control’ the development of the NCPE. This centres on a discussion of the attempt to ‘control’, firstly, the ‘form’ of physical education by constraining discussion and consultation about its purpose; secondly, the ‘structure’ and ‘content’ of provision by controlling the development of the NCPE (through constraining the actions of the WG¹⁰⁹ and the NCC); and thirdly, the ‘method’ of its implementation in schools by restructuring ITE and INSET. Although these aspects of ‘control’ are tackled independently to clarify the arguments made in this discussion, crucially, they were not mutually exclusive. Rather, they were interlinked first in the RR’s endeavour to ‘soften-up’ opposition to its discourse and then to have that discourse accepted as ‘common-sense’.

The NR/RR were determined to have the ‘form’ of physical education defined as sport, with traditional competitive team games (TCTG) as a compulsory part of the curriculum (see chapter six: p197). This chapter, in light of the ‘evidence’ that was at hand both in the run-up to the making of the NCPE and during its development, critiques the NR/RR’s apparent lack of understanding of physical education, and their insistence on defining it as ‘sport and games’. It is argued that the NR/RR’s SPEC interests meant that they were ideologically predisposed to endorse a definition of physical education which served their political project ahead of educational objectives. It is suggested that there was ample opportunity for the government to ‘bridge the gap’ between itself and educationalists over the aims of a physical education programme in state schools. However, it is argued that as the RR sought to protect its political objectives, it needed to avoid evidence which either contradicted its rhetorical claims, or which suggested that a progressive focus may have been more

¹⁰⁹ This chapter concentrates on the aspects of symbolic (discursive) and material (resources) controls which were placed on the WG in the form of overt ‘pressures’. However, there were also unseen ‘pressures’ placed on the WG by the SoS and the MfS which were tantamount to ‘political bullying’. These are discussed in Appendix H: p91.

educationally worthwhile. Thus, it is shown that alternative discourses were not only avoided, they were vilified, suppressed and ignored as the RR endeavoured to widen the 'gap' rather than bridge it.

In relation to the RR's endeavour to control the 'structure' and 'content' of the physical education curriculum, this chapter outlines the process of the development of the NCPE. This is set in the context of physical education's low curriculum status, which was intensified by the 'two way shift' (from LEAs) in education: the centralisation of power and control (over content and resourcing) and the decentralisation of responsibility and accountability (see chapter five: p163, and Appendix F: p38). Account is taken of the differences between the RR's and the progressive educationalist's definition of 'physical education' in the subsequent 'changes' made to the NCPE text by central government after the WG's IR. This discusses the 'controls' placed over discursive and resource possibilities by central government (see also Appendix H: p85). This chapter also reflects on educationalists' interpretations of the government's actions and discusses their possible effects.

In terms of its endeavour to control the 'methods' of teaching (implementing) the NCPE in schools, the RR sought to control teachers' actions and redefine Initial Teacher Education (ITE) as *training* (ITT) (see Appendix G: p55). This chapter outlines briefly how educationalists' 'progressive' intentions in physical education ITE were in direct conflict to the RR's¹¹⁰ political intent. It is argued that the RR vilified ITE in seeking to suppress progressive developments and 'de-skill' the teaching profession (reduce professionalism) to 'soften-up' opposition to centrally devised reforms.

Constraining Consultation About the Purpose of Physical Education

The internal debate between physical educational professionals in the mid 1980s, between the merits of a traditional physical education programme and the introduction of progressive ideals and equal opportunities, was, essentially, a contest between

¹¹⁰ This is not to say that the educationalists' viewpoints are 'correct'. The views discussed are those of the educationalists who were selected for interview (see Appendix B).

educational ideals. However, the public debate initiated by the Right centred on the 'form', 'content' and 'methods' of physical education, and was political rather than educational (see Talbot 1993b: p40). In an attempt to influence the public's perspective, the press claimed that the nation's economic and social stability were being undermined by ideologically driven progressive education content and methods. RR's politicians asserted that physical education should comprise 'traditional games and sport' (see chapter six: p223). The government, therefore, commissioned reports to investigate the state of 'sport' in state schools.

The Findings of the First Reports on 'Sport in Schools'

The wording of the titles of the two reports commissioned by the government on the state of 'Sport In Schools' in 1987 (Murdoch's 'Desk Study' and the Sports Council's 'Schools Sports Forum') was significant. The use of the term 'Sport in Schools' appeared to privilege the RR definition of physical education as 'sport and games'. Nonetheless, through the consideration of evidence from varied sources, both reports endorsed a 'progressive' discourse (see chapter six: p214). Further, Murdoch (1987: p7-11) stressed that the media debate over competitive sport was political and patriotic, and obsessed with competition (winning), which intensified the confusion between the terms 'physical education' and 'sport'. As a result the debate became polarised and tension arose. In Murdoch's, and the profession's view, the focus on competition created harmful effects for the young due to its aggressive and divisive nature. Further, Murdoch's report clearly stated that physical education was not sport, and that sport was only part of physical education. The SSF Report (1988: p1-2) argued that;

The lack of understanding in many quarters of the difference between sport and physical education is a real problem. While sporting activities are often part of physical education programmes, they are included for educational purposes and in the pursuit of educational objectives.

Moreover, the PEA's 1987 'Commission of Enquiry' into the state of physical education in schools found that 'outside' pressures on physical education were due to a 'misunderstanding' on the part of parents, head teachers, HMI and non-physical education teachers. The PEA (1987: p12) indicated that "...parents need re-educating

to ensure that team games are not seen as the only relevant form of physical education". It argued that a fundamental philosophy defining the values of physical education was needed because different interpretations and expectations of the term 'physical education' led to confused curriculum planning.

These were not suggestions that the RR wanted to pursue prior to development of the NCPE. It wanted its definition of physical education as sport and traditional team games endorsed to allow its discourse to influence the official pedagogic text. The RR needed, therefore, to either suppress these findings or discredit them as ideologically motivated. Thus, the government commissioned the 'Education Science and Arts Select Committee' (ESASC) to undertake another investigation of the state of 'Sport in Schools'¹¹¹ which reported in 1991 (discussed below). This was at the same time as the physical education WG was deliberating the NCPE (see Evans and Penney 1995a).

A Need for Consultation

Marsh and Rhodes (1992: p187) argue that consultation over policy is required to ensure that central government is as fully informed as possible. They highlight how consultation and negotiation assist in the implementation of policy. Failure to consult followed by imposition of narrow political objectives ensures opposition from the well established implementation network. The School Sports Forum highlighted a 'gap' between policy makers' intentions and physical educationalists' aims;

All we have been saying indicates the need for a better understanding among policy makers of the aims of physical education, its relationship to other aspects of the school curriculum, its interface with sport, and the contribution it could and should make to the personal development of children and young adults (SSF 1988: p21).

The need for consultation between the government and educationalists was outlined, and the opportunity to 'bridge the gap' was afforded by the evidence collected. However, consultation would have publicly exposed the RR to the progressive

¹¹¹ Some of the Conservative members of ESASC, who were in the majority, such as Thornton (chair), Greenway and Evennett were prominent RR MPs.

discourse which critiqued its rhetorical claims for traditional games. The RR would have been required to acknowledge the educational values of the progressive discourse and compare them against the educational values of its own discourse. This would, potentially, have undermined media claims that the virtues of games and sport were 'common-sense' (see chapter six: p210). It could also have indicated that the RR's rhetoric was never intended to become the reality. Thus, the RR needed to suppress critical debate over educational reform and create the circumstances to allow professional input to be ignored. If the NCPE was to serve NR/RR interests, it was necessary that the WG endorse 'compulsory traditional competitive team games'. This was the backcloth against which the remit for the physical education WG was written and the WG selected (see Appendix H: p72).

The Physical Education WG's Perspective

The members of the PE WG selected by the government were expected to endorse 'traditional' content and method (see WG IR, DES 1991a). Membership was based partly on social networking and partly on political objectives (see Appendix H: p76). It was significant that the WG lacked practising physical education teachers and Advisors, but included 'sportsmen' and business representatives. Evans and Penney (1994: p14) argue that;

The social composition of the group thus signified a particular view of PE. On the one hand the subject was to comprise an amalgam of discrete (strongly classified) activities in which competition, team games and 'skilling' were to feature prominently. On the other hand it was to be considered a subject without history, association or identity.

Thus, the historical struggles and contemporary developments in physical education did not have a forum for discussion. This was important when taken into consideration with the fact that the WG was not given a starting point for discussion nor a reference point of the nature of child centred physical '*education*'. However, it was given terms of reference, a limited time scale, no indication of resourcing and a framework ('structure') of ATs and PoS which required to be filled. The remit and time scale set constraints on the agency of the WG as the SoS wanted quick development and implementation to prevent organised opposition (Graham and Tytler

1993: p14). Further, physical education came at the end of an implementation process which reinforced existing subject boundaries and hierarchies.

Former MfE Robert Dunn claimed that the parameters placed on the WG were essential;

RD ... Parameters placed on the Working Group would have been the remit they were given to work within. That remit may well have been constrained by financial implications and the time available. If there was not a remit and parameters were not set, those groups would keep on writing and writing, and publishing and expanding, a final conclusion would never be forthcoming.

The RR clearly had contempt for the WG and were never prepared to allow them to investigate and develop physical education fully. Nevertheless, several WG members explained that exposure to educational arguments resulted in the group endorsing a progressive discourse. Talbot explained the development;

MT One of the things in that is the attitude to what can be called 'experts'. The way in which they are used in the system. That is very easily plotted through the national curriculum process. In the early stages of the NC, these experts were to be brought in along with the businessmen that they brought in to the NC Groups. Somehow there would be some melding of these very alien cultures to make the academics, the experts, more 'sensible' and for the businessmen to influence the curriculum in a more pragmatic way. But, that did not happen. What happened was that most of the business people went 'native'. That rebounded on the government and there was a tendency to then dismiss the groups, the experts, as marginal loonies. That relates to all this 'mythology, about teacher training and 'leftist' and 'progressive' tendencies.

Professor Elizabeth Murdoch felt, initially, that the appointment of Ian Beer as chair of the WG was a strategy to promote the RR line;

EM However, his [Beer's] conversion was quite marked. He struggled with it. He did not want to change.... The WG were very sport orientated to start, but they were very much different when they finished. That annoyed the government I think. He had a lot of battles with the Ministers that they had not expected to have with him.

WK Because they expected the group that they had selected to find for what they wanted?

EM Yes that is right. I think they expected to plant through him, some quite powerful ideas. Except that he began to resist those ideas.

Beer explained that he, and the other non 'experts', underwent a dramatic change of knowledge and understanding about physical *education*;

IB ...The other area where my perception of physical education did change, was through the input from certain groups of people within physical education, particularly the lecturers within physical education.... We as a group, were on a very rapid learning curve. ...The government had selected a wider variety of backgrounds and experiences within that physical education Working Group than any other Group in the national curriculum. It was a terribly disparate group to try and weld together as a team...Therefore, everyone arrived with their own personal agenda. It was very much a question of everybody within that working group having their own learning curve.

Thus, through exposure to a considerable body of evidence and professional experience, the sports and business people on the WG were converted to thinking in terms of educational needs rather than sporting achievement. The IR (DES 1991a) stated that;

..sport is perhaps most often associated with competitive games, whether team or individual. However wide the definition, a clear distinction needs to be made between sport and physical education. Contrary to popular belief, the terms are not synonymous (paragraph 4.3: p7).

And that;

Sport covers a range of physical activities in which adults and young people may participate. Physical education on the other hand is a process of learning, the context being mainly physical. The purpose of this process is to develop specific knowledge, skills and understanding and to promote physical competence. Different sporting activities can and do contribute to that learning process, and the learning enables participation in sport. The focus is however on the child and on his or her development of physical competence, rather than the activity (paragraph 4.4 p7).

Not only was the difference clearly outlined, but the connection between physical education and sport, and the importance of physical education in developing future participation in sport were explained. However, the WG came into direct conflict with the aims of the RR. Its statements endorsed a child centred education which the RR were not prepared to entertain. What this shows is how exposure to educational

arguments swayed the views of the WG. This goes some way to illustrate why the RR needed to avoid acknowledging these arguments publicly.

Unlike the WG who respected evidence, the RR was ideologically predisposed towards a certain form, content and outcome in physical education. It needed to establish its definition of 'citizenship', through 'traditional competitive team games' (TCTG), to allow for 'social order' and 'social ordering' in the 'social market' (see chapters four: p118, and chapter five: p157). SoS Clarke used his position of power and authority to attack the WG's findings in an endeavour to make it conform to secure the NCPE desired by the NR/RR. The WG had constructed a model for physical education based on a 'learning process' of three Attainment Targets (ATs): 'Planning and Composing', 'Participating and Performing' and 'Appreciating and Evaluation' (DES 1991a: p25). However, Clarke insisted that there be only one AT covering 'performance'. The undermining of the three ATs to one AT highlighted the difference between educational need and political intent. Evans, Davies and Penney (1994: p62) assert that "...rarely do we catch a glimpse of how arrogant, unpleasant and aggressive the state can be in pursuit of its own ends" (see Appendix H: p91).

'Consultation' over the NCPE

To prevent its imperatives from being diverted, the RR sought to keep all discussion *within* its discourse and not *of* it. This amounted to going through a consultation process described as a sham by HE lecturer Chris Laws;

CL I am one of the people that they have 'listened' to. I am very much involved in the PEA and as an Advisor for SCAA....That is the whole point, they do not consult with anybody about what is going on. Even those people that they are supposed to consult with ...No, the government do not take advice...They do it because they produce their own agenda. For example, the consultation for the new proposals for the NC. They actually designed the response sheets themselves. Now, in their defence, I suppose it would perhaps be very difficult to collate a whole host of open ended responses. All the same, if you only allow time for people to respond in the way that you want them to respond, you have diverted the agenda.

The process of consultation, both for the IR and the FR, was strongly framed and limited by the NCC (NCC Consultation Report 1991). There was very little

opportunity for subjective comments. Respondents were asked to agree or disagree with specific concerns. They were not able to raise their own (see Appendix H: p83). Further, the responses received were collated then largely ignored (see Penney 1994). Murdoch (1992: p18) argued that the consultation process was far too short. The Draft Order was before the House of Commons (HoC) on January 28 and all consultation had to take place before March 4, a gap of only four weeks. By March 10 the NCPE Orders were before the HoC to be finalised.

The RR's Sources of 'Expertise' in Physical Education

The RR's determination not to consult with physical educationalists meant that 'advice' came from narrow sources. This led to a poorly informed government. A Civil Servant directly involved with the development of the NCPE, who wished to remain anonymous, described the role of the DES in advising the government at the time of the NCPE WG;

XX SARD, is a bit anomalous. It is the 'Sport and Recreation Division', which has now moved with the Minister to DNH. At that time they had just moved from the DoE to the DES. They were somewhat worried about what they had to do. Who ever had briefed the Minister [Atkins] for that [WG] meeting had done a bad job. It was not the business of the DoE to do so, it was SARD's job. One of the problems is that SARD has never, as a body, informed itself about physical education. ...Senior Civil Servants from SARD do not understand the difference between curriculum physical education and competitive school sport. I find that deeply worrying. I find it dreadful condemnation of a highly paid group of people who ought to know better. That is something else that was there. The DES young Civil Servants were terrific in their liaison between the Group and the Ministers. SARD did not help with that.

Civil Servants in SARD were appointees who shared a similar habitus with the RR. Their remoteness from state education was furthered by Civil Service training (see Lawrence 1992: p111)¹¹². The advice from SARD endorsed the RR's definition of physical education as sport and games. Sue Campbell of the NCF explained that the RR was determined to privilege its narrow, political definition of physical education in state schools;

¹¹² This point is substantiated, although denied, by Thatcher (1993) in her autobiography (see chapter four: p128).

SC The political stance at this moment is ‘that’ [sport as a means of character building] - their heads tell them that ‘that’ is achieved on ‘the playing fields of Eton’. We are back to that age quite honestly. It is almost that mentality “If we get children playing competitive sport we are not going to have hooligans on the street”. Everybody knows that is an extreme position. The PM is a very sensible man. ...He wants to make a difference. However, if the advice they get comes with a particular prejudice and it happens to reinforce their own beliefs, it is very difficult thereafter to break that down.

WK Where is that advice coming from?

SC It comes from the DfE and the DNH. I am sure it has not missed your attention that Ian Sproat, as Minister for Sport, believes that competitive sports are the **only** answer...They do not have a level of understanding of even the very basics. They do not want to know about the basics. They just want to know what they know.

As their message suited RR objectives, the national governing bodies (NGBs) of sport were able to influence the government through the CCPR. CCPR Vice-Chairman Ray Carter stressed that;

RC Through heavy lobbying by CCPR...Sir Malcolm Thornton, offered to recommend that the CCPR ‘School Sports Charter’¹¹³ should be first introduced to the world by a press conference from the Houses of Parliament. That was last March [1994]... the PM, in question time later that same day, said “What a marvellous idea” prompted by Sir Malcolm Thornton.

WK What is the government doing about it?

RC I would like to think, I would hate to say that the government *is* going to do something, but from the soundings that we have taken I would suggest that there will be something significant about school sport promoted by the PM sometime this autumn. There will be definite proposals for changing the climate of sport in schools. That is all we can hope to do. From our proposals and our ideas, that other people must have, schools will feel *obliged* to do more for sport...We have met the PM’s advisors on physical education. He is certainly very concerned about the state of school sport. We have been listened to and something will happen.

This advice came through in John Major’s speech at the Conservative Party Conference in 1994 with his push for compulsory TCTG in schools. This was

¹¹³ The aims of the document ‘A Charter for School Sport’ (CCPR 1994) espoused the need for TCTG at all levels of education, and that initial teacher training should be carried out by the NGBs in the form of sports coaching (discussed below).

furthered in 1995 with the launch of the DNH document 'Sport: Raising the Game' (see Kay 1996). The aim to 'oblige' schools to do more 'sport' (games for all pupils up to the age of sixteen) became compulsory in 1995 (PT No. 6, April 1995). Again this highlights how the RR sought 'advice' on physical education that acted to confirm and reinforce its own prejudices¹¹⁴. My argument is that this was also the case with the procedures surrounding the deliberations of, and conclusions drawn by, the 1991 ESASC Report 'Sport in Schools' (see also chapter six: p217).

The ESASC Report

The previous reports commissioned by the government to investigate the state of 'Sport in Schools' had endorsed a progressive discourse. This, prior to the deliberations of the WG, was an outcome that the government disliked. The ESASC report was commissioned because the RR needed a report which endorsed sport and games. This meant that physical educationalists were not invited to give evidence. Professor Murdoch explained how physical education had to fight to be heard;

EM ... The Select Committee were meeting on 'Sport in Schools'. When Select Committees meet they really are looking at something pretty seriously because it is a cross party affair. I got wind of this Select Committee meeting talking about 'sport'. I then found out that they were going to be interviewing the CCPR, the National Council for School Sport, the Sports Council, I think the National Coaching Foundation. They were not interviewing physical education at all. It was completely excluded from any input. It just so happened that I decided to go and observe one of the sessions to see how the Select Committee worked. We realised it was absolutely diabolical. The questions that were being put to the sporting bodies were education questions and they were getting wrong answers. They were getting partial answers, they were getting prejudiced answers. Understandably so.

WK As part of that it seems that the education profession has been vilified, denigrated and by-passed. They seem to have been looking to the right wing think tanks to produce policy. Is that, in physical education, almost a lack of consultation on purpose?

EM Yes. Oh yes. Oh yes. They will avoid consultation if they can possibly help it. Like the Select Committee where we had to fight our way in, almost with a battering ram at the doors.....

¹¹⁴ This outlines the type of argument which had an influence on the RR. Although, in this instance, the CCPR's influence found a voice in RR speeches post 1992, it had been central in lobbying the government with the same arguments in the mid 1980s (see chapter six: p202).

Thus, far from looking at the aspect of physical education 'fairly seriously', it appeared that ESASC - a cross party committee - was investigating physical education under the RR definition of 'sport'¹¹⁵. Nonetheless, physical educationalists gained a voice through their own efforts and through written contributions (ESASC Appendices).

Educationalists argued that physical education was about the needs of pupils and that, as such, the debate about the role of competition should follow the educational debate not lead it (BCPE and PEA p88). The majority of evidence given to ESASC concerned an explanation of physical education's endeavours to develop understanding and to create positive learning experiences to foster participation (ASS County Councils p95, HMI p42, NCF p140). It was argued that to both create future participation and improve health, the solution was not merely to create compulsion to exercise but to educate pupils to understand exercise, and to give pupils independence to make informed decisions by giving them "...opportunities to reflect, discuss and debate" (SCOPE and PEA p142). SCOPE and the PEA (ESASC p142) went on to explain that it was a myth that simply to participate in physical education would both improve health and create outstanding performers. The answer was not simply to impose a limited and narrow set of traditional, elite activities.

Despite arguments which explained both the conceptual differences and the links between physical education and sport (BCPE p26, Lewis HMI p43, SCOPE and PEA p142), the ESASC Report (paragraph 14) endorsed traditional competitive games and concluded that they should be compulsory up to the age of fourteen (see chapter six: p217). Not only did this signal that physical education had a function beyond that of knowledge and understanding, namely cultural reproduction, but also that sport was to define the subject in school and that it would be skill centred 'activity', rather than child centred 'education'. The government was, at last, happy with a report that supported its wishes. It stated that "The Government shares the

¹¹⁵ This begs questions of the ideological intentions of the other political parties. It also begs questions of how Select Committees are appointed, also how and who decides which bodies will be selected to give evidence.

Committee's view that sport is an essential part of the school curriculum" (HoC 1992: p1v)¹¹⁶.

RR Members' Vilification of the Evidence Given to ESASC

During interview the RR members of ESASC vilified the considerable and considered evidence presented to the committee. David Evennett's statements were underpinned with RR ideology and arrogance;

WK The evidence collected for the ESASC Report 'Sport in Schools', 1991, seemed to suggest - even that from the sports people - that physical education should be more about educating the individual than the development of particular sports. However, the conclusion drawn by the committee stated that traditional teams games should be the major part of the physical education curriculum. It stated that there was more to PE than education, there was a wider cultural imperative and a case for national success. How do you account for that conflict?

DE The evidence that was presented to the Committee came from people who had an 'unenlightened self interest' in the process. They were looking at the situation from a particular and narrow viewpoint. The committee had a responsibility to look at the situation from a national viewpoint. We had to take into account that we were dealing with taxpayers' money. The public was being misled by educationalists. Their perception was being shaped by school teachers. PE teachers did not take sport seriously and that was beginning to become the attitude of many parents. We saw from a national point of view that other countries were having much greater sporting success than we were. Parents were beginning to question why that was. After all teachers were paid by taxpayers money. There is no lack of talented individuals in this country, but teachers refusal to do competitive games and sports stopped that talent coming through. The UK is more concerned with the development of all children rather than pushing talented individuals in schools. That is why we do not do so well at the international level as Germany.

The evidence given to ESASC in terms of individuals' development and educational needs was thus ignored in favour of wider right-wing political requirements. Harry Greenway attacked the emphasis on individual needs as non-sense and stressed the necessity of compulsion;

¹¹⁶ When considering the conclusion of the ESASC it is vital to take account of the RR membership's wider political views as well as their views of physical education (see Chapter Five: p157).

WK From reading the PE journals there appears to be conflict over that. Educationalists seem to be saying that compulsion to those traditional team games actually turns children off activity.

HG I do not accept that. I would like everything to be voluntary with children, but in fact children are lazy like everyone else. If you say to them that they can choose themselves, then they go and lie down. You have to remember that.

Sir Malcolm Thornton, Chair of ESASC, manipulated the research evidence to put the RR case. He then immediately undermined it when confronted with it;

SMT ...I go back to the importance of the healthy body and healthy mind. Children's' metabolisms have to be working properly. Physical activity, and especially sport, ensures this. But there is also a great deal of enjoyment gained through sport.

WK Researchers would disagree that 'that' is true for all children.

SMT I have no time for this pseudo-research, this pseudo-psychology. It is all 'garbage'. People like to play sport. For young men it is crucial. They have more hormones flying around their bodies than they know what to do with. There needs to be some channelling of aggression and playing games and sports are the ideal way to do that.

WK Again an aspect of social control but this time in a 'wider society' sense?

SMT What it is is common-sense. Sport should not be dragged down to a political level. It is common-sense that people need a balance between work and enjoyment. Sport is a specific activity that gives that balance. To debate issues over competition denies the common-sense values of sport for human development. What we have to do as politicians is remove ourselves from the debate between groups motivated by self-interest, and make decisions based on common-sense which are of the greatest benefit to the public and to society.

Thornton's claim that RR values and beliefs were 'common-sense', tied with the RR's aim to establish its discourse as politically neutral and 'natural', while vilifying alternatives as ideologically motivated (see chapter four: p142). His exhortation that theory was damaging to society was pushed even more strongly by David Evennett;

DE God save us from the experts. There is a great gulf between the experts and the public. The experts have a narrow, specialist knowledge. Experts led to the overloading of the NC. It was a disaster. The advice from the experts cannot be taken on board. They all have competing demands over who is the expert and what is best educationally. What education needs is balance within the context of society. The NC has to be balanced within the taxpayers money and demands.

Evennett's assertion that ESASC was working in the interests of the public against the dangerous self-serving interests of educational experts, who ignored public demands and wasted money on experimentation, echoed the RR's wider rhetoric. He blamed educationalists for an imbalance due to too much emphasis on progressive methods, and continued to define physical education as sport. However, Evennett not only meant 'sport in schools', he was also concerned with the sport's 'business' and its role in wealth creation;

DE There is also the fact that sport is a big business commercial concern. Sport generates a massive tax revenue. That comes not only through employment in the industry and the payment of consumers to either participate or spectate. It also comes through the consumer demand for the equipment that is required and the jobs that that creates. Sport is a very important area in many respects

Thus, rather than physical education contributing to a balance of positive experiences and opportunities for all children, the RR's demand for traditional sports based on a rhetoric of 'character building and health', can be viewed as serving narrow political and economic interests. Clearly the RR did not wish to 'bridge the gap' between its ideology and empirical 'hard fact'.

Opportunities to 'Bridge the Gap'

There were frequent opportunities to 'bridge the gap' prior to the development of the NCPE. However, they were avoided. Boyson's responses gave an indication of the RR's attitude;

WK What research or what preparation do you think the government undertook to formulate the national curriculum?

RB I have no idea. I have no idea. I am not a great believer in this pseudo-research.

WK Why is that?

RB Well I think it is common sense. If you get six ordinary parents and two teachers they could do the curriculum in a night.

In his view RR policies did not need to be either consulted or critically evaluated. With the government holding such attitudes it proved difficult to advise them. Sue Campbell of the NCF explained that it also proved extremely difficult to advise Civil Servants;

SC ...I am not sure that anyone has gone in and said "Hold on. There are more things than competitive sports" I like to think that I have. I have said it until I am blue in the face. I have spent hours trying to explain to DFE and DNH the difference between physical education and sport and what they are trying to achieve. It is not easy. I am talking to lay people. These are not people with a background and knowledge in physical education and sport. They have not researched it. They are people who are maths, English and geography graduates. They are very clever people but they do not understand physical education.

WK Talking about 'bridging the gap'. You have been giving that background to them. There have been numerous reports done to show the difference, they have commissioned them, the evidence is there. However, they appear to have ignored them or pushed them aside.

SC I know. Do not ask me. I despair with you. I do not understand. The evidence is there. The voice is there. The NCWG were a very good, well rounded, balanced group. They came out with as well as balanced a document as they could, with all that they were trying to put into the curriculum. It was a damn good document.

However, the RR was not prepared to accept the WG's endorsements and considerable pressures were placed on it after the IR to conform to the wishes of the SoS (see Appendix H: p84). After the publication of the FR, the RR sought to control the development of the NCPE to a greater extent to suppress the progressive discourse, as we shall see below.

RR 'Control' of the NCPE Development Process

Professor Talbot (1993: p46) gradually realised the political influences in policy making;

...during my time as a member of the Working Group I came to realise that public representation is much less a part of decision making in our so-called democratic society than I had supposed. Instead, it became clear that the mythologies surrounding subjects, and the long-held opinions of Ministers and civil servants, were far more important in the arbitrary decisions which were taken, than reasoned and informed argument. The strength, source, visibility and publicity of representations were more important than their quality.

These pressures continued when the WG's recommendations were passed to the NCC. The NCC, already identified as a body created to do the RR's bidding, was expected to toe the line (see chapter five: p165). Kevin Gilliver (previously with the NCC and at the time of interview Professional Officer for Physical Education with SCAA) outlined that the government 'controlled' curriculum development;

WK You said there that your job is to advise government. Do you feel that your advice is taken?

KG Phew! ... Well I have got to say yes haven't I? We have just sent our advice to the SoS, last Friday, for the new NC in PE. Time will tell whether our recommendations have been accepted or not.

WK With your background in physical education, is what you are seeing in schools now what you believe should be there?

KG Well I have got to say 'yes' haven't I. That is a difficult question for me to answer. I work for this particular organisation and this particular organisation's recommendations go forward to the SoS. Therefore, it is the recommendations that come from the Authority, the 'authority' here makes the decisions about what should go forward and the 'authority' here has made its decision. In the Authority's mind the decision that is made is the correct one. That is a nasty question that.

When questioned further Gilliver explained the position he found himself in;

WK You have said a couple of times “I am not sure if I can answer this question”, “I would have to say that”, as if you do not really agree with it.

KG You can do your best to extract from this what you can. In the end because who I work for I have to be careful what I say. I do not want to be misconstrued.

WK Do you feel constrained in what you can say?

KG Not really. You sometimes have to be a little bit careful. It is not unduly constraining. I have been reasonably frank so far.

Advice from those directly involved with organisations like the NCC, who had considerable experience, knowledge and understanding in the field, was not wanted. Former NCC chair Duncan Graham confirmed that SoS Clarke ignored the NCC’s advice (Graham and Tytler 1993: p92). Graham highlighted his anxiety over Clarke’s actions, explaining that;

I realised then that if a Secretary of State was prepared to treat a well disposed advisory council in that way he would be prepared to do anything if it suited him.

The motives behind political interference in the making of the NCPE were highlighted by a Civil Servant (G1) involved in the process;

WK What I am trying to do is to look at the political influence in the curriculum and to see if there is a dominant ideology at work here. To see if the Radical Right Conservatives have had an input into education and why. I am trying to work out if there is a wider push towards the compulsion of games for ulterior motives.

G1 If this is non-attributable, then yes, there is a certain amount of political interference concerning the aspect of games. In the draft proposal you have probably seen that games is one of the activities to be pursued at KS4. That is through the will of the DFE. That is obvious to anyone. There is also the question of “Who has been influencing the DFE. Has it been the PM, has it been the Minister for Sport?” So, yes there has been political interference.

WK You said that there had been political interference, in what respect?

G1 Not directly. That would never come directly. It would be indirectly through the DFE. They would never divulge that there had been political interference. It is obvious that there has been. Otherwise the DFE would not have the particular views and beliefs that they do have.

WK Is there anything else you feel is important.

G1 Personally, it is not the curriculum I would have wanted. There is too much political interference. That is especially true of the compulsion of competitive team games at KS4. KS4 has two areas of activity, which is narrow enough, but compulsion to games will turn most pupils off physical activity for life. It is too narrow, too politically motivated.

This statement reiterates the educationalists worry that team games dominated the curriculum and that they were the one area that did not need to be 'imposed'. Other members of the Civil Service explained that because they still worked with the DFE they were unable to discuss the development of the NCPE, due either to the Official Secrets Act or tenure of employment¹¹⁷. It seems highly undemocratic that an education system should be subject to secrecy to prevent investigation and evaluation of the motives behind reform of any description.

An 'Ideological Mind-Set'

Policy making decisions were increasingly centralised to a poorly informed, unaccountable RR clique (see chapter five: p157). With parliament as a body of busy people, not possessing specialist knowledge who pass laws they have neither read nor understand (Haviland 1988: pv), consultation would seem to be imperative. However, investigation of Hansard showed how MP's arguments were driven by opinion and assumption, rather than by examination of various sources of data and information. Baker (1993: p198) stated that;

Most ministers around the table could not distinguish between the curriculum, covering the full range of knowledge that a child has to absorb, and the syllabus, covering the detailed programme of study leading to an exam. Their views were drawn mainly from their own experiences of education or occasionally based on that of their children.

Those educationalists interviewed felt that the Government's beliefs could be explained with reference to the 'old public and grammar school' experiences of Ministers and Civil Servants. They felt that Ministers and Civil Servants believed that

¹¹⁷ I was informed by my head of department that he had been contacted, anonymously, by a Civil Servant on the PE WG. My head of department was informed that as all the Civil Servants who worked with the PE WG were still employed by the DES, none would be available for interview.

'games' were 'common-sense', and took it for granted that these were appropriate for all pupils. Margaret Talbot suggested that;

MT ...Kenneth Clarke has this view about experts. It is that they are a load of woolly minded 'so and sos'. He sees it like he sees it. He is arrogant enough to think that 'that is' the way it is. If he does not see reflection in PE, therefore, there is no reflection in PE. Therefore all this rationalisation, all this stuff that he saw as making PE more complicated was not needed. He wanted it swept away.

She commented that;

MT ...There is a real problem about the anti-intellectual ideology of this government. They would never admit that but it has been there since Thatcher. ...There is this fear of questioning the status quo as if attitudes towards authority are inevitably undermined by it. If there are strong values and beliefs, that will not be the case...

Murdoch (1993: p68) felt that;

One of the greatest barriers to co-operation has been a misunderstanding that is prevalent among very influential people, of the difference between physical education and sport. Among significant policy makers, a considerable confusion still exists in clarifying not only the difference between physical education and sport but also the relationship of one to the other.

However, Professor Alan Tomlinson (Brighton University) re-emphasised the conflicts between education and government;

AT ... There are Major's very simplistic philosophies about the meaning of 'games'. Also his Ministers talk about the meaning of games and the value of games. They restore an 'old public school model' to the centre of the debate. That does not fit at all well with the physical education practitioners, such as Liz Murdoch or others who have attempted to effect the policy in much more humanistic and developmental senses. Their model of the physical education curriculum has not been about control. Rather it is about self-development and the enhancement of the quality of life¹¹⁸.

¹¹⁸ Nonetheless, the model offered by the WG was still about 'control', even if in a different form. It was not a case of 'control' or 'no control'.

Dame Angela Rumbold, MfE at the time of the NCPE WG, suggested that the conflict was based on political prejudice rather than misunderstanding;

AR How can it be physical education if it isn't sport?

WK That is what they [educationalists] would ask. They would say that physical education is not sport, that sport is not physical education. Is that something you would disagree with?

AR Very profoundly. I do not understand, quite honestly how else you would interpret physical education, other than by putting it into the connotation of participating in sport.

The same was true of the comments made by Sir Malcolm Thornton, Chair of the 1991 ESASC report 'Sport in Schools';

WK You have said a lot about sport while talking about education. Is there a difference between sport and physical education, between games and physical education?

SMT No. There is no difference at all. It is to do with exercising the body. The only difference is in the context in which that is done. Physical education is exercise in the gymnasium. Sport is exercising outside in the form of team games. It is more concerned with developing strength, co-ordination and balance and so on.

However, even this distinction did not appear to be upheld in the immediate build up to consultation over the FR and the publishing of the Statutory Orders (SO). In Sue Campbell's experience, the politicians either ignored, avoided or castigated discourse other than their own;

SC ...I have spent the last six months talking in five government departments...I have met Senior Ministers from the Home Office, Environment, Health, Education and Heritage. I would say that there is a very poor understanding of physical education. That there is a considerable opinion about sport. I am not saying they understand. They have strong opinions.

However, Civil Servant 'G1' felt that the confusion was intentional rather than a result of 'honest' ignorance. Another Civil Servant directly involved with the development of the NCPE substantiated this view;

B1 ...I have tried to educate him [Sproat]. He is as Robert Atkins was...The problem is that not only do they not understand what PE is, they do not want to, and refuse to understand it.

Murdoch highlighted that in her meetings with different MfS this attitude came across forcefully;

EM It is very interesting that Robert Atkins was a classic case of man who just could not see past 'the sporting experience'. He could not understand what we were talking about. Colin Moynihan was another one. He said "If it means 'poncing' about in rooms the way I have seen some people doing, I am not having any of it" He said "A good dose of boxing for every child is what I would like" That was his basic attitude. We had to challenge that but they were very, very firm.

My argument is that the apparent 'ignorance' of this 'ideological mind-set' was not accidental. Rather, it was intentional and not the expression of some ill-informed 'misunderstanding'. To have acknowledged the educational arguments would have meant recognition of a form of physical education deemed threatening to the production of both a conservative 'citizenship' and its associated social hierarchy.

A Critical Realist Interpretation of RR 'Misunderstanding'

All this suggests that the RR intentionally perpetuated the 'information gap' in an attempt to suppress evidence which either did not suit its ends, or which argued that the effect (the reality) of its version of physical education would not deliver what its rhetoric promised (i.e. mass voluntary participation in competitive team sport post-school). Deliberate avoidance and vilification of opposing evidence indicated that the RR was determined to enforce its definition of physical education. This was evident in the discrepancy between the RR's rhetorical claim that national economic and industrial needs were behind the development of the NC, and its unwillingness to listen to industrialists' advice when confronted with it. Duncan Graham remarked;

There was something that did not add up: industry was in favour of our whole curriculum approach and had representatives on the working groups. Baker was friendly with industry and yet he appeared to want to stop work which they approved and supported (Graham and Tytler 1993: p20).

Seemingly, the kind of citizen the industrialists wished to develop did not concur with the RR's wishes. Evans (interview) explained that;

JE ...the industrialist on the initial Working Group, his concept of vocationalism wasn't the Old Right view, it was the New Right view, or the New Vocationalists' view, of a flexible individual. His thinking was not narrowly in terms of sport, competition and skilling. His view was that of the Group, he was willing to take on board the view of the educationalists that some kids don't like sport, they don't gain any satisfaction from it, from being forced to do it. They realised that what industry now needed was an all round person, an individual.

Thus, although the RR's rhetoric was claimed to be based on industrial needs, the imposition of compulsory TCTG, apparently, ran counter to what industry requested. Professor John Tomlinson (interview) outlined similar sentiments when giving his evaluation of RR rhetoric;

JT That is a perfect illustration. There in microcosm is exactly what has happened generally. All the arguments, including those from industrialists, are for open minded, independent, thinking individuals. However, government cannot cope with that. They do not want to cope with that. They are afraid of it.

WK Because...?

JT Because they think it is threatening. It is protecting some old establishment and antiquated structure "The Playing Fields of Eton...we won the Battle of Waterloo there" and all that. Which, when you think about it, is absolute nonsense. Hardly anybody who fought at Waterloo had been to Eton. At least not those who died, or very few.

Clearly, in its endeavour to reproduce its version of capitalist arrangements, the RR needed to nurture moral subjugation and reflexivity, not autonomous and reflective individuals. Thus, its policies were educationally flawed and lacked support. It adopted an authoritarian and prescriptive implementation process, issuing instructions and controls in the smallest details through the bureaucratic use of Circulars and Orders. Further, implementation was deliberately under-resourced (see Marsh and Rhodes 1992). Understanding these points assists in understanding the mechanisms employed by the RR in the making of the NCPE (discussed below). The rhetoric of 'market freedom' had no place in deciding the form or content of physical education

policy. In response to this, Murdoch (1992: p19) argued that avoidance of consultation and vilification of alternative findings would pose serious problems for the assurance of a sound physical education experience for children;

The suspicion shown by the government to anyone who professes or is alleged to be an expert or a professional will not fail to reduce the influence of those whose task it should be to sharpen the leading edge of our thinking. Good practice can only be grounded in appropriate theory and subsequent critical thinking, otherwise how can that practice be validated and evaluated?

There was a clear ‘gap’ between the views of the RR and those of progressive educationalists. However, the abundant opportunities to bridge the gap were systematically undermined or ignored. Rather than not understanding progressive ideas, the RR deliberately avoided them. If it had been prepared to ‘bridge the gap’, it would not have vilified the progressive discourse. Clearly, the RR was determined to have its political interests served by the NCPE. It could not publicly expose itself to the same research that changed the WG’s perspective if its political imperatives were to be met (see Appendix H: p80). The deliberate juxtapositioning of physical education with sport was intended to create a conceptual confusion to allow the RR to instil its ideological definition of physical education in state schools through the NCPE.

The NCPE: The RR’s Endeavour to Control the ‘Content’ of Physical Education Provision

The ERA outlined a NC framework (‘structure’) of ATs and PoS which limited both the form and content of the curriculum. Physical education’s low status (through ‘priority areas’ and ESGs - see chapter five: p167), and its late arrival in the implementation of the NC, meant that resources were diverted to other subjects through LMS. This was the context in which the WG had to deliberate.

The Interim Report (IR): The WG's Theory of Physical Education

The NCPE IR outlined the importance of developing individuals' knowledge and understanding through physical education. Chapter One of the IR outlined that education seeks to maximise the potential of every child, and, as such, is wider than skill development. Further, the WG argued that physical education is more than just activity, it is about the development of the mind and critical thinking;

...children who are required to make few decisions for themselves and who merely respond to instructions are likely to acquire accurate physical skills, but are unlikely to develop judgement, adaptability or independence (WG IR: p9).

Beer, Chair of the NCPE WG, emphasised the critical importance of understanding;

IB You will have read our report on the NC. Of course we wrote into it that every child at different KSs should have a level of understanding of why it was taking exercise. Until you begin to understand the importance, say during adolescence, of putting your pulse rate up to a higher level you cannot quite see why the devil you bother to do it. An understanding of the basic physiology of the heart and circulation is absolutely crucial. Of course, until you understand how your body is actually working, it becomes more difficult for a top class physical educationalist to develop to a high potential. I am not going to say 'sportspersons' (interview).

Beer's argument was that participation is dependent on understanding and worthwhile experience, and that making activity compulsory is not enough to ensure future participation¹¹⁹.

The IR created a clear vision of physical education based on progressive principles. Child centred education and equality were embedded in its 'instructional', 'distributive' and 'regulative' rules (see Evans and Penney 1994). It was largely supported by the physical education profession (interviews). The IR was felt to highlight the 'experiential cycle' (Fawcett and Bunn 1992: p23) of 'plan, do and review' which emphasised learning through exploration to develop understanding,

¹¹⁹ It is interesting that Beer stresses that he does not wish to use the term 'sportsperson'. This is interesting in light of the NR/RR's use of 'sport' to define physical education (see Chapter Six: p203, and Appendix H: p85).

leading to a 'democratic autonomy' (McNamee 1992b: p25). The WG was prepared to continue towards its FR using the same arguments. However, the RR was not prepared to let it do so.

The RR's 'Influence' as the IR became the FR

The WG indicated that the concept of 'entitlement' in the ERA did not recognise that that children do not come to school equally pre-disposed to enjoy its opportunities;

...it would be a mistake to equate access with opportunity, and it is important to appreciate the distinction between the two ...attitudes and expectation ...These effects are particularly important in physical education, where teaching method may have been adopted for traditional rather than educational reasons (DES FR 1991: p15 para 6.3).

This statement was in direct conflict to the RR's rhetoric, not only that the NC was broad and balanced with equality of access to all pupils, but that traditional methods and content were 'common-sense'. It was part of the WG's struggle to maintain a progressive focus in physical education despite the constraints put in place by the SoS (see Appendix H: p94). These constraints showed both the political nature of control in the development of ERA policy, and how central government was able to impose the structure of educational policy through ATs and PoS. The constraints limited the discursive possibilities of the WG in the development of the NCPE. So much so that the FR was a document of compromise within the available resources, laden with the RR's SPEC interests (Penney 1991: p36-37). For example, in the view of the educationalists interviewed, the rationale was sound but the recommendations on equal opportunities lacked strength. Beer (1992: p8-9) reiterated the WGs concerns that equal opportunities were now implicit rather than explicit in the text of the NCPE, and would therefore struggle to reach the surface of teachers' consciousness. He was disappointed that the SoS and the NCC had greatly de-emphasised the content on equal opportunities in the NCPE SO (interview). However, as the FR was never intended to offer more than 'guidance' to the SoS and the NCC, at no stage had they to acknowledge the work undertaken by the WG. Once the FR was published the WG had no further input.

RR ‘Influences’ as the FR became the Statutory Orders (SO) through the NCC

After the publication of the FR, the NCPE was issued to the NCC for consideration and consultation based on the recommendations of the SoS. SoS Clarke (DES News 206/91) suggested that the recommendation of the WG provided an excellent basis for the consultation exercise to be undertaken by the NCC. Nonetheless, he instructed the NCC to have regard to the practicality of the proposals, the levels of EKSS targets and PoS, and if there were any omissions. In his view the WG’s recommendations were still too ‘educational’. He was determined to have them even more practically based. He instructed the NCC that;

You will see that our proposals adopt the Working Group’s recommended attainment target and end of key stage statements. I should however be grateful if you could consult on and advise me on how these might be amended to bring out even more clearly that attainment should be judged on the basis of pupil’s activity (DES News 206/91).

With the NCC, as with the WG, Clarke put economic concerns before educational concerns. He instructed the NCC that it should consider whether the WG’s recommendations were practicable and reasonable in the light of the resource implications (DES News 206/91). Thus, not only was he stating that the WG’s recommendations were too expensive, he was constraining the NCC to stick to minimum expenditure, perhaps even to trim the FR. This was reinforced with the decision to question whether Appendix D of the FR should be included at all¹²⁰. Despite a large percentage of support for the retention of Appendix D, the NCC (1991b) decided that it should not be included. It also concluded that there should be a reduced range of activity in the curriculum and that games would be compulsory. This tied closely to the conclusions made by ESASC. NCC Chair David Pascal hinted at the nature of the pressures placed on the NCC in the wording of his letter to SoS Clarke¹²¹. He wrote that “...Council is confident that the recommendations contained in this report achieve your aim of emphasising the practical nature of physical

¹²⁰ Appendix D in the FR outlined the rationale for PoS. It emphasised the educational aspects of physical education, within its practical foundations.

¹²¹ It is unclear from the official communications what the levels of pressure were. What is known is how much pressure was imposed unofficially in the background (see Appendix H: p91).

education” (NCC 1991b: p16). However, Clarke ‘turned-around’ the apparent roles of NCC and SoS with his statement that;

There has been considerable support for the recording of the Attainment Targets and Programmes of Study, recommended to me by the National Curriculum Council, to make the requirements for PE more easily understood and more easily accessible to teachers and parents (DES News 112/92).

Clarke was effectively implying that the NCC had the major role in this process of recommendations. This was not the case. Further the use of the word ‘considerable’ is a rhetorical obfuscation. There may well have been ‘considerable’ support for the Government’s view on ATs and PoS. However, there was ‘considerably’ more opposition to it. Nonetheless, such rhetorical obfuscation allowed the SoS to claim that games had to be compulsory to ensure a balance in physical education (DES News 112/92).

Kevin Gilliver, the civil servant in charge of physical education at the NCC, indicated that changes made at this stage were minimal and of little significance in the process (interview). However, members of the WG stressed that changes between the FR and the SO were very significant indeed, and altered fundamentally what was possible and probable in physical education in schools (interviews). Professor Elizabeth Murdoch;

EM ...originally we have seen four documents so far and there will be a fifth fairly shortly. That [IR] was a fairly dense and detailed document...We are now just waiting for the final version of that [Dearing] which will then, I presume, be the new SO. What has happened in that whole period of time is that what we really believed in the very first instance, in the IR, has been quite markedly changed. Somethings have been preserved somethings have been completely lost.

And Professor Margaret Talbot;

MT Particularly in the rationale. The richness and the wealth in the way which we phrased the philosophy and the ‘raison d’être’ of the subject was lost. Yes...There was enormous loss. There was virtually no mention in the Statutory Orders of equal opportunities. That was a terrible tragedy...

WK Did you not mention that there were small but significant changes in the wording as well?

MT There were. Yes, there were. ...There were differences in the way that things were expressed. Much of the 'enabling' language was changed to much more 'directive' language. It was a great pity that we lost the work on equal opportunities.

Crucially, these pressures were not exerted solely upon physical education. They were also exerted upon maths, English, history and geography (Graham and Tytler 1993). All the WGs were intended to compile reports which endorsed the Government's political demands. The RR's political intent in physical education can be read in Atkins' claim that;

All members of the working group contributed to a cogent and well-argued report, one that we largely accept. Most of all, it said that competitive games were an essential part of a programmes of physical education (Hansard 1991 Vol. 199, Col. 993).

Firstly, it is known that all members of the WG did not 'contribute' in the sense implied (see Appendix H: p79). Secondly, the WG members stated categorically in the FR that competitive games were not their 'most of all' essential. Most importantly, however, is Atkins' revelation that the WG report was "...one that we largely accept". In other-words, the Government intended to ignore the findings it did not like.

As the NCPE development moved from the IR to the SO the documents became less and less detailed at every stage. However, the changes were not exacted to make it more useful to educationalists. Murdoch suggested that changes were made, firstly, because the government did not like what the WG had written, and, secondly, because it wanted a slimmed down and directive SO document (interview). She argued that as a result of the simplification process much of what was good in the early documents was lost (Murdoch 1992: p150). Murdoch explained the substance and implications of the changes demanded by the SoS;

WK You have written about the reduction in quality in the document from the FR to the SO. How much did the process and the content change once the WG had given it over to the SoS and the NCC?

EM The changes came in condensing things. In particular the 'End of KS statements'. These are really critical in this. If what you are asking children to do is clearly stated, then what you lead up to in doing that is very important. But if these end of KS statements become rather global and rather vague then what goes before it can be almost anything. I think that what happened towards the end of that process, before the SO came out, was that the global end of KS statements, become more global. They tended to be combined a little more closely together. Not markedly, because they could not really alter it too much - they did not know enough about it to really alter it. Obviously, they had one or two people look at it and made it, probably, with 'less teeth'. But not a lot, you can trace it through. It is harder to see the progression sometimes and harder to be able to say that we really could differentiate.

Beer suggested that the Civil Servants who endeavoured to steer the WG towards what was possible were then involved in changing the content once the FR was handed over;

IB ...The PoS in the SO were written by...I do not know whom. Not by the politicians, but presumably by the same CSs who were working for the group. They were all the time under, as I saw it, pressures from the politicians to simplify things, to make things shorter, less prescriptive and so on. That is true.

Senior HMI 'F1' made it clear that pressures were placed on the NCC to change the WGs' proposals;

WK How much were the WG proposals changed once they had handed over the FR?

F1 Well yes. They were. They were changed by several process which were interlocking. The first thing was, that as a draft, they were sent for approval by the Minister. The CSs would propose redrafts which, at that point, they were in a position to put in. The WGs, once the material was handed over, did not remain in place. Any redrafting was done by CSs. They did not refer back to the WGs to ask if the changes were all right. The consultative process that came about once the FRs were published, where teachers, the public, political groups no doubt, could submit their views on the curriculum to the NCC. These FRs went through another set of redrafting by the NCC before they were turned into the NC itself. The FR the NCC report then the SO.

WK And there were subtle but significant changes?

F1 Oh Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes

WK In what ways?

F1 Do not press me too much for detail at this point. This is down to specific text. This comes out, particularly, in the way in which things were drafted. It is very sensitive...That does show at an absolutely personal level how a senior politician, in that case Margaret Thatcher, was ready to intervene directly with the formulation of the actual wording of the NC¹²².

Thus, at each stage of the development of the NCPE the RR's political intent was enforced more forcefully through the constraints placed on language use and the possible level of resourcing. These were critical in constructing the DES's 1992 NCPE SO.

RR Constraints on Discourse and Resources¹²³

Evans, Penney and Bryant (1993d: p8-9) argue that;

...the development of the NCPE vividly illustrates not only the tension between stated...educational intentions...and harsh economic realities, but also that policy 'making' is a political process in which not all parties have similar capabilities to influence 'outcomes'. It also demonstrates that the form of control can simultaneously be both very obvious and very subtle.

The very obvious controls were the conditions set by the SoS and the tone of his communication. Subtle controls were the controls over language and resources. Control of the distribution of resources was a very powerful way to control the policy process, both directly and indirectly. A rhetoric of economic crisis created the justification for a narrowing of the curriculum and imposing greater accountability. This strongly suggests that the 'concern' over resources was employed by the RR as a 'rhetorical device' to constrain the development of a progressive discourse in the NCPE. It set the 'structural confines' for the scope and possibility of the NCPE, constraining the WG's discussion within what was 'economically viable'.

¹²² See also Appendix H: p89, where 'F1' discusses the language used in the NC documents.

¹²³ See Appendix H: p86 for a fuller discussion of the RR's control over the development of the NCPE through its political power and authority to constrain both discourse and resources.

The RR claimed that the cost of physical education was a prime economic concern. Pawsey, a prominent and influential right-wing Tory MP, and chair of the 'Conservative Back Bench Education Committee', stated that;

JP ...What about the provision of 'kit'. Providing 'kit' is a very expensive business. When I say 'kit' I mean 'resources'. That means both the equipment and the teachers. Providing all the equipment for so many activities is very expensive, and then there is the space both to store it all and to use it. Not only that, there is the business of training Masters. It is a long and expensive business to train teachers. It makes much more sense to provide activities that Masters can already do. Most masters will know rugby and football for the boys. For the girls, teachers will certainly know netball and hockey. In the summer Masters will know cricket. It makes much more sense to provide games that the Masters already know and for which the 'kit' is not as expensive. Rather than have to provide new 'kit' or train teachers over a long period, both being very expensive¹²⁴.

In this ideology, cost cutting and traditionalism interact. It completely displaces the notion of physical 'education' with specific, 'traditional' physical activities. Physical education was to be a casualty of the RR's cost cutting. The RR's endeavour to have 'Masters' taking 'games', rather than specialists teaching physical 'education', was going to be achieved through the 'back-door'. Games provision meant that physical 'activity' could be provided at minimal cost with no need for training specialist teachers (Penney 1994: p292).

The Effect of the NC Policy on Physical Education Provision

The research of Evans, Penney and Bryant (1993a, 1993b, 1993c, 1993d) suggested that the market was also having a detrimental effect on physical education. It was resulting in the differentiation of provision from school to school and between subjects within schools. LMS formula funding meant that physical education's low academic status reduced its bargaining power for resource (Evans, Penney and Bryant 1993b, 1993c). This meant that, despite the DES assurance that all pupils would receive the same entitlement, it could not be guaranteed.

¹²⁴ This is a clear expression of the sexism, elitism and narrowness of RR thinking.

The rhetoric of 'flexibility' (giving schools and teachers the decision to determine how much time was to be afforded to subjects within the curriculum) gave the appearance of freedom, but it ensured that all subjects would not get the same resources. According to Evans, Penney and Bryant (1993b: p27) "...In the context of scarce resources, 'entitlement' and 'flexibility' may be fundamentally incompatible" and "...the priorities at the market end of educational planning may simply be incompatible with educational criteria.". 'Flexibility' freed school governors from having to provide resources for physical education above those essential to reach End of Key Stage Statements (EKSS).

The RR could not afford progressive education 'socially', 'politically' or 'culturally'. The outcome of the development of the NCPE was a physical education text, which although purportedly had wide spread popular appeal and gave access to all, had the potential to perpetuate difference and cultural exclusivity. However, constraining the development of policy at the macro and meso levels could not ensure its unfettered implementation at the micro level if teachers continued to enjoy professional autonomy. For RR objectives to be met, teaching methods also had to be 'controlled'. This meant replacing progressive objectives in ITE and INSET with RR objectives.

Higher Education's (HE) Aims in ITE: The Development of Professionalism

Appendix after appendix in ESASC outlined and emphasised the aims of HE in ITE. The BCPE (ESASC: p28) outlined that "...Courses are designed to produce teachers who are critically reflective of their professional practice and as far as a possible exponents of the practical activities of physical education". Critical reflection on practice was seen to be as important as practical ability. SCOPE (ESASC: p143) stressed the need for teachers to understand and make allowance for the social, economic, political and educational contexts within which schools work, to encourage their sensitivity to individual educational needs. SCOPE referred to this as the 'pedagogic foundation' which would enable teachers to adapt to educational needs. To reach this level of professionalism, SCOPE (ESASC: p143) indicated that through ITE;

...student teachers are encouraged to develop intellectual skills which enable them to become better informed, to be more active in their own learning, to challenge, to analyse and to evaluate rather than to absorb and imitate; they are introduced to evidence and learn to recognise what counts as evidence, how to develop an argument and to distinguish rationally from prejudice and doctrine. The concept that lies at the heart of teacher education is the notion of professionalism.

This evidence was presented to ESASC at the same time as the WG submitted its reports to the SoS (see Appendix H: p80). The IR (DES 1991: p9-10) stressed the requirement for teachers to be professional educators to ensure that experiences in physical education were both educational and developmental for all pupils. The FR (DES: 1992: p15) further stressed 'child centred' education, commenting that "...It is also important to emphasise that the child is more important than the activities in which they are engaged. The game is not the important thing - the child is". ESASC and the WG reports were published at a time when debate surrounding the possible content of the NCPE was in the public eye. Parfitt (1992: p70) argued that "...reflection is the most critical part of learning...it is a dynamic aspect of knowledge development...it is also part of the process in which, and by which, school students and teachers come to know how the learning is progressing". Such arguments contrasted starkly with comments made by Pawsey in connection with reflective practice (see Appendix G: p70). However, HE's intentions were anathema to the RR. Ironically, the educational strength of HE's argument may have exacerbated physical education's political weakness. This was borne out in the ESASC conclusion (paragraph 14) which, despite all the evidence it had received (see above), emphasised 'training' rather than 'education' and privileged the position of compulsory TCTG (see chapter six: p218).

Conflict Between HE and the RR

Fawcett and Bunn's (1992: p36) description of reflective practice highlighted the potential political danger of the 'progressive' HE discourse to the RR project;

Basically, reflective teaching involves analysing one's own beliefs, values and attitudes, monitoring the effects of one's actions and questioning the

assumptions and consequences of teaching acts, analysing teaching strategies and considering the ethical, social and political implications of such practice.

This was the antithesis of the RR's aims. Such theory endangered the RR's quest to achieve political objectives through a narrow, functional physical education curriculum. Giroux (1983: p21) indicated that theory allows the teacher to undertake reflective thought and critique which improves understanding and practice. This furthered Lawton's (1980: p129) argument that information gathered during research, and knowledge gathered through experience, leads to critical reflection which 'bridges the gap' between policy constructed at the macro level and its implementation at the micro level. However, as already discussed, the RR not only wished to avoid 'bridging the gap', they intended to widen it, much to the dismay of educationalists involved in physical education and sport. Professor Murdoch, for example, had argued in evidence presented to ESASC that "...unless you bring children to a relative awareness of their own learning, I do not think learning has taken place...". Chris Laws of SCOPE argued that "...If children are going to develop an active lifestyle, they have to be involved in their own learning and understanding why an activity is going to be important to them" (SCOPE - ESASC 1991; p33). Such arguments opened up possibilities for 'bridging the gap' between the RR and HE. However, HE was ignored (discussed above), unsurprisingly given that the arguments put forward by educationalist's were exactly what the RR were trying to remove from education.

The RR Attack on HE and ITE

This section does not outline the RR's policies for ITE in detail. Neither space nor time allows for such a large undertaking. Rather, this section outlines the ideology of prominent RR MPs involved with the construction of policies for ITE (termed ITT) and INSET, and their views of what and how 'physical education 'teaching' should be¹²⁵.

Central government policy in ITT embodied the initiatives of the RR, who sought to justify reform through vilification of progressive ideals (see chapter five: p160). Vilification began with the Black Papers in the 1960s and 1970s (see chapter

¹²⁵ For a fuller discussion of RR policies in ITE and INSET see Appendix G: p54.

six: p197) and reforms to ITT began with the coming to power of the RR government in 1979 (see Appendix G: p56). This coupling of vilification (symbolic attack) with legislated reform (material control) continued through the 1980s and early 1990s.

During interview Boyson was scathing of HE;

RB Unquestionably when it all went wrong, was when colleges went to self-discovery, spouting a non-sensical society and started to say that there was problems with the traditional methods. Physical education is not about boys throwing a ball by themselves to discover how far they can throw it, and then try to throw it further. The only way for a child to develop is through competitive team games. Children need to be educated and that needs traditional methods. Progressive methods are non-sensical and teach dangerous attitudes to children. They are from another planet and are to be laughed at. They would not be understood by anybody and are no good for anybody.

This statement encapsulated the RR's assault on education. It attacked teacher education; misrepresented and undermined progressive developments; imposed the view that only traditional form and content was based in common-sense; and that education's purpose was utilitarian. In a condescending attack on teachers, Boyson portrayed progressive developments as ideologically motivated and worthless;

RB I think the colleges of education diverted away from their...what they should do in physical education, which was...I mean the body, the strength of the body, the control of the body, games and the good sportsmanship that came from it, and we had all this individual...discovery of the individual. Which was to my mind a total non-sense. I mean, if the child wants to discover by himself he can sit on a table at home and discover. You don't need to waste time having teachers to teach him. ...I had physical education teachers at that time who did not want any competitive games at all, and you know you had all this, as if they had come from outer-space some of these people, 'brainless'. And eh...well brainless is probably not a fair statement, I mustn't say brainless. But they were in another world and they had no idea of what the real world was like, either for the child or for the parents.

Boyson outlined that, in his view, physical education should concentrate on training the physical and the social. His statements undermined a considerable body of research which argued that 'training' and 'compulsion' did little to foster positive attitudes (see Biddle and Fox 1988, Fox and Biddle 1988a, 1988b). Further, Boyson not only attacked teachers and teacher education, but, with typical RR arrogance,

outlined how they *should* be. He also described how and what physical education *should* be in schools;

WK What about the subjects that are involved in the content of teacher training courses?

RB Well the content is obvious to understand... it seems to be perfectly simple. I could write it down for anybody in the country in two hours if they paid me enough to do it and...they won't do... is to develop the physique of the individual, to bring in teams games to develop the co-operation that is necessary in individuals, to actually induct them into all kinds of things from canoeing, climbing and all kinds of others, that's all. I mean its perfectly simple you don't need a degree for that. All this searching for a degree is a sign of lack of confidence.

WK How do you think the situation with teacher training could be improved in the future?

RB Well I think it is with what I have said. I mean, I don't... I have never been involved basically in... I have had the end product of teacher training. But the main thing about teacher training is to actually do it inside the classroom. It is not a theoretical thing. You can have someone who is very good at the theory, it is your ability to enthuse boys and girls. That is the...to enthuse them for good causes for literacy and numeracy, and in this case for games, and physical fitness.

Boyson emphasised clearly that RR policy was driven by SPEC imperatives, and that alternative discourses were to be vilified, discredited, ignored or suppressed. Significantly, physical education ITT also came under attack from RR MP Sir Malcolm Thornton, chairman of ESASC. He followed the same ideological logic;

SMT Education has been anti-sport. It has been anti-education. That has come mainly through the left-wing teacher training institutions. They have portrayed education as some kind of process which controls people. That is absolute nonsense. The attack on competitive games was seen as an anti-establishment gesture. A way to 'boot-out' the culture they did not like. Teacher training has developed a generation of teachers that have been subjected to that 'unfortunate propaganda'. It has coloured their views. Teacher training institutions have had a very much liberal or left-wing philosophy. Education has become very much part of a political agenda....That is why teacher training has to be more 'on-the-job'. There needs to be some 'learning about learning' but that should be done on a day release system to college. Not the other way around. There is some need for theory but what teachers need is to experience good practice. That is achieved through being in

school and learning from teachers who are involved practically with delivering the National Curriculum¹²⁶.

A particularly acrimonious attack came from fellow ESASC member and RR MP Evennett;

DE It is clear that we do not have the best people in teaching. Of those, sports teaching is least good. There are very few graduates in the profession. They are ill-equipped to teach the health side. They are not good organisers or motivators. We have a body of people who were trained in the 1960s and 1970s. They require retraining to be brought up to date. They need to have their skills changed and a new approach is needed.

Evennett, albeit unintentionally, outlined how the RR (trading on inaccurate and misleading information about the teaching profession) attempted to shape the public's attitude towards, and perceptions of, physical education in schools. In this view, the teachers' job was to produce national squads and a healthy nation. Parents who thought along the same lines as teachers also needed to have their minds changed. In Evennett's mind physical education in schools was **sport**, and it was the schools' job to concentrate on sporting excellence. By this stage in the interview Evennett was becoming rather irate with the line of questioning. When questioned about the reduction in support for in-service education of teachers, Evennett revealed the RR's hidden intentions to remove physical education teachers from schools;

WK We have seen a decline in INSET provided by LEAs due to changes in funding and the number of LEA Advisors had been cut. There appears to be very little opportunity to help educate teachers.

DE LEA Advisors are a 'waste of space'. The input to sport in schools has to come from the sports industry. The sports industry would be a very popular provider of coaches. Schools should bring in sports people. They have a greater interest in sport than PE teachers and are more motivated to teach competitive games. There should be more sports people and more coaches in schools, rather than teachers. These people know the practical side of sport. They know the business and the industry. That is the way forward. We need to get people from sport into schools. People who know what they are doing.

This viewpoint which had profound implications not only for the future of the physical education profession, but also for the educational value of pupil's physical

¹²⁶ This 'theory' is critiqued in Appendix I (see Appendix I p103).

'experiences', was all the more worrying when taken in consideration with former MfE Angela Rumbold's narrow explanation of children's learning;

AR ...the easiest way to describe it is when you look how you teach a child to read. ...Now, there were some of the rather 'wilder' views about how a child like, you know, if you sat it down with a pile of books one day it would learn to read. Now actually that is rubbish. The way you teach a child to read is a combination of things. You do need to expose children to books and the printed word. You also need to teach children how to distinguish what the shapes are and how to put those shapes together. You also need to show them what the whole word looks like. So, there are a whole range of things that you do. But the most important thing of all is practice. It is one of those extraordinary, extraordinary things that you notice with children - if you have done any teaching at all - is that one week the child will be struggling with simple words then the next week it will have got the knack 'just like that'. Then from being able to read simple words it goes on very quickly to being able to read altogether. It is a bit like the language break through, or learning to ride a bicycle, or whatever, one day you can't and the next day you can. It is that skill of imparting, and taking the care to ensure that you impart that skill to the child which then enables it to...to ...to...

WK How does that transfer to physical education and the training of teachers?

AR Well, well, well...lets look at riding a bicycle. Again, a skill, or learning to skate, it is a skill of teaching and helping children to understand the whole matter of balance. One day they fall off, the next day they have suddenly got it and they are away. It is like riding a horse, it is like kicking a football in the right direction, it is like tennis, it is like all of these things. One day you can, where the previous day you could not. And learning to swim, it is exactly the same thing. These are skills which we know human beings can do, and some can do better than others, but you can teach everybody to do them...

This statement showed little understanding of learning theory (see Kelly 1990: p61). It reduced the science of pedagogy to a simplistic act where physical education had little to do with learning and understanding, and more to do with the acquisition of skill through repetitive practice. These ideological views were reflected in ITE and INSET policy.

RR Policy on ITE and INSET

Throughout the 1980s RR educational policy saw resources cut for physical education on the grounds of an economic crisis (see Appendix F: p41). This resulted in reduced

INSET provision, a reduction in the numbers of LEA Advisors, and a shift in HE from the BEd. route in ITE to the PGCE route (see Appendix G: p58)¹²⁷. The RR did not consult with physical educationalists over the curriculum content and teaching methods of ITE. This was again to the dismay of educationalists, many of whom were bitterly opposed to the measures being proposed (see Appendix I: p103). The RR preferred to 'consult' with bodies which held the same views (discussed above). The CCPR, which represented the interests of the NGBs was one of those bodies. In its 'Charter for School Sport' the CCPR 'advised' that ITT should centre on competitive sports to be coached by the NGBs; that in-service training should concentrate on the government's objectives of sport and health; and that a school's record in sport should be part of the compulsory information printed in its prospectus (CCPR 1994: p8). Hawkins (1994: p8) of the Conservative Backbench Sports Committee (CBSC), developed the CCPR line that ITT should be in the form of structured coaching from the NGBs and that teachers should develop excellence and talent. Hawkins' (1994: p1) argument that "...competitive sports are vital for children's physical and general development and training for life...", reiterated the ideological imperative for sport in schools in the form of TCTG. His justification for TCTG was that national sporting success suffered due to;

...far too much scope, with the relaxed and limited provisions of the national curriculum as it is a present, for small but significant numbers of teachers to peddle the fashionable socialist and educational nostrum...a small but significant number of schools where the teaching staff are unwilling to organise or encourage any kind of competitive sports or games (Hawkins 1994: p2).

The RR's attack on teachers as left-wing subversives continued into its third decade. In 1993 the RR took control for the development of ITT away from HE and placed in the hands of a centrally appointed quango, the Teacher Training Agency (TTA).

With the combination of the possible limiting of ITE to the development of the NCPE, constraining practising teachers' actions through the prescription of

¹²⁷ A central plank of RR policy was to introduce 'on-the-job' ITT through the 'Article and Licensed Teachers' Schemes based on a rhetoric of economic crisis. However, despite this rhetoric, the Government was forced to admit that training teachers through the Articled and Licensed schemes cost nearly twice as much as through HE (Hansard 1992 Vol. 200, wa. 239).

curriculum content and resource cuts, the reduction in the number and effectiveness of LEA in-service advisors, the difficulties faced by student teachers on the PGCE Mentor route (see Appendix I: p103), and the possibility of sports people replacing physical education teachers in schools, the future of an educationally sound physical education provision looked to be under threat in the long-term: there was the possibility of a long-term downward spiral of constrained reflection and a de-skilled profession. The ultimate concern was that teachers would be controlled by central government (see Evans 1995a and 1995b).

Summary

The imposition of the RR's discourse on education was affirmed in law with the passing of the 1988 ERA. Thereafter, education policy was increasingly constructed and implemented from the centre, both directly and indirectly, for example, through the constraints placed on the WG at the meso level, rather than evolving from the periphery and the ITE institutions. In effect, the NCPE was the imposition of the NR/RR's discourse in state schools, though not in its 'pure' form. This had direct implications for the continuation of professionalism in physical education teaching¹²⁸. The reduction in resource provision (funding, staff and curriculum time) to physical education in schools through LMS, combined with the privileging of compulsory competitive team games as a part of the NCPE, was an endeavour by the RR to have its version of education and schooling replace all forms of progressive provision. Through its political power and authority to constrain the 'form', 'structure', 'content' and methods' in physical education, the NR/RR had gained 'control' over the possibilities for its provision in state schools in England and Wales. The seeds had been sown for further conflict between the RR and progressive educators within physical education. This, potentially, would provide justification for further central controls over ITE, teaching practices and the content of the NCPE post 1992.

¹²⁸ Kirk (1992a, p225) argues that;

In circumstances such as this, physical educators not only risk losing what little control and authorship they have had over the process of defining their subject, but may be forced to accept and work within the myth of 'traditional physical education' (with all of its sedimented biases and distortions), as it is understood by the general public, including votes-conscious politicians, journalists, elite athletes and other sports personalities and celebrities and commercial sponsors.

Chapter Eight

Conclusion: Critical Self Reflection on the Critical Realist Perspective

Introduction

With the election of the Labour government on the first of May 1997, this research project changed from an interpretation of contemporary policy to an interpretation of policies set firmly in historical time and place. This change, over which I had no control (save for voting in the general election), was typical of the complexity and shifting nature of my research. The advantage of the change of government was that it brought the research (though not necessarily the development of Conservative education policies) to a clear end. In turn, this allowed for an analysis of the effectiveness and changes made to the RR policies between 1992 and 1997. However, despite brief reference to developments mentioned in this chapter, this is not a task which is taken to hand in this thesis.

The nature and scope of the NR project has been delineated thoroughly by others¹²⁹. My task was to investigate the place of physical education within that project. My investigation was based at the macro level of political intent. It investigated the power of the NR/RR's discourse, as the dominant social, political, economic and cultural group, to determine the 'social reality' of the whole of UK society. My data has shown that the NR/RR sought to use physical education as a central component of its 'hegemonic project' to shift the UK's dominant moral values from 'social democracy' to the 'social market'. Thus, education policy was used as a mechanism in the NR/RR's endeavour to restructure the 'social whole' in such a way that it favoured capitalism rather than social democracy. The intent was to imbue a 'citizenship', based in 'social Darwinism', which legitimated and reproduced 'social order' (social control) and 'social ordering' (hierarchy and inequality). An individual's sense of the 'self' and 'free-will' were to be constrained relative to his/her 'place' in the social hierarchy. This was to be achieved by the NR/RR discourse becoming 'accepted' as common-sense. This would be achieved through the 'step-by-step softening-up' of opposition and the exercise of the RR's political power and authority to manipulate symbolic (ideological) and material (legislative) rules and

¹²⁹ See Apple 1993, Ball 1997, Barnett 1992, Demaine 1993, Dunleavy, Gamble and Peele (Eds) 1990, Durham 1991, Evans and Davies 1993c, Gilmour 1992, Hall 1985, Hutton 1996, Jessop, Bonnett, Bromely and Ling 1988, Kavanagh 1990, Marsh and Rhodes (Eds) 1992, McPherson and Raab 1988, Skidelskey (Ed) 1988, Wilson 1992.

resources to undermine alternative discourses. Physical education was to be defined as 'sport and games' and used as a tool to imbue particular 'conservative values'. However, this chapter, as the conclusion to this thesis, discusses more than simply the place of physical education policy in the NR/RR project. It highlights my growing understanding of the complexities of the 'policy process'. Further, by investigating the nature of the RR's intent and methods of policy construction and implementation, this chapter offers the 'critical-realist perspective' as a contribution to interpreting and understanding the policy process more widely.

'Critical realism' was constructed as the theoretical perspective to analyse NR/RR policy as no single academic perspective seemed to capture the scope of the NR/RR project. The 'realist' aspect of this perspective is that policy is constructed by the dominant SPEC group to favour its interests while conceding as little as possible to alternative and opposing subordinate interests. What is conceded is in the interest of maintaining a status quo which favours dominant interests (such as provision for education and health). The 'critical' aspect of this perspective is that policy must be analysed in this context. Thus, critical realism connects with aspects of Neo-Marxism (Ranson 1995). It is, in effect, the analysis of the NR/RR's political determinism. Nonetheless, the rejection of the NR/RR's discourse by the electorate in May 1997 indicates that the endeavour was not so straightforward. Therefore, this chapter offers an appraisal of my critical realist perspective. However, it discusses not only the weakness of the perspective, but also its strengths. It argues that critical realism has brought increased understanding of the SPEC context of the development of the NCPE. It allowed the asking of the question "...'who' controlled 'what', why' and 'how' in the making of the NCPE?". Thus, I argue below that my research offers the possibility of a greater understanding of the nature of the policy process, specifically in terms of SPEC power and control, and the dominance of structure over agency as a dominant political group seeks to make policy serve its interests.

Bernstein's work on the 'contexts of production' offers one way of making sense of pedagogy and the policy process (see Evans 1992: p234, Evans and Penney 1993, 1994). Bernstein refers to the 'primary context' being the production of discourse, the 'secondary context' being its selective reproduction in schools, and

'recontextualisation' being where the discourse is interpreted and adapted. Evans (1992) highlighted that Bernstein's model allowed the exploration of both the production and reproduction of knowledge and the relationships between these processes. The aim of my critical realist interpretation was to understand the production of the NCPE by locating its political, ideological, cultural and economic origins. The perspective has, therefore, concentrated on the context of the 'primary' production of policy in order to investigate the ideological intent which framed the 'context of probability' for decision making in the 'secondary' and 'recontextualising' contexts. I have drawn upon Bernstein's concepts in this chapter to discuss the NR/RR's intentions in the construction, implementation and evaluation of policy.

At first sight, my critical realist perspective may appear to allow too much to the power of a dominant discourse to determine peoples' agency both in terms of their thoughts and actions. However, my argument has been that it is that power which allowed the NR/RR, over eighteen years, to manipulate the public's perspective through the conjoined manipulation of symbolic and material rules and resources. This allowed the RR to change the structures which govern society to an extent which meant that people's agency was constrained within the NR/RR discourse. Ultimately this was through resource controls which were established by legislation, so much so that the 'New Labour' government's rhetoric in education, and elsewhere, has been strongly framed, if not determined, by these discursive and structural constraints.

As a means of reflecting upon my critical realist perspective, this chapter discusses the intentions and findings of my research. It contends that engaging with established social theory brought to light the 'policy flow' which indicated a degree of autonomy for meso and micro actors. This meant that I needed to question the determinism of my critical realist perspective. This is done by exploring my theoretical and methodological reservations. Despite acknowledgement of a 'policy flow' which suggests meso and micro agency, I argue, by investigating the RR government's endeavour to control the construction, implementation and evaluation of policy, that it sought to constrain such meso and micro agency in the implementation of centrally devised policy. I then discuss the contribution of my research, and the critical realist perspective, to the understanding of the policy process

at the macro level. This is in terms of the relationships between dominant political intent, 'power and control', structure, discourse and 'framed' agency.

The Intent and Findings of my Research

The intent of my research was to understand the purpose behind the development of the NCPE. Thus, my initial research question asked 'why' the NCPE was implemented in schools in England and Wales in September 1992. This entailed finding out 'who' was responsible for its development, 'what' its purpose was, and 'how' it was to be implemented. My research, through the theoretical (critical realist) analysis of empirical data, led to this question being answered. The NR/RR were identified as those 'who' were responsible for the development of the NCPE. It was identified that 'why' it was developed was to serve the macro social, political, economic and cultural interests of the NR/RR, namely the reconstruction of capitalist arrangements. The NR/RR intended to use physical education as a major tool of their hegemonic project. It was to transmit and reproduce the 'citizenship' needed for the 'social market'. 'How' this was to be achieved, was through the conjoining of symbolic (ideological) and material (legislative) rules and resources to both undermine progressive definitions of physical education and privilege the NR/RR's definition of physical education as 'sport and games'. Chapter seven showed that the NR/RR's definition of physical education as 'sport and games' was not a conceptual misunderstanding on their part, as believed by some educationalists. It was, rather, an ideological imperative. The fact that the NR/RR vilified alternative discourse and avoided consultation indicated that the conceptual differences were intentional and instrumental. Defining physical education as 'sport and games' was intended to allow the NR/RR's ideology to be transmitted through a curriculum constructed at the centre, and implemented by teachers acting as representatives of government policy at the periphery, in schools. Thus, 'what' the NR/RR sought to achieve was control of the 'form', 'structure', 'content' and 'methods' of physical education provision, and so its effect, in state schools and, subsequently, beyond.

The NR/RR, therefore, intended to alter the nature (form, content, structure, methods) of schooling. They established 'codes' (Bernstein 1977 and 1990, see also

Atkinson 1985) for education which acted to both give meaning to the pedagogic discourse, explicitly regulating and restricting the progressive discourse, and structure individual teacher and pupil relationships to the text. The 'codes' (such as NR/RR perspectives towards economic efficiency, the moral and social order, meritocracy, competition and reward) set the possibilities for the 'pedagogic device' (the form, structure, content and method of education), which in turn set the rules for the de/recontextualisation of policy texts in LEAs and schools. These 'codes' also set the frames and boundaries for the socialisation of pupils into particular forms of knowledge and citizenship. Policy was determined by ideological interests and specific objectives were prescribed. The macro political intent was for 'top-down' implementation of policy from the centre to schools. The RR endeavoured to use implementation structures to control the policy process based on its 'democratic political authority'.

The objective of my research was, therefore, the investigation of power relations, and the involvement of organisations and institutions in exercising that power. My task was to analyse the complexity of SPEC structural and historical constraints (see Bottomore 1993, Whitty 1997). However, the rejection of the RR government by the electorate in May 1997 showed that the macro aims of the NR/RR were not so simple to achieve. Clearly, the hegemonic project to shift 'social reality' in the UK permanently to the Right, and to have conservatively driven structures dominant over agency, was not totally successful at the micro level. There was clearly still the opportunity for agency for those at the 'bottom' of the policy process.

The 'Policy Flow': A Cyclical Process

Prudent policy making requires knowledge and understanding of the issues, adequate planning and resourcing, and full evaluation leading to improvement (Hogwood and Gunn 1993: p241). It is a cycle involving the participation of all actors at all levels, where social action is grounded in the two-way flow of information (see Hudson 1993a). However, this was not a model that the NR/RR were prepared to entertain (this is returned to below).

Although the RR was determined to employ a 'top-down', centre to schools, method of policy construction and implementation, Evans¹³⁰ and his associates (along with other analysts of the policy process, e.g. Bowe, Ball and Gold 1992) argued that it was not a case of policy makers having power and subordinates having none (interview). The very fact that meso and micro actors were involved in the process meant that they had a degree of power and a potential to 'resist' (see Evans and Penney 1994: p40). There was the opportunity for them to exercise a degree of autonomy. Members of the NC WGs, LEAs (at the meso level) and teachers (at the micro level) had the power to make the implementation of centrally determined policy 'problematic'. They had the capacity to think and act relatively independently, to 'adapt and adopt' the NC, and so, potentially, change or modify both its form and intended outcomes. They thus had the ability to decontextualise and recontextualise the NR/RR discourse, either as spoken or written text (but, as we see below, not in the context of their own making). As policy passed from central government to LEAs, to schools and then to teachers, it was recontextualised (i.e. either contested, resisted, adapted or adopted). The policy transmitted became the interpretation of interpretations. It was open to sites of resistance, adaptation and change and thus was evolutionary. There was no one site of policy making and no one site of implementation. The NCPE policy process was not a 'legislative moment' but a continual process of 'engagement, interpretation and struggle' (Evans, Penney and Bryant 1993d). This does not mean, however, that the resultant practices were either any less conservative, or more progressive than those intended by the RR.

Because the NR/RR did not consider information which did not suit its objectives, and refused to consult with educationalists, there was a 'bottom-up' influence on policy as conflicts arose over objectives and implementation methods. This level of agency at the 'bottom' of the hierarchy impaired the ability of central government to simply impose its initiatives. Thus, 'top-down' policy implementation

¹³⁰ The work of Evans and associates post ERA has been concerned with the NCPE policy process and the possibility of agency both within and upon policy prescribed from the centre. Their work has contributed greatly to the understanding of the implementation process and the need for the RR to reduce recontextualisation of its policies. See Evans 1992, 1993, 1995a, 1995b, Evans and Davies 1990, 1993a, 1993b, 1993c, Evans, Davies, Bass and Penney 1996, Evans, Davies and Penney 1993, Evans and Penney 1993, 1994, 1995, Evans, Penney and Bryant 1993a, 1993b, 1993c, 1993d, Evans, Penney and Davies 1995, Penney 1991, Penney 1994, Penney and Evans 1991a, 1991b, 1994a, 1994b, 1995.

was not perfect and the reconstruction of capitalist requirements was not guaranteed. However, my data lends weight to the argument that we should guard against over-emphasising the scope for agency in the policy process at the meso and micro levels. My research has shown that, because the connection between specific practices and wider social-political and cultural forces are complex, central government has both the resources and the wherewithal to constrain the policy process. Nonetheless, the concept of a 'bottom-up' influence on NR/RR policy suggests obvious contradictions with my critical realist (neo-Marxist) interpretation of political determinism on the part of the NR/RR. There is, therefore, a need to reflect upon both the theoretical underpinnings of my research and methodological approach used to collect and analyse data.

Theoretical and Methodological Reservations

Chapters one and two revealed that the focus of my theoretical and methodological approach was grounded in my biographical perspective of the social, political, economic and cultural whole, firstly, as an opponent of the NR/RR, and, secondly, as an outsider (a Scot) looking into the English educational system. There are obvious questions about my intentions for undertaking this research. My motivation was clearly political. Issues arise, therefore, about my personal agenda and my taking the 'moral high-ground' in the conceptualisation, conduct, design and interpretation of my research (see Ball 1997). Part of being self-critical is my acknowledgement that my research is not neutral as I was part of the cultural and ideological setting that I researched. It was important for me to critique my personal agenda, and allow the reader to do the same¹³¹.

My investigation focused at one level, on macro power and control in the construction of education policy. The obvious danger of my critical realist perspective, therefore, is that it is over-deterministic: that is to say it has the tendency to privilege macro-order, macro-discourse and macro-control over micro-agency thoughts and actions. Engaging with established social theory showed that the reality of policy process is much more complex than my 'immature' interpretations. This

¹³¹ See Paechter (1996) for a different view of the need for researchers to outline their theoretical and methodological approaches in relation to issues of validity and 'power'.

research project is clearly only the first stage of a long-term learning process which will more than likely be life-long. One must therefore be cautious about the conclusions I have drawn and view them with critical scepticism.

The process of subjective/interpretive research meant engaging with established theories about the social world and education policy in particular (Apple 1982, 1989, 1990, 1992, Ball 1990, Bernstein 1990, Dale 1982, 1989, Giroux 1983, Lauder 1990, Lawton 1980, Simon 1991, Tomlinson 1993, Young 1971). This increased my understanding of the complexity of the 'social whole'. It meant challenging my biography and attitudes to ensure that the objective of my thesis was not a narrow attempt to substantiate opinions, but was, instead, a reasoned argument which engaged with theoretical interpretations to offer an analysis of the context of the development of the NCPE. This meant applying a 'self-critical' analysis to the subjective selection and analysis of data, and my role in constructing a version of knowledge about knowledge. That is the focus of this chapter.

Engaging with theory made it clear that the social world is not as simple as some having total power over others. This may be the aim of the SPEC powerful, but it is unlikely to be achieved in the UK given the complex relationship between the state and civil society, and a system of parliamentary democracy. Rather than coercion by force, dominance in the UK requires considerable work in the symbolic and material domains by powerful and empowered 'groups' to construct a consensus around 'solutions' (discourse) to 'crises' (real or constructed). There is a 'politics of knowledge', a struggle over what counts as 'valid' (Apple 1993, Archer 1984, Ball 1994a, Bernstein 1990, Chitty 1994, Dale 1989). Moreover, domination through discursive practices is never total as no discourse is 'closed' and an individual's biography effects how he/she relates to its texts. As other analysts have found, there is always and inevitably 'slippage' between policy intent and its implementation in practice (Bowe, Bold and Gold 1992). Further, there are always alternative discourses to which an individual can relate. Thus, at the micro level, 'subordinates' have the ability to decontextualise and recontextualise the dominant discourse. The aim therefore for the dominant group is to reduce or prevent this happening. This, as is discussed throughout this thesis, was the NR/RR's intent.

However, my thesis has never claimed that the NR/RR discourse was totalitarian and imposed successfully ‘across the board’. My critical realist perspective was not a claim as to ‘what was’, rather, it was an investigation of macro-political intent and the mechanisms employed in trying to achieve it. My data has shown that the NR/RR’s macro-political intent was a ‘hegemonic project’ to establish its discourse as the ‘common-sense’ definition of social reality. My research has thus endeavoured to bring in to focus “...the nature of the relationships between educational practice and the state, and between human agency and structure” (Penney and Evans 1994: p39). It did not therefore investigate the effects of RR policy at either the meso (e.g. LEA) or micro (school and physical education departments) levels in any great depth. Nonetheless, the perspective constructed is eclectic, and my analysis and the inferences drawn are based on the subjective interpretation of selective evidence. The thesis is not neutral. It is interlinked with aspects of my biography, habitus and socialisation. Clearly, other researchers, with different biographies, could have adopted a different perspective, collected different evidence and come, through subjective interpretation, to different conclusions. However, my perspective is not esoteric. It actively encourages the asking of the question ‘why, who, what and how’ in the policy process. The answers found to this question through this research project outlined in the arguments made in previous chapters in relation to the connection between dominant ideological intent and structural constraints strengthen the inferences I have made about the development of the NCPE in the context of the NR/RR’s hegemonic project. The issue is of how the power and authority of a dominant political group, which has its political intentions underpinned by narrow ideological interests, can have detrimental implications for the construction of education policy which is pupil centred and enshrined in social justice. The following section outlines the evidence which supports my critical realist interpretation of the NR/RR’s intent to control the policy process.

The NR/RR Endeavour to ‘Control’ the Policy Process

‘Controlling’ the Construction of Policy

To have its ideological interests dominant in the political agenda, the RR manipulated the policy process through a rhetoric of ‘rational’ decision making based on information and knowledge. However, my data showed that the RR avoided information from subordinate sources which highlighted what it either did not wish to know or become known more widely. It sought to keep alternative issues off the political agenda by suppressing subordinate demands. The RR, therefore, needed to avoid exposure to conflicting information and knowledge which may have compromised its political decisions. This was clearly evident with the reaction of the government and Civil Servants to the NCF chairperson’s (Sue Campbell) efforts to enlighten them about the difference between ‘physical education’ and ‘sport and games’. The RR’s hostile reaction to the progressive discourse endorsed by Murdoch’s Desk Study (1987) and the SSF (1988) (reports commissioned by central government), and its rejection of the evidence submitted by educationalists and sportspersons to ESASC in 1991, showed how information could be either ignored or manipulated by politicians who preferred ideological rhetoric to educational ‘hard facts’. The selection of the NCPE WG showed how, in some cases, competent critical people were ‘screened out’ in favour of those who it was thought (incorrectly as it turned out) would toe the government line. Further, not only was ‘unwanted’ information rejected, such as the WG’s recommendation of three ATs in their NCPE Interim Report, but politically ‘useful’ knowledge from the CCPR and NGBs concerning the ‘traditional values’ of ‘sport and games’ was adopted by RR decision makers as they endeavoured to privilege their discourse. Chapters five, six and seven (and Appendix F) showed how the RR had the authority and power to articulate selected social and educational concerns (such as the threat of social democracy and permissiveness, the ‘necessity’ for economic efficiency through introducing a market in education, linking education more closely to the needs of industry, the need to reduce the theoretical in teacher ‘training’ and increase the practical, and the need for pupils to be more competitive). In its endeavour to achieve specific political ends the NR/RR sought to construct a perception of what people were to care about, and how

they were to perceive their own and others' bodies. It had the power to defy opposition, blatantly, setting and resourcing the physical education agenda on the basis of its ideological self-interest.

Self-interest meant that the political preferences and aspirations of the NR were to come before all others. Concealing this self-interest necessitated an ideological shift, with state apparatus both transmitting the dominant symbolic hegemony and controlling resources. The relationship between the power to control the flow of both information and resources in the construction of 'knowledge', was central in the definition of 'truth' by the NR/RR. 'Control' of the resource of information was central in the (re)construction of subordinates', that is to say the public's 'knowledge' of their interests and their 'understanding' of physical education. The RR sought to use their control of information to prevent subordinates gaining both the knowledge and understanding of their 'rights' and the ability to realise them (see Adler and Asquith 1993: p399) This was evident, not only with the disbanding of the Schools' Council, the ILEA and the Metropolitan Councils, but also, as outlined in chapters six and seven, with the constraints placed over the consultation procedures for the WG's Interim and Final Reports by the NCC. Of course, as my data showed, the actions of the NCC were also constrained by the SoS (see Graham and Tytler 1993). The rejection of unwanted information by the RR gave it the power to construct its definition of social knowledge and physical education as 'facts' and 'truths', which were all the more difficult to contest as the RR claimed they were politically 'neutral'. The RR's disregard for any progressive educational voice was, therefore, a clear indication that policy decisions were to be driven by political interests and arrived at undemocratically. This resulted in incremental policies which allowed little or no place for the opinions or decisions of those at the 'periphery' (see Gregory 1993: p213). However, more than just rejecting information, dominant decision makers also refused to acknowledge theoretical understandings of the policy process (discussed below), which could, ironically, have helped them achieve their conservative aims.

Nonetheless, decisions taken at the macro level do not define the policy process completely; there is a long chain of links in the implementation of policy,

involving many actors at the meso and micro levels of practice (Hogwood and Gunn 1993: p241)¹³². Implementation structures therefore needed to be controlled if NR/RR interests were to be served. For the RR to legitimate its educational rationale, the means, getting organisations to function towards the ends, were more important than the ends themselves (see Minogue 1993: p16). The centre's aim was thus to reduce, or remove, local autonomy through resource controls, prescribed policy and devolved responsibility and accountability. In other words, control of implementation.

'Controlling' the Implementation of Policy

For the RR's 'centrifugal' method of policy implementation to be successful it needed the acquiescence of those 'lower' in the implementation process. Where obedience could not be assured, the RR either simply removed the link in the implementation chain (for example the disbanding of the Schools Council, the ILEA and Metropolitan Councils), or reduced the power of intermediate bodies (as was the case with the 'two-way-shift' of power away from the LEAs). Chapter five (and Appendix F) has shown that, not only were the number of links in the policy chain reduced to cut down the possibilities for the de/recontextualisation of policy, the agency of subordinates involved in the process was also constrained through prescription, resource cuts and accountability. However, the RR sought to cloud the distinction between structure and agency.

For its macro objectives to be met, the RR needed to manage the complex, hierarchical system of policy implementation. It aimed to constrain the agency of implementing actors by setting in place mechanisms which conditioned behaviour and reduced opportunities for critique and recontextualisation. This depended on establishing hierarchical control to ensure that education conformed to central directives. However, the endeavour to reduce opposition to 'top-down' implementation required legal enforcement to make subordinates conform. Thus, the legal boundaries of Education Acts set the possibilities which compromised moral beliefs and rationalised professional ideals within political and practical realities, as

¹³² See also Ball (1997) for a discussion of how the processes of policy implementation have been transformed by the NR/RR through shifts in the dominant characteristics of social discipline and moral regulation which have effected meso and micro agency.

obligations became more powerful than rights (see Lipsky 1993). Indeed, I have shown that the imperative behind the RR's 'step-by-step' programme of authoritative legislation was to put in place implementation structures which set the procedures for the administration of education (see Hjern and Porter 1993). Education policy, with its central controls over planning and budgets, devolved responsibility and accountability, and its public evaluation procedures, was a standard technique of hierarchical management where high-level administrators sought to structure the behaviour of subordinates (see Elmore 1993). The RR needed to reduce and constrain the autonomy of teachers, which ultimately meant reducing their professionalism. Hierarchical discipline was established via the NC requirements and target setting with measures of effectiveness, for example linking pupil achievement in Key Stage assessments with teacher appraisal. Thus, translating policy into action consisted of elaborating the NR/RR's definition of educational objectives into specific tasks. Much of the empirical data provided in chapters five, six and seven, suggests that the intent was to prevent 'reflective agency' and transform it into 'reflexive action'.

The RR's political authority gave it the power to set the discursive frame and to pass Education Acts which replaced educationalists' 'rights' with 'duties and responsibilities', purportedly for the well-being of the 'nation state' (for example SoS Baker's repeal of the 1965 Remuneration of Teachers Act and the setting-up of the Interim Advisory Committee on teachers pay in 1987). It used the 'law of the land' (Education Acts and DES Circulars) to centralise power and control, but devolve responsibility and accountability. Constraint on subordinates autonomy came through the prescription, formalised rules, standardisation and accountability within the 1988 ERA. The ERA clearly outlined that the relationships of power and control between the government and educationalists were hierarchical and authoritative, with allocated responsibilities. Actions were outlined and actors at all hierarchical levels were given their 'roles' as local environmental variables were ignored in favour of obligations of implementation. Duties, rules and resource allocation were formalised and legally enforced as implementation became structured rather than negotiated. Increased accountability, through administrative controls, augmented compliance between education policy from the centre and the behaviour of teachers at the periphery. Implementation procedures were portrayed as 'neutral', however, the RR's control

over resource distribution ensured that it remained in control. Chapters five and six (and Appendix F) have shown that policy, symbolically, espoused a rhetoric of change but purposively lacked adequate resources for effective implementation.

By setting a formal structure to relations and processes through the ERA and direct ESGs, an environment of behavioural norms was established. This became the implementation 'culture' which sought to construct consensus (with parents and industry) and constrain conflict within macro parameters. Accountability to prescribed expectations, through the NC's ATs and PoS, played a central role in reducing professional input into educational provision. Through accountability, the RR sought to restrain the cognitive and emotional behaviours of LEAs and teachers, and so reduce the opportunity for opposition as professionalism was constrained. The aim was to force teachers and other progressive educationalists to 'react to', rather than 'act upon', 'given' circumstances. Management of implementation behaviour thus changed from overt manipulation of resources to more indirect and subtle manipulation of attitudes, values and beliefs through cultural symbolism, ritual and ideological representation. Chapters four and five have shown that the NR/RR sought to enlist parents' support for its discourse through cultural symbolism and ideological representation, as well as through the (fictitious as it turned out) possibilities of 'parental power'.

'Controlling' the Evaluation and Revision of Policy

RR 'control' over the evaluation and revision of education policy was evident during the period of its construction. The removal of the School's Council, and its replacement with the centrally appointed SCDC and the SEC in the early 1980s, indicated that policy constructed at the centre was not intended to be open to either critical or formative evaluation. This was also the case with the consultation procedures devised by the NCC for educationalists over the physical education WG's Interim and Final Reports. These were little more than a 'token gesture' of democracy which largely ignored educationalists' concerns. Further, the reduction in the number of LEA Advisors and the change of role of HMI from 'facilitators' to 'inspectors' of

educational practice, constrained the possibilities for the recontextualisation of NC policy along more educational lines at the local level.

There were clearly deep structural levels in the policy decision making process. The RR's political interests were the core beliefs, the ideological intent, which drove the construction and implementation of policy. The RR sought, through legislation regarding local responsibility and accountability, to ensure that evaluation of policy concerned its effectiveness on the basis of their definitions of 'educational values' and economic efficiency, not its intent. Evaluation was, therefore, to take place at the 'secondary level' which was influenced by environmental factors and other policies¹³³. Debate over the 'secondary aspects' of RR policy meant that any change which was to occur would take place at the surface, leaving the ideological core of policy unchallenged and intact (see Sabatier 1993). My data has indicated that keeping the debate at the secondary, arguably superficial level, was intended to keep discussion *within* policies rather than *of* them. Further, secondary critique by subordinate groups was constrained within the knowledge and 'truths' constructed by the NR/RR as 'traditional', 'neutral' and 'unquestionable'. In addition, introducing the concept of 'flexibility' to policy allowed it to be manipulated to avoid unwanted input. It also afforded the opportunity that policy could be made to continue to serve dominant interests in case of wider environmental change (see Smith and May 1993). The result of the lack of negotiation or compromise, and the 'top-down' policy intentions which ignored established theories of successful policy implementation, was an 'implementation deficit' between dominant intent and subordinate needs (Hill 1993: p235). Research evidence was readily available to those dominant in policy decision making (Marsh and Rhodes 1992). However, chapters six and seven showed that the RR ignored this because it intended to create an 'implementation gap', and generate resistance to central policies from the teaching profession in an endeavour to legitimate greater central control over education policy. This was evident in two areas. Firstly, in the discrepancy, the 'gap', between the need for resources expressed at the periphery and the level of provision by central

¹³³ Crucially, social issues are subjective and difficult to quantify, they also lead to questions about economic efficiency, accountability and responsibility. Further, social evaluation of policies is unwanted by the dominant political group as such information is always available to the opposition. It was, therefore, denied by the RR that such information had any importance, and a rationale of economic efficiency ignored the subsequent social costs.

government. Secondly, in the prescription of policy by central government without consultation, which left no room for professional input or critique. Further, and significantly in terms of educational provision in the near future, this lack of consultation and critique of policy, according to civil servants involved with SCAA (non-attributable interview data), continued into the processes concerned with the Dearing Review of the NC post 1992.

The Effect of RR Control over the Policy Process

The RR's control over the construction, implementation and evaluation of education policy was legitimated within a rhetoric of conviction and necessity. It ignored the need to establish a consensus over education's purpose and practice, and successfully constructed the ERA as a framework for embedding its ideological discourse in the form, structure, content and methods of education. This discourse defined 'individualism' as self-interest and personal responsibility in the 'social market', and 'citizenship' as a set of duties and individual responsibilities rather than rights, opportunities and social co-operation. Economic, political, ideological and institutional structures set the boundaries for social development and educational change (Penney 1994: p301). These structural confines sought to create 'structured agency' by setting an educational framework within which teachers and pupils had to react to and work. Justice was not a part of the RR's educational policy (Evans and Davies 1993a).

The 1988 ERA brought into education a complex system of resourcing, testing, accountability and incremental policy which systematically reduced the role of the LEAs. Evans, Penney and Bryant (1993a: p332) believed that;

The arrival of the ERA thus may signify an important victory on the part of the central state in the battle for control over the curriculum and pedagogy of schooling. It may well be that the NC and a regular system of testing, along with the powerful pull of consumer choice and demand from below, and the financial restriction or inducement from above, will facilitate a much more routinized performance of the knowledge reproduction system.

They feared that the RR's educational policies would result in greater educational segregation and so social segregation along lines of both ability and culture. They argued further that;

...far from raising standards in schools as the rhetoric of the ERA and NC would have us believe, both ERA and NC may produce and exacerbate educational and social inequalities in the state education system, erode the egalitarian values and commitments that were embodied in the 1944 Education Act and seriously damage the quest of providing a quality PE for *all* (Evans, Penney and Bryant 1993b: p27).

The ERA, and accompanying measures, such as the NC, national testing, teacher appraisal, open enrolment, LMS and formula funding, set a framework for education practice. There was little scope for contestation, and the recontextualisation of policy and practice in schools was constrained through accountability in the 'market place'. Reforms to ITE, HMI, increased selection and budget cuts post 1992, tightened the frame of control still further. They also set the frame for physical education provision. The DNH's 'Sport Raising the Game' in 1995, a document saturated with NR ideology and intent, represented the high-point of the RR's endeavour to establish its version of worthwhile physical activity in the physical education curriculum.

A Critical Realist (Neo-Marxist) Interpretation

The measures employed by the NR/RR to set the agenda and structure autonomy seem to fit well with neo-Marxist interpretations of elite/state control in the production and implementation of policy (see Ranson 1995). The lack of subordinates' input into policy making shows that policy decisions were narrowly political. The rhetoric of 'rational choice' was not the reality as political intent and power took precedence over informed, reasoned debate and decisions based on an understanding of plural interests. The RR's ideological predispositions underpinned policy decisions. This showed the link between the way issues were defined and resources allocated. It also supported a macro theory of state control where dominant interests and the structural distribution of power were interlinked (see Ham 1993). Chapters five and six (and Appendix F) have shown that the privileging of capitalist needs meant that social concerns were subordinated. Policy was manipulated within a rhetoric of 'cost-analysis', which

claimed that economic efficiency taking precedence over educational needs was 'rational'. However, 'economic efficiency' was the rhetorical justification for greater central control of a system in which structures favoured powerful interests, and where the powerful had a monopoly over resources and information. Chapter four has highlighted that using cuts or changes in the distribution of resources as measures to discipline dominated groups was central to the NR's market ideology. It was, centrally, a question of constraining 'agency' within both the material boundaries of the structural hierarchy and the symbolic boundaries of the 'common-sense' of the NR/RR discourse (ideology). The NR/RR's endeavour was to influence both conscious and unconscious morals in an attempt to construct a consensus over actions, practices, values, norms and beliefs, within their definition of 'citizenship'. Centrally, chapter four has shown that the NR/RR's aim was to construct and reproduce a 'common-sense' acceptance of capitalist arrangements, relations and effects as 'neutral' and 'natural'. The intent was to imbue the population with a 'capitalist moral character' which would accede to the effects of a 'social market'. It was a question of hierarchical (structured) power, control and agency (autonomy relative to social 'place').

The Contribution of my Research to Understanding the Policy Process

My research has explored the connections between NR/RR ideological intent and the policy process in education. It has shown the connections between the RR's political authority, its power through the 'law of the land' (for example the 1988 Education Reform Act), and its ability to 'steer' (if not control) the process of the making of the NC and NCPE. Centrally, this concerned the power of macro actors to constrain the agency of meso and micro actors through the manipulation of 'social, political, economic and cultural' hierarchical structures. I have shown that the NR/RR endeavoured to use state education to influence the understanding of 'social reality' and so the operating of the 'social whole' to favour the interests of capital. Through a complex interplay between symbolic (discursive) and material (legislative) rules and resources the RR set its ideological definitions of institutional, figurational, symbolic, economic and educational 'norms' as 'codes', which framed and constrained the possibilities for choice and action at the micro level. The 'market' in education

divided opposition both on the basis of competitive self-interest to gain 'custom' and resources and through the responsibility of implementing central policy with accountability to parents. Initial resistance to central policy, for example from the School's Council, ILEA and teaching unions, was undermined through the discursive ideologies of the market and individualism. These, alongside legislative measures which established financial frames, formed the material context in which the Working Groups, LEAs, school governors and teachers had to work. Education legislation under the RR shifted power (for the construction and resourcing of policy) to the centre, but shifted responsibility and accountability (for its 'effective' implementation) to the periphery through the representation of autonomy and flexibility in educational texts. Yet, the ERA and NC comprised frames which obfuscated shifting power relations, loss of schools' autonomy and increasing centralisation. Under the RR education was organised in, and controlled through, an administrative bureaucracy. The reality was of the centre's power to structure, constrain and frame not only the educational text, but also the actions of subordinates in its endeavour to make educational policy serve its narrow and sectional ideological interests.

Issues of 'Agency and Structure' and 'Power and Control'

I briefly argued above that there is scope for agency at the meso and micro levels, but that it is constrained within the structural context of hierarchical power and control which is 'manipulated' by the authority of the dominant political group. My thesis, therefore, is that the RR manipulated the connections between macro political power and control and the ability to manipulate structures to constrain meso and micro agency, to construct policy which served its interests at the expense of others' needs. This process seems to fit well within, and be explained by, Althusser's description of the 'Ideological State Apparatus' (which with the NR/RR included control over the distribution of resources), and theories of the power of discourse once it has become legislated and institutionalised as 'text' (Apple 1993, Bernstein 1990, Evans and Penney 1994). In light of my suggestion that the RR was able to frame and constrain the agency of subordinate actors, it is necessary to engage with the concept of micro agency to outline my argument about the controls placed upon it.

The Issue of Micro Agency

Giddens (1979: p119) argued that;

All social positions, within social systems, are 'power positions' in the sense that they are integrated within reproduced relations of autonomy and dependency; contestation of role-prescriptions is a characteristic feature of power struggles in society.

Clearly, therefore, it is not straightforward that central government has absolute power, that subordinates have no agency, and that their every thought and action is controlled by the hierarchical structures which are used to govern society. Giddens (1982: p199) argued further that;

Power relations in social systems can be regarded as relations of autonomy and dependency; but no matter how imbalanced they may be in terms of power, actors in subordinate positions are never wholly dependent, and are often very adept at converting what ever resources they posses into some degree of control over the conditions of reproduction of the system.

This was as true of the actions of the Working Groups 'chosen' by central government to construct the NC as it was of teachers in their 'role' as agents in implementing the NC. Nonetheless, Giddens (1995a), and other social theorists¹³⁴, still concluded that structural constraints are predominant over micro autonomy. It is, therefore, necessary to engage in a critical macro analysis of the policy process.

My Theoretical Analysis: Structured, Framed and Constrained Agency

Most social theories struggle with the issue of the relationships between structure and agency. My critical realist perspective has indicated that, during the period of NR/RR government from 1979 to 1992 (1997), macro-structures (the institutions of authority that control the state) dominated micro-agency (autonomy). However, in common with the social theorists Giddens (1979) and Foucault (Poster 1993), I have argued

¹³⁴ Theorists such as Foucault (Poster 1995), Bourdieu 1995a and 1995b, Mouzelis 1995, Habermas 1995a, Apple 1993 and Bernstein 1990.

that 'control' over thought and action was not, and is not, absolute. My data has shown that power and control were exercised through the RR's political authority to manipulate symbolic and material rules and resources. Chapters five and six (and Appendices F and G) have shown that 'control' over micro-agency was possible through 'legislative constraints' and 'moral conformity'. This is a theory of dominance through structures rather than a theory of determinism. Althusser's (see Barrett 1995, Scott 1995, CDoS) view of subordinates as 'puppets' of macro intent is viewed to be too deterministic and too narrow a perspective of the social whole. However, I have argued that this was the NR/RR's intent. It was their intention to determine, through education, how people think. Critical realism connects with Gramsci's (Bellamy 1995, CDoS) theory of 'hegemony'. By outlining the underpinnings of NR/RR ideology in chapter four, I have argued in chapters five and six that the NR/RR sought to achieve their objectives through a hegemonic project founded on 'authoritarian populism'. This was to be achieved through a discourse of ideological representation which legitimated material constraints and directive resourcing, which both undermined education provision and confirmed particular ideological assertions while vilifying others. However, as the spoken text could not be controlled, it was imperative for the RR to transform its discourse into policy text which could be controlled to a greater extent (see Ranson 1995). Having its discourse as policy text would 'control' issues of educational form, structure, content and method. This would then become practice, which would limit the capacity for micro-agency. The hierarchical structures were intended to act as 'social systems' (Scott 1995) which could be managed and monitored. There was to be no allowance by the NR/RR for the 'duality of structure' (Giddens 1993a and 1993b). The power base of resource constraints was intended to lead to a form of socialisation which ensured that 'power positions' and 'power relations' were strictly hierarchical. However, the result of the 1997 general election went some way to endorsing Giddens' rather than the New Right's view of how social systems work.

My data suggests that the NR/RR sought to 'frame' agency at the meso and micro levels. Agency existed but the possible choices for action were limited (for example with the deliberations of the NCPE WG). This came mainly through the setting of resource constraints. It also came through either acceptance or rejection

(‘choice’ as a matter of habitus) of the NR/RR’s discourse, which allowed the identification of subversive opposition (‘them’) as undeserving, and the allocation of resources to the deserving citizens (‘us’) through the power of law (text). In this way, the NR/RR had control over the structures and institutions (material and figurational) of domination which infiltrated every aspect of social and personal life. This acted to limit autonomy, and construct the contexts in which actors could operate. These ‘contexts’ gave the appearance of pluralism, acting to obfuscate the level of hierarchy and control, but set in place parameters to ensure that the boundaries of ‘unthreatening’ agency were not over-stepped without reproach. Policy texts limited what was possible, thinkable, sayable and doable. As we saw in chapters six and seven, this was true in the development of the physical education curriculum to be taught in state schools.

My data reinforces Evans, Davies and Penney’s (1994) view that the NCPE both developed from and contributed to the NR/RR discourse. Chapter seven (and Appendix H) has shown that by limiting the curriculum possibilities inherent within the NCPE, the RR sought to constrain professional agency at the meso and micro levels. This was intended to prevent the distortion of macro-policy from the centre as it descended through the multiple levels of implementation. Thus, the conditions of recontextualisation were neither to be altered nor controlled by the agents involved in the implementation process. Evans, Penney and Bryant (1993d: p6) argued that the policy process should be understood as a ‘relational activity’ in which the actions of individuals “...act upon and help shape, create and/or recreate the social and organisation contexts in which they are located”. However, they warned that individual’s actions “...are also shaped by those contexts and the political, social and cultural influences or constraints which are found within them”. Thus, in their, and my, perspective, agency is not determined, but constrained by the structures which create tradition and permit cultural practice. Therefore, interpretation and so recontextualisation (agency) are framed within the knowledge and understanding of the social structures (symbolic, material and figurational) which give meaning to practices and events.

From 1979 the RR aimed to reduce progressive educationalists' agency systematically by re-establishing the predominance of central decision making over professional autonomy. Professional autonomy was, through contractual obligations, replaced with 'duties'. The RR had political power and authority over both the ideological and material rules and resources of the State. Chapters five and six (and Appendix F) have shown, in Althusser's terms, that the NR/RR sought control of the 'Ideological State Apparatus' (ISA) (including, critically, the control of both legislation and the distribution of resources as 'repressive' measures). However, as the NR/RR government was voted out of office in 1997, it appears to have lost the battle for ideological hegemony. Yet, on closer analysis of the effects of the period, and without taking Althusser's definitions of ISA to mean the narrow imposition of ideology and control, the successes of the NR/RR's hegemonic project become clearer.

The NR/RR were able to frame agency by restructuring discursive and structural boundaries to serve their interest over those of others. As outlined above, policy development changed from a cyclical process of 'implement, review and revise', to a system of 'top-down' imposition. The discursive saturation of NR ideology established a short term change of public opinion. This allowed for the construction of a legislative framework which constrained (and constrains) individual's agency for the immediate future. The NR/RR's discourse was intended as a meta-narrative. However, ultimately, the NR's moral discourse was the RR's political undoing. The NR/RR outlined the 'moral high-ground' for others but then 'broke the rules' themselves. This went some way to undermining their 'legitimate' position of authority and leadership.

Nonetheless, the number of sites of interpretation of education policy have been reduced and teachers' actions have been framed at the micro level. This is also true for the LEAs at the meso level. Appendix H shows how the frames which constrained the actions and possibilities of the NCPE WG demonstrated the power of the RR and the ways in which that power was exacted both directly and indirectly. Chapters six and seven show how the NCPE text was embedded in the ideology of cultural restoration while more progressive educational discourses were marginalised.

In attempting to obfuscate these controls and emphasise 'agency', the RR ascribed the term 'flexibility' to physical education. However, agency is determined by resources and not by simple slogans. 'Flexibility' gave the rhetorical appearance of freedom from constraint but in reality the opposite was true (see Ball 1997). Rather than increasing possibilities, flexibility was constrained by the lack of resources. It offered 'responsibility without power' (Evans, Penney and Bryant 1993d; p9). Agency was thus not only framed overtly by the policy text, but also covertly through the resource implications of not following it.

It is questionable, therefore, whether the NR/RR's hegemonic project came to an end with the election of the 'New Labour' government in 1997. Rather, by establishing its discourse as education text and setting structural constraints over resources, both through legislation, the NR/RR's project may remain in place for some time to come. The 'New Labour' government may have to restructure this framework before it can implement its own policies in earnest¹³⁵.

The Contribution of the Critical Realist Perspective

The view of power derived from my study connects, at one level, with the thinking of Giddens (1979, 1982), Foucault (see Poster 1995) and Ball (1994b), in that it suggests that some level of power resides with all actors whatever their 'place' in the policy process. However, my research indicates that there are connections between macro social, political, economic and cultural arrangements, 'democratic' political power and social hierarchy. It has shown that dominant actors have the wherewithal to manipulate both figurational and institutional macro SPEC structures (the 'social whole) to serve their interests at the expense of subordinate groups' interests. They have the authority to influence the definition of 'social reality' through a discourse which 'shifts' social arrangements in their favour, and which then seeks to reproduce these as 'neutral' and 'natural' common-sense. I have shown that, in their endeavour to privilege their ideological definitions as pedagogic practice in education texts,

¹³⁵ Further, as the NR/RR shifted the political terrain so far to the Right, the New Labour discourse was forced to abandon many of its outdated and outmoded socialist principles and move further to the Right to become acceptable to many of the British electorate. Although the New Labour discourse is enshrined in a rhetoric of 'social justice' only time will tell how effective it will be in achieving its aims.

dominant actors adopt methods to protect their discourse. Such as, avoidance of evidence gathered through research and experience which questions dominant rhetorical justifications, constraint on professional critique of policy, reduced professionalism, prescription, and accountability controlled through resource constraints. Control is drawn to the centre but responsibility passed to the periphery.

My data suggests that the hierarchical power relations between individuals involved in the construction and implementation of policy determine the levels of constraint and so agency. There is a 'policy flow' but the positions of power are not equal. The policy cycle of 'plan, implement and review' operates at the macro level on the basis of ideological intent, with micro actors as agents of implementation. It appears, therefore, that structure is predominant over agency. In this perspective, post-modernist and micro interpretative theories (Ball 1994, see also Evans and Davies 1993c and Ranson 1995)¹³⁶ of the policy process stand in danger of obfuscating issues of macro power and control. As macro actors strive to hide these, post-modernist and micro interpretative theories may exacerbate obfuscation of the links between ideological intent, macro power and control, and issues of the predominance of structure over agency.

My data also suggests however that the ideological interests of the dominant political group are not always immediately visible during the process of policy development¹³⁷. Chapter five, by highlighting the links between the NR/RR's attack on socialist policies and its claims that the introduction of TVEI in schools through the MSC was politically neutral, indicates how dominant interests can be obfuscated through both discursive claims to legitimate policy and the redistribution of resources. Policy, as resources constraints, could then either cause or 'prove' discursive claims. This highlights that it is possible for the 'dominant group' to conjoin symbolic and material rules and resources to gain ascendancy in the social, political, economic and

¹³⁶ Ball (1997) discusses issues of micro interpretive research and offers guidance to researchers, while focusing on one aspect of practice or policy, not to ignore wider [macro] social, political, economic and cultural influences, as well as the effects of other policies on micro-practice. He indicates that researchers must be aware of the links between structure, discourse and agency.

¹³⁷ However it can be both visible and brutal through the direct intervention of dominant actors in the actions of those appointed to make policy, for example with the physical education WG at the meso level.

cultural terrain. Chapters four and five have shown that the dominant group has the political power to 'steer' democratic debate through a rhetoric of 'crisis', influence the public's understanding of social reality and set discursive possibilities which justify a particular distribution of resources for particular purposes. The RR's intent was to constrain subordinates free-will and action through conformity to the Law, as discursive controls over meanings and interests constrained critical evaluation and revision of policy by micro actors. Yet, as has been discussed, this was difficult to achieve. Nonetheless, in terms of 'political intent', this heightens the opportunity for the dominant group to privilege its definition of the role of education within society. Its endeavour then is to have this discursive text institutionalised as policy text so that meso and micro actors are forced to work within it. This depends on managing the construction and implementation of the text through a framework of constraint. Control of symbolic and material resources is therefore central to 'controlling' the policy process. Much of the empirical data reported in my research tends to endorse this view, and lends weight to those analysts who warn of the dangers of over-emphasising an individual's capacity to resist and contest change at the expense of understanding how they are constrained by socio-political and economic frames and legislative measures. This study suggest that the discursive frames are perhaps the most powerful of the constraining influences as they work to define what, and what not, to think. My data has shown, therefore, that SPEC hierarchies of power and control are inescapable. However, it has also shown that they are contestable.

My critical realist perspective, by seeking links across theories which explore structure, discourse and agency, offers a method to critique policy, rather than a method to research for policy. It explores the relationship between educational reform and the wider SPEC interests that are embedded in educational policy constructed by central government. Critical realism adopts the neo-Marxist perspective of 'elite theory' that a discourse of 'crisis' is enacted to allow the dominant group to steer democratic debate and pursue its SPEC priorities. Centrally, this is in relation to the complex 'social, political, economic and cultural' relations underpinning a 'system' of domination and subordination which both defines the 'nation state' and outlines duties and responsibilities within it (and to it) on the basis of 'general needs'. Although critical realism does not offer an alternative to the 'nation state', it both outlines the

view that a measure of a state's social progress resides in the welfare of its citizens, and indicates a belief that policy should be enshrined in social justice.

End Note

The preceding chapters have brought together my theoretical perspective with empirical data in a reflective debate about the purpose of the development of the NCPE. I argue, therefore, that my interpretation, that the political intent behind the construction and implementation of the NCPE was grounded in the NR's desire to reconstruct capitalist arrangements of 'social order' and 'social ordering', through imbuing the conservative values of a 'citizenship' based on 'social Darwinism' for the purpose of serving a 'social market economy', stands up to critical scrutiny.

Bibliography

Conservative Party, "Politics Today" (PT), Conservative Research Department

1979

PT, 'Local Government Issues - Comprehensive Reorganisation', No. 1, 22 Jan 1979

PT, 'Five Years of Labour Government', No. 4, 5 Mar 1979

PT, 'The General Election', No. 8, June 1979

PT, 'Briefing Notes', No. 9, 18 June 1979

PT, 'The Budget', No. 10, 2 July 1979

PT, 'Labour's Legacy', No. 15, 8 Oct. 1979

PT, 'Conservative Conference 1979', No. 16, 29 Oct. 1979

PT, 'Briefing Notes', No. 18, 19 Nov. 1979

PT, 'Education', No. 19, 3 Dec. 1979

1980

PT, 'Briefing Notes', No. 1, 28 Jan 1980

PT, 'Conservative Conference 1980, No. 18, 27 Oct. 1980

1981

PT, 'Education' No. 5, 30 Mar. 1981

PT, 'Laying the Foundations', No. 18, 12 Oct. 1981

PT, 'Conservative Conference 1981', No. 20, 2 Nov. 1981

1982

PT, 'Education', No. 12, 28 June 1982

1983

PT, 'Four Years Work', No. 8, 2 May 1983

PT, 'Conservative Conference 1983', No. 17, 31 Oct. 1983

1984

PT, 'Education', No. 3, 20 Feb. 1984

PT, 'Domestic Policy Developments', No. 13, 6 Aug. 1984

PT, 'Conservative Conference 1984', No. 18, 29 Oct. 1984

PT, 'The New Session', No. 21, 26 Nov. 1984

1985

PT, 'Local Government Issues', No. 3, 18 Feb. 1985

PT, 'Education', No. 14, 9 Sep. 1985

1986

PT, 'Education', No. 19, 20 Nov. 1986

1987

PT, 'The Conservative Programme', No. 9, 23 July 1987

PT, 'The Future of Education', No. 19, 10 Dec. 1987

1988

PT, 'Reviving the Inner Cities', No. 12, 24 June 1988

PT, 'Education Reform', No. 15, 11 Aug. 1988

1990

PT, 'Education: Moving into the New Era', No. 10, 12 July 1989

1991

PT, 'Education and Training for the Twenty First Century', No. 8, 13 June 1991

PT, 'The New Legislative Programme and The Economy', No. 17, 15 Dec. 1991

1992

PT, 'Schools: Our Plans for the Future', No. 11, 10 Sep. 1992

PT, 'OFSTED : The Revised Parents Charter', No. 13, 1992

1993

PT, 'Education', No. -, 1993

1995

PT, Britain's Schools, No. 6, 4 April, 1995

DES Circulars

- 1979** - 5/79, (Public Spending Cuts) 12 July
- 1980** - 1/80, 'Education Act', " May
- 2/80, (Proposed Changes to School), 14 July
- 1981** - 1/81, '1980 Education Act', 5 March
- 2/81, (Surplus Places), 16 June
- 4/81, 'Education Act 1980: School Government', 30 June
- 6/81, 'The School Curriculum
- 7/81, (Teacher Appointments: SoS Powers), 21 Oct.
- 8/81, Education Act 1981', ----
- Administrative Memorandum 1/81, (Local Govt Training Boards and MSC)
- Administrative Memorandum 2/81, (Numbers of Pupils in Schools)
- 1982** - 1/82, 'Approval of Advanced FE Course in England', 9 Feb.
- 4/82, 'Statutory Proposals for Secondary Schools and Falling Rolls
- 6/82, 'The YTS: Implications for the Education Service', 8 Sep.
- 7/82, (Changes to Teacher Probation), 15 Oct.
- Administrative Memorandum 1/82, (Financial Support for Priority Area (Re)Training)
- 1983** - 2/83, (Teacher Training - More in Schools), 18 Feb.
- 3/83, 'The In-Service Teacher Training Grants Scheme', 31 Mar.
- 7/83, (LEAs to conform to 1980 Education Act), 6 Dec.
- 8/83, 'The School Curriculum', 8 Dec.
- Administrative Memorandum 1/83 'Probationary Year', 26 Jan
- Administrative Memorandum 2/83, 'Publication of HMI Reports', 1 Feb.
- 1984** - 3/84, 'Initial Teacher Training Approval of Course', 13 April
- 4/84, 'The INSTT Grants Scheme', 30 April
- 6/84, 'Education Support Grants', 18 July
- 1985** - 3/85, 'INSET Grants Scheme', 5 June
- 4/85 'Education Support Grants', 7 Aug.
- -/85, 'Midday Supervision in Schools', 20 Dec.
- 1986** - 1/86, 'INSTT Grants Scheme', 2 Jan.
- 2/86, School Attendance and Educational Welfare Services', 10 Feb.
- 3/86, 'Initial Teacher Training', 21 April
- 5/86, 'Education Support Grants', 25 June
- 6/86, 'LEA Training Grants Scheme 1987-1988', 29 Aug.
- 7/86, 'Courses in Teacher Training Institutions', 29 Aug.
- 8/86, '1986 Education (No. 2) Act', 19 Dec.
- 1987** - 187, (Publication of HMI Reports), 19 Feb.
- 3/87, 'Providing Quality', 6 May
- 4/87, 'Advanced Further Education Courses', 13 May
- 5/87, 'Teachers Pay and Conditions', 15 May
- 7/87, 'Education (No. 2) Act 1986: Further Guidance', 7 Aug.
- 8/87, 'Pay and Conditions', 11 Aug.
- 9/87, 'LEA Training Grants Scheme', 26 Aug.
- 10/87, 'Approval of Teacher Training Courses', 26 Aug.

- 1988** - 5/88, 'LEA Training Grants Scheme'
 - 7/88, 'Education Reform Act, LMS'
 - 10/88, 'ERA: GMS'
- 1989** - 2/89, 'Charges for School Activities'
 - 3/89, 'ERA: Religious Education and Collective Worship'
 - 5/89, 'ERA; The Schools Curriculum and Assessment'
 - 11/89, ERA: Statutory Approval of Qualifications'
 - 12/89, 'School Teachers' Pay and Conditions of Employment'
 - 13/89, 'LMS of Schools'
 - 14/89, 'The Education (School Curriculum and Related Information) Regulations 1989'
 - 16/89, 'Ethnically Based Statistics on School Pupils'
 - 17/89, 'The Education (Schools Records) Regulations 1989'
 - 18-89, 'The Education (Teachers) Regulations 1989'
 - 20/89, 'LEA: Training Grants Scheme'
 - 21/89, 'GMS: Financial Arrangements'
 -24/89, 'Initial Teacher Training Approval of Courses'
- 1990** - 1/90, 'Statutory Approval of Qualifications (ERA: Section 5)'
 - 2/90, 'National Curriculum in English'
 - 3/90, 'Design and Technology'
 - 6/90, 'Teachers Pay and Conditions of Employment'
 - 7/90, 'Management of the Schools Day'
 - 8/90, 'Records of Achievement'
- 1991** - 1/91, 'Statutory Approval of Qualifications Under Section 5'
 - 2/91, 'Education Regulations 1991'
 - 6/91, (Parental Choice and Open Enrolment)
 - 7/91, 'LMS: Further Guidance (Compulsive Statements)'
 - 8/91, 'Local Government Act 1988: Competition in Sports and Leisure Facilities'
 - 9/91, 'Education Reform Act: The Education (Information on School Examination Results) Regulations
 - Draft Circular 'Grants for Education and Training', 1 July
 - 11/91, 'The Education (Pupils' Attendance records) Regulations 1991'
 - 12/91, 'School Teacher Appraisal (Regulation 4)'
 - 13/91, 'The Education (Teachers) (Amendments) Regulations 1991'
- 1992** - 1/92, 'NC: Flexibility at KS4'
 - 5/92, 'Reporting of Pupils' Achievements to Parents'
 - 6/92, 'ERA 1988: Statutory Approval of Qualifications Under Section 5'
 - 7/92, 'The Parent's Charter: Publication of Information About School Performance in 1992'
 - 9/92, 'Initial Teacher Training (Secondary Phase)'
 - 14/92, 'Report on Individual Pupil's Achievement'
 - Draft Circular, 'Admission arrangements', 14 Dec.

DES News / Press Releases

- 1989 - 355/89, Rumbold, -----, 17 Nov.,
- 1990 - 51/90, MacGregor, 'Helping Today's Children Become Tomorrow's Citizens', 16 Feb.
 - 143/90, MacGregor, 'Property of the Nation Depends on the Skills of Young People', 2 May
 - 231/90, MacGregor, 'John MacGregor Announces Physical Education Working Group', 11 July
 - ---/90, MacGregor, 'Training and Enterprise', 18 Oct.
 - 373/90, Eggar, 'Business needs a properly educated workforce', 16 Nov.
 - 385/90, Eggar, 'Teacher Training a Priority Area', 29 Nov.
- 1991 - 52/91, Atkins, 'Ethics in Sport', 14 Feb.
 - 65/91, Atkins, (Sport as a Multi-Million Business)
 - 81/91, Atkins, 'More Money for Sport', 11 Mar.
 - 82/91, Atkins, '£700, 000 for NCF'
 - 133/91, Clarke, (Removal of Five Year Waiting for GM Schools to Begin Selection), 25 April
 - 206/91, Atkins, 'Sport in School is the Basis for Excellence', 26 June
 - 274/91, -----, 'Ken Clarke Announces Plans for National Curriculum Physical Education', 21 Aug.
- 1992 - 2/92, -----, 'Clarke Announces Radical Overhaul of Teacher Training', 4 Jan
 - 40/92, -----, 'Clarke Launches Consultation on Teacher Training Reform'
 - 96/92, -----, 'Clarke Announces Major Changes for New Teachers'
 - 97/92, -----, 'City Technology Colleges to dispense with need for qualified teachers'
 - 112/92, -----, (Recording of Achievement in PE / KS3 to have Compulsory Games)
 - 130/92, -----, 'Future Employment Prospects for Her Majesty's Inspectorate'
 - 397/92, Blatch, 'Education reforms will create flexible, knowledgeable and adaptable workforce'

Education Science and Arts Select Committee (1991) Fourth Report 'Sport in Schools' (ESASC), London, HMSO

- Association of County Councils (1991) Appendix 7, ESASC Vol. 2, p95
 Association of Metropolitan Authorities (1991) Appendix 8, ESASC Vol. 2, p100-101
 BCPE and PEA (1991) Appendix 4, ESASC Vol. 2, p78 -88
 Committee for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (1991) Appendix 2, ESASC Vol. 2, p70-71
 Confederation of British Industry (1991) Appendix 37, ESASC Vol. 2, p174
 Charlton B (1991) Appendix 39, ESASC Vol. 2, p177-178
 DES (1991) Appendix 1, ESASC Vol. 2, p67-69
 Duffy D (1991) Appendix 45, ESASC, p189
 English Schools Football Association (1991) Appendix 22, ESASC, p148-149
 Health Education Authority (1991) Appendix 38, ESASC, p175-176
 Laws C (BCPE, BAALPE, SCOPE) (1991) Appendix 5, ESASC, p89-93
 Lines G (BCPE) (1991) Appendix 6, ESASC, p92-93

NASUWT (1991) Appendix 10, ESASC, p105-107
 National Coaching Foundation (1991) Appendix 18, ESASC, p140-141
 PEA (1991) Appendix 20, ESASC, p146-146
 Peart HT (1991) Appendix 40, ESASC, p179-180
 SCOPE and PEA (1991) Appendix 19, ESASC, p142-144
 Sports Council (1991) Appendix 13, ESASC, p112-116
 Sports Council for Wales (1991) Appendix 14, ESASC, p117-129
 University of Exeter (1991) Appendix 31, ESASC, p163-164
 Whitlam P (1991) Appendix 27, ESASC, p155-157

Hansard - Official Reports of the House of Commons Debates

Fifth Series Sessions

1979-1980 - Vol. 967-990
 1980-1981 - Vol. 991-1000

Sixth Series Sessions

1980-1981 - Vol. 1-28
 1981-1982 - Vol. 31-42
 1982-1983 - Vol. 44-51
 1983-1984 - Vol. 52-65
 1984-1985 - Vol. 67-83
 1985-1986 - Vol. 86-103
 1986-1987 - Vol. 105-115
 1987-1988 - Vol. 118-140
 1988-1989 - Vol. 142-160
 1989-1990 - Vol. 162-178
 1990-1991 - Vol. 180-196
 1991-1992 - Vol. 198-204
 1992-1993 - Vol. 207-216

Newspaper References

Atkin R and Brasher S (1986) Tennis at breaking point, Observer, May 12 1986
 Barker B (1985) Human talent..., Guardian, December 13, 1985, p16
 Barnard P (1987) Play safe sports, Times, March 12 1987
 Deeley P (1986) Sport at the back..., Telegraph, December 18, 1986, p27
 Dowd M (1986) Sports in schools are under threat, Times, November 20, 1986
 Foot D (1986) England man..., Guardian, November 20, 1986, p32
 Goodbody J (1986) Competition or recreation, Times, November 26, 1986
 Goodbody J (1986) ILEA sports chief lacks team spirit, Times, July 5, 1986
 Goodbody J (1986) Pupils losing out at sport, Times, July 4 1986
 Goodbody J (1986) Study to promote sport in schools, Times, November 27, 1986
 Goodbody J (1986) Why children aren't playing games, Times, July 18 1986, p10
 Gregg J (1988) Unfit for adult life, Times, June 30 1988, p13

- Gribben R (1986)** Prince attacks negative view of competition, Daily Telegraph, November 27, 1986
- Guardian (1987)** Teachers at fault, Guardian, March 11, 1987
- Hackett G (1985)** Worried sports chiefs call for games policy, TES, December 13, 1985, p5
- Harris D (1986)** Duke speaks of ghastly quality in some schools, Times, November 27, 1986
- Kemble B (1987)** Pupils losing out as school sports and games are cut, Sunday Times, March 1987
- Langley W (1985)** Why schools won't..., Daily Mail, October 28, 1985
- Lawson P (1986)** Making a stand, TES, May 10, 1986
- Lindley R (1987)** Sport in schools: passing the fitness test?, Listener March 12 1987, p2-13
- Lodge B (1986)** PE provision declines, TES, November 21, 1986
- Marlam C (1986)** Collision course, Sunday Telegraph, November 23, 1986
- McNab T (1988)** Radical policy needed to avert dangers, Times, March 30 1988, p42
- Millar D (1986)** Council fails to face the crux, Times, November 20, 1986
- Rees J (1986)** School sports on the run, Daily Telegraph, November 19 1986
- Road A (1986)** No sporting chance, Observer, March 16, 1986, p44
- Road A (1986)** School competition is OK after-all, Observer, November 23, 1986
- Sparkman A (1986)** Shaping sports future, Sunday Times, January 19, 1986
- TES (1983)** Minister hits teachers for six, TES, March 25, 1983
- Times Editorial (1986)** This sporting life, Times, December 27, 1986
- Today (1986)** Barmy Britain, Today, July 11, 1986
- Wiley S (1989)** Campaign launched to stop the rot, Times, October 27, 1989
- Wilson N (1986)** A sick note for the old school of sport, Independent, November 18, 1986, p25
- Wilson N (1986)** The elite road or equality street?, Independent, November 19, 1986
- Wood N (1986)** MP seeks law to preserve school sports, Times, October 14, 1986

Main Bibliography

——— (1986) Trends and Developments in Physical Education - Commonwealth Conference Jordanhill Glasgow, London, E and FN Spoon

AAA

- Abercrombie N, Hill S and Turner B (1983)** Determinacy and Indeterminacy in the Theory of Ideology, New Left Review, Vol. 142, p55-66
- Adams I (1985)** An Opportunity for Philosophical Vigour in British PE, in The Physical Educator, Vol. 24. No. 2, Spring 1985, p--
- Adler M and Asquith S (1993)** Discretion and Power, in Hill M (Ed) The Policy Process, Hemel Hempstead, Harvester Wheatsheaf, p399-406
- Ainsworth S (1976a)**, Conceptual Analysis and Physical Education, Unpublished Paper, Glasgow, Scottish School of Physical Education
- Ainsworth S (1976b)** Sport, Seriousness and Education, Unpublished Paper, Glasgow, Scottish School of Physical Education

- Aldridge A (1995)** Negotiating Status: Social Scientists and Anglican Clergy, in Hertz R and Imber J (Eds), Studying Elites Using Qualitative Methods, London, Sage, p111-123
- Alexander-Hall J (1986)** A Case for the Retention of Games in the Secondary School Physical Education Curriculum, in BJPE, Vol. 17, No. 5, Sep./Oct. 1986, p163-164
- Allan G (1991)** Qualitative Research, in Allan G and Skinner C (Eds) Handbook for Research Students in the Social Sciences, London, Falmer, p177-189
- Allison L (1984)** Right Principles: A Conservative Philosophy of Politics, Oxford, Balckwell
- Almond L (1982)** Changing the Focus; in BJPE, Vol. 13, No. 5, p131-144
- Almond L (1986)** Research-Based Teaching in Games, in Evans J (Ed) Physical Education, Sport and Schooling, London, Falmer, p155-165
- Almond L (1987)** An Exercise Policy for Schools: Do we need one?, in Bulletin of PE, Vol. 23, No. 3, Winter 1987, p28-31
- Almond L (1989a)** Children Physically Unfit, in Bodytalk, Vol. 4, No. 4, Feb.-Mar. 1989, p--
- Almond L (1989b)** Developing Personal and Social Skills Within Physical Education, in Almond L (Ed) The Place of PE in Schools, London, Kogan Page Ltd. p139-146
- Almond L (1989c)** Introduction, in Almond L (Ed) The Place of Physical Education in Schools, London, Kogan Page Ltd.
- Almond L (1989d)** New Wine in a New Bottle: Implication for a National Physical Education Curriculum, BJPE, Vol. 20, No. 3, Autumn 1989, p123-125
- Almond L (1989e)** The Place of Physical Education in the Curriculum, in Almond L (Ed) The Place of Physical Education in Schools, London, Kogan Page Ltd., p13-36
- Almond L (1990)** Four Questions about a National Physical Education Curriculum, Bulletin of Physical Education, Vol. 26, No. 1, Spring 1990, p5-8
- Almond L (1991)** An Open Statement to the Members of the PE Working Group, BPE, Vol. 27, No. 1, BAALPE
- Anderson P (1987)** The Figures of Descent, New Left Review, Vol. 161, p20-78
- Apple MW (1982)** Reproduction and Contradiction in Education, in Apple MW (Ed) Cultural and Economic Reproduction in Education, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, p1-31
- Apple MW (1988)** Facing the Complexities of Power, in Cole (Ed) Bowels and Gintis Revisited, London, Falmer, p112-130
- Apple MW (1989)** Ideology and the State in Educational Policy, in Dale R The State and Education Policy, Milton Keynes, Open University Press, p1-22
- Apple MW (1990)** Ideology and Curriculum (Second Edition), London, Routledge
- Apple MW (1993)** Official Knowledge: Democratic Education in a Conservative Age, London, Routledge
- Appleby R (1992)** Professionalism at Risk?, in Golby N and Appleby R (Eds) The Making of the National Curriculum, Tiverton, Fairway Publications, p33-38
- Arber A (1993)** 'The Research Process' in Gilbert N (Ed) Researching Social Life, London, Sage
- Archer MS (1984)** Social Origins of Educational Systems (University Edition), London, Sage
- Archer MS (1988)** Culture and Agency, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press
- Arnold PJ (1991)** Health Promotion and the Movement Curriculum, Health Education Journal, Vol. 50, No. 3, p123-7

Armstrong N, Balding J, Gentle P and Kirby B (1990) Pattern of physical activity among 11 to 16 year British children, British Medical Journal, Vol. 301, July 28 1990, p203-5

Ashworth C (1983) Sociology and the Nation, Salisbury Review, Vol. 11, No. 2, Winter 1983, p8-11

Aspin D (197-) Ethical Aspects of Sports and Games in Physical Education, Paper from Department of Education, University of Manchester

Atkins R (1994) Letter to author on 'Conservative Policy on Physical Education', May 1994

Atkinson P (1985) Language, Structure and Reproduction: An Introduction to the Sociology of Basil Bernstein, London, Methuen

Atkinson R (1984) Inflation and Middle Class Values, Salisbury Review, Vol. 3, No. 1, Oct. 1984, p4-5

BBB

BAALPE (1989a) Physical Education for Ages 5-16, Plymouth, BAALPE

BAALPE (1989b) Physical Education 5-16, Bulletin of PE, Vol. 25, No. 1, Spring 1989, p43

BAALPE (1990) Physical Education in the National Curriculum: Discussion document submitted in support of the Interim Working Group, Exmouth, BAALPE

BAALPE (1991) Comments on the National Curriculum Report, Bulletin of PE, Vol. 27, No. 2, Summer 1991, p45-53

BAALPE / PEA / SCOPE (1989) Physical Education in Schools from 5-18, Bulletin of PE, Vol. 25, No. 1, p44

Bailey K (1989) What should Physical Education be Accomplishing?, Bulletin of PE, Vol. 25, No. 3, Winter 1989, p28-29

Bailey K (1991) Physical or Sport Education, Bulletin of Physical Education, Vol. 27, No. 3, Winter 1991, p4-6

Bailey L (1995) The Correspondence Principle and the 1988 Education Reform Act, in BJSE, Vol. 16, No. 4, Dec. 1995, p479-494

Bailey L and Almond L (1983) Creating change by creating games?, Physical Education Review, Vol. 6, No. 1, p16-18

Bain LL (1990) A Critical Analysis of the Hidden Curriculum in Physical Education, in Kirk D and Tinning R (Eds) Physical Education, Curriculum and Culture, London, Falmer, p23-42

Ball SJ (1990) Politics and Policy Making in Education: Explorations in Policy Sociology, London, Routledge

Ball SJ (1994a) Culture, Crisis and Morality: The Struggle over the National Curriculum, Paper from Author, London, Kings College

Ball SJ (1994b) Education Reform: A Critical Post-Structural Approach, Buckingham, Open University Press

Ball SJ (1995) Researching Inside the State: issues in the interpretation of elite interviews, in Halpin D and Troyna B (Eds) Researching Education Policy: Ethical and Methodological Issues, Lewis, Falmer Press, p107-120

Ball SJ (1997) Policy Sociology and Critical Social Research: a personal view of recent education policy and policy research, British Educational Research Journal, Vol. 23, No. 3, June 1997, p257-275

Baker K (1993) The Turbulent Years: My Life in Politics, London, Faber and Faber

- Bantock GH (1975)** Progressivism and the Content of Education, in Cox CB and Boyson R (Eds) Black Paper 1975: The Fight for Education, London, Dent, p14-20
- Barnett A (1992)** Thatcherism, New Left Review, Vol. 134, p47-64
- Barrett M (1995)** Althusser and the problem of Determination, in -----, Social Theory, Cambridge, Polity, p44-48
- Barrow HM (1977)** Man and Movement: Principle of Physical Education, London, Lea and Febiger
- Barrow R (1976)** Common Sense and the Curriculum, London, George Allen and Unwin Ltd.
- Barry N (1990)** Ideology, in Dunleavy P, Gamble A, Peele G (Eds) Developments in British Politics, London, Macmillan, p17-43
- Bash L and Coulby D (1989)** (Eds) The Education Reform Act: Competition and Control, London, Cassell
- BBC (1987)** Panorama, 'Is Your Child Fit For Life?', March 1987
- BCPE (1987)** BCPE Interim Working Group Report, Plymouth, BAALPE
- Beck M (1990)** Physical Education is more than Sport, BJPE, Vol. 21, No. 3, Autumn 1990, p356
- Beer I (1992)** Physical Education in the National Curriculum, Education Today, Vol. 42, No. 1, p5-10
- Bell L (1986)** Managing to Survive in Secondary School Physical Education, in Evans J (Ed) Physical Education, Sport and Schooling, London, Falmer, p95-116
- Bellamy R (1995)** The Social and Political Thought of Antonio Gramsci, in -----, Social Theory, Cambridge, Polity, p32-37
- Belohradsky V (1983)** Bureaucracy, Ideology and Evil, Salisbury Review, No. 5 Autumn 1983, p11-13
- Beloff M (1979)** The State and its Servants, London, Conservative Political Centre
- Bennett N (1990)** The Primary Curriculum, in Brown T and Morrison K (Eds) The Curriculum Handbook, London, Longman
- Bernstein B (1971)** On the Classification of Framing Educational Knowledge, in Young MFD (Ed) Knowledge and Control, London, Macmillan, p47-69
- Bernstein B (1977)** Class, Codes and Control, Vol. 3: Towards a Theory of Educational Transmission, Second Edition, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul
- Bernstein B (1990)** The Structuring of Pedagogic Discourse, Vol. IV, Codes and Controls, London, Routledge
- Bevan F (1989)** A health-based approach to the teaching of physical education, BPE, Vol. 2, Summer, p36-44
- Bevan F and Hickman J (1990)** The relationship between the role of the LEA Inspector / Advisor and the Advisory Physical Education Teacher, Bulletin of PE, Vol. 26, No. 2, Summer 1990, p12-13
- Biddle S (1989)** Innovation Without Change and the Ideology of Individualism, BJPE, Vol. 20, No. 2, Summer 1989, p64-65
- Biddle S (1991)** Motivating Achievement in Physical Education: A Psychology of Success and Failure, in Armstrong N and Sparkes AC (Eds) Issues in Physical Education, London, Cassell Education
- Biddle S and Fox K (1988)** The Child's 'Perspective in Physical Education (Part 4 - Achievement Psychology)', BJPE, Vol. 19, No. 4/5, p182-185
- Biffin J (1986)** Forward from Conviction, London, Conservative Political Centre
- Billington R, Strawbridge S, Greensides L, Fitzsimons A (1991)** Culture and Society, London, Macmillan

- Blackledge D and Hunt B (1985)** Sociological Interpretations of Education, London, Croom Helm
- Blowers A (1993)** Master of Fate or Victim of Circumstance, in Hill M (Ed) The Policy Process, Hemel Hempstead, Harvester Wheatsheaf, p157-179
- Bottomore T (1993)** Political Sociology (Second Edition), London, Pluto Press
- Bourdieu P (1995a)** Social Space and Symbolic Power, in -----, Social Theory, Cambridge, Polity, p111-120
- Bourdieu P (1995b)** Structures, Habitus and Practices, in -----, Social Theory, Cambridge, Polity, p95-110
- Bowe R and Ball SJ with Gold A (1992)** Reforming Education and Changing Schools: Case Studies in Policy Sociology, London, Routledge
- Bowles S and Gintis H (1976)** Schooling in Capitalist America : Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul
- Bowles S and Gintis H (1988a)** Can There Be a Liberal Philosophy in a Democratic Society? in Cole (Ed) Bowles and Gintis Revisited, London, Falmer, p225-323
- Bowles S and Gintis H (1988b)** The Correspondence Principle, in Cole (Ed) Bowles and Gintis Revisited, London, Falmer, p1-4
- Bowles S and Gintis H (1988c)** Schooling in Capitalist America: Reply to Our Critics, in Cole (Ed) Bowles and Gintis Revisited, London, Falmer, p235-245
- Boyson R (1969)** The Essential Conditions for the Success of a Comprehensive School', in Cox CB and Dyson AE (Eds) Black Paper Two: The Crisis in Education, London, Critical Quarterly Review Society, p57-62
- Boyson R (1970)** In Defence of Examinations: The Unanswered Case, in Cox CB and Dyson AE (Eds) Black Paper Three: Good Bye Mr Short, London. Critical Quarterly Review Society, p 100-104
- Boyson R (1974)** Oversubscribed: The Story of Highbury Grove School, London, Ward Lock
- Bradshaw J (1992)** Social Security, in Marsh D and Rhodes RAW (Eds) Implementing Thatcherite Policies: An Audit of an Era, Buckingham, Open University Press, p81-99
- Bridges D (1993)** School Based Teacher Education: The Limits of Pragmatism, Paper to BERA Conference, Liverpool, September 1993
- Brohm J-M (1989)** Sport: A Prison of Measured Time, London, Pluto Press
- Broom E (1986)** High Performers in Sport, Dance and Education: Partners or Antagonists, in Trends and Developments in Physical Education, London, E and FN Spon
- Brown B (1991)** The role of a movement learning resource, Bulletin of PE, Vol. 27, No. 2, p21-23
- Brown T and Morrison K (1990)** (Eds) The Curriculum Handbook, London, Longman
- Bryman A (1992a)** Quantity and Quality in Social Research, London, Routledge
- Bryman A (1992b)** Research Methods and Organisation Studies, London, Routledge
- Bucher CA (1983)** Foundations of Physical Education and Sport, London, CV Mosby Co.
- Burchill J (1991)** Inspecting Schools: Breaking the Monopoly, London, Conservative Political Centre
- Burgess B (1991a)** (Ed) Field Research: A Source Handbook and Field Manual, London, Routledge
- Burgess B (1991b)** 'Early Field Experiences' in Burgess B (Ed) Field Research: a Source Book and Field Manual, London, Routledge p15-17

- Burgess B (1991c)** 'The Unstructured Interview As Conversation' in Burgess B (Ed) Field Research: a Source Book and Field Manual, London, Routledge p107-110
- Burgess B (1991d)** 'Multiple Strategies in Field Research' in Burgess B (Ed) Field Research: a Source Book and Field Manual, London, Routledge p163-167
- Burgess B (1993)** In the Field: An Introduction to Field Research, London, Routledge
- Burke PK (1990)** The Role of Examination Groups in the Curriculum, in Brown T and Morrison K (Eds) The Curriculum Handbook, London, Longman
- Burt C (1992)** The Pursuit of Truth, Salisbury Review, Vol. 11, No. 2, Dec. 1992, p4-9
- Butler E, Pirie M and Young P (1985)** The Omega File: Education Policy, London, Adam Smith Institute, p 269-285
- Butt R (1975)** Politics in Education, in Cox CB and Boyson R (Eds) Black Paper 1975: The Fight for Education, London, Dent, p42-45
- Butterfield S (1993)** National Curriculum Progression, in Chitty C (Ed) The National Curriculum: Is it Working?, Harlow, Longman

CCC

- Calderdale Education Department (1991)** Response to the National Curriculum Working Group Interim Report, Halifax, Calderdale MBC
- Cale - and Almond L (1992)** Children's Activity Levels: A Review of Studies Conducted on British Children, PE Review, Vol. 15, No. 2, Autumn, 1992, p--
- Campbell I (1993)** KS4: The National Curriculum Abandoned, Chitty C (Ed) The National Curriculum, Is it Working?, Harlow, Longman. P154-160
- Carlson DL (1988)** Beyond the Reproductive Theory of Teaching, in Cole (Ed) Bowles and Gintis Revisited, London, Falmer, p158-173
- Carnoy M (1982)** Education, Economy and the State, in Apple MW (Ed) Cultural and Economic Reproduction in Education, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, p 79-126
- Carr D (1978)** Practical Pursuits and the Curriculum, Journal of Philosophy of Education, Vol. 2, 1978
- Carriage E (1986)** Not a Soft Option, Bulletin of Physical Education, Vol. 22, No, 1, Spring 1986, p15-21
- Carrington B and Leaman O (1986)** Equal Opportunities in Physical Education, in Evans J (Ed) Physical Education, Sport and Schooling, London, Falmer Press, p215-225
- Carrington B and Williams T (1988)** Patriarchy and Ethnicity: The Link Between School Physical Education and Community Leisure Activities, in Evans J (Ed) Teachers, Teaching and Control in Physical Education, London, Falmer Press, p83-95
- Carroll B (1986)** 'Troublemakers': Making a Name in Physical Education: A Study of a Label, in Evans J (Ed) Physical Education, Sport and Schooling, London, Falmer Press, p 117-132
- Carroll B (1991)** Assessment in the National Curriculum: What the teacher has to do, BJPE, Vol. 22, No. 2, Summer 1991, p8-10
- Carroll B and Hollinshead G (1993)** Equal Opportunities: Race and Gender in Physical Education: A Case Study, in Evans J (Ed) Equality, Education and Physical Education, London, Falmer, p154-159
- Casbon C (1989)** Which way now to the National Curriculum, BJPE, Vol. 20, No. 1, Spring 1989, p4-6

- Casbon C (1991)** The Place of Games in the Physical Education of Children, BJPE, Vol. 22, No. 1, Spring 1991, p7-10
- Casbon C (1992)** The National Curriculum - Taking the road towards independence, BJPE, Vol. 23, No. 1, Spring 1992, p6-7
- CCPR (1994)** A Charter for School Sport, London, CCPR
- Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (1981)** Unpopular Education: Schooling and Social Democracy in England Since 1944, London, Hutchinson
- Chanan G (1987)** Everyone's Schools: A Reply to the Hillgate Group, York, Centre for the Study of Comprehensive Schools (CSCS)
- Chappell B (1988)** The Future of School Sport, BJPE, Vol. 19, No. 4/5, July/Oct. 1988, p152-153
- Chappell R (1990)** Editorial, Bulletin of Physical Education, Vol. 26, No. 3, Winter 1990, p3-5
- Chitty C (1993a)** Introduction: The School Curriculum: From Teacher Autonomy to Central Control, in Chitty C (Ed) The National Curriculum: Is it working?, Harlow, Longman, p1-24
- Chitty C (1993b)** KS4: The National Curriculum Abandoned?, in Chitty C (Ed) The National Curriculum: Is It Working?, Harlow, Longman, p146-153
- Chitty C (1993c)** Managing a Coherent Curriculum: Four Case Studies in Chitty C (Ed) The National Curriculum: Is It Working?, Harlow, Longman, p80-100
- Chitty C (1993d)** Postscript: The Dearing Review, in Chitty C (Ed) The National Curriculum: Is It Working?, Harlow, Longman, p161-166
- Chitty C (1994)** Consensus to Conflicts: The Structure of Educational Decision Making Transformed, in Scott D (Ed) Accountability and Control in Educational Settings, London, Cassell, p8-31
- Chowdhary-Best G (1993)** Conservatism's Big Idea, Salisbury Review, Vol. 11, No. 3, Mar. 1993, p23-26
- Clarke G (1992)** Learning the Language: Discourse Analysis in Physical Education and Sport, London, Falmer, p146-166
- Clegg S (1993)** Efficiency Rules OK? Weber and the Economic Alternatives, in Hill M (Ed) The Policy Process, Hemel Hempstead, Harvester Wheatsheaf, p121-134
- Codd J, Gordon L and Harker R (1990)** Education and the Role of the State, in Lauder H and Wylie C (Eds) Towards Successful Schooling, London, Falmer, p15-32
- Coe MJ (1986)** Games Education, BJPE, Vol. 17, No. 6, Nov./Dec., 1986, p202-204
- Cohen A (1991)** The Children's Crusade, Athletic Business, Vol. 15, No. 10, Oct. 1991, p--
- Cohen GA (1981)** Freedom, Justice and Capitalism, New Left Review, Vol. 126, p3-17
- Cohen L and Manion L (1992)** Research Methods in Education, London, Routledge, p307-335
- Cole M (1988a)** (Ed) Bowles and Gintis Revisited: Correspondence and Contradiction in Education, London, Falmer
- Cole M (1988b)** Contradiction in the Education Theory of Bowles and Gintis, in Cole (Ed) Bowles and Gintis Revisited, London, Falmer, p33-48
- Cole M (1988c)** Correspondence Principle Theory in Education: Impact, Critique and Re-evaluation, in Cole (Ed) Bowles and Gintis Revisited, London, Falmer, p7-15
- Coleman W (1992)** Succumbing to the Soviets, Salisbury Review, Vol. 11, No. 2, Dec. 1992, p10-13
- Collins H (1995)** Erving Goffman on Ritual and Solidarity, in -----, Social Theory, Cambridge, Polity, p71-78

- Colquhoun D (1989)** Health Related Fitness and Individualism: Continuing the Debate, BJPE, Vol. 20, No. 3, Autumn 1989, p118-122
- Colquhoun D (1992)** Technocratic Rationality and the Medicalisation of the Physical Education, PE Review, Vol. 15, No. 1, p5-12
- Comer SJ and Sparkes AC (1992)** Governors, Grant Maintained Status and Physical Education: Some insights from a case study, Bulletin, Vol. 28, No. 1, Spring 1992, p6-11
- Conservative Party (1979)** The Conservative Manifesto 1979, London, Conservative Central Office
- Conservative Party (1983)** The Conservative Manifesto 1983, London, Conservative Central Office
- Conservative Party (1987)** The Conservative Manifesto 1987: The Next Moves Forward, London, Conservative Central Office
- Conservative Party (1992)** The Conservative Manifesto 1992: The Best Future for Britain, London, Conservative Central Office
- Cottle TJ (1991)** 'The Life Study: On Mutual Recognition and The Subjective Inquiry' Burgess B (Ed) Field Research: A Source Handbook and Field Manual, London, Routledge, p123-128
- Cowell CC (1973)** The Contribution of Physical Activity to Social Development, in Mangan JA (Ed) Physical Education and Sport: Sociological and Cultural Perspectives, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, p53-87
- Cox B (1992)** The Great Betrayal, London, Chapmans
- Cox CB (1981)** Education: The Next Decade, London, Conservative Political Centre
- Cox CB and Boyson R (1975)** (Eds) Black Paper 1975: The Fight for Education, London, Dent, p4
- Cox CB and Boyson R (1977)** Editorial, in Cox CB and Boyson R (Eds) Black Paper 1977, London, Temple Smith, p93
- Crewe I (1988)** Has the Electorate Become Thatcherite, in Skidelsky R (Ed) Thatcherism, London, Chatto and Windus, p25-50
- Crompton K (1987)** A Curriculum for Enterprise: Pedagogy or Propaganda, School Organisation, Vol. 7, No. 1, p5-11
- Cronin R (1983)** The Meaning of Freedom, Salisbury Review, No. 4, Summer 1983, p33-36
- Crouch C (1990)** Industrial Relations, in Dunleavy P, Gamble A, Peele G (Eds) Developments in British Politics, London, Macmillan, p318-325
- Crowther I (1983)** Mrs Thatcher's Idea of the Good Society, Salisbury Review, No. 3, Spring 1983, p41-43
- Crowther I (1984)** The Politics of Restoration, Salisbury Review, No. 7, Spring 1984, p10-15
- Crowther I (1989)** Thatcherism and the Good Life, Salisbury Review, Vol. 8, No. 1, p4-7
- Crowther I (1993)** The Morals of Moderns, Salisbury Review, Vol. 12, No. I, Sept. 1993, p47-50
- Croxon D and Levoir N (1984)** Time-tabling pressures: its effect on physical education, BJPE, Vol. 15, No. 4, p108-109

DDD

- Dale R (1982)** Education and The Capitalist State: Contributions and Contradictions, in Apple MW (Ed) Cultural and Economic Reproduction in Education, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul. P127-161
- Dale R (1989)** The State and Education Policy, Milton Keynes, Open University Press
- Dahrendorf R (1988)** Changing Social Values Under Mrs Thatcher, in Skidelsky R (Ed) Thatcherism, London, Chatto and Windus, 195-210
- Deem R (1994)** School Governing Bodies: Public concerns and private practices, in Scott D (Ed) Accountability and Control in Educational Settings, London, Cassell, p58-72
- Deleging P and Colebatch H (1993)** Structure and Action as Constructs in the Practice of Public Administration, in Hill M (Ed) The Policy Process, Hemel Hempstead, Harvester Wheatsheaf, p344-361
- Demaine J (1989)** Privatisation by Stealth: New Right Education Policy ACE Bulletin, No. 28, March 1989, p--
- Demaine J (1993)** The New Right and the Self- Managing School, in Smyth J (Ed) A Sociologically Critical View of the Self Managing School, London, Falmer
- DES (1980)** A Framework for the School Curriculum, London, DES
- DES (1981)** The School Curriculum - Red Books, London, DES
- DES (1983)** Teaching Quality, London, HMSO
- DES (1985)** Better Schools, London, HMSO
- DES (1987)** The National Curriculum 5-16: A Consultation Document, London, HMSO
- DES (1989a)** National Curriculum: From Policy to Practice, London, DES
- DES (1989b)** Physical Education from 5-16, London, HMSO
- DES (1991a)** National Curriculum Physical Education Working Group Interim Report, London, DES
- DES (1991b)** Physical Education for Ages 5-16: Proposals of the SoS for Education and Science and SoS for Wales, August 1991, London, DES
- DES (1991c)** Sport and Active Recreation, London, DES
- DES (1992)** Physical Education in the National Curriculum, London, DES
- DES/NCC/BCPE (1990)** The Planning, Assessment and Evaluation of Physical Education as a Foundation Subject of the National Curriculum from 5-16, Invitation Conference, Bournemouth, March 26-28, DES
- DFE (1994)** Final Report on the National Curriculum and its Assessment, London, DFE
- DFE/WO (1995)** Physical Education in the National Curriculum, London, HMSO
- Dick F (1986)** Physical Education and Sports Coaching, BJPE, Vol. 17, No. 6, Nov./Dec. 1986, p199-201
- Deuchar S (1992)** Professionalism in Education, Salisbury Review, Vol. 10, No. 4, June 1992, p37-40
- Devons E and Gluckman M (1991)** 'Procedures for Demarcating a Field of Study' in Burgess B (Ed) Field Research: a Source Book and Field Manual, London, Routledge p19-21
- Dickenson B (1989)** Accreditation: A Different Dimension for Physical Education, in Almond L (Ed) The Place of Physical Education in Schools, London, Kogan Page Ltd, p147-156

- Dodds P (1993)** Removing the Ugly 'Isms' in Your Gym: Thoughts for Teachers on Equity, in Evans J (Ed) Equality, Education and Physical Education, London, Falmer, p28-39
- DNH (1995)** Sport Raising The Game, London, DNH
- Donald J (1992)** Dewey-Eyed Optimism: The Possibility of Democratic Education, New Left Review, Vol. 192, p133-144
- Drewett P (1991)** Assessment and Development and Challenges in Physical Education, in Armstrong N and Sparkes AC (Eds) Issues in Physical Education, London, Cassell Education, p109-122
- Drewett P (1992)** A Chance to Make A Physical Education Curriculum, or Reinventing the Wheel?, in Golby M and Appleby R (Eds) The Making of the National Curriculum, Tiverton, Fairway Publications, p19-23
- Ducland-Williams R (199-)** Thatcherism and Educational Policy, Unpublished Paper, Coventry, University of Warwick
- Dunford J (1990)** Managing the Curriculum with Governing Bodies, in Brown T and Morrison K (Eds) The Curriculum Handbook, London, Longman, p42-48
- Dunleavy P (1990a)** Government at the Centre, in Dunleavy P, Gamble A, Peele G (Eds) Developments in British Politics, London, Macmillan, p96-125
- Dunleavy P (1990b)** Introduction: Prospects for British Politics in the 1990s, in Dunleavy P, Gamble A, Peele G (Eds) Developments in British Politics, London, Macmillan, p1-16
- Dunleavy P (1993)** Explaining the Privatisation Boom: Public Choice Versus Radical Approaches, in Hill M (Ed) The Policy Process, Hemel Hempstead, Harvester Wheatsheaf, p135-152
- Dunleavy P, Gamble A, Peele G (1990)** (Eds) Developments in British Politics, London, Macmillan
- Dunleavy P and O'Leary - (1993)** The Evolution of Marxist Approaches to State Organisation, in Hill M (Ed) The Policy Process, Hemel Hempstead, Harvester Wheatsheaf, p69-85
- Dunwich C (1993)** History has not ended, Salisbury Review, Vol. 11. No. 3, Mar 1993, p15-19
- Durham M (1991)** Sex and Politics: The Family and Morality in the Thatcher Years, London, Macmillan

EEE

- Eagleton T (1992)** The Crisis of Contemporary Culture, New Left Review, Vol. 196, p29-42
- Eggleston J (1977)** The Sociology of the School Curriculum, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul
- Elliot J (1988)** The State versus Education: The Challenge for Teachers; BERA Conference, 1 March 1988, p46-46
- Ellis-Jones A (1985)** The Politics of Economics, Salisbury Review, Vol. 3, No. 3, p43-47
- Elmore RE (1993)** Organisational Models of Social programme Implementation, M (Ed) The Policy Process, Hemel Hempstead, Harvester Wheatsheaf, p313-348
- Elster J (1995)** Rational Choice Theory, in -----, Social Theory, Cambridge, Polity, p121-125
- Education Reform Bill (1987)**, London, HMSO
- Education Reform Act (1988)**, London, HMSO

- Evans J (1986a)** Introduction: Personal Troubles and Public Issues: Studies in the Sociology of Physical Education, in Evans J (Ed) Physical Education, Sport and Schooling, London, Falmer, p1-10
- Evans J (1986b)** (Ed) Physical Education, Sport and Schooling, London, Falmer
- Evans J (1987)** Teaching and Learning in Physical Education: Towards a Qualitative Understandings, PE Review, Vol. 10, No. 1, p30-39
- Evans J (1988)** (Ed) Teachers, Teaching and Physical Education, London, Falmer
- Evans J (1989)** Health Related Fitness: A Suitable Case for Treatment?, BJPE, Vol. 20, No. 4, Winter 1989, p189-190
- Evans (1990)** Defining a Subject: the rise and rise of the new PE, British Journal of Sociology of Education of Education, Vol. 11, No. 2, p155-169
- Evans J (1992)** A Short Paper About People, Power and Education Reform, in Sparkes A (Ed) Research in Physical Education and Sport, London, Falmer, p231-247
- Evans J (1993)** (Ed) Equality, Education and Physical Education, London, Falmer
- Evans J (1995a)** Reconstructing Teacher Education, European Physical Education Review, Vol. 1, No. 2, p111-121
- Evans J (1995b)** Teachers' Professional Knowledge, Pedagogy and the Future of Teacher Education, from AIESEP International Conference, The Wingate Institution, Israel, June 1995
- Evans J and Clarke G (1988)** Changing the Face of Physical Education, in Evans J (Ed) Teachers, Teaching and Control in Physical Education, London, Falmer Press, p125-141
- Evans J and Davies B (1986)** Sociology, Schooling and Physical Education, in Evans J (Ed) Physical Education, Sport and Schooling, London, Falmer, p11-37
- Evans J and Davies B (1988)** Introduction: Teachers, Teaching and Control, in Evans J (Ed) Teachers, Teaching and Control in Physical Education, London, Falmer Press, p1-20
- Evans J and Davies B (1990)** 'Power to the People?' The Great Education Reform Act and Tomorrow's Schools: A Critical and Comparative Perspective, in Lawlor N and Wylie C (Eds) Towards Successful Schooling, London, Falmer, p53-71
- Evans J and Davies B (1993a)** Equality, Equity and Physical Education, in Evans J (Ed) Equality, Education and Physical Education, London, Falmer, p11-27
- Evans J and Davies B (1993b)** Introduction, in Evans J (Ed) Equality, Education and Physical Education, London, Falmer, p1-10
- Evans J and Davies B (1993c)** Postscript: Physicals Education Post ERA in a Post-Modern Society, in Evans (Ed) Equality, Education and Physical Education, London, Falmer, p233-238
- Evans J, Davies B, Bass D, Penney D (1997)** Playing for Position: Education Policy, Physical Education and Nationalism in Wales, Journal of Education Policy, Vol. 12, No. 4, p285-302
- Evans J, Davies B and Penney D (1994)** What ever happened to the Subject and the State, Discourse, Vol. 14, No. 2, p59-64
- Evans J, Davies B and Penney D (1996)** Teachers, Teaching and the Social Construction of Gender Relations, Sport, Education and Society, Vol. 1, No. 2, p165-183
- Evans J and Penney D (1992)** Investigating ERA: Qualitative Methods and Policy Orientated Research, BJPE, Research Supplement, 1992
- Evans and Penney (1993)** The Politics of Pedagogy, from The II Enuncuento UNISPORT Sobre Sociological Deportora - Investigacion Alternaturua EN Education FISICA, Malaga, Spain, Sept. 1993

- Evans J and Penney D (1994)** Whatever Happened to Good Advice? Service and Inspection after the Education Reform Act, British Educational Research Journal, Vol. 20, No. 5, p519-533
- Evans J and Penney D (1995a)** Physical Education, Restoration and the Politics of Sport, Curriculum Studies, Vol. 3, No. 2, p183-195
- Evans J and Penney D (1995b)** The Politics of Pedagogy: Making a National Curriculum Physical Education, Journal of Education Policy, Vol. 10, No. 1, p27-44
- Evans J, Penney D and Bryant A (1993a)** Improving the Quality in Physical Education? The Education Reform Act 1988 and Physical Education, Quest, Vol. 45, No. 3, p321-338
- Evans J, Penney D and Bryant A (1993b)** Playing by Market Rules: Physical Education in England and Wales after ERA, in McFee G and Tomlinson A (Eds) Education, Sport and Leisure, Brighton, Brighton University, p17-31
- Evans J, Penney D with Bryant A (1993c)** Physical Education after ERA, BJPE, Research Supplement, No. 13, Autumn 1993, p2-5
- Evans J, Penney D and Bryant A (1993d)** Theorising Implementation: A Preliminary Comment on Power and Process in Policy Research, Physical Education Review, Vol. 16, No. 1, p5-22
- Evans J, Penney D and Davies B (1995)** Back to the Future: Education Policy and Physical Education, in Armstrong N (Ed) New Directions in Physical Education, London, Cassell, p 1-19
- Everest C (1988)** Who knows when extra is essential?, in Haviland J (Ed) Take care Mr Baker, London, Fourth Estate, p191-193

FFF

- Fairclough N (1997)** Critical Discourse Analysis: A Critical Study of Language, London, Longman
- Fawcett T and Bunn R (1992)** The National Curriculum: A Pause for Breath and Time to Reflect on Methods of Practice. Are We Practising what we Preach, BJPE, Vol. 28, No. 2, Autumn 1992, p26-40
- Fentem PH (1992)** Exercise in Prevention of Disease, British Medical Bulletin, July 1992
- Fielding N (1993)** 'Qualitative Interviewing' in Gilbert N (Ed) Researching Social Life, London, Sage, p135-154
- Figuera P (1993)** Equality, Multi-Culturalism, Anti-Racism and Physical Education in the National Curriculum, in Evans J (Ed) Equality, Education and Physical Education, London, Falmer, p90-104
- Flew A (1988)** Corruption Among the Clerks, Salisbury Review, Vol. 16, No. 4, June 1988, p13-17
- Flintoff A (1990)** Physical Education: Equal Opportunities and the National Curriculum: Crisis or Challenge, Physical Education Review, Vol. 13, No. 2, p85-101
- Flintoff A (1993)** Gender, Physical Education and Initial Teacher Education, in Evans J (Ed) Equality, Education and Physical Education, London, Falmer, p184-205
- Ford A (1979)** 11 Plus is too late, BJPE, Vol. 10, No. 1, Jan. 1979, p12
- Forsyth M (1984)** Politics of the Rates, London, Conservative Political Centre
- Foster J (1985)** The Declassing of Language, New Left Review, Vol. 150, p29-46
- Fox K (1987)** Making the most of Physical Education: A Position on Curriculum Content, BJPE, Vol. 18, no. 6, Nov./Dec. 1986, p248-251

- Fox K (1988a)** The Child's Perspective in Physical Education (The Psychological Dimension), BJPE, Vol. 19, No. 1, p34-38
- Fox K (1988b)** The Child's Perspective in Physical Education (Part 5 - The Self-Esteem Complex), BJPE, Vol. 19, No. 6, Nov./Dec. 1988, p247-253
- Fox K (1992)** Education for Exercise and the National Curriculum Proposals: A Step Forwards or Backwards, BJPE, Vol. 23, No. 1, Spring 1992, p8-11
- Fox K and Biddle S (1988a)** The Child's Perspective in Physical Education (Part 2), BJPE, Vol. 19, No. 2, p79-82
- Fox K and Biddle S (1988b)** The Child's Perspective in Physical Education (Part 3 - A Question of Attitude), BJPE, Vol. 19, No. 3, p107-111
- Frater G (1994a)** Criteria of Chimera?: Defining Standards for Assessment and Inspection (Draft Paper from Author), Coventry, University of Warwick
- Frater G (1994b)** Literacy and Policy (Draft Paper from Author), Coventry, University of Warwick
- Freeman-Moir J, Scott A and Lauder H (1988)** Reformism or Revolution: Liberalism and the Metaphysics of Democracy, in Cole (Ed) Bowles and Gintis Revisited, London, Falmer, p209-224
- Freire P (1972)** Pedagogy of the Oppressed, London, Penguin
- Frisby D (1995)** Georg Simmel: Modernity as an Eternal Present, in -----, Social Theory, Cambridge, Polity, p23-31

GGG

- Gamble A (1987)** Class Politics and Radical Democracy, New Left Review, Vol. 164, p113-122
- Gamble A (1990a)** The Free Economy and the Strong State: The Politics of Thatcherism, London, Macmillan
- Gamble A (1990b)** The Thatcher Decade in Perspective, in Dunleavy P, Gamble A, Peele G (Eds) Developments in British Politics, London, Macmillan, p333-358
- Gash N (1989)** The Radical Element in the History of the Conservative Party, London, Conservative Political Centre
- Geertz C (1995)** The World in a Text: Levi Strauss's Tristes Tropiques, in -----, Social Theory, Cambridge, Polity,
- George L and Kirk D (1988)** The Limits of Change in Physical Education: Ideologies, Teachers and the Experiences of Physical Activity, in Evans J (Ed) Teachers, Teaching and Control in Physical Education, London, Falmer Press, p145-154
- Giddens A (1979)** Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure and Contradiction in Social Analysis, London, Macmillan
- Giddens A (1982)** Profiles and Critiques in Social Theory, London, Macmillan
- Giddens A (1995a)** Elements of the Theory of Structuration, in -----, Social Theory, Cambridge, Polity, p79-88
- Giddens A (1995b)** Institutional Reflexivity and Modernity, in -----, Social Theory, Cambridge, Polity, p89-94
- Gilbert N (1993a)** 'Research, Theory and Method' in Gilbert N (Ed) Researching Social Life, London, Sage
- Gilbert N (1993b)** 'Writing About Research' in Gilbert N (Ed) Researching Social Life, London, Sage
- Gilmour I (1992)** Dancing with Dogma: Britain Under Thatcherism, London, Simon and Schuster Ltd.

- Gintis H and Bowles S (1988)** Contradiction and Reproduction in Educational Theory, in Cole M (Ed) Bowles and Gintis Revisited, London, Falmer, p16-32
- Giroux HA (1983)** Theory and Resistance in Education: A Pedagogy for the Opposition, London, Heinemann Educational Books
- Glasser B (1991)** 'Generating Formal Theory' in Burgess B (Ed) Field Research: a Source Book and Field Manual, London, Routledge p225-232
- Golby M (1992)** Introduction, in Golby M and Appleby R (Eds) The Making of the National Curriculum, Tiverton, Fairway Publications, p5-7
- Gordon I, Lewis J and Young K (1993)** Perspectives in Policy Analysis, in Hill M (ED) The Policy Process, Hemel Hempstead, Harvester Wheatsheaf, p5-10
- Gore JM (1990)** Pedagogy as Text in Physical Education Teacher Education, in Kirk D and Tinning R (Eds) Physical Education, Curriculum and Culture, London, Falmer, p101-138
- Graham D with Tytler D (1993)** A Lesson for Us All: the Making of the National Curriculum, London, Routledge
- Gray J (1983)** The Peace Movement and Moral Inversion, Salisbury Review, No. 3, Spring 1983, p10-11
- Gray J (1995)** 'Vive la Difference', THES, Oct. 13, 1995, p17
- Green D (1987)** The New Right: The Counter Revolution in Political, Economic and Social Thought, Brighton, Wheatsheaf
- Gregory R (1993)** Political Rationality or Incrementalism, in Hill M (ED) The Policy Process, Hemel Hempstead, Harvester Wheatsheaf, p212-231
- Gross R (1992)** Psychology, The Science of Mind and Behaviour (Second Edition), London, Hodder and Stoughton
- Groves R (1979)** Can we restore character to physical education?, BJPE, Vol. 10, No. 1, Jan 1979, p8-9
- Gruner R (1990)** The Old Virtues, Salisbury Review, Vol. 8, No. 3, Mar. 1990, p19-24
- Gyte G (1990)** The Secondary Curriculum, in Brown T and Morrison K (Eds) The Curriculum Handbook, London, Longman, p12-17

HHH

- Habermas J (1979)** Conservatism and Capitalist Crisis, New Left Review, Vol. 115, p73-84
- Habermas J (1995a)** The Normative Content of Modernity, in -----, Social Theory, Cambridge, Polity, p150-159
- Habermas J (1995b)** The Tasks of a Critical Theory, in -----, Social Theory, Cambridge, Polity, p142-149
- Hall J (1990)** The Effects of Recent Legislation on the Curriculum, in Brown T and Morrison K (Eds) The Curriculum Handbook, London, Longman, p18-30
- Hall S (1985)** Authoritarian Populism, New Left Review, Vol. 151, p115-123
- Halpin D (1997)** In the Grip of the Past?, Tradition, Traditionalism and Contemporary Schooling, Paper - International Sociology of Education Conference (Educational Policy, Social Justice and Change), Rutland Hotel, Sheffield 3-5 Jan. 1997
- Halsey AH (1988)** A Sociologist's View of Thatcherism, in Skidelsky R (Ed) Thatcherism, London, Chatto and Windus, p173-189
- Halstead M (1994)** Accountability and Values, in Scott D (Ed) Accountability and Control in Educational Settings, London, Cassell, p146-165

- Ham C (1993)** Power in Health Services, in Hill M (Ed) The Policy Process, Hemel Hempstead, Harvester Wheatsheaf, p180-191
- Hammersley M (1993)** 'The Researcher Exposed: A Natural History in Burgess B (Ed) The Research Process in Educational Settings: Ten Case Studies, London, Falmer p39-68
- Hammersley M and Atkinson P (1992)** Ethnography : Principles in Practice, London, Routledge
- Handy C (1994)** The Empty Raincoat, London, Hutchinson
- Hardy C (1987)** Competition, Sport and Schools, BJPE, Vol. 17, Newsletter
- Hardy C and Sparkes A (1987)** School Sport and The Control of the Physical Education Curriculum, Bulletin of Physical Education, Vol. 23, No. 2, p28-31
- Hargreaves D (1982)** Ten proposals for the future of PE, BPE, Vol. 18, Autumn, p5-10
- Hargreaves John (1982)** Sport, Culture and Ideology, in Hargreaves Jennifer (Ed) Sport, Culture and Ideology, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, p30-61
- Hargreaves J (1987)** The Body, Sport and Power Relations, Sociological Review Monograph, Vol. 33, p139-159
- Harris J (1989)** A Health Focus in Physical Education, Almond L (Ed) The Place of Physical Education in Schools, London, Kogan Page Ltd, p129-138
- Harris J (1990)** Putting Health First: An Alternative Policy and practice for Physical Education, Loughborough, Loughborough University
- Harris J and Elbourne J (1992)** Highlighting Health Related Fitness within the National Curriculum - Part 2, BJPE, Vol. 23, No. 2, Summer, p5-8
- Harris R (1986)** Morality and Markets: Gospel of an Economist, London, Conservative Political Centre
- Harris R (1988)** The Politics of Compassion, Salisbury Review, Vol. 6, No. 3, Mar. 1988, p34-38
- Harris R (1989)** The Conservative Community: The Roots of Thatcherism and its Future, London, Centre for Policy Studies
- Hart D (1988)** Who'll pay to prop the school gates open?, in Haviland J (Ed) Take Care Mr Baker, London, Fourth Estate, p16-170
- Hartley D (1992)** Teacher Appraisal: A Policy Analysis (Chapter One), Edinburgh, Scottish Academic Press
- Hartnett A and Naish M (1979)** Knowledge, Pseudo-Knowledge and Method of Legitimation, Physical Education Review, Vol. 11, No. 2, p76-88
- Haug F (1984)** Morals Also Have Two Genders, New Left Review, Vol. 143, p51-68
- Haviland J (1988)** (Ed) Take Care Mr Baker, London, Fourth Estate
- Hawkins N (1994)** The Importance of Sport in Education from the Conservative Backbench Sports Committee (Paper from Author), London, Conservative Central Office
- Health Education Authority (1992)** Health related exercise in the National Curriculum, Newsletter, June 1992
- Heath C and Luff P (1993)** 'Explicating face-to-face interaction' in Gilbert N (Ed) Researching Social Life, London, Sage, p307-326
- Hekman S (1995)** Gadamer and Ricouer in Hermeneutics, in -----, Social Theory, Cambridge, Polity, p49-53
- Hendry CB (1986)** Changing Schools in a Changing Society: The Role of Physical Education, in Evans J (Ed) Physical Education, Sport and Schooling, London, Falmer, p41-69

- Henning E (1986)** The enclosure of the body - on the historical relativity of 'health', 'nature' and the environment of sport. Journal of Contemporary History (GB), Vol. 21, No. 1, p99-121
- Henry I (1993)** The Politics of Leisure Policy, London, Macmillan
- Hertz R and Imber J (1995)** Introduction, in Hertz R and Imber J (Eds) Studying Elites Using Qualitative Methods, London, Sage, pvii-xi
- Hill M (1993)** (Introductions) The Policy Process, Hemel Hempstead, Harvester Wheatsheaf
- Hill M (1996)** Social Policy: A Comparative Analysis, London, Harvester Wheatsheaf
- Hillgate Group (1986)** Whose Schools? A Radical Manifesto, London, Hillgate Group
- Hillgate Group (1987)** The Reform of British Education: From Principles to Practice, London, The Claridge Press
- Hillgate Group (1989)** Learning to Teach, London, The Claridge Press
- Hirschkop K (1986)** Bakhtin, Discourse and Democracy, New Left Review, Vol. 160, p92-113
- Hirst J (1979)** No Account of the Individual, BJPE, Vol. 10, No. 1, Jan 1979, p10-11
- HMI (1983)** A View of the Curriculum, London, HMI
- Hjern B and Porter D (1993)** Implementation Structures: A New Unit of Administrative Analysis, in Hill M (Ed) The Policy Process, Hemel Hempstead, Harvester Wheatsheaf, p248-265
- Hodkinson P and Sparkes AC (1993)** Pre-Vocationalism and Empowerment: Some Questions for Physical Education, in Evans J (Ed) Equality, Education and Physical Education, London, Falmer, p170-184
- Hogwood B and Gunn L (1993)** Why 'Perfect Implementation' is Unattainable, in Hill M (Ed) The Policy Process, Hemel Hempstead, Harvester Wheatsheaf, p238-247
- Holt J (1976)** How Children Learn, London, Penguin
- Holt J (1977)** Instead of Education, London, Penguin
- Honeyford R (1985)** The Right Education, Salisbury Review, Vol. 3, No. 2, Jan. 1985, p28-30
- Honeyford R (1987)** The Swann Fiasco, Salisbury Review, Vol. 5, No. 3, April 1987, p54-56
- Honeyford R (1990)** The National Curriculum and its Official Distortion, Salisbury Review, Vol. 8, No. 4, June 1990, p11-12
- House of Commons (1991)** Government Response to the Education Science and Arts Select Committee Fourth Report 'Sport in Schools', London, HMSO
- House of Commons Education Science and Arts Select Committee (1991)** Fourth Report 'Sport in Schools', Vol. I, London, HMSO
- House of Commons Education Science and Arts Select Committee (1991)** Fourth Report 'Sport in Schools' - Evidence, Vol. II, London, HMSO
- Howe G (1982)** Conservatism in the Eighties, London, Conservative Political Centre
- Howe G (1988)** The Conservative Revival of Britain, London, Conservative Political Centre
- Howell D (1983)** The Peoples Business, London, Conservative Political Centre
- Hoyle E (1986)** Curriculum Development in Physical Education 1960-1985, in Trends and Developments in Physical Education, London, E and FN Spon
- Hudson B (1993a)** Collaboration in Social Welfare, in Hill M (Ed) The Policy Process, Hemel Hempstead, Harvester Wheatsheaf, p362-376

- Hudson B (1993b)** Michael Lipsky and Street Level Bureaucracy, in Hill M (Ed) The Policy Process, Hemel Hempstead, Harvester Wheatsheaf, p386-398
- Hughes R (1979)** Relevance of Physical Education, BJPE, Vol. 10, No. 1, Jan. 1979, p4
- Humberstone B (1993)** Equality, Physical Education and Outdoor Education: Ideological Struggles and Transformative Structures?, in Evans J (Ed) Equality, Education and Physical Education, London, Falmer, p217-232
- Hunter A (1995)** Local Knowledge and Local Power: Notes on the Ethnography of Local Community Elites, in Hertz R and Imber J (Eds) Studying Elites Using Qualitative Methods, London, Sage, p151-170
- Husen T (1979)** The School in Question, Oxford, Oxford University Press
- Hutton W (1996)** The State We're In, London, Vintage
- Hyams D (1994)** Through a Class Darkly, Salisbury Review, Vol. 12, No. 3, Mar. 1994, p23-29

III

- Illich I (1972)** Deschooling Society, London, Calder and Boyars
- Illich I (1973)** Tool for Conviviality, London, Calder and Boyars
- Illich I (1976)** After Deschooling What?, London, Writers and Readers

JJJ

- Jackson PM (1992)** Economic Policy, in Marsh D and Rhodes RAW (Eds) Implementing Thatcherite Policies: An Audit of an Era, Buckingham, Open University Press, p11-31
- Jarvie G (1987)** Book Review on Evans J (1986) Physical Education, Sport and Schooling, Leisure Studies, Vol. 6, No. 3, p368-370
- Jarvie G and Maguire J (1994)** Sport and Leisure in Social Thought, London, Routledge
- Jenkins B (1993)** Policy Analysis: Models and Approaches, in Hill M (Ed) The Policy Process, Hemel Hempstead, Harvester Wheatsheaf, p34-43
- Jessop B, Bonnett K, Bromley S and Ling T (1984)** Authoritarian Populism, Two Nations and Thatcherism, New Left Review, Vol. 147, p32-60
- Jessop B, Bonnett K, Bromley S and Ling T (1985)** Thatcherism and the Politics of Hegemony, New Left Review, Vol. 153, p87-101
- Jessop B, Bonnett K, Bromley S and Ling T (1987)** Popular Capitalism, Flexible Accumulation and Left Strategy, New Left Review, Vol. 165, p104-122
- Jessop B, Bonnett K, Bromley S and Ling T (1988)** Thatcherism, Cambridge, Polity
- Jewett A (1989)** Curriculum Theory in Physical Education, International Review of Education, Vol. 35, No. 1, p35-49
- Jones C (1991)** 'Qualitative Interviewing' in Allen G and Skinner C (Eds) Handbook for Research Students in the Social Sciences, London, Falmer, p203-214
- Jones G (1992)** Teacher Perceptions of the National Curriculum in Physical Education in the primary School, Bulletin of Physical Education, Vol. 28, No. 2, Autumn 1992, p6-14
- Jones G (1993)** Teacher Perceptions of the National Curriculum in Physical Education in the Primary School (Part 2), Bulletin of Physical Education, Vol. 29, No. 1, Spring 1993, p7-10

Jones K (1989) Right Turn: The Conservative Revolution in Education, London, Hutchinson Radius

KKK

Kavanagh D (1990) Thatcherism and British Politics: The End of Consensus?, Oxford, Oxford University Press

Kay W (1996) The Radical Right, Social Control and the National Curriculum in Physical Education, in Scottish Centre Research Papers in Sport, Leisure and Society, Vol. 1, 1996

Kelly AV (1990) The National Curriculum: A Critical Review, London, Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd

Kemp P (1992) Housing, in Marsh D and Rhodes RAW (Eds) Implementing Thatcherite Policies: An Audit of an Era, Buckingham, Open University Press, p65-80

Key R (1988) Reforming Our Schools, London, Conservative Political Centre

Khripkova A (1980) Physical Education and the Intellectual Development of Children, UNESCO Quarterly Review of Education, Vol. X, No. 1, 1980

King A (1988) Margaret Thatcher as a Political Leader, in Skidelsky R (Ed) Thatcherism, London, Chatto and Windus, p51-65

Kirk D (1986a) The Curriculum and Physical Education: Towards a Critical Perspective, in Trends and Developments in Physical Education, London, E and FN Spoon

Kirk D (1986b) Health Related Fitness as a Innovation in the Physical Education Curriculum, in Evans J (Ed) Physical Education, Sport and Schooling, London, Falmer, p137-183

Kirk D (1988a) Ideology and School-Centred Innovation: A Case Study and Critique, Journal of Curriculum Studies, Vol. 20, No. 5, p449-464

Kirk D (1988b) Physical Education and Curriculum Study: A Critical Introduction, London, Croom Helm

Kirk D (1992a) Curriculum History in Physical Education: A Source of Struggle and a Force for Change, in Sparkes A (Ed) Researching in Physical Education and Sport, London, Falmer, p210-230

Kirk D (1992b) Defining Physical Education: The Social Construction of a School Subject in Post war Britain, London, Falmer

Kirk D (1993) The Body, School and Culture, Deakin University Press

Kirk D and Colquhoun D (1989) Healthism and PE, British Journal of Sociology of Education, Vol. 10, No. 4, p417-434

Kirk D, McKay J and George LF (1986) All work and no play? Hegemony in the Physical Education curriculum, in Trends and Developments in Physical Education, London, E and FN Spoon

Kirk D and Tinning R (1990) Introduction: Physical Education, Curriculum and Culture, in Kirk D and Tinning R (Eds) Physical Education, Curriculum and Culture, London, Falmer, p1-22

Kirk G (1986) The Core Curriculum, London, Hodder and Stoughton

Knight C (1990) The Making of Tory Education Policy in Post-war Britain 1950-1986, London, Falmer

Knox O (1983) The Aims of Education, Salisbury Review, No. 4, Summer 1983, p11-12

Kreiger J (1986) Reagan, Thatcher and the Politics of Decline, Cambridge, Polity Press

LLL

- Larrain J (1979)** The Concept of Ideology, London, Hutchinson
- Larrain J (1989)** Theories of Development, Cambridge, Polity Press
- Lauder H (1990)** Education, Democracy and the Crisis of the Welfare State, Education and the Role of the State, in Lauder H and Wylie C (Eds) Towards Successful Schooling, London, Falmer, p33-52
- Lawlor S (1988a)** Correct Core, London, Centre for Policy Studies
- Lawlor S (1988b)** Opting Out: A Guide to Why and How, London, Centre for Policy Studies
- Lawlor S (1990)** Teachers Mistaught, London, Centre for Policy Studies
- Lawrence I (1992)** Power and Politics at the Department of Education and Science, London, Cassell
- Laws C (1990)** Individualism and Teaching Games: A Contradiction of Terms, BJPE, Research Supplement, No. 8, Winter 1990, p1-6
- Lawson N (1982)** What's Right with Britain, London, Conservative Political Centre
- Lawson N (1988)** The New Britain, London, Centre for Policy Studies
- Lawton D (1975)** Class, Culture and the Curriculum, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul
- Lawton D (1980)** The Politics of the School Curriculum, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul
- Lawton D (1989)** Education, Culture and the National Curriculum, London, Hodder and Stoughton
- Leaman O (1988)** Competition, Co-operation and Control, in Evans J (Ed) Teachers, Teaching and Control in Physical Education, London, Falmer Press, p97-107
- Lee J and Fitz J (1994)** Constituting good practice: HMI and its influence on policy and pedagogy, in Scott D (Ed) Accountability and Control in Educational Settings, London, Cassell, p87-104
- Leigh R (1989)** The Role of Examination in Physical Education: A personal view, Bulletin of Physical Education, Vol. 25, No. 1, Spring 1989, p20-26
- Letwin O (1988)** Aims of Schooling: the Importance of Grounding, Centre for Policy Studies
- Letwin O (1990)** Educating the 1990s, in Cooke A (1990) (Ed) British Society in the 1990s, London, Conservative Political Centre
- Letwin SR (1992)** The Anatomy of Thatcherism, London, Fontana
- Lewis J (1985)** The Red Faces of Religion, Salisbury Review, Vol. 3, No. 2, Jan. 1985, p10-11
- Levy DJ (1985)** Conservatism and Ideology, Salisbury Review, Vol. 3, No. 3, April 1985, p15-18
- Leys C (1985)** Thatcherism and British Manufacturing: A Question of Hegemony, New Left Review, Vol. 151, p5-25
- Lilley P (1989)** Thatcherism: The Next Generation, London, Centre for Policy Studies
- Lipsky M (1993)** Street Level Bureaucracy, in Hill M (Ed) The Policy Process, Hemel Hempstead, Harvester Wheatsheaf, p380-385
- Lister E (1991)** LEAs: Old and New, London, Centre for Policy Studies
- Lloyd P (1987)** Evaluation of the Senior Physical Education Programme: A Time for Change, BJPE, Vol. 18, No. 6, Nov./Dec. 1987, p252-254
- Lloyd-Evans G (1987)** Out With In-Service, Salisbury Review, Vol. 5, No. 3, April 1987, p51

- Lukes S (1993)** Three Distinctive Views of Power Compared, in Hill M (Ed) The Policy Process, Hemel Hempstead, Harvester Wheatsheaf, p50-58
- Lynn R (1977)** Competition and Co-operation, in Cox CB and Boyson R (Eds) Black Paper 1977, London, Temple Smith, p107-113
- Lynn R (1991)** Educational Standards, Salisbury Review, Vol. 9, No. 3, Mar. 1991, p38-40

MMM

- Major J (1992)** The Next Phase of Conservatism; The Privatisation of Choice, Conservative Political Centre
- Mangan JA (1973a)** Physical Education as a Ritual Process, in Mangan JA (Ed) Physical Education and Sport: Sociological and Cultural Perspectives, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, p87-102
- Mangan JA (1973b)** (Ed) Physical Education and Sport: Sociological and Cultural Perspectives, Oxford, Basil Blackwell
- Mangan JA (1973c)** Some Sociological Concomitants of Secondary School Physical Education, in Mangan JA (Ed) Physical Education and Sport: Sociological and Cultural Perspectives, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, p20-34
- Mangan JA (1981)** Athleticism in the Victorian and Edwardian Public School, London, Falmer
- Marks J (1987)** The New Model Labour Party in Action, Salisbury Review, Vol. 5, No. 2, Jan. 1987, p27-30
- Marsh D (1992)** Industrial Relations, in Marsh D and Rhodes RAW (Eds) Implementing Thatcherite Policies: An Audit of an Era, Buckingham, Open University Press, p32-49
- Marsh D and Rhodes RAW (1992a)** The Implementation Gap: Explaining policy change and continuity, in Marsh D and Rhodes RAW (Eds) Implementing Thatcherite Policies: An Audit of an Era, Buckingham, Open University Press, p170-187
- Marsh D and Rhodes RAW (1992b)** (Eds) Implementing Thatcherite Policies: An Audit of an Era, Buckingham, Open University Press
- Marsland D (1988)** The Welfare State as Producer Monopoly, Salisbury Review, Vol. 6, No. 4, June 1988, p4-9
- Marsland D (1990)** Poverty, Salisbury Review, Vol. 8, No. 3, Mar 1990, p12-16
- Marsland D (1991)** The Bedrock of Freedom, Salisbury Review, Vol. 10, No. 1, Sept. 1991, p9-12
- Mason MG (1973)** The Work of the Sociologist in Physical Education in Mangan JA (Ed) Physical Education and Sport: Sociological and Cultural Perspectives, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, p20-22
- May M (1993)** Editorial, Bulletin of Physical Education, Vol. 29, No. 1, Spring 1993, p3-5
- May T (1993)** Social Research: Issues, Methods and Processes, Buckingham, Open University Press
- Meakin DC (1981)** Physical Education: An agency of moral education?, Journal of Philosophy of Education, Vol. 15, No. 2, 1981, p241-253
- Meakin DC (1986)** The Moral Status of Competition; An issue of concern for physical educators, Journal of Philosophy of Education, Vol. 20, No. 1, 1986, p59-67
- Meek C (1986)** Physical Education in the 'New' Curriculum, BJPE, Vol. 17, No. 3, May/June 1986, p105-108

- Meek C (1991)** Mainstreaming Physical Education, in Armstrong N and Sparkes AC (Eds) Issues in Physical Education, London, Cassell Education, p74-90
- Meighan P (1981)** A Sociology of Education, London, Holt, Rinehart and Winston
- Meiskins Wood E (1988)** Capitalism and Human Emancipation, New Left Review, Vol. 167, p3-21
- Merridale P (1988)** What limits to self-sufficiency?, in Haviland J (Ed) Take Care Mr Baker, London, Fourth Estate, p137-138
- Metcalfe G (1986)** Curriculum Development and Physical Education, BJPE, Vol. 17, No. 5, Sep./Oct. p184-185
- Miliband R (1983)** State Power and Class Interests, New Left Review, Vol. 138, p57-68
- Miliband R (1985)** The New Revisionism in Britain, New Left Review, Vol. 150, p5-29
- Minogue K (1988)** The Emergence of the New Right, in Skidelsky R (Ed) Thatcherism, London, Chatto and Windus, p125-142
- Minogue M (1993)** Theory and Practice in Public Policy and Administration, in Hill M (Ed) The Policy Process, Hemel Hempstead, Harvester Wheatsheaf, p10-33
- Mishan EJ (1983)** Not By Economics Alone, Salisbury Review, No. 4, Summer 1983, p38-42
- Mommsen WJ (1995)** Capitalism and Socialism: Weber's Dialogue with Marx, in ----, Social Theory, Cambridge, Polity, p14-22
- Moore J (1983)** Why Privatise?, London, Conservative Political Centre
- Moore J (1986)** The Value of Ownership, London, Conservative Political Centre
- Moore P (1983)** Tradition and Worship, Salisbury Review, No. 4, Summer 1983, p4-5
- Moore P (1989)** The State of Physical Education or the State's Physical Education?, Education Today, Vol. 40, No. 1, p39-40
- Moore R (1988)** The Correspondence Principle and the Marxist Sociology of Education, in Cole M (Ed) Bowles and Gintis Revisited, London, Falmer, p51-85
- Moser CA and Kalton G (1993)** Survey Methods in Social Investigation, Aldershot, Dartmouth
- Mouzelis N (1995)** Sociological Theory: What Went Wrong?, London, Routledge
- Murdoch E (1986)** Future Trends in the Physical Education Curriculum, BJPE, Vol. 17, No. 3, May/June, 1986, p83-86
- Murdoch E (1987)** Sport in Schools (Desk Study), Brighton, Brighton Polytechnic and Sports Council
- Murdoch E (1990)** Physical Education in the National Curriculum: Interim Working Group Progress Report, BJPE, Vol. 21, No. 1, Spring 1990, p223-224
- Murdoch E (1991)** Physical Education and the National Curriculum, BJPE, Vol. 22, No. 1, Spring 1991, p22-25
- Murdoch E (1992)** Physical Education Today, Bulletin of Physical Education, Vol. 28, No. 2, Autumn 1992, p15-24
- Murdoch E (1993)** Education, Sport and Leisure: Collapsing Boundaries, in McFee G and Tomlinson A (Eds) Education, Sport and Leisure, Brighton, Brighton University, p65-72
- Murdoch E (1994)** A Decade of Change - Development or Regression?, BUCPEA Annual Conference, 26-28 March 1994

McMcMc

- Mac an Gaill M (1993)** The National Curriculum and Equal Opportunities, in Chitty C (Ed) The National Curriculum : Is it Working?, Harlow, Longman
- McAuslan P (1988)** The Constitution: Does the Bill Offend it? , In Haviland J (Ed) Take Care Mr Baker, London, Fourth Estate, p264-267
- McConachie Smith J (1990)** A National Curriculum in Physical Education: Processes and Progression, BJPE, Vol. 21, No. 1, Spring 1990, p226-230
- McConachie Smith J (1991)** Assessment of Progression in National Curriculum Physical Education, BJPE, Vol. 22, No. 2, Summer 1991, p11-15
- Macdonald K and Tipton C (1993)** 'Using Documents' in Gilbert N (Ed) Researching Social Life, London, Sage
- McDonald P (1988)** Historical Social Reform and the Correspondence Principle, in Cole M (Ed) Bowles and Gintis Revisited, London, Falmer, p86-111
- McFadden C (1995)** Resistance to Schooling and Educational Outcomes: Questions of Structure and Agency, in BJSE Vol. 16, No. 3, p293-308
- McFee G and Tomlinson A (1993)** Curriculum, Change and Critique: Themes in the Study of Education, Sport and Leisure, in McFee G and Tomlinson A (Eds) Education, Sport and Leisure, Brighton, Brighton University, p3-13
- McLennan G (1993)** The Evolution of Pluralist Theory, in Hill M (Ed) The Policy Process, Hemel Hempstead, Harvester Wheatsheaf, p 59-68
- Maclure S (1988)** Introduction, in Haviland J (1988) Take Care Mr Baker, London,, Fourth Estate, pxi-6
- Maclure S (1992)** Education Reformed (Third Edition), London, Hodder and Stoughton
- McIntosh P (1968)** Physical Education in England Since 1800, London, G Bell and Sons Ltd.
- McIntosh P, Dixon JC, Munrow AD, Willets FR (1986)** (Eds) Landmarks in the History of Physical Education, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul
- McNamee M (1990)** Assessment and Attainment: Physical Education and the National Curriculum, BJPE, Vol. 21, No. 1, Spring 1990, p233-235
- McNamee M (1992a)** Attempting to Locate the Education in Physical Education, Irish Educational Studies, Vol. 11, p119-133
- McNamee M (1992b)** Physical Education and the Development of Personhood, Physical Education Review, Vol. 15, No. 1, p13-17
- McPherson A and Raab C (1988)** Governing Education: A Sociology of Policy Since 1945, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press

NNN

- Nairn T (1979)** The Future of Britain's Crisis, New Left Review, Vol. 113, p43-70
- NCC (1990a)** Curriculum Guidance Eight: Education for Citizenship, York , NCC
- NCC (1990b)** Curriculum Guidance Four: Education for Economic and Industrial Understanding, York, NCC
- NCC (1991a)** Curriculum Guidance Three: The Whole Curriculum, York, NCC
- NCC (1991b)** National Curriculum Council Consultation Report: Physical Education, York, NCC
- NCC (1992a)** PE in the NC: A Report to the SoS for Education and Science on the Statutory Consultation for the ATs and PoS in PE, York, NCC
- NCC (1992b)** Starting Out with the National Curriculum, York, NCC

- Nelligan C (1991)** Physical Education and Sport: Are they Compatible?, Bulletin of Physical Education, Vol. 27, No. 2, Summer 1992, p5-7
- Nixon J and Rudduck J (1994)** Professionalism, Judgement and the Inspection of Schools, in Scott D (Ed) Accountability and Control in Educational Settings, London, Cassell, p105-119
- North J (1986)** The Politics of Forgiveness, Salisbury Review, Vol. 4, No. 4, p32-36
- No Turning Back Group (1985)** No Turning Back, London, Conservative Political Centre
- No Turning Back Group (1986)** Save Our Schools, London, Conservative Political Centre
- No Turning Back Group (1990)** Choice and Responsibility: The Enabling State, London, Conservative Political Centre
- Nyiri JC (1986)** Tradition as a Collective Talent, Salisbury Review, Vol. 4, No. 3, p4-6

OOO

- O'Brien M (1993)** Social Research and Sociology, in Gilbert N (1993) Researching Social Life, London, Sage, p1-17
- O'Conner M (1991)** Interview of the Month - Robert Atkins, Report, Vol. 13, No. 7, May 1991, p3
- OFSTED (1993)** Physical Education Key Stages 1, 2 and 3, London, HMSO
- O'Hear A (1986)** Education Beyond Present Desire, Salisbury Review, Vol. 4, No. 3, p8-10
- O'Hear A (1988)** The Dilemma of Reason, Salisbury Review, Vol. 6, No. 3, Mar 1988, p51-53
- O'Hear A (1989)** Ten Years of Conservative Education Policies, Salisbury Review, Vol. 8, No. 1, p19-22
- O'Neill (1992)** Athletics teaching in schools - Change at last?, BJPE, Vol. 23, No. 1, Spring 1992, p12-17
- (The) One Nation Group (1992)** One Nation 2000, London, Conservative Political Centre
- Open University (1994)** Society and Social Science: A Foundation Course, Blocks One to Seven, Milton Keynes, Open University
- Ostrander S (1995)** 'Surely You're Not in This Just to Be Helpful': Access, Rapport and Interviews in Three Studies of Elites, in Hertz S and Imber J (Eds) Studying Elites Using Qualitative Methods, London, Sage, p133-150
- Ozga J and Gewirtz S (1995)** Sex, Lies and Audiotape: Interviewing the Education Policy Elite, in Halpin B and Troyna B (Eds) Researching Education Policy: Ethical and Methodological Issues, Lewis, Falmer Press, p121-135

PPP

- Paechter C (1996)** Power, Knowledge and the Confessional in Qualitative Research, Discourse, Vol. 17, No. 1, 1996, p75-84
- Pain S (1986)** Physical Education and Health in the United Kingdom, BJPE, Vol. 17, No. 1, Jan/Feb. 1986, p4-7
- Palmer F (1986)** Optional Discipline, Salisbury Review, Vol. 4, No. 4, p17-20

- Parfitt G (1992)** Reflective Thinking in the National Curriculum: An Entitlement at Risk, in Golby M and Appleby R (Eds) The Making of the National Curriculum, Tiverton, Fairway Publications, p68-74
- Parry J (1987)** Physical Education Under Threat, BJPE, Vol. 18, No. 6, Nov./Dec. 1987, p243-244
- Parry J (1988)** Physical Education, Justification and the National Curriculum, Physical Education Review, Vol. 11, No. 2, 1988, p--
- Partington G (1987)** The Social Philosophy of the Compassionate State, Salisbury Review, Vol. 6, No. 1, p4-8
- Paxman J (1991)** Friends in High Places: Who Runs Britain, London, Penguin
- PEA (1986)** Sport Education in Schools, BJPE, Vol. 17, No. 6, p196
- PEA (1987)** Report of a Commission of Enquiry: Physical Education in Schools, London, PEA, March 1987
- PEA (1989)** Local Management of Schools and Charging for School Activities, BJPE, Vol. 20, No. 3, Autumn 1989, p149-150
- PEA (1990)** Physical Education Within the School Curriculum: PEA Statement, BJPE, Vol. 21, No. 1, Spring 1990, p222
- Peele G (1990)** Parties, Pressure Groups and Parliament in Dunleavy P, Gamble A, Peele G (Eds) Developments in British Politics, London, Macmillan, p69-95
- Penney D (1991)** Making a case for physical education: preparing for the National Curriculum, BJPE, Vol. 22, No. 4, Winter 1991, p36-39
- Penney D (1994)** No Change in a New Era, PhD Thesis, University of Southampton, March 1994
- Penney D and Evans J (1991a)** The Impact of the Education Reform Act on the Provision of Physical Education and Sport in the 5-16 Curriculum of State Schools, BJPE, Vol. 22, No. 1, Spring 1991, p38-42
- Penney D and Evans J (1991b)** Physical Education and Sport in Schools: The Challenges of Change, 16th Universaide FISU/CESU Conference, Sheffield, 15-17 July 1991, p443-446
- Penney D and Evans J (1994a)** Changing Structures: Changing Rules, CEDAR International Conference, University of Warwick 15-17 April 1994
- Penney D and Evans J (1994b)** From 'Policy to Practice': The Development and Implementation of the National Curriculum for Physical Education, in Scott D (Ed) Accountability and Control in Educational Settings, London, Cassell, p32-40
- Penney D and Evans J (1995)** Changing Structures; Changing Rules: The Development of the 'Internal Market', in School Organisation, Vol. 15, No. 1, 1995
- Perry P (1986)** Future Trends in Teacher Training, BJPE, Vol. 17, No. 3, May/June 1986, p80-81
- Peters RS (1966)** Criteria of Education and Worthwhile Activities: Ethics and Education, London, GAU
- Pollard A (1988)** Physical Education, Competition and Control in Primary Education, in Evans J (Ed) Teachers, Teaching and Control in Physical Education, London, Falmer Press, p109-123
- Pollitt C (1993)** The Development of Management Thought, in Hill M (Ed) The Policy Process, Hemel Hempstead, Harvester Wheatsheaf
- Portillo M (1992)** A Vision for the 1990s, London, Conservative Political Centre
- Poster M (1995)** Foucault and Marxism, in -----, Social Theory, Cambridge, Polity, p172-180
- Potter (Dennis) (1994)** Channel Four Interview, 5 1994 April

- Poynton S (1986)** Games do have a place and value: they provide sportsmen and women, BJPE, Vol. 17, No. 5, Sep/Oct. 1986, p161-163
- Pring R (1988)** Education Act 1988: Lessons not learnt from TVEI, BERA Conference Papers, 10 March 1988, p17-26
- Proctor N (1984)** Problems Facing Physical Education After the Great Debate, Physical Education Review, Vol. 7, No. 1, p4-11
- Proctor N (1987)** Should Physical Education be in the National Curriculum, BJPE, Vol. 18, No. 6, Nov./Dec., p245-247

RRR

- Radnitzky G (1990)** Quality or Equality in 1992, Salisbury Review, Vol. 8, No. 3, Mar 1990, p35-39
- Ranson S (1995)** Theorising Education Policy, in Journal of Education Policy, Vol. 10, No. 4, p427-448
- Raymond C (1992)** The Need for a National Curriculum Physical Education, in Golby M and Appleby R (Eds) The Making of the National Curriculum, Tiverton Fairway Publications, p24-31
- Read B (1994)** Games in the national curriculum: Effecting Change, BUCPEA Annual Conference 26-28 March 1994, p89-92
- Redwood J (1991)** Conservative Philosophy in Action, London, Conservative Political Centre
- Regan D (1987)** The Municipal Threat to Defence, Salisbury Review, Vol. 5, No. 3, April 1987, p22-26
- Regan D (1990)** City Technology Colleges: Potentialities and Perils, London, Conservative Political Centre
- Rhodes RAW (1992)** Local Government Finance, in Marsh D and Rhodes RAW (Eds) Implementing Thatcherite Policies: An Audit of an Era, Buckingham, Open University Press, p50-64
- Rhodes RAW and Marsh D (1992)** Thatcherism: An Implementation Perspective, in Marsh D and Rhodes RAW (Eds) Implementing Thatcherite Policies: An Audit of an Era, Buckingham, Open University Press, p1-11
- Ribbins P (1993)** Telling Tales of Secondary Heads, in Chitty C (Ed) The National Curriculum: Is it working?, Harlow, Longman
- Richmond WK (1975)** Education and Schooling, London, Methuen and Company
- Ridley N (1991)** My Style of Government, London, Hutchinson
- Robertson ER (1994)** Trained Practitioners or Educated Professionals?, BUCPEA Annual Conference 26-28 March 1994
- Robinson S (1990)** There has to be more to it than that!, Bulletin of Physical Education, Vol. 26, No. 2, Summer 1990, p23-26
- Rorty R (1995)** Habermas and Lyotard, in -----, Social Theory, Cambridge, Polity, p160-171
- Rose C (1986)** A Response from an Advisor, Bulletin of Physical Education, Vol. 22, No. 2, Summer 1986, p20-26
- Rustin M (1989)** The Politics of Post-Fordism: or, The Trouble with 'New Times', New Left Review, Vol. 175, p54-78

SSS

- Sabatier PA (1993)** Top-Down and Bottom-Up Approaches to Implementation Research, in Hill M (Ed) The Policy Process, Hemel Hempstead, Harvester Wheatsheaf, p266-293
- Sallis J (1990)** Gaining Public Understanding of the School Curriculum, in Brown T and Morrison K (Eds) The Curriculum Handbook, London, Longman, p31-35
- Salter M (1990)** Personal Development Through Physical Education A Way Forward?, BJPE, Vol. 21, No. 2 Summer 1990, p304-306
- Saunders ED (1973)** Sociological Orientation to the Study of Physical Education in Mangan JA (Ed) Physical Education and Sport: Sociological and Cultural Perspectives, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, p7-19
- Saunders ED (1982)** Sport, Culture and Physical Education, Physical Education Review, Vol. 5, No. 1, p4-15
- Saunders ED (1986)** Trends and Developments in Physical Education, in Trends and Development in Physical Education, London, E and FN Spoon
- SCAA (1994a)** Dearing: The Final Report, London, SCAA
- SCAA (1994b)** Physical Education in the National Curriculum: Draft Proposals, London, DFE
- School Curriculum and Development Committee (SCDC) (1987)** INSET in Physical Education, BJPE, Vol. 18, No. 4, July/Aug. 1987, p180
- Schools Sports Forum (1988)** Sport and Young People: Partnership and Action, London, Sports Council
- SCOPE (1993a)** Response to the Government's Proposals for the Reform of Initial Teacher Training, Canterbury, Christ Church College
- SCOPE (1993b)** Response to requests for comments on the curriculum and testing in schools, Canterbury, Chris Church College
- Scott D (1994a)** Introduction, in Scott D (Ed) Accountability and Control in Educational Settings, London, Cassell, p1-8
- Scott D (1994b)** Making schools Accountable: Assessment Policy in the Education Reform Act, in Scott D (Ed) Accountability and Control in Educational Settings, London, Cassell, p41-57
- Scott J (1995)** Sociological Theory: Contemporary Debates, Edward Elgar, Aldershot
- Scottish Office (1995)** Scotland's Sporting Future - A New Start, Scottish Office Education Department, Edinburgh
- Scruton SJ (1986)** Images of Femininity and the Teaching of Girl's Physical Education, in Evans J (Ed) Physical Education, Sport and Schooling, London, Falmer, p71-94
- Scruton R (1980)** The Meaning of Conservatism, Hamondsworth, Penguin
- Scruton R (1984)** Editorial, Salisbury Review, Vol. 3, No. 1, 1984, p2
- Scruton R (1987a)** Introduction, Salisbury Review, Vol. 5, No. 2, Jan 1987, p2
- Scruton R (1987b)** Introduction, Vol. 6, No. 2, Dec. 1987, p2
- Sealey A (1994)** Language and Educational Control: The Construction of the LINC Controversy, in Scott D (Ed) Accountability and Control in Educational Settings, London, Cassell, p121-136
- Semple M (1992)** Cultural Diversity, Physical Education and Dance, BJPE, Vol. 23, No. 2, p36-38
- Sexton S (1987)** Our Schools: A Radical Policy, Warlingham, Institute of Economic Affairs Education Unit

- Sharp R (1988)** Old and New Orthodoxies: The Seduction of Liberalism, in Cole M (Ed) Bowles and Gintis Revisited, London, Falmer, p189-208
- Sharpe B (1991)** Physical Education in Scottish Secondary Schools, SJPE, VOL. 19, No. 1, May 1991
- Shearsmith K (1993)** An Alternative Ideology to Underpin Physical Education Practice, BJPE, Vol. 24, No. 1, Spring 1992, p37-41
- Shilling C (1993)** The Body, Class and Social Inequalities, in Evans J (Ed) Equality, Education and Physical Education, London, Falmer. p55-73
- Simon B (1988)** The Curriculum and the Reform Bill, BERA Conference Papers, 10 March 1988, London, Institute of Education, BERA, p6-16
- Simon B (1991)** Education and the Social Order 1940-1990, London, Lawrence and Wishart
- Simons H (1988)** (Ed) The National Curriculum, BERA Conference Papers, 10 March 1988, London, Institute of Education, BERA
- Skidelsky R (1988)** (Ed) Thatcherism, London, Chatto and Windus
- Skinsley M (1987)** The Elite: Whose responsibility?, BJPE, Vol. 18, No. 2, Mar/April 1987, p55-58
- Skocpol T (1993)** Bringing the State Back In, in Hill M (Ed) The Policy Process, Hemel Hempstead, Harvester Wheatsheaf, p86-100
- Smith G and May D (1993)** The Artificial Debate Between Rationalist and Incremental Models of Decision Making, in Hill M (Ed) The Policy Process, Hemel Hempstead, Harvester Wheatsheaf, p197-211
- South East Council for Sport (1992)** Address by the Minister for sport Mr Robert Atkins MP Nov. 1991, Bulletin of Physical Education, Vol. 28, No. 1, Spring 1992, p57-63
- Spackman L (1986)** A Response from the Higher Education Sector, Bulletin of Physical Education, Vol. 22, No. 2, Summer 1986, p17-19
- Sparkes AC (1986a)** Changing the Future: Coming to terms with the past, in Trends and Developments in Physical Education, London, E and FN Spoon
- Sparkes AC (1986b)** Strangers and Structures in the Process of Innovation, in Evans J (Ed) Physical Education, Sport and Schooling, London Falmer, p183-193
- Sparkes AC (1987)** Strategic Rhetoric - A constraint in changing the practice of teachers, British Journal of Sociology of Education, Vol. 8, No. 1, March 1987, p37-54
- Sparkes AC (1988)** The Micropolitics of Innovation in the Physical Education Curriculum, in Evans J (Ed) Teachers, Teaching and Control in Physical Education, London, Falmer Press, p157-173
- Sparkes AC (1989)** Health Related Fitness and the Pervasive Ideology of Individualism, in Physical Education Today, Perspectives 41, Exeter, University of Exeter
- Sparkes AC (1990a)** The Emerging Relationship Between Physical Education Teachers and School Governors: A Sociological Analysis, Physical Education Review, Vol. 13, No. 2, p128-137
- Sparkes AC (1990b)** School Governors and Physical Education in the 1990s: On the need for effective advocacy, BJPE, VOL. 21, No. 1, Spring 1990, p236-238
- Sparkes AC (1991a)** Curriculum Change: On Gaining a Sense of Perspective, in Armstrong N and Sparkes AC (Eds) Issues in Physical Education, London, Cassell Education, p1-19

- Sparkes AC (1991b)** Exploring the Subjective Dimension of Curricular Change, in Armstrong N and Sparkes AC (Eds) Issues in Physical Education, London, Cassell Education, p20-35
- Sparkes AC (1992)** The Paradigms Debate: An Extended Review and Celebration of Difference, in Sparkes AC (Ed) Research in Physical Education and Sport, London, Falmer, p9-60
- Sparkes AC (1993)** Challenging Technocratic Rationality in Physical Education Teacher Education: The Potential of a Life History Approach, Physical Education Review, Vol. 16, No. 2, p107-119
- Spencer G (1991)** Methodological Studies in the Study of Bureaucratic Elites, in Burgess R (Ed) Field Research: A Source Handbook and Field Manual, London, Routledge, p23-30
- Sports Council (1990)** Briefing Paper for Local Authorities, London, Sports Council, June 1990
- Sports Council (1993)** Young People and Sport: Policy and Frameworks for Action, London, Sports Council
- Sports Council and BCPE (1993)** Why Physical Education, London, Sports Council
- Stratford KJ (1983)** Left Chauvinism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism, Salisbury Review, No. 2, Winter 1983, p12
- Straw J (1988)** How Many Schools in the Escapers Club?, in Haviland J (Ed) Take Care Mr Baker, London, Fourth Estate, p 103-105
- Stoker G (1990)** Government Beyond Whitehall, in Dunleavy P, Gamble A, Peele G (Eds) Developments in British Politics, London, Macmillan, p126-149
- Suter and Hawes (1993)** Relationship of Physical Activity, Body Fat, Diet and Blood Lipid Profiles in Youths 10-15 Years, Medicine and Science in Sports Exercise, Vol. 25, No. 6, June 1993, p--

TTT

- Talbot M (1993a)** A Gendered Physical Education: Equality and Sexism, in Evans J (Ed) Equality, Education and Physical Education, London, Falmer, p79-89
- Talbot M (1993b)** Physical Education and the National Curriculum: Some Political Issues, in McFee G and Tomlinson A (Eds) Education, Sport and Leisure, Brighton, Brighton University, p34-64
- Taylor C (1980)** The Elected members Guide to Reducing Public Expenditure, London, Conservative Political Centre
- Taylor C (1990)** Raising Educational Standards, London, Conservative Political Centre
- Tebbit N (1985)** Britain's Future: A Conservative Vision, London, Conservative Political Centre
- Tebbit N (1986)** The Values of Freedom, London, Conservative Political Centre
- Templin TJ, Savage M and Hagg M (1986)** Deprofessionalism and the Physical Educator, in Trends and Developments in Physical Education, London, E and FN Spoon
- Thatcher M (1993)** The Downing Street Years, London, Harper Collins
- Therborn G (1983)** Why Some Classes are More Successful Than Others, New Left Review, Vol. 138, p37-37
- Therborn G (1984)** New Questions of Subjectivity, New Left Review, Vol. 143, p97-108

- Thomas N (1988)** Will the tools help the teacher help the child?, in Haviland J (Ed) Take Care Mr Baker, London, Fourth Estate, p71-73
- Thomas S (1989)** Making Sense of the Public Image of the 'New' Physical Education, in Physical Education Today, Perspectives 41, Exeter, University of Exeter
- Thomas S (1991)** Equality in Physical Education: A Consideration of Key Issues, Concepts and Strategies, in Armstrong N and Sparkes AC (Eds) Issues in Physical Education, London, Cassell Education
- Thomas S (1993)** Education Reform: Juggling the Concepts of Equality and Elitism, in Evans J (Ed) Equality, Education and Physical Education, London, Falmer, p105-124
- Thompson G (1990)** The Political Economy of the New Right, London, Printer
- Thompson J (1995)** Ideology and Modern Culture, in -----, Social Theory, Cambridge, Polity, p133-141
- Thornton A (1992)** The New Age, Salisbury Review, Vol. 11, No. 2, Dec. 1992, p14-16
- Thorpe R (1984)** Four fundamentals for planning a games curriculum, BPE, Vol. 20, No. 1 p24-28
- Thorpe R and Bunker D (1989)** A Changing Focus in Games Teaching, in Almond L (Ed) The Place of Physical Education in Schools, London, Kogan Page Ltd, p42-71
- Tomlinson A (1993)** Interrogating the Policy Text, in McFee G and Tomlinson A (Eds) Education, Sport and Leisure, Brighton, Brighton University, p85-92
- Tomlinson J (1988)** Curriculum and the Market: Are they compatible?, in Haviland J (Ed) Take Care Mr Baker, London, Fourth Estate, p9-13
- Tomlinson J (1989)** The Education Reform Bill - 44 Years of Progress?, Journal of Education Policy, Vol. 4, No. 3, p275-279
- Tomlinson J (1991)** Comprehensive Education in England and Wales 1944-1991, European Journal of Education, Vol. 26, No. 2, p103-117
- Tomlinson J (1993)** The Control of Education, London, Cassell
- Tomlinson J (1994)** Making Sense of Power Shifts: Central and Local Government and the Schools - 1980 to 1984, Management in Education, Vol. 18, No. 3, Autumn 1994, p3-5
- Tozer M (1986)** To boldly go where no subject has gone before, BJPE, Vol. 17, No. 6, Nov./Dec. 1986, p205-207

VVV

- Vander Elst P (1991)** An End in Itself?, Salisbury Review, Vol. 10, No. 1, Sept. 1991, p33-36
- Veljanovski C (1990)** The Political Economy of Regulation, in Dunleavy P, Gamble A, Peele G (Eds) Developments in British Politics, London, Macmillan, p291-304
- Verabioff LJ (1986)** Can We Justify Daily PE?, Caper Journal, Vol. 52, No. 2, Mar/April 1986, p8-11

WWW

- Walford G (1994)** Educational Choice, Control and Inequality in Scott D (Ed) Accountability and Control in Educational Settings, London, Cassell, p73-86
- Wallerstein I (1988)** The Bourgeois(ie) and Concept and Reality, Vol. 167, p91-106
- Ward A (1987)** Physical Education: A foundation or fringe subject? NUT Educational Review, Vol. 1, No. 2, Autumn 1987, p50-52,

- Warwick University (1991)** Response to NCC Consultation on NCPE, Coventry, Warwick University Department of Physical Education
- Weale A (1990)** Social Policy, in Dunleavy P, Gamble A, Peele G (Eds) Developments in British Politics, London, Macmillan, p197-216
- Weber M (1993)** Rational-Legal Authority and Bureaucracy, in Hill M (Ed) The Policy Process, Hemel Hempstead, Harvester Wheatsheaf, p105-109
- Weber M (1994) [1930]** The Protestant Work Ethic and The Spirit of Capitalism, London, Routledge
- Welsh A (1992)** Champion Coaching Project, BJPE, Vol. 23, No. 3, Autumn 1992, p21-23
- White JP (—)** (Notes from) Towards A Compulsory Curriculum, Un-Published Undergraduate Study Paper - Scottish School of Physical Education, Glasgow, Jordanhill College
- Whitehead M (1988)** The Danger of Fun, BJPE, Vol. 19, No. 4/5, July/Oct. 1988, p155
- Whitehead M (1990)** Teacher/Pupil Interaction in Physical Education: The Key to Success, Bulletin of Physical Education, Vol. 26, p27-30
- Whitehead N (1986)** Future Trends in Sport, BJPE, Vol. 17, No. 3, May/June 1986, p101-104
- Whitty G (1989)** The New Right and the National Curriculum: State Control or Market Forces, Journal of Education Policy, Vol. 4, No. 4, p329-341
- Whitty G (1990)** The Politics of the 1988 Education Reform Act, in Dunleavy P, Gamble A, Peele G (Eds) Developments in British Politics, London, Macmillan, Chapter 14
- Whitty G (1997)** Social Theory and Education Policy: The Legacy of Karl Mannheim, BJSE, Vol. 18, No. 2, p149-163
- Whyte WF (1991)** Interviewing in Field Research, in Burgess B (Ed) Field Research: A Source Handbook and Field Manual, London, Routledge, p111-121
- Williams AE (1986)** Determinants of Activity Levels Among Adolescents with Particular Reference to the Physical Education Curriculum, in Trends and Developments in Physical Education, London, E and FN Spon
- Williams A (1987)** Health and fitness in the PE curriculum - regression or progression, Health Education Journal, Vol. 46, No. 3, p103-107
- Williams A (1992)** Physical Education, in Ribbins P (Ed) Delivering the National Curriculum: Subjects for Secondary Schooling, London, Longman, p176-194
- Williams A (1993)** Who Cares About Girls? Equality, Physical Education and the Primary School Child, in Evans J (Ed) Equality, Education and Physical Education, London, Falmer, p125-138
- Williams A and Jenkins C (1988)** A Curriculum for a Fit State: The National Curriculum Proposals and Physical Education, BJPE, Vol. 19, No. 3, May/June 1988, p112-115
- Williams EA (1993a)** The Contribution of Physical Education to Personal and Social Development, Pastoral Care in Education, Vol. 11, No. 1, March 1993, p21-25
- Williams EA (1993b)** The Reflective Physical Education Teacher: Implications for Initial Teacher Education, Physical Education Review, Vol. 16, No. 2, p137-144
- Williamson T (1986)** Editorial, Bulletin of Physical Education, Vol. 22, No. 2, Summer 1986, p5-8
- Wilson E (1992)** A Very British Miracle: The Failure of Thatcherism, London, Pluto Press

Winslow G (1992) The National Health Service, in Marsh D and Rhodes RAW (Eds) Implementing Thatcherite Policies: An Audit of an Era, Buckingham, Open University Press, p100-116

Woofit (1993) Analysing Accounts, in Gilbert N (Ed) Researching Social Life, London, Sage, p287-305

Worthen J (1987) GCSE English: A Cause for Concern, Salisbury Review, Vol. 5, No. 2, Jan 1987, p4-8

Wragg E (1987) 'Conducting and Analysing Interviews' in Bell J (Ed) Doing Your Research Project, Milton Keynes, Open University Press, p177-197

Wragg T (1988) Education in the Market Place: The Ideology Behind the 1988 Education Bill, London, NUT

YYY

Young MFD (1971) An Approach to the Study of Curricula as Socially Organised Knowledge, in Young MFD (Ed) Knowledge and Control, London, Macmillan, p19-46

The New Right and Physical Education: A Critical Analysis

(Volume Two: Appendices)

by

William Lawrence Kay

A Doctoral Thesis

**Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the award of
Doctor of Philosophy of Loughborough University**

November 1997

© by William Lawrence Kay 1997

Appendices

Contents	Page
Abbreviations	2
Appendix A	
- Interview Schedule	4
Appendix B	
- Interviews Undertaken During PhD Research	5
Appendix C	
- MPs Position in Government / Civil Servants in Education	8
Appendix D	
- Responses of Those Contacted	10
Appendix E	
- The Concepts Underpinning the Critical Realist Perspective	15
- Contents	15
Appendix F	
- Education Reforms from 1979 to 1992	34
- Contents	34
Appendix G	
- Reform and Control of Teaching Practices... ...and Teacher Education	54
- Contents	54
Appendix H	
- Pressures and Constraints Placed on the NCPE... ...Working Group	72
- Contents	72
Appendix I	
- Education's Response to the RR's 'Games' Discourse	95
- Contents	95

Abbreviations

ACSET	Accreditation Council for the Selection and Education of Teachers
APS	Assisted Places Scheme
APU	Assessment of Performance Unit
AT	Attainment Target
ASI	Adam Smith Institute
BAALPE	British Association of Advisors and Lecturers in Physical Education
BBC	British Broadcasting Corporation
BCPE	British Council of Physical Education
BPs	Black Papers
CATE	Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education
CBEC	Conservative Backbench Education Committee
CBI	Confederation of British Industry
CBSC	Conservative Backbench Sports Committee
CCCS	Centre for Contemporary Curriculum Studies
CCPR	Central Council for Physical Recreation
CCT	Compulsory Competitive Tendering
CDoS	Collins Dictionary of Sociology
CPC	Conservative Political Centre
CPG	Conservative Philosophy Group
CPS	Centre for Policy Studies
CRS	Conservative Research Centre
CS	Civil Servant
CTC	City Technology College
DES	Department of Education and Science
DG	Dominant Group
DSPU	Downing Street Policy Unit
EKSS	End of Key Stage Statement
ESASC	Education, Science and Arts Select Committee
ERA	Education Reform Bill
ERB	Education Reform Act
ESG	Education Support Grant
FR	Final Report (NCPE WG)
GMS	Grant Maintained Status
HE	Higher Education
HG	Hillgate Group
HMI	Her Majesty's Inspectorate
HoC	House of Commons
HRE	Health Related Exercise
HRF	Health Related Fitness
IEA	Institute of Economic Affairs
ILEA	Inner London Education Authority
INSET	In-Service Education for Teachers
IR	Interim Report (NCPE WG)
ITE (T)	Initial Teacher Education (Training)
KS	Key Stage

LEA	Local Education Authority
LMS	Local Management of Schools
MfE	Minister for Education
MfS	Minister for Sport
MP	Member of Parliament
MSC	Manpower Services Commission
NA	National Assessment
NC	National Curriculum
NCC	National Curriculum Council
NCF	National Coaching Foundation
NCPE	National Curriculum Physical Education
NGB	National Governing Body
NPFA	National Playing Fields Association
NR	New Right
NT	National Testing
NTBG	No Turning Back Group
OE	Open Enrolment
ONG	One Nation Group
OSA	Official Secrets Act
PCF	Per Capita Funding
PE	Physical Education
PEA	Physical Education Association
PM	Prime Minister
PoS	Programme of Study
PT	Politics Today
RoA	Record of Achievement
RR	Radical Right (Governments 1979-1992)
SCAA	Schools Curriculum and Assessment Authority
SCDC	Schools Curriculum Development Council
SCOPE	Standing Conference on Physical Education
SD	Social Democracy / Social Democratic
SEAC	Schools Examination and Assessment Council
SEC	Schools Examination Council
SO	Statutory Orders (Physical Education)
SO and SO	Social Order and Social Ordering
SoS	Secretary of State
SPEC	Social, Political, Economic and Cultural Factors
SR	Salisbury Review
SSF	School Sports Forum
TCTG	Traditional Competitive Team Games
TGAT	Task Group on Assessment and Testing
TGFU	Teaching Games for Understanding
TEI	Teacher Education Institutions
TWS	Two Way Shift (from the LEAs)
TVEI	Technical and Vocational Education Initiative
UK	United Kingdom
US	United States of America
WG	Working Group
WS	Welfare State

Appendix A

Appendix A - Interview Schedule

Check List

- Discuss interview location
- Permission to use tape recorder
 - Check batteries / tape / microphone / test run

Interview Topics

- 'Outline'
 - Brief explanation of research
 - Own Role in Physical Education / Development of NCPE
 - Wider Aims of the Conservative Party since 1979
 - Aims for Education
 - Market / Two Way Shift
 - Aims for Physical Education
 - education, child centred
 - games, sport centred
 - Research Undertaken / Accessed
 - Reports on 'Sport in Schools'
 - Teacher Education / Training
 - Conservative aims
 - vilification
 - constraint on reflection / critique / theory
 - Attack on Education / Physical Education
 - vilification of 'progressive' / research
 - espousal of culture / tradition / sport / competition in NCPE
 - ESASC
 - contrary to 'evidence'
 - found for games as 'more than educational value'
 - Reality versus Rhetoric
 - effect of policy / ERA on physical education
 - market / LMS / provision
 - reduction in Advisors / LEA role
 - Evans' work
 - NCPE WG constrained by SoS / MfS
- Appearance of ulterior motive of 'morals' / citizenship / character / social control
- Any points which interviewee wishes to raise / Thank interviewee for time etc.

Appendix B

Appendix B - Interviews Undertaken During PhD Research

Date	Interviewee	Position / Place	Period During Research
19/1/94	A1	Conservative Party Advisor / HE Lecturer	Month 4
31/1/94	Peter Harrison	Secretary, Physical Education Association	Month 4
14/3/94	Dr Elizabeth Robertson	Lecturer in Physical Education, Warwick Uni.	Month 6
22/3/94	Alistair Loadman	Lecturer in Physical Education, Winchester	Month 6
23/3/94	Dr Sir Rhodes Boyson	Conservative MP, Former Minister for Education, Black Paper Editor	Month 6
28/3/94	Robert Dunn	Conservative MP. Former Minister for Education	Month 6
30/3/94	Peter Gardner	HE Lecturer, Warwick	Month 6
16/4/94	Dawn Penney	Policy Researcher	Month 7
3/5/94	Dr Barry Troyna	HE Lecturer / Education Researcher, Warwick Uni.	Month 8
5/5/94	Prof. John Evans	Lecturer in Physical Education, L'borough	Month 8
5/5/94	Dr Jack Demaine	Policy Researcher / Lecturer, Loughborough	Month 8
9/5/94	John Howells and Chris Roberts	Head of School and Financial Administrator, Plymouth	Month 8
10/5/94	Anne Shapcott	Head of Division, Hertfordshire College	Month 8
12/5/94	Stuart Sexton	IEA, Conservative Party Advisor on Education 1976-1986	Month 8
13/5/94	Dr Mike McNamee	HE Lecturer, Cardiff	Month 8
17/5/94	Ian Beer	Chair of NCPE Working Group	Month 8
18/5/94	Gill Clarke and Chris Laws	Policy Researcher / Lecturers, Chichester	Month 8
23/5/94	Stuart Ainsworth and Andrew Johnston	Policy Researcher / Lecturers, Strathclyde Uni.	Month 8
May 1994	W1	Head of PE, Bucks	Month 8
June	C1	Head of PE, Warks	Month 9
27/7/94	A1	Conservative Party Advisor / HE Lecturer	Month 10

10/8/94	Ray Carter	Central Council for Physical Recreation	Month 11
6/9/94	Fred Hirst	BCPE / Head of School, Liverpool	Month 12
4/10/94	Prof. Elizabeth Murdoch	NCPE Working Group / BCPE / Head of School, Brighton	Month 13
4/10/94	Kevin Gilliver	Professional Officer for PE, SCAA	Month 13
5/10/94	Dame Angela Rumbold	Conservative Party Deputy Chair, Former Education Minister	Month 13
Oct. 1994	B1	Advisor to Conservative Party	Month 13
Oct. 1994	G1	Civil Servant / NCC	Month 13
7/10/94	Prof. Alan Tomlinson	Researcher / HE Lecturer, Brighton Uni.	Month 13
10/10/94	Prof. JA Mangan	Researcher/ HE Lecturer, Strathclyde Uni.	Month 13
17/10/94	Prof. Margaret Talbot	NCPE Working Group / Head of School, Leeds Metropolitan Uni.	Month 13
17/10/94	Sue Campbell	NCF	Month 13
19/10/94	Dr Elizabeth Robertson	Lecturer in Physical Education, Warwick Uni..	Month 13
Oct. 1994	D1	Head of PE, Berks.	Month 13
Oct. 1994	MI	Civil Servant	Month 13
24/10/94	Gyles Brandreth	Conservative MP, Former Chair NPFA, Now Vice-Chair	Month 13
31/10/94	Dick Fisher	PEA / Head of School, Strawberry Hill	Month 13
28/11/94	Prof. John Tomlinson	Head of Education, Warwick Uni..	Month 14
Nov. 1994	H1	PE Teacher, West Mids.	Month 14
3/12/94	F1	Former Chief HMI	Month 15
10/12/94	James Pawsey	Conservative MP. Advisor to the Association of Teachers and Lecturers Chair of Conservative Education Back Bench Committee	Month 15
12/12/94	David Evennett	Conservative MP / ESASC / Parliamentary PPS to Baroness Blatch	Month 15
12/12/94	Harry Greenway	Conservative MP, ESASC Member	Month 15

14/12/94	Sir Malcolm Thornton	Conservative MP, Backbench Education Committee, Chair ESASC	Month 15
14/12/95	Dr Christopher Knight	Education Researcher / Teacher, Kent	Month 15
20/12/94	Prof. Grant Jarvie	Researcher / HE Lecturer, Head of School, Herriot Watt Uni.	Month 15
23/2/95	Prof. John Evans	Lecturer in Physical Education, Loughborough Uni.	Month 17
23/2/95	Dr Dawn Penney	Researcher, Loughborough Uni.	Month 17

Appendix C

Appendix C - MPs Position in Government / Civil Servants in Education

MPs in Education

Year	Secretary of State for Education	Ministers for Education
1979	Mark Carlisle	Baroness Young Rhodes Boyson McFarlane
1980	Mark Carlisle	Baroness Young Rhodes Boyson McFarlane Channon
1981	Keith Joseph	Channon Shelton Boyson Waldegrave
1982	Keith Joseph	Channon Shelton Boyson Waldegrave
1983	Keith Joseph	Robert Dunn Peter Brooke
1984	Keith Joseph	Robert Dunn Peter Brooke
1985	Keith Joseph	Robert Dunn Peter Brooke Chris Patten
1986	Keith Joseph	Chris Patten Robert Dunn George Walden
1987	Kenneth Baker	Angela Rumbold Robert Dunn Baroness Hooper Jackson
1988	Kenneth Baker	Angela Rumbold Robert Dunn Baroness Hooper Jackson
1989	Kenneth Baker	Angela Rumbold Butcher Jackson
1990	John MacGregor	Angela Rumbold Jackson Howarth
1991	Kenneth Clarke	Tim Eggar Howarth Fallon Atkins

MPs Position in Government (continued)

1992	Kenneth Clarke	Tim Eggar Howarth Fallon Atkins
1993	John Patten	Baroness Blatch Forth Boswell
1994	John Patten	Baroness Blatch Forth Squire Boswell
1995	Gillian Shephard	Baroness Blatch Forth Squire Boswell

Civil Servants in Education

Year	Special Advisor	Permanent Secretary	Chief Medical Officer	Deputy Secretary
1979-1984	S Sexton			
1985	S Sexton	Sir DJS Hancock	Sir D Acheson	
1986	S Sexton	Sir DJS Hancock	Sir D Acheson	
1987	T Kerpel MBE	Sir DJS Hancock	Sir D Acheson	
1988	T Kerpel MBE	Sir DJS Hancock	Sir D Acheson	
1989	T Kerpel MBE	Sir DJS Hancock	Sir D Acheson	
1990		John Caines	Sir D Acheson	NW Stuart
1991		Sir John Caines KCB	Sir D Acheson	NW Stuart CB
1992			Sir D Acheson Dr K Colman	NW Stuart CB
1993		Sir G Holland KCB	Dr K Colman	JMM Vereker

Appendix D

Appendix D - Responses of Those Contacted**Members of Parliament**

Name	Date	Positive / Negative	Comments
K Clarke (C)	17/1/94	Negative	'Too Busy' - pleasant
K Joseph (C)	17/1/94	'Helpful'	Against NC, but trying to raise standards
J MacGregor (C)	17/1/94	Negative	'Too Busy' - pleasant
A Howarth (C)	18/1/94	Negative	Suggested Eric Forth
G Walden (C)	18/1/94	Negative	'Knows nothing at all'
R Atkins (C)	18/1/94	Positive	Offering Interview
R Dunn (C)	18/1/94	Positive	Accepting Interview
W Waldegrave (C)	18/1/94	Negative	Suggested Peter Brooke
P Brooke (C)	19/1/94	Negative	Not responsible for schools, memory lapsed - over ten years
P Channon (C)	19/1/94	Negative	Not area of responsibility - pleasant
J Butcher (C)	20/1/94	Abrasive	No philosophy - but Conservatives for competition and excellence, anti-socialist
M Thatcher (C)	20/1/94	Negative	'Too Busy' - from private office
N Forman (C)	20/1/94	Negative	No view on matter
R Boyson (C)	21/1/94	Positive	Accepting Interview
R Jackson (C)	25/1/94	'Helpful'	Suggested A Rumbold
A Rumbold (Dame) (C)	26/1/94	Positive DFE '86-'90	Responsible for setting up the WG
J Young (Baroness) (C)	2/2/94	Negative	'Too Busy'
Hooper (Baroness) (C)	12/2/94	Helpful	Suggested Research Dept., Conservative Central Office
R Key (C)	21/1/94	Helpful	Not his department. Suggested Eric Forth and Ian Sproat
M Forsyth (C)	22/2/94	Negative	'Too Busy'
J Pawsey (C)	28/2/94	Helpful	Passed letter to Backbench Sports Committee
N Hawkins (C)	1/3/94	Positive	Sent paper from Backbench Sports Committee
K Baker (C)	4/3/94	Answered questions	Responding to letter asking about 'sport' in the NC No Interview

Members of Parliament (Continued)

R Atkins (C)	11/4/94	Negative	Responding to several phone calls and a questionnaire. No longer offering to meet
R Atkins	19/5/94	Negative	Sent Conservative PE Policy
P Thompson (L)	16/7/94	Positive	Offer of Interview (ESASC)
G Brandreth (C)	18/7/94	Positive	Offer of Interview
A Rumbold	19/7/94	Positive	Date for Interview (Not suitable)
N Hawkins	29/7/94	'Helpful'	Suggested Sproat or Coe
N Kinnock (L)	23/8/94	Negative	Too Busy
M Gordon (L)	26/8/94	On Holiday	ESASC
P Thompson (C)	26/8/94	On Holiday	ESASC
E O'Hara (L)	30/8/94	Positive	Offer of Interview (ESASC)
H Greenway (C)	30/8/94	Positive	Offer of Interview (ESASC)
A Rumbold	5/9/94	Positive	New Interview Date
D Turner (L)	6/9/94	Positive	Offer of Interview (ESASC)
G Steinberg (L)	13/9/94	Positive	Offer of Interview (ESASC)
M Thornton (C)	19/9/94	Positive	Offer of Interview (ESASC)
D Evennett (C)	28/9/94	Positive	Offer of Interview (ESASC)
J Pawsey (C)	18/11/94	Positive	Interview / Kenilworth Surgery
D Evennett	28/11/94	Positive	Date of Interview
J Pawsey	28/11/94	Negative	Will not give a set time
J Pawsey	21/12/94	Negative	Not happy with transcript
J Pawsey	13/1/95	Negative	Irritated about transcript
J Pawsey	24/1/95	Negative	Wanting transcript amended
J Pawsey	28/2/95	Negative	Amended transcript himself

Policy Units

Unit	Date	Assistance	Comments
Conservative Research Department		Sent information on 'sport' + Politics Today No. 6, '93 Education	Equating PE as sport
NCC		Sent list of publications	No letter, no date
HMSO	9/11/93	No information provided	Suggested DFE
ESRC	29/11/93	Highlighted that NCPE research is on-going	Suggested J Evans
Centre for Policy Studies	30/11/93	Sent list of publication	General - not PE

Policy Units (Continued)

Policy Studies Institute	20/12/93	Sent list of publications	General - not PE
DFE (MB Baker) pp Sir G Holland	19/1/94	Civil Service only advises govt. Ministers on effect of policy	Fairly rude reply
Adam Smith Institute	24/1/94	Indicated no involvement in education policy	Suggested IEA
SCAA (Kevin Gilliver)	24/1/94	Sent reports on NC implementation	Offered 'self' for future contact
IEA	4/3/94	Nothing published on PE	Suggested Conservative Central Office
IEA (Stuart Sexton)	29/4/94	Agree to interview	
A Lewis	July 1994	Not Able to Assist	DFE Employee NCWG
K Gilliver	25/7/94	Positive	Offer of Interview
Dr C Knight	5/8/94	Helpful, if rude (Tory Advisor)	Offer of Interview
I Broadbridge	10/8/94	Not Able to Assist	For J Bird, M Sawyer and S Quazi, Secs. NCWG
J Benham	27/9/94	Not Able to Assist	DFE Assessor for NCWG

Professional Bodies

Name	Date	Assistance	Comments
Health Education Authority		Catalogue of titles 1993	
Sports Council		List of Publications on topic, highlight problems for PE	Copies of Reports with PEA 1993
PEA (Harrison P)	23/11/93 19/1/94	Suggested that PEA is generally happy with NC	Agree to interview
National Playing Fields Association	17/1/94	Not able to assist, sent book list and 1993 Report	Commented on sport in schools
SCOPE (Fry B)	19/1/94	Enclosed SCOPE Article	Suggested SCOPE conference proceedings
CCPR	20/1/94	No help	Suggested Conservative Party Office
BCPE (Hirst F)	21/1/94	Suggested further reading	Agree to interview
NCF (S Campbell)	20/7/94	Positive	Offer of Interview
CCPR	26/7/94	Offering Interview	Ray Carter Deputy Chair
R Carter CCPR	18/8/94	Thanking for Interview	Copy of 'Charter for School Sport'

Educationalists

Name (Establishment)	Date	Assistance	Comments
Cowling M		Offered to 'chat' if I thought it would be helpful	Denied TES suggestion of Conservative Party Education Advisor
Fisher RJ (St Mary's College)	20/1/93	Helpful	Offered interview
Golby Dr M (Uni of Exeter)	1/11/93	Details of NC publication	
Evans Dr J (Southampton Uni.)	2/11/93	Helpful	Sent publications list, offered interview
Fox Dr K (Uni. Of Exeter)	11/11/93		Suggested A Sparkes
Thompson I (Stirling Uni.)	24/11/93	Helpful	Sent articles
Flintoff A (Leeds Metro)	24/11/93	Helpful, offered assistance	Suggested M Talbot
Demaine Dr J (Loughborough Uni.)	12/12/93	Helpful	Sent articles and references. Offer of Interview
Wragg Prof. E	14/1/94	Helpful	Sent publication
Sparkes J (King Alfred's)	27/1/94	Helpful	Agree to interview with Alistair Loadman
Wigmore S (Sheffield Hallam)	9/2/94	Unhelpful	'Too busy'
Kirk Dr D (Deakin Uni., Australia)	1/3/94	Highlighted Right's manipulation of PE, undermining progressive, creating 'myths' for interest	Sent articles
McNamee Dr M (Cardiff Institute)	28/3/94	Helpful	Agree to interview
Shapcott A (Uni. of Herts)	30/3/94	Helpful	Agree to interview
Ainsworth A and Johnson S (Strathclyde Uni)	7/4/94	Very helpful	Agree to interview
Howells J (St Mark and St John, Plymouth)	20/4/94	Helpful	Agree to interview
Demaine Dr J (Loughborough Uni.)	25/4/94	Helpful	Agree to interview

Educationalists (Continued)

Clarke G + Laws C (West Sussex Institute)	27/4/94	Very helpful	Agree to interview
J Evans Prof.	29/7/94	Helpful	Publications Information
JA Mangan	16/8/94	Helpful	Offer of Interview
A Tomlinson Prof.	3/9/94	Helpful	Offer of Interview
D Fisher	12/9/94	Helpful	Offer of Interview
S Ainsworth	19/9/94	Helpful	Publications Information

Working Group in Physical Education

Name	Date	Assistance	Comments
Beer I (Chair)	20/2/94	Offering to talk over the telephone	
Beer I (Chair)	27/3/94	Suggesting interview by meeting	Responding to questionnaire
M Talbot	15/7/94	Positive	Offer of Interview
E Murdoch Prof.	21/7/94	Positive	Offer of Interview
T Marshall	29/7/94	Unhelpful	Done with J Evans
D Brunsten	August 1994	Unhelpful	Done with J Evans
A Norman	26/8/94	Positive	Offer of Interview (Unable to take up offer due to distance and expense)
J Fashanu	1/10/94	Unhelpful	Too Busy
All Other Members		No Reply	No Reply to Follow Up

Appendix E

Appendix E - The Concepts Underpinning the Critical Realist Perspective

<u>Contents</u>	<u>Page</u>
Preliminary	16
The Realist Perspective	16
Culture	16
Nationalism	16
Myth	16
Ritual	17
Capitalist Culture	17
Structures and Capitalist Structures	17
A Dominant Group	18
Issues of Macro-Micro Authority, Power and Control	19
Nationalism as a Tool of Domination	19
Ideology	19
Knowledge	20
Language	21
Discourse	21
Texts	22
Hegemony	22
Capitalist Hegemony	23
Habitus	24
Socialisation	24
Habitus and Rationality	24
Structuration	25
Symbolic Rules and Resources	25
Material Rules and Resources	25
Social Reality	25
Agency and Structured Agency	26
Self and Free-Will	27
Hierarchical Agency and Relative Autonomy	27
Capitalist Structures and Agency	28
The Critical Perspective	29
Policy	30
Information as Knowledge	30
Knowledge as Rationality	31
Prescription, Implementation Structures and Accountability	31
Hierarchical Implementation Structures	31
End Note	33

Preliminary

This appendix delineates the concepts which construct my critical realist perspective. It is divided into two parts to outline the realist and critical underpinnings of the whole perspective. Although the concepts are not presented in a particular order, many over-lap and inform each other in a developmental nature.

The Realist Perspective

Culture

Culture is the lived practices of society which;

...does not only refer to folklore, dress, diet or popular music. It embraces all that a group of people have together realised and pass on as part of their heritage. It refers especially to shared symbolic and cognitive systems, to language, beliefs, values, religion, way of life, and social institutions or patterns...all human made components of society (Figueroa 1993: p91).

In this perspective, culture is socially constructed as symbolic representations, and myths are institutionalised as shared cultural experiences and practices. Society is characterised by behavioural norms which become set as 'traditional', 'common sense' values, morals and beliefs of what action, practices and behaviour 'ought' to be. Cultural 'norms' in the UK are viewed as structural, social, political and economic inequalities, with the government controlling the state resources and apparatuses of SPEC reproduction. An individual's consciousness and understanding of this social reality is both created and constrained through interpretation using 'traditional' knowledge. Central to this are issues of nationalism, myth and ritual.

Nationalism

Culture acts not only to reflect social practice but also to legitimate it through the idealisation of traditional practices. Cultural traditions become the basis of functioning in a society of a collective identity. However, nationalism can also divide a society. A cultural identity for a nation state immediately leads to exclusivity and thus exclusion. Relationships between the exclusive and the excluded leads to difference and thus social inferiority and inequality (from Donald 1992: p134). Cultural differences are highlighted to divide groups into 'desirables' and 'others' ('them and us'). The traditions and structures of inequality that come with them become the 'solution' to external, or internal, infiltration and subversion. This requires the creation of a myth of historical cultural unity, shared meanings and experiences and so associations and understandings.

Myth

Myths are present in all societies. They come from the selective interpretation and representation of history, which seeks to subdue contradiction within and between social relations. Myths can be used to construct a particular version of cultural knowledge, which is passed on as cultural heritage and espoused as 'truth'. They often function to sustain the social order, are rarely problematised and thus are difficult to

challenge. These myths are accepted as 'truths' when the meanings are received but not analysed critically. Kirk (1992a: p222) explains that "...a myth is a way of thinking that is so deeply buried in our collective consciousness that it is, most of the time, invisible". In critical realism, culture is seen to operate through a hierarchy of images and concepts which create hierarchical structures and relationships. A shared cultural history is constructed by the dominant group and has idealised values of tradition, stable structures, practices and benefits to the nation, through the specific selection and interpretation of history (Archer 1988). A mythical culture of nationhood is intended to create a social conformity and to obfuscate cultural diversity and confrontation. The 'truth' of the dominant discourse is constructed to establish certain possibilities for thought and action while constraining others through 'moral leadership'.

Ritual

Rituals are symbolic constructs, which have been institutionalised as the 'shared' values, morals and beliefs of what action, practices and behaviour 'ought' to be. In my perspective the 'self' exists in these stratified, structural relations of symbolic and material 'reality', where macro cultural rituals have influence over micro action.

Capitalist Culture

Capitalism is based on capital exchange in the competitive market economy to secure the limited resources fundamental for the needs of survival. All relations are to capital (social, political, economic or cultural), either in terms of control of it (domination) or dependency (subordination) on those in control. Domination leads to the ability to control capital exchange and thus to benefit most from that exchange. It allows for the differentiated distribution of moneys to purchase the resources which fulfil needs. This acts to distribute power, where resources both create and constrain what is possible. The greater the accumulation of resources the greater the power and thus the greater the control of society by dominant groups. Capitalism is, fundamentally, a system dependent on hierarchical domination and inequality, where individuals' needs and economic concerns come second to the required SPEC arrangements. These requirements both construct and constrain historical structures, practices and institutions of domination and subordination in society which shape cultural practices. Thus, social and cultural development is tied into the characteristics and workings of capitalist requirements. As such, the political system determines social input rather than vice versa (Jenkins 1993: p42), where dominant interests are not always moral, and political intent may not always be what is needed socially (Minogue 1993: p24). Critical realism argues that the capitalist intention is to imbue a 'capitalist moral character' in the population for the purpose of 'social order' (discipline) and 'social ordering' (hierarchy) through 'consent' rather than through 'coercion'. Specifically, this is to 'legitimate' both the social market and its effects.

Structures and Capitalist Structures

The economic, political, ideological and institutional structures set the boundaries for social and economic development and change (from Penney 1994: p301). They act as a controlling mechanism in society where relations and practices are constructed to serve dominant demands. State institutions, such as education, transmit dominant

interests, norms, rationality and understandings, which define the socialisation and sensitisation of subordinate actors. Mouzelis (1995: p118) suggests that;

As a set of rules and resources, structure is both medium and outcome of the conduct it recursively organises. In the capacity of medium it furnishes the rules and resources that make social conduct possible. *Qua* [in the capacity of] outcome, its reproduction and transformation result from the instantiation of rules in action and interaction.

In this way, control of structures can manipulate the constitution of social systems which make up the social whole. Social norms are central to its functioning. To understand the 'social whole' it is vital to analyse the way in which 'technological, appropriative and ideological' rules are embedded in SPEC norms and roles (Mouzelis 1995: p90). This;

...allows us to see norms / roles not simply as a means for the societal regulation of actors, but also as a means through which actors constitute, reproduce and transform social orders. Whether in the sphere of the economy, polity, religion or elsewhere, social construction always implies normatively regulated technological, appropriative and ideological arrangements (Mouzelis 1995: p93).

Structures, thus, both construct and constrain action, possibility and opportunity, and lead either to actors' domination or subordination according to their SPEC status. They also produce, legitimate and reproduce inequality. The actor's relationship and orientation to society (through a complex process of socialisation) leads to a social position and status which creates a conscious and unconscious disposition. In this way, social and cultural systems and institutions shape relationships, opportunities and positions of domination (macro) or subordination (micro).

Centrally, social structures are inseparable from the subjective intention of those that make them, manipulate them or transform them (see King 1993: p125). Institutional structures set controls on the dissemination and distribution of rules and resources which seek to establish 'a' social reality and so social stability. Where capitalist relations are the root of social structures, capitalist concerns define the boundaries of possibility which constitute culture. As hierarchical segregation in capitalist society is based on the criteria of 'capital' accumulation, hierarchical relationships of power can construct social interaction and practices, and constitute scope for agency and partnerships (from McPherson and Raab 1988: p4). 'Social ordering' can thus be central to 'social order' and social control.

A Dominant Group

Domination is achieved, historically, by ideology ascendancy in periods of struggle. The aim is to gain 'active consent' (Apple 1982: p12) for this dominant ideology then reproduce it. Critical realism views that there is a complex relationship between a dominant capitalist class and dominant SPEC arrangements. So much so, that 'deep' structural arrangements (capitalist traditions) have influence over the 'surface' structural institutions, such as government. The endeavour of the dominant capitalist class is to use state apparatus as mechanisms of power and control so that it remains

dominant with as little SPEC cost as possible (see Milliband 1985: p15, Apple 1989: p113, Dale 1989: p29).

Issues of Macro-Micro Authority, Power and Control

Structures are seen as functional in the contexts of both social organisation and interaction, and as institutional mechanisms which constitute, reproduce or transform SPEC arrangements and relationships. Different levels of macro and micro structure and agency are suggested to exist within hierarchical structures, resulting in a 'hierarchical authority of interests'. The capitalist SPEC arrangements of social stratification and inequality, thus, become entrenched institutionally as 'technical'. The construction of multiple social hierarchies both depends on hierarchical roles and allocates hierarchical roles. 'Hierarchical agency' thus, it is argued, leads to 'strategic' agents (both macro and micro) with influence over both symbolic and material resources and rewards, for example policy and its effects. In this perspective, macro actors are more producers than products of the social world and micro actors are more products than producers of it (see Mouzelis 1995: p142). Critical realism thus investigates the interaction of the macro-micro in terms of domination and subjugation. Policy construction and implementation are located within this context.

Nationalism as a Tool of Domination

Globalisation and the 'internationalisation' of economics threaten the traditional position, power and privileges of dominant elites within the isolation of the nation state. Globalisation of resources and labour leads to implications of crisis for control by historically elite groups: control based on an ideological hegemony of spiritual leadership, cultural suppression, economic oppression and moral subjugation. Critical realism views that the concept of the 'nation state' and the espousal of a 'traditional national cultural identity and superiority' are part of the mechanism of capitalist hegemonic domination, used in the quest to reproduce a status quo serving dominant interests. National issues are powerful in both shaping and legitimising policy for 'national interests' and 'national security'. It is viewed that the threat of a permanent crisis to 'nationhood' is constructed by the dominant group to counteract globalisation and internationalisation. The call to traditional 'national well-being' by dominant groups is seen a rhetorical justification of their control. Nationalism is thus espoused as the 'right' culture, and necessary to ensure the freedom from other cultures encroaching on the superiority of British (English) values and traditions. A constructed crisis through fear of other nations and other cultures taking-over the 'nation' therefore leads to a 'legitimate' means of control. Policy is espoused in the rhetoric of 'national' self-interest, which, in reality, endeavours to control subordinated groups (Miliband 1983: p64).

Ideology

Ideology is the building block of society. Althusser claims that;

Human societies secrete ideology as the very element and the atmosphere indispensable to their historical respiration and life...ideology (as a system of mass representations) is indispensable in any society if men are to be formed, transformed and equipped, to respond to the demands of their conditions of existence (cited in Abercrombie, Hill and Turner 1983: p61-62).

Ideologies develop as the merging coalition of fragile compromises between groups with similar self-serving interests. They are interest-based representations of how SPEC arrangements and functions 'ought' to be, and are transmitted through a discourse of selective language which endeavours to both define and legitimate beliefs. Each society evolves idiosyncratically and its ideological functioning becomes its cultural identity. British capitalism is bound together by a network of social relationships and interactions between groups. In this perspective, the dominant ideology functions at a level beyond individual consciousness and control, where institutional knowledge, discourse and text are manipulable, and where surface structures function to imbue a 'false consciousness' of stratified place and relations as 'material reality'. Thompson (1995) explains ideology as either 'neutral' or 'negative'. Critical realism concurs with the second notion, seeing the UK's dominant capitalist ideology as negative and based on highly selective content. In this sense it is viewed as polemic, symbolic and contextual. Its 'deep' structural discourse is institutionalised at the 'surface' structures through texts. At one and the same time, it seeks to both fragment opposition and unify these fragments within its discourse. Further, it endeavours to legitimate and rationalise its definition of the SPEC arrangements by concealing divisional interests and intentions while seeking to reify itself. It does this through the construction and identification of an opposition as an 'enemy', to allow for the discharge of its ideological values. Thus, alternative ideologies, it is considered, are required by the dominant group as sites of opposition and resistance to allow the creation of a threat of 'crisis' to the nation. Critical realism argues that constructed opposition also gives the representation of democracy, however, alternative ideologies are viewed to be contained and subordinated within structural arrangements.

Knowledge

Knowledge defines what is known and thought about the world, delimits what counts and why, and governs subsequent action (O'Brien 1993: p6). Access to knowledge is access to understanding the external social reality which is powerful in conditioning individual personality. Thus, there is a 'politics of knowledge' over what counts as valid (Penney and Evans 1994: p39). Certain forms of knowledge predominate and are privileged due to the power of dominant groups to define 'right and wrong' and what is 'true and false' (May 1993: p27). 'Knowledge' embodying dominant meanings, values and practices, is legitimated and justified through 'political authority'. My critical realist perspective views that knowledge is constructed to serve the continually changing requirements of British capitalism. A theoretical framework, which gives the dominated groups meanings and assumptions as 'natural facts', is constructed within which to interpret and understand the world. Indeed, Guba (cited in Sparkes 1992: p26) claims that 'facts' can only be understood as reality *within* a theoretical framework of knowledge which is always a value laden construct. 'Facts' about the nature of the world and social relations and structures within it are constructed by, and in favour of, dominant group interests. The selection of what is to

be transmitted is more concerned with 'exclusion' than 'inclusion', where threats to the reproduction of the capitalist social arrangements are suppressed (see Dale 1989: p40). Interpretations are structured by a history of negotiation and regulation which portrays dominant knowledge as neutral and objective common-sense (from Sparkes 1992: p39). 'Other' definitions of knowledge are vilified as subjective, ideological representations. Knowledge can then be 'fixed' within the dominant group's ideological boundaries, where the rhetoric of 'objectivity' can lead to oppression and suppression through 'technocratic rationality'. Social knowledge is thus imbued with the codes, practices and values of the dominant ideology, and is transmitted with the aim of engineering a 'moral consensus' to lead to social conformity. Critical realism contends that the construction of knowledge is central to the construction of a social reality which functions to serve capitalist SPEC requirements. In this context, knowledge is viewed as oppressive (May 1993: p27). Despite this, there is conflict over the power and authority of interests and the dominant discourse has to be transmitted to subordinate groups. Education is viewed by critical realism as the structure which functions to transmit, legitimate, reproduce or reform this 'knowledge'. It is seen as a compulsory institutional form which seeks to socialise the population to serve capitalist ends by developing specific hierarchical aspirations, roles, expectations and demands. It aims to construct a specific social reality which both constructs and constrains agency, and legitimates the status quo of capitalist SPEC order and stability. The language used for the transmission of interests is, therefore, hierarchical in terms of time, space, depth and width.

Language

Language is socially and historically located, and is central to all social interactions and relations. It is the medium of communication in social and organisational life (see Bryman 1992b: p163). Hirschkop (1986: p107) explains that language "...is not a system of abstract linguistic categories but a concrete, ideologically coherent discursive practice which serves the ideological, thus the socio-political, unification and centralisation of society". Language is neither ideologically empty nor neutral, but selected to construct and make claims for a particular, ideologically based social reality. It transmits constructed representations and meanings, and is a tool of symbolism, communication and socialisation. Crucially, it is the means of both conveying and interpreting the symbolic representations of the dominant ideological discourse. Thus, it is the means of access to knowledge and understanding, and, so, is a context of power. This means that language is a vehicle for the transmission of ideologically constructed 'truth' and therefore, potentially, social control as constraint over the possibilities of communication become institutionalised (see Wooffitt 1993). Conversely, the opposite is also true (see Clarke 1992: p47)¹. Nonetheless, in the context of my research, discourse is viewed to be constructed to serve capitalist ends

Discourse

Discourse frames and conveys important social issues through specialised knowledge: it defines what is said and how it is said. Ball (1993) claims that;

¹ Clarke indicates that language and discourse have meanings and interpretations which serve multifarious functions and have polymorphic consequences. This indicates the possibility of agency and opposition.

Discourses are about what can be said and thought, but it is also about who can speak, when, where and with what authority...We do not speak a discourse it speaks us. We are the subjective, the voices, the knowledge, the power relations that discourse constructs and allows (cited in Penney and Evans 1994a).²

Discourse is constructed by groups according to their ideological predispositions, which are engendered through habitus. Critical realism views capitalist discourse as a 'meta-narrative', manipulable in the practice of domination. It is viewed to be used as a hegemonic device to both establish and reproduce power by constructing dominant representations as 'truths' (see Gore 1990: p105)³. It is formed into selected 'technical' (measurable) knowledge, represented as rational common-sense about SPEC arrangements, and transmitted as neutral. Further, it endeavours to constrain the interpretation of what is 'right' and what is 'possible', and to (re)construct social reality by transmitting values which *give* meaning to experiences. It is, thus, a symbolic apparatus which organises SPEC knowledge and experience systematically within dominant beliefs, values, requirements and interests. A 'false consciousness' of 'social reality' can be constructed through selected information, institutionalised as material 'official knowledge' and transmitted through state apparatus. The UK's dominant capitalist discourse may espouse pluralism and free-will, however, in my view its underlying aim is to suppress subordinates and create a 'social reality' and 'free-will' imbued with capitalist definitions (Apple 1993, Archer 1988, Dale 1989, Simon 1991). Interpreting a 'given' discourse depends on the receiver's 'discursive repertoire' and their contextualisation of their sense of the 'self' (see Bryman 1992b: p137 / p223). However, the authoritative hegemony sustains SPEC relationships and, in turn, people become situated in a particular context according to personal, social and positional characteristics (Abercrombie, Hill and Turner 1983: p56-57).

Texts

The dominant group seeks to make its discourse the 'official discourse' of the crucial institutions of SPEC power which govern society. It does this through its political authority and power to construct policy texts. Texts are viewed by critical realism to be the making of 'subjective' representation (dominant ideology) into 'objective' (material) discourse. This becomes a narrative, which is turned into action. It is institutionalised as practice and used in administration as a mechanism for social control. It is the dominant group's endeavour to turn its ideology into 'material reality'. Interpretation and understanding of this is based on an individual's orientation, which is constrained by socialisation and habitus.

Hegemony

Hegemony is the fundamental mechanism of one group sustaining power over others through SPEC relations. It is the link between political dominance and cultural formation, where the framework of social structure is;

² Ball's position is critiqued by some researchers as allowing too much scope for agency, and which fails to acknowledge the determinacy of its own position (see Evans and Penney 1994: p8, Penney and Evans 1994a).

³ Gore claims that discourse is the central functioning of power in society which permeates all aspects of life. Gore also indicates that power can only be exercised through economy with the 'truth'

...a whole body of practices and expectation, the whole of our living; our sense and assignments of energy, our shaping perceptions of ourselves and our world. It is a lived system of meanings and values - constitutive and constituting - which as they are expressed as practices appear reciprocally conforming (Williams 1977 cited in Jarvie and Maguire 1994: p116)

Critical realism views that hegemony is achieved when a dominant group has 'control' of the 'deep' SPEC substructure and has the ability to constrain 'surface' institutions. It endeavours to use these to transmit its interests, subordinate the population and retain or extend its social control (CCCS 1981, McPherson and Raab 1988). Hegemony thus;

...refers to the existence of a dominant set of ideas which supports a social and economic system and which permeates the thinking of people living within it. Practices which support the interests of dominant groups are legitimated when they come to be regarded as 'natural', are implemented as 'common-sense' and are thus internally regenerated (Pollard 1988: p120).

In this perspective, with 'common-sense' norms as the understanding 'given' to interpret experiences, dominant rules become embedded as expectations. Hegemony results when 'active consent' for dominant values and practices has been established. Constructed social practices therefore reproduce behaviour that leads to social order through the conscious conformity of 'self-containment', rather than through direct conflict (Apple 1990: p35). However, this has to be reinforced continually and the need for hegemony indicates a constant struggle for ideological domination.

Capitalist Hegemony

Capitalist hegemony advocates that positions of domination have been achieved through individual effort and ability in past struggles; that only the elite minority know the solutions to the 'crises' within the state; that only it has the political understanding to lead; and that there are no feasible alternatives (see Dale 1989: p28). It is a mechanism used to hide and overcome the inequalities and exploitations of the capitalist system, where constructed social knowledge justifies private ownership and the concentrated accumulation of capital by an elite group as 'natural'. It endeavours to reproduce capitalist SPEC arrangements by socialising people into hierarchical roles, and intends that its perception and understanding of social reality be internalised as 'common-sense' and accepted reflexively as natural and neutral. In this way it endeavours to gain consent for dominant solutions to SPEC crises, real or constructed, through conscious subordination and the reproduction of dominant social formations for the good of the 'nation'. Thus, it is essential for capitalist hegemony;

...to encapsulate what a nation is; it must reflect back to the citizens an image of themselves, their individual and collective hopes and fears, possibilities and limitations, which does not conflict with the requirements of the dominant mode of production (Dale 1982: p151).

Economic efficiency is an imperative when domination depends on capital accumulation, and it is viewed that SPEC structures are manipulated in the struggle to

dominate through both consent and coercion. Domination, thus, allows the construction and control of a discourse which legitimates a differentiated distribution of resources. The discourse of state institutions becomes that of economic efficiency and effectiveness, and resource parameters are set by ideological rhetoric (Dale 1989: p11). When capitalist SPEC arrangements change and require reform, hegemony is central in the ascendancy of the new ideological force. Ideological ascendancy requires the creation of a new common-sense to develop dominance of the 'new' (from JBBL 1985: p89). The 'new' seeks to create norms of behaviour by shaping perceptions and giving its meaning to SPEC practices (Apple 1982: p3). The dominant group aims to change thoughts, actions and behaviours through the transmission of dominant codes and conventions, and to 'normalise' and reproduce its new interests as 'common' cultural values, beliefs and practices. It also aims to suppress subordinate ideologies at the very start of reform.

Habitus

Habitus is perceived as the historically structured arrangements of hierarchical SPEC status, relations, divisions, identity and access to resources which both constrain agency and opportunities, and act to construct differentiated knowledge and consciousness (see Bourdieu 1995a). Habitus, thus, imbues a sense of tradition and norms, leading both to a structured disposition of cognitive understanding of 'social reality' and 'common-sense', and the perception of the 'self' within the social hierarchy. The 'self' is viewed by critical realism to be socially constructed in relation to a false social reality. It can be interpreted, discussed, tested and created or recreated (Mouzelis 1995: p50). It is viewed that conscious interpretation of one's 'self' within this 'reality' is through the use of 'a priori' dominant meanings and definitions (see chapter three: footnote 25). These are symbolic representations which are reproductive, and which the dominant group can use to manipulate aspirations into expectations and demands which serve its interests. Social groups, divided hierarchically, can interpret habitus as a site of identification and thus embrace values and practices which reproduce their subordination consciously and unconsciously as unity and resistance.

Socialisation

Socialisation is seen as the patterned psychological development of individuals within the symbolic codes and material constraints of SPEC arrangements. It is viewed to be the constructed and constrained understanding of society, social experiences and the self, through an 'a priori' social reality of dominant social representations and definitions.

Habitus and Rationality

In my critical realist perspective habitus is viewed to influence 'rationality' and decision making. Choice can be constrained symbolically by 'tradition' and materially by institutionalised 'norms' (for example where ideology has become text and text has become practice). Decisions thus become selective according to group or self-interests. Political decisions, portrayed in a rhetoric of 'rational common-sense', are viewed to be made on the basis of selective, dominant group-serving information which avoids conflicting evidence or alternative solutions. When the political

rationale centres on consensus over the control of resources, the political system is required to construct a false reality of 'rationality' around their differentiated distribution. Critical realism argues that consensus is, therefore, the manipulation of 'rationality' to justify policy based on dominant political interests.

Structuration

Structuration is the view of the 'duality' of action and structure, where roles, practices and so on, become embedded, institutionalised and normalised. In my critical realist perspective, the embedding of dominant knowledge, symbols, unconscious interpretations and practices, leads to constraint on individual micro action. It is asserted that the pattern of relations and practices transcends time and space into organised systems and organised actions: 'structures'. Structuration therefore presumes the process of reflexivity to institutional rules and resources, both symbolic and material.

Symbolic Rules and Resources

The symbolic rules and resources are seen as the shared social constructs of moral values which lead to agreement and consensus over practices and behaviours, and which, as a result, constrain action. Conscious interpretation of one's 'self' in this 'reality' is through the use of 'a priori' dominant meanings and definitions. The 'self' is therefore viewed by critical realism to be socially constructed.

Material Rules and Resources

The material rules and resources are viewed by critical realism to be when subjective representation (ideology) becomes 'objectified' (institutionalised) as 'surface' SPEC arrangements, organisation and practices to form SPEC 'norms'. These can be used as systems, measures or sanctions for coercion, domination or social division.

The concepts outlined above are now linked to show the basis of my critical realist interpretation of the period of RR control from 1979 to 1992.

Social Reality

Social reality is the ideological, epistemological and philosophical beliefs which construct 'a' meaningful and intelligible understanding of the social world (Bryman 1992a: p51, Sparkes 1992: p26). It is a mental framework which makes sense of shared material social practices, meanings and assumptions. Individuals draw on this to construct a 'common-sense' consciousness of the contemporary existence of the 'self' and their 'place' within the SPEC whole.

However, critical realism views that the UK's historical dimension creates the contemporary context, where the 'self' is constructed in the symbolic relativism of time and space. It views that hierarchical control over rules and resources is critical in constructing possibilities for interpretation of the 'self', and that understanding life chance 'opportunities' is limited to lived experiences constrained by society's historical codes and conventions. The 'material' world experienced by individuals serves capitalist arrangements. The 'reality' is deemed to be a framework of 'surface'

controls over 'actual experiences', which constructs a false consciousness of a 'real world'. In this way, structures, systems, institutions, hierarchy, stratified SPEC roles, social division, inequality and morals of individual responsibility and self-interest are seen as the 'norm'. Society is thus governed by a set of 'a priori' norms of behaviour which regulate action. In this reading, agency is constructed and constrained by hierarchical structures: it is freedom *within* them, a 'structured agency' (this is returned to below). An individual's access to resources and understanding of 'self', their autonomy, is relative to their place in the social strata, their 'habitus', which both motivates and constrains behaviour. Habitus influences an individual's perceptions of social reality, which shapes their role and agency (see Giroux 1983: p128). The reverse is also true. This leads to hierarchical perspectives of social reality, with contestation based on political and value considerations which affect life practices (May 1993: p3). 'Common-sense' is thus constructed through differentiated access to the interpretative devices created to make sense of the world. It is constructed through the definitions and representations given by the dominant group to the systems of social arrangements, interaction and relations. It is therefore manipulable by the dominant group. It is viewed that, through the manipulation of symbolic and material rules and resources, the dominant group can construct and constrain the boundaries of 'self-perception' to shape conscious and unconscious social patterns, and therefore shape agency and action.

Agency and Structured Agency

Agency is the perception of individual autonomy. Critical realism views agency as the limit of opportunity, which is both constructed and constrained by SPEC structures. It is, arguably, constructed through a complex interplay of habitus, self-image and the interpretation of experiences and understanding of 'reality'. The contemporary hierarchical positioning of actors established through historical structures is viewed to set the contexts for their agency. This relationship between structure and agency leads to a social hierarchy, where social forces impinge on actors' actions and constrain interaction and negotiation. This inevitably constrains individual thought, action, experience and understanding, but does not control it. Critical realism suggests that actors' consciousness is shaped and constrained such that their purpose and intent is constructed according to hierarchical position and habitus. This leads to 'relative autonomy' of disposition and interaction where agency is 'structured'. This 'structured agency' is viewed to constrain the recontextualising of the contemporary 'social reality' and the perception of the 'self' and 'free-will' within it. Centrally, in this perspective, the dominant group aims to prevent reflection and confine agency to reflexive action within its discourse of ideologically bound representations and definitions of common-sense. However, to be accepted, the dominant ideology must be defined as the common interests of all members of society through mechanisms of transmission (Archer 1988: p55). Subordinates must therefore be socialised into a constructed and constrained 'a priori' social reality, where understanding social experiences and constructing the 'self' is limited by structural confines. In the critical realist perspective, understanding 'free-will' is argued to necessitate an analysis of actors intentions and meanings and the way in which social reality is 'pre-interpreted' through 'social facts' which constitute the dominant groups discourse and subordinate individuals' 'discursive consciousness' of it.

Self and Free-Will

My critical realist perspective interprets the 'self' as the individual's perception of free-will. It is viewed to be socially constructed to constrain levels of agency and action, where socialisation is the patterned psychological development of individuals within the symbolic codes and material constraints of SPEC arrangements. Within this context, it is viewed that opportunity reflects how actors relate to and understand their hierarchical position, which becomes their social reality. This construction of self-perception creates 'a' social reality which affects individuals' rationality. Psychological development of the 'self', in this context, can lead to acceptance of the hierarchical inequalities of outcome of the 'social market' as 'natural', although it is not guaranteed. The 'self' can, thus, be viewed as the 'internalisation of regulation' in terms of social control. Actions, as agency, are viewed to take place within the socially constructed image of the 'self', constrained by both conscious and unconscious moral self-regulation. Thus, normative roles and voluntary interaction are linked to forms of socialisation through 'habitus'. Mouzelis (1995: p109) indicates that "...as internalisations of 'objective' social structures, the elements of habitus are shared by all human beings who have experienced similar socialisation processes". In this way, actors are exposed to norms, knowledge and rules, according to their habitus, which transmit the context of intention and order, and which reproduce themselves. It is viewed, therefore, that structures and agency are implicit in producing, legitimating and reproducing each other in a process of 'structuration' (Giddens 1979, 1982, 1995a, 1995b)

Concession to both concepts of structure and agency is fundamental in understanding the social whole, because;

...both figurational (hierarchical relationships) and institutional (hierarchical rules / roles) structures are absolutely indispensable for understanding how social wholes are constituted and reproduced. Any attempts to derive the one from the other unavoidably leads to lopsided or impoverished accounts of the social world (Mouzelis 1995: p77).

Critical realism concurs with structuration's view of the 'duality' of action and structure. In this perspective the dominant group can manipulate symbolic and material 'surface' structures to construct 'crisis', and either undermine or 'legitimate' aspects of culture: for example the Welfare State. In other words, state institutions not only govern action, by structuring and shaping interpretation of experience, they also create a predisposition in the individual to act in certain ways (see Archer 1984: p6). In this perspective, structures are predominant over agency which, in the last instance, is always conditioned.

Hierarchical Agency and Relative Autonomy

Critical realism views that agency is interdependent with actors' hierarchical positioning and status. In the UK, as elsewhere, the hierarchy is one of privilege and inequality between divisions in society. It is viewed to restrict the actions of interest groups either dissatisfied, or in conflict, with the dominant group. Thus, the concept of agency and free-will is critical in the process of social transformation through domination and subordination. However, historical hierarchical structures and values

do change with time and space, and agency can cause the transformation. This suggests that socialisation can be adopted, adapted or rejected, and that habitus is flexible. Nevertheless, it is likely that agency and autonomy will be relative to the hierarchical status of the actors. Also, that micro agency is weaker than macro agency and structural boundaries. In other words;

It is these hierarchised structures or social wholes that constitute the chief means for understanding how players, whose actions and interactions stretch only little or moderately in time and space (i.e. micro and meso actors) link up with the macro actors, with the individual or collective players whose actions stretch more widely in time and space (Mouzelis 1995: p136).

Agency, therefore, is seen to be relative to social position, where macro actors make the rules for micro actors. However, Bernstein (1990: p174) indicates that there can be resistance to the reproduction of privilege which results in a level of agency and discretion towards the dominant codes and their context. Individuals' or collectives acceptance of the dominant discourse is likely to fall on a continuum from acceptance to opposition (see Scott 1994: p43). This will depend on their biographical position and relational interactions within the rules and regulations of the social and cultural hierarchy: their habitus and status. However, although alternative views not necessarily controlled by the privileged discourse are possible, critical realism views that they always occur within the pre-existing codes and structures of society and are therefore constrained by them. Even those ideologically opposed to the dominant structures are forced to use them, their language and its meanings to have an 'official' voice. Opposition forces are thus constrained. It is viewed that social 'developments' are incorporated into the dominant discourse to appease the opposition, then defused to maintain the status quo. The state apparatus of the Law controls those that step outside the 'common-sense' cultural framework. Agency and autonomy thus are seen as relative to hierarchical status.

Capitalist Structures and Agency

Critical realism argues that, at the macro level, discourses not only have the power to create constraining structures in society but that these structures can be used for ideological purposes by the dominant group. The perspective contends that control over the dissemination of knowledge, combined with control over the distribution of resources, assists the dominant group in its endeavour to form a consciousness which both legitimates structural inequalities and seeks to reproduce them. Communication between hierarchical groups is through a discourse which can be influential in both the creation of hierarchy and subordination within it. Political authority can, therefore, constrain 'knowledge' and condition the relationships between hierarchical groups. Control over dominated groups is a matter of constraint and is viewed to be achieved when they have to conform to the dominating structures to question their own position. Such that "...all who aspire to knowledge through the public curriculum will have to conform to standards and achievements set by those in authority", those being set by the dominant group to "...preserve their territory and to protect their vested interests" (Kirk G 1986: p54-55). The dominant knowledge is open to ideological deconstruction and reconstruction as individuals call on alternative discourses. However, dominated groups must use the dominant discourse and structures to be

heard. They are, therefore, constrained at the outset. Thus, individual micro autonomy (agency) is viewed to be framed by macro structures and discourse.

In this perspective, an individual's understanding of experience is seen to work at the subconscious level, and because external reality shapes internal reality, agency is not free. Thus, consciousness is formed into the 'regulative', 'selected', 'integrative' and 'acquired' 'codes' (Bernstein 1990: p14) which are both determined by, and determine culture. Culture is not neutral, but orientated towards political interests and intention. These codes give meaning to the contexts of relationships which form the structural hierarchy of capitalist domination and privilege. The capitalist hegemony's aim is to become internalised so that submission to its arrangements occurs. Hirschkop (1986: p111) suggests that capitalism separates fact from value and demands acceptance of social processes, while regulating individual action through a moral discourse uninterested in excuses. The aim is to 'legitimate' control, inequality and differentiation through a capitalist hegemony which endeavours to shape a 'common-sense' based on competition and meritocracy. Thus, its dominant ideology is evident both consciously and unconsciously in acting to structure agency at hierarchically stratified levels.

In this view, discourse is constructed with deliberate 'neutrality' to hide where power and control lie (Archer 1984: p78). It is constructed to deny the existence of structure and agency and hide the reality of divisional inequality, with individual action constrained. It endeavours to reproduce or transform capitalist SPEC arrangements; manipulate and define the constructed and constrained social experiences; construct a social consciousness which negates contradictions and conflicts as neutral and natural; shape individuals' perception of social reality; and predetermine their actions according to their 'habitus'. In other words, discourse is viewed as an ideological strategy of cultural reproduction. Where discourse works as an ideological strategy to enforce particular hierarchical relationships, practices and consciousness, it is considered by critical realism to be a tool of 'ideological hegemony'. The dominant group, it is viewed, strives to prevent its knowledge and facts being interpreted and changed. Thus, the discourse conceals its real intentions by disguising its links to institutionalised social practices. Critical realism views that it is in this context, and for these purposes, that policy is constructed and implemented, and, therefore, the context in which policy has to be critiqued.

The Critical Perspective

Critical realism is a critical perspective which focuses;

...upon the formation of consciousness, culture and everyday life, and how these formations maintain the legitimacy of existing political and social interests. The language and intention of such theory is political - to consider moments of domination, ideology, hegemony, and emancipation in social life and social change (Sparkes 1992: p37).

It is, therefore, a theory which seeks to get beneath the political rhetoric of representation and expose the reality of narrow political intent behind policy.

Policy: Capitalist 'Rational' Decision Making Based on Information and Knowledge

Information as Knowledge

Sound policy making requires knowledge and understanding of the issues, adequate planning and resourcing, and full evaluation leading to improvement (Hogwood and Gunn 1993: p241). Such that "...resource and information flows constitute the bases of a social action system..." (Hudson 1993a: p372). This indicates that the flow of information should be two way. However, control of the resource of information can be central in the construction of individuals' knowledge of their 'interests'. The power to control information can lead to, or prevent, both the knowledge and understanding of rights and the ability to realise them (Adler and Asquith 1993: p399). Critical realism views that the structural relationship between the power to control the flow of information and resources to construct knowledge, is the social force central to the definition of 'truth'. This, it is viewed, apportiones the ability to both achieve narrow ends and to defy opposition, blatantly, by setting the political agenda. Having dominant ideological interests on the agenda requires keeping other issues off it by preventing subordinate "...demands becoming political issues or even from being made" (Lukes 1993: p52). In the endeavour to legitimate the rationale, the means, getting organisations to function towards the ends, are often more important than the ends themselves (Minogue 1993: p16). In other words, control. Concealing self-interest necessitates an ideological shift. It is viewed that state apparatus both transmits the symbolic dominant hegemony and controls resources. In this perspective, the dominant group articulates selected social concerns, seeking to construct a perception of what people [are to] care about. It has the power to create an agenda of unimportant issues (Lukes 1993: p57-58). Self-interest means that political choices come before plural decisions. Nonetheless, the dominant group must avoid exposure to conflicting information and knowledge which might compromise its political decisions (Gregory 1993: p214).

Critical realism views the dominant group as seeking to avoid information from subordinate sources which highlights what the elites either do not wish to know or become known more widely. In this perspective, information is ignored, or manipulated, as politicians prefer ideological rhetoric to political reality. Not only is information rejected, but 'useful' knowledge is adopted by decision makers. Further, "...competent critical people may also be 'screened out' in favour of incompetent uncritical people..." (see Minogue 1993: p21-2). Centrally, social issues are subjective and difficult to quantify, they also lead to questions about economic efficiency, accountability and responsibility. Thus, social evaluation of policies is unwanted as such information is always available to the opposition. It is therefore denied that such information has any importance and a rationale of economic efficiency ignores the subsequent social costs. The danger for subordinate groups is that rejection of unwanted information by the dominant group gives it the power to construct social knowledge and 'facts' as 'truth', which cannot be reflected upon easily (Smith and May 1993: p199). The dominant group thus disregards public choice which is, therefore, a clear indication that policy decisions are political and undemocratic (Dunleavy 1993: p144). Yet, more than just rejecting information, dominant decision makers also refuse to accept theoretical understandings of the policy process (discussed below).

Knowledge as Rationality

The suggested lack of liberal policy making implies that policy decisions are narrowly political. The concept of rational choice is questioned by critical realism when political intent and power take precedence over informed, reasoned debate and decisions based on an understanding of plural interests. Analysis of the ideological underpinnings of policy decisions is thus crucial "...to establish links between the ways issues are defined and resources allocated, the nature of structural interests and the distribution of power, and macro theories of state" (Ham 1993: p184). When capitalist requirements are privileged social concerns are subordinated, and cuts or changes in resource distribution are seen as measures to discipline dominated groups. Policy is, arguably, manipulated under the rhetoric of 'cost-analysis', where economic efficiency is claimed as 'rational'. However, 'economic efficiency' is seen as the rhetorical justification behind the reality of greater central controls and prescription: control, therefore, of a system where structures favour powerful interests, and where the powerful have a monopoly over resources and information.

Sabatier (1993: p287) identifies structural levels in the decision making process. He outlines 'core beliefs' and 'near core beliefs' (political intent) which take place prior to policy implementation, and 'secondary aspects' (effects) which are the evaluation of policy. Sabatier suggests that critique takes place over secondary aspects, which are influenced by environmental factors and other policies. Debate at the level of 'secondary aspects' means that change occurs at the surface, while the core political intent is neither uncovered nor changed, and the status quo remains intact. Critical realism concurs with Sabatier, and argues that debate at the secondary, arguably superficial, level can be viewed as functional to keep discussion *within* policies rather than *of* them. Secondary critique by subordinate groups is viewed to be constrained by constructed knowledge and 'truths', and critique of core beliefs by the dominant group is constrained by ideological predispositions. However, dominant macro decision making is not the end of policy implementation and there is a long chain of links in the process (Hogwood and Gunn 1993: p241). Perfect 'top-down' implementation is unlikely as local autonomy may conflict with central government authority. Implementation structures therefore need to be controlled if dominant interests are to be served. The centre's aim is thus to remove or reduce local autonomy through resource controls, prescribed policy and devolved responsibility and accountability.

Prescription, Implementation Structures and Accountability

Policy determined by ideological interests prescribes specific objectives. This suggests a macro political intent of 'top-down' implementation. To understand how the dominant group endeavours to control policy implementation from the centre, it is necessary to analyse the role and powers of the implementation structures and of significant actors within them.

Hierarchical Implementation Structures

Policy implementation is a complex process which requires careful management for macro objectives to be met. The dominant group aims to constrain the agency of implementing actors by setting in place mechanisms which condition behaviour.

Indeed, the imperative behind a programme of authoritative legislation is to put implementation structures in place which set the procedures for administration (Hjern and Porter 1993: p251-2). The centre creates the overall framework of resources and relations while local actors are responsible for actual implementation. In this perspective the state apparatus is used to ensure that policy supports capitalist requirements while appearing to have relative autonomy.

Relationships of power and control are hierarchical and authoritative, with allocated responsibilities. Actions are outlined and actors are given their place and role. Duties, rules and resource allocation are formalised and are legally enforced as implementation becomes structured rather than negotiated (Hudson 1993a: p370). Elmore (1993: p317) indicates that "...hierarchical control is the single most important element insuring that organisations behave as systems....The translation of policy into action consists of a deliberate, stepwise process in which goals are elaborated into specific tasks". Hierarchical discipline comes through target setting with measures of effectiveness. The "...standard techniques of hierarchical management - budget and planning cycles, clearance procedures, reporting requirements, and evaluation systems - are the means by which high-level administrators attempt to structure the behaviour of subordinates" (Elmore 1993: p323). These act to keep the actions of subordinates within the dominant ideological boundaries. By setting a formal structure to relations and processes, an environment of behavioural norms is established. This becomes the implementation 'culture' which acts to construct consensus and constrain conflict. The opportunity for opposition from hierarchical subordinates is reduced as professionalism is constrained. Micro action is therefore restrained by macro parameters and accountability. Pollitt (1993: p300-307) suggests that macro controls act to influence the cognitive and emotional behaviours of micro actors.

However, this does not mean that 'top-down' policy implementation is perfect and capitalist requirements are guaranteed. There is a 'bottom-up' influence on policy implementation as conflicts arise over objectives and methods. Policies are open to sites of resistance, adaptation and change and thus are evolutionary. The aim of the dominant group, therefore, is to shape agencies to serve their interests by reducing sites and opportunities for critique and recontextualisation. This objective may well come before the actual policy aims (Dunleavy 1993: p142). When government aims to reduce 'subversion' to 'top-down' implementation, legal enforcement is required to make subordinates conform. Legal boundaries are used to set possibilities which compromise moral beliefs and rationalise professional ideals within political and practical realities, as obligations become more powerful than rights (Lipsky 1993: p380-383). Professionalism is thus undermined politically, and eroded through prescription and selective training. In this perspective, accountability to prescribed expectations plays a central role in reducing professional input. Increased accountability through administrative controls increases compliance between subordinate behaviour and dominant policy (see Hudson 1993b: p392). Implementation procedures may be portrayed as 'neutral', however, control of resources ensures that the dominant group remains in control (Minogue 1993: p19). Policy may, symbolically, espouse a rhetoric of change, but purposively lack adequate resources for effective implementation (Hill 1993: p236). Management of implementation behaviour thus changes from overt manipulation of resources to covert, indirect and subtle manipulation of attitudes, values and beliefs through cultural symbolism, ritual and ideological representation.

Terms such as 'flexibility' in policy allows dominant manipulation to avoid unwanted input. It can also ensure that policy can be made to continue serving elite interests in case of wider environmental change (Smith and May 1993: p207). Hill (1993: p235) posits that lack of negotiation and compromise leads to an 'implementation deficit'. This has been the topic of much research which is readily available to those dominant in policy decisions (Marsh and Rhodes 1992a). Questions arise therefore about how much dominant policy makers want to change the status quo. Crucially, inadequate resources result in a low level of change, which may be the core intent. However, symbolically, the dominant group can juxtapose low levels of change as ideological subversion and self-interest on the part of opposition subordinates (Hill 1993: p379). The rhetoric, thus, is of the centre's justification in reducing professional autonomy and discretion, prescribing policy and specifying training which are claimed as crucial to ensure 'untainted' policy implementation. This also serves to reduce the possibility of professional reflection and critique. In this perspective, not only do the controlled and powerless remain so, the reduction of autonomy exacerbates their predicament. Prescription here does more than suggest low trust, it removes autonomy. It is also the antithesis of the capitalist claims of the perfection of the free market mechanism.

End Note

The concepts discussed above form the basis of my critical realist perspective. They are argued to have been employed in an inextricably interlinked manner by the NR/RR as the dominant group from 1979 to 1997. Their endeavour, it is argued, was to influence both conscious and unconscious morals in their attempt to construct a consensus the over actions, practices, values, norms and beliefs within their definition of 'citizenship'. Centrally, their aim was interpreted to be the endeavour to construct and reproduce a 'common-sense' towards capitalist arrangements, relations and effects as 'neutral' and natural'. This centred on the intent to imbue the population with a 'capitalist moral character' which would accede to the effects of a 'social market'.

Appendix F

Appendix F - Education Reforms from 1979 to 1992

Contents:	Page
Proem	35
Chronology of Reform	35
Pre 1979 - Provision and Right Wing Critique	35
The Right's Reform of Education	37
1979 to 1986	37
Parental Choice	38
Structure and Partnerships	39
The Two Way Shift (TWS)	40
School Governing Bodies	41
The Economic Crisis as the Basis of Policy	41
Education as a Solution to Economic Crisis: Shifting the... ...Definition and Function to the Right	43
1986 to 1988	45
1988 to 1992	49
The National Curriculum	50
LMS	50
School Governors	52
HMI	52
End Note	53

Proem

This appendix details the background to chapter five. It outlines the reforms made to education in England and Wales by the Conservative governments between 1979 and 1992. The period prior to 1979 is discussed briefly to highlight the circumstances which the Right inherited⁴. The themes which underpin the Right's widespread and complex reforms implemented since 1979 are identified by investigating motivation, policy development, implementation and controls at the macro level. This is undertaken in the form of a brief chronology. Centrally the period of 1979 to 1992 is identified as having two broad but distinct stages of policy and reform. Firstly, 1979 to 1988 is viewed as a period of 'softening-up' opposition and resistance to Right-wing policy, and secondly, 1988 onwards is seen as the implementation of Right-wing reforms. Within these periods it is argued that further distinct stages and policies can be identified as the focus of 'step-by-step' reform. This discussion concentrates firstly on the period of 1979 to 1988 leading into ERA, it then assesses reforms from 1988 as a consequence of the ERA. It argues that the concepts emerging are those of the inter-working of the symbolic and material resources of the state, a dominant rhetoric of representation and misrepresentation, and a centralising of SPEC controls as the Right sought to control education to serve its interests.

Chronology of Reform

Pre 1979 - Provision and Right Wing Critique

The 1944 Education Act was passed on the grounding of war-time social democratic consensus politics which continued into the post-war period. The Act provided the conditions in which selection and the 'tripartite' system of education in England and Wales developed. It also devolved a great deal of control to the Local Education Authorities (LEA) (Demaine 1993). The dominant influence of civil servants at the DES in the development of curriculum initiatives had been reduced and passed to the LEAs and, to a lesser extent, to teachers. Although the civil servants still controlled the allocation of financial resources, decisions over the spending of block grants was with the LEA. The examination system exerted constraint on the syllabus but teachers still had considerable autonomy over what and how they taught. The Right voiced its concerns about the provision and function of state education throughout the late 1940s and 1950s. In the 1950s the political Right began an assault on educationalists' autonomy and 'progressive' educational methods with its 'One Nation' document. The competence of teachers to teach the 'right things' in the 'right way' was questioned.

Throughout the 1950s and 1960s the standard of living in the UK was increasing as affluence and capital accumulation increased. The Labour Party, driven partly by the focus on egalitarianism within the social democratic consensus, introduced a system of comprehensive education in the 1960s (see Simon 1991). The development of comprehensive education was an attempt to challenge the SPEC barriers and stigma created by the selectivity of the 'tripartite' system. The shift to comprehensive education was made mandatory on all Local Authorities with Labour's

⁴ For a fuller explanation of education provision in the post-war period see CCCS 1981, Knight 1990 and Simon 1991

1976 Education Act. However, a fully comprehensive system was never established. Political questions during this period concerned the relationship between the structure of education and equity of opportunity. Questions within education concerned 'grouping policies' (especially in the primary sector), and the content and teaching methods of the 'traditional' curriculum which were seen constraints over access and equity. There was a development of 'progressive' methods and content. Yet, despite the rhetoric of egalitarianism, the policy of equity was never fulfilled as comprehensive schools became as selective internally as the tripartite system had been externally (Evans 1986).

The right-wing discourse of the period concerned issues of educational standards, cost and the relevance of education to economic requirements. The establishment of the Black Papers in the 1960s saw an organised right-wing political and ideological assault on education. Anything which did not fall within their definition of 'traditional' was attacked as subversive. They portrayed education as being in the clutches of 'permissiveness' which was claimed to be causing the breakdown of society's moral base and so causing social decline (Hartley 1992: p9, Knight 1990: p115). Progressive educationalists were attacked as dangerous, politically motivated left-wing levellers-down of outcome. Their alleged removal of competition was claimed to undermine the establishment of effort and ability essential for the process of capital production. Teachers were portrayed as untrustworthy, thus requiring greater controls and changes to their 'training'. The rhetoric was of a wider left-wing subversion due to an ideological vacuum caused by social democracy. The Right espoused a right-wing discourse of the requirement of education to transmit morals and religion to establish social and economic order (see Jones 1989: p40). They insisted that the only way to prevent social decline was to reinstate traditional cultural values, heritage and knowledge in education and demanded a return to 'traditional' structure, content and methods. Nationalism was a central plank of the Right's rhetoric (Jones 1989: p64). Rhodes Boyson was a central figure in this attack, both as a Black Paper editor and Conservative Party activist prior to 1979. His role was greatly increased with his appointment as Minister for Education (MfE) in 1979. Education was portrayed by the Right as being in a state of crisis, and thus requiring greater central control. It can be argued that the Right went some way to constructing a representational crisis over the state of education. It can also be argued however that, because education did not function primarily towards right-wing ends and reproduce society how they believed it ought to be, there was a genuine crisis in the eyes of the Right. Nonetheless, research shows that during the 1960 and 1970s education was neither in crisis itself, nor the cause of wider economic and social crisis. Rather, during this period standards rose, social barriers were beginning to be broken down and, as a result, the economic situation was improving (Tomlinson 1991: p116).

Problems arose between the cost of social democratic provision and the economic recession of the early 1970s. The Left acknowledged that the post-war social democratic consensus policies were not achieving the desired results in terms of producing a trained labour force for economic requirements (CCCS 1981). Many of the aspects of recession matched the representations in the Right's discourse. Industry complained that school leavers had inadequate levels of skills to fill roles in the workplace. The Left, seemingly prompted by the Right's discourse, began to ask similar questions. PM Callaghan's 1976 Ruskin Speech called for greater economic

relevance in the curriculum, greater central involvement and improved standards. The speech also called for a 'great debate' about education. The Right-wing attack moved to the media. The debate shifted educational discussion towards industrial requirements, academic and moral standards and concern over economic efficiency based on output (Apple 1993: p19). The shift was away from viewing education as a 'service' and viewing it as based on functional objectives and technical rationality. The Right espoused that education was about 'common-sense' not about theory (Lawrence 1992: p10). They attacked research bodies such as the Schools' Council as subversive and wasteful. The espousal of their own objectives as common-sense allowed educational theory to be undermined and ignored. They asserted that they knew more about education than educationalists and based support on populist appeals of parental choice and power. The media debate was an important mechanism for the Right to inform the public about the 'crisis' in education and to give their 'solutions' to it.

When the Right took office in 1979 they were able to claim that they were doing no more than following the initiatives of the previous Labour administration. However, the underlying motives and levels of centralisation were different from those intended in the Ruskin speech. This was evident when meetings took place at Westminster with groups interested in the outcome of education which included neither educationalists nor parents (Knight 1990: p115).

The Right's Reform of Education

1979 to 1986

Britain's political landscape changed in 1979. The Conservatives gained office on the back of right-wing solutions to the economic and social crisis which were portrayed as the fault of previous post-war social democratic governments, both Labour and Conservative. They were heavily influenced by the NR coalition (see chapter four: p116). The administration claimed to reject the policies of past governments and promulgated radical solutions to the crises, terming themselves the 'Radical Right' (RR). The NR rhetoric sighted education as the key to recapturing the country's 'greatness' and espoused a return to 'traditional' standards, content and methods. The NR attacked the lack of educational and financial accountability as the cause of allegedly falling standards. The ethos of the NR discourse was 'value for money' and education was evaluated on the basis of its function in meeting desired ends. The Right's rhetoric was for the requirement for education to function towards the needs of society, primarily those of the economy. Underpinning this was the claimed necessity of the nation's industrial and commercial sector to compete successfully in the world market.

The 'market' was given by the Right as the elixir to end left-wing 'producer-capture' of education and the alleged resultant crisis in moral standards and economic output which threatened national stability. 'Parental choice' was the rhetoric claimed to increase standards and accountability as schools competed to attract 'consumers'. Choice was claimed to be based on diversity and differentiation in the educational market place. Thus, schools were made to publish their results and the HMI were made to publish their reports. Steps to put a market in place in education had therefore begun before 1988. However, the ERA with Local Management of Schools (LMS),

Open Enrolment (OE) and Per Capita Funding (PCF), *forced* schools into the market place. The ERA sought to instil a market ethos, ethics, values and practices into schools both in methods of management and teaching. The NC and National Testing (NT) both set educational minimums and provided market information essential for consumer choice.

The ERA was the pinnacle of the process of centralisation leading to greater control over the development and implementation of policy with the Secretary of State (SoS) and the Department of Education and Science (DES). However, the ERA was passed in 1988 some eleven years after the Right-wing administration first came to power. This indicates that the establishment of the conditions necessary for the implementation of right-wing policies took considerable time and effort. The shift to the right required changing residual ideological values from 'social democracy' to the 'social market'. Underlying this was the aim to engineer social values towards establishing a belief of individuals' abilities as predetermined and objectively testable (Elliot 1988: p59). The Right knew that this would not have been possible in 1979 and that policies needed to follow a 'step-by-step' development as each new initiative built upon the possibilities created by previous initiatives. Centralisation through Right-wing educational reforms found expression in the structure, form, and content of education and in initiatives introduced to exercise some degree of control over teaching methods (see Appendix G: p55). This came through both ideological attack and legislation to control both the input of resources and their use. This was combined with the rhetoric of the increased role of parents in their children's education.

Parental Choice

For the Right to reduce resistance to their policies they needed to gain control over education by removing the powers and authority of previously significant bodies. Central to this was the endeavour make parents their allies in their attack on education. This involved an ideological attack which sought to convince parents that the education system was in crisis and adversely effecting their children's future prospects. Education standards became the focus of attention. The Right were intent on setting standards nationally as a benchmark for national comparison by testing basic skills at set ages (PT, No. 1, 1979: p16). They criticised the secrecy surrounding the development and teaching of the curriculum. Teaching was purportedly in the hands of left wing subversives, and Labour administrations were charged with putting "...ideology before common-sense" (PT, No. 4, 1979: p84). Schools were to be compelled to publish their results in a bid to convince parents that the Government was making education more accountable in terms of examination performance (DES News, 20 Feb., 1981). This linked directly to the Right's policy of 'parental choice', assured through the Parents Charter, first noted in the 1979 Conservative manifesto and made Law in the 1980 Education Act. Parents were able to choose schools beyond the normal residential boundaries, creating a market in which schools were in competition for 'consumers'. The 1980 Act also legislated that LEAs had to take account of parental wishes, except in exceptional cases (PT No. 19, 1979: p375, DES Circular 1/81). In terms of a school's performance the HMI were to inspect schools performance related to practice, publish the results, follow up on their findings and then publish those. This added to the information about individual schools, information essential for consumers to make choices in a market place. In turn, this fuelled the policy of 'open enrolment' where schools' pupil-intake was to be to their

capacity. Funding for pupils was on a 'per capita basis', paid by the LEA of the pupils residential area with Local Authorities recouping expenses between each other.

The Right claimed that the keys to their educational policy were 'standards and choice' and that "...standards can only be raised through the active involvement of parents and on an emphasis on the basic skills of literacy and numeracy." (PT, No. 19, 1979: p374). The focus was on content, teaching and achievement outcomes. In this way the Right were seeking to creating both educational expectations and consumer demands. The rhetoric was on improving academic standards through the efficient use of resources by 'preventing social philosophy and various fashions at the expense of academic standards' (Boyson, 1982 Hansard, Vol. 26, Col. 139). The market in education, based on parental choice, not only acted as populist policy it also ensured that schools were constrained in their opposition to the Right's policies. Failure to adopt the market principles would have meant a school not meeting the expectations and demands of content and method created by the Right. Thus, schools would suffer the financial penalties of per capita funding attached to open enrolment. In this way the Right set the context of the educational debate, practice and choice *within* their policies, not *of* them. These initiatives can be viewed as a bid to remove the power and influence from the educational 'partners'.

Structure and Partnerships

Previous to 1979 there had been a partnership, in rhetoric at least, in educational developments between the government, DES, LEAs, teaching unions and HMI. This had led to a 'balance' which prevented the domination of education by one group. There was a distribution of levels of power which opened central reforms to critical evaluation and recontextualisation as local areas exercised their degree of autonomy. When policy did not suit local needs there was room for interpretation and adaptation. It also made it possible for initiatives to develop and disseminate from the local level. The fragile levels of autonomy given to teachers and LEAs through the 1944 Act led to the possibility for progressive developments. In this way, 'partners' acted as sites of national division and possible opposition to centrally imposed objectives and a system of prescribed curriculum content and testing to create national uniformity.

The Right sought to implement policies which allowed for the prescription of content and limited the use of resources. To achieve its objectives, right-wing policy had to be imposed on local areas. Crucially, to gain control of education the Right had to reform the distribution of power and reduce the autonomy of educational partners by dismantling the decentralising initiatives made in the 1944 Act and centralising the control of education. The fragile partnerships had to be brought to an end and local autonomy 'brought into line' within a set framework of national parameters and measures of accountability. Pressure on the partners' level of autonomy came on two interlinked fronts. Firstly through the ideological attack and secondly through legislation to control the input and use of resources, where the second was 'justified' by the first. The traditional partners, especially the LEAs and teaching unions, came under close public scrutiny and were blamed for many of the wider failings of the country. LEAs were attacked as the most 'dangerous' site of subversion and resistance to 'common-sense' reforms. The new partnership was, rhetorically, to be between the government and parents and government and employers.

Crucially the shift in terminology from 'partners' to 'accountability' suggests a shift in perception from 'trust' to 'mistrust' (Lawton 1980: p12). This seems to be true both in the perceptions of the Right and in the representations their rhetoric portrayed to the public. The outcome was to lead to contradictions between the government and educationalists over the aims of 'education'. The legislation of the 1980s saw reversals of the 1944 Act with a shift in political relationships of power and control in education as the Right strove to regain control from the Labour controlled local authorities (McPherson and Raab 1988, Demaine 1993). The post-war consensus was broken and the Right took the lead at the centre as the market and centralisation led to a 'two way shift' of powers away from the LEAs.

The Two Way Shift (TWS)

The 'two way shift' sought the removal of the autonomy of intermediate sites in the policy implementation process between the construction of policy and its transmission in schools. The autonomy of the LEAs was the most troublesome aspect of opposition to the Right's determination to impose its policies with as little resistance as possible. Policy was implemented which was intended to remove the powers of the LEAs. Their autonomy was reduced through financial legislation and their authority was reduced both upwards through centralisation and downwards through decentralising measures to place market forces on education, which themselves were controlled by the centre. This 'two way shift' of power away from the LEAs is viewed as a central part of the precise 'step-by-step' reconstruction of the educational framework by the centre as they gradually gained more and more control. At each step the opportunities for autonomy over actions were removed as power relations changed.

As well as LEAs, the Right was required to reduce or remove the autonomy of bodies which had the authority to critique educational initiatives or offer alternatives. Two such bodies were the HMI and the Schools' Council. The HMI was restructured from a body of 'advisors' to a body of 'approvers' (see Lea and Fitz 1994) and the Schools' Council was removed. Legislation forcing the HMI to publish its reports provided market information on schools both at local educational level and at the national political level. The Schools' Council, an independent body of educationalists with responsibility for development and evaluation in curriculum and assessment, had acted to prevent central domination. As such it was a threat to right-wing control of education. It was disbanded by SoS Joseph despite advice to the contrary in a Parliamentary Report. Joseph established and appointed two groups, the SCDC and the SEC. Lawton (1980: p74) claims that the Schools' Council was attacked because the Right wanted a body to tell it what they wanted to hear. Former chair of the NCC Graham (Graham and Tytler 1993: p14-15) verified this claim;

Once the Schools' Council was abolished it was clear that never again would there be a body that got in the way of civil servants, which threatened Ministers, or gave any kind of voice to local government. Above all nobody ever again was to control both the curriculum and examinations, a determination that led to the eventual decision to set up the NCC and SEAC as two quite separate bodies. SCDC was, therefore, created to be as woolly and advisory as possible

Removal of the School's Council reduced the influence of the unions in educational developments and acted to remove a site of research, evaluation and innovation. It also prevented open debate about educational policy. With the increase in central controls the possibilities of developing non right-wing alternative initiatives and places of critical evaluation of central policies were either suppressed or eliminated. The SEC and SCDC were not elected, not independent, not neutral and not open to public scrutiny. They were set up to follow the right-wing line.

School Governing Bodies

Another part of the shift away from LEAs concerned the governance of schools. The 1980 Education Act legislated that every school should have its own governing body rather than a number of schools being grouped under one LEA governing body. Governors were to be elected with parent and teacher appointments, with governors from the LEA and local community vetted by the SoS (DES Circ. 1/80). The requirement for 'foundation governors' from the community (DES Circ. 4/81) was explained in Parliament by MfE Dunn (Hansard 1983, Vol. 46, wa. 286) to "...ask local authorities to pay particular attention, when approving governors, to the valuable contribution which persons drawn from industry and commerce can make to the work of school governing bodies". Governing bodies were given greater responsibility over the functioning and effectiveness of the school based on clear guidelines from the SoS (Mellor, Hansard 1985, Vol. 88, Col 584). Pressure was immediately brought to bear on governors in line with the government's intention of 1981 to introduce records of the number of pupils in education to "...allow for a measure of the quality of output and hence to an assessment of the financial return on educational expenditure" (Carlisle Hansard, Vol. 1000, wa. 345). This tied the new mechanisms for the appointment of governors into the rhetoric of economic concerns and increased local accountability.

The Economic Crisis as the Basis of Policy

My argument that education was a central focus of the Right's political project is supported by the fact that the first parliamentary debate on their coming to power concerned legislation to reverse Labour's 1976 Act (which compelled all LEA's to reorganise educational provision on comprehensive grounds). Although the Right's rhetoric centred on economic concerns, it appears that their first concern was with structural differentiation. The 1976 Act threatened the reproduction of SPEC hierarchies through the differentiated distribution of knowledge on the grounds of selection. The economic recession of the 1970s not only resonated with the claims made by the ideological Right, but also provided the 'justification' for the political Right to impose economic directives and limits which acted to reduce choices and possibilities at the local level (Sparkes 1990a: p132). There was a determination to remove social democratic input from education by removing its resource base.

In 1979 SoS Carlisle indicated that spending needed to be controlled as part of the wider policy of 'monetarism'. The issue was claimed to be one of public spending not one of spending on education, and education had to take its share of public expenditure cuts (PT, No. 16, 1979: p133). The justification given was that falling school rolls, causing a low teacher-pupil ratio, allowed economies without lowering standards. It was also highlighted as the justification for a reduction in teaching and

non-teaching staff. This was confirmed by Carlisle's policy statements (Hansard 1979, Vol. 972, Col. 198);

I remind the House again that, in the end, we can spend only as much money on education as the country can afford. What we can spend and afford in future depends upon our ability to expand the economy of this country, by leaving more money for the potential of the wealth creating sectors.

The Right outlined that the private sector was the body which created the wealth which allowed public services to be provided, and that this required money (Hansard 1979, Vol. 980, Col. 1704). They claimed that a five percent cut in the education budget was imperative to reduce public spending, allowing taxation to be cut to allow adequate resources for the private sector to create wealth (Hansard 1979, Vol. 978, Col. 1674). Cuts made in the education budget were made an LEA responsibility (DES Circ. 5/79). The government identified the areas of school meals, milk and transport as non-essential items to be cut by the LEAs. Spending on buildings and improvements was also targeted (PT, No. 18, 1979: p359) and the *statutory* duty of LEAs to provide non-educational services were to be changed to *powers* (Carlisle Hansard 1979, Vol. 97, Col 131). This highlighted the Right's notion of education as a privilege rather than a right.

Education change was to undermine the social democratic policies of Labour held local government which were seen by the Right as socialist strongholds wreaking havoc on educational standards (Thornton, Hansard 1979, Vol. 973, Col. 125). The move was to make local government more responsible and so more accountable for financial savings. This was justified by the Right's claim that "It is consistent with the Government's philosophy of giving Local Authorities the maximum freedom to decide their own policies in accordance with local circumstances" (Hansard 1979, Vol. 978, Col. 1684). However, this claim was not the basis of government legislation. Circular 2/81 put pressure on Local Authorities to determine and make public their expenditure levels. The emphasis of this pressure was the requirement on LEAs to remove surplus places from the school roll to make better use of allegedly scarce resources. The circular also urged the selling off of capital assets such as buildings and land to make money. This was part of the Right's drive to bring schools into the enterprise culture as the government determined not to overspend on education (Carlisle, Blackpool Oct. 15, 1981). The government's setting of targets for LEA spending through block grants to each Local Authority (LA) meant that savings had to be made from other areas if not from education. This meant that people living beyond LA boundaries would not be effected by increases in either local rates or national taxation to meet local over-spending. Throughout this time the Right were emphasising that there was "...no automatic relationship between expenditure and standards" (Boyson, Hansard 1981, Vol. 1000, Col. 507). However, this was quite clearly contradicted in a subsequent statement by Boyson (Hansard 1981, Vol. 1000, Col 508) where he stressed that "...there will be a certain amount of money that can be spent on education, and it is important that we get the priorities right in deciding where that money is spent".

In 1981 Keith Joseph became SoS and was determined to reduce spending on education even further. Joseph was the intellectual behind the right-wing Thatcherite governments (Durham 1991) and his appointment as SoS brought radical right-wing

ideology to the heart of education initiatives. From 1981 LEAs had to begin bidding for in-service grants for priority areas identified by the government (Hansard 1983, Vol. 35, wa. 26). By 1983 Block Grants had been replaced by Direct Grants allocated to priority areas. In 1984 Education Support Grants (ESGs) were introduced through the 1984 Education Act, which DES Circ. 6/84 stressed were "...to encourage local education authorities to re-deploy a limited amount of expenditure into activities which appear to the Secretary of State to be of particular importance". Money for the ESG was to be with-held from the Rate Support Grant. ESGs were to be bid for, with the SoS deciding the educational needs at a national level (Hansard, 1983, Vol. 48, Col. 633). However, despite the alleged shortage of cash the private sector was not to be charged VAT on fees and they were to retain their charitable status. In addition, the Assisted Places Scheme (APS) was established which paid for children of proven academic ability to be transferred to private schools from state schools using public money. This redistribution of resources (both financial and intellectual) to the private sector came on the back of rhetoric which derided the state system.

Education as a Solution to Economic Crisis: Shifting the Definition and Function to the Right

Immediately after the RR came to office, functionalism and utilitarianism in education were high on agenda. The government's rhetoric of the efficiency of educational outcomes concerned the relevance of education to economic requirements. The rhetoric centred on the effective concentration of scarce resources. Education was defined as instrumental for post school life, geared towards the requirements of industry (Hampson, Hansard 1979, Vol. 967, Col. 298). The requirements of industry were obfuscated in the rhetoric of what was best for individual children. Hampson (Hansard 1980, Vol. 982, Col. 1700) indicated that education and training were to meet the needs of both industry and young people. The links between education and industry were overtly stated by MacFarlane (Hansard 1980, Vol. 982, Col. 1724), with the Right's desire to have more industrial understanding in schools, where;

..the importance of preparing young people for adult and working life. This must be a primary aim of our education and training system if our young people are to achieve fulfilment as individuals. It goes without saying that it is vital for the economic and industrial revival of and future of our country.

In January 1980 the government published 'A Framework for the School Curriculum' which outlined its proposals for a basic curriculum of key subjects: RE, English, maths, science, a foreign language and physical education, with time guidance for each (PT, No. 1, 1980: p7). The beginnings of the NC, the proposals outlined the Right's preliminary concerns about content and finances. The proposal claimed that the HMI reports stressed the requirement for a rationale for a 'common curriculum' and for common certification through a common core examination syllabus (Carlisle, Hansard 1980, Vol. 980 Col. 224). The immediate concern for the Right was to make the curriculum more vocational in orientation. The Manpower Services Commission (MSC) was to have an input in education to prepare pupils for employment and train them for working life (PT, No. 12, 1982: p214). Joseph identified that the MSC would be funded directly to develop technical education in schools with the purpose of spreading technical education through schools for those pupils with less academic ability (Boyson, Hansard 1983, Vol. 39, wa. 375). The two tier academic and

vocational education system was more clearly marked. The Conservative Manifesto 1983 (p15) stressed that “Training for work must start with better, more relevant education as school”. The vocational impetus was to be achieved through the introduction of the Technical and Vocational Education Initiative (TVEI) which Joseph explained was “...to ensure that the education service provides school leavers with the skills and abilities they will need in future life” (PT, No. 3, 1984: p42). The SoS required information on schools’ use of resources, roles, policy, relevance to work and their progress along those lines. DES Circular 8/83 stated that schools had to set down their curricular aims to allow assessment and evaluation, and that the HMI was to inform the SoS of schools’ performance. By 1984 the Government’s Curriculum Discussion Paper outlined the two Key Stages in the secondary school as 11 to 14 and 14 to 16, reiterating the subject order which the Government espoused as priority areas (PT, No. 3 1985,; p50). The White Paper ‘Better Schools’ (DES 1985) outlined the aims of educational reform and Government policy in lines with those in the 1984 Discussion Paper.

The government’s educational White Papers were significant documents, important in terms of increased central control in education. The White Paper ‘Teaching Quality’ (DES 1983) moved towards reducing the role of the ‘partners’ in education, leading to antagonism (see Appendix G: p58). In 1985 the Government published the White Paper ‘Better Schools’ (DES 1985) which set out the educational intentions of the Right. It outlined their commitments over financing, curriculum content and delivery, and the role of Government given an electoral ‘mandate’. ‘Better Schools’ (DES 1985: p4) emphasised that “The duty of the Government is to ensure as far as it can, through the efforts of all who are involved with our schools, that the education of the pupils serves their own and the country’s needs and provides a fair return to those who pay for it”. The idea of economic efficiencies, already being fed to the public, was reinforced. As we have seen, earlier initiatives had already begun to undermine the educational ‘partnership’ between the LEAs, schools and central government.

In terms of consolidating vocational training, ‘Better Schools’ (DES 1985: p16) stated that “The Government believes that the linking of education and training, whatever form it takes, should have preparation for employment as one of its principle functions”. The Schools Curriculum and Development Council (SCDC) was to concentrate on developing the curriculum outlined by the Government. Also in 1985, Parliament debated the White Paper ‘Education and Training for Young People’ which outlined that TVEI was to make education more vocational. Industry was to have a greater input in education, not only in the form of school governors but within the development of a curriculum based on their specific local needs. ‘Better Schools’ (DES 1985: p63-65) indicated that governors co-opted from industry would not only push industry’s requirements in schools, but that they would also run schools based on business and financial concerns by bringing market principles into schools to dictate a schools policy and ethos. This resonated directly with the policies expressed by the right-wing pressure groups (ASI 1985, NTBG 1986 and 1987, Hillgate Group 1986 and 1986, IEA 1987, the CPS and the CPC)⁵. The Right’s aim, it seemed, was to subordinate education to the requirements of employers in the form of vocational

⁵ The NR factions were divided over the focus of policy. During this period the vocationalists were dominant. However, they never challenged the academic curriculum and their dominance was not to last.

preparation⁶. The culmination of the role of education for industry was the development of the City Technology Colleges, partly financed by industry, with a vocational rationale.

1986 to 1988

Up to 1986 the Right's policies in education appeared to be fragmented and without direction. However, on closer inspection of the discursive relationships between the aims and intentions of different policies, the more cohesive and coherent underpinnings of policy begin to appear. In a chronology of policy Tomlinson (1993) highlighted how changes in education were developmental, each new policy building on the possibilities established by previous policies. Up to 1986 the chronological development of policy saw;

1977-83 Curriculum 11-16 Project, 1980 Education Act, 1981 Block Grants for spending, 1983 Teaching Quality, 1983 CATE, 1983 TVEI, 1983, TRIST (TVEI), 1984 Rate Capping, 1984 ESGs, 1984 DES Paper 'Parental Influence at School', 1984 ACSET Report, 1984 Circ. 3/84 and Letter 7/84 ITT criteria, 1985 CATE scrutiny, 1985 'Better Schools'.

Prior to 1986 the government appeared to be 'clearing-the-ground' for the imposition of further, more right-wing policies. As the Right consolidated power and were successful in gaining the upper-hand ideologically, they established a position from which to move more forcibly, and their policies became more bold and more direct. Undermining education had taken time and effort, leading to the development of the circumstance which, in 1988, allowed for greater central imposition. Opposition within education and parental attitudes towards Right-wing policy were being 'softened-up'. The education establishment's credibility had been undermined, both ideologically and through the imposition of standards that could not be met with the existing level of resourcing. Former Minister for Education Robert Dunn indicated that change was intentionally developmental and that prior to 1988 the government had not broken the strength of the educational partnerships to an extent to allow central imposition:

RD 1988 was the establishment of radical changes in education. The ideas had been around before then but they had remained on the desk of the Secretaries for State. They had probably not been prepared to confront the educational establishment, or perhaps wanted change to occur slowly. Kenneth Baker, more radically, took the initiative and put the policies into practice. The 'tripartite' partnerships of the DES, LEAs and teacher organisations had run education since the 1940s. It was critical to break these partnerships if change was to occur (interview).

Increasing centralisation presaged a massive removal of education's autonomy in readiness for the Right to impose its policy from the centre. Kenneth Baker became SoS in 1986 which both brought the Downing Street Policy Unit to the heart of educational policy making, and led to greater direct control over educational matters

⁶ The reality of this representation of the wishes of industrialists is questioned as a rhetorical tool seeking to allow greater central control over education for the right-wing intent of social order and social ordering.

for the SoS. Education policy embodied the interests of the right-wing pressure groups and highlighted the Right's determination to avoid any input from educationalist's. Prior to 1986 the Right had established ways to by-pass the educational establishment, allow greater central intervention and reduce the possibility of meaningful consultation in the construction and implementation of policy. Not only was there a 'two way shift' of power from LEAs, there was also a shift at the centre where educationalists at the DES were replaced by economists with loyalty to the government (McPherson and Raab 1988: pxi, Lawrence 1992). Power shifted from experienced educationalists to civil servants with no educational experience but who served the interests of the Right (Tomlinson 1994: p173). The shift in emphasis in policy from educational to economic concerns was therefore more straightforward.

A second phase in the implementation of policy can be outlined from 1986 to 1988 which highlights tighter controls on teachers' actions, initial teacher education (training), resource allocation and removal of areas of opposition;

1986 Education (No. 2) Act , 1986 Appraisal, 1986 Circ. 6/86 ITT, 1986 LEA Training Grants Scheme, 1987 Teachers Pay and Conditions Act - Interim Advisory Body [to 1991], 1987 Pilot Appraisal, 1988 ERA, 1988 Circ. 5/88 ITT, 1988 ILEA abolished.

The Education (No. 2) Act 1986 began the process of pulling together the apparently fragmented areas of Right-wing policy. The links became overt rather than covert. The 1986 Act gave the Right control of education and moved to reduce the role of LEAs and teachers through Law. Education was shifting from a 'public service' to a 'function' driven by the requirements of capital. One hundred and fifty years of educational development was reversed under ten years of Right-wing government (Tomlinson 1993: p99).

The 1986 Education Act established the roles and responsibilities for both local government and governing bodies. The shift of responsibility from LEA to schools (the decentralising part of the TWS) was highlighted by MfE Chris Patten (Hansard 1986, Vol. 90, wa. 193) with his statement that "The local education authority will not then be able to over-ride the governing body or the head teacher in the discharge of functions allocated to them". This was to centre around the control of resources. Schools were to be run as small businesses. The 1986 Act gave governors control of the length of the school's day, staff appointments and resource allocation. These duties were accountable through the requirements for schools to publish their information annually in relation to their published plans, plus the additional responsibility of a parental AGM. The 1986 Act paved the way for the ERA. In 1988 the ERA furthered the duties, responsibilities and the accountability of the governing body. The establishment of 'School League Tables' created even greater pressure to conform to the government's set standards and benchmarks, especially in the 'priority areas'. Governors became concerned with budget controls before educational considerations.

The Right were beginning to feel that their shift was taking effect. According to Boyson (1987 Hansard, Vol. 118, Col. 552) "The tide of movement against collective control has come". Removing power from the LEAs was to be achieved through the delegation of budgetary control directly to schools. The rhetoric was one

of improving teaching and learning through Local Management of Schools (LMS) (PT, No. 19, 1987: p147). However, schools were to remain accountable and provide information of financial activities to parents (DES Circ. 7/87). DES Circular 3/87 highlighted that, for the Right, quality was defined as standards of achievement which depended upon "...the quality and range of the curriculum and the effectiveness of its delivery and to secure the best possible return for the resources found for education". Education's effectiveness was, therefore, defined as cost effectiveness rather than educational effectiveness.

The control of both material and symbolic resources demonstrated that the Right needed to establish control of the structure of education to ensure a certain provision and to allow manipulation of content. The NC consultation document (DES 1987) tied content to a rhetoric of economic needs, stating that the NC was to be the priority in ESG spending. Up to 1987 reforms had put the control of school resources largely in the hands of governors, with public accountability to government. The government pressured school governors over curriculum developments and educational provision. Minister for Education Dunn (1987 Hansard, Vol. 108, wa 504) wrote that "The Government believe that an important objective for the school curriculum is that it should become increasingly practical and relevant to the demands of adult working life". The government's direct pressure on governors sought to install them as agents rather than actors in educational decisions. By co-opting governors from industry the intent was to steer local education provision towards the requirements of the economy, not towards the needs of children. The requirements of industry and commerce provided the justification for centralisation and priority subjects. Minister for Education Rumbold (1988 Hansard, Vol. 125, Col 808) claimed that;

Many employers have complained that some of the young people who have left school at the age of 16 and gone straight to work have not covered sufficient subjects during their education as it stands at present. The national curriculum will go a long way towards remedying that situation.

It seems clear that it was the government's intention, through national testing and the NC, to force education towards the requirements of the economy. The implementation of core and foundation subjects and national testing to assess the 'effectiveness' of education were instrumental to these aims. The ideological rhetoric of the Government endeavoured to define expectation and demands about the purpose and outcomes of education. Parental choice, based on market information, was one method of controlling education, where parents were repeatedly informed by the media and politicians that education was politically left wing and needed to be controlled. The Right were thus manipulating information in the market place. Boyson (1987 Hansard, Vol. 118, Col. 553) indicated that "A child's education is the biggest responsibility in a parents life" and that parents would not want experts to define the content or method of the education of their children. This was a clear indication of the change of emphasis from parental 'choice' to parental 'responsibility' and so 'accountability' The Right were thus seeking to manipulate the actions of parents in the market place.

By 1987 the Right had the ability to articulate their intent more overtly and forcefully. This was evident in Heseltine's (Hansard 1987, Vol. 123, Col. 820)

statement which emphasised the part to be played by the NC and NT in providing market information to influence parental choice, and which clearly indicated the intent to control teachers' actions within the Right's policy and intentions;

Instead of a system which seeks to obscure everyone's ability for fear that the less able will lose out, we shall have a much franker and more stimulating environment where success is recognised and measured. Instead of hiding the examination results of all schools so that no one can point to indifferent results, we shall see schools competing to persuade parents that standards of individuals schools are the highest available. Teachers will be judged against the background of facts that relate to their schools and their performance. The more generalised, the more cosy and less accountable days are over, in education as in many other aspects of British performance.

Accountability would be assessed on objective measurements, which required no recognition of social factors. Not only would success be measured so to, therefore, would failure. The less able would be identifiable, and their performance as less able measured and made clear for all to see. There would almost inevitably be concomitant psychological consequences of low self-esteem and labelling. Further, schools would not wish to have failures in their midst as this would indicate that standards were low.

Prior to 1988, consultation with educationalists over the development of the NC was, on the whole, made ineffective as the influence of partners was reduced and evaluating bodies such as the School's Council were removed. The DES (1987) consultation document was more of a mechanism for the Right to inform parents and public what their reforms were to be. Right-wing Conservative MP Pawsey (1987 Hansard, Vol. 118, Col. 566), a member of the Commons 'Education, Science and Arts Select Committee' (ESASC), stressed that;

...the national curriculum should ensure that school time - teachers' and pupils' time - is concentrated on what are increasingly seen as the more important subjects and to the detriment of more peripheral studies. A greater concentration on those subjects will benefit children when they leave school because they will be able to use them in their adult working lives...The national curriculum should reflect the needs of an industrial-based society and the recognition that, in an increasing technological world, our young people must be trained in the subjects that they will use in the outside world

This view laid stress on a subject based curriculum with defined priority areas, and had clear implications for the status and provision of physical education. In the absence of any opposition this statement signalled how the NC would be. The NC was to be introduced with clear, set, right-wing aims. SoS Baker (see Baker 1993: p192) outlined the five main objectives in his NC 'Blue Print' as setting standards of knowledge, providing teachers with clear and precise work objectives, ensuring information to parents on pupil progress, ensuring national continuity and to help teachers concentrate on getting the best from all pupils. This embodied the political intentions outlined by the Right prior to 1979 and up to 1986. Significantly, teachers were to be viewed as agents not as autonomous professionals, there to implement a curriculum devised to achieve outcomes identified by central government (see Appendix G: p55).

1988 to 1992

The Right had established the conditions for the imposition of their education policies. The 'step-by-step' softening-up' of opposition had been achieved through a series of ideological (symbolic) and legislative (material) measures. The ground had been prepared for the ERA in 1988 and right-wing education policy could be espoused and implemented more openly. A mass of legislation followed;

1989 revised ITT criteria Circ. 24/89, 1989 INSET Circ. 20/89, 1989 Audit Commission on LEAs, 1990 SoS makes appraisal compulsory, 1990 GEST [training grants], 1991 School Teachers' Review Body on Pay and Conditions, 1991 Circ. 12/91 Appraisal phased in with Statuary Regulations, 1991 School Teachers' Pay and Conditions Act, 1992 More school based ITT, Circ. 9/92 new CATE guidance, 1992 STRB Report, 1992 Education (Schools) Act, 1993 Dearing, 1993 Bill to remove LEA powers, 1993 HMI Changes.

Up to 1988 the Right's education policies followed a 'step-by-step' development, 'softening-up' opposition both inside and outside education. 1988 saw the culmination of the Right's ideological attack on education and the ascendancy of a right-wing hegemony which 'guaranteed' the implementation of the ERA. The ERA established a new power structure in education which privileged the Right at the centre of government. It allowed the Right to outline its definition of education, and influence public expectations. In so doing it also defined the government's educational responsibilities, set in Law by the ERA to act as a framework of control. The ERA introduced, amongst other initiatives, the NC and NT, Local Management of Schools (LMS) and Grant Maintained Status for schools (GMS), as well as detailing the power and financial responsibilities of governing bodies.

The ERA provided a legislative framework with which to control education. It gave the SoS the right to impose market principles and a NC on schools, and allowed Ministers of Education the opportunity to become more involved in policy construction and implementation. It allowed the SoS to delineate priority areas and concomitant allocation of resources. It also gave the SoS the power to change the legislation and to control the actions and policy of individual schools. The establishment of the National Curriculum Council (NCC) and the School's Examination and Assessment Council (SEAC) would be the only check on the authority of the SoS. However, these two bodies, created by the ERA to replace SCDC and SEC, were appointed by the SoS to consult on recommendations, as instructed by the SoS. The Right now, it seemed, had the ability to define the purpose of education and to influence its form, content and teaching methods. Prescription at the macro level of education legislation, however, could not guarantee the implementation of education policies at the micro level. Further controls over the actions of teachers was necessary (see Appendix G: p62).

The National Curriculum

The construction of the NC took place prior to the ERA legislation of 1988. It was led by the TGAT which had been established to develop the NC's ATs and PoS⁷. The NC structure which it designed endorsed a clear subject hierarchy and seemed to take little notice of educational research evidence. The curriculum 'framework' was then 'filled' by WGs appointed for each NC subject. These WGs were heavily constrained by the Right's ideological directives and by legislation which set limits to the resources available for education (Bowe, Ball and Gold 1992, Graham and Tytler 1993, Evans, Penney and Bryant 1993b, Evans and Penney 1995b: p28). Minister for Education Rumbold (1989 Hansard Vol. 164, wa. 200) stated that the development of the national curriculum "...will be achieved largely by the redirection of existing resources". Additional resources for education were to come from the existing Rate Support Grant.

The Right's rhetoric continued to stress the needs of industry and commerce in wealth creation. It insisted that skills had to be tailored more to the requirements of the economy (see Maples, 1988 Hansard, Vol. 130, Col. 383). The NC was to be the centre piece of the Government's educational reforms (Politics Today No. 10, 1990: p261). It would force closer links between education and industry, with the latter having a more prominent place in curriculum development. National Testing (NT) was to make schools more accountable to those requirements. Testing to the ATs was to establish if pupils had learned what the WGs had decided they were expected to know by ages 7, 11, 14, and 16. In effect the NC and NT were intended to control education and provide the benchmarks and information required by the 'economy'. Indeed, publishing information about a school's success in what SoS Clarke (1990 Hansard, Vol. 180, Col. 480) called 'a sensible range of subjects with clear, set aims and objectives', required measurement of success to allow the reporting of the standards achieved to the consumer. The Government's White Paper 'Education and Training for the Twenty First Century' set out plans "...to give Britain for the first time, a fully integrated system of education and training - from school through further and higher education, to training and work" (PT No. 8, 1991: p130). These initiatives (legislated measures) provided a cover to justify further central control of education and had little to do with the needs of the economy.

LMS

Local Management of Schools (LMS) transferred a school's budget spending from the LEA to the governors. It constituted a key mechanism in the 'two way shift' of authority and power from LEAs as schools were forced into the market place. Under LMS schools would be resourced through formula funding based on subject and pupil 'weighting' (DES Circular 7/88). Inevitably market forces were to become a central factor in governors' decisions on educational matters. LMS thus sought to significantly reduced the role of LEAs while making the schools responsible for the success, or otherwise, of education provision. However, governors were not given

⁷ It is important to emphasise that, through TGAT, assessment led the development of the NC. The framework set by ATs and PoS is therefore viewed as a 'mechanism' intended to constrain the actions of teachers. It is acknowledge that greater attention could have been given to an investigation of assessment as a central tenet of the NR/RR's hegemonic project. However, neither word limit nor a refined focus on physical education policy allowed such an analysis to play a central role in this thesis.

complete autonomy over educational or financial decisions. DES Circular 7/88 stated that, under LMS, the annual expenditure of both the LEA and schools were to be published. There was to be accountability through responsibility. The obligation was on schools to cater for the priority areas (see chapter one: footnote five) defined by central government (DES Circ. 5/88). The right's rhetoric claimed that LMS aimed "...to make schools more responsive to their clients - parents, pupils, the local community and employers" (DES Circular 7/88). The needs of employers and parents would be met through more and clearer certification. Control over the use of resources was thus to remain firmly in the hands of the government.

The delegation of budgets to schools represented a key element of the Government's overall policy to improve the quality of teaching and learning in schools (PT No. 10, 1990: p269). However, schools had first to implement government policy if they were to secure resources at all. SoS Clarke's commented that:

It is important to have a formula distribution of the money based on pupils and that we do not accept the existing costs of schools...We should not shrink from adopting a formula for the allocation of funds based on the number of pupils because it means that the future growth of money depends on the ability of a school to attract funds (1990 Hansard, Vol. 193, Col. 246).

Schools had to adopt Government priorities or suffer financial penalties. DES Circular 7/91 outlined that LMS was also intended as a measure to tighten schools spending through formula funding:

LMS is one of the most significant reforms of the Education Reform Act (the Act). LMS allocates resources to schools on a fairer and more open basis and gives schools greater autonomy in the management of resources (DES Circular 7/91: para 2).

Again the shift of power was away from LEAs, with the legislation establishing that they should hold no more than ten per cent of educational resources for administrative expenses. By 1992 Education Minister Forth (Hansard, Vol. 210, wa. 233) indicated that LMS had worked in obliging schools to provide education in line with government wishes;

LMS has ensured that schools are funded mainly on the basis of their success in recruiting pupils - the more pupils they attract, the more money they get. In this way, LMS has given schools a strong incentive to be responsive to parents and rewards good school.

'Good schools' were those which already met the Right's criteria. At the same time Forth also recognised that LMS shifted power away from the LEAs to schools, making them more accountable. A whole series of legislation had, by 1990, shifted control of education to the centre and divided provision into small groups or individual units (schools) competing for limited resources to ensure their survival in the market place. Competition had to take place within a value framework set by the Conservative Right. The fragmentation of collective opposition to government reform

created the circumstances to allow the Right to impose even more radical and ideological policy on education, and so, on society.

School Governors

The Right still needed to gain greater control over education at the local level. Schools needed to be constrained into making the 'right' decisions within the 'freedoms' given to them under LMS. DES Circular 14/89 highlighted that schools were to publish information on curriculum and assessment that would be useful to users in an annual report, or 'prospectus', with information of exam results, teachers roles, the syllabus, the NC and NT, with the following year's curriculum information to be outlined in advance. Governors were a vital mechanism in this endeavour and the Right were striving to attract the 'right' people to that role. In 1990 SoS MacGregor (DES News 18 Cot 1990) stated that;

By becoming governors, local business men and women can bring skills to the governing body which are invaluable, and can help to ensure that the education and training which is provided for our young people is both of high quality and relevant to the needs of business.

The intention of having an education system working to serve the requirements of industry were reiterated by Minister for Education Eggar (DES News 373/90, 16 Nov. 1990) in a press release entitled 'Business need a properly educated workforce'. Both press releases emphasised the importance to industry of TVEI and other technical input into the curriculum and qualifications gained from schooling. Governors were to push industry's requirements to a greater extent than before.

The pressure on schools to secure resources through per capita funding was emphasised in DES Circular 9/91 with the legal requirement for all schools to publish their examination results. The circular indicated, clearly, that testing was intended to provide information for both the market and political statistics and to control provision and practice;

How its pupils perform in public examinations is a key indicator of how well any school is doing in meeting its duties. Making such information readily accessible as soon as practicable on a consistent basis is essential: to inform both the choices made by the clients of the education service and the decision made by its managers at all levels. (DES Circular 9/91)

The lowly status of physical education in relation to academic subjects was again endorsed by this statement. Clearly the priority areas identified by the Government were to be the focus of provision.

HMI

HMI were seen by the Right as a central force for restructuring or removing bodies that had the potential to critique government objectives. HMI was to be used as a body which not only worked to improve teaching quality but also to control teachers' actions (ASI 1985: p274). By 1991 these ideological intentions had become more overt. Burchill (CPS 1991: p12) wrote that HMI should report directly to the SoS on

the collecting of objective statistical information, both to make all areas of education accountable and to provide information to parents for market choice. Burchill stated that HMI should ensure quality based on value for money, and prevent any form of socialist interference in education. In this view progressivism in education was left wing, wasted money and lowered standards. HMI, prior to this, were seen as part of the subversive education establishment. Thus, from 1992 the HMI were persistently attacked by the Right. Subsequent legislation radically altered its structure, membership and responsibilities. HMI was replaced by OFSTED, an appointed body, in 1992/3.

By the 1990s the Right had gained control of education through a 'step-by-step', 'softening-up' of the opposition, both outside and inside education, for the purpose of manipulating it to serve their ends. Boyson's (1991 Hansard, Vol. 195, Col. 683-4) remarked;

Over the last twelve years, the Government have tried to get to grips with education problems; yet somehow, the education establishment has constantly eluded us. For the first time, we have now brutally taken the whip hand to ensure that what we want done will indeed be done.

Education was to be prominent in the transformation and reproduction of capitalist arrangements in the UK at the end of the twentieth century.

End Note

My argument is that the Right constructed a 'crisis' in education which was alleged to be a threat to national stability and security. In their endeavour to shift public expectation to both support and demand right-wing solutions, the Right needed to construct an opposition within education as the cause of 'crisis'. This opposition then became the target of right-wing ideological attacks. My assertion is that a 'real' opposition then emerged in the shape of teachers' industrial action. Policy in the period of 1979 to 1988 centred primarily on restructuring education. The market in education divided local sites of collective action through the introduction of direct competition for 'consumers' and so resources. This suggests a complex and inextricable interlinking of the manipulation of symbolic and material resources in the Right's endeavour to control education, seeking to make it serve narrow right-wing interests.

Appendix G

Appendix G - Reform and Control of Teaching Practices and Teacher Education

Contents:	Page
Proem	55
RR Intent	55
1979 to 1986	57
1986 to 1988	61
1988-1992	63
The Discourse and Arguments of RR MPs	67
The Effects of Reform: Deskillling the Profession	68
End Note	70

Proem

To make education serve the requirements of capital (see chapter three: p98), the RR needed to gain control of its form, content and the method of its delivery. To control education, the RR knew that they had to 'control' teachers' actions and have them work as agents rather than professionals. This was an imperative if the RR were to be able to impose their ideology on and through education. However, achieving such control required a progressive undermining of the teaching profession.

RR Intent

During the 1960s and 1970s Higher Education (HE) was encouraging teachers to critique the educational values in 'traditional' policies and to challenge or adapt them. This developing professional autonomy gave teachers the ability to critique centrally devised policy and turn it into worthwhile educational experiences (see Lawton 1980: p32, Kirk 1986). The RR knew this had to be stopped if policies which served capital were to be implemented effectively. Former RR Cabinet member Gilmour (1992: p174) explained that the RR's aim was firstly to dismantle teachers' status by attacking them on the basis of poor standards, then reconstruct the teaching force in the way it wanted. In 1972, while SoS for Education, Margaret Thatcher outlined her intentions for teacher training;

The goal is no less than building a body of teachers well prepared. Academically, to sustain confidently the formidable task to which they are called: to guide each generation of children into full appreciation of our culture, to enhance the intellectual abilities to the highest standard of which each is capable, and to develop their practical and human skills so that each child may be enabled to make his or her maximum contribution to the health, wealth and harmony of a democratic society (cited in Tomlinson 1993: p109).

This statement is underpinned by right-wing ideological intentions. It embodied the rhetoric which was to form the basis of the wider hegemonic project of the 1980s (see chapter four: p130).

The priorities of capital were at the core of RR policy (see chapter four: p116). The RR intended that schools would function to transmit and inculcate capitalist requirements. This necessitated central directives and controls on education. Content based on the 'capital' requirements of institutions outside education was to be devised at the centre (see Apple 1990: p60). There was also a need for statistics to show 'efficiency' in education for political purposes (see Lawton 1989: p47). These 'political' statistics would need a national system of simple testing based on age related 'norms' of achievement. Educational outcomes could then be measured against centrally devised criteria which set a checklist of parameters based on the rhetoric of national requirements (see Lawton 1989: p19). This would also measure teachers' performance. Teachers were thus required to become agents of a technicist system of transmission and assessors of pupils' assimilation of utilitarian content. The RR desired to disempower teachers to prevent them applying educational critique to central directives and either changing them or including their own input (see Archer 1984: p111). Teachers were not required to evaluate central initiatives and they were to do less in terms of curriculum development. This would 'ensure' both traditional

input and methods (see Halpin 1997), and marginalise progressive developments. Tomlinson (1993: p3) argues that central controls placed on teacher training are "...the most sensitive litmus paper of all to indicate how much those in authority really care about the education of the people". From 1979 the RR endeavoured to control both initial teacher education and constrain teachers' actions.

Teachers were attacked as the cause of Britain's economic and moral crisis and so decline. Right wing populist attacks sought to devalue and alienate teachers by portraying them as incompetent, politically motivated, left-wing subversives who were forcing standards down through levelling to the lowest ability (see Black Papers). The rhetoric was of the need to make teachers more accountable both politically and financially. This laid the foundations of justification for central controls and change⁸. It also formed the basis for an attack on teacher *education* which was, according to Joseph the 'chief source of pollution' (Letwin 1992: p 239). To put it another way, the chief source of critique and therefore opposition. As we see below, throughout the period of 1979 to 1992 the Right interlinked ideological attacks on teachers with legislative reforms to initial teacher education (ITE), defined by the Right as 'initial teacher *training*' (ITT)⁹. The changes to be made in teacher *training* were to be radical (Thatcher 1993: p597). Thatcher was concerned that education should be the transmission and learning of 'facts', with no need for sociological and psychological concessions. Her intention was to take initial teacher training (ITT) away from HE through a system of apprenticeships, founded on populist RR rhetoric;

I also believed that too many teachers were less competent and more ideological than their predecessors. I distrusted the new 'child centred' teaching techniques, the emphasis on imaginative engagement rather than learning facts and the modern tendency to blur the lines of definable entities like 'humanities'. And I knew from parents, employers and pupils themselves that too many people left schools without a basic knowledge of reading, writing and arithmetic (Thatcher 1993: p590).

Control of teachers is possible through the combination of centrally prescribed educational aims and content, the defined use of limited resources and accountability for the achievement of central aims. The aim is to make teachers implement central policy which inculcates conformity to political ideology, rather than to educate individuals (Kirk 1986: p76). Despite their opposition, teachers' ability to resist 'top-down' imposition is constrained both by legislative tools and ideological tools which set parameters to possible agency (see Apple 1989: p15). During interview Professor Tomlinson (Warwick University) argued that schooling can be used to educate individuals democratically or to control them by limiting their education. He argued that the RR sought to de-power people through anti-democratic measures in education. To allow for the control of education the NR/RR's ultimate aim was to undermine the power and influence of the teaching unions (see Thatcher 1993, Baker 1993). The endeavour was to undermine support for teachers to allow a 'step-by-step' implementation of reform.

⁸ As we see below, financial accountability was itself a form of covert political control where cuts in resources undermined teachers' ability to meet the standards set by the RR, justifying greater central controls to disempower teachers further.

⁹ Redefining *education* as *training* was highly significant in terms of a change from professionalism to proletarianism.

1979 to 1986

From 1979 the curriculum and administration arrangements for teacher education were the first things to be controlled more tightly by the RR (Tomlinson 1993: p3). The ideological impetus behind change was evident in the attacks made on teacher education in parliamentary debates. These began as soon as the RR gained power. The objective in the RR's rhetoric was to raise standards, which was claimed to require raising the quality of teachers and teacher training (Carlisle 1979 Hansard, Vol. 967, Col 225, Boyson 1979, Hansard Vol. 972, Col. 179). Change would increase the practical skills of teaching, which would encourage both work and discipline in pupils, and do away with 'socialist fads' and educational theory in ITT (Greenway 1979 Hansard, Vol. 970, Col. 1123, Forman 1979 Hansard, Vol. 980, Col. 223). Boyson's (1979, Hansard Vol. 982, Col. 1153) assertion that "Teachers have within their hands the training of the young" indicates that controlling teachers was a crucial aim for the RR.

When he became SoS in 1981, Joseph's political statements echoed the claims made by the ideological Right previous to 1979. He indicated that the way to raise educational achievement was through improving the quality and skills of teachers, not through increased spending on education (PT No. 20, 1981: p378). Joseph highlighted that improvements would come through a higher quality of entrants to ITT and through focusing on areas identified as priorities by the Right. Limiting the resources available to education would prevent the development of 'progressive' practices. Joseph asserted that teachers who did not use traditional methods were wasting scarce resources which was undermining the economic base of the country. Alternative teaching methods were to be stopped and progressive teachers removed. The emphasis was on 'traditional' methods and content, with a vocational slant. Minister for Education (MfE) Robert Dunn (1981 Hansard, Vol. 2, Col. 647) insisted that "It is important that the industrial moguls in our society should be brought into the school at an early opportunity". More liberal educationalists argued that, if implemented, such an approach would negate the findings of years of research into learning theory and 'child centred' education (see Apple 1982, CCCS 1981). Nonetheless, over the next ten years ITE was to undergo a catalogue of changes which together undermined stability and curtailed research and development (Robertson 1994: p12).

Boyson (PT No. 12, 1982: p213) undermined progressive developments, claiming that quality in education meant tradition and that "...traditional teaching methods practised with confidence win the respect of pupils". The emphasis on traditional methods and content was aimed to change educationalists' philosophy and attitudes away from progressive methods to the embodiment of a curriculum serving capitalist requirements. The populist rhetoric justifying the need for changes to teacher education was outlined by Joseph's (1982 Hansard, Vol. 16, wa 103) declaration that;

Whatever the difficulties, and I know that they are great, we shall be failing in our duty to the children and their parents on the one hand, and to the taxpayers and ratepayers and all who work or seek to work in a trading base on the other, if we keep ineffective teachers in the schools or employ more teachers than we can afford.

Significantly, Joseph (1982, Hansard Vol. 39, Col. 540) indicated that the first priority was to improve the arrangements for ITT. The White Paper 'Teaching Quality' (DES 1983) was an initial bid to gain control of ITT. When enacted it gave the government the power to approve or reject ITT courses through the 'Accreditation Council for the Selection and Education of Teachers' (ACSET). Its reference point was centrally devised, with explicit criteria defining how teacher 'training' was to be. The White Paper outlined the Right's intention to differentiate ITT within existing resources to ensure a 'better fit' between qualifications and the subject taught. ITT was to have more practical input, less theory and a greater concentration on discipline and classroom management. Discipline was not only to be exercised over pupils but also, as Joseph (1983 Hansard Vol. 39, Col. 541) indicated, over teachers;

The schools depend crucially on the professional skill and commitment of the teachers. The Government believe that the White Paper provides a sound basis for enabling the teachers in our schools to serve their pupils as the nation, and they themselves, would wish.

The objective of turning teachers into agents of capitalist requirements can be seen in the intentions of 'Teaching Quality' (DES 1983: p8);

Qualification and training alone do not make a teacher. Personality, character and commitment are as important as the specific knowledge and skills that are used in the day to day tasks of teaching. Good teachers need to have mastery of the subject matter they teach and the professional skills needed to teach it to children of different ages, abilities, aptitudes and backgrounds. But they also need those skills which are necessary for the effective performance of their role outside the classroom in the social and corporate life of the school, and in relation to parents and community.

Further controls were put in place with the appointment of the 'Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education' (CATE), replacing ACSET in 1984. CATE scrutinised existing ITT courses and had the authority to assess and approve new ITT courses within a remit set out by the SoS. This laid the foundation for the control of ITT. The ideological aims were reiterated in MfE Robert Dunn's (1985 Hansard Vol. 77, wa 11) statement that CATE criteria for approval of ITT courses was to ensure that courses;

...include the requirement that students should be given an understanding of the type of society in which pupils are growing up and of the relationship between the adult world and what is taught in schools. In particular, they should be equipped to help pupils acquire understanding of the values of a free society and its economic and other foundations.

There was also a drive to reduce the provision of the four year BEd. and replace it with the one year PGCE in the majority of subjects (Waldegrave 1982, Hansard Vol. 31, wa 114). Education Minister Peter Brooke (1983, Hansard Vol. 45, wa 72) claimed that "...it is normally the postgraduate-trained teacher who has the subject expertise which is the best foundation for confident teaching at secondary level".

The possibility of developing educational reforms as 'child centred' practices through In-service courses (INSET) was also to be controlled, primarily through financial constraint. Joseph had already indicated that there was no need for more resources in teacher training, only for better use of existing amounts. LEAs were given the responsibility for providing INSET training on centrally approved and resourced courses. These were in areas which the government designated as priorities (Joseph, 1982, Hansard Vol. 32, wa 20). Bidding for direct Educational Support Grants (ESGs) for INSET was limited to these specific priority areas (DES Circ. 3/84, 4/84, 6/84, 3/85, 5/85, 6/86). In 1985 MfE Chris Patten (Hansard, Vol. 96, wa 443) stated that it was the job of LEAs to provide INSET within the curricular aims and objectives set out in the White Paper 'Better Schools' (DES 1985). Thus, accountable objectives were set, with Local Authorities responsible for their achievement within resource limitations which severely limited the possibility of these objectives being met. This continual referral to the LEAs' responsibility to provide ITT and INSET educational services made them accountable while removing responsibility and accountability from central Government.

ITE had been instrumental in developing educational knowledge and understanding, with INSET as the most effective method of both disseminating and critiquing new initiatives among practising teachers. Reduced resources led to a reduction both in the effectiveness of ITE and the number of LEA Advisors responsible for INSET courses (Bevan and Hickman 1990, Rose 1986, PEA 1987). Not only that, Government policy changed the role of LEA Advisors / Inspectors from a body concerned with educational and professional development to a body concerned with assessing practice. Their role of "...planning, organising, delivering and evaluating in-service..." provision was transformed to the "...systematic monitoring, evaluation, inspecting and reporting..." of teacher effectiveness (Bevan and Hickman 1990: p12-13, see Evans and Penney 1994: p532). At a time of massive reform in education it would appear that both ITE and INSET should have been a priority.

As well as direct controls over ITT and INSET, the combination of legislated reform, overload, constraint over resourcing, centralisation, prescription and TVEI¹⁰ implementation (see Appendix F: p37-43), which all effected practice, there was a parallel and continuing attack on teachers' abilities and motives, and their alleged waste of limited resources during economic recession. The ideological Right's insistence that teachers were to be, or become the 'right' kind of people (PT No. 3, 1984: p41) found voice in 'Better Schools'. It stated that the government wanted committed and orderly teachers, using the 'right' methods with the 'right' content, and that industrial experience was to be part of ITT (DES 1985: p44). There was an assertion by the Right that teachers should have wider experience than teaching, greater experience of industry and commerce, more training 'on the job' and less input of educational theory (ASI 1985: p279). Such policies seemed to call for an end to previous endeavours to make teaching an all graduate profession.

Another method of controlling teachers within the prescribed right-wing criteria and parameters was to couple pay with the achievement of standards set by the Right. To this end, SoS Joseph (1984 Hansard Vol. 60, wa 1332) was determined to

¹⁰ The introduction of TVEI through the MSC not only acted to overload teachers, it also reallocated a proportion of the limited educational resources.

link payment to assessment of professionalism, standards and performance in examinations. The salary structure was to be reviewed with the setting up of a working party to look into 'performance related pay'. Joseph (PT No. 3 1985: p49) indicated that;

To my mind it is an absolute requirement that we develop arrangements for the regular appraisal of the professional performance of each individual teacher.

Such policy, coupled with overload, cuts in resourcing and specific duties and responsibilities, meant that appraisal on the Right's terms - linked to pay - would lead to problems with the unions over 'bargaining rights'. This was made certain with Joseph's (1985 Hansard Vol. 79, wa 446) insistence that salary increases would only be available if teachers agreed to government objectives and contracts. Discipline and excellence were to be achieved through differentiation (i.e. more selection in the system) and the introduction of appraisal (Hillgate Group 1986: p6, NTBG 1986: p8). Legislation and the loss of autonomy led to the breakdown of any worthwhile negotiations between the government and the teaching unions (Lawrence 1992: p8). The effect was that teachers had less and less control over curriculum development decisions. The need and opportunity for teachers to think about the issues in education were reduced.

Despite RR claims, teachers had never had control over the definition of educational objectives nor the allocation of resources (Apple 1989: p15, Apple 1993: p118). Their autonomy consisted of the possibilities set by the institutional parameters within which they worked. Despite evidence to the contrary (see Frater 1994a) the RR insisted that HMI Reports showed substandard educational outcomes due to poor teaching and poor discipline (PT No. 3 1985). This attack paved the way for the RR to impose changes to make teachers more accountable. The RR's centralising of control over the curriculum and setting of externally imposed standards of 'expected' outcome, sought to reduce autonomy further and control teachers through the standardisation of provision (Dale 1989: p134). Financial control, through ESGs for specific RR priorities, was concerned more with controlling form and content than with long-term educational issues. Simple political statistics to fuel the market required teaching and testing measurable 'facts'. This functional testing would disempower teachers (Apple 1993: p122). The opportunity to provide progressive input was diminished as RR 'standards' required short term reproduction of 'facts', with efficiency based on economic accountability.

Knight (1990: p177) indicated that the offensive on teachers and teacher training was pitched at a moral level where teachers unions were portrayed as 'the enemy within'. This was evident in the NTBG's (1985: p10) assertion that;

Some teachers find it easier to spout their political prejudices to their charges than to make the intellectual effort to master a real subject, let alone to teach it.

The ASI (1985: p279) wanted teachers to have experience outside education, with 'on-the-job' training free from 'theory'. It proclaimed that;

...teachers of art, physical education, and certain other subjects do not necessarily need to be graduates even when teaching at secondary school level:

but it is clearly desirable that they should have appropriate qualifications in their own specialist subject (ASI 1985: p280).

Teachers were thus to disseminate specific subject knowledge. No understanding of educational theory meant that it would not impinge on teachers' delivery of the centrally devised curriculum.

1986 to 1988

The reforms made to ITT by SoS Joseph prior to 1986 laid the foundations for more resolute reforms by new SoS Baker from 1986. As teachers' powers were progressively eroded the ideological intentions of the NR/RR became more vociferous and policy became more radical. Teachers and ITT were attacked more vehemently on the grounds of ideological differences.

The RR (Hillgate Group 1986: p8) aimed to bind teachers into contracts which laid down specific duties and responsibilities. Contracts would obligate teachers to use 'traditional' methods and content, to achieve discipline and excellence through differentiation and to introduce appraisal (NTBG 1986: p6). Developments within education had been working against such practices, and resistance through strong teacher unions and LEAs was assured. This illustrates the RR's priority of undermining union power and dismantling the influence of LEAs and HE. The IEA indicated that ITT departments focusing on discipline and control, a spiritual input and more practical training should be expanded, while those teaching educational theory should be closed (Sexton 1987: p20-21). Rather than have student teachers discuss educational practices and experiences in university, they were to be kept busy in schools, free from the clutches of the 'loony' educationalists. Linking ITT directly to the needs of capital, Pawsey (1986 Hansard Vol. 91, Col. 668) argued that;

..it seems that there is a need for a shift in teacher training so that teachers are more exposed to the demands of the factory and the office and have a better understanding of the requirements of modern business. The syllabus and the ethos of teacher training colleges should reflect a greater understanding of the needs of industry.

However, this rhetoric of industrial needs can be viewed as a rhetorical tool to justify greater central controls.

Increasing central controls were acting to de-professionalise teachers by forcing accountability to prescribed criteria. They were overloaded by legislation and alienated by populist attacks. Identifying teachers as the cause of crisis 'justified' tighter controls. Teachers were thus subject to two direct attacks, firstly through the wider 'union-bashing' at Local Authority level, and secondly through changes to education which saw the role of teaching unions diminished (Lawrence 1992: p8). The ideological attacks, coupled with central controls over resource use and the 'regulation' of ITE and INSET, inevitably led to conflict between the government and teachers unions in the mid 1980s. It can be viewed that the RR's methods were organised and employed to deliberately create confrontation and industrial action, which undermined the teachers' position and, so, justified greater central controls (see Whitty 1990: p315). Indeed, strike action appeared to match the Right's rhetorical

representations of teachers espoused prior to 1986. The strikes fuelled the Right's assertions that teaching unions were politically motivated, intent on left wing ends which were damaging children's education (Greenway Hansard 1985 Vol. 76, Col. 1416, Joseph H 1985 79, 841, Joseph 1985 H 81, 756, Joseph H 1985 82, 856, Joseph H 1985 89, 141, Carlisle, 1986, Hansard Vol. 90, Col. 520). They gave the Right the opportunity to wrest further control from teachers and impose more radical reform. MfE Howarth (1986, Hansard, Vol. 90, Col. 530) claimed that teachers had;

...responded by abdicating responsibility and undermining the principle of authority, which is profoundly damaging to our children's education. It tempts one to the conclusion that education is too fragile and precious to be left to the educationalists.

While MfE, Rumbold (1986 Hansard Vol. 107, Col. 109), justified the need for more central control with reference to national stability and security;

The standard and quality of education in our schools to a large extent depends upon the teachers. They are very important people, not only in respect of the quality of their pupils but for the future development of our political and social life. They are also important in the economic development of the country

The Right sought to remove the dominating role of the National Union of Teachers (NUT) from the Burnham Committee¹¹ (PT No. 3 1985: p49). Joseph (1986 H Vol. 73, Col. 843) claimed that Burnham was failing and needed to be by-passed. After initial restructuring by Joseph, Baker removed the Burnham Committee and replaced it with an Interim Advisory Committee (IAC) on teachers pay. His rhetoric claimed that selfish bigots (teachers) were causing a national 'crisis' in education (Baker 1987 Hansard, Vol. 111, Col. 475). Like Thatcher, his intent was to undermine and marginalise the role of the unions (Baker 1993: p172). Baker repealed the 1965 Remuneration of Teachers Act, which he explained "...in effect removed all negotiating rights for pay and conditions from the teacher unions" (Baker 1993: p174). Teachers' 'rights' were now defined as 'duties' and 'responsibilities'. The possibility for improvements in levels of pay was conditional on teachers accepting contracts which enforced their duties and responsibilities (1987, Hansard Vol. 106, Col. 437). Teachers had no choice but to accept the conditions laid down by the IAC. The Right, it seemed, had gained an important victory.

With the reduction of union powers and the loss of bargaining rights, the way was now open for a much wider and more radical restructuring of the teaching profession. CATE was again set the task of monitoring and approving ITT and INSET courses for the allocation of direct grants (DES Circ 3/86, DES 1987: p28). MoE Butcher (H 1988, 140, 167) indicated that the Training Agency and the Department of Trade and Industry were to play a larger part in educational matters. Baker (1993: p247) wanted a further shift from 'obscure and elaborate' theory and more practical training with a shortened BED. He stressed that ITT was fundamental to the production of a teaching force able to implement the forthcoming NC. CATE was

¹¹ The Burnham Committee was a body set up by the '1965 Remuneration of Teachers Act' to negotiate teacher's salaries. It was made up of representatives from the LEAs, teaching unions and central government.

given further, more detailed criteria with which to reassess ITT and INSET courses within NC requirements. Baker (1988, Hansard Vol. 125, wa 630) outlined that;

This arrangement will allow fuller account to be taken of the teacher requirements of the national curriculum in light of the programmes of study for the core and foundation subjects which may be recommended by subject working groups as and when they are established.

The TGAT was appointed, according to Baker (1987, Hansard Vol. 123, Col. 774), to raise standards and confidence in teachers and in the education system. In other words, to bring teachers within the expectations and demands set for the public by the RR. This point was more clearly explained in DES Circ 5/89 which highlighted that assessment at Key Stages was to assist with monitoring, with pupils results used as a measure in teacher appraisal. By 1987, teachers remuneration was changed, union 'rights' were diminished, duties and responsibilities were fixed through contracts, performance became publicly accountable, the LEAs role was reduced, ITT was restructured and HE input was constrained. This victory for the Right was consolidated further with the continued reduction of teachers' autonomy through the forthcoming ERA legislation.

1988-1992

The ERA legislated for the appraisal of teachers' performance. By setting standards, benchmarks of achievement and teaching objectives, the NC and NT acted to control curriculum content and constrain teaching while shifting responsibility for provision from central government to schools. Testing to benchmarks fuelled appraisal and greatly increased teachers accountability. The NC prescription of content and assessment presaged uniformity and conformity throughout England and Wales. This, combined with the massive demands of implementing change, ensured that the opportunities for teachers to exercise professional autonomy, skills and judgements were reduced (Apple 1993: p121, Appleby 1992: p33, Parafitt 1992, Demaine 1989: p5, 1993: p45). Nonetheless, the RR were determined to secure even more control over teachers and ITT (see Lawlor 1990).

The attack continued with claims that 'in-service' training was an 'imposture', with academics dreaming up pseudo-objective theories and jargon, claiming it to be valuable research in order to justify their own position (Lloyd Evans 1987: p51). The demand was for traditional knowledge and content (Lloyd Evans 1987: p51, Flew 1988: p15, Hillgate Group 1989: p19, O'Hear 1989: p21). The NR were advocating how and what education should be. NR education adviser Sheila Lawlor (1988b: p28) explained to parents what their expectations were;

There is no secret about what makes for a good and popular school: a strong head teacher with a clear sense of purpose, supported by parents and governors alike in the direction he wants to take the school; teachers who are keen and who provide the very best encouragement for their children to learn; good discipline and a character with which children can identify and which means that learning can take place in an ordered background; and schools which reinforce values which parents wish their children to have.

This outlined what schooling should be. The RR outlined what education should be. The Hillgate Group (1989: p1) asserted that 'good' education was "...the transmission of knowledge, cultural and moral values to the next generation", which required 'effective' teachers. Effective teachers were those who were able and willing to teach within the RR framework who had a "...commitment to real education, and to the survival of our country's knowledge, skills and culture" (Hillgate Group 1989: p1). In this view education functions to secure the interests of a capitalist economy. Butcher (1988, Hansard Vol. 140, Col. 167), outlined education's importance in fulfilling business and economic requirements;

Teacher training is the issue of the moment. It is our view that we should focus on the quality, relevance and practicality of training. We do not want the colleges to become playgrounds for behavioural scientists, and thankfully, the majority are not. This is a serious question that must be addressed as a matter of great priority.

The RR claimed that ITT was intellectually undemanding, and, with its self-serving ideological interest, harmful to teachers and pupils (Flew 1988: p13). The attack on ITT was encapsulated by O'Hear (1989: p21) with his claim that it was filled with ineffective progressive education where;

...candidates for teaching have to undergo unnecessary and often spurious studies in 'education'. Such studies are unnecessary because teaching is above all a practical skill, to be learned by doing, rather than by theoretical study...inculcating questionable and educationally subversive doctrines of equality, the very doctrines which are then, all too often, reinforced by professional 'advisors' and bureaucrats. Education is an achievement: and achievements cannot be granted equally, irrespective of merit.

For the RR education was inherently iniquitous (not all pupils can 'succeed'), and to prepare pupils for the social market, at the lowest financial cost.

The ideological attacks came thick and fast. A whole gamut of initiatives vilified ITT as a waste of time, indicating the requirement for an apprenticeship system which freed trainee teachers from procedures which exposed them to "...pretentious pseudo-subjects, uncomprehended smatterings, or shameless propaganda" (Hillgate Group 1989: p12). The Hillgate Group claimed that ITT was suited to an apprenticeship system which would prepare teachers for the correct implementation of the NC. This and the ERA were intended to;

...help undermine the power of the education establishment. It is this establishment which, by neglect and design, has done much over the last twenty years to spread unreason in the name of enlightenment, to encourage ignorance in the name of equality, to put political agitation in the place of knowledge, and often to conceal from the public the truth of what it has been doing (Hillgate Group 1989: p19-20).

Undermining ITT was a political imperative which was surrounded in ideological rhetoric espoused as 'common-sense' (Letwin 1990: p21). ITT was claimed to be a barrier to 'good' candidates - the 'right' candidates - and a system which undermined

the standards of those that entered, through forcing 1960s fashionable social theories instead of 'packages of knowledge' (Lawlor 1990). This argument began to dominate the parliamentary speeches and public statements of the RR MPs (Pawsey 1990, Hansard Vol. 180, Col. 511, Thompson 1991 Hansard Vol. 190, Col. 86). Education Minister Eggar (DES News 385/90) claimed that, with RR changes to ITT;

It is no longer possible to spend our time studying education theory. The four disciplines have disappeared [history of education, psychology of education, philosophy of education and the sociology of education]. There are few theorists still around. But they are being marginalised...The evidence is overwhelming that they [ITT courses] have changed in the direction we want.

The ERA and NC were intended to constrain practising teachers within RR parameters. According to Coombs (1987 Hansard Vol. 130, Col. 388)

The national curriculum will lay down a framework in which teachers will know what is expected of them - they will know the objectives to which they are expected to teach. That will provide the certainty necessary to the achievement of a good set of standards in education.

SoS Clarke (1991 Hansard Vol. 183, Col. 293) argued that appraisal would act as 'quality assurance', 'disciplining' teachers to carry out their duties 'effectively'. DES Circ. 12/91 highlighted that appraisal would be used in considering teachers for promotion. LMS was to be a key element in 'improving' the quality of teaching through 'per capita funding' which would act to control teachers' actions in relation to pay (PT No. 12 1990: p273). It was also intended to open the way for schools to hire 'Articled' and 'Licensed' teachers. Both Stuart Sexton and Rhodes Boyson had advocated an apprenticeship system to the Conservative Party in 1978 and regretted that the 'Licensed' and 'Articled' teaching schemes had taken over ten years to be implemented (interview). Both the NC and LMS helped to move ITT and INSET away from Higher Education. (Schools are now required to 'buy-in' in-service from the LEAs and HE, which was previously 'provided'.) The NC also, indirectly, placed further controls on ITT. The NCC (1992) explained that the introduction of the NC "...has helped to clarify the essential knowledge, understanding and skills which new teachers need to acquire and develop during initial training...". It set limits to what could be taught in ITT and reduced the opportunity for student teachers to engage in reflection and critique. Higher Education was to comply with the centrally set criteria for ITT. DES Circ. 9/92 stated that the purpose of these arrangements was "...to ensure that courses are suitable in preparation for teachers, in the context of the Government's policy objectives for schools".

The RR wanted schools to imbue capitalist values. Marsland (1991: p11) claimed that because "In Britain...the school's role as an institution for civilising barbarians has almost entirely been abandoned...", capitalist requirements of 'nationalism, order, territory, laws, freedom, democracy and liberal economics' were being undermined. In other-words, the transmission of right-wing ideology. The RR rhetoric of a 'moral crisis' undermining national stability was focused upon the teachers, who were allegedly undermining the role of education to discipline children and instil 'Victorian values and morals'. Letwin (1992: p259) indicated that;

The national curriculum was meant to put that right, by cutting through the fog of methodology which filled the teacher-training colleges, and installing a few simple and necessary goals at the heart of the education system.

This leaves little doubt that RR reforms to ITT were ideologically informed. This ideology was infused in the attack on teachers as left-wing subversives. Former MfE, Walden (1991 Hansard Vol. 195, Col. 701), in a long and damning defamation, claimed that educationalists were 'inbred' and lacked intelligence;

I have no faith in the education industry, as constituted, to take account of new ideas in education and to treat them with reserve. They are merely ideas and do not deserve to be immediately implemented and foisted on the impressionistic minds of young teachers who, sadly, are among the lowest achievers in terms of A levels...What is the effect of having hastily adapted and adopted theories of unproved substance as the basis of reports, then thrusting them on people who - lets us be frank - may not be of the highest intellectual calibre. Moreover, that is much more likely to damage their students than it is to aid them. The Government have much work to do to sort out the over-reliance on theory, transmitted and transmuted by people who are not of the first intellectual quality and in whose hands these theories are extremely dangerous.

The danger intimated was to the 'nation', however, the reality was a danger for the RR failing to achieve their narrow, utilitarian political and social objectives. The imperative for the RR was to remove 'half-baked' theory from education and replace it with teachers of 'good' character, competent in instilling 'moral leadership' (Marsland 1991: p11). In other words, teachers with 'capitalist moral character' who would instil the same in their charges. In that respect, RR MP Pawsey (1990 Hansard Vol. 175, Col. 901) determined to tell teachers how to teach;

Teaching is best achieved in a firm, disciplined framework, both at home and at school. When that framework is absent, chaos begins. We need to get back to some of the basics, both in teacher training and in the classroom...Over the past 25 years, teaching has suffered from too many experiments and too many theories. Too many proven methods have been scrapped, on the scantest of evidence, for the new fashions of the day, and children's education has suffered as a result.

Thus, in a parliamentary debate about ITT, there is little surprise that SoS Clarke's statement indicated that teacher preparation was a central plank of RR reform;

...it is extremely unlikely that I shall introduce at any stage a more significant step than the proposals that we are discussing today. We are addressing the most vital thing of all in considering the quality of our education service. The quality of the education that we give young people in our schools depends above all on the quality of the teaching profession that provides it (1991 Hansard, Vol. 190, Col. 34).

Since 1992 the RR has established a Teacher Training Agency to oversee ITT and INSET. The reduced autonomy for teachers has lessened the opportunity for them to

reflect on both policy and practice (see Evans 1996). In 1997 SoS Gillian Shephard announced plans for a National Curriculum for ITT (Hansard January 1997) which will, if implemented, introduce even greater central controls over the teaching profession.

The Discourse and Arguments of RR MPs

During interview all RR MPs and Advisors made scathing attacks on ITT. The underlying axiom was that teacher training should be taken out of the hands of higher education; that mastery of the subject should come first and that learning to teach was the practical ability to disseminate 'knowledge' with little need for understanding of learning theory or child development. Former Minister Angela Rumbold argued that it was the education system that failed teachers and pupils. In a seemingly both irrational and incoherent argument, she asserted that the system was 'silly', unrealistic and inadequate because it filled teachers heads with 'particularly silly educational philosophy' (interview). Her argument revealed the prejudice and ideological imperatives which were the cornerstone of much of the RR's policy in teacher training.

MP David Evennett (ESASC, PPS to Baroness Blatch) vilified ITT in a bigoted and misleading attack;

DE Teacher training colleges are filled with 'failed teachers'. Those who are really good at the job remain as teachers. All teacher educators do is remove the enthusiasm from young teachers. They do not enthuse and they do not revise their practice. They instil despondency and despair in young teachers. There is far too little time spent on 'in-school' practice. There is far too much theory and far too little practice of the practicalities of teaching. There must be a better balance of more 'on-the-job' learning.

He outlined his views;

DE What is essential is to rid teaching of the ethos of the teacher training colleges. It has done nothing but damage to teacher training. The mistake was that we left it too long. That should have been the very first thing we did to reform education. Not the last. It is fundamental to education that teachers are well-trained, enthusiastic and part of a professional team. What we find in the teaching profession is that it is full of individuals who were unable to get better forms of employment. They lack calibre, are not enthusiastic and more often than not are interested in peddling politics.

Much of the ideological underpinning and arrogance behind these views came from the writings of NR pressure groups (discussed above) and the parliamentary rhetoric of Rhodes Boyson, the powerhouse of RR education policy (see chapter five: p156). The danger here was that the teaching profession would, in the long term, become 'de-skilled'.

The Effects of Reform: Deskillling the Profession

The ERA legislation was intended to control education through the power of law. It was not primarily concerned with the quality of provision (Appleby 1992: p37). The NC was an attempt to reduce teacher autonomy through the prescription of content and assessment leading to uniformity and conformity. The role of teachers would be changed to that of agents as assessment for appraisal was central to market and political accountability. Ball (1990: p215) highlights that the ERA did more than set definite parameters for action;

... the ERA is not just about control over the definition of school knowledge. It is also about control over teachers and teachers' work. It rests upon a profound distrust of teachers and seeks to close down many of the areas of discretion previously available to them. In doing this it brings into being a massively over-determining system of education

The intent was that teachers would change from educators of children to implementors of the NC, with children's educational experiences falling within the requirement for national testing (Bowe, Ball with Gold 1992: p95).

LMS as part of the ERA was central in the RR's determination to control teachers. RR MP Evennett explained the role of LMS in ensuring that teachers worked within NC boundaries;

DE It is the job of the head and the governors to get rid of poor teachers. LMS allows them to do that. Yes, good teachers will get more work, but it is important for trainee teachers to be exposed to good teaching and experience it as part of school life. That will prepare them more thoroughly for the job than the theory of education at teacher training college. Students came out of college with masses of understanding of theory but not with the practical skills of actually doing the job. Most of what they learned in college was irrelevant. What teachers need to know is how to keep discipline, how to motivate a class, how to prepare lessons and get children through examinations. That is the practical aspect of teaching (interview).

This attack confirms the account illustrated by Bowe, Ball with Gold (1992: p162) that;

The interplay between cost analysis and measures of performance within the context of LMS also raises a variety of possibilities for the monitoring and control of teachers. From this point of view the LMS package can be seen as being as much disciplinary as it is administrative.

The NC and NT acted to impose a centrally controlled framework of 'authoritarian pedagogy' (Jones 1989: p133) which served the RR's narrow political interests. The intention was to overload the teaching profession and reduce the chance for the them to interpret reforms professionally. Coupled with that, in-service and Advisory services were dismantled. Kirk (1988a: p462-463) indicated that what is most important is the extent to which teachers' consciousness is structured, and thus "...how far teachers are able to recognise problems in their own practice and conceive

of possible solutions and alternatives". This was the very autonomy the RR were determined to prevent. RR MP Harry Greenway outlined that HE was;

HG ... A lot of 'dotty' left wing theory [which] does not contribute anything to it. In fact it can undermine peoples morale and confuse them

To successfully restructure teacher *training* it was imperative for the RR to impose its policies. Greenway outlined that such restructuring centred on 'on-the-job' ITT;

HG ...Teaching is really, mainly about doing the job. You learn to teach by doing it.... For that reason we are moving to a more practised based teacher education.

The RR aim to prevent autonomous, professional reflection through such restructuring was, to an extent, effective. Imposition of aims and content, based on technical rationality pressed ITT towards becoming a predetermined process of 'how' to achieve a predetermined end. As such, neither objectives nor content required reflection upon the question "Why?" (see Sparkes 1993: p107-108). Anxiety over such possibility was expressed by professor Alan Tomlinson;

AT With the stress towards 'on-site apprenticeship systems', which is essentially what the move is...the real danger is of the lack of time for informed reflection. Learning things on the job for professionals who are not necessarily 'professionalised' for the new role - the whole mentorship area is very difficult, the efficacy of the system and the relationships between schools and ITE. If that is not clear and it becomes a question of money and status, the victims in all of this will be the trainee teachers - there will not be time for mature reflection or informed reflection in the ITE, it will be learning shortcut, survival tactics in education. These will be based on tradition and precedent and not informed by adequate theory and guidance.

Others expressed similar disquiet about the direction of ITT¹². When this concern was put to RR MP James Pawsey his reaction was not only dismissive it was condescending;

WK Educationalists are concerned that the reduction in theory in teacher education, through the 'learning on the job', is removing the opportunity for students to reflect on their work.

JP That is a rather 'pompous' statement. What do you mean 'the opportunity to reflect'? You mean 'think about the job'. Anybody has time to think about their job. They can do that in the bath, in the car or when they are out shopping. They do not need half an hour set aside so that they have time to 'think about the job' What a waste of time. When do I get time to think about my job? You tell me. When do you make time to think about what you are doing. Do not tell me you need to have half an hour a day set a side to that.

¹² Similar views were expressed by Professor John Evans of Loughborough University, Dick Fisher of the PEA, Dr Elizabeth Robertson, Chris Laws of SCOPE, Professor Elizabeth Murdoch, Professor Margaret Talbot, Senior HMI 'F1', Peter Harrison of the PEA, and Sue Campbell of the NCF during interview.

WK I was thinking more about 'critical reflection', not time put aside to 'think about the job'. Research shows that, due to reform, teachers are so overloaded with work that they do not have time to think about what they are doing, far less spending time to act as mentors for trainee teachers.

JP What bloody rubbish. There are good and bad people doing every job. There are bad teachers who do as little as possible just to get through the job - there are some MPs who are the same - just as there are PhD students who will do as little work as possible to pass. However, there are others who do a good job. There are many, many dedicated and committed individuals who work hard at what they do. Those are the people who make the time to 'think about the job'. People who are honest and dedicated will make time to become good mentors. They set a good example for everyone else. This idea of time for 'reflection' is pompous crap.

When sent a transcript of the interview for conformation these were statements which Pawsey, understandably, wished to be omitted. However, a similar argument was put forward by David Evennett;

WK Critics of the system say that the ability to reflect critically is being lost from teaching.

DE Teacher trainers have not been critically reflective. All the reforms to teacher training have been due to government pressure. Teacher trainers did not develop any new ideas. Teachers were leaving colleges not being equipped to face the practical problems of teaching. They had no ideas in teacher training colleges of how to deal with the crucial areas of discipline and preventing truancy. When people come forward with no new ideas they cannot claim to be critical. They have not developed any change. The practical problems in schools are never discussed in teacher training institutions. There may be discussion over the latest psychology or sociology but not over the fundamental, practical aspects of teaching. These issues are all too often left for the parents to deal with.

The rhetoric here was that 'critical reflection' over the 'needed changes' was only being undertaken by the Government, and as such had to be imposed upon HE. Teacher training had to be instruction in how to deal with issues that were important to the RR in achieving their objectives, centrally the imbuing of a 'capitalist moral character' and a conservative 'citizenship', rather than in developing the most beneficial educational experiences for pupils.

End Note

The effects of RR policy can be seen not to be the deskilling of teachers but, the future de-skilling of the profession. Skills cannot be taken away, but the opportunity and possibility for their use can be prevented through legislation and control over resources. A whole range of legislation systematically eroded the knowledge base of ITE, moving teachers towards technicians rather than professionals (Evans, Penney and Davies 1995: p15). The RR intended that teachers would become skilled 'subject'

teachers rather than teachers of individuals. The reduction in educational and pedagogic theory sought to change teachers from reflective professionals to reflexive agents of centrally devised objectives. Education was intended to be a mechanism of social control and capitalist cultural reproduction, with teachers as 'trainers' of practical skills and 'imbuers' of moral obedience.

Appendix H

Appendix H - Pressures and Constraints Placed on the NCPE Working Group

Contents	Page
Proem	73
RR Influence Prior to WG	73
WG Remit	73
Selection of the WG	75
The Concerns of the Physical Education Profession	76
A Political Selection and its Effectiveness	77
WG Deliberations to the IR	81
The RR's Response to the IR	82
Consultation over the IR	84
Constrains Placed on the WG After the IR	85
Resources	85
Language	87
Secrecy	89
The Pressures Placed on the WG by the SoS and the MfS	90
Post IR Constraints	93
IR to FR	93
FR to SO	94
End Note	94

Proem

In an endeavour to serve wider SPEC interests, the NR/RR sought to privileged its definition of physical education as ‘traditional sport and games’ in the NCPE and so in state schools (see chapter six: p203). This appendix outlines the pressures placed on the NCPE Working Group (WG) to endorse the NR/RR definition. These pressures were both overt through the selection and remit of the WG, and covert through the actions of the SoS and MfS ‘behind-the-scenes’. The overt pressures are discussed in relation to constraints over resources and discursive possibilities which affected the WGs deliberations both subtly and forcefully. The covert pressures are discussed by highlighting the aggressive stance the SoS and MfS took towards the WG. It is highlighted that the political power and authority of the SoS and MfS resulted in the NR/RR definition of physical education being privileged in the NCPE Statutory Orders.

RR Influence Prior to WG

In addition to the endeavour to have its definition of physical education endorsed in ‘official reports’ (see chapter seven: p247), the RR attempted to juxtapose the meaning of physical education with sport through Party publications. This was evident in Key’s (1988: p31) ‘Conservative Political Centre’ contribution concerning the NCPE;

The recognition accorded to physical education in the national curriculum as one of the seven foundation subjects should go some way towards concentrating the minds of educationalists, teachers, government ministers and all those who care about sport for our young people. It is certainly a healthy sign that physical education will be compulsory for all children of school age

Key defined physical education as sport, highlighting that it was to be compulsory for all pupils. This statement came at a time before the WG had been established and before compulsory competitive traditional team games was ‘official’ policy. This gives an indication both of the pressures which were to be exerted on the WG to endorse the RR view, and the thinking behind the WG’s remit.

WG Remit

The ERA gave the SoS the power to select the WG and to define its terms of reference. ‘The National Curriculum 5-16: A Consultation Document’ (DES 1987: p5) outlined that the NC WGs’ role was to fill in the attainment and assessment structures, the ATs and PoS, devised by the ‘Task Group on Assessment and Testing’. The government explained that TGAT was established first to construct a framework within which the WGs would operate to ensure consistency across the NC (DES 1987: p26). The DES (1987: p25) highlighted that;

The Working Groups will be expected to ensure that the content and teaching of their subject’s brings out its relevance to and links with pupil’s own experience and practical application; and that the programmes of work contribute to the development in young people of personal qualities and competence, such as self-reliance, self-discipline, an enterprising approach and

the ability to solve practical real-world problems, which will stand them in good stead for later life.

This hardly indicates that experts were to advise the Government on what should be in the NC. However, more than this, the ideological underpinnings of the statement are clear. The emphasis on 'selfism' and 'enterprise' was the main thrust of the NR/RR's ideological discharge in their attempt to shift society's values from social democracy to the social market (see chapter four: p116). The Consultation Document was hardly to initiate a consultation process. Duties and responsibilities were laid down and the desired outcomes of the process were stipulated. The WGs' reports were to go to the SoS who could alter them, then to the NCC and SEAC - two bodies appointed directly by the SoS - which would consult on the SoS's recommendations (see chapter seven: p263), they would then be returned to the SoS who would decide upon the Statutory Orders (DES 1897: p16-18). It was clear even at this stage in the development of the NC, prior to the establishment of the physical education WG, that the WGs were intended to do little more than endorse the Government view.

The first stage in developing the NCPE was to detail the WG's task. Moynihan (Hansard 1987 Vol. 124, Col. 276) indicated that;

A PE working group will be established in due course to make recommendations about the content of PE programmes and guidelines about what children should be expected to achieve at particular stages. The group's recommendations will be the subject of further consultation by the NCC. Although the content of PE programmes will be the subject of secondary legislation, there is no intention to prescribe the amount of curriculum time to be devoted to PE or any other subject.

It was established at the beginning of the process that the WG would do no more than offer recommendations to be consulted upon by the NCC. Further, that there was to be no indication of curriculum time for physical education. This was to effect the WG's deliberations. The tone for the WG's deliberations, and the content the Government expected to be discussed, was set by Rumbold (Hansard 1987 Vol. 124, wa. 100);

The working group on physical education which my right hon. Friend will set up in due course will recommend guidelines for the content of physical education as a foundation subject within the national curriculum. Taking account also of the recommendations of the Forum on School Sport set up by my right hon. Friend the SoS for the Environment to consider the place of sport in schools, we hope to ensure a balanced programme of physical education, including competitive sport within all maintained schools.

The place of competitive sport as part of physical education was thus established. Rumbold's reference to the work of the SSF was at a time before it had published findings that the RR did not like (see chapter seven: p240). Prior the publication of its Interim Report (IR), MfE Eggar emphasised the expectations, and pressures, placed on the WG by the RR;

The government fully recognise the importance of sport in schools. The national curriculum working group on physical education has been asked to take account of the contribution which competitive sport can make to the curriculum as a whole. The group's interim report is due to be submitted by the end of the year (Hansard 1990 Vol. 182, Col. 291-292).

These statements indicate that the government was fully expecting the WG to endorse competitive sport. This was, in part, based on the WG's remit which stated that;

The group should express an attainment target in terms of what is to be expected of pupils at the end of key stages. This expectation should take the form of a single statement of attainment in broad terms for each key stage which may comprise components covering different aspects of the subject. Each statement should represent what pupils of different abilities and maturities can be expected to achieve at the end of the key stage in question. These statements are then to form part of the **statutory** Order for the subject (IR DES 1991: p80) (original emphasis).

Attention is drawn to the wording which specifies "...an attainment target...". This indicates a prescription over the WG's deliberations, rooted firmly in participation. The remit was thus the RR's first attempt to control the development of the NCPE.

Due to the recently initiated market in education (see Appendix F: p37), physical education came into the picture defined as a practical subject with low status. This was emphasised by the staggered implementation of the NC and the WG's remit, which stated that;

The SoS intends that, because of the nature of the subject, the objectives (attainment targets) and means of achieving them (programmes of study) should not be prescribed in as much detail for physical education as for the core and other foundation subjects (DES 1991, WG IR Appendix A).

The reasoning behind the lack of prescription was that the SoS "...considers that schools and teachers should have substantial scope here to develop their own schemes of work" (DES 1991, IR: p69). However, Talbot (1993: p44) explained that, with no statutory level of achievement, only statutory End of Key Stage Statements (EKSS) and PoS, the WG had different terms of reference to other subjects. She suggested that the DES did this to privilege the SoS's definition of physical education. The terms of reference for the WG reinforced physical education's low status.

Selection of the WG

MfE Rumbold outlined the criteria for the WGs' membership;

Members of subject working groups are being appointed for their personal knowledge and expertise, not as representatives of institutions or bodies. Each subject working group will have a small membership comprising a chairman and members drawn mainly from the head-teachers and teachers of primary and secondary schools, local education authority advisors, higher education and the world of employment. The intention is that, between them, members

will have knowledge of and expertise in all the major aspects of their foundation subjects (Hansard 1987 Vol. 120, wa. 499).

However, these assertions were not accurate in relation to the membership of the physical education WG. Clearly, initial controls over the development of the NCPE would come with the construction of the WG. Significantly, the appointments were secretive. This seemed to suggest that the RR intended to construct a WG which would endorse its traditional discourse rather than a progressive discourse. The membership was set by SoS MacGregor on July 10, 1989. It contained few practising teachers or LEA Advisors. Nonetheless, MfE Rumbold claimed that;

In appointing members to the various national curriculum subject working groups, the Government looked for a range of professional expertise and experience. We also ensured that each group had at least one member from the business world (Hansard 1988 Vol. 136, wa. 7).

This claim of knowledge and expertise of 'physical education' in the Group was somewhat dubious. Further, the role of business people in developing a physical education national curriculum needed to be questioned in utilitarian terms (see chapter seven: p241). The appointments to the WG were the first revelation of the RR's aims (see DES 1991a: p71).

The Concerns of the Physical Education Profession

The profession felt that the WG had a definite 'sporting' orientation (Drewett 1992: p19) and that appointments were political (interviews). Dick Fisher explained that the PEA wrote to the Government to express its concern over the appointments;

DF ...The PEA wrote to Angela Rumbold and stated that there were no practising specialist PE teachers on the WG. She wrote back and said that people were picked for their personal qualities and the contribution they could make. They were not picked for the group that they represent. That is in itself quite interesting. It is almost as if [she felt] there is a lobby group trying to get in and influence our ideas. What we were saying was if they wanted to prepare a curriculum for the secondary specialist should they not have people in the WG who are doing the job? Someone to give real insight as to what is really going on. Her response was as if we were trying to swing some political line. All we said that there should be a PE teacher on the WG. They did not appoint one.

Fisher stressed that this indicated to him that the WG was politically appointed. The profession's apprehension towards the WG was discussed with its Chairman Ian Beer;

WK At that time there was a great deal of animosity towards the WG within the profession. Was that a situation you were aware of?

IB Animosity towards the WG because of the way it had been selected? Oh yes of course. And because of fact that the PE people did not think the right people had been selected. Of course I did. One of my problems was 'me' with the Group. What was I doing there? Who was not a physical

educationalist. Who had never taught in a maintained school. Played an elitist, aggressive game for his own personal development. Where was I coming from...Yes we were very aware there was a lot of antagonism against us, against me from the group, from the selection of the group from the PE profession ...We were well aware of the animosity. We of course tried to get the views of as many people as possible.

Clearly, the 'political' nature of the appointments was a potential stumbling block in the development of the NCPE.

A Political Selection and its Effectiveness

Beer highlighted that he had no input into the selection of WG members;

WK How was the WG selected?

IB You tell me when you find out. I do not have a clue. I was asked to be chairman about six months before it was published. I immediately said "Good. Who can I have on my Group?". To which I was firmly told by the politicians "That is not your decision". Which in retrospect I understand, I did not quite at the time. If I been allowed to chose we would have ended up with 'Beer's Boys'. The whole thing would have been a disaster area. So, the government, I was told, interviewed a very large number of people, and then antagonised one or two by then not inviting them to join the Group. I just do not know how they selected it. All you can say by looking at the Group, was that they were determined to have a mixture, clearly, of a couple of lecturers, the Deputy Head, Primary Head, Head of Physical Education, some sportsman of very high calibre - who had done their own thing at a very high level, which I suppose is one of the reasons why I was asked. Although I think there were other reasons why I was asked, not to do with physical education but to do with Chairmanship and the writing of Reports - the others were representative of industry, outdoor education. I think it was a jolly good Group.

What Beer indicated here was that the WG did include educationalists, and that the membership was not as 'sport orientated' as the profession at first feared. This seems to confirm Rumbold's claim that the WG selection sought to represent all interested groups;

WK I would like to move on to the NCWG. There appears to be speculation about how members of that group were selected. Was there any criteria for membership?

AR We did have criteria, because 'a' we wanted to have a manageable Group, 'b' it was very important not to miss out any of the interests groups. So, there had to be sportsmen, there had to be people who taught physical education in schools and in colleges, in tertiary and secondary education, there had to be people who covered ballet and movement and music and dance. It was a very broad field and there had to be there all these component parts in order to be fair and in order not to cut out any of the various interests. So, it

was an exceedingly difficult job actually deciding how to pick twelve people who covered all of those interests.

Despite these assertions, Beer still questioned the 'balance' of expertise and knowledge on the WG;

IB The government had selected a wider variety of backgrounds and experiences within that physical education WG than any other Group in the NC. It was a terribly disparate group to try and weld together as a team. It was a very good exercise in captaincy and teamwork to start off with. Therefore, everyone arrived with their own personal agenda. It was very much a question of everybody within that working group having their own learning curve. ...The WG were a group of 'experts' - although you could challenge that statement really, as a physical educationalist you could argue that there was a only small number of experts on the WG, about three or four, the rest were not.

The lack of 'experts' on the WG was the reason why Beer's job was difficult. His lack of knowledge of the selection process prevented him from knowing that the WG was selected according to a political agenda rather than educational needs. This was substantiated by a civil servant involved with the NCC

'G1' ...the SoS would have had an input. The members were recommended by HMI, Ministers and 'others'. They were interviewed and selection was made according to 'suitability'.

A Senior HMI directly involved in the selection process outlined how acceptable nominations for the WG depended less on individuals' personal knowledge and expertise than with their relationship with Ministers.

WK You said that you had some input into the WG. However, it appears that the selection to other WGs were totally controlled by the government.

F1 Oh yes it was, but it happened in both ways...People like me were asked for names of who might be the chair of the committee and members of the committee. That did not mean that we had power to nominate, we had power to suggest. I went to a meeting in Elizabeth House run by one of the Senior Deputy Secretaries, just below Permanent Secretary - I must rely on confidentiality because this comes under the Official Secrets Act¹³ - They told us who they wanted to Chair the WGs. We were asked to suggest others to be members. Many nominations came from Ministers who knew of people through Societies or London Clubs.

WK So it is a case of social networking?

F1 Yes, it is the social networking. A great deal of it is social networking. It is a 'them and us' priority ...Having got those nominations they then sorted

¹³ It is incredible that the development of a state education curriculum should be subject to the Official Secret Act. It seems unlikely that how a WG was chosen should be a matter of national security.

and filtered them. It was quite remarkable, every person who was on a short list, barring two, were personally interviewed by the Ministers before they were put on the committee. If Ministers then subsequently dislike the work produced it **cannot** be because the members of the committees were not personally vetted by the Ministers themselves. That actually happened.

Social networking was evident with the appointment of the sportsmen to the WG. Rumbold revealed one of the criterion for membership - friendship with a Minister;

AR Well, John [Fashanu] was part of the team. John was a very good example of someone who had started from nowhere and made a success. I thought ...he is a friend of mine, and I thought that John added a dimension to the team, because, in a sense there was a man who had become a very successful, world class footballer. There was no need for him to have done that, but he happened to be very, very good at that. We all like to be good at things. He was an example of someone, it seemed to me, who encompassed everything we wanted to demonstrate. You know, he was a boy who had not had a particularly privileged background, who was black, who had made it into a premier football club team, and was actually a great success. He, in turn, put back all of his terrific personality and his ability to talk to people and so on. It was a very good thing to have.

However, WG members stressed that the reality of Fashanu's selection and contribution was rather different. Professor Murdoch highlighted that his membership was political;

EM Angela Rumbold was interviewing for the WG during that period. When we were interviewed most of us asked who the other members were likely to be and why were they there. There was a huge unrest at that time over the membership of the WG ...I asked Angela Rumbold about the selection and she said "Well, we are putting in these top level sportsmen because, you know, we have to give this thing some credibility to the public. The children will look for their heroes and role models being there and maybe then they will pay attention to it and be interested in it if they are there." She did not add, but she meant - 'if it is all a bunch of educationalists you can forget it'.

Professor Talbot told a similar story about social networking with WG member Phil Norman, and Fashanu's contribution;

MT ...Most of the group were nominated either through the physical education networks - they went to the Staff Inspector to identify people who should be on the Group - and also through personal contacts with the Minister. Moynihan nominated several members and that can be traced through the Group. At the end of my vetting interview with Angela Rumbold I asked why I had been nominated. She said that I had been nominated through two routes. One, through the Staff Inspector and two, through Moynihan who had presented our Degree at the previous Awards Ceremony. Other people were just through Moynihan. People like Phil Norman, the businessman, the rower.

WK Rowing was the connection?

MT He was in Moynihan's coxed four.

WK Angela Rumbold told me John Fashanu was a friend of hers.

MT I am not sure if he was a friend. I asked her why he was chosen. I had my interview directly after him. I remember the words she used "Oh! He is the black 'street cred'" Those are the words she used. Then she said that she was a Wimbledon season ticket holder. She was MP for Wimbledon. I do not know whether the friendship has come since then or not. But she certainly knew of him and knew his background before he was nominated. Most people in physical education would have said "Come ON. There are plenty black people in physical education doing a really good job" He contributed nothing. Absolutely nothing to the process. He was only there, in total, for three and a half days. He never ever met north of Peterborough.

Another member indicated that when Fashanu was present he spent most of the time on his mobile phone making business calls. Beer verified that Fashanu's membership was close to a 'wasted place';

IB ...John Fashanu was on the WG. I said to him at the end of the first meeting, because he had not opened his mouth "John you have not said anything. What do you think?" His reply was "I have not understood a word that has been said"

Clearly, it was possible for Fashanu to have improved his knowledge of physical education with a little effort. However, Professor Murdoch stated that this was never his aim;

EM ...A number of members of the WG actually admitted that their views were changed and they then saw the value of physical *education* for the children. With the exception of one member, John Fashanu. He was just not being effected by anything. He hardly ever came and when he did he did his own thing all of the time.

It could be perceived that Fashanu's absences were the cause of his stubbornness, or, alternatively, that his friendship with Rumbold was his reason for being on the WG, and that his role was to continue to endorse a sports and games orientation¹⁴.

The SoS had control of the selection of the WG and sought to define what physical education should and would be by setting boundaries on the Group's actions. The inclusion of people from outside education, specifically those from the worlds of sport and industry, was a skilful construction of members who, initially, reflected the RR's definition of physical education. Evans and Penny (1995b: p32) argue that a regulation of 'technocratic rationality' (see chapter seven: p244) was embedded in the structure and leadership of the WG, legitimated by an accompanying rhetoric of

¹⁴ This section is not intended to be a 'witch-hunt' against John Fashanu. It does however show how appointing the WG according to political criteria was education's loss.

educational neutrality which attempted to hide the interests and agenda of the SoS but barely succeeded. They indicate that;

On the one hand the subject was to compromise an amalgam of discrete (strongly classified) activities in which competition, team games and 'skilling' were to feature prominently. On the other hand it was to be considered a subject without history, association or identity...signalled that every thing except the conventional (games and sport) was for negotiation (Evans and Penney 1995b: p32)

This unclear point of departure would prove significant for the WG in relation to its 'terms of reference'. The fact that the WG membership lacked practising teachers and Advisors is not insignificant. It meant that the historical struggles and contemporary developments within physical education would not have a forum for discussion. However, it also meant that those selected had to find their own 'starting-point'. Although the WG was expected to endorse the RR's definition, members did not see this as their role. Nonetheless, as is discussed below, the SoS had such potential powers that it would not have mattered what the WG eventually recommended. If it did not fit with RR requirements, greater controls would be brought to bear.

WG Deliberations to the IR

As highlighted above the WG was a disparate body of individuals on a learning curve about physical 'education'. The 'terms of reference' gave the WG no starting point of the nature of physical education. Further, it was given a limited time scale to fill the ATs and PoS framework. My perception is that the restriction on time was a direct attempt to control the WG's deliberations. The WG did not have time to start anew and there was pressure on it to define NC physical education as sport. This was made clear by MfE Tim Eggar (Hansard 1990 Vol. 182, Col 291-292);

The government fully recognise the importance of sport in schools. The national curriculum working group on physical education has been asked to take account of the contribution which competitive sport can make to the curriculum as a whole.

Nonetheless, the WG selected the 1987 British Council of Physical Education (BCPE) report as its starting point. This report was a crucial piece of work as it outlined a progressive discourse in physical education¹⁵. The WG used this as the basis of their deliberations, and the IR went some way to developing its themes.

By the time of the IR, all the WG members had adopted the progressive process of physical education (Evans and Penney 1995b: p34). It advocated a 'process model' of physical education comprising of three attainment targets: 'Planning and Composing', 'Participating and Performing' and 'Appreciating and Evaluating'. This was supported by the physical education profession which saw the IR as developing pupil's independence by developing knowledge and understanding for all, with a move away from an elite games orientation (BAALPE 1990, Casbon 1991,

¹⁵ It is significant that that the BCPE report was chaired by WG member Professor Murdoch. However, she claimed that she did not champion the report and that the WG adopted it of its own accord.

McConachie-Smith 1990, Raymond 1992). The IR also highlighted the importance of good teaching in developing an educational process in physical education. Further, its 'Rationale for Physical Education' outlined the importance of children developing self-esteem through challenging false assumptions and stereotypes about physique. Clearly, those selected for the purpose of endorsing sport had their perspectives changed. However, the original remit did not give scope for the recommendation of the three ATs. With the RR's vilification of progressive, child centred learning, and its aim to define physical education as sport, the three ATs signalled a direct conflict between the WG and the RR. Moreover, Beer wrote to SoS Clarke to indicate the WG's misgivings about the lower status given to physical education as one of the last subjects to be introduced to the NC, and the short time available in which to develop the NCPE. He also outlined the WG's intentions to look at levels of resourcing and the implications for teacher education (IR DES 1991a). This also conflicted with RR's intentions (see chapter seven: p262).

The RR's Response to the IR

The Government's reaction to the IR was hostile. The WG's endorsement of a progressive model was an anathema to the RR, and there was no intention to allow the WG to discuss ITE. Pressure on the WG became more aggressive. This was explained by Beer;

IB ..The IR came out, Atkins remained but Clarke arrived. I gave the IR to him. He got 'excited' about it. He wrote a rather rude letter about it. He wrote a 'stropy' letter because he just came in and wanted things different. He wanted the three ATs to be one AT and told us not to write so much 'jargon'. It was a fairly stropy letter... Clarke helped to push that...that was the first fight I had on my hands...That was one sort of pressure. There was also the pressure to reduce the five areas...It was not subtle pressure going on in our work. Kenneth Clarke's interference was not subtle because he is not subtle. He came in like a sledge hammer. He said that it had only got to be two areas at the age of sixteen. The WG were very upset and very angry about that.

WK Those who I have talked to in the profession feel that the interim report was very good. However, something seemed to happen between the IR and the FR. They felt that the Government did not like the findings and in some way controlled them and changed them.

IB Yes, to a certain extent they are right. As I say, Kenneth Clarke ordered us. That interference is clear and he says it in his letter, at KS4 to go from five to two areas.

SoS Clarke's letter (IR DES 1991a) was in response to both the IR and Beer's letter. It was a very damning attack on the work of the Group. The letter contained eleven paragraphs which criticised the IR from content to the language used. It undermined nearly every aspect of the WG's findings.

Clarke's first concern was clearly to constrain the future actions of the WG. His attack was based on economic considerations. He stressed that he expected the WG's recommendations "...to be realistically related to the general level of funding

which can be reasonably expected to be available”. However, the WG stressed that there was no indication of what resources might be available (interviews). Economic concerns were put before educational considerations, with resources allocated to the ‘priority’ areas (see chapter one: footnote five). Using this as justification, Clarke wrote “I therefore see no need for you to pursue the matter of time allocation, except in the sense that you should have regard to what is likely to be practicable within the constraints of the rest of the curriculum”. The place and status of physical education was very clear and firmly set. Clarke’s second concern was to undo what had already been done. His letter also emphasised his discontent with three ATs. He wanted only one AT which highlighted the practical, active nature of the subject. This attacked the heart of the WG’s progressive discourse. Professor Murdoch stressed that the WG tried to explain that the three ATs aimed to embody performance, but highlight the importance of the other aspects in understanding and improving it. However, the SoS and MfS were adamant that there would be one AT;

EM That is where their reactions to our work comes from. Their reactions to the IR. Our first document outlined the three areas of physical education, the ‘planning’, the ‘performing’ and the ‘evaluating’. Now that model had grown over many, many, many years of thinking. It was actually in peoples’ minds, but no one had articulated it quite like that before. ...That model had been in the system for a while. When we produced it in the IR, the SoS threw it back at us. He just threw it straight back at us very powerfully and said “You will not have all that clap-trap, sitting on bottoms and thinking. This is a ‘doing’ subject and the children will be performing. Make me a performance curriculum.” That was his attitude, as clear cut as that. We were told to get rid of these ‘bits’ that “did not really matter”.

This clearly shows how the RR sought to use the power and authority of government ruthlessly to achieve its aims. MfE Eggar (Hansard 1991 Vol. 184, wa 320) obfuscated Clarke’s aggressive intervention, claiming that the SoS intended to offer ‘guidance’ to the WG in reply to their findings. The IR was discussed in parliament and the Government justified its stance on grounds of both resources and the language used by the WG. MfS Atkins was more aggressive and attacked the WG, indicating that the language used was a matter of concern and that it “...needed to be that which ordinary parents and the constituents of both the hon. Gentleman and myself could understand” (Hansard 1991 Vol. 186, Col. 1215). He also argued that “...it would have been utterly irresponsible of the Government to have accepted those recommendations without any understanding of the costs involved. It would have been foolhardy in the extreme” (Hansard 1991 Vol. 186, Col. 1216). Thus, the RR were delineating what discourse and language was possible in and about physical education. It was setting limits to what could and could not be discussed and negotiated. They were defining what physical education *could* be. The resource allocation was dictating what physical education *would*, and *would not*, be. Further, the Government was creating a situation of ‘them and us’ towards the Group.

The insistence on one ‘performance’ AT highlighted the ideology behind the RR’s definition of physical education. MfE Rumbold indicated that physical education was never intended to have similar status to other areas of the curriculum;

WK It appeared that, from the Interim Report, that the SoS was not particularly happy with the findings of..

AR No! I don't know who it was. Was it Kenneth Clarke at the time? Yes, it would have been Kenneth Clarke. He may well not have been. Probably because it did not concentrate nearly enough on football and cricket and sensible things like that, in his view, and a bit too much on movement and music and dance and so on which he would have thought were a bit 'wimpish'.

WK It was quite clear that he did not want three ATs, just the one.

AR Yes, well I think that is probably quite sensible. I think in terms of what you can achieve. I do not think it is necessary you see, because I do not think physical education falls into the same category as maths or English. It never should have been. It was never intended that it should be. It was simply intended that we put the marker down that whatever else you sacrificed in the whole superstructure of the national curriculum, you should not sacrifice the opportunity for physical education to play its part in the school life and in college life.

This attitude separates the physical and the cognitive areas of the curriculum and re-establishes the dualism between mind and body. It views education as instrumental¹⁶. Clearly it was imperative for the RR to take greater control of the process at this stage if their objectives were to be met. Greater constraints were therefore placed on the WG after the IR as the government sought to impose its discourse and intentions over those of the 'experts' appointed to 'advise' it.

Consultation over the IR

At this stage in the development of the NCPE comments on the IR were invited from the profession and the public. The majority of responses favoured the development of knowledge and understanding through three ATs, but disagreed with one AT which, through its assessment of practical performance, was felt to disadvantage many, especially those with Special Educational Needs (Raymond 1992 p25). One 'performance' AT was felt to undermine the philosophy of the IR by not reflecting the educational base of physical education, and by removing the focus on learning and understanding the values of physical activity (BAALPE 1991: p48, Casbon 1991: p7). The concern was that one AT further marginalised physical education's status and so resourcing at a time when it seemed possible that the subject might well have become optional. Beer (1992: p5) explained that the possibility of physical education as optional effected the workings of the Group. However, these concerns had no effect on the SoS or MfS (see chapter seven: p260).

Atkins comments highlighted how the RR adopted then adapted WG findings to suit its own ends;

¹⁶ Clearly, from a sociological viewpoint, there are many aspects of Rumbold's statements which could, and perhaps should, have been challenged. However, Rumbold only allowed ten minutes for the interview (see chapter two).

Perhaps the most important limb of our policy on school sport...is the inclusion of physical education in the national curriculum. PE is now a compulsory subject for all pupils in maintained schools between the ages of five and 16. It is the first time that PE has been a statutory requirement...Of course, a distinction must be made between what we mean by physical education in the curriculum and the overall place of sport in schools. There is no doubt that PE should include a significant amount of sport, including competitive team games. I was glad to see a recognition of that in the interim report of the PE working group (Hansard 1991 Vol. 186, Col 1215).

Members of the WG indicated that this was not the intention of the IR, and that the progressive model offered quite the reverse. They highlighted that the compulsion of team games for all pupils went against their beliefs and that their intention was to develop opportunity for all, not just the elite (interviews).

Constraints Placed on the WG After the IR

Clarke's letter in the IR and Atkin's comments in parliament made it clear that the government intended to conjoin discursive and resource constraints in an attempt to control the WG. With the emphasis on 'practical activity' the place of a progressive pedagogy would be severely diminished, and the level of resourcing would effect what was possible to deliver.

Resources

The WG's remit (DES 1991, IR p80) had indicated the SoS's intentions over local resourcing;

The SoS intends that, because of the nature of the subject, the objectives (attainment targets) and means of achieving them (programmes of study) should not be prescribed in as much detail for physical education as for the core and other foundation subjects. He considers that schools and teachers should have substantial scope here to develop their own schemes of work. It is the task of the Physical Education working group to advise on a statutory framework which is sufficiently broad and flexible to allow schools wide discretion in relation to matters to be studied. (Original emphasis)

HMI 'F1' stated that economic pressures were brought to bear on the WG after the IR when it was clear that it endorsed a progressive child centred definition and not the traditional forms wanted by the RR (interview). The emphasis in the remit reinforced physical education's low status in terms of LMS and signalled it as a site for minimal resource provision within a school's budget. Reduced status and so reduced resourcing in LMS was already affecting progressive possibilities adversely (Penney and Evans 1991a, 1991b). The remit meant that the WG was not able to prescribe levels of physical education provision. No prescription would ensure that no minimum level of resourcing or provision was set by law. If the SoS's comment that '...schools and teachers should have substantial scope...' is read in the light of the financial implication of LMS, preventing a prescriptive NCPE meant that no minimum requirements of resourcing had to be met by schools. Thus, schemes of work could be developed with 'substantial scope' within the limitations of the

resources secured by physical education in the far from equal competition between subjects under LMS. In short, by not stipulating set minimums, schools were free to provide as few resources as needed to provide PoS which met the minimum requirements of the ATs. All schools had to do was ensure a provision which reached the minimum level of a non statutory statement of attainment¹⁷. The WG was thus constrained by both direct controls through the remit and indirect controls through resource implications in schools. These worked together to reduce the possibility of a progressive input. Evans and Penney (1995b: p42) referred to these constraints as ‘codes’ which controlled the thoughts and actions of the WG: the remit was a ‘discursive code’ and the control of resources a ‘production code’, both showed the State’s power and domination.

The WG was given no indication of the resources which would be made available to physical education. This acted to impinge upon their workings. Professor Murdoch highlighted that resource implications were crucial in deciding what it was possible to provide in schools and so plan for in the NCPE;

EM The resources base, the financial base was always a difficult one. They would not really talk resources. They would not talk resources to us. When you are writing a NC, resources do not really come into it. They dare not. Time did not come into it. They would not give us any help with time scales or that kind of resource. They would not guarantee any kind support for in-service development or anything of that nature. Now, we understood that there was to be a resources base put behind it in terms of launching it, but it never appeared. We believed there was to be, and we were very genuinely led to believe, that there would be a big flow in behind the NC implementation to give us money for in-service. But it did not happen. Why it did not happen I do not know.

However, in the light of increased professionalism in physical education teaching (see chapter seven: p269), and with the RR determined to prevent both the development of the progressive model and its dissemination through INSET, it is highly unlikely that resources would have been made available.

The WG’s remit also stated that it was to “..advise on a statutory framework which is sufficiently broad and flexible to allow schools wide discretion in relation to matters to be studied” (IR DES 1991a: p69). The critical point here is the misleading concept ‘flexibility’. The term could be read in two ways. One, using the DES’ definition which claimed that “...Without such flexibility there would be a loss of the essential element of spontaneity in teaching and learning” (‘Physical Education from 5 to 16’ DES 1989: p2). Or, two, as having political connotations in relation to the provision of resources. The NASUWT (ESASC 1911: p105) indicated that the notion ‘flexible’ gave out the wrong signal about physical education. In this perspective, the SoS’s desire to have physical education defined as ‘flexible’ tied into his endeavour to prevent a prescriptive provision;

¹⁷ With this taken into account, the WG’s remit ties into my perception that physical education was intended to have reduced input of resources (time, staff and financial) at the local level which reduced the possibility of a progressive provision, yet, with ‘games’, the RR input, becoming compulsory.

You will of course be aware of my decision that PE in the National Curriculum at key stage 4 should have a particularly flexible definition. By a 'particularly flexible definition' I mean that pupils should have a wide choice of activity at key stage 4, of a more flexible kind than you are recommending. I envisage that they should be required to keep fit and active by participating in some sport or other PE activity of a sensible kind. I have it in mind that pupils should have a choice of two or even one of the areas of activity...The end of key stage statements for key stage 4 should reflect this greater flexibility (IR DES 1991a)

Clarke's intention should be read with the knowledge of the RR's intention to prevent progressive or child centred methods. The phrase "...sport or other PE activity of a sensible kind" is important in relation to the RR's ideological exhortation of competitive team games as 'sensible'.

Evans, Penney and Bryant (1933d: p9) argued that 'flexibility' was an important rhetorical device for the RR, which emerged as a key concept in government rhetoric in the dilemma of providing education in a recession. It was used to systematically reduce the requirements of the NCPE and shift responsibility for provision from the government to schools while appearing to give 'agency' to the latter. The lower a subject's status the greater the flexibility afforded to it. Thus, schools had freedom under LMS to provide less resources. However, without resources a subject's flexibility was reduced. Evans, Penney and Bryant (1993b: p26) argued that 'entitlement' and 'flexibility' were likely to be incompatible in a context of scarce resources.

Language

The language used to define physical education gave it a particular meaning and defined its status. The text of the IR endorsed the progressive discourse through the three ATs. This was not what the RR wanted. SoS Clarke therefore attempted to subordinate the progressive discourse by attacking it as 'jargonistic';

I recognise that the Group wishes to avoid using jargon and other language that is comprehensible only to the specialist. I am afraid that I am not convinced that you have succeeded in your aim. I ask you to continue your efforts in this direction particularly in the non-statutory statements of attainment, many of which will, at the lower levels, be delivered by non-specialists. I am also aware that you have given careful thought to the titles of the attainment targets, but I do not consider that the words used are satisfactory. I attach importance to titles which will be readily understood by non-specialist teachers, parents and pupils (IR DES 1991a: para. 4).

Clarke's insistence that the language should be simplified and non jargonistic was an endeavour to ensure that it was not controlled by the educationalists. This was a direct attempt to constrain the WG's use of the progressive discourse and to privilege the RR's 'practical' discourse. This was evident in Clarke's letter;

I look forward to seeing the results of your further work on the programmes of study. I remind you that these should focus on the active side of PE, should

not be too detailed and should contribute to a sensible non-prescriptive statutory framework for PE (IR DES 1991a: para. 7).

Not only was PE to be centred on activity, that activity was not to be specific or prescribed. Evans and Penney (1995b: p37) explain that the focus on the 'practical' side of physical education;

..signalled a counterfactual, an alternative conception of PE and how the body within it was to be schooled. Reducing three attainment targets to one not only simplified the language of the subject it potentially damaged irreparably the Group's progressive conception of what PE and the child ought to be and again laid bare the Secretary of State's 'restorationist' expectations of what PE was to be.

In Clarke's view physical education was a 'doing' subject and not a 'thinking' subject, it was there to ensure particular political and social outcomes. He continued to pressure the WG to make the three ATs into one AT and allow 'flexibility' in provision. In response, the WG indicated in the FR that during consultation the replies were split between language being too jargonistic and it being easily accessible to non-specialists. The WG highlighted that "Inevitably in any subject area the professionals involved develop specialist language which may not be fully understood by others. This is as true for physical education as for any other of the foundation subjects" (DES FR 1991: para 5.11, p10). However, a former Chief HMI 'F1' directly involved with the development of NC text, outlined that the language of the national curriculum text was not only for use in education, it was part of the political project to ensure that policy would serve several political purposes;

F1 A NC document, particularly the Orders themselves which are the legally enforceable paper, really serves two or three different readerships and two sets of purposes, at two different periods of time. They go like this - at the period of consultation it is published but in draft form and inviting everybody to respond. The purpose of the NC documents - and we are right down to Statutory Orders of Achievement (SOA) - is to excite agreement. That is the agreement of the public at large. That actually has all sorts of implications about the way it is written, the language that it is cast in. In a sense because the government has got to win agreement with the members of the public, the profession and the politicians, three very disparate sets of people with very different sets of assumption and intentions. The language of the SOA, curriculum intentions ...has got to be cast very, very broadly. There has to be the use of extremely generic terms. Literally, in terms of critical language, it is written with a high element of indeterminacy. That purpose is actually 'date limited'. When the consultation is finished and the Statutory Orders are published, the same language is carried on. That is because that is what has excited the agreement. Broadly speaking there was agreement about the NC. However, from then onwards that is a document of application and use by the profession. Particularly, by the profession for the purposes of assessment. The real paradox that 'that' sets up is that language which is cast in a form to excite 'general agreement', but has those generic and indeterminant characteristics, is in a sense the least appropriate language for actually managing and guiding an assessment system. That poses one of the big paradoxes that Ministers have

not understood. It is because of that, in large measure, that we have got the revision of the NC. The government kept on criticising the NC for being vague and unclear. Well it is if you press it. But it had to be like that to get the agreement of all these disparate parties. For assessment purposes it is not particularly helpful. Thus we got the thrust from people like Lord Griffiths to change it to make it all much more definite and hard nosed and put in more directive and imposed fashion - telling teachers what they would do and what pupils would do - if they had had their way in English they would have named specific books, particular parts of speech and so on at each age group. Without ever saying what they meant by knowledge of course. Which is critically important.

WK It is broad and generic and unclear, is that politically purposive?

F1 Of course. Yes. It is **absolutely** necessary politically that it be like that to get the agreement to get it through the consultation. It is also manipulable at a later stage. It is what CSs have been doing for years. They write in that Latinate, generic style with a lofty authoritative, high end of formality, extended, standard English. They can then run all sorts of verification crosses through it. It is then interpretable in a variety of ways.

Simplification of the language used in physical education to 'sport and games' would not only gain greater public understanding, it would also increase the opportunity for political manipulation at a later stage. This is pertinent in connection with the changes made to the NCPE by the NCC between the FR and the SO (see chapter seven: p263). The WG had no further input after the FR.

Secrecy

The 'discursive codes' and 'production codes' were not the only 'codes' imposed by the RR. The SoS also imposed secrecy on the WG between June 1990 and July 1991. Talbot (1993 p34) explained that;

...members of the working group were asked to remain silent about their deliberations and progress of the group, and about the DES and Ministerial dialogue, from August 1990 until after the Final Report...was published in August 1992. This in effect prevented members of the Group entering into dialogue on the national curriculum with colleagues inside and outside the PE profession, for a year of their lives

The WG could not therefore communicate the restrictions placed upon them by the SoS to other members of the profession or wider interest groups. It also prevented the discussion and critique of the NCPE development with those with direct experience, knowledge and understanding of physical education in schools. Talbot (1993: p45) indicated that;

The secrecy within which the Group was forced to work meant that understanding of the effects of these imposed restrictions was limited among other members of the physical education profession, and among allies in the

worlds of health, dance and sport. Indeed, we were frequently accused of 'selling-out' to the government

What the SoS achieved, effectively by law, was to privilege the RR's discourse in the making of the NCPE, while preventing a critical evaluation of its principles. This secrecy also prevented professional discussion about the attitudes and methods employed by the SoS and MfS to privilege that discourse (discussed below). However, the imposition of secrecy was not only with the WG. All those secretariat members and HMI approached indicated that they could not discuss the process due to the implications of the 'Official Secrets Act'¹⁸. This placed control of the process firmly in the hands of central government. Physical education's circumstances may have highlighted this process more clearly than most, however, as Graham and Tytler (1993: p31 and p62) explained, the same processes and pressures were experienced by the WGs for Mathematics, English, History and Geography, with all FR's going to No. 10 Downing Street for Mrs Thatcher's approval before publishing.

The Pressures Placed on the WG by the SoS and the MfS

Beer explained that the pressures on the WG were evident from the first meeting;

IB ... The first time I felt any kind of hidden agenda, constraint, influence - what ever you want to call it - was actually at the first meeting. The Civil Servants I found produced for me 'the chairman's guide to the agenda. "We would suggest that you might like to take the meetings in this sort of way". I read it all very carefully. As you would expect it was all very well, extraordinarily well prepared, by high powered Civil Servants (CSs) doing their job extremely thoroughly. In the first meeting, about two thirds of the way through the agenda, there was an item that I thought was not all that important. I took it in a totally opposite way. There was 'agitation', you know, among the CSs "That is not the way it is to be done." To which I replied "Look I am chairman of this thing" That helped me because I soon realised that if I was not very careful, the CSs could rule the roost and manipulate in a rather cunning kind of way. If they wished to. I do not know whether they wished to or whether they did not. It is fair to say that the WG every now and again - there was an observer, come advisor, from the DES who would keep quiet - would ask the advisor "Do you think we will get away with this?". The advisor would do their very best to tell us what they thought the politicians view was. It was not intrusive the other way round. It went from our direction to them, not the other way. The CSs wrote some of their own specific jargon and things into the WGs report because they did an awful lot of the putting together. Now who was pulling the strings of the CSs I do not know.

Boundaries were clearly being set from 'behind the scenes' over what it was possible for the WG to discuss. When the WG endorsed the progressive discourse in the IR

¹⁸ The fact that the development of the state education system was subject to the 'Official Secrets Act' indicates a lack of democracy in the process. It is extraordinary that a curriculum to be taught in state school, which was 'intended' to be the best possible for all children, should be conducted in secrecy and be permitted to consider only the Government's definition of the 'educational' needs of children. Such a curriculum should, in my view, be a forum for discussion and critique of many ideas and discourses to achieve the best provision possible.

these pressures became more obvious. Beer indicated that the government was not prepared to let the WG continue 'unchecked';

IB The politicians having set up the Group, then must leave it to the experts advice mustn't they? That is what they did it for. If the Group comes up with results or recommendations that the politicians do not like, then that is when it gets a little more interesting.

Professor Murdoch highlighted the context of the force which was placed on the WG;

EM The first was the IR which had to be set halfway through the life of the WG. That one really laid the ground work. That is the one where we declared our intentions basically, and tested the Ministers on it. That was where we got our first wave of response from them. That was quite a good process because it meant we were not running head on into the gate at the final stage. That came back to us, obviously, with some 'changes' or some 'recommendations' - or some 'insistences'. That is where we got the biggest 'thump' I think.

She indicated that the government pressed the WG to endorse the RR discourse

EM ...That is when we got this *very powerful* criteria of one AT. Not to have three ATs and all the rest of it. We had to cut to one. We had to do 'this' and 'that'. That was their attempt to try and cut it....

WK In the SoS's letter about the IR the recommendations, as you said earlier, they were not recommendations at all.

EM Oh they were categorical "You will do this. You will take away this sitting around bit and you will get performance as your central focus. You will strengthen the performance." That is in the letter and it is actually pretty clear in that if you read it.

Murdoch highlighted that the pressures placed on the WG by the SoS and MfS was less than subtle;

WK I was not entirely sure how powerful that was. It [Clarke's letter] does not really let the reader know.

EM No. Well we had some quite interesting meetings with Ministers. Some of the most powerful meetings were with Robert Atkins. He joined us on more than one occasion. At one meeting in particular we were all about to hand in our resignations. He was just thumping the table and yelling at us that 'We would have this and we would have that, then the next thing'. Then he revealed total ignorance of what was actually going on in schools. He just did not know. All of us got very, very upset. Everybody did, everybody did. So much so that the chairman wrote a letter of apology to all of us about what we had to put up with as professionals. He felt that this was quite beyond anything we should have to be subjected to. He [Atkins] was rude, and *fighting* mad to have totally un-educational processes.

The RR was clearly determined that the NCPE would embody its values. So much so that MfE Rumbold confirmed that the WG's and educationalists' views were not the most important factor in the development of the NCPE;

WK Was it important that the education establishment, as you have mentioned, did not have an assertive voice in that Group?

AR Well, I think the reality about it all is that if you are going to produce a report which at the end of the day is going to be acceptable, you have to take account of what the education establishment was going to regard as acceptable.

WK So that was a consideration?

AR It was a consideration, but it was not necessarily the 'be all and end all' of it but it was definitely a consideration.

However, Beer highlighted that consideration of the educationalists' views as to what was acceptable was definitely not the "...'be all and end all' of it...";

IB ... It is right to conclude that if it had not been for the intervention of Kenneth Clarke, the WG would have continued to work along the lines of the IR.

WK So he was a large factor in changing the direction of the Group?

IB That would be fair to say...I would not put it down totally to Kenneth Clarke, but he concentrated our minds mightily.

The process of concentrating the minds to produce a NCPE that the Government wanted was not lost on the WG. They knew that the ERA allowed the SoS either to ignore the WG's findings totally, or disband the WG and replace it with a more 'suitable' one. Professor Talbot explained that the WG decided to make a stand;

MT ...That was another choice we had in February, to say that we would resign. It was a very definite decision that we took. Would we resign and let someone else move in to do exactly what they wanted. Or, would we stay and try to get the best out of it that we could. That was a collective decision. That was interesting because it was one of the few collective decisions within which Ovet and Fashanu were there. They had to be there because the Minister was, it was no accident. There was, however, no splintering. It was a Group decision.... Ian Beer was called to Clarke and had a very, very unpleasant meeting. The Civil Servants said that it was the rudest and most disgusting behaviour they had ever seen from a Minister to a volunteer, in effect. He never told us that until much later. It shows his integrity not to unload that to us...Ian Beer never told us just how badly he had been treated, until later. He was a very, very responsible chairman.

From this point the WG continued with their task to the best of their abilities within the constraints imposed upon them.

Post IR Constraints

The constraints placed on the WG by the SoS bound them more tightly to the framing of the original remit. The ‘recommendations’ made by the SoS were in reality ideological impositions enforced through resource implications. However, the WG was determined not to be bound by the ideological intention of the RR and sought to hold onto the progressive philosophy. Professor Talbot highlighted the dilemma for the group;

MT ... We thought long and hard about making a ritual stand for three, or having a fall back position of two [ATs]. The fall back position was immediately rejected because we had tried incredibly hard not to work on the dualism of mind and body. Not to separate the thinking and the doing. It is tragically artificial. Our only choice was to go for one but to embody the three within it. That is what we came up with.

IR to FR

The pressure from the SoS and the MfS meant that the WG had to reduce the three ATs to one AT in the FR. The single AT blended together the three original ATs with the emphasis on ‘participation’ but with the ‘planning’ and ‘evaluating’ aspects embodied within it. In the FR (DES 1991b: p17) the WG highlighted its concerns about a single AT, explaining that a purely ‘activity’ based orientation would exclude the majority of pupils and reduce the quality and understanding for all. Murdoch outlined the WG’s intention as they worked towards the FR;

EM ... That FR was well received. I was amazed at how well it was received. It was not simple. We did not play to the simplistic wishes of some people who would tell us what to do. We really did outline a philosophy. People accepted it and were keen and excited by it.

The WG felt they had done well to retain the progressive philosophy within the text in the light of constraints placed upon them. Murdoch pointed out that;

EM They [educationalists] became aware of what we had done. We made it quite clear to a lot of people what we had done. People said “We can still see it in there”. They said “This is still what we want”.

However, the FR would not ultimately form the Statutory Orders (SO) for the NCPE. The RR did not accept the educational philosophy of the FR and determined to reduce it further between the publishing of the FR and the implementation of the SO in September 1992. The subsequent changes made to the WG’s recommendations further undermined its endeavour.

FR to SO

Erosion of the WG's principles came with the handing over of the FR to the SoS. This was the end of the WG's input. The NCPE then went to the NCC for consultation with further 'recommendations' from the SoS for reductions based on resource implications and the use of language. A rhetoric of economic feasibility hid the power of central government to influence the development of the NCPE on ideological grounds. This is made more obvious with an investigation of the process of consultation undertaken during the development of the NCPE and the RR's suppression of evidence contradictory to their rhetoric (see chapter seven: p244). Penney (1994: p158) argued that the ERA was a process of subordination and domination where;

... the 'production' of the NCPE as a policy text demonstrated the privileging of the Conservative Government's political, economic and ideological interests. At the 'level' of the process neither the structure nor the mechanisms allowed for the interest groups outside of the government to significantly challenge the discourse.

End Note

The RR sought to construct and impose a pedagogy of physical education which was crucial for its version of SPEC reproduction. Thus, the SoS and the MfS sought to use their power and authority to embed in the NCPE text *what* physical education should be and *how* it should be taught. The context of the making of the NCPE acted to both constrain the actions of the WG and give the *appearance* of 'agency'. Economic and discursive structures governed the process and constrained the possibilities for the WG and the NCC. They shaped the production of the NCPE text and, potentially, the implementation of that text in schools.

Appendix I

Appendix I - Education's Response to the RR's 'Games' Discourse

Contents	Page
Proem	96
The RR's 'Sports and Games' Rhetoric	96
Responses to the RR's Arguments	97
Developing Individual Well-being and Encouraging...	
...Future Participation	98
The Aims of Physical Education's Progressive Discourse	101
The Dangers of the Progressive Discourse to the RR	102
The RR Attempt to Control Physical Education Provision	103
The Educationalist's Response to ITE Reforms	104
End Note	108

Proem

This appendix discusses physical educationalists' perceptions of the value of the RR's definition of physical education as 'sports and games' (see chapter six: p203)¹⁹. This focuses on the RR's claims that 'sports and games' contributed to individuals' physical and mental well-being (self esteem). These claims are evaluated on the basis of educational critique. The educationalists' arguments for a progressive, 'child centred' physical education programme is then presented to allow for a comparison between the two views. My argument is that the aims of the progressive discourse were 'dangerous' to the RR as they sought both to challenge the content and methods of the 'traditional' curriculum, and to develop individuals' awareness of their physical and social circumstances²⁰. Thus, the RR needed to suppress both the methods and content of the progressive discourse by reforming ITE and INSET (see Appendix G) and 'controlling' the development of the NCPE (see Appendix H). Educationalists' views of reforms to ITE are, therefore, discussed briefly.

The RR's 'Sports and Games' Rhetoric

The RR claimed that 'sport and games' was a more 'suitable' definition of physical education than the 'child centred' definition advocated by progressive educators (see chapter six: p203). One focus of this was the claim that 'sports and games' were the best way to build an individual's 'self-esteem'. At the time when the NCPE Statutory Orders were being finalised, these claims were made by Education Select Committee (ESC) member Lady Olga Maitland;

We need to bear in mind just how important these sports in schools are. They induce not only physical but mental health. A child who does well on the sports field but is a low academic achiever will feel his morale lifted. He will feel better and that will be reflected in his school work. It will raise self-confidence all round. We all know that if people believe they can do something, they can. By lacking faith in themselves many people fail to achieve, but sport enables non-academics to flourish. That is most important for children who think that they are failures and who may become problematic in later life. It can divert potential hooligans by channelling their energies constructively in the sports hall (Hansard 1992 Vol. 212, Col. 1295).

Not only does Maitland's argument reiterate the dualism between body and mind, it asserts a simplistic link between the transfer of success on the sports field to success in the classroom and in later life. Most significantly however, it outlines the RR's view of sport as being essentially 'male' and utilitarian, aimed towards 'social order'

¹⁹ This discussion outlines views at opposite ends of the spectrum. This does not assert that these are the only views surrounding physical education and sport. There are, clearly, views across the whole spectrum and not all educationalist endorse the progressive discourse. Further, it is acknowledged that all views of physical education are founded on a political agenda, either with a large or small 'p'. It is significant, however, that all those 'educationalists' interviewed endorsed a progressive discourse, and, that they were all senior figures in HE physical education departments. I did not actively 'seek-out' educationalists with this view. Neither did I actively avoid 'sports educators'. I had no idea what values would be articulated to me by respondents. The perceptions of the Sports Council, the NCF and the School Sports Forum are also highlighted.

²⁰ It is important to highlight that that my views of physical education are rooted in the progressive discourse (see chapter one: p26).

(control). Former MfE Angela Rumbold reiterated the same views (interview). She also indicated that games, by allegedly building self-esteem, had a role in developing an individual's status and position and taught them to learn their 'place' (see chapter six: p227). This meant being able to accept failure in other walks of life and was associated with the role of games in reproducing 'social ordering' (hierarchy). It was for these reasons, among others, that sports and games were to be compulsory for all pupils. However, the RR's rhetoric of well-being and future participation, contradicted the arguments made by educationalists, the SSF, the NCF and the Sports Council which were founded on experience and research (see chapter seven: p251).

Responses to the RR's Arguments

During interview, educationalists challenged the government's rhetoric about the value of games and sport 'over-and-above' physical education. They argued that their experience showed them that compulsory competitive team games resulted in negative experiences for the majority of pupils, which undermined their enthusiasm and interest in sport in later life. It was argued that the majority of children have neither the physical development nor the ability to play complex 'traditional competitive team games'. Elizabeth Robertson of Warwick University questioned whether positive learning experiences could be fostered through compulsory 'traditional' competitive team games;

ER I am making a professional judgement as a result of many years of experience and an understanding of the kind of motivations of individuals. Also from the feedback that I get from colleagues, fellow professionals and teachers. There are some individuals who like competitive team games and sport, and who are good at them. But it does not need any kind of 'expert' to look at twenty two thirteen year olds with 'average' ability, out on a hockey pitch in the middle of January, in freezing cold conditions with one ball between them, to stand back and observe how much physical activity and how much specific skill development work those individuals would be involved in, in a fifty minute lesson.

John Howells of St Marks and St Lukes College Plymouth, argued that the RR's rhetoric that more sport in schools would increase international success and prestige, and encourage participation in later life, was both a misrepresentation and a misconception of physical education's role and capabilities;

JH ...This whole notion of compulsory games ...we are now somehow going to use physical education to produce, it would seem, gold medalists and world champions in competitive sports. Our soccer and cricket teams are doing badly, the solution to give all fourteen to sixteen year olds compulsory games is nonsense.

WK Why is it nonsense?

JH Because that is not going to achieve the aims that they want. They are going about it the wrong way. Forcing fourteen and fifteen year old girls, who are not designed physically or emotionally to do hockey, on very badly prepared pitches in the cold, soaking wet in the rain - if someone actually

believes that that is going to switch kids onto competitive games they have got...they want to go and try it sometime. It is not going to work.

This questioned whether the RR's rhetoric of the importance of physical training in the fostering of positive attitudes was well founded. Professor Murdoch suggested that a physical education programme focusing on activity 'training' would do little to empower children to take control of the physical dimension of their lives;

EM Well, if it is very activity orientated or 'sport' orientated, then the child serves the activity or the child serves the sport. The child then never feels that they are at a certain level or quality... So, when one looks at the child one says "Right, now how can the physical education process, or the sport, serve the child?" There is so much in physical education that is not just about playing games or sport or taking part in activity. It is about the whole personal development of the child. The physical education experience is a hugely personal development. With the result that you cannot avoid being 'person centred' once you see that.

The educationalists argued that individual development, knowledge, understanding and empowerment comes through positive experiential learning which creates appreciation of the bodies changing requirements. Sue Campbell of the NCF agreed, and stressed that;

SC ... It requires nurturing...Without that, sport and physical education mean nothing. Just setting up an activity is not physical *education*. If children are not educated all they do is fail.

Fred Hirst of BCPE outlined that such 'learning' requires regular, positive achievement experiences in a conducive environment;

FH ...if you put people into particular environments there is no guarantee that they are learning. If you want to take the psychological definition of 'learning', it is "permanent change in behaviour". That is a very difficult thing to measure and register. So too is 'skill'. What makes you a skilful person? In many respects skill learning occurs as a consequence of achieving a particular goal on a consistent basis, not on a one-off 'pot luck' situation. It has got to be a consistent and permanent change in behaviour.

The arguments put forward by the educationalists highlight the complex nature of learning, and the need to structure positive experiences and environments. They also indicate that encouraging a dualism between mind and body will do little to foster either positive attitudes in pupils or encourage participation in physical activity in later life. The narrow, mechanised and functional objectives outlined in the RR's rhetoric appear political rather than educational.

Developing Individual Well-being and Encouraging Future Participation

The RR's rhetorical claims for 'sport and games' contradicted physical educationalists' increased knowledge and understanding about children's affective development. Throughout the 1980s researchers argued that pupils' experiences in

physical education lessons shaped their attitudes towards both their level of ability and their bodies, which significantly effect individual self-esteem (Carrington and Leaman 1986). Critical evaluation of the effects of compulsory competitive activities led to an understanding that they could act to inform pupils what they **could not** do. A bias towards highly skilled competitive activities resulted in visible measurement of losers as 'failures'. This caused negative experiences. For a great many pupils failure was the only experience, which led to alienation, neglect and an aversion towards activity. Thus, as physical education is a social process which has long lasting effects on attitudes towards 'oneself' and others, these experiences were not conducive to encouraging life long participation. Therefore, as physical experiences can either empower or disempower according to self-esteem and attribution of locus of control (see Evans and Davies 1993b: p3), development of self-esteem depends on informing pupils what they **can** do. Mental well-being depends on individual achievement, not on comparisons against 'hierarchical norms' based on cultural values. Research suggested that, as self-esteem is a concept of self-worth, children are psychologically motivated to avoid situations that cause hierarchies of self-belief and perceptions of an individual's worth in others (Biddle and Fox 1988: p182-185, Fox 1988a: p34, Fox 1988b: p247). Avoiding injury to mental well-being led to avoidance of physical activity. This has obvious implications for future physical well-being. Educationalists repeatedly emphasised that compulsory team game experiences acted to undermine self-esteem for the majority of pupils. Professor Evans stressed that;

JE ... Simply putting team games on the curriculum is going to alienate a great many children. It is not going to achieve any long lasting love of physical activity. Quite the reverse. It is going to alienate them and turn them away. And that is tragic.

The RR's endeavour to shift society's values from 'social democracy' to the 'social market' centred on imbuing the notion of hierarchy as 'natural' according to individual 'effort and ability': effectively 'social Darwinism' which advocated the repudiation of guilt by the 'strong' towards the 'weak' (see chapter four: p130). The RR claimed that compulsory competition was 'good' for society, and compulsory competitive games was seen as integral in encouraging it (see chapter six: p223). However, research contradicted these claims. Biddle (1991: p92) argued that the hierarchical outcomes of competition determined a child's 'locus of control'. Attributing winning to levels of 'effort and ability', meant that losers believed that they did not have the ability to improve, and winners believed that losers did not put in enough effort. Losers thus sought to avoid situations which undermined their self-esteem. Further, Biddle (1991: p98) argued that, between the ages of seven to ten, children learned to distinguish between 'effort and ability' as individual 'capacity' to achieve. This created expectations in children of their ability to achieve, which in turn effected future levels of effort. Future, voluntarily, participation was encouraged through the creation of positive experiences and attitudes, not through stratification by criteria of ability or inability (Biddle 1989: p64). Educationalists argued that individuals had to be empowered to develop their own knowledge and understanding. This was evident in Professor Murdoch's contribution to ESASC's (1991) report on 'Sport in Schools';

Enthusing children and giving them a base to be participants for the rest of their lives starts early. It starts with confidence in their own ability. If we do not have that, I do not think we have children who wish to continue (ESASC p33).

The Sports Council went further to explain that;

...each experience of physical activity is of paramount importance in determining an individual's life long pattern of participation in sport and recreation. The foundations laid down in school are therefore important elements in the physical experiences of the majority of British children and it is essential to ensure that such early experiences are of high quality...Age 14-16 is a critical age in the development of attitudes to an active lifestyle...The years of adolescence are critical in the development of a strong self-concept and self-esteem. Physical competence is central to self-esteem (ESASC p112-113).

It seemed that, far from developing self esteem and contributing to a healthy population in later life, the RR's definition of physical education as (compulsory) 'sport and games' would result in an avoidance of physical activity for the majority of the population when they no were longer subject to compulsory participation at school.

When this question of the educational value of compulsory competitive games was raised with RR MP James Pawsey²¹, he flatly refuted any possibility of negative experiences;

WK But what about the compulsion for children to play competitive games. The majority do not want to be involved in the traditional competitive team games?

JP I do not agree with you there. I go round schools and I talk to children and they say they love games. All children love games, especially team games. They love to compete and be winners. Look in the playground every break, all you see is children playing games

And, in terms of the arguments about the undermining of self-esteem and well-being;

WK The Government rhetoric is of health, but research shows that these traditional team games do not raise health levels...

JP Nonsense. That is utter crap. I see children running around all the time when playing these games. It is well known that games improve children's health. That is not just physical health but mental health. What is the Latin saying, "A health body and a healthy mind". Being an active child helps foster activity in later life and means adults are healthy.

²¹ Pawsey was chairmen of the Conservative Back Bench Education Committee.

WK That is surely only true for the minority, thirty per cent, who enjoy these activities. They will continue to play in later life. However, the majority, through compulsion, are turned off games and a positive attitude is not created.

JP I do not know where you get you figures...

WK Reports like Wolfenden...

JP ...but again I disagree with them. You say you have thirty percent who enjoy it. I say there are at least another thirty percent on top of that, and another thirty per cent who do it. The last ten per cent, well the least said about them the better.

Pawsey's statements showed the RR's contempt for any arguments which contradicted its aims or belied its rhetoric, and that the RR was prepared to make up its own figures about participation. His final utterance was admission of the RR's contempt towards those children who lack the 'capacity' to be winners.

The Aims of Physical Education's Progressive Discourse

All the educationalists interviewed stressed that 'experience' did not necessarily lead to 'learning'. They were concerned to put the child at the centre of a developmental learning process. This was outlined by Peter Harrison, Secretary of the PEA;

PH [We are] ...attempting to develop an informed user able to reassess their needs and plan appropriately as they get older. To present positive experiences which motivate and encourage through knowledge and understanding...

Murdoch (1990: p223) argued that 'education' is about *how* children learn, rather than *what* they learn, and that physical education needed to change from 'performance' to 'learning'. She emphasised this during interview;

EM If we are going to have a life long effect on young people, which I think is the only rationale for education - I do believe that education has an immediacy, yes. And that the immediate effect is very important - if it is going to be real education it is going to change their behaviour over a period time. That is a long term concept just by its very structure. If that is to be done in physical education, what is needed is to equip people with the skills they can use over long periods. Also, to equip them with the ability to keep involved in activity for a long time. Now, in the physical sense, people change quite markedly over a period of time. Our thinking processes do not change anything like as markedly as our physical processes change, in terms of use. Our thinking processes tend to widen and deepen, but the physical processes change. Peoples' likes, wishes and abilities are very different over their lives. With the consequence that they have got to be able to *know* how to change with that, how make decision and select activities that are appropriate, to know how to make activities work for them and be worth while and so on. That is a *thinking* process, it is a *learning* process. What we were trying to do with

children was to give them the skills required. We never denied that this was a skills based 'doing' subject and that children should come out of it very adept, clever and skilful. However, at the same time they should come out with the knowledge to be able to go on learning with a changing body in a changing environment. That was, and is, a 'learning to learn' approach. We were not just helping them to learn now, we were actually helping them to learn how to learn over a life long period. That is where our thinking bit came in.

Professor Evans outlined what this meant;

JE ... Firstly, that they have an understanding of their bodies, they have a knowledge of what makes their body work and the potential that lies in their body. I see it as a way of having kids understanding the relationship between their corporeal, bodily selves, and their potential for fitness / health / leisure / the overall quality of their lives. ... Now to me, in dealing with those things physical education *has* to take on board both the physical and the social elements. You can't physically educate the child without at the same time telling her/him how their opportunities to be empowered bodily are implicated by social attitudes or affective responses.

This highlighted the importance of developing an understanding of social circumstance and constraints in assisting all in children to develop their potential. This aim to tackle social issues, in combination with creating experiences and opportunities for children to critically evaluate their own circumstances, has obvious dangers for the continued reproduction of capitalist arrangements based on rhetorical justifications. As such, progressive physical education was a political 'hot-potato'.

The Dangers of the Progressive Discourse to the RR

Professor John Tomlinson of Warwick University outlined the dangers to the RR of progressive educationalists' endeavour to develop individual's knowledge and understanding and to develop awareness of their social circumstances through critical evaluation of them;

JT ...They [RR] attributed to the education service the idea of creating dependent people. The irony of it was that progressive education was actually about developing independent minded, individualistic people who could none-the-less see that other people should be treated the same way. Good education is about both individualism and inter-dependence, and respect between individuals. However, that was not how it was seen by the Right. The danger in attributing to education that it contributed to, or was somehow responsible for, the 'dependency culture' is that they [the RR] remove the very things in education that are needed to make market economy work. Those are enterprise and individualism. They will also have to recognise that if enterprise and individualism are promoted, it is going to be uncomfortable for government because people will not always be comfortable about what happens.

Professor Murdoch indicated that increased professionalism in physical education acted as a threat to the RR because it encouraged teachers to be critically reflective over both curriculum content and its cultural implications;

EM ... I think we have become more powerful in that, in the sense that we have become aware of how a bad PE programme can affect a child so adversely. The power of a PE programme to adversely affect children if it is not actually geared to them. So, I think we have decided to try, with curriculum development, to really make it possible for teachers to direct the PE programme to the children....The whole attitude and atmosphere is changing remarkably. That is where physical education is different. That is where it is not 'sport', necessarily. We are actually looking at people. We are actually trying to educate people to be able to enjoy a life of physical activity, comfortably and happily for the rest of their lives. For some that is just not sport. Sport is an anathema.

This gives an indication to why the RR sought initially to constrain ITE and INSET then to progressively gain more and more control over it (see below and Appendix G).

The RR Attempt to Control Physical Education Provision

In its bid to control both the content and form of physical education provision in state schools, the RR sought to influence the public's perception of physical education to create a taken for granted 'common sense' that physical education was sport and games (Evans and Penney 1995a). The media was used in the struggle to define an 'official knowledge' of physical education. Progressive educators were vilified as the 'loony left' subversives in the endeavour to 'justify' central controls. Evans and Penney (1995a: p187) indicate that;

It is critical to note that in this discourse on sport, PE is mentioned only as a practice warranting derision, as a counterpoint to the good practices and positive outcomes to be derived from competitive sports. Sport (and particularly competitive teams games) is equated with Physical Education. The discourse reduces PE to sport, obfuscating the broader curriculum intentions and pedagogic ambitions of the subject and its teachers...this is a profoundly political act. It projects a particular definition of the subject and its aims, fabricates and reinforces one version of a particular aspect of social life in schools, in this case PE

The attack highlighted that physical education is a social, political, economic and cultural issue, which concerns aspects of power and subordination in society.

The process of developing the NC showed where power and control lay in terms of developing educational policy. It embodied power relationships and the discursive strategies concomitant to them. Central government authority was invoked in the production of a curriculum which sought to ensure the reproduction of capitalist arrangements, values and practices. This resulted in the removal of as many recontextualising and reframing bodies between the government and schools as was possible (see Appendix F: p39-41). Evans and Penney (1995a: p185) highlight that;

At the heart of our argument is the claim that the state has endeavoured to both control and define the form and content of the NCPE through the use of discursive strategies and the manipulation of agents and practices within this recontextualising field.

This also meant that ITE and In-service were constrained and reformed to limit critique of central policy, and restrain the dissemination of the progressive discourse. Evans, Penney and Bryant (1993c: p326) indicate that;

...the rush towards innovation and control has limited the opportunities for teachers to reflect on the pedagogical, social, and cultural implications of a NCPE. Nor do the texts of the 'final order', the statutory requirements of the NCPE or the non-statutory guidelines which accompany them encourage them to do so...at a time when issues of equity and equal opportunities ought to be uppermost in the thinking and practice of physical educators if they are to protect the interests of all children in their care, we find them relegated in the official discourse of the subject to a position that will hardly capture a teacher's concerns

The NCPE not only took steps to remove teachers' autonomy through prescription, and reduce the possibilities for teachers to engage in reflective practice, the text did not actively encourage teachers to reflect on the educational value or effect of practice to promote professional development. Control was therefore to come through both what was and what was not written in the text. Of course, this also left the door open for a level of agency and opposition.

Educationalist's Response to ITE Reforms

Educationalist were concerned with several effects of RR ITE policy. These included the shift in emphasis from a 'child centred' input to an 'activity centred' input, the effects of 'on-the-job' ITE and the 'Mentor' system introduced by the Teacher Training Agency (TTA), the shift in ITT from a four year degree to a PGCE, the reduction in LEA advisory staff, and the possible consequence of sports people taking the place of physical education teachers.

Shilling (1993: p69) argued that the RR's determination to implement a technocratic, performance orientated NCPE had its dangers because;

... activity-centred training [NC] is likely to direct teachers towards *technical* concerns associated with conceptualising and executing a performance, rather than the *social* concerns surrounding bodily dispositions.

In this way teacher education *could* be limited to knowledge of the activities within the confines of the NC ATs and PoS. Dick Fisher of SCOPE warned of a possible loss of academic freedom in the short-term and a dilution of professionalism in the long-term which could result in ITE becoming subservient to the aims of the RR (interview).

As part of the consultation process over changes to ITE introduced by the TTA, SCOPE (1993a: p2) highlighted the dangers to the continuation of 'good' and safe practice through removing HE from ITE and introducing the 'Mentor' system;

The acquisition of in-depth subject understanding, across a complex range of activities, is assimilated within a framework of ongoing professional development. Initial teacher training can only provide the first and therefore limited phase in this development. To assume that teachers in schools have all the necessary knowledge and understanding is totally misguided.

ITE lecturer Dr Elizabeth Robertson of Warwick University claimed that the ideology behind RR rhetoric was now being expressed in ITE;

ER ... in terms of teacher education, one of the things that seems to be clear to me, is that the government are claiming - one of the arguments they are using for changing teacher education, is that teacher 'training' over the last ten to twenty years has been ineffective. Why, because the teachers out there cannot do their job properly. So, what are they doing? They are putting the 'training' of new teachers in the hands of those very same, poor, teachers. By saying they [trainees] have got to learn 'on the job' in schools, the only people they can learn from, unless they are going to learn from trial and error, are the very people that the government are saying are no use at doing their job (interview).

Potentially, when those trained 'on-the-job' become the mentors to the next generation of student teachers, the situation will be amplified. In Bridges (1993: p5) view, 'on-the-job' training ignores the social and moral factors which impinge on education, seeking only to achieve specified ends; it leaves unchallenged factors and contexts which are not experienced; and ignores or disguises dilemmas and omits them in solutions. He argued further that the conceptual capacity of the student to recognise and solve problems is reduced as limited experiences lead to 'conceptual blindness', where reflection is removed by Mentors who unwittingly *guide* and *construct* rather than *encourage* reflection and *question*, and so pass on their own ideology. The RR's aim to de-skill the profession would, thus, be well on the way to being achieved.

Those educationalists interviewed were highly critical of the change of route in ITE²². They indicated that change was forced on HE due to cuts in financial and temporal resources. They felt that the one year PGCE course heightened dangers to pupil safety as it provided a lack of knowledge and a reduced variety of school experience for student teachers. Professor John Tomlinson of Warwick University argued that the reduction in time in physical education due to the PGCE was critical;

WK How important is the four year degree to the teaching profession in comparison with the 'on the job' one year method?

²² Chris Laws of Bishop Otter College Chichester, Alistair Loadman of King Alfred's College Winchester, Elizabeth Robertson of Warwick University, Margaret Talbot of Leeds Metropolitan, Elizabeth Murdoch of Brighton University, Alan Tomlinson of Brighton University, Fred Hirst of BCPE and Dick Fisher of PEA

JT Enormously important. There is, I think, an advantage of the four year route. If time is taken to help people to understand how human beings learn, it actually makes them better at learning themselves in their own HE. ...The PGCE route is respectable enough. However, the opportunity to understand learning in your own HE is lost. At least if it happens it happens as a result of the individual's efforts later. The contribution to further professional development is not built in. The other route, the 'Articled' and the 'Licensed' teachers have to be disregarded as derisory. I am quite sure that any teacher with any age of children...needs a really good HE base themselves, in what ever subject. It develops the general powers of the mind, to analyse and to think straight and so on. What ever the subject matter, that is what HE is about. The individual also becomes very knowledgeable and expert in a particular subject. After that, the big thing is to learn about the process of teaching that and how children are helped to learn it. That is much more difficult and takes longer than people think.

Tomlinson was also concerned about the effect of the non graduate entry into teaching. Others in HE were more critical of the political intentions of the RR. John Howells of St Luke's and St John's Plymouth, felt that the momentum towards PGCE courses was driven not only by economic imperatives, but also by the imperative to dilute professionalism;

JH I feel very strongly about this because there is great pressure on the government to get cheap teachers and to go totally PGCE. The reason for that, I think, is quite cynical. With the PGCE group you can turn the tap on and turn it off in one year. You can dictate the numbers. Putting teacher training over to schools when they are already overburdened with all the pressures that I spoke about earlier, I think will be catastrophic. Particularly for the weak student. I think the BEd. course gives the student the chance to grow up in four years. It gives a progressive insight and learning experience into becoming a teacher....What happens if you have a failing student, can you judge someone so quickly, have they got enough time to mature...?

His critique was based on the need for teachers to be professional and autonomously reflective to ensure provision of the best educational experiences possible.

The evidence given to the ESASC 1991 report 'Sport in Schools' warned of the dangers of the reduction of Advisory staff for the provision of an effective physical education programme in the light of reduced resources and inadequate ITE and INSET. Ray Carter of CCPR²³, a former headmaster, emphasised that;

RC And of course, since LMS we have less PE Advisors. They were *vital* people to primary schools. There are fewer PE courses.

WK How important were the LEA advisors to the process?

²³ Carter's argument was based on the CCPR's assertions for the need for 'games' in schools. It does, however, highlight the important role played by Advisory staff.

RC Vital. Absolutely vital. A good LEA Advisor, particularly in primary school where it is most rare to have a PE specialist, even then when they do have one they very often do not use their expertise across the whole school. The primary has teachers who just do not understand. PGCE courses have eight hours of PE. That is all the girl has in terms of physical education training. It is a one year course you see.

WK There has been a decline in LEA Advisors. Why is that?

RC Yes. Because the authority cannot afford them. That is LMS. The money has gone into schools. It has by-passed the LEAs...A disaster. It has been a disaster. In the same way, as for all Advisors, there has been a reduction in numbers.

WK How has that been disastrous?

RC Because the PE Advisors were the experts who could go into schools and observe and say "This is how to do it". They could also put on *free* In-service courses at schools. That has certainly been lost. I do not think there are enough PE specialists being trained within colleges.

Murdoch (1992: p16) highlighted that financial cuts and limited time for the implementation of the NCPE created an 'implementation gap', where there was no longer a coherent mechanism of support to take teachers from documentation to delivery. Yet, the government insisted that ITE and in-service were the responsibility of the LEAs. However, OFSTED²⁴ (1993: p20) reported that many teachers "...lacked knowledge and expertise in teaching physical education: they needed more effective guidance to help improve the quality of their teaching". Thus, despite the RR's rhetoric (Atkins, Hansard 1991 Vol. 199, col. 993 and Key, Hansard 1992 Vol. 212, col. 1249) about the vital role of teachers to assist the government to achieve its aims in physical education, the reality was somewhat different. This was especially pertinent when the publishing of information and OFSTED reports put schools and teachers performance in the spotlight for market choice.

The possible consequences of employing sports people to teach physical education were outlined by Sue Campbell of the NCF;

WK You mentioned physical education and sport. Is there a difference between the two?

SC Yes there is. In some cases people would say that it is a matter of intention rather than a matter of the activity. In other words, if you go along and watch someone *coaching* tennis and you go along and watch someone *teaching* tennis, what the children are doing may look perceptively the same. They will have a racket in their hands and the ball, we hope, will be going over the net. However, the intention of the person working with them may be quite different. The coach will be looking to increase performance whilst having a concern for the individual. The teacher is looking to achieve wider educational

²⁴ OFSTED replaced HMI in 1992/3

objectives through a physical medium. That is **not** just philosophical. It impinges on the way the person leads and structures that activity. What the activity is being used for is the difference. Is it not necessarily that the activity the child is doing looks different, it is the intention of the person working with that child that is different.

Campbell emphasised that the NCF was involved with *educating* coaches about children's needs rather than the requirements of sport. She felt that excellence for a minority of elite performers was a goal to be pursued and encouraged in extra curricular time. This indicates that the country's premier body involved with coaches' development did not agree with the radical policy wanted by the RR, and advised them so (see chapter seven: p251). Evans (1995a and 1995b) was concerned that teachers would, ultimately, through reforms to ITE and constraints over INSET, come under the confining control of central government, leading to reduced reflection and a de-skilled profession.

End Note

It seems clear that, despite the educational arguments, the RR was not concerned whether making traditional competitive team games compulsory for all pupils was educationally worthwhile. Rather, compulsory competitive team games were a central tenet of the RR's endeavour to develop its version of citizenship (see chapter five: p158). The RR was concerned to impose its definition of physical education to facilitate its political, social, cultural and economic interests. Thus, team games became the only compulsory element of the NCPE. This was despite considerable and consistent evidence from educationalists, and many in the world of sport, which argued a contrary viewpoint. As such, through the law of the land, traditional competitive team games were enforced as a compulsory part of the education of every child in state school. Further, reforms to ITE sought to reduce teachers' autonomy and critical reflection in a bid to reduce their opposition to NR/RR initiatives in the longer-term.