

**THATCHERISM IN SCOTLAND:
AN EXPLORATION OF EDUCATION POLICY
IN THE SECONDARY SECTOR**

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

by

MARGARET A. ARNOTT

**Department of Government
UNIVERSITY OF STRATHCLYDE**

August 1993

'The copyright of this thesis belongs to the author under the terms of the United Kingdom Copyright Acts as qualified by the University of Strathclyde Regulation 3.49. Due acknowledgement must always be made of the use of any material contained in, or derived from, this thesis.'

DECLARATION

Except where otherwise indicated this thesis is my own work.

Margaret A. Arnott

August 1993

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	1
List of Tables	3
Acknowledgements	5
Introduction	6
<u>PART 1 CONSERVATISM IN SCOTLAND</u>	
<u>Chapter 1 Conservative Statecraft in Scotland</u>	10
Introduction	10
Basic Tenets of "British" Conservatism	10
Rejection of Ideology	11
Role of Government	12
Conservative Attitude to Continuity and Change	15
The Constitution	18
National Identity and Patriotism	19
Development of Conservatism in the Scottish Context	21
Attitude to Continuity and Change	22
<i>Conservative Governments and the Scottish Central Administration</i>	25
The Constitution and the Union	30
National Identity and Political Values	33
Reconciling 'Dual Identities': Squaring the Circle ?	40
Conclusion	49
<u>Chapter 2 Thatcherism and the Government of Scotland</u>	54
Introduction	54
The Thatcher Governments and Thatcherism: A Departure from Traditional "British" Conservatism ?	54
Ideological Nature of Thatcherite Statecraft	57
Thatcherite Statecraft and Organic Change	68
The Role of Government	70
Thatcherite Statecraft and the Constitution	74
Implications for the Government of Scotland	75
The Constitution and the Union	76
Thatcherite Interpretation of Change	84
Conclusion	84

PART 2 THATCHERITE EDUCATION POLICY IN SCOTLAND

<u>Chapter 3 The Scottish Education System: A Historical Perspective</u>	90
Introduction	90
Administrative and Institutional Structure of the Scottish Education System	91
Scottish Education Department	91
Scottish Consultative Council on the Curriculum and the Scottish Examination Board	97
General Teaching Council	100
Implications of Administrative and Institutional Differences	101
Culture of the Scottish Education System	102
Education Policy-Making in the Scottish Context	116
<u>Chapter 4 Thatcherite Education Policy in Scotland: Part 1</u>	127
Introduction	127
Standard Grade	128
National Certificate	132
5-14 Programme	135
The Development of TVEI: Conflict and Consensus	137
Conclusion	142
<u>Chapter 5 Thatcherite Education Policy in Scotland: Part 2</u>	
Introduction	146
Elements of Thatcherite Education Policy	147
Choice	147
Competition	153
Financial	156
Conclusion	158
Thatcherite Education Policy in Scotland	159
Choice	159
Competition	170
Financial	173
Conclusion	179

PART 3 REACTIONS TO THATCHERITE EDUCATION POLICY IN SCOTLAND

<u>Chapter 6 A Study of Head Teachers' and Teachers' Attitudes: Methodological Procedures</u>	184
Introduction	184
Aims of Fieldwork	184
Location of Fieldwork	187
Focus of Fieldwork	191
Selection of Schools	193
Head Teacher Interviews	195
Survey of Teachers' Attitudes	199
Parental Reactions	205
Some Problems In Conducting Research Into Thatcherite Education Policy	207
<u>Chapter 7 Reactions of Educational Professionals to Thatcherite Education Policy</u>	211
Introduction	211
Perceptions of Head Teachers	211
Community Schooling	212
Status of Teachers	227
Generalist Tradition	
Perceptions of Teachers	229
Community Schooling	236
Generalist Tradition	244
Status of Teachers	247
Implications for Policy- Making in Scotland	253
<u>Chapter 8 Parental Reactions to Thatcherite Education Policy in Scotland</u>	261
Introduction	261
Differing Contexts of Parental Reactions in Scotland and England	261
Parental Reactions	265
School Boards	266
Opting Out	274
National Testing	275
Relationship Between the Educational Professionals and Parents in Scotland: Some Implications for the Thatcher Governments	279

**PART 4 IMPLICATIONS OF THATCHERITE STATECRAFT IN
SCOTLAND**

Thatcherism and the Government of Scotland 286

**The Implications for Future Conservative Governments in
Scotland 296**

Appendices

Appendix 1: Fieldwork Schools 306

Appendix 2: Head Teacher Interview Schedule 308

Appendix 3: Questionnaire to Principal Teachers 310

Bibliography 316

**THATCHERISM IN SCOTLAND : AN EXPLORATION OF
EDUCATION POLICY IN THE SECONDARY SECTOR**

The continued existence of a distinctive civil society in Scotland has certain implications for Conservatism in Scotland. Specifically, Scottish Conservatives can identify with a set of institutions which are peculiarly Scottish. Scottish Conservatives can accommodate this stance with their Unionist philosophy so long as the British leadership of the party is willing to recognise and exercise some degree of flexibility over how Scotland is governed. Problems arise for the Conservative Party in Scotland when Conservative statecraft chooses to either ignore or undermine the distinctive elements of Scottish civil society.

The Thatcher Governments were different in significant respects from previous post war Conservative Governments. Ideology informed a number of policies which were introduced by the Thatcher Governments and specifically those policies which challenged the social component of the social democratic state. This had implications for the Thatcher Governments in Scotland. By pursuing ideologically motivated social policies, which undermined the social democratic consensus, the Thatcher Governments were seeking to alter the most distinctive institutions in Scottish civil society. In order to understand the implications that this had for the government of Scotland, an analysis has been conducted of Thatcherite education policy .

The Scottish education system has been and continues to be an important component of Scottish national identity. The thesis analyses a number of issues in relation to education policy, including the manner in which educational professionals reacted to Thatcherite education policy, and what the implications were of their reactions for the implementation of policy. The reactions of teachers and head teachers to Thatcherite

education policy demonstrate that the distinctiveness of the Scottish education system presented the Thatcher Governments with specific problems in their implementation of public policy

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1	Analysis by Region of Views on Whether the Quality of Education Should be the Same for All	36
Table 1.2	Analysis by Region of Attitudes of the Ability of Comprehensive Schools to Teach Basic Skills	37
Table 5.1	Composition of School Boards	168
Table 5.2	Comparison of DMR and LMS	174
Table 6.1	Analysis of Response Bias	202
Table 7.1	Teachers' Attitudes to Opting Out	231
Table 7.2	Relationship between necessity Opting out and demand for opting out in Scotland	233
Table 7.3	Financial Repercussions of Opting Out	235
Table 7.4	Relationship between Teachers' Perceptions of Anglicisation and Level of Consultation Prior to Introduction of Opting Out	235
Table 7.5	Teachers' Attitudes to School Boards	236
Table 7.6	Perceptions of School Boards and Opting Out	237
Table 7.7	Perceptions of School Boards and Demand for Opting Out	238
Table 7.8	Perceptions of Anglicisation and Extent of Consultation Prior to the Introduction of School Boards	240
Table 7.9	Perceptions of Anglicisation and School Boards	241
Table 7.10	Extent of Influence School Boards have on the Curriculum	245

Table 7.11	Relationship between Financial Powers of School Boards and Influence on the Curriculum	246
Table 7.12	Perceptions of anglicisation and Parental Participation	247
Table 7.13	Perceptions of Anglicisation and Composition of School Boards	248
Table 8.1	Parental Reactions to National Testing	278

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I should like to acknowledge the Economic and Social Research Council for awarding the Research Studentship which made this research possible (Award No. R00428824004). I am grateful to the staff of the Social Science Statistics Laboratory and the Computing Centre at Strathclyde University for their assistance.

Principally, my thanks go to my supervisors. Malcolm Punnett, who supervised the first two years of the research, commented on earlier drafts of the chapters. I would like to acknowledge John Curtice, who has supervised the thesis since 1990, for his continued support. His suggestions and comments on the thesis were invaluable.

I wish to record my thanks to head teachers and teachers who participated in the fieldwork. I would also like to thank the Director of Education in Strathclyde Region for permission to conduct the fieldwork.

I would also like here to record my thanks to those I have worked with over the past two years, at Birmingham University's Centre for Educational Management and Policy Studies and latterly at the University of Edinburgh and the Scottish Council for Research in Education.

My thanks go to my parents, Helen and Ian Arnott, for their encouragement and understanding.

The thesis is divided into four parts. The first part, which includes chapters 1 and 2, introduces the hypotheses and research questions addressed in the thesis. Broadly speaking, these chapters analyse different brands of contemporary Conservative thought in Scotland and Britain. The first chapter examines the distinctive intellectual roots of Scottish Conservatism and assesses the extent to which Scottish Conservatism and "British" Conservatism share certain beliefs and principles. The chapter also examines the reasons why Scottish Conservatism is distinct from "British Conservatism." The second chapter focuses specifically on the Thatcher Governments and Thatcherism. The chapter analyses the approach which the Thatcher Governments adopted to the government of Scotland. A number of issues are examined, including the extent to which ideology influenced the approach adopted by the Thatcher Government in Scotland. In order to understand the approach adopted, the chapter opens with an analysis of how Thatcherism differs from "British Conservatism."

The second part of the thesis concentrates on education policy in Scotland. The chapters in this part of the thesis explore the implications of Thatcherite statecraft in Scotland for education policy. By looking at education policy it is hoped to gain an insight into how the Thatcher Governments governed in Scotland. In order to understand the distinctive context in which the Thatcher Government had to implement its education policies, a summary of the administrative and institutional arrangements of the Scottish education system is given in chapter 3. There is also a discussion of the culture or ideology which permeates that system. Some thought has also been given to the implications which the existence of a distinctive Scottish education system has for the policy process. Chapters 4 and 5 examine Thatcherite education policy in Scotland. Chapter 4 looks at those policies which were dealt with uncontroversially and discusses why these policies were able to command the support of the educational community. Chapter 5 opens with a discussion of the elements of Thatcherite education such as competition and choice. How these

elements were applied to education policy in Scotland is discussed in the second part of the chapter.

The third part of the thesis consists of the analysis of the fieldwork data. Chapter 6 outlines the methodological procedures which were employed in the fieldwork. It explains the aims and location of the fieldwork. There is also a discussion of some of the difficulties of conducting research into education policy in Scotland. Chapter 7 analyses the fieldwork data collected from teachers and head teachers. The chapter examines how teachers and head teachers reacted to the implementation of Thatcherite education policy. The implications of these reactions for policy-making in Scotland are also examined.

Chapter 8 focuses on the reaction of parents in Scotland to Thatcherite education policy. A number of issues are addressed including the extent to which parents and teachers in Scotland had a shared view of on the kind of education service they wanted to see in Scotland. If there was a shared view what were the implications of this for the Thatcher Governments ? Another issue examined in this chapter is the degree of success the Thatcher Government had in mobilising parental support behind its education policies.

The final part reflects upon the earlier parts of the thesis and includes some concluding comments on how the Thatcher Government governed in Scotland. There is also some discussion of the implications of Thatcherite statecraft in Scotland for future Conservative Governments. The thesis also furthers our understanding of the kind of problems central governments might face in implementing education policy in Scotland.

Part 1 Conservatism In Scotland

CHAPTER 1

CONSERVATISM AND SCOTLAND

Introduction

Throughout Britain Conservatives share certain beliefs and principles. These basic tenets of Conservatism are examined in the first section of this chapter. In the second section it is argued that differences emerge among Conservatives in applying their basic principles to the Scottish political environment. Conservative statecraft in Scotland has had to contend with the implications of Conservatism's development within two distinct national contexts.

What do we mean by statecraft ? According to Bulpitt the primary concern of statecraft is "to resolve the electoral and governing problems facing a party at any time. As a result it is concerned as much with the 'how' as the 'what' of politics."¹ If statecraft is to be defined in such terms, the analysis of Conservatism should assess not only Conservative principles and beliefs but also how these principles are applied by the Conservative Party towards the government of Scotland. This implies that Conservative administrations will, as Andrew Gamble has argued in relation to the Thatcher Governments, make policy decisions which "reflect the Conservative political interest."²

Basic Tenets of Conservatism

Without a clear understanding of what constitutes "British" Conservative philosophy it would be impossible to identify the respects in which Scottish Conservative thought is distinctive. The assumption here is that Conservatives as a whole do have a specific philosophy which conditions their political outlook. Just as Socialists refer to certain ideals and values so do Conservatives.

There is a tendency to present Conservatism in a negative manner. It is characterised as anti-rationalist, anti-state, anti-equality and opposed to the idea of radical change. A definition of Conservatism, in more positive terms, may be more elusive and problematic than definitions of socialism or liberalism. Conservatism is, however, much more than a negative philosophy. There are identifiable Conservative approaches and traditions, which Rhodes Boyson refers to as the "characteristics" of Conservatism³, David Willets describes as "principles"⁴ and what Ian Gilmour prefers to call "perennial themes"⁵

Rejection of ideology

These approaches and traditions are described by Conservatives as pragmatic. Arguably, any political party if it wishes to attain power may tactically adapt its ideological pretensions in favour of a more pragmatic outlook. Where Conservatives claim they are different from adherents of socialism, liberalism or indeed any other "-ism", is the contempt they hold for ideology, preferring themselves to be guided by what is practicable in given circumstances.

To Conservatives it is superfluous and indeed dangerous to follow a determinist political programme shaped by ideology. Ian Gilmour is far from being the only Conservative to believe that ideology will ultimately undermine freedom because of its belief "in simplicity."⁶ Conservatives reject the notion that man is essentially good, and hold that he is on the whole evil, or at very best imperfect. In Roger Scruton's words "a society has its diseased and destructive factions, and it is with those the conservative is at war."⁷ Man, so this line of argument continues, is therefore incapable of creating a perfect society. Noel O'Sullivan contends that the most apt description of Conservatism is "the philosophy of imperfection committed to the idea of limits."⁸ The pessimistic attitude of Conservatism is exemplified in the quote below from Rhodes Boyson's book *Centre Forward*:-

It (the Conservative Party) starts from the concept of the fallen man and does not imagine that from imperfect nature an ideal or perfect society can be fashioned. It believes that life can be made tolerable and even good, but not that the pre-Fall-of-Man, Garden of Eden society, can be reconstructed...It thus accepts the non- perfectibility of man and does not desire to transform him, entrap him or burn him to save his political soul. Instead it believes that by studying the past and using it as a compass bearing for the present, men can achieve a great deal as long as they understand their limitations. ⁹

Norton and Aughey have argued that the imperfect nature of man means that ideology cannot succeed:-

Ultimately, man cannot be sheltered from his own imperfections and for this reason ideology and doctrine are inherently flawed. ¹⁰

Ideology, to a Conservative, is not the answer to political problems because, as Francis Pym contends, "(ideology) flies in the face of human nature, common sense, historical and personal experience."¹¹ Instead, the Conservative must only accept what is practicable, not what is preferred in a utopian society. This fatalistic approach to politics influences the Conservative view of the role of government.

The Role of Government

Conservatives therefore believe that man is imperfect, and that the creation of an utopian society is not possible. The perception which Conservatives have of human nature, and specifically of the fallibility of man influences the view they have of government. So what is the role of government ? Conservatives agree that government has the right to exercise supreme authority. However, there are two views about how that authority should be used to counter man's imperfection. Conservatives disagree about when, and in what conditions, it is appropriate for government to exercise its supreme authority, and under what conditions government is best able to exercise its authority. These two views have been succinctly summarised by Norton and Aughey:-

There is one school of thought within the Conservative Party which accepts the State should be used to help alleviate these imperfections, while another rejects State intervention in this context and argues against interfering with the "natural order" of society.¹²

Two distinct concepts of government have developed in the post war period. On the one hand, there are those Conservatives who advocate a strictly limited role for government. On the other hand, some Conservatives endorse government intervention. The former draw heavily on the work of the New Right to justify their stance, and specifically the New Right critique of Keynesianism and the post-war consensus. This group has severe misgivings over the extent of government expansion since 1940. The encroachment of government into more and more areas of economic and social policy has not to be just stopped, but reversed. In their eyes, the issue is whether government should be involved in anything outwith purely regulative functions. The growth of government has jeopardised the freedom of the individual by restricting his right of choice.

This line of argument is echoed in the writings of Michael Oakeshott. No government should lose sight of the fact, Oakeshott asserts, that the role of government is "specific and limited" and therefore, by implication one may deduce, not open and wide-ranging.¹³ Its sole function is to rule, through the enforcement of law :-

And the office of government is not to impose other beliefs and activities upon its subjects, not to tutor or to educate them, not to make them better or happier in another way, not to direct them, to galvanise them into acts, to lead them, or co-ordinate their activities so that no occasion of conflict shall occur; the office of government is merely to rule. This is a specific and limited, easily corrupted when it is combined with any other, and in the circumstances, indispensable.¹⁴

Oakeshott stresses one should not misinterpret this "specific and limited" role, as government having no responsibilities or duties.¹⁵ On the contrary, it is the duty of government to preserve peace and protect the rights and the property of the

individual. In achieving this objective government must not compromise the individual's right of choice. Government, in the last analysis, is to be an arbitrator adjudicating when "activities", not individuals, come into conflict. The "specific and limited" role he assigns to government is to foster peaceful coexistence so that each member of society is free to pursue his own activities. It would be folly for a government to attempt to change men for the better. To go down this road would stifle the freedom of the individual and ultimately end in dictatorship.

The authority of government, some Conservatives argue, has been undermined because it has become too cumbersome. The obvious solution is to excise those functions which do not, in their view, fall within the remit of government. A leaner government would be better equipped to exercise its authority in those areas where its involvement was legitimate, such as maintaining peace and regulating the market.

Not all Conservatives endorse this line of argument, choosing instead to argue that government cannot simply sit back and ignore the plight of the less fortunate in society. W.H.Greenleaf has described this as the "development of Conservatism in the collectivist mode."¹⁶ This has produced, he maintains, a "brand of Conservatism that has increasingly found both necessary and proper the intervention of government in the nation's economic and social life."¹⁷ Admittedly, these Conservatives have recently been perceived to be out of step with official party policy, but this should in no way detract from the important contribution they make to contemporary Conservative thinking. These "One Nation" Tories, the "wets" of the popular press, believe that the Conservative Party, as the party of the nation as a whole, has certain obligations. Ian Gilmour writes:-

A party which puts forward policies that blatantly favour only one section of the community does not believe in "One Nation" and plainly is not a national party. (The Tory Party) does justly claim to put the national interest before any sectional interest, such as an abstraction like the working class, and before any ideology such as socialism.¹⁸

Government, therefore, has a duty to preserve the unity of the nation and this means not promoting the interests of one group of society at the expense of another group. If government did not behave in this manner, it would be divisive, and ultimately, undermine its own legitimacy, and the stability of society. This vision has a long tradition in the Conservative Party. Disraeli, for instance, believed that government had a role to play in helping the poorer sections of society. Indeed Lord Blake credits Disraeli with being the founder of modern Conservatism.¹⁹

"One Nation" Conservatives do not go so far as to advocate a systematic programme aimed at dramatically extending the role of government but they do acknowledge government has a duty to assist those in need of help. The important point is that these Conservatives recognise a need for government intervention outwith purely regulatory functions.

The Conservative Attitude to Continuity and Change

Conservatives are not opposed to change. Indeed we recognise that the certain thing about life is that it does change. Certainly, we do not equate change with progress and we have always resisted both abnormal change and abnormal pace of change... Above all, we envisage change in terms of building brick by brick, not of tearing everything down and starting again.²⁰

The above quote, taken from Francis Pym's book *The Politics of Consent*, encapsulates two aspects essential to the Conservative view of change. Firstly, Conservatives are not inherently opposed to change. Conservatives follow Burke's reasoning on this matter, accepting that change is necessary in order to conserve, providing it is slow and continual. Radical change, on the other hand, is inappropriate because man can never make a fresh start, he must always build on what already existed. It might be closer to the truth to describe the Conservative

position as advocating adaptation of existing institutions and conventions rather seeking to initiate change.

Contemporary Conservative thought on this issue has been influenced considerably by the writings of Michael Oakeshott. In his essay *On Being Conservative* he outlines his perception of the Conservative attitude to change and continuity. Oakeshott argues that change can only be tolerable to a Conservative if it does not cause any radical repercussions and therefore may be easily accommodated within society. It is by applying these criteria that Conservatives should decide whether change is desirable or not. Oakeshott differentiates between the desire for change for its own sake (radicals are guilty of this) on the one hand, and on the other, change that is aimed at innovation. For Conservatives to accept the latter it must be associated with improvement. If Conservatives chose, however, to endorse any kind of change they must recognise that "(change) will always lead to more extensive change than originally intended."²¹ Accordingly, Conservatives must always remember "the disruption entailed has always to be set against the benefit anticipated."²²

The second aspect of the Conservative attitude to change to which Pym refers is the belief that it should be limited in nature. This is a theme which can be found frequently in writings on the nature of Conservatism. Rhodes Boyson also emphasises the need to place strict controls on the extent of change. Conservatives, he argues, should be wary of change that will have repercussions throughout the whole of society. The logic is that if change is limited then it is possible to control the damage it may cause.²³

Change is viewed with scepticism. The status quo is the preferred option. Conservatives are wary of the introduction of radical initiatives, however well

prepared and rational the planning may be for these initiatives. Above all, change must be evolutionary and grounded in the historical development of practices and institutions. Change initiated by politicians who follow a determinist ideological programme is dangerous; it will cause untold damage. This applies also where change is speculative in nature and its proponents are convinced the results will be beneficial. Perhaps speculative change may have positive effects but a Conservative is not willing to risk its effects being negative and undermining stability. It is better to live with prevailing disadvantages or faults of existing practices and institutions, than to be overzealous and introduce speculative change. Conservatives believe that this runs the risk of ending up in a position worse than that before the change was initiated. In this context, change is destructive. Hence, the Conservatives' preference for limited change based in practical experience that will maintain stability in society.

Ian Gilmour, as James Mitchell has noted, claims there are two identifiable Conservative attitudes to change. The first is associated with Sir Robert Peel who, in Gilmour's words, "accepted the inevitable at the very last moment or even later."²⁴ The second attitude is labelled Disraelian and differed significantly from the former because, "whereas Peel usually accepted the inevitable, Disraeli tried to forestall it."²⁵ Gilmour explains that the Disraelian attitude is "anticipatory" and is likely to result in less change than would occur under the Peelite approach.

The Conservative attitude to change is above all conditioned by the desire to preserve. As a result, Conservatives tend to have a romanticised notion of the existing British institutions and practices. Nevil Johnson points out that in doing so they may be appealing "to conditions and experiences which have vanished for good."²⁶ Conservatives, he states, perceive their role as essentially "defensive and protective" and by implication not innovative and radical.²⁷ The Conservative Party,

however, has the same *raison d'être* as all other political parties namely, to win power. This presents Conservatives with a dilemma. What do they do if confronted by demands for radical change by the electorate ? How do they reconcile their natural aversion to change with the desire to win popular approval ? Some Conservatives believe that radical change under any circumstances will wholly undermine institutions and practices, thereby achieving the very thing that the change was trying to prevent. This is the reasoning of those Conservatives who reject legislative devolution.

The Constitution

The constitution has in the minds of Conservatives become associated with a number of traditions, conventions and institutions. These include the House of Lords, the Union, and the judiciary. One of the key components of the constitution, for Conservatives, is the principle of parliamentary sovereignty. A.V.Dicey maintained that it meant that "Parliament has under the English constitution, the right to make or unmake any law whatever; and, further, that no person or body is recognised by the law of England as having a right to override or set aside the legislation of Parliament."²⁸ The constitution is a set of rules and customs which man should comply with in their exercise of power. In the words of Roger Scruton the constitution comprises "those rules and customs through which men engage in the exercise of power: it is what guides, limits and authorizes power..."²⁹

Conservatives regard the constitution as a product of experiences and practices acquired over generations. As such it should be treated with respect and accorded, as one Conservative phrases it, "more importance than formal constitutions or laws."³⁰ To preserve the substance of the constitution, while also maintaining the status quo, Conservatives argue, change must be organic. Paradoxically, Conservatives have found themselves in some instances conceding radical constitutional change in order

to preserve the existing power structure. It was a Conservative, not Liberal, Government that enfranchised the working class male in the Reform Act of 1867.

National Identity and Patriotism

In the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries the Conservative Party has been associated with the concept of the nation. By implication, this has led Conservatives to regard themselves as patriots. Patriotism, they believe, can unify a nation. Rhodes Boyson includes a chapter on this very topic in *Centre Forward* entitled "Patriotism, National Unity and Identity". Throughout the chapter he uses emotive language. For instance, he argues "without patriotism a society falls apart and the people thwarted of confidence and pride turn to worship false gods."³¹ Boyson also harks back to the days of the Empire when Britain was a world power and "gave peace, security, prosperity and the foundations of freedom to peoples who never had them before."³² Patriotism, this line of argument continues, acts as a bond between people in a nation. Logically, therefore, the party which can present itself as representing the national interest can unite society. Sectionalism is rejected in favour of national unity.

In *Conservatism and Conservatives* Norton and Aughey argue patriotism is an accepted principle of Conservatism :-

Social unity remains the end of Conservative politics. Patriotism is the sentiment that remains essential to its attainment. The Conservative Party still believes that it, distinctly, is identified with the history, traditions and symbols of the British nation, and that it is best fitted to interpret the needs of the nation.³³

Conservatism has been thought of having a disposition towards imperialism and a commitment to the Empire. Disraeli in the 1870s recognised the political significance of attitudes towards the Empire. In a speech at the Crystal Palace on June 24th 1872 he presented the Conservative Party as the protector of the Empire. The theme of imperialism ran through the speech. Disraeli argued:-

It (the issue) is whether you will be content to be a comfortable England, modelled and moulded upon Continental principles and meeting in due course an inevitable fate, or whether you would be a great country, an Imperial country. England is the metropolis of a great maritime Empire extending to the boundaries of the farthest Ocean.³⁴

The decline of Britain's status in the world had implications for Conservative politics. One of the things that made the party distinctive to the electorate was the pride it had in the British nation. This changing perception may ultimately, Rhodes Boyson believes, undermine social unity in Britain. He suggests pride in the British nation served not only to unite the working class throughout the country but also to heighten working class awareness of the Conservative Party's identity. Undermining this pride and British self-confidence could irrevocably damage national unity, especially at a time of economic crisis.³²

Under Margaret Thatcher's premiership, the image of the Conservatives as the party of nation and patriotism was vigorously promoted. Events, many of which were quite fortuitous, enabled her to exploit hitherto latent patriotic and nationalist values. The first Thatcher Government was able to capitalise on resentment against the unions that had built up largely in response to the "Winter of Discontent." Conservatives argued that by pursuing their own sectional interests, the "trade union barons" were undermining the national interest. In labelling trade unions as the "enemy within" the Government presented the actions of the unions as irresponsible and against the good of the nation.

The increasing importance of British nationalism to contemporary Conservative politics only really became explicit at the time of the Falklands conflict. With the assistance of a predominantly right-wing popular press, the Government was able to capitalise on the conflict to restore its popularity. The sharp decline in the Government's and specifically Margaret Thatcher's popularity was stemmed, and the

party position in opinion polls improved dramatically.³⁵ Richard Eccleshall maintains that for Conservatives the Falklands conflict was "a symbol that the nation's domestic decline could be arrested, and its role on the international stage restored."³⁶ In Margaret Thatcher's words:-

The spirit of the South Atlantic (was a sign that) Britain had ceased to be a nation in retreat...and still has those sterling qualities which shine through our history.³⁷

In the final stages of the Thatcher Government, Margaret Thatcher and some of her close political allies sought to depict British membership of the European Exchange Rate Mechanism as a threat to British nationality and in particular to the revered concept of parliamentary sovereignty.

The experience of the Thatcher Governments indicates that patriotism and British nationalism is still relevant to Conservative politics. After the Falklands conflict, the Conservative Party was able to exploit patriotism as a positive influence on the electorate. Margaret Thatcher recognised that patriotism can still act as a bond between people in a nation and in this respect she remained within the parameters of established Conservative thought.

The Development of Conservatism in the Scottish Context

The development of Conservatism in Scotland has been informed by a distinctive Scottish tradition. This has influenced the way in which Scottish Conservatives have applied the basic tenets identified above to the Scottish context. The discussion below centres on those tenets of Conservatism which have particular relevance to the Scottish context, namely, the Conservative attitude to change and continuity; the constitution and the Union and national identity. The key question is how were these tenets applied to the Scottish context ? The discussion of the commitment which

Conservatives have to national identity proceeds along slightly different lines from the discussion of the Conservative attitude towards change. In order to understand the interpretation which Scottish Conservatives have of this tenet, one must first assess the extent to which a distinctly Scottish identity existed. Thus, this section begins with an examination of the extent to which there is a specifically Scottish identity. The discussion then moves on to how Scottish Conservatives were able to reconcile their Scottish identity with their political outlook.

Attitude to continuity and change

Scottish Conservatives belong to a party which wishes to preserve certain key English institutions and practices. If they do not wish the Scottish party to be anglicised, Conservatives in Scotland must logically seek to preserve a different set of institutions and practices from their colleagues south of the border. The views of Conservatives in Scotland on the desirability of change within the Scottish context would be at odds with those of "British" Conservatives. This potential for conflict follows from the basic Conservative tenet that change should be evolutionary and grounded in the historical development of institutions and practices some of which are different in Scotland and England.

In his essay *Conservatism and Progress* John Buchan stressed that change should be informed by tradition. He argues that "there should be no violent disruption, that growth should be continuous like the growth of a plant. With a living thing you cannot have change that is too drastic"³⁸ Buchan described himself in his autobiography *Memory Hold the Door* "as a Tory in the sense that I disliked change unless the need for it was amply proved, and that I desired to preserve continuity with the past and keep whatever foundations were sound. As I used to put in a fisherman's simile, if your back cast is poor your forward cast will be a mess." ³⁹

Scotland's society has remained distinctive in a number of important respects from that of her southern neighbour. The Union Settlement of 1707 ensured that, at least as far as social institutions were concerned, Scotland would retain her own distinct identity. The Act of Union transferred economic and political control from Edinburgh to London, but guaranteed that in the social sphere Scotland would retain her distinctive institutions. Specifically, provision was made for what are frequently referred to as the "three pillars of Scottish society" namely Scots Law, the Kirk and the education system.

The Scots legal system is distinct from the English system. Much of the Scots legal tradition is based on Roman law rather than common law which is the basis of English law. Lord Cooper, Lord Justice General 1947-1954, dates the Scottish legal tradition from Stair:-

The publication of his (Stair's) Institutions in 1681 marked the creation of Scots Law as we have since known it- an original amalgam of Roman Law, Feudal Law and native customary law...To this work and its author every Scots lawyer has since paid tribute of almost superstitious reverence...⁴⁰

The existence of a separate legal system has contributed to the maintenance of Scottish national consciousness. In his essay *Scots Law Today* Professor Michael Meston maintains that "Scotland has laws, courts and legal professions quite separate from those of the other constituent parts of the United Kingdom."⁴¹ Writing in 1991, the Lord Chancellor, Lord MacKay of Clashfern, argued that:-

It is surely a very remarkable fact that 280 years after the Treaty of Union which the Parliaments of Scotland and England were united into the Parliament of the United Kingdom the Scottish Legal System and the principles under which it operates are as strong today as they were at the time of the Union.⁴²

Scotland through its legal system, he maintains, has made a "distinctive contribution to the legal heritage of the world."⁴³

The Kirk's central position in Scottish society was also maintained under the terms of the Union. The Church of Scotland was much more independent of State control than the Anglican Church was in England. One writer has commented:-

British Governments had to deal with a very different Establishment from the one which their members knew. The ecclesiastical development of Scotland since the Reformation had produced a Church not only doctrinally and liturgically dissimilar and administratively distinct from England but much more independent of the State.⁴⁴

At the time of the Union, there was a very close relationship between the Kirk and education. The Kirk was responsible for the provision of most elementary education. It was the practice of the Kirk to provide a broadly based education. Scottish education long maintained a generalist tradition. For instance, the 'A level system' in England encourages pupils to specialise, while in Scotland 'the Highers' do not encourage any such narrow specialisation.

If the prerequisite for change is that it must be organic, then clearly Scottish Conservatives could not condone change that might be organic to English society but not to Scottish society. Irrespective of whether the change is driven by a Peelite or Disraelian approach, it could be potentially damaging politically for the party to institute any form of change not relevant to the Scottish context. While it will be argued later that the Peelite approach to change may present more problems for Conservative statecraft in Scotland than the Disraelian approach, one should not assume, that because the nature of change instituted by a Conservative Government is Disraelian, it is then automatically relevant to the Scottish context. The rationale behind radical change in England may counter Scottish traditions and practices. In such a case, Scottish Conservatives find it increasingly difficult to accommodate their Scottish identity with their political outlook.

However, in identifying Peelite and Disraelian attitudes to change, Ian Gilmour used the question of Scotland to demonstrate how Disraelian change may help to forestall more dramatic and profound change. Writing in the mid 1970s, Gilmour speculates, that:-

If either party had been more sympathetic earlier to Scottish aspirations for greater control over her own affairs, probably less change would have been necessary than now seems probable.⁴⁵

It is in its handling of the government of Scotland that Conservative statecraft has arguably been most disposed to adopting a Disraelian attitude. The development of the Scottish Office under successive Conservative administrations is an example of Disraelian change. The discussion below of the development of the Scottish Office under Conservative Governments demonstrates that Conservative statecraft has indeed been prepared to acknowledge and respond to the Scottish tradition.

Conservative Governments and the Scottish Central Administration

Successive Conservative Governments have made a significant contribution to the development of a central administration in Scotland. The impetus for reforms in the Scottish administration has, as Mitchell states:-

...usually been of two sorts; either they (Conservative Party) have been responding to political pressure- appeasing Scottish nationalism, or for reasons of administrative efficacy.⁴⁶

The Scottish Office was established in Hanham's words as "a concession to Scottish sentiment."⁴⁷ Prior to 1885 the government of Scotland was largely in the hands of the Lord Advocate and the Scottish Secretary. However, in practice it was the Scottish boards which conducted most Scottish matters on a day to day basis. This administrative system has been described by Hood et al "as a group of departments which existed as distinct departments or boards in or for Scotland prior to their incorporation in the Scottish Office."⁴⁸ These included the Scottish Education

Department (SED); the Board of Supervision for the Relief of the Poor and for Public Health and the Fishery Board. There had been growing dissatisfaction at treatment of Scottish business in Parliament. In response to cross party pressure for the establishment of the Scottish Office, Gladstone's Government introduced a Bill in 1884, receiving its Royal Assent under the Conservative Government of Lord Salisbury.

Shortly after its creation in the late 1880s, the Scottish Office assumed responsibility for law and order. However, the creation of the Scottish Office did not mark the end of the Board system of management. The role of Scottish Secretary was "essentially that of a co-ordinator."⁴⁹ He did not have, nor was he intended to have, an innovative role. Richard Parry maintains:-

What the 1885 Scottish Office did not do was to absorb and consolidate the existing agencies of Scottish government. The office was a symbolic effort to acknowledge Scottish dignity and provide a territorial focus for Scotland.⁵⁰

Hanham has argued that prior to 1914 a major administrative reorganisation was unlikely because of the salience of the Home Rule issue. However, after 1914 Home Rule was less of an issue and, as Hanham states, "the inconveniences of the existing system began to seem more pressing."⁵¹ In 1914 the Royal Commission on the Civil Service (the MacDonnell Commission) criticised the Scottish boards for being out of step with civil service practices. Specifically, the Commission was unhappy with the lack of communication between the boards and central government. It was also critical of the manner in which people were appointed to the boards. It was not until 1928, however, that a Bill was presented to Parliament based on the recommendations of the MacDonnell Commission.

In the inter war period three significant Acts aimed at reforming the government of Scotland were passed by Conservative Governments. The first was passed in 1926

and increased the status of the Scottish Secretary to Secretary of State and the Under Secretary to Under Secretary of State. The remit of the Scottish Office was unchanged and the reforms could really only be regarded as symbolic. However, as Mitchell states "the Scottish Unionists made much of this change."⁵²

The second significant piece of legislation was the Government's much delayed response to the MacDonnell Commission- the Reorganisation of Offices (Scotland) Act, 1928. The objective of this Act was to reform the Scottish boards: although the boards were under the remit of the Scottish Office they had little in common with each other in terms of organisation or practices.

The third piece of legislation was the Reorganisation of Offices (Scotland) Act. In 1936 the Gilmour Committee was appointed by Walter Elliot, then a Conservative Minister, to review the responsibilities of the Scottish Office and its administrative arrangements. The Committee was headed by a former Conservative Secretary of State for Scotland, Sir John Gilmour. It was clearly stated in the committee's remit that the department would be based in one building in Edinburgh. The committee suggested that whenever possible Scottish business should be dealt with in Edinburgh rather than in Whitehall. Changes to the organisation of departments were also proposed. For instance, the Secretary of State would assume legal responsibility for the Department of Agriculture for Scotland, the Department of Health for Scotland and the Prisons Department for Scotland, rather than responsibility lying with the Departments. These recommendations and others were encapsulated in the Reorganisation of Offices (Scotland) Act. This Act established the modern day Scottish Office. The board system was completely dismantled and subsumed within the Scottish Office.

It would be probably fair to say that the impetus for the reforms introduced in the 1930s was, at least in part, due the revival in the Home Rule movement. The impetus was also partly due to administrative considerations. Mitchell suggests that the Sir Godfrey Collins (Secretary of State for Scotland 1932 - 36) intended that the reforms would also improve the efficiency of the central administration in Scotland.⁵³

Midwinter et al state that the term "administrative devolution", which dates from the 1930s, "was invented by a civil servant proposing reforms aimed as a response to agitation for Scottish Home Rule...The term deliberately conveyed the idea that the Scottish Office represented a form of self government."⁵⁴ Conservatives opposed Home Rule on the grounds that what was required was a reformed Scottish Office rather than a Scottish Parliament. Speaking at a time of nationalist revival in 1932 Sir Richard Horne suggested that the Scottish administration should be reviewed:-

There is, in my view, far too much of the departmental work of Scotland done in Whitehall. I think that these Departments ought to be more accessible to the people concerned in their operation, and that really, in general principle, there should be retained at Whitehall only that kind of Department which is necessary for the Parliamentary side of their proceedings. I do not think that the House has any realisation of the difficulties under which Scottish business has to be conducted. The Secretary of State for Scotland has in Edinburgh a dark room in the buildings of the Courts...And the Under Secretary has to share a room with him ! So far as Departments are concerned, they are spread over the town, with long distances between some of the buildings...I say that this is not only bad for Scottish business, but it is unworthy of the dignity of Scotland.⁵⁵

Nationalist arguments were used by Conservatives to support the continued existence of a distinctive Scottish administration during the Attlee Government. In the late 1940s the party issued a policy document entitled *Scottish Control of Scottish Affairs*. The document was concerned with the detrimental effects which the centralist policies of the Attlee Government and, in particular the policy of nationalisation, were allegedly having on Scotland. It recommended that

nationalised industries in Scotland should be under Scottish control. A Royal Commission to review relations between Scotland and England was proposed. Other recommendations included the appointment of an additional Parliamentary Under Secretary of State and the creation of the post of Deputy to the Secretary of State for Scotland.

When the Conservative Party was returned to power in 1951 the only recommendation to be implemented was the undertaking to establish a Royal Commission. However, the Commission's remit did not include the possibility of creating a Scottish Parliament. The only measure introduced to upgrade the status of the Scottish Office was the establishment of the office of Minister of State. When the Balfour Commission reported in 1954 it suggested only minor alterations to the Scottish administration.

It seems apparent from the discussion above that the reforms initiated by Conservative Governments helped Scottish Conservatives to reconcile their Scottish and British identities. They were able to argue that what was needed to reform Scottish administration was a reorganisation of the Scottish Office rather than the creation of a Scottish Assembly. Moreover, they could present these arguments in nationalist terms. One such argument was that the Scottish Office should be given increased responsibility and status in recognition of Scotland's nationhood.

The Conservative Party has employed Disraelian change in Scotland as means of opposing Scottish Home Rule. Conservative Governments have been willing to facilitate the development of a distinctive central administration in Scotland as a way of appeasing Scottish nationalism. This willingness to consider radical change in the Scottish context, in order to stem nationalist demands, not only enabled Scottish Conservatives to accommodate their Scottish identity with their political

outlook, but perhaps more importantly, it gave the party a distinctive Scottish image. Conservatives were able to employ Disraelian change in order to oppose Scottish Home Rule. Those Conservatives who adopt the Peelite position may do so on the grounds that, because there is a different status quo north and south of the border, the introduction of Disraelian change may widen the differences between Scotland and England. Ironically perhaps for the Tory Party, its involvement in the development of a distinctly Scottish central administration has contributed to the general awareness of a Scottish political arena.

Constitution and the Union

The maintenance of the Union is a long established element of Conservative thinking on the constitution. Conservative thinking on constitutional matters is particularly relevant to the analysis of Scottish Conservatism. The Conservative Party's long association with Unionism has had a strong bearing on the development of a Scottish tradition within the party. As James Mitchell has argued Unionism in its Scottish context has:-

...three distinct meanings; as a social and cultural meaning, as an expression of Scotland's constitutional position within the United Kingdom, and a jurisprudential meaning as the sovereignty of Parliament.⁵⁶

The importance of religion in Scottish society at least until the 1960s inevitably had repercussions on politics (see below). Religion played a crucial part in the development of the social and cultural dimension to Unionism. Unionism made its first significant impact on Conservative politics in the late nineteenth century when the Irish Question dominated British politics.⁵⁷ The relationship between Orangeism and Unionism provided Conservatives with a loyal source of working class support from the late nineteenth century until well into the twentieth century. In her study of Orangeism in nineteenth century Scotland, Elaine McFarland argues that the "LOI (Loyal Orange Institution) must have impressed the Conservatives as itself as (*sic*)

useful source of working class votes."⁵⁸ Orangeism, especially before World War I, was used to woo the working classes.

However, in the past forty years or so Scotland has become notably more secular. Nevertheless, Budge and Unwin's work indicated that religious affiliation was still an important factor in voting behaviour in the mid 1960s (see below). Mitchell believes that by the early 1980s the social and cultural dimension of Unionism, "was shown to be a thing of the past when Michael Ancram, a member of a leading Scottish Catholic family, became Scottish Party Chairman in the 1980s, and in the 1982 Glasgow Hillhead by-election when a Catholic, Gerry Malone, was adopted as candidate."⁵⁹ This particular dimension of Unionism has steadily declined in importance in the post war period. One aspect which has arguably become increasingly important when assessing Unionism in its Scottish context is the constitutional position of Scotland within the UK.

A distinctly Scottish dimension is apparent within Scottish Conservative thought towards Scotland's constitutional status. The discussion in the final section of this chapter indicates that from the time of Walter Scott to the present day Scottish Conservatives have articulated their support for the Union with England in the Scottish context. The importance of Scotland's constitutional status within Unionism is evident in Ian Lang's, the Secretary of State for Scotland, argument that:-

The Union has yielded, and continues to yield, enormous benefits to Scotland...The maintenance of the Union is essential if Scots are able to continue to play our major part in leading the United Kingdom.⁶⁰

The Scottish dimension to Unionism has manifested itself in the establishment and the subsequent development of the Scottish Office. This institutional response to the distinctiveness of Scottish civil society carries with it the risk that it may lead to

demands for legislative devolution or even the break up of the Union. In contemporary Scotland, Scottish Conservatives are divided about how they should respond to this risk. There are those Conservatives who believe debate on the constitutional status of Scotland has deflected the party from what should be its main priorities namely, to encourage enterprise, cut back the remit of government and increase the choice of individuals; whether or not the terms of the Union with Scotland should be changed is politically irrelevant to both the Conservative Party and Scotland. As Michael Forsyth puts it:-

We've (Conservatives) always been a unionist party and devolution was a diversion from the main challenge facing Scotland, which was to make ourselves competitive in world markets and create jobs.⁶¹

During the 1980s some Conservatives, mainly although not exclusively Thatcherites, argued against legislative devolution on the grounds that, what was important was, in the words of Michael Heseltine, "devolution of power to the people, not to bureaucratic institutions."⁶² The editorial in the May 1990 edition of the Scottish Conservative was also vehemently opposed to legislative devolution. It asserted:-

Let us (the Conservative Party) bravely warn the people of Scotland of the pain and penalty which would attend a Labour Government and a Scottish Assembly, so that our present and future prosperity in Scotland will flourish and the threat and poverty of an independent, separated and isolated Scotland, does not befall us.⁶³

Pro-devolutionists strongly reject the idea that legislative devolution would be against the good of the Union. On the contrary, in their view, it is essential, not only to improve the electoral performance of the party in Scotland but more importantly, to preserve the Union itself. If the Conservative Party fails to convince Scots that their interests are best served by the remaining in the United Kingdom, they may start to look upon the Union as obsolete, leaving independence as the next logical step. Pro-devolutionists would concede that sometimes radical change is necessary

in order to preserve those institutions and practices Conservatives believe essential to the continuance of good government and the best interests of Britain.

Despite their disagreement over the need for a reformed structure of government for Scotland, both pro and anti- devolutionists have at no time questioned the maintenance of the Union. One of the central tenets of British Conservatism is belief in the Union and the principle of parliamentary sovereignty. That principle is central to the final aspect of Unionism identified by Mitchell, namely the 'jurisprudential meaning'. In his words, "the central position of Parliament has been of paramount importance in Unionist thinking."⁶⁴ However, in stressing the development of Unionism in the Scottish context one should not under-estimate the importance which Scottish Conservatives attach to the maintenance of Union. Ultimately it is the preservation of the Union which is of critical importance.

National Identity and Political Values

One tension which Scottish Conservatives face is between their "Scottish" and "British" identities. The extent to which these two identities are in conflict is partly dependent on the degree to which they are distinctive. It is also partly dependent on the extent to which Conservative statecraft is willing to accommodate the Scottish identity. Mention has already been made of the institutional distinctiveness of the Scottish political arena but to what extent is it possible to argue that distinctive social attitudes prevail in Scotland ? The values prevalent in Scottish society are an essential component of the Scottish identity. For this reason it is important to assess whether Scottish national consciousness is different from English national consciousness. Such an assessment will inform our understanding of the problems Scottish Conservatives face when reconciling their Scottish identity with their political outlook. The chapter closes with an examination of this very issue.

Studies of Scottish political behaviour have demonstrated that an allegiance to a Scottish national identity does exist. In *Scottish Political Behaviour*, for instance, Budge and Unwin investigated whether or not there was a widespread feeling of national consciousness in Scotland. They use a UK survey carried out in 1959, in addition to local surveys carried out in the Glasgow constituencies of Cathcart, Craigton, Kelvingrove and Woodside in 1964 and 1965 to reach their conclusions. They found that in Glasgow and "therefore inferentially among the Scottish electorate in general" national consciousness was just as important as class in determining how Scots voted :-

Even when confronted by a direct decision between class and national loyalties, even or greater numbers of electors opted for a Scottish as a class identification. Again, this is proof of the pervasiveness of Scottish loyalties among the Scottish electors. A majority of Scots of all ages, classes and religious denomination display Scottish feeling to an extent equal to that of class feeling.⁶⁵

It is possible to identify a number of powerful elements to Scottish national consciousness. These elements have contributed to and strengthened the distinctiveness of Scottish civil society. Budge and Unwin maintained that religion was an important component of the Scottish identity. Their principle finding was that "religion is a social factor strongly correlated with the choice of a party among the Scottish electors, whereas it is not correlated with this choice among English electors."⁶⁶ This is born out by the figures. In 1950 nearly 58% of the Scottish population were members of a church compared to only 23% of the English and Welsh populations combined. The picture that emerged from Budge and Unwin's study was of political and social divergence between Scotland and England, a divergence that was reflected in the attitudes of Scots on range of issues. For instance, it emerged from the Glasgow surveys that the majority of respondents felt the Labour Party would receive the most votes in Scotland. In England the general feeling was the Conservative Party would do best. Further, Scots electors perceive

Scots and English as distinct groups each with their own characteristics. Scots associated the term "English" with the South of England and Public schools.

One element of the Scottish identity in particular, namely the notion that Scottish society is more egalitarian, is particularly potent. In his recent book David McCrone asks the question whether Scots are more egalitarian than their neighbours south of the border. He believes that "few myths are more powerful and prevalent in and about Scotland that it is a more egalitarian society than England."⁶⁷ McCrone found that the pattern of social mobility in Scotland and England was not significantly different. However, despite this finding he concludes that Scotland is more egalitarian because the myth "is not dependent on 'facts', because it represents a set of social, self-evident values, a social ethos, a celebration of sacred belief about what it is to be Scottish."⁶⁸

Over the past twenty years or so Scottish politics have become increasingly distinctive. Scottish issues have featured prominently in the Scottish political agenda. What Lindsay Paterson has referred to "a new generation of oppositional corporate bodies such as the Standing Commission on the Scottish economy and the Constitutional Convention " has reinforced the Scottish identity. It would seem that Scottish civil society has become more not less distinctive in the past twenty years or so.⁶⁹ This trend has also manifested itself in electoral behaviour of Scots.⁷⁰ Thus recent political trends which have heightened the general awareness of the Scottish identity have accentuated the problems which Scottish Conservatives face in accommodating their Scottish identity.

However, is there any truth to assertion that Scots are more egalitarian than their English neighbours ? The commitment to community or comprehensive education has been identified as one of the defining characteristics of the Scottish egalitarian

myth. The evidence in the tables below implies that in Scotland a different attitude existed towards education and in particular towards comprehensive education. This difference may be due to the allegedly more egalitarian nature of Scottish society. If this were the case, then one would expect that in Scotland there would be a stronger commitment to an education system which offers the same quality of education to everyone. Table 1.1 shows the responses given to a question in the British Social Attitudes Survey which asked whether the quality of education should be the same for all.⁷¹ It should be noted that Scotland reacted differently from England on this issue. In Scotland 64% of respondents thought that the quality of education should be the same for all. In England the Midlands came closest to the position adopted by Scotland, with 53% of respondents replying that the quality of education should be the same for all. The largest difference, 18%, existed between Scotland and the south of England. Table 1.1 demonstrates that Scotland did have a stronger commitment to comprehensive schools than was the case in England.

Table 1.1 Analysis by Region of Views on Whether the Quality of Education Should be the Same for All

Region	Same for all	Pay for Better	Total
Scotland	64%	36%	434
North	51%	49%	1157
Midlands	53%	47%	757
South	46%	54%	1399
Greater London	51%	49%	477

Source: Combined British Social Attitudes Data Set

Further evidence of the commitment to comprehensive education in Scotland was found in the responses given to a question which asked respondents if they thought that comprehensive schools taught basic skills adequately or not?⁷² Table 1.2 indicates that respondents in Scotland judged comprehensive schools in more favourable terms than in England. In Scotland 68% thought that comprehensive schools taught students basic skills very well or quite well. The north of England came the closest to Scotland on this issue. 59% of respondents in the north thought

that comprehensive schools had performed this task very well or quite well. This figure compared with 57% in the Midlands, 54% in the South and 53% in Greater London.

Table 1.2 Analysis by Region of Attitudes to the Ability of Comprehensive Schools to Teach Basic Skills

Region	Very Well	Quite Well	Not very well	Not at all well	Total
Scotland	11%	57%	26%	6%	219
North	12%	47%	32%	9%	687
Midlands	8%	49%	32%	10%	393
South	8%	46%	35%	11%	810
Greater London	6%	47%	38%	9%	222

Source: Combined British Social Attitudes Data Set

The comparison between Scotland and England has shown that the former had a stronger attachment to the comprehensive system of schooling. In other words, comprehensive schooling does appear to be a nationalist issue, nationalist, in the sense that there is a clear cleavage between Scotland and England. One might expect that this cleavage could have repercussions for the implementation of education policy in Scotland. Governments which introduce policies perceived as a threat to the comprehensive system are perhaps more likely to encounter opposition in Scotland than in any other part of Britain.

The evidence from the research conducted by Miller and by Curtice supports the view that the Scots are more egalitarian than the English. John Curtice's work on regional social attitudes in the 1980s has demonstrated that there was a tendency for Scots to be more egalitarian. He adopted a similar approach to that used by William Miller in his study *The End of British Politics* to establish whether or not there was any ideological divergence between the North and the South. (see below) Both writers investigated the variation of attitudes on a range of issues. Curtice found significantly:-

Those items which most sharply divide the North from the South are all the ones which stress the need for greater economic equality in society and on what ought to be done about one of the major sources of economic inequality and unemployment.⁷³

Not only was there a sharp divergence between the north and south of England on these issues but Scotland also diverged more sharply than the North of England from the South. Asked whether the government should redistribute wealth from the better off to those who were less well off 30% of Scots agreed that Government should compared to 25% in the north of England, 22% in the Midlands , 22% in London and 17% in the south of England.

In the *End of British Politics?* Miller's comparison of the 1974 British Election Survey and the 1974 Scottish Election survey also highlights the extent of the divergence between Scottish and English social attitudes. In terms of social structure Scotland is very different to southern England and to a lesser extent different to the north of England. The difference between the Scots and the English on religion remains significant, even though Scots are less religious than they were in the 1960s. By the 1970s 43% of the Scottish population were members of a church compared to 34% of the English population. In housing tenure there was also a sharp divergence between Scotland and England. Council housing was far more extensive in the former, with 52% of the population living in council housing. In the south of England the figure was only 20% and in the North 36%.⁷⁴

The most interesting part of Miller's work is his analysis of policy issues. He looks at the policy preferences of the Scots in relation the north of England, the south of England and England as a whole. On nine issues there was very little difference in the position adopted by the Scots and the English (nationalisation, trade union power, Labour's ties with the unions, big business power, the need to curb communism, workers' control, government control of land, cash for the NHS and

foreign aid). Significantly there were 13 issues where the Scots and the English differed. On some of these 13 issues such as the need to decentralise government, Miller believes the differences can be explained by regional rather than national factors. National differences appear on pollution control, social services cuts, comprehensive education, repatriation of immigrants. Miller speculates that if the questions had been put to English respondents national differences would be evident on R.C. schools and a Scottish Assembly.⁷⁵

The comparison of Scottish and English policy preferences reveal, Miller maintains, "Scotland did have a special approach to political issues." He continues:-

They (the Scots) were no more attached to the socialist prescription of nationalising industry but were markedly more favourable to the social democratic remedies of social services, spending on poverty, redistributing wealth and establishing comprehensive schools...In short, there is evidence that whether self consciously aware of it or not, Scottish politics did exist in the minds of the Scottish electors as they gave a high level of attention to special issues and reacted in a distinctive way to more general British issues.⁷⁶

It is more difficult, however, to account for the differences found. John Curtice puts more emphasis on economic factors than Bill Miller does:-

It appears that the differing economic circumstances of the North and the South have influenced their inhabitants perceptions of the respective roles of the state and the free market. The individualist philosophy of the market has a firmer hold in the South, where the market is believed to have delivered opportunities more effectively.⁷⁷

But economic factors are only part of the explanation. Miller believes that social attitudes in Scotland are also influenced by national consciousness. To substantiate this, he points to the fact that "(differences between the Scots and English) were most marked where Scottish institutions or the special Scottish issues of oil and self-government were involved, but they extended to other matters as well."⁷⁸

The discussion above demonstrates that a distinctive Scottish identity does exist and that a potent aspect of this identity is the belief that Scottish society is more

egalitarian than English society. However, it is important to remember that there is a distinctively Scottish tradition within Conservatism to which Scottish Conservatives can lay claim. Its development is an indication that Scottish Conservatives have been able to translate their political beliefs to the Scottish context. The questions which now need to be addressed are how successful have Scottish Conservatives been in reconciling their 'dual identities', and have they been more successful at certain times than others ?

Reconciling 'Dual Identities': Squaring the Circle ?

We have seen that Scottish Conservatives operate in a distinctive political environment. Not only do Scottish institutions and traditions differ from those in England but attitudes and values prevalent in Scotland are also different. Since the Union Scottish Conservatives have been concerned with how they can reconcile their political outlook with their Scottish identity. Indeed much of what concerned Walter Scott in the early nineteenth century Scotland is still relevant to Scottish Conservative politics in the late twentieth century.

In the *Letters of Malachi Malgrowther*, Walter Scott is concerned with much more than simply debating the pros and cons of whether Scottish banks should be allowed to issue their own notes. The issue served to focus Scott's mind on the wider concern of how Scottish Conservatives could reconcile their adherence to political Unionism with their desire to protect the Scottish identity. Edwin Muir has described Scott as:-

...by instinct a Conservative who believed in the established order and tradition. But the phase Scotland had reached in his time involved him a divided allegiance. The established order was the Union...he had no choice but to adhere to it; for it was rooted in history and sanctified by the past. But at the same time he saw this established order destroying another established order, that of Scotland. That order was equally old, equally rooted in history and sanctified by the past, and moreover it was the order to which he was most intimately bound by birth, early memory and the compulsion of his imagination.⁷⁹

It is not entirely obvious from the *Malachi Letters* and his other work the *Tales of a Grandfather* whether he was in favour of the Union. David Daiches and Allan Massie believe these two works indicate Scott's support for the Union. P.H.Scott interprets Scott's work differently. He cites Chapters 60 to 62 in the *Tales of a Grandfather*, in which Scott discusses the negation of the Union and its consequences, to prove:-

...that, like the Scottish negotiators, he would have preferred a "federative union" with Scotland retaining her rights as a separate Kingdom, making her own laws, and adopting her own public measures, uncontrolled by the "domination of England."⁸⁰

It would be fair to say that Scott did have some reservations about the Union but that these stopped short of arguing for its dissolution. In the *Malachi Letters* Walter Scott argues:-

We (Scotland) had better remain in union with England, even at risk of becoming a subordinate species of Northumberland.⁸¹

What emerges is that Scott did not believe the purpose of the Union was to bring Scottish traditions and practices in line with those of her neighbour. His first letter is highly critical of attempts to introduce "uniformity" for "uniformity's sake" and the government's banking proposals mark only the start of such attempts.⁸² Anglicisation was perceived as a very real threat and one which all Scots should fight against:-

Neither do I mean that we should struggle with illiberality against any improvements which can be borrowed from English principle. I would only desire that such ameliorations were adopted, not merely because they are English, but because they are suited to be assimilated with the law of Scotland, and lead, in short, to her evident utility.⁸³

However, there were those Scots who felt that the Union was an important contribution to the process of modernising Scotland. England was commonly regarded in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries as the leading European nation. Thus Scotland should seek to emulate England.

In comparison to his first letter, rather more emotive language is used in Scott's second letter, where he pleads with Scottish MPs to unite, whatever their politics, against a "foreign enemy" and later he informs the reader "there is no room for compromise or surrender."⁸⁴

Scott's work has a continual relevance, in a number of respects, to contemporary Scottish Conservatism. Much of his writing is concerned with how Scots can reconcile their dual identities within the Union. He believed that Scottish patriotism was not necessarily inconsistent with British patriotism and that all Scots should be able to reach, what James Robertson later described as a "patriotic compromise" or "patriotic dualism."⁸⁵ Scots could balance their dual identities quite readily providing England did not attempt to dominate the Union.

The point to emphasise is that Walter Scott defined his Conservatism in Scottish, not British terms. He was staunchly proud of Scotland, in particular her legal and banking systems, and criticised England for using Scotland as a "sort of experimental farm" and for the intolerance of the English.⁸⁶

Awareness of the Scottish identity has remained an important strand of Conservative thought in Scotland in the twentieth century. Speaking in a debate on Scottish Home Rule in 1924, Sir Henry Craig, Tory MP for Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities, defended the Union in these emotive terms:-

I would ask honourable members who press this Bill (the Government of Scotland Bill) to remember that they have not a monopoly of love for their country, of patriotic feelings, or of heartfelt...⁸⁷

After Sir Henry Craig's death in 1927, John Buchan represented the Scottish Universities in Parliament. James Mitchell has suggested that Buchan was probably

less concerned than Walter Scott with the marginalisation of the Scottish identity.⁸⁸

Referring to patriotism Buchan stated:-

He (man) is a Yorkshireman or a Scot before he is a Briton, a Briton before he is a citizen of the world; and he will not be a good Briton unless he is first of all a good Yorkshireman, or a good cosmopolitan unless he is a good Briton. That is the supreme value of tradition.⁸⁹

Another influential Scottish Conservative during the inter war years was Walter Elliot. Elliot made a significant contribution to the development of Scottish tradition within Conservatism. It was Elliot who referred to the tradition of "democratic intellectualism" within Scottish society. Alluding to this tradition Elliot argues:-

It is a heritage wherein intellect, speech and, above all argument are passports to the highest eminence in the land.⁹⁰

Elliot held office in three departments. He was Minister of Agriculture between 1932 and 1936, Secretary of State for Scotland 1936 to 1938 and Minister of Health 1938-40. The policies pursued by Elliot while he was Secretary of State for Scotland could be described as interventionist. Prior to his appointment to the Scottish Office, Elliot had been involved in developing what Chris Harvie has described as "Britain's first approach to regional policy", the Special Areas Act 1934.⁹¹ During his time at the Scottish Office Elliot attempted to use this Act to reform the Scottish economy. He played his part in the creation of Special Areas which received preferential treatment in an attempt to encourage investment and reduce unemployment. It was under this scheme that Hillington Industrial Estate was established.

Elliot also took a keen interest in housing policy and acted to improve the condition of the Scottish housing stock. By 1938 the number of houses built had reached 26,000. Elliot was closely associated with the creation of Scottish Housing Association for Special Areas. Financed solely by the Treasury, this body was able

to provide additional housing stock. In a further potential boost to the Scottish economy during Elliot's Secretaryship, Glasgow was secured as the venue of the 1938 Empire Exhibition.

Elliot also made an attempt to stimulate the economy of the Highlands. Here success eluded him. Had the Caledonian Power Bill had successfully passed through Parliament, it would have gone some way to reduce the high levels of unemployment in the Highlands. Elliot's interventionist policies in agriculture included the creation of the Agricultural Wages Board for Scotland and the establishment of a statutory minimum wage for Scottish farm workers. Throughout his term at the Scottish Office, Elliot introduced measures which were designed to alleviate the economic and social problems which faced Scotland. Indeed Chris Harvie has suggested that:-

Alone among Scottish Conservatives, he was prepared to make common cause with Labour in urging new initiatives to cope with the decline of the Scottish economy. ⁹²

Paradoxically, evidence based solely on Elliot's book *Toryism and the Twentieth Century*, gives one a different impression of the politician. There is little in the book to indicate that he had a strong interest in Scottish affairs. One has to agree with Mitchell's judgement that "it is a peculiarly *English* history to which Elliot makes reference."⁹³ Elliot describes the long historical roots of Toryism, developing his argument in an English context. The first chapter of the book traces the history of the Tory party from Hampden to Wesley. References are made to the English Civil War, to Charles I and Cromwell, and to the Glorious Revolution. There is little indication that this book was written by a Conservative proud of his Scottish identity. The fact that Elliot was able to write about Toryism without referring to Scotland is symbolic of the difficulties which Scottish Conservatives have in

reconciling their Scottish identity with political beliefs. However, this is not to understate Walter Elliot's contribution to the development of Scottish Conservatism. The policies he pursued while he was Secretary of State for Scotland were clearly innovative. He was keenly aware of his Scottish identity and George Pottinger, a former Principle Private Secretary at the Scottish Office asserted that Elliot "thought of himself as a homespun Scot."⁹⁴

But how important was Elliot's brand of Conservatism to the electoral success of the Conservative Party in Scotland in the 1940s and 1950s ? The party made steady progress at the general election polls reaching its peak in 1955 with 50.1% of the vote. It would seem that the political context of the time was an important factor. The post war political consensus centred on the role of the interventionist state. Indeed Paul Addison and Arthur Marwick maintain that this consensus may even date back to the 1930s.⁹⁵ The crucial point has been made by McPherson and Raab:-

There was, it is true, a strategy for post- war redevelopment. Many of its roots were Scottish and owed a great deal to the consensus politics established in the 1930s through the agency of 'middle opinion' ⁹⁶

It is interesting to note that by accepting interventionist policies the Conservative Party was also accepting policies which had Scottish 'roots'. Indeed Walter Elliot made an important contribution to these roots. Elliot was a member of the Council of State established by Tom Johnston, Secretary of State for Scotland (1941-45) in 1941. The Council which included all former Secretaries of State and the one surviving Scottish Secretary, Lord Alness, was set up to examine policies for economic regeneration. Enquiries were established into herring industry, hydro-electricity, hill sheep farming, and land settlement.⁹⁷ Elliot suggested that the Council should examine housing, health services and food production as topics.⁹⁸ A crucial feature of the Council was the consensual manner in which it operated. Before the Council acted its members had to secure the support of their own parties.

In the event of any dissenting voices the issue would be set aside. The consensus which existed at the British level between the Conservative and Labour parties helped Scottish Conservatives to reconcile their Scottish identity with their political outlook. The party did not suffer from a lack of a Scottish identity.

That Scottish identity has been marginalised in the past twenty years or so. Writing shortly after the 1987 General Election, Struan Stevenson, then leader of the Conservative group on the Convention of Scottish Local Authorities, argued that "Scottish Tories remained in an identity crisis." Scottish Conservatives face a dilemma:-

How can they express their patriotism to Scotland without first seeming to be unpatriotic to Great Britain ? This issue surfaced time and time again involving issues like Gartcosh, Caterpillar and even the Cold Weather Allowance, and left the majority of voters certain that Scottish Conservatives placed the welfare of the United Kingdom above the parochial interest of Scotland.⁹⁹

The implications of Thatcherite statecraft for the governing of Scotland are discussed at length in the next chapter. The important point for the argument here is that it also had implications for the Scottish identity of the party. As the quote above reveals, an increasing strain was placed on the dual identities of Scottish Conservatives during the time of the Thatcher Governments. Thatcherism sought to attack those consensual policies of the post war period which probably had enabled the Conservative party to accommodate the Scottish context.

George Younger managed for some seven years to juggle his Scottish and Thatcherite identities. It was not until the Scottish Office began to change character after Younger's departure to the Ministry of Defence that the Thatcher Government introduced many of its most radical policies in Scotland. Michael Forsyth a well known Thatcherite was appointed to the education and health teams. Forsyth was perceived as leading the Thatcherite programme in Scotland. One could argue that

Younger managed successfully to retain his commitment to Scottish interests while he was Secretary of State. In James Mitchell's words:-

Younger succeeded in being at once part of Mrs Thatcher's cabinet and simultaneously apart from it...In his Scottish fiefdom, he made no pretence to Thatcherite rigour and portrayed himself as a supporter of interventionist old-style Keynesianism, ...as if the Scottish Office was not part of British central government.¹⁰⁰

The last point made by Mitchell is significant. What Younger had in effect managed to do was to present the Scottish Office as a form of corporatist self government. This is not to suggest that Thatcherism did not have any impact on the remit of the Scottish Office while Younger was Scottish Secretary. The Thatcher Governments prior to 1987 were pre-occupied with macro-economic concerns rather than securing policy change in social areas. Arguably, this enabled Younger to present himself as a guardian of Scottish interests. For instance while he was Secretary of State he was able to prevent the closure of Ravenscraig. This suggests that Younger was attempting to limit the effects of Thatcherite economic policy on Scotland. Arguably Younger would not have been able to present himself 'as a supporter of interventionist old-style Keynesianism' if the Thatcher Government had sought to introduce radical change in social policy in Scotland while he was Scottish Secretary.

To sum up, Scottish Conservatives find it more difficult to reconcile their dual identities in the late twentieth century than was the case in the late nineteenth or early twentieth centuries, because of the growth of government. The potential for government to interfere in matters that affect the Scottish identity, such as education, is far greater. At the time of the Union's creation, government had a very limited role and Scotland was largely left to run her own affairs with the exceptions of defence, taxation and foreign policy. In the eighteenth century and well into the nineteenth century Conservatives were able to maintain their Scottish identity while espousing

British nationalism. However, Government has impinged on more and more policy areas.

In the 1950s the Conservative Party did not suffer from a lack of a Scottish identity. It has been suggested that the party's endorsement of interventionist policies with Scottish 'roots' enabled Conservatives to articulate their policies in the Scottish context without compromising their identity. One of Walter Elliot's achievements as Secretary of State for Scotland was to respond to some of the worst economic and social problems in Scotland with interventionist policies which were designed to meet Scottish needs.

However, Conservatives, especially in the past twenty years or so, have been faced with the dilemma of having to choose which of their identities is more important. One the one hand, they could support government proposals, which intentionally or not, may erode the Scottish identity of the party or, on the other hand, oppose any such moves and put the interests of Scottish party before the British one. Whatever choice they make, Conservatives will receive criticism, either from within the party for supporting the parochial interests of Scotland before Britain, or from their fellow Scots for putting Britain before Scotland. Malcolm MacKenzie, Vice chair of the Scottish Tory Reform Group, has succinctly summarised the problem which faces the Conservative Party in Scotland:-

Scottish Toryism must equate itself with Scottish culture and consciousness. This does not mean abandoning the ideology and the policies of Conservatism defined in the UK basis. It does mean translating Conservative principles into Scottish conditions ...It also means a two way process whereby Scottish thinking clearly influences Conservative thinking at the UK level.¹⁰¹

Conclusion

In order to understand how Conservatism has developed in the Scottish context one must be aware of the basic tenets of Conservatism. Certain attitudes and traditions influence how Conservatives approach politics, whether or not they belong to the Scottish Conservative and Unionist Party. For instance, how a Conservative interprets the Scottish Home Rule issue is preconditioned by the Conservative view of change and adherence to the Union. While stressing that there are common principles to which all Conservatives in Britain adhere, it is important not to marginalise the distinctive nature of Conservatism in Scottish society. Scottish Conservatives operate in a distinctive political environment. Not only do Scottish institutions and traditions differ from those in England but attitudes and values prevalent in Scotland are significantly different. In applying their basic tenets to the Scottish context, Conservatives have implemented policies which themselves have enhanced the Scottish political dimension. Conservative Governments have made a significant contribution to the development of a Scottish central administration.

The dilemma which has faced Scottish Conservatives since 1979 is that they have found it increasingly difficult to reconcile their Scottish identity with their British one. As government intervention increased so did the potential for conflict between their dual identities. Government, especially under Margaret Thatcher, was perceived as acting against the best interests of Scotland. As a consequence, Scottish Conservatives were often faced with the choice of siding with the Government or rebelling against their own party..

NOTES AND REFERENCES

¹ Bulpitt, J. (1986) 'The Discipline of the New Democracy: Mrs Thatcher's Domestic Statecraft' *Political Studies* Vol. 34 p.21

² Gamble, A. (1988) *The Free Economy and the Strong State* p.24

-
- ³ Boyson, R. (1978) *Centre Forward: A Radical Conservative Programme* p.14
- ⁴ Willetts, D. (1992) *Modern Conservatism* p.63
- ⁵ Gilmour, I. (1978) *Inside Right* p.146
- ⁶ *Ibid* p.147
- ⁷ Scruton, R. (1980) *The Meaning of Conservatism* p.25
- ⁸ O'Sullivan, N. (1983) *Conservatism* p.12
- ⁹ Boyson, R. *op cit.* pp.9-10.
- ¹⁰ Norton, P. and Aughey, A. (1981) *Conservatives and Conservatism* p.66
- ¹¹ Pym, F. (1984) *The Politics of Consent* p.172
- ¹² Norton, P. and Aughey, A., *op. cit.*, p. 66
- ¹³ Oakeshott, M. (1981) 'On Being Conservative', in *Rationalism in Politics and Other Essays* p.184
- ¹⁴ *Ibid* pp.186-187
- ¹⁵ *Ibid* p.188
- ¹⁶ Greenleaf, W.H. (1983) *The British Political Tradition Vol.2 The Ideological Heritage* p.197
- ¹⁷ *Ibid* p.262
- ¹⁸ Gilmour, I. *op. cit.*, p.160
- ¹⁹ Blake, R. (1985) *The Conservative Party From Peel to Thatcher* p.2
- ²⁰ Pym, F. *op. cit.*, p.173
- ²¹ Oakeshott, M. *op. cit.*, pp.170-71
- ²² Pym, F. *op. cit.*, p.173
- ²³ Boyson, R. *op cit.*, pp.10-11
- ²⁴ Gilmour, I. *op. cit.*, p.127
- ²⁵ *Ibid* p.127
- ²⁶ Gilmour, I. *op. cit.*, p.127
- ²⁷ *Ibid.* p.129
- ²⁸ Dicey, A.V. (1927) *Law of the Constitution* p.38
- ²⁹ Scruton, R. *op cit.* p.52
- ³⁰ Gilmour, I. *op cit.*, p.212
- ³¹ Boyson, R. *op cit.* p.145

-
- ³² *Ibid* p.139
- ³³ Norton, P. and Aughey, A. *op cit.*, p.45
- ³⁴ Quoted in Rhodes James, R. (1977) *The British Revolution* pp.25-26
- ³² Boyson, R. *op cit.*, p.145
- ³⁵ A MORI opinion poll at the start of the conflict in April 1992 placed the Alliance at 34%, Conservative Party at 33% and the Labour Party at 33%. By the end of May the Conservative Party position had improved to 51%. Labour were at 25% and the Alliance support had fallen to 22%.
- ³⁶ Eccleshall, R. (1984) 'Conservatism' in Eccleshall, R. et al (eds) *Political Ideologies* p.81
- ³⁷ *Ibid* pp.81-82
- ³⁸ Buchan, J. (1929) 'Conservatism and Progress' in *Spectator* November p.755
- ³⁹ Buchan, J (1947) *Memory Hold the Door* p. 151
- ⁴⁰ Cooper, Lord (1991) 'The Scottish Legal Tradition' in Meson, M., Sellar, W. and Lord Cooper *The Scottish Legal Tradition* p.69
- ⁴¹ Meston, M. (1991) 'Scots Law Today' in Meson, M., Sellar, W. and Lord Cooper *The Scottish Legal Tradition* p.2
- ⁴² MacKay, Lord (1991) 'Forward' in Meson, M., Sellar, W. and Lord Cooper *The Scottish Legal Tradition* p.vii
- ⁴³ *Ibid* p.ix
- ⁴⁴ Kellas, J.(1980) *Modern Scotland* p.27
- ⁴⁵ Gilmour, I. *op cit.*, p.130
- ⁴⁶ Mitchell, J. (1990) *Conservatives and the Union: A Study of Conservative Party Attitudes to Scotland* p.17
- ⁴⁷ Hanham, H.J. (1969) 'The Development of the Scottish Office' in Wolfe, J.N. (ed.) *Government and Nationalism in Scotland* p.51
- ⁴⁸ Hood et al (1985) *From Growth to Retrenchment ? A Perspective of the Development of the Scottish Office* p.54
- ⁴⁹ *Ibid* p.52
- ⁵⁰ Parry, R. (1987) 'The Centralisation of the Scottish Office' in Rose, R. (ed.) *Ministers and Ministries* p.107
- ⁵¹ Hanham, H.J. *op cit.*, p.57
- ⁵² Mitchell, J. *op. cit.*, p.22
- ⁵³ *Ibid* p.24
- ⁵⁴ Keating, M. , Midwinter, A. and Mitchell, J. (1990) *Government and Politics in Scotland* p.61
- ⁵⁵ Hanham, H.J. *op. cit.*, p.65

⁵⁶ Mitchell, J. *op cit.*, p.8

⁵⁷ This point has been made by Kendrick, S. and McCrone, D. (1989) ; Mitchell, J (1990); Urwin (1966)

⁵⁸ McFarlane, E. (1990) *Protestants First: Orangeism in Nineteenth Century Scotland* p.172

⁵⁹ Mitchell, J. *op. cit.*, p.11

⁶⁰ Lang, I. (1993) 'Introduction' in *Scotland in the Union: A Partnership for Good* pp.7-8

⁶¹ Quoted by Harvie, C. in 'Grasping the Thistle', Cargill, K. (ed.) *Scotland 2000* p.14

⁶² Heseltine, M. (1990) Devolution: Questions only Tories Can Answer in *Scottish Conservative* No.3 p.12

⁶³ *Scottish Conservative* (1990) Editorial No.3

⁶⁴ Mitchell, J. *op. cit.*, p.14

⁶⁵ Budge, I. and Unwin, D.W. (1966) *Scottish Political Behaviour: A Case Study in British Homogeneity* p.132

⁶⁶ *Ibid*

⁶⁷ McCrone, D. (1992) *Understanding Scotland: The Sociology of a Stateless Nation* p.88

⁶⁸ *Ibid* p.120

⁶⁹ Paterson, L. (1991) 'Ane End of Ane Auld Sang: Sovereignty and the Re-Negotiation of the Union' in Brown, A. and McCrone, D. (eds.) *Scottish Government Yearbook 1991* p.114

⁷⁰ The results for the General Election in Scotland are given below. Number of seats are given in brackets

1979 : Labour 41.5% (44) Conservative 31.4% (22) Liberal 9% (3) SNP 17.3% (2)

1983 : Labour 35.1% (41) Conservative 28.4% (21) Alliance 24.5% (8) SNP 11.7% (2)

1987 : Labour 42.4% (50) Conservative 24% (10) Alliance 19.4% (9) SNP 14% (3)

1992: Labour 39% (49) Conservative 25.2% (11) Liberal Democrat 13.1% SNP 21.5% (3)

⁷¹ The exact wording of the question was "Should the quality of education be the same for all children, or should parents who can afford to be able to pay for better education ?"

⁷² The wording of the question was "From what you know or have heard, please tick one of box on each line to show how well you think state secondaries nowadays....teach young people basic skills such as reading, writing and maths ?"

⁷³ Curtice, J. (1990) One Nation in Jewell, R. (ed.) *British Social Attitudes 1989* p.134

⁷⁴ Miller, W.L. (1981) *End of British Politics ?*, p.79

⁷⁵ Miller, W.L. *op cit.*, p.89

⁷⁶ *Ibid* p.89

⁷⁷ *Ibid* p.135

⁷⁸ Miller, W.L. *op. cit.*, p.94

⁷⁹ Muir, E. (1982) *Scott and Scotland* p.90

-
- 80 Scott, Sir W. (1981) in Introduction to *The Letters of Malachi Malgrowther* p.xxix
- 81 *Ibid* pp.21-22
- 82 *Ibid* p.17
- 83 *Ibid* p.51
- 84 *Ibid* p.74 and p.81
- 85 Robertson, J. (1990) 'Walter Scott and the Crisis of Unionism' in *Radical Scotland* Vol.46 p26
- 86 Scott, Sir W. *op cit.*, p.10 and p.7
- 87 Warner, G. (1988) *The Scottish Tory Party: A History* p.188
- 88 Mitchell, J. *op cit.*, p.4
- 89 Buchan, J. (1929) *op cit.*, p.755
- 90 Elliot, W. (1932) 'Scottish Politics' in Duke of Atholl et al (ed.) *A Scotsman Heritage* p.64
- 91 Harvie, C. (1983) 'Elliot and the Politics of Adventure' in *Weekend Scotsman* 9th April
- 92 *Ibid*
- 93 Mitchell, J. *op cit.*, p.4
- 94 Pottinger, G. (1979) *The Secretaries of State for Scotland, 1926-1979* p.64
- 95 See Addison, P. (1975) *The Road to 1945* Chapter 1 and Marwick, A. (1964) 'Middle Opinion in the thirties: Planning, Progress and Political "Agreement"' *English Historical Review* Vol.79
- 96 McPherson, A. and Raab, C. (1988) *Governing Education* p.155
- 97 Pottinger, G. *op. cit.*, p.91
- 98 Campbell, R.H. (1979) 'The Council of Ex Secretaries of State for Scotland and Industrial Policy 1941-1945' *Scottish Industrial Review* Vol. 2 pp.3-10
- 99 Stevenson, S. (1987) *The Governing of Scotland*
- 100 Mitchell, J. *op. cit.*, pp.98-99
- 101 MacKenzie, M. (1988) *Scottish Toryism, Identity and Consciousness: A Personal Essay* p.5

CHAPTER 2

THATCHERISM AND THE GOVERNMENT OF SCOTLAND

Introduction

The ideas and principles which are influential in both "British" Conservatism and Scottish Conservatism, and which have shaped the views Conservatives have of how Scotland should be governed, were discussed at length in the previous chapter. This chapter turns to the question: did the Thatcher Governments have a distinctive approach to territorial politics and in particular to the governing of Scotland ? A necessary first step is to identify the ideas and principles which influenced the policies of the Thatcher Governments.

The aim of the first section of the chapter is to explore the extent to which Thatcherism constituted a new development in British Conservative thought. There has been much debate about whether Thatcherism was distinctive from British Conservatism. It was plainly different from the brand of Conservatism advocated by Macmillan and Douglas-Home but in what respects? The second section of the chapter explores how the ideas and principles which the Thatcher Governments sought to promote influenced the manner in which Scotland was governed.

The Thatcher Governments and Thatcherism: A Departure from traditional "British" Conservatism ?

Did the Thatcher Governments endorse the ideas and principles which are prevalent in "British Conservatism" or was the brand of politics it pursued distinctive and even incompatible with other strands of Conservatism ? This question can only be answered if one considers the political environment which allowed Thatcherism to develop and subsequently to reach maturity through the policies of the Thatcher Governments. The analysis will then focus on the nature of Thatcherism and examine the similarities and differences between Thatcherism and "British" Conservatism. There can be little doubt that the brand of Conservatism favoured by the Thatcher Government had implications

for the kind of economic and social policies which were pursued and for the policies which were introduced in Scotland.

It has been widely suggested that Thatcherism developed in a political environment which was susceptible to a rightwards swing.¹ The desire for a more right wing approach, however, was not the impetus for the election of Margaret Thatcher as leader of the Conservative Party in 1975; rather, it was dissatisfaction with the style of Heath's leadership. Although Margaret Thatcher beat Ted Heath in the leadership contest, she did not have the unanimous support of the party. Indeed, she does not even appear to have been the preferred candidate of the right. A significant proportion of the higher echelons of the party also still preferred Heath and were not overly enthusiastic about the election of Margaret Thatcher to the post of party leader.

In his essay *The Great Moving Right Show* Stuart Hall argues that the swing to the right dates from the late 1960s and "had developed through a number of different stages."² The first stage was "the backlash to the revolutionary ferment of 1968."³ The second stage was Powellism. The views of Enoch Powell on immigration have perhaps received the most attention. However, he also played a crucial role in encouraging the Conservative Party to rethink its commitment to Bustkellism and Keynesian techniques of economic management. In Tony Lane's opinion, "Powell's intellectual influence was quite extraordinary by giving clarity and coherence to what had been a hotch-potch of vague and disconnected ideas."⁴ The final stage, identified by Hall, which contributed to the rightwards shift was Ted Heath's Selsdon Programme. The economic problems which Britain faced in the 1970s were of course not new. Initially, the Heath Government between 1970 and 1972 attempted to reduce the level of state intervention in the economy and cut public expenditure. A number of quangos including the Prices and Incomes Board and the Industrial Reorganisation Corporation were abolished. The Government would no longer intervene to rescue

"lame duck" industries. Instead it encouraged industry and the economy in general to become more competitive and efficient. The Heath Government was forced by a series of events to backtrack on its policies. In 1971, for instance, it nationalised Rolls Royce to prevent its closure. This backtracking by the Heath Government meant that it too was perceived by some Conservatives to be interventionist.

The failure of governments in the 1960s and 1970s to deal with the relative weakness of the British economy heightened interest in possible alternatives to interventionist policies. Butskellism had been undermined by a series of economic problems in the 1970s such as the oil crisis, the exchange rate crisis and the recourse to the International Monetary Fund (IMF). The elements of continuity between the economic policies of the Callaghan Government, formulated under the conditions of the IMF loan, and those of the incoming Thatcher Government have been noted by a number of commentators.⁵ It was not a Tory Chancellor but Denis Healey who, however reluctantly, was the first to introduce monetarist policies. Hoover and Plant argue the conditions of the IMF loan "marked the end of the intellectual hegemony of Keynesian economic thinking."⁶ Keynesianism and the necessity to maintain full employment had been abandoned before the Conservative Party had won the 1979 election.

Jessop et al have provided perhaps the most satisfactory description of the development of Thatcherism. The authors argue that Thatcherism progressed in three stages. Each stage contributed to an original feature in the development of Thatcherism. During the first stage Thatcherism evolved into a "social movement" which was defined by its hostility to the Keynesian Welfare State.⁷ This period ended with the Conservative victory in the 1979 General Election. The second phase Jessop et al refer to as "period of consolidation" and ended only when Margaret Thatcher and her supporters gained control of the party, Cabinet and the political agenda. The last phase of Thatcherism was "consolidated Thatcherism" with government activity stretching into areas of social concern as well as economic concern. The ultimate

objective was to transform society. It is argued later in this chapter that the Thatcher Government experienced the greatest difficulties implementing its policies north of the border during this last phase .

There has been considerable debate amongst political scientists about the extent to which Thatcherism was compatible with British Conservatism. Some have argued that Thatcherism was distinctive because of the ideological nature of its policies. Others have stressed the centralist nature of the policies advocated by Thatcherites. It is possible, however, to identify four main ways in which Thatcherism ran counter to established Conservative traditions. The first was the ideological component of Thatcherism. The principle reason that doubts have arisen as to whether Thatcherism was compatible with the traditions of British Conservatism was its relationship with the ideology of the New Right. The second and related way in which Thatcherism was at odds with British Conservatism was its attitude to change, and specifically the desire to pursue radical change. Thirdly, the role envisaged for government in Thatcherite statecraft was distinctive. Finally, Thatcherism had a unique approach to constitutional matters including the nature of the constitutional relationship that should exist between Scotland and England.

Ideological Nature of Thatcherite Statecraft

The claim of Thatcherites to engage in conviction politics rather than consensual politics raises the question of whether or not Thatcherism was an ideological phenomenon. There has been disagreement over whether Thatcherism constituted an ideology or not. Martin Holmes is in little doubt that Thatcherism was ideological :-

Thatcherism is a full blown ideology which does depart radically from the post-war consensus in a way that Mr.Heath's Seldon Man (1970-1971), or Mr.Callaghan's monetarist experiment (1976-1978) did not. Thatcherism is both reactive to the failures of Keynesian political economy, including those of the Conservative administration, but also visionary, in aiming at a different economy and society...Thatcherism is not a total package with a pre-ordained political prescription for every topical controversy. Instead it is a specific ideology of a few central tenets.⁸

These "central tenets" were to promote the market economy and to destroy socialism. To Holmes it was inevitable that Thatcherism would be ideological because of the rightwards shift away from a collectivist society based on socialism and Keynesianism. Samuel Finer adopts a similar line of argument. In common with Holmes, Finer believes the critical point was that Thatcherism challenged assumptions made under the Keynesian era and offered in its place a radical alternative. Antony Wright believes that Thatcherism was explicitly ideological and explains that "Thatcherism had an ideological mission, which went far beyond particular policies and single elections."⁹ These accounts of Thatcherism concentrate on the ideas and principles which guided the Thatcher Governments. An alternative interpretation focuses on the policies of Thatcher Governments. Advocates of this approach question the notion that the policies pursued by the Thatcher Government were consistent with a coherent ideology. Andrew Gamble claims that the ideological component of Thatcherism may have been exaggerated :-

...a closer look at the actual policies of Thatcherism reveals that the influence of the liberal strand of the New Right doctrine has been exaggerated and that in most areas it is the conservative strand that has predominated.¹⁰

If one accepts the argument that there was an ideological dimension to Thatcherism then Thatcherism clearly breached one of the fundamental principles of British Conservatism namely, the rejection of ideology. The term, ideology, has been used here to refer to a set of ideas which forms the basis of a theory about the political and economic nature of society. The doctrinaire approach of the Thatcher Governments has been criticised by a number of former ministers under the Thatcher Governments. Writing in 1984, Norman St. John Stevas believed that the commitment of Thatcherites to liberal economic theory and in particular to monetarism was undermining traditional Conservative beliefs. According to St. John Stevas there was a very real danger that, under Margaret Thatcher's leadership, Conservatives would "seek to define them

(traditional Conservative beliefs) in a morally limited and intellectually stunted way."¹¹ He feared that the Conservative Party was moving to a stage when it would be based on dogma and ideology not on broad traditions and principles of British Conservatism:-

There comes a point at which good Conservatives must part company with the liberal enthusiast; it is allied to the theory that justice harmony and the highest common good are automatically achieved by the operation of the free market...The art of Conservative politics is to strike the right balance and to permit the fostering of self-interest without exposing weaker individuals to exploitation and the community to disruption. The equilibrium of the free market is a myth because it regards man as an economic rationalist, ignoring his motives of pride, ambition and self-aggrandizement.¹²

The implication of Conservatives following an ideological path is that they fail to take into account man's imperfections and accept that man is not capable of creating the perfect society.

Similar sentiments were echoed in Francis Pym's critique of Thatcherism *The Politics of Consent*. Pym is more critical than St. John Stevas of the "absolutest approach" of Margaret Thatcher's premiership where "everything had to be clear cut: absolutely in favour of one thing absolutely against another."¹³ This kind of conviction politics, Pym feels, ignores basic Conservative traditions. The traditional Conservative view of ideology is that it is divisive and threatens to undermine national unity. By imposing rigid principles, ideologues do not accommodate historical and personal experience. In the words of Francis Pym :-

Conservatism is an approach that flows from life, not a doctrine to be imposed on life...It is pragmatic rather than ideological. It does not lack ideals, but it prefers to base them on human values and not intellectual principles.¹⁴

Clearly then some Conservatives do view Thatcherism as a divergence from true Conservative traditions epitomised by Macmillan and Butler, especially in economic policy where the influence of New Right ideology was particularly evident (see below). Ian Gilmour explains Thatcherites believe that until the arrival of Margaret

Thatcher as party leader the Conservative Party had "forsaken its true principles, ideas and traditions and instead of preserving a free and competitive society had merely been paving the way for tyranny and socialism".¹⁵ Gilmour believes such a view is mistaken.

The principle reason why Thatcherism was perceived to be an ideological phenomenon was its relationship with the New Right. The New Right was an important source of ideas for Thatcherites and the Thatcher Government. John Gray refers to the "conquest of conservatism by the ideas and doctrines of the New Right."¹⁶ The influence that New Right thinking had on Thatcherites clearly set them apart from the more paternalistic Conservatives like Sir Ian Gilmour, Francis Pym and James Prior who advocated "One Nation" Conservatism. By the late 1970s, some Conservatives came to believe that the New Right was able to fill the vacuum left by the rejection of Keynesianism. Its think tanks such as the Centre for Policy Studies, the Adam Smith Institute, the Institute of Economic Affairs and the Hillgate Group were offering alternative policies. By consulting and maintaining an active interest in the work of these bodies the Thatcher Government helped to incorporate the ideas of the New Right into the policy process. The Thatcher Governments, Andrew Gamble maintains, used New Right ideology to legitimise its policies or as a source of new ideas not as a programme of action :-

New Right ideology was less a blueprint than a pool of ideas which were available to ministers either to justify policies or to seek new solutions. The climate of policy-making was very fluid under the Thatcher Government. What emerged was not a new consensus but a considerable widening of the parameters of policy-making so that many solutions which formerly would have been ruled out were now entertained.¹⁷

The Thatcher Governments did not adopt New Right ideology wholesale but rather used it selectively. Policies were driven by their own blend of traditional British Conservatism and New Right ideology.

Among the elements of New Right thought drawn upon by the Thatcher Governments were the rejection of the social democratic consensus and the notion that Capitalism was in any way responsible for the 1930s Depression.¹⁸ Sir Keith Joseph in his Preston Speech in 1974 was critical of the Conservative Party for allowing itself and capitalism to be blamed for the 1930s Depression. It was unnecessary government intervention, he argued, at the time of world economic crisis that had led to economic disaster in the 1930s, not capitalism. Further, Macmillan's decision, in response to the Depression, to redirect Conservative policy to follow the "Middle Way" had been disastrous for the party and the country and must be reversed. Thatcherites argued that the Conservative Party must not allow its principles to be compromised as it had done in the post-war period. Conservative Governments had presided over a socialist society. By not reversing the steady expansion of the state which had occurred under Labour Governments, the Conservative Party had been responsible for the "ratchet effect" of gradually increasing socialism.

The influence of the New Right can be seen in the economic policies of the Thatcher Governments, particularly in the field of macro-economics. The views of Milton Friedman were influential in the early years of Thatcherism. Patrick Minford has observed that the Thatcher Government "was very much in touch with the work of economists and others trying to develop and apply the liberal tradition."¹⁹ In common with the New Right, Thatcherism rejected the priorities of Keynesianism and in particular the assumption of post-war Governments that macro-economic policy should be designed to regulate demand and maintain employment. A combination of mechanisms had been used by post war Governments to reduce unemployment, namely interest rates, fiscal changes and increased public expenditure in order to stimulate demand and thereby create jobs. However, the priority of Thatcherite macro-economic policy was not to maintain full employment, but rather to control inflation.

Whether in practice the Thatcher Government pursued monetarist policies is a contentious issue. That the Thatcher Governments adopted the rhetoric of monetarism is undeniable. Ministers continually argued that the reduction of inflation was the primary objective of government and that all other economic concerns such as unemployment and wage increases must be subordinate to this objective. Kavanagh and Morris have quoted from a letter written by the Treasury to the House of Commons Treasury and Civil Service Committee in June 1980 which for the first time explicitly set out the economic priorities of the Thatcher Government:-

The Government has explicitly not set its targets in terms of...price stability and high output and employment, because these are not within direct control.²⁰

What appeared to be within the Government's control was the money supply. In the 1980s the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Geoffrey Howe, introduced the Medium Term Financial Strategy which set out expenditure targets for the next five years. Samuel Brittan has noted that it was more "significant for the general idea than for detailed monetary numbers."²¹ Jim Bulpitt has argued that one of the reasons why Thatcherites were attracted to monetarism was because "it promises the centre the prospect of managing the economy through those policies which it has some control."²² Jim Bulpitt has argued that in order to achieve and retain power the Conservative Party had traditionally employed a strategy of "statecraft."²³ The essential component of this statecraft was to create and maintain a successful economy. The extent of government intervention in the economy, Bulpitt argues, inevitably meant that the Government was held responsible if the economy was depressed. In light of this fact, the Thatcher Governments had attempted to restrict government involvement to those areas which government could successfully manage. According to Bulpitt's argument, the Thatcher Government's preoccupation with the alleged inefficiency of the state was not a direct response to popular disillusionment but rather a means to an end. That end was to gain effective political control of government and to retain that control.

During the first Thatcher administration interest rates were increased in an attempt to reduce the money supply, and in the 1981 budget the Public Sector Borrowing Requirement (PSBR) was reduced, despite soaring unemployment. At a time of recession, the Thatcher Government introduced a deflationary budget. However, the economic policies initially pursued by the Thatcher Government were abandoned after a short period. That the Government failed to reduce the level of public expenditure is now accepted widely amongst economists.²⁴ Attempts to control the money supply failed. By 1984 Chris Patten argued the "principles of monetarism had been abandoned."²⁵

In micro-economic policy, the Thatcher Government also drew upon the ideas of the New Right. The aim was to create a "free society" and to promote an "enterprise culture" which would replace the alleged tendency which had developed in society to rely too heavily on the State. This aspect of Thatcherism drew upon the libertarian wing of the New Right. Hayek believed that the most important effect of state intervention and the paternalist welfare state was that they cause "psychological change in the character of the people" which undermines liberty.²⁶ Rhodes Boyson wrote that "the present welfare state, with its costly universal benefits and heavy taxation is producing a similar economic and spiritual malaise amongst our people."²⁷ This belief was also expressed by Margaret Thatcher in a speech she gave to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in May 1988 :-

...intervention by the State must never become so great that it effectively removes personal responsibility. The same applies to taxation for while you and I work extremely hard whatever the circumstances, there are undoubtedly some who would not unless the incentive was there.²⁸

What was paramount was the freedom of the individual. Keynesian techniques of economic management and the welfare state severely curtailed the ability of individuals to organise their lives as they saw fit. The relationship between the market

and freedom was central to both Thatcherite micro-economic policy and social policy.

To achieve the aim of stimulating an "enterprise culture", the Thatcher Governments introduced a number of measures such as the abolition of wage controls and bank lending controls. However, it is in the public sector that the Thatcher Governments concentrated their attacks on the perceived "dependency culture". Put in its simplest terms, the Thatcher Governments sought to make the public sector, and nationalised industries in particular, more "efficient" by opening them up to market forces. Hence the programme of privatisation. The term privatisation has been used to refer to a collection of policies introduced by the Thatcher Governments which include the selling of nationalised industries; contracting out and deregulation. At a first glance, the link between this programme pursued by the Thatcher Governments and the New Right would seem obvious. Rod Rhodes has, however, stressed that "privatisation can be seen as one of the more modest implications of the "New Right" views on freedom."²⁹ A note of caution, however, must be introduced. It cannot be conclusively argued that Thatcherism, at least initially, had deliberately decided to go ahead with a programme of privatisation.

In the 1979 Manifesto and in earlier policy documents issued while the Conservative Party was still in opposition little reference was made to privatisation. Admittedly the 1979 Manifesto did include a pledge to sell off British Aerospace, shipbuilding industries, National Freight Corporation and Government shares in the National Enterprise Board.³⁰ However, this hardly constituted an attempt to introduce a deliberate privatisation programme aimed at the wholesale reduction of state ownership in the economy. Samuel Brittan believes that the Thatcher Government went ahead with privatisation only in those industries where it judged political resistance would be weakest.³¹ Denis Kavanagh has argued that privatisation only became crucial to Thatcherite economic strategy from 1982 onwards.³² Prior to that date, he maintains,

the Thatcher Government had the limited aims of reducing State intervention in industry and forcing the nationalised industries to operate under tighter financial controls. Marsh and Rhodes have argued along similar lines that:-

Privatisation was not a consistent, coherent policy development in opposition and carried out in power. Indeed, the government's interest in privatisation grew in the second term for political rather than economic reasons. Selling public assets to reduce public expenditure was more popular than cutting public services.³³

Thatcherism questioned the foundations of post war Governments and in particular the assumption that government had a duty to intervene in the economy to maintain full employment. This rejection of government intervention rested on the conviction that Keynesian economic management was inflationary. Under the Thatcher Governments there was a change in emphasis in economic policy away from demand management towards control of the money supply. Further, the confidence which Thatcherites placed in the ability of the market to allocate resources efficiently led them to be highly critical of the apparent readiness with which post war Governments intervened in the economy. Except in a few cases such as defence, the market was always preferred, on moral and economic grounds to Government intervention. Government intervention, Thatcherites maintain, restricts the individual's choice while the market allows choice to flourish. The results of the market were produced by individual choice. The supremacy of the market over Government should be reflected in economic policy. Government's role is to establish the optimum conditions for the market to operate as freely as possible. In line with this Hayekian thinking the Thatcher Governments introduced a series of policies such as tax cuts, a significant real reduction in regional aid, the abolition of wage councils and privatisation. The assumption behind Thatcherite economic policy was that the Conservative Party had been heading in the wrong direction since World War II.

The use of New Right ideas distinguished the Thatcher Governments from post-war Conservative Governments. It has been shown that the influence of the New Right

was especially evident in the economic policies of the Thatcher Governments. In this respect, Thatcherism's adherence to liberal economic theory distinguished it from traditional British Conservatism. The relationship between Thatcherism and the New Right was at its closest in the rejection of the social democratic consensus. The consequence of this for Thatcherites was that they had to extend their criticism beyond Labour Governments to Conservative Governments. Thatcherites re-interpreted British Conservatism, and as a result the Thatcher Governments questioned the brand of Conservatism which post war Conservative Governments had endorsed. It followed, then, for Thatcherites, that Thatcherism was wholly compatible with British Conservative thought. In the words of David Willetts, who was, prior to his post at the Centre for Policy Studies, a member of Mrs. Thatcher's Policy Unit at Downing Street, "Thatcherism is within the mainstream of Conservative philosophy."³⁴ Moreover it was Margaret Thatcher who was responsible for reviving the Conservative principles which had been lost in the post war period:-

By the mid 1970s, Conservatives had lost sight of their key principles and it took Mrs Thatcher to remind the party of them.³⁵

Andrew Gamble has argued what made the brand of Conservatism advocated by the Thatcher Governments distinct from "British Conservatism" was the nature of the statecraft it employed; in other words, the manner in which the Conservative Party wins and holds on to power. The Thatcher Governments placed a greater emphasis on ideology and this had consequences for the kind of statecraft which was pursued. Gamble argues that "Thatcherism never did subordinate statecraft to ideology...It simply had a different view of statecraft. It rejected the idea that a successful statecraft had to practice opportunism and be ready to surrender principles."³⁶

There is perhaps a tendency to exaggerate the extent to ideological phenomenon of Thatcherism was actually implemented. This is largely due to the rhetoric employed by Thatcherites and their opponents. Indeed David Marsh and Rod Rhodes have argued

that, "The Thatcherite revolution is more a product of rhetoric than reality."³⁷ In the health service, for instance, the extent to which ideological change was pursued was limited because of the commitment to maintain a health service funded by taxation and available to all. In reality, the ideological dimension of Thatcherism was constrained by electoral considerations and what Marsh and Rhodes have described as the "implementation gap". This gap was a consequence of its approach to policy making and specifically, the Thatcher Governments' failure to consult and negotiate with those interests affected by a policy:-

Their (the Thatcher Governments') rejection of consultation and negotiation almost inevitably led to implementation problems, because those groups/agencies affected by the policy, and who were not consulted, failed to co-operate, or comply, with the administration of policy.³⁸

The Thatcher Governments may not have achieved all that they wished but they were able to secure substantial changes in social policy. However, it is possible to identify policy areas which were characterised by continuity rather than by radical change. In their analysis of environmental policy under the Thatcher Governments, Ward and Samways concluded that it was "marked by continuity in the large part because of the continued importance of a series of policy networks."³⁹ The limits of Thatcherism were also evident in agricultural policy. Here the political agenda was set by 'exogenous factors' such as failings in the Common Agricultural Policy rather than ideological concerns.⁴⁰ If we took these two policies we would have to conclude that Thatcherism was more a rhetoric than a reality.

It would be wrong, however, to reject the notion that the Thatcher Governments did not pursue and implement some policies which were ideologically motivated. In certain policy areas, the Thatcher Government was explicitly ideological. In social policy, for instance, the Thatcher Governments attempted to promote the rights of the individual by encouraging the introduction of market forces. Privatisation developed into an ideologically motivated policy aimed at reducing the role of the government. It was

during what Jessop et al identified as the last phase of Thatcherism namely, "consolidated Thatcherism", that the Thatcher Governments pursued the most radical of its policies which were intended to transform society. The argument has not been that the Thatcher Governments were the first Conservative administration to pursue ideologically-motivated policies. Some of the policies initially pursued by the Heath Government had an ideological dimension. What separated the Thatcher Governments from previous post war Conservative administration was both the nature of, and the extent to which ideological policies were pursued.

Thatcherite Statecraft and Organic Change

Thatcherism was at odds with the traditional Conservative perception of change. Conservatism, as shown in the previous chapter, aims to preserve, but the ideological dimension of Thatcherism meant that the Thatcher Government sought to instigate radical change in some areas. The 1987 Conservative manifesto stated that, if re-elected, the Thatcher Government would "press on with the radical reform which we embarked upon in 1979."⁴¹

Both the pace and nature of change under the Thatcher governments was criticised by "One Nation" Conservatives. Thatcherism, because of the influence of New Right ideology, did not base change on the desire to maintain stability but rather on ideological principles. The danger of this approach was that it tended to produce unlimited change. Conservatives stress that change must be limited so as to reduce the potential damage it may cause.

The disagreements between Thatcherites and "One Nation" Conservatives on the issue of the Union were due to their different interpretations of when change was necessary and what form it should take. "One Nation" Conservatism tends to endorse organic change and, what Ian Gilmour has labelled as, "anticipatory change."⁴² In other

words, to maintain power Conservatives would be willing to remove grievances before they had time to develop. On some occasions Conservatives cannot just sit back and wait for the inevitable to happen, they must indulge in predicative or "anticipatory" change. One such occasion is in the government of Scotland. Gilmour and other Conservative pro-devolutionists support constitutional reform because it may result in less change than would be the case if Scottish aspirations for self-government were continually thwarted. Legislative devolution, they believe would provide for the distinctive Scottish institutions and values while remaining within the United Kingdom.

Thatcherites, though, do not recognise that "anticipatory change" is necessary to preserve the Union. Instead, they believe that, because Britain is a unitary state, Government should bring its component parts closer together and not encourage diversity. In particular, Scotland and England should be brought into line on policy matters. Politics in Scotland had been allowed to diverge from mainstream British politics, and the result had been demands for constitutional reform. The stance adopted by the Thatcher Governments to legislative devolution is discussed in more detail in the next section of the chapter.

It has been shown above that in a number of areas the Thatcher Governments pursued quite radical policies which were influenced by the ideas of the New Right. This was a consequence of Thatcherites rejecting the social democratic consensus. The Thatcher Governments sought to change society. Ted Honderich argues that in the 1980s it was the Conservative Party which advocated the "politics of alteration":-

...the Thatcher Governments set out to undermine or overturn as much as possible of what others regarded as decent institutions and practices of the society, institutions and practices which others took to have made a little contribution to advancing civilisation. In fact Conservative Party politics, was the politics of alteration. In one large part it was reactionary politics, which is to say intent on alteration in the direction of a society long since left behind.⁴³

The extent to which the Thatcher Governments transformed society is debatable and in particular the extent to which the Thatcher Governments succeeded in making the electorate Thatcherite. The research conducted by Edgell and Duke has substantiated the view of Jessop et al and Andrew Gamble that a new Thatcherite consensus failed to develop. What is apparent, however, is that in those areas where the Thatcher Government pursued ideologically motivated policies its legacy has been the strongest. Specifically, the shift towards market values had a profound effect on social policy and the welfare state in particular. The change which resulted from such policies initiatives in the welfare state was criticised by "One Nation" Conservatives who, for reasons referred to above, had a strong commitment to the welfare state. They had particular concerns about the extent to which the Thatcher Governments were accentuating existing inequalities in society.

The point to stress here is that traditional British Conservatism accepts organic change. Thatcherism had a different approach and used change to pursue ideological and political motives rather than to preserve and maintain stability. One should not imply from this that Thatcherism totally disregarded established institutions and practices but it was selective in which institutions and practices it sought to preserve. In constitutional terms, this approach meant that Thatcherites defended the Union on ideological grounds of maintaining central control throughout the UK, rather than out of a desire to preserve the status quo.

The Role of Government

In contrast to previous post war Conservative Governments, the Thatcher Government sought to redefine the role of the state in welfare provision. Edgell and Duke believe that the Thatcher Governments were relatively successful in achieving that aim:-

In an attempt to reassert the role of market forces in British society during the 1980s, Thatcherism has increased the internal coherence of the dominant ideology to the extent that it has been successful in reducing the welfare role

of the capitalist state...the finance of the welfare state depends less and less on redistributive collectivist principles and more and more on charging the consumers of the welfare state.⁴⁴

This social philosophy led the Thatcher Government to question the post war assumption that government should attempt to redistribute wealth. The objective of the Keynesian welfare state had been to incorporate those who were less well-off into society by ensuring that they too benefited from the country's economic growth. For much of the post war period the resources directed to social welfare programmes had been significant. Thatcherites rejected the notion that government should through its policies pursue social justice. This attitude rested on the assumptions that the welfare state had been inefficient in economic terms and in social terms had produced undesirable moral side-effects such as a dependency culture.

The economic policies which the Thatcher Government pursued had implications for the nature of social policy. There were two identifiable strands to the social philosophy of the Thatcher Governments. The first was the desire to promote through its social policies traditional Tory values such as authority and self-help. The second strand comprised the attempts by the Thatcher Government to set its social policies in the context of Thatcherite economic philosophy. In the health service, for example, the Government introduced reforms which were designed to establish "internal markets" in the service. The desire to promote "market forces" and improve "efficiency" had profound consequences for the welfare state. Substantial changes, for instance, were made in the running of National Health Service (NHS) during the period of the Thatcher Government.⁴⁵ The Government outlined its expectations for the NHS in the White Paper, *Working for Patients*, which was published in January 1989. Although the paper contained a pledge to maintain the NHS as a predominately tax financed system it did include recommendations for sweeping change. The Thatcher Government intended to introduce the competition and market forces into the NHS. "Internal markets" would be set up within the system. In Gerald Wistow's words, the

Government aimed "to introduce competition into the NHS through the separation of the purchasing and providing functions"⁴⁶ In Wistow's opinion the "internal market" will mean that hospital will have to "compete in terms of cost and outcomes. Thus control over diagnostic and treatment procedures, length of stay, readmission rates and other outcomes will become essential to their business planning."⁴⁷ Since April 1990 District Health Authorities have been funded to buy services from within the NHS or from an independent provider to satisfy the needs of their patients. It was the Government's intention that hospitals and other health services, or the provider units as they are referred to, would compete for the DHAs contracts. These units have been free to become NHS trusts which would allow them to establish their own terms and condition of service. They would be able to establish their own priorities or areas of expertise. The changes made as a result of the *Working For Patients* document were a radical break with the past. Indeed Norman Johnston believes that under the Thatcher Government, "the NHS has been forced to become part of the enterprise culture and to adopt some of the attitudes and practices of the private market."⁴⁸ Specifically, the establishment of internal markets has created a competitive system within the NHS.

Policy initiatives were also implemented which introduced market forces in community care provision. In March 1988 the report *Community Care: Agenda for Action* was published. The report was written by Sir Roy Griffith, Margaret Thatcher's personal adviser on health care and recommended radical changes. The report stated, "social services authorities should see themselves as the arrangers and purchasers of care services- not monopolistic providers".⁴⁹ The Griffith Report formed the basis of the White Paper *Caring for the People* with two significant exceptions. Firstly, Griffith's review was confined to England and Wales but the Government decided to include Scotland in the legislation. Secondly, the Government rejected Griffith's recommendation that the money local authorities receive to fund community care should be ring fenced.⁵⁰ Thus, the principle of competition was also a feature of the

community care legislation which took effect in 1991.

Most Thatcherites wished to see the relationship between government, the welfare state and the individual citizen redefined. This was a consistent theme of social policy under the Thatcher Governments and especially during the period of the last Thatcher Government. Across a range of public services the Thatcher Government set out to enhance the power the individual citizen had in relation to the professionals. This concept, for instance, underlay the parental choice legislation introduced by the Thatcher Governments.

Jessop et al have labelled Thatcherism attitude towards equality as a "Two Nation Project."⁵¹ This project was multi faceted. Each facet amounted to a rejection of "One Nation" Conservatism. Under Thatcherism, Government, on the one hand, was unsympathetic to the needs and demands of the poorer sections of society such as the unemployed and pensioners. On the other hand, it rewards the "productive" members of society. Thatcherism, according to Jessop et al, defines "productive" as those who are employed in the production of goods and services that can be sold at a profit without relying on a government subsidy.⁵² "One Nation" Conservatives, in contrast, regarded Thatcherism as divisive, and a threat to national unity, and as such a deviation from traditional British Conservatism. It jeopardised the basic tenet of British Conservatism that national interest was always to be placed before sectional or class interests.

Ian Gilmour, Francis Pym and Norman St. John Stevas all belong to a school of thought that believe the ultimate objective of the Conservative Party is to maintain national unity. These "One Nation" Conservatives believe that Government has an acknowledged redistributive role and that it must act to narrow social divisions. This belief flies in the face of Thatcherism's rejection of the post war consensus. Gilmour

and others in the Conservative Party have been critical of the apparent willingness of Thatcherites to reject equality in favour of social stratification. "One Nation" Conservatives maintain that government, has a duty to incorporate the disadvantaged members of the community into society by ensuring that they too benefit from the country's economic growth, primarily through welfare benefits and the provision of "free" state education. Following Hayek Thatcherites, however, regard governments' attempts to maintain social justice as an interference in the operation of the market. In their view, government should only establish the rules and conditions which allow the market to operate as freely as possible and in so doing uphold individual freedom and choice.

Thatcherite Statecraft and the Constitution

The attitude that the Thatcher Governments had towards the constitution also set them apart from previous post-war Conservative Governments. This attitude was in part influenced by the Thatcherite view of change. Thatcherites believed that the constitution was not something that should be defended solely on the grounds that it was the product of generations of experience. Nor was it something that should be used solely to defend existing institutions and traditions. The constitution could be also used to initiate change. Such views permitted the Thatcher Government to use constitutional conventions to pursue policies that might be perceived to be radical or ideological. Thus the convention of parliamentary sovereignty and the Union were used to facilitate the introduction and implementation of policies by the Thatcher Government.

The constitution was used by the Thatcher Governments to pursue ideological ends. A different kind of Unionism was advocated by Thatcherites. The constitution was something that the Thatcher Governments used, when necessary, for ideological ends. The implications for the constitution of indulging in ideologically motivated change

were of little or no consequence. For Thatcherites the importance of the Union did not lie in the provisions that it included for the continued existence of a distinctive civil society in Scotland. Rather the Union offered Central Government the opportunity to implement its policies throughout Britain and in the case of the Thatcher Governments to pursue an ideological mission. This placed Thatcherism at odds with both Scottish Conservatism and "One Nation" Conservatism.

The second factor which influenced the Thatcherite approach to Constitution was their view on national unity. This attitude had particular implications for the Union.

Andrew Gamble noted:-

The years of Thatcher's leadership marked the final moments and the exhaustion of the Conservatives' old Unionist formula. The Conservatives are no longer the party of the Union, striving to unite the country on the basis of solid bodies of opinion in all regions and cities of the country to Crown and Parliament.⁵³

Prior to Thatcherism the traditional Tory concern with national unity had gone hand in hand with Unionism. The maintenance of the Union, "One Nation" Conservatives believed, was essential to national unity. They were concerned that the Conservative Party must not allow itself to be marginalised in Scottish politics. Marginalisation would carry the risk of undermining the Union.

If it is accepted that Thatcherism was a divergence from the traditional Conservative approach to politics what were the implications of this divergence for Scottish Conservatives ? Did Thatcherism's ideological nature colour its approach to how Scotland was governed 1979-1990 ?

Thatcherism and the Thatcher Governments: Implications for the Government of Scotland

It has been argued in the previous section of this chapter that Thatcherite statecraft departed from the statecraft employed by previous post war Conservative

Governments. The distinctiveness of Thatcherite statecraft had implications for the governing of Scotland. In two areas in particular the repercussions for Scottish politics were significant. Firstly the attitude which Thatcherites had towards change, and specifically towards ideologically motivated change, had implications for the way in which Scotland was governed. In some policy areas, and in social policy in particular, the Thatcher Governments were intent on pursuing policies which were influenced by ideological concerns rather than a desire to accommodate the distinctive aspects of Scottish society. The attempts by the Thatcher Governments to redefine the role that government had in civil society were particularly significant in the Scottish context. The Scots, it was argued in the previous chapter, were more egalitarian than the English and one indication of this was the attitudes they had towards the social democratic consensus. In education, for instance, Scots had a greater commitment to comprehensive schooling. By challenging the role that government had in the post war social democratic state the Thatcher Governments alienated themselves from mainstream Scottish politics.

The second area in which Thatcherite statecraft had specific implications for the Scotland was the stance which the Thatcher Governments adopted towards the constitution and the Union. The unwillingness of the Thatcher Governments to introduce legislative devolution only served to heighten the political salience of the issue north of the border.

The Constitution and the Union

Thatcherism promoted a brand of Unionism which drew upon the ideas of the right wing libertarian element of the party. From the mid 1970s, the Conservative Party underwent a qualitative change in its position on the issue of devolution. The Conservative Party under Margaret Thatcher was not always associated with the uncompromising Unionist stance which separated the party from other political parties in Scotland.

In 1975 when Margaret Thatcher was elected leader it was party policy to support the establishment of a Scottish Assembly. In May 1976, at the Scottish Conservative Conference, a motion was passed reaffirming the party's commitment to the establishment of a directly elected Scottish Assembly. Mrs Thatcher, and the party's spokesperson on devolution, William Whitelaw, both voted in favour of the motion. The speech given by William Whitelaw to conference gave no indication that a Conservative Government under the premiership of Margaret Thatcher would reject the principle of legislative devolution.:-

There is a clear feeling that Scottish legislation based on a separate legal system is not adequately considered at Westminster... Nor is it felt that the Secretary of State for Scotland, the Scottish Office and other public bodies in Scotland are scrutinized as they need be...They would certainly get more time for debate in another Assembly. This is a feeling I believe we neglect at our peril.⁵⁴

By 1977 the party's position on devolution had become more confused. Francis Pym, then party spokesperson on devolution, made a speech to the Scottish Conservative Party conference which did not support any particular form of devolution. Commenting on the devolution motion passed at the 1977 Conference Chris Baur wrote in the Scotsman that it could be interpreted to "mean all things to all men because it means nothing at all."⁵⁵ However, the confusion about the Conservative Party's stance on devolution did not last long. The Scotland and Wales Bill forced the issue of devolution back on to the political agenda of the Conservative Party. In January 1977 the Conservative Shadow Cabinet decided to oppose the Bill. This split the party, with Alick Buchanan Smith and the entire Scottish front bench team resigning. Margaret Thatcher was then free to appoint the anti-devolutionist Teddy Taylor as Shadow Scottish Secretary. Significantly, Conservative opposition focused on the technicalities rather than the principles of the Bill. One of the main criticisms made of the Bill was that it would only add to bureaucracy and lead to further government inefficiency. In a speech on Labour's devolution proposals in the House of Commons

in December 1976 Margaret Thatcher argued:-

The Government proposes two legislatures, two Executives and two groups of civil servants. Such a structure does not make for efficient government for the citizens of any part of the UK.⁵⁶

During the 1979 Referendum campaign the Conservative supported but did not run the "Scotland Says No Campaign." This allowed Conservative pro devolutionist to campaign for a Scottish Assembly from within the party. In the 1979 General Election, unlike the previous three elections, the Conservative Party manifesto made no mention of a Scottish Assembly either directly or indirectly elected. The only specific recommendation was, in light of the Referendum result, to repeal the Scotland Act. A further indication that the Conservative Party was shying away from a commitment to creating a Scottish Assembly was the rather vague statement included in the manifesto to hold all party talks on how Scotland was governed. The first Thatcher Government responded to demands for legislative devolution by creating the Select Committee on Scottish Affairs and allowing the Scottish Grand Committee to meet occasionally in Edinburgh.

Throughout the 1980s the official party line was that legislative devolution was not a priority for the Scottish electorate. The views expressed by Norman Tebbit, shortly before the 1987 General Election, were typical of those expressed by Thatcherites. In a visit to Scotland Norman Tebbit, who was at that time party chairman, argued that a Scottish Assembly would only be a millstone around the Scottish electorate's neck and "one would need to build Hadrian's Wall twenty feet higher to keep the Scots in."⁵⁷ This comment was indicative of the hostility which the Thatcherite wing of the Conservative Party had towards any moves to introduce legislative devolution.

In a paper *Making Unionism Positive: Proposals for a Tory Agenda for Scotland*, published by the Centre of Policy Studies, Liam Fox, Mark Mayall and Alistair Cooke

argued that the Conservative Party should reaffirm its commitment to Unionism. The impetus for writing the paper was the poor electoral performance of the Conservative Party in Scotland in the 1987 General Election. Fox et al wrote in their introduction:-

It is the ambivalence of the Conservative Party towards its own Unionist philosophy in relation to Scottish affairs which has lies behind this decline.⁵⁸

The fact that Scotland and England have been united by the Acts of the Union into a unitary state has certain specific implications, they argue, for the manner in which policy should be formulated and implemented throughout Britain. Since 1979, Fox et al maintain, politics in Scotland has been allowed to diverge from the mainstream of British politics. In Scotland, there has been an unhealthy preoccupation with devolution and collectivist policies, whereas in England the debate has moved on, under the influence of the Thatcher Governments, to consider how best to reduce government involvement and promote and reward individualism. It is the duty of the Conservative Party to bring Scotland back into the mainstream of British politics. To do this Conservatives must regain control of the political agenda in Scotland.

Fox et al assert that there is a definite correlation between the electoral decline of the Conservative Party in Scotland and its reluctance to campaign actively in support of the Union and against legislative devolution. The Party would only regain lost ground once it has made Unionism the crucial issue in Scottish politics. Conservatives should stress to the electorate that support for legislative devolution was incompatible with the maintenance of the Union. Indecisiveness, in this area, had cost the party dearly in terms of electoral support:-

...for too long, on the central issue of devolution, it (the Conservative Party) vacillated between two options: neither rejecting or embracing either with any very significant degree of fervour, consistency or conviction. The party suffered greatly as a result of this irresolution. Its Unionism, which ought to be the foundation of Scottish Conservatism, acquired a defensive, even apologetic air. This inspires no one.⁵⁹

There is a section in the Conservative Party therefore that believes the party has been

side-tracked by devolutionists, and as a result has lost sight of its real objectives. While reaffirming their commitment to the Union, Conservatives, they argue, must not allow devolutionists to set the agenda. These Conservatives are convinced that Conservative Governments must incorporate Scotland into their political initiatives rather than marginalising her. Hence, the claim by Thatcherites that Scotland needs more not less Thatcherism in order re-establish the electoral dominance of the Conservative Party in Scotland.

Constitutional change was at best irrelevant and at worst incompatible with the brand of conservatism which Thatcherites advocated. It would not be advantageous for a Government, which wished to pursue ideologically motivated social policies, to devolve responsibility for social policy to a Scottish Assembly. This was especially pertinent given the electoral position of the Conservative Party in Scotland in the 1980s. It was therefore important that if the Thatcher Governments introduced policies which were likely to be challenged north of the border, its statecraft in Scotland should maintain central control in order to implement its policies. It was extremely unlikely that the Conservative Party would be the largest single party in a Scottish Assembly.

Not all Conservatives endorsed the Thatcherite interpretation of Scottish politics. Pro-devolutionists stressed that the party must be prepared to adapt itself to changing circumstances. Not to do so would marginalise the Conservative Party in Scotland and ultimately put the Union at risk. There was an element within the Conservative Party in Scotland which believed that the blinkered attitude of staunch Unionists was undermining Scottish Conservatism. As Struan Stevenson, a prominent pro-devolutionist and leader of the Conservative Group on COSLA, emphasises :-

The fact that our democratic institutions have remained stable over a long period does not mean that they are perfect. A healthy democracy must develop and adapt itself to changing circumstances.⁶⁰

Devolution, then, was a means of maintaining the unity of the United Kingdom. If the

Conservative Party did not respond to dissatisfaction with the system of government the Union might disintegrate.

Responding to the electoral defeat suffered by the Conservative Party in Scotland in 1987, Struan Stevenson distributed a paper entitled *The Governing of Scotland* to the Scottish media. The paper was critical of the party's leadership both in Scotland and at a national level, in particular for its lack of awareness and interest in Scottish politics. In stark contrast to the arguments of Liam Fox et al, Stevenson unequivocally rejected the notion that Scots would turn to the Conservative Party in droves once they have experienced the full benefits of Thatcherism. He maintained it was "pointless suggesting more robust Thatcherism or more centralisation, when in practice these are the very policies that the Scottish voters have rejected."⁶¹ The only chance the Conservative Party had of preventing a terminal decline is to reinforce the Scottish identity of the party, primarily by advocating legislative devolution. In Stevenson's view by refusing to consider the possibility of constitutional change the Thatcher Governments had seriously misjudged the political situation in Scotland:-

The question of constitutional reform lies at the very heart of our present unpopularity... Scottish Tories who have always thought of themselves as "British first and Scottish second" have discovered that this philosophy in no way accords with the feelings of the average Scot. While the Opposition parties find it easy to identify and discuss the grievances of the Scottish people, Scottish Tories remained trapped by a national identity crisis. How can they express their patriotism to Scotland without seeming unpatriotic to Great Britain? This dilemma surfaced time and again involving issues like Gartcosh, Caterpillar and even the Cold Weather Allowance, and left the majority of voters certain that Scottish Conservatives placed the welfare of the UK above the parochial interests of Scotland... The firmly rooted perception of our party is that we are English-based, English controlled and have no identifiable Scottish dimension. That cost us votes.⁶²

The 1987 General Election result was the catalyst which led to a renewed interest within the Conservative Party in constitutional reform. Both pro-devolutionists and staunch Unionists interpreted the result as justification for their respective stances. Electoral decline, the latter believed, was a direct result of the party failing to capitalise on its Unionist philosophy. Pro-devolutionists interpreted the Conservative defeat in

Scotland as a direct consequence of the party's anti-devolution stance.

The nature of the constitutional relationship between Scotland and England is an emotive issue for Conservatives and presents particular problems for Scottish Conservatives. Scottish Conservatives find it difficult to reconcile their Scottish identity with their loyalty to Britain. At a time when awareness of the Scottish dimension heightened, not only in politics but also in history and literature, the Conservative Party refused to alter its commitment to the constitutional status quo, giving rise to the perception of the party being anti-Scottish and pro-English. The difficulties faced by Scottish Conservatives were acute during the period of the Thatcher Governments. This was a consequence of the Thatcherite view of change, and of the brand of Unionist politics which were pursued.

Both pro-devolutionists and staunch Unionists agreed that the major problem which faced the Scottish Conservative Party during the 1980s was that the party had lost the political initiative in Scotland. However, this is where the consensus ends. Views on how exactly the party should remedy the situation were coloured by conflicting judgements of when change, in this instance constitutional, was necessary. Anti-devolutionists feared that to initiate such a radical reform in the structure of government would upset Scotland's relationship with England. The constitution would be put into a state of flux and ultimately the Union might disintegrate. To advocate legislative devolution would also contradict the belief Conservatives have in limited change. It would, they maintained, be impossible to anticipate the possible repercussions of such a constitutional reform. To institute such a break with existing practices of government could cause untold damage and aggravate relations between Scotland and England rather than improve them.

It is worth noting that the stance adopted by the Thatcher Governments on other aspects of the constitution also had repercussions for the government of Scotland.

Attention has tended to focus on how the Thatcher Governments approached the issue of devolution and neglected other areas of the constitution. The Thatcher Governments were in fact able to use the convention of parliamentary sovereignty to pursue their policies in Scotland. The 1987 Conservative manifesto presented the Thatcher Governments as decisive and strong because of the parliamentary majorities they had been able to secure. In the manifesto under the heading "A Strong and Stable Government" it was claimed:-

All these improvements in the wealth and standing of our country have only been possible because we have had a strong government with sound policies and a decisive majority in Parliament.⁶³

Citing the convention of parliamentary sovereignty was a well established practice and by no means unique to the Thatcher Governments. What separated the Thatcher Governments from previous Conservative Governments was the political context in which this constitutional convention was exercised. The Conservative Party, in the House of Commons, was increasingly seen throughout the 1980s as an "English" party. The number of Conservative MPs who represented Scottish constituencies steadily declined, while the number of Conservative MPs representing English constituencies and especially southern English constituencies rose. No Government in the post war period had to face such a stark division of electoral loyalties within Britain. Commenting on the changing perception of the Tory Party in the 1980s, David McCrone has argued:-

Modern Conservatism spoke overwhelmingly with a southern English voice. The populist, nationalist, anti-statist appeal which sustained Thatcherism in England for the whole of the 1980s had distinctively negative resonances north of the border.⁶⁴

The Scottish dimension to politics north of the border became increasingly important in the 1980s. The Labour Party was again campaigning for a Scottish Assembly to be established. Two factors together, the decline in the Conservative vote in Scotland and the increasing salience of the Scottish dimension, meant that the Thatcher Governments were increasingly perceived to be introducing policies which were not

relevant to Scotland. The context in which the Thatcher Governments used constitutional conventions had led to repercussions which were specific to the Scotland.

Thatcherite Interpretation of Change

It has been argued above that Thatcherism, unlike traditional British Conservatism, did not shy away from using ideology to shape its statecraft. Its primary objective was not to conserve but rather to maintain central control to allow it to challenge the social democratic consensus. Under such circumstances, it was perhaps not surprising that the Thatcher Governments refused to make concessions to Scottish distinctiveness; such a path would have ultimately removed power from the centre. In an earlier section it was argued that the Thatcher Governments had introduced social policies which undermined the social democratic consensus. These policies, which were ideologically motivated, were applied throughout Britain. If there was in Scotland a stronger attachment to the social democratic consensus, and to the values associated with that consensus, then one might expect that the reaction in Scotland to Thatcherite social policy would be on the whole unfavourable. Moreover, the Thatcher Governments judged that the need to pursue ideologically motivated social policies was more important than accommodating the "Scottish dimension" to politics north of the border. This approach compounded the problems faced by the Thatcher Government in implementing its policies. By neglecting the Scottish dimension, and arguably denying its existence, the Thatcher Government heightened the awareness of the Scottish dimension. In David McCrone's opinion "the attack on state institutions ...was easily perceived as an attack on 'Scotland' itself."⁶⁵

Conclusion

The approach adopted by the Thatcher Government in Scotland arose more by accident than design. For instance in social policy one of the guiding principles of Thatcherite

policy was not to accommodate the "Scottish dimension" but rather to ensure that certain ideological principles would be pursued. What separated the Thatcher Government from previous Conservative Governments was the apparent reluctance of the former to alter its approach in light of opposition to its policies north of the border.

One result of Thatcherite statecraft was a growing perception in Scotland throughout the 1980s that the Thatcher Governments were anglicising society, in the sense that government was introducing policies in Scotland which were designed to meet the problems and needs of England rather than those faced by Scotland. This perception was partly due to the refusal of the Thatcher Governments to implement even a limited form of legislative devolution. But it was no coincidence that accusations of anglicisation levelled at the Thatcher Governments increased as it intensified its challenge to the social democratic consensus. In its initial stages this challenge was mounted to the economic aspects of the consensus such as demand management. Significantly, economic policy was a unitary, all British policy. The same, however, was not true of the social components of the consensus. In the past, Government policy had been more flexible in this area. The Scottish Office presides over a distinctive Scottish education system, legal system and local government system.

Education policy was an essential component of the social democratic consensus. What policies did the Thatcher Governments pursue in Scottish education ? Did Scottish education policy under the Thatcher years become more centralised, and if so how did the Scottish educational community react to this development ? Or did Thatcherite education policy accommodate Scotland's distinctive education system ?

NOTES AND REFERENCES

¹ There have been numerous accounts of the rise of Thatcherism. Amongst the most authoritative are Jessop et al (1988) *Thatcherism: A Tale of Two Nations* ; Gamble (1988) *Free Economy and the Strong State*; Hall, S. and Jacques, M. (eds.) (1983) *The Politics of Thatcherism* ; Kavanagh (1987) *Thatcherism and British Politics* and Riddell, P. (1989) *The Thatcher Decade*

² Hall, S. (1983) 'The Great Moving Right Show' in Hall, S. and Jacques, M. (eds) *The Politics of Thatcherism* p.19

³ *Ibid* p.19

⁴ Lane, T. (1983) 'The Tories and the Trade Unions: Rhetoric and Reality' in Hall, S. and Jacques, M.(eds) *The Politics of Thatcherism* p.175

⁵ See for instance Kavanagh, D. (1987) *op cit.*

⁶ Hoover, K. and Plant, P. (1989) *Conservative Capitalism in Britain and US* p.146

⁷ Jessop et al (1988) *op. cit.*, p.60

⁸ Holmes, M. (1989) *Thatcherism: Scopes and Limits 1983-1987* pp.8-9

⁹ Wright, A. (1989) 'Endpiece: Ideological Politics Now' in Tivey, L. and Wright, A. (eds.) *Party Ideology In Britain* p.207

¹⁰ Gamble, A. *op. cit.*, p.361

¹¹ St. John Stevas, N. (1984) *The Two Cities* p.35

¹² *Ibid* p.36

¹³ Pym, F. (1984) *The Politics of Consent* p.8

¹⁴ *Ibid* pp.172-173

¹⁵ Gilmour, I (1977) *Inside Right* p.32

¹⁶ Gray, J. (1990) 'Conservatism, Individualism and the Political Thought of the New Right' in Clarke, J. (ed) *Ideas and Politics in Modern Britain* p.87

¹⁷ Gamble, A. (1988) *op cit.*, p.12

¹⁸ The term social democratic consensus refers to the political consensus which existed in the post 1945 period about the management of the economy and the development of the welfare state. In this chapter and throughout the thesis it has been used in much the same context as David Marquand described it in his book *The Unprincipled Society* :- 'as a shorthand for a set of commitments, assumptions, expectations, transcending party conflicts and shared by the great majority of the country's leaders, which provided the framework within which policy decisions were made.' (p.18) As David Dutton has argued in his study, *British Politics Since 1945: The Rise and Fall of Consensus*, consensus does not mean total agreement. There was never total agreement between the Labour and Conservative parties. Both parties contained those who adopted extreme positions. Significantly, though it was the right wing of the Labour party and the left of the Tory party which dominated in the post war years. As a consequence, there was a movement towards the 'middle ground'. An element of continuity existed between Labour and Conservative Governments. For instance the 1945 Labour Government pursued a policy of nationalisation which was not reversed by the 1951 Conservative Government. The exception was the steel industry which was re-nationalised by the Labour Government in 1967. Kavanagh and Morris have identified 5 distinct element to the political consensus namely, the mixed economy, a commitment to full employment, the conciliation of the trade unions, the commitment to the welfare state and the retreat from Empire.

¹⁹ Minford, P. (1990) 'Ideology and Pragmatism in Economic Thatcherism' in Clarke, J.C.D. (ed) *Ideas and Politics in Modern Britain* p.191

²⁰ Kavanagh, D. and Morris, P. (1989) *Consensus Politics from Attlee to Thatcher* p.48

²¹ Brittan, S. (1989) 'The Thatcher Government's Economic Policy' in Kavanagh, D. and Seldon, A.

- 22 Bulpitt, J. (1982) 'Conservatism, Unionism and the Problem of Territorial Management' in Madgwick, P. and Rose, R. *Territorial Dimensions in the UK* p.167
- 23 Bulpitt outlines his interpretation of Thatcherite statecraft in his article *The Discipline of the New Democracy: Mrs. Thatcher's Domestic Statecraft*.
- 24 See for instance Keegan (1984) *Mrs Thatcher's Economic Experiment* and Brittan (1989) *op cit.*
- 25 *Guardian* (1984) 3rd May
- 26 Quoted in Barry, N. (1987) *The New Right* p.121
- 27 Quoted in Clarke, J et al (1987) *Ideologies of Welfare: From Dreams to Disillusion* p.131
- 28 *Guardian* (1988), 'The Sermon on the Mound' 23rd May
- 29 Rhodes, R.A.W. (1988) *Beyond Westminster and Whitehall* p.23
- 30 Kavanagh, D. *op. cit.*, p.83
- 31 Brittan, S. *op. cit.*, p.6
- 32 Kavanagh, D. *op cit.*, p.96
- 33 Marsh, D. and Rhodes, R.A.W. (1992) 'Implementing Thatcherism: Policy Change in the 1980s' *Parliamentary Affairs* Vol.45 p.37
- 34 Willetts, D. (1992) *Modern Conservatism* p.60
- 35 *Ibid* p.46
- 36 Gamble, A. *op. cit.*, p.153
- 37 Marsh, D. and Rhodes, R.A.W. (1992) 'The Implementation Gap: Explaining Policy Change and Continuity' in Marsh, D. and Rhodes, R.A.W. (eds.) *Implementing Thatcherite Policies: An Audit of an Era* p.187
- 38 *Ibid* p.181
- 39 Ward, H. and Samways, D. (1992) 'Environmental Policy' in Marsh, D. and Rhodes, R.A.W. (eds) *Implementing Thatcherite Policies* p.134
- 40 Smith, M.J. (1992) 'CAP and Agricultural Policy' in Marsh, D. and Rhodes, R.A.W. (eds) *Implementing Thatcherite Policies* p.151
- 41 *Conservative Manifesto 1987: The Next Moves Forward* p.9
- 42 Gilmour, I. *op cit.*, p.146
- 43 Honderich, T. (1990) *Conservatism* p.4
- 44 Edgell, S. and Duke, V. (1991) *A Measure of Thatcherism: A Sociology of Britain* p.225-226
- 45 See Waite, B. (1991) *The Rhetoric of Independence: The Ideology and Practice of Social Policy in Thatcher's Britain* and in particular chapter 3 for an examination of Thatcherite policies in the welfare state. Also Johnston, N. (1990) *Reconstructing the Welfare State* gives an overview of the effects of Thatcherism on the welfare state. For a review of the effects of Thatcherism on the welfare state in the early 1980s see Le Grand, J. and Robinson, R. (1984) (eds.) *Privatisation and the Welfare State*

-
- ⁴⁶ Wistow, G. (1992) 'The National Health Service' in Marsh, D. and Rhodes, R.A.W. *Implementing Thatcherite Policies* p.110
- ⁴⁷ *Ibid*
- ⁴⁸ Johnston, N. (1990) *op cit.*, p.94
- ⁴⁹ Griffiths, D. (1991) *Politics of Health* p.74
- ⁵⁰ *Ibid*
- ⁵¹ Jessop et al, *op cit.* p.87
- ⁵² *Ibid* p.88
- ⁵³ Gamble, A. (1988) *op cit.*, p.166
- ⁵⁴ Quoted in Conservative Research Department (1977) *The Campaign Guide 1977* p.519
- ⁵⁵ *Scotsman* 13th May 1977
- ⁵⁶ Conservative Research Department, *op cit.*, p.520
- ⁵⁷ *Scotsman*, 20th April 1987
- ⁵⁸ Fox et al (1988) *Making Unionism Positive: Proposals for a Tory Agenda in Scotland* p.1
- ⁵⁹ *Ibid* p.11
- ⁶⁰ Private paper written by Struan Stevenson on the Scotland Act.
- ⁶¹ Stevenson, S. (1987) *Governing Scotland* p.1
- ⁶² *Ibid*
- ⁶³ *Conservative Manifesto 1987: The Next Moves Forward* p.8
- ⁶⁴ McCrone, D. (1992) *Understanding Scotland: The Sociology of a Stateless Nation* p.173
- ⁶⁵ *Ibid* p.172

Part 2 Thatcherite Education Policy in Scotland

CHAPTER 3

THE SCOTTISH EDUCATION SYSTEM: A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Introduction

This chapter focuses on the Scottish education system. By looking at education it is hoped to gain an insight into how the Thatcher Governments governed in Scotland. The education system has contributed and continues to contribute to Scottish national consciousness and the distinctiveness of civil society in Scotland. One of the arguments of the first two chapters was that Conservatives do not have a shared view of how Scotland should be governed. A number of different approaches have been advocated, ranging from accommodation to assimilation. The Thatcher Governments, it was argued, have adopted a distinctive approach to territorial politics. The chapters in this part of the thesis explore what the implications were of Thatcherite statecraft for education policy in Scotland. But first, it is necessary, because of the distinctive nature of the education system north of the border, to examine the context in which the Thatcher Governments have implemented their policies.

The chapter is divided into three main sections. The first outlines briefly the administrative and institutional structure of the education system in Scotland. The next section examines the culture or ideology which permeates that system. The chapter closes with a discussion of the implications which the Scottish educational tradition and distinctive administrative arrangements have for governments when they implement education policies in the Scottish context. One must be familiar not only with the distinctiveness of the education system but also with the ways in which Scots used this distinctiveness in their relationship with Central Government.

Administrative and Institutional Structure of the Scottish Education System

The Scottish education system has a distinct institutional arrangement within the UK framework. Separate legislation is passed for Scotland in educational matters, and it is the Scottish Office, not the DFE (Department for Education), which has responsibility for Scottish education. There are a number of administrative institutions which are unique to Scotland, namely the SED (Scottish Education Department); the SEB (Scottish Examination Board); the SCCC (Scottish Consultative Council on the Curriculum) and the GTC (General Teaching Council). The administration of education policy is therefore conducted in a distinctly Scottish network of institutions.

Scottish Education Department

Origins and Early Development

The Acts of Union made provision for the continuance of a distinct education system in Scotland. After 1707, there was therefore still a need for a separate administrative apparatus to run the system. In George Davie's words "local autonomy" was allowed to persist:-

The principle of centralisation was confined to the Parliamentary and fiscal spheres, and local autonomy remained intact not only in the church but also in the judicature, and, what is equally important, in certain fundamental institutions in which legal and clerical interests met, such as, above all the education system.¹

In post-Union Scotland, as a consequence of this "local autonomy", the development of a separate apparatus to administer the Scottish education system antedated the establishment of the Scottish Office in 1885. The nature of educational provision in Scotland was very different from that of her southern neighbour. By the early eighteenth century Scotland was aiming to establish a school in every

parish. By the nineteenth century both the school and the university systems were relatively well developed compared to England. In education, and in some other areas such as the poor law, a separate administrative system had evolved. A number of departments or boards pre-dated the Scottish Office. These included the SED and the Board of Supervision for the Relief of the Poor and for Public Health. In budgetary terms the SED was by far the most significant of these departments.

It is worth noting that educational issues featured prominently in the period shortly before the Scottish Office was established. In particular the "Revised Code" in 1862 sparked off a furious debate in Scotland. Michael Keating has argued that the way Scotland was governed in the century or so following the 1745 Rebellion failed to accommodate Scottish differences and the Code exemplified this failure:-

....the neglect of Scotland's native traditions had meant that much of the reforming legislation was ill-adapted to Scottish practice. In 1862, for example, the "Revised Code" for educational aid caused such an outcry that it had to be abrogated in Scotland and a Royal Commission established, leading to the foundation of the Scotch (*sic*) Education Department and a separate Education Act in 1872.²

A brief discussion of the Code gives a insight into the events which surrounded the establishment of the Scotch Education Department (renamed the Scottish Education Department in 1918). The Code was based on recommendations made by the Newcastle Commission. The remit of this Royal Commission was confined to England and did not extend to Scotland. The Code proposed to alter the manner in which schools had been funded. Opposition focussed on the proposed switch to payment by results achieved in the three Rs. Research conducted by Thomas Wilson has revealed that the Code was perceived as at best irrelevant and at worst disastrous for the Scottish education system.³ R.D. Anderson has argued that the Code was irrelevant to Scotland in three respects. Firstly, payment according to results achieved in the three Rs gave teachers an incentive to ignore subjects such as Latin and Greek which were also taught in Scottish schools. Secondly, implicit in

the Code was the assumption that teachers had themselves only received a basic education. No recognition was given to the fact that teachers in Scotland often had university qualifications. Finally, the author of the Revised Code did not intend that grants would be given to children other than those whose parents belonged to the labouring classes. Anderson explains that this aspect of the Revised Code would have caused difficulties because schools in Scotland catered for a mix of social classes.⁴

Scottish MPs petitioned for a separate Royal Commission for Scotland to be established before any reforms were introduced. In response to their demands the Argyll Commission was established in 1864. The 1872 Education (Scotland) Act was based on the findings of the Commission. Probably many Scots regarded this Act as Scottish. Commenting on the 1871 bill which the 1872 Act was based upon one Scottish MP, Lyon Playfair, who prior to entering the House of Commons was a professor of Chemistry at Edinburgh, argued:-

Primary and secondary education are...so thoroughly ingrained in Scotland that you cannot deal with them separately, nor would Scotchmen give one farthing for a system of national education in which they were separated.⁵

Playfair welcomed the inclusion of burgh schools in the bill. In contrast to the situation south of the border, the role of school boards would extend beyond elementary education. R.D. Anderson notes that "in many respects the Act went beyond the Argyll report and beyond what had been introduced in England."⁶ Amongst the most significant of its provisions were the establishment of a Board of Education to administer the schooling system, and the extension of the public schooling system. Education was made compulsory for 5 to 13 years old. School boards assumed responsibility for parish and other public schools. Scotland thereby developed a national system whereas south of the border board and voluntary schools developed separately.

The Scotch Education Department came into existence following the 1872 Education Act. Robert Bell and Nigel Grant have argued "the feeling of separateness was...such that it seemed quite natural for the 1872 Education Act to be followed by the setting up a separate Scotch Education Department."⁷ Only with establishment of the Board of Education in 1899 did England get an equivalent body to the SED. However, Anderson notes that "until the creation of the Scottish Office in 1885 it (the SED) lacked real independence of the English Department."⁸

Functions

The SED function's can be divided into two broad areas. Firstly, there is the administrative side of the department's functions. Within the department there are a number of divisions which, with the exception of Educational Statistics, are overseen by Assistant Secretaries. The remits of these divisions, as W.M.Humes argues, are not fixed. Rather, they are liable to change as policies are reviewed and new priorities are set.⁹ In total, Humes identified eight separate divisions. These are listed below:-

- (i) Public School Organisation; Private Sector Schools; Special Educational Needs
- (ii) School Curriculum and Assessment; Education for 16-18s
- (iii) Vocational Further Education
- (iv) Arts; Sport; Community Education
- (v) Higher Education
- (vi) Educational Statistics; Supply of Teachers
- (vii) Administration of Colleges of Education; Training of Teachers; Teachers' Salaries and conditions
- (viii) Building, Research, Planning, etc.

From this brief description of the SED's administrative functions it is evident that its responsibilities are both extensive and diverse. Its administrative functions are, however, only one side of the SED's activities. The other main function, which is distinct from the department's administrative operations, is the inspection of schools. This activity has been performed by the Inspectorate.

Traditionally, the Inspectorate has been regarded as one of the most influential

bodies in the Scottish education system. This is in part due to the long history that the Inspectorate can lay claim to. The Inspectorate predates the SED and, unlike the SED which was based in London until the 1920s, it was located in Scotland from its creation in 1840. Its influence is also in part due to the role that the Inspectorate has in the education system. The nature of that role has altered over time.

In the 1950s the Inspectorate had a leading role in curriculum development. The SED, through the codes and circular it issued, had principal control of curricular matters. One function of Inspectorate was to oversee the implementation of the SED directives. Some commentators have noted that this aspect of the Inspectorate's work became increasingly important under the leadership of John Brunton. Brunton was Senior Chief Inspector between 1955 and 1966. Amongst the most significant publications of the SED at this time were the reports *From School to Further Education* in 1963 and *Primary Education in Scotland* (commonly known as the Primary Memorandum) published in 1965. Gatherer's work on curriculum development in Scotland has led him to conclude that during the late 1950s and 1960s:-

...the Inspectorate took a new role, their inspectorial function giving way to a strong leadership in curricular development.¹⁰

This "new role" has, however, since been redefined. In the mid 1960s a series of institutional reforms led to establishment of the CCC and SCEEB (Scottish Certificate of Education Examination Board). Previously, the Inspectorate had been responsible for every aspect of the examination system; from the setting of the examinations to awarding the certificates. Until the 1960s, it was also responsible for conducting inspections of the teacher training colleges. As a result of this restructuring, the Inspectorate's influence over curricular matters was reduced. The CCC assumed principal responsibility for curricular developments and the SCEEB was responsible for the school examination system (see below). McPherson and

Raab suggest that a concurrent development which further diminished the influence of the Inspectorate was that "no longer were SED Secretaries to be ex-Inspectors."¹¹ Gatherer notes that "the current emphasis of the inspectors lies more in the implementation of curricular policies through their examination and analysis of the work of schools."¹² The Inspectorate through its membership of key bodies such as the CCC and the SCEEB continued to have an important role in curricular developments in Scotland. In other areas the influence of the Inspectorate has been enhanced.

The last official description of the Inspectorate's role was produced in 1983 in the Rayner report. Sir Derek Rayner was Managing Director of Marks and Spencers. The report indicates that there has been a shift away from curricular matters towards more managerial concerns such as the identification of "cost effective ways" and identification of "attainable norms of quality". McPherson and Raab have also argued that, as the SED placed more importance on matters relating to school staffing and premises, the Inspectorate became increasingly concerned with school management.¹³ The functions identified in the Rayner report have been reproduced below:-

- (i) to provide information, assessment and advice to Ministers, the SED, other Government Departments and agencies and the other central bodies involved in education.
- (ii) to provide an audit by assessing and reporting on the quality of education and training provided to make available to those responsible for taking action, the advice and assistance considered necessary to effect an improvement.
- (iii) to identify and make known the educational needs of the nation having taken account of the perceived needs and wishes of parents and pupils.
- (iv) to identify cost-effective ways of meeting these needs and to influence the responsible bodies and agencies to meet them.
- (v) to indicate desirable and attainable norms of quality and to advise on the actions required to achieve these.
- (vi) to give a lead in developmental work in various sectors of education, formal and informal, and to work with directors of education, heads of schools and colleges, advisory and executive bodies and others through appropriate forms of liaison to bring about necessary changes in the

system.¹⁴

The influential role which the Inspectorate had and continues to have, has led historians and analysts of the Scottish education system to identify it as one of the defining features of the Scottish system. A major difference between the Scottish and English Inspectorates is that the former did not have local authority Inspectors. It has only been in the past twenty years or so that advisory teams have become established in education authorities. G.S.Osborne suggests that the existence of two Inspectorates in England namely the local authority inspectors and the HMI may serve to undermine the influence that each can wield in schools.¹⁵ Also, the proportionally larger Scottish Inspectorate allows for greater central control.

Consultative Committee on the Curriculum and the Scottish Examination Board

The CCC was created in 1965. This body was created to fill the vacuum left after the demise of the Advisory Council on Education. The Advisory Council was established in response to provisions set out the 1918 Act and it last met in 1961. Its membership included educationalists and representatives of parties with an interest in educational matters. The intention was that Advisory Council would allow educationalists to have an input into the policy-making process. As its name suggest this quango had only advisory status. W.A. Gatherer claims that the CCC was in contrast:-

...a new phenomenon in Scottish education being a kind of standing working party, with its membership changing every 4 or 5 years, solely concerned with the curriculum. Not since the Sixth Advisory Council in the 1940s had there been a mechanism for reviewing the whole curriculum.¹⁶

The CCC is also a quango. It is responsible to the Secretary of State for Scotland. Both the structure and the remit of the CCC have changed over time. The first major structural changes were made in 1976. Two major new sub-committees, Committee on Primary Education (COPE) and Committee on Secondary Education (COSE) were established to consider curriculum development in the primary and secondary

sectors respectively. The CCC could also now publish whatever material it chooses under its own name. During the period of the Thatcher Governments two further reviews of the CCC were conducted. The first was announced in 1979 and culminated in the Rayner report. The review was consistent with the Government's aim of reducing public expenditure and scrutinising quangos. It was headed by Sir Derek Rayner and a Minister of State at the Scottish Office, Earl Mansfield.

The outcome of the Rayner study was regarded as a success by the CCC. Humes argues:-

It (the Rayner enquiry) performed a useful political function as far as the SED was concerned. Existing arrangements were publicly validated by the study. The Minister responsible for education could now say that the CCC had been closely scrutinised and had emerged with credit from the exercise.¹⁷

One explanation offered by Humes for the review's findings was that the higher echelons of Scottish education had successfully mobilised opinion against any proposals which might have emerged:-

When it was first set up, the Rayner study threatened to undermine the position of CCC members particularly the full-time staff in the secretariat and the SCDS (Scottish Curriculum Development Service). There was, however, a successful mobilisation of forces against any attempt at major reconstruction.¹⁸

If Humes was correct in his judgement, then the difficulties encountered by the Thatcher Government in this first review were specific to Scotland. The second review was conducted by D.J. Crawley an Assistant Secretary at the SED between 1984 and 1986. Gatherer believes that "the Crawley Review reflected a number of the Thatcher Government's educational preoccupations."¹⁹ The most noteworthy of these "was that based on the Thatcherite principle of value for money, the whole enterprise would be established as a company limited by guarantee."²⁰ In 1985 the new Scottish Consultative Council on the Curriculum (SCCC) was established. Gatherer has been critical of some of the reforms which were implemented following the Crawley Study. In particular, he was concerned that the government would now set the SCCC's agenda, and that it would only be able to publish

material that would be cost-effective.

The SCCC is an influential body in curriculum development in Scotland and is one means through which the SED is also able to exert control over the curriculum. The other significant source of influence for the SED in curricular matters is the SEB. In common with the SCCC, the SEB has an advisory function. The Education (Scotland) Act of 1963 made provision for the establishment of the Board which was first appointed in 1964. Prior to this date, as mentioned above, the responsibility for the examination system lay with the Inspectorate. Doubts about the Inspectorate's ability to cope with the extra work involved in new 'O'Grade examinations, which had been introduced in 1962, was the catalyst for the creation of the Board.²¹ The Board is expected to advise the Secretary of State on national examination, and also to conduct those examinations. McPherson and Raab are sceptical of the degree of independence the Board has from the Secretary of State. The right to appoint the Board's membership together with the control of the purse strings gives the Secretary a substantial amount of influence over the Board.²²

The existence of only one examination board in Scotland and influence of the SCCC allows the SED to exercise far more direct control over curricular matters than the DFE is able to exert. The introduction of the National Curriculum in the 1988 Education Reform Act has given the DFE more control over curricular matters, but it still falls short of the influence wielded by the SED. The existence of a single examination board is one reason why the Scottish education system has generally been regarded as more centralised than the education system south of the border. A further reason which is commonly mentioned to account for the more centralised system in Scotland are the arrangements for teacher training. It is to this issue the discussion now turns.

General Teaching Council

The colleges of education contribute towards the distinctiveness of teacher training in Scotland. Up to 1993 these were all separate from the universities and were funded by the SED. The principle activities of the colleges are pre-service and in-service training. However, another distinctive element of teacher training in Scotland is the existence of the GTC. Prior to the establishment of the GTC, the teaching profession in Scotland had made explicit a number of concerns related to status, conditions of service and pay.²³ In the early 1960s the teacher training colleges started to run a Bachelor of Education degree. With this qualification, it was no longer necessary for teachers to first receive a university degree before entering the profession.²⁴ It was in this context that the GTC was established. In addition to advising the Secretary of State on the supply and training of teachers, the GTC has a number of other functions. These include setting the entrance requirements for teacher training; overseeing the training given to prospective teachers; certification and keeping a register of all those entitled to teach in Scottish schools. The result of these arrangements is that the SED has more direct control, than the DFE, over the standard of teaching appointments.

The existence of the GTC has also perpetuated the notion that the professional status of teachers in Scotland is higher than their colleagues south of the border. This is in part a consequence of the regulatory role the GTC performs. In order to teach in Scottish schools teachers must have satisfied the conditions set out by the GTC. A recent editorial in the *Times Education Supplement (Scotland)* stressed the connection between the GTC and professionalism:-

Scottish education has always been fond of qualifications. The ending of unqualified teachers, compulsory registration with the General Teaching Council and the arrival of the all-graduate profession has provided great feelings of superiority for Scots.²⁵

There is also a historical dimension to this notion of professionalism. It has been

argued that teachers in Scotland are better qualified than teachers in England. James Kellas asserts "the teacher is accorded higher status in Scotland than in England."²⁶ This point was brought out in the discussion earlier in the chapter of the reaction to the proposed Revised Code in the 1860s (see above). One of criticisms made of the Code was that it did not accommodate the fact that teachers in Scotland had commonly received some university education.

Implications of Administrative and Institutional Differences

Clearly the influence that the Secretary of State has over examinations and curriculum in Scottish schools through the SEB and the CCC gives the SED more direct influence in education than the DFE exercises. It is for this reason that it is generally thought the SED had more influence than the DFE, and that the Scottish system is more centralised. The quote below from G.S.Osborne's book *Scottish and English Schools* is illustrative of this belief:-

In part the SED played a more active role for historical reasons, and in part because Scotland is a relatively small country. In part it may be that those administrators and inspectors who have themselves been educated in Scotland have been tempted to control more effectively what they know more intimately. But in part the Department has governed the schools with a heavier hand because it has been expected to do so. The ideal in England in spite of increasing professionalism is still the amateur. In Scotland respect is reserved for the expert.²⁷

The explanations offered by Osborne to explain the "more active role" of the SED are specific to Scotland. Similar explanations have been offered by other writers. McPherson and Raab maintain that a tendency had developed for "policy-making to be departmentally led, and for Scots to look to the SED for a lead."²⁸

One must acknowledge the centralist tendencies that exist in the administrative structure of Scottish education and the fact that these tendencies are recognised as a distinguishing feature of Scottish education. One must not, however, exaggerate the extent of central control which exists. The SED has to face some influential actors in

the policy making network in Scotland. The teaching unions, for example, are a more united force than in England and Wales. Indeed the main teaching union the Educational Institute of Scotland, until the 1960s enjoyed the "monopoly of the channels of official consultation with the Department."²⁹

Central government therefore has to pursue its education policies in Scotland in a distinctive context. In part this is due to the institutional and administrative distinctiveness of the Scottish education system discussed above, but it is also partly due to the traditions and myths which pervade the education system. These traditions and myths are examined below.

Culture of the Scottish Education System

There is a received wisdom amongst historians and analysts of the Scottish education system that there was, and continues to be in Scotland, a specific outlook, informed by the "Scottish myth" or more specifically the "democratic tradition," on the purpose of education. The popular belief in the "Scottish myth" has been maintained in three respects. Firstly, many features of contemporary education, as R.D. Anderson points out, can be traced back to the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. For instance, the four year degree course in Scottish universities has been interpreted as part of the "generalist tradition" which still exists in Scottish education.

Secondly, the Scottish educational tradition was and continues to be an important component of Scottish national identity. In the words of R.D. Anderson:-

But in Scotland there was an advanced and distinctive educational tradition which could be traced back to the Reformation. The belief that Scottish education was peculiarly "democratic" and that it helped sustain certain corresponding democratic features of Scottish life, formed a powerful myth. A belief which influences history by interacting with other forces and pressures ruling out some developments as inconsistent with the national tradition and shaping the form in which institutions inherited from the past

are allowed to change.³⁰

The "Scottish myth" reflects the values and attitudes which allegedly pervade the Scottish society. It has been used to maintain a sense of Scottish nationhood. For instance, the "Scottish myth" has been used as evidence that Scottish society is more egalitarian than English society. Adherents of the democratic myth applaud the values found in Knox's *First Book of Disciplines* which provide the foundation of Scottish education and have, themselves, been transposed to Scottish society. Calvinists believed that literacy was essential if an individual was to be a good Christian. Reading and discussing the Bible was central to Presbyterian faith. The supporters of the 1560 Reformation hoped to achieve this by creating a national schooling system. Regardless of their social backgrounds, children would be able to receive some elementary schooling. It was stated in the *Book of Disciplines* that:-

The children of the poor must be supported and sustained at the charge of the Church until trial be taken whether the spirit of docility be found in them or not. If they are found apt of letters and learning then they may not - neither sons of the rich nor sons of the poor - be permitted to reject learning. They must be charged to continue their study, so that the Commonwealth may have some comfort of them.³¹

The values encapsulated in the *First Book of Disciplines*, it is argued, have been transposed to Scottish society. The relationship between the values and attitudes of a society and the kind of education system established is a close one. As Keith Evans maintains:-

The aims, the extent, the organisation, the curriculum and the methodology of education will reflect the existing institutions and the dominant attitudes, values and forces which characterise a particular society.³²

Historians of the Scottish education system point to the divergence in attitudes and values which existed between Scottish and English societies, to explain the distinctive characteristics of Scottish education. In his work *The Democratic Intellect*, George Davie referred to the "apartness in social ethics" which existed between Scotland and England.³³ This gulf between the two countries, according to Davie, was exemplified in their education systems :-

...central expression (of divergence in social ethics was) an educational system which, combining the democracy of the Kirk-elders with the intellectualism of the advocates, made expertise in metaphysics the condition of the open door of social advancement.³⁴

G.S. Osborne in his account of schooling in England and Scotland stressed that England had difficulty in comprehending the democratic character of education provision in Scotland. He speculates that this may have been due to the emphasis placed on voluntary provision of education in England:-

The democratic tradition of Scottish education has been the object of considerable admiration by English observers, even when they have not appreciated the precise flavour of it. One reason for their admiration has been that there is much charitable in the English attitude towards state education.³⁵

He was emphatic that "such an attitude is no part of the Scottish democratic tradition."³⁶ Other historians of the Scottish education system, T.C. Smout, L.T. Saunders and R.D. Anderson have also referred to the divergence between Scottish and English attitudes towards the nature of educational provision.³⁷

The final way in which the "Scottish myth" has been maintained is through the language and arguments which have been articulated in debates about education policy in Scotland. There is a tendency to set such arguments in the context of the "Scottish myth." McPherson and Raab argue that one of the reasons why the SED was able to win the selective education vs. comprehensive education debate in the 1940s, which left it free to pursue a policy of bipartite schooling was that:-

The Department regained the advantage in its ideological battle to establish bipartite, social efficiency model of schooling as a legitimate descendant of the Scottish democratic tradition.³⁸

Gray et al cite a Director of Education in 1965 opposing comprehensive reorganisation on the grounds that it was irrelevant to Scottish education :-

...although considerations of class consciousness and social apartheid may be major issue in England, especially in the context of secondary education, they are much less important in Scotland.³⁹

These comments indicate that there were those within the higher ranks of the Scottish system who were willing to articulate their arguments in the Scottish context. The responses which Governments meet to their education policies are likely to be coloured by the myths and traditions which inform the Scottish system. In order to fully understand the context in which the Thatcher Government, and indeed any other Government, has to implement its education policies in Scotland, it is not enough to be aware of the fact that there are educational institutions which are unique to Scotland. One must also have an understanding of the culture which informs those institutions. This culture relies heavily upon the myths and traditions which have evolved over centuries. These give expression to beliefs and perceptions that people hold rather than necessarily providing a reflection of the situation in reality. Gray, McPherson and Raffe interpret a myth as "a story that people tell about themselves."⁴⁰ David McCrone referring to the Scottish education system claims that myths and traditions continue to have contemporary significance:-

Like traditions, myths connect with past realities. They do, however, draw selectively from the past, a process which involves selective exclusion as well as inclusion. In doing so, myth becomes a contemporary and active force providing, in most instances, a reservoir of legitimation for belief and action.⁴¹

What were the "past realities" which formed the foundation of the democratic myth? It is possible to identify three distinct components to the Scottish myth namely, a desire to ensure mass education; the belief that Scottish education was egalitarian and therefore more democratic and finally, the generalist tradition. Significantly, there was considerable consensus about the components which constitute the "Scottish myth."

It must be stressed that the "Scottish myth" is not a static phenomenon. Some

elements of the myth have been emphasised at particular times, and some have been distorted to justify new developments. In the late nineteenth century, when schooling in England was still predominantly private, Scots extolled the benefits of having a national system of schooling. In contrast, in the late twentieth century the egalitarian nature of Scottish education has been stressed in relation to the policy of schools opting out of local authority control. The two main teaching unions in Scotland, the Educational Institute of Scotland (EIS) and the Scottish Secondary Teachers Association (SSTA), argued against the policy on the grounds that it could lead to a two-class, socially decisive system. The framework of the educational debate in Scotland has been influenced by, and continues to be influenced by, the prevailing perception of the "Scottish" myth. Despite this dynamic element to the myth, there is a general consensus amongst academics and education professionals on what constitute the principal components of the myth.

The desire to provide a mass education system was the first component of the myth. Scotland has a long tradition of striving to provide a public education system. As L.T.Saunders points out, "the provision of education was a matter of public obligation" since the seventeenth century.⁴² A series of Acts in the seventeenth century established the parochial system of education whereby each parish was required by law to provide a school and teacher supported by local monies. Saunders argues that the parochial school was "both an equalising and selective agency"; equalising because all social classes mixed in such schools and because parents believed education was more than preparation for employment, but an end in itself; selective because the schools catered for the preparation of an elite that would attend university and subsequently enter the professions.⁴³

The fact that even prior to the 1872 Education Act Scotland was considered to have a national system of schooling contributed greatly to the maintenance of the

"Scottish myth" in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Parish schools, burgh schools and Universities formed a national system that was allegedly open to all social classes and which was financed by public funds supervised by the Church and the State. J.D.Meyers and R.D.Anderson both argue that one of the most distinctive features of Scottish education was the direct relationship between the parish school and the universities which had developed in response in the absence of a secondary school system.⁴⁴ In England no equivalent relationship existed and the quality of teaching reflected this fact. In Scotland, university subjects- Latin, Greek and Maths- were usually taught by the local dominie who often had some university training. The same was not true in England. Under the Scotch Code of 1873, the Government was finally successful in its attempts to fund schools on the basis of results. Opposition to the Code focussed on the alleged damage it would cause to the Scottish educational tradition:-

(The) educational arguments (against the Code were) peculiar to Scotland. One was the tradition of the poor but able boy going straight to university from the parish school, and the other was the oft-stated claim that in Scotland there was a social mix of classes in one school. The clauses of the Revised Code it was argued, would destroy these hallmarks of Scottish education. Educational arguments against the Code were also expressed but in less nationalistic character.⁴⁵

There were no links between the elementary schools and the universities or indeed between elementary schools and secondary schools in England. Sanderson states "there was no normal access or flow from elementary to secondary education" in England.⁴⁶ The impasse between the two levels, he explains, was due to the way in which the English differentiated between on the one hand those who it was felt were entitled to elementary education, and on the other hand those who should be offered the opportunity of further education. Education of the former was perceived as an act of charity that would serve both as a means of propagating religious beliefs and a method of social control. However, secondary education in England was a commodity which should be sold and not a charitable service. The differentiation in the English education system can be explained by looking at the attitudes which

underpinned that system. It is worth examining in greater detail the different attitudes which were prevalent in England and Scotland towards the provision of education, because these attitudes continue to have some contemporary significance. It is largely as a result of its inheritance of a national educational system that Scottish education was thought to be traditionally more democratic and egalitarian than was the case in England.

In England a national system of education did not exist, before 1870 and there was hostility towards state involvement in education. This largely negative approach to the public provision of schooling presented Scotland with serious problems. England moved very gradually towards accepting a state run national system of elementary schools. This has led some historians of the English education system to describe the eighteenth century English attitude to schooling as "backward". Clyde Chitty refers to "England's backwardness in creating a national education system."⁴⁷ Andy Green has noted that in the period from 1660 to 1870 England was unique in the Europe for "the almost total absence of those state initiatives which were so significant in continental development."⁴⁸ The emphasis, until the late nineteenth century, was on voluntary provision by the churches. As one historian of the English education system argues :- "Only slowly and reluctantly did they (the churches) accept the developing role of the state in the field of elementary education."⁴⁹ It was not until the 1870 Education Act that the Government changed the emphasis from "mere state assistance (to) direct state provision of elementary education."⁵⁰ In Scotland, this principle had been laid out in the 1696 Act which stated that a school should be established in each parish and that a salary of a teacher in every parish should be paid by a tax on local people. In this sense, the parish school belonged to the community. Individuals regardless of whether or not they had children were expected to contribute towards the teacher's stipend. The notion of the community school and public provision has a long tradition in Scotland. The

exact form of the community school has, however, changed over the centuries.

Why was there such a difference in attitudes between the two countries ? In the mid nineteenth century, at the very time when Scottish MPs were attempting to introduce Bills to the House of Commons which would have made significant contributions to the public provision of education, English legislators regarded the national provision of education as a negative development. This negative attitude was exemplified in the structure of English education provision.⁵¹ In the nineteenth century, three fundamental divisions existed within the school system. At the top was the Public School system designed for the aristocracy and the landowning elite. Below the Public Schools was the grammar school system which had very little connection with the former. At the bottom of this three tier school system was the vast majority of the population with little or no education provision being offered until the 1870 Act made tentative steps to involve the state in education provision.⁵²

In contrast to Scotland where provision was made for the lad o'pairts, very few scholarships to grammar schools were available to the lower classes in England until the twentieth century. It would probably be fair to say that the obstacles for a bright, working class child to attend an English university were almost insurmountable. In addition, the Scottish school system, it is alleged by Anderson, did not possess the strict social divisions that pervaded the English system. England until very late into the nineteenth century, clung to a backward and untrusting view of how the school system should be structured. Anderson maintains, that in Scotland in contrast "the traditional social authorities were readier to accept the whole extension of education because they felt they could control its consequences."⁵³

The discussion above reveals that England was reluctant to adopt an attitude similar

to that which existed in Scotland towards the public provision of education. T.C. Smout believes English acceptance of the arguments advanced in Scotland in favour of mass provision is an example of the "Scottization of England."⁵⁴ James Kellas also claims that there was a direct Scottish influence on English education, in the respect that "English education has owed a great deal to the example of Scotland in establishing within the British State the principle of a "career open to talent."⁵⁵ This comparison with England reveals that there was a divergence in attitudes towards education north and south of the border and that this in turn may have contributed to the distinctiveness of the Scottish education system.

The second component of the Scottish myth was that Scottish education system was egalitarian. In contrast to the propensity towards the mass provision of education, which can to some extent be quantified, the "democratic" or egalitarian nature of Scottish education is a more elusive concept. Nevertheless, this fact has not undermined the belief still prevalent amongst educational professionals and writers on Scottish education, that education system is essentially egalitarian. David McCrone believes that:-

...few myths are more powerful and prevalent in and about Scotland than that it is a more egalitarian society than England, and that the commitment to 'getting on' is greater...Although the egalitarian myth is often to be found in accounts of the Scottish past it is by no means dead, if only because history in the form of the reconstructed past is a potent social and political force in Scotland.⁵⁶

This belief that Scottish education is more democratic rests on two assertions. The first is closely associated with the nature of the Scottish education system namely, that it was a national system and, more importantly, that it was open to all regardless of income. Secondly, as mentioned above the Scottish school system was not pervaded by the social class divisions which existed in England.⁵⁷

Social barriers, it is alleged, were not inherent in the school system in Scotland.

One historian claims that in parish schools "children of exceptionally diverse ages, aptitudes and social strata all received an education."⁵⁸ This egalitarianism was exemplified in the "lad o'pairs" who could rise up through the education system by merit, regardless of his social standing. The implicit assumption behind this ideal was that those with genuine talent would be given every encouragement and opportunity to progress up the social hierarchy. This encouragement would initially be given by the local dominie who tutored the "lad o'pairs" to prepare him for the bursary competitions which would enable him to attend university. Thus, the romanticised view of education emerged that it was not the reserve of the privileged but rather, that it was open to ability. It would be more accurate to describe the Scottish system as meritocratic than democratic.

By definition the "lad o'pairs" myth placed serious limits on access to education. In fact very few talented children in Scotland were able to move up the social hierarchy. In practice, the landowners and the church monitored social mobility within their parish and social advancement would be virtually impossible without their approval.⁵⁹ The "lad o'pairs" served as a safety valve, offering the lower classes the chance, however slim, that their children through their own talents could move up the social ladder. In this respect, the "lad o'pairs" was a more subtle attempt at social control. Anderson's analysis of data collected for the Argyll Commission indicates "that without doubt universities were serving a wide range of the community."⁶⁰ In a sample of 882 students from the four universities in certain arts classes nearly a quarter, 23%, were working class. However, few of those classified "came from the really poor."⁶¹ Anderson found that, "the overwhelming mass of working-class students were sons of artisans and skilled workers, with a bias towards the more traditional trades."⁶² Such trades included carpenters and joiners, masons and boot and shoemakers. Another important point made by Anderson is that although the numbers of working class attending university are

noteworthy:-

...the working class was far larger than the middle class. The 117 sons of ministers were drawn from an occupational group of 4,205, while the 46,190 miners in Scotland provided 13 students, which meant that a minister's son was about a hundred times as likely to go to university as a miner's.⁶³

Education was never intended to be anything other than elementary for the masses. Social control could be maintained by closely regulating the number of children from the lower classes allowed to take their education beyond the three Rs.

The second reason why Scottish education is thought to be more egalitarian is because of the apparent lack of social stratification within the school system. The middle classes in Scotland tended to favour day schools to boarding schools. Anderson believes that this middle class propensity to remain within the day school system is explained by the bourgeois' conviction that the day schools, especially the academies, unlike their counterparts in England, "reflected their social and political advancement and their belief in science, material progress and individual ambition."⁶⁴ As a result, the English Public Schools found it difficult to challenge the prestige of the academy. Further, Anderson believes that this bias in favour of day schools had important repercussions for Scottish society :-

While the general pattern was one of turning towards "British" loyalties, leading day schools allowed the Bourgeois to maintain its distinctiveness from the anglicised upper classes and to preserve a distinct Scottish identity.⁶⁵

Although there is some validity in the claim that Scottish education was more egalitarian, it must be qualified. In particular, the myth of the "lad o'pairs" has been romanticised. McPherson and Raab's study of the Scottish educational community since 1945 demonstrates the continued relevance of this myth to policy makers.⁶⁶ Research conducted by Gray et al also found that the myth informed decision making within the Scottish educational system, "Influential people subscribe to it; it is involved in the run up to decisions and may, therefore, influence change."⁶⁷

However, the researchers questioned:-

...the folk image of the lad o'pairts, and the accompanying notion of equality...Scottish education since the war has been neither meritocratic nor equal; the levels of inequality are similar to those observed in England and other Western societies.⁶⁸

The myth of the lad o'pairts epitomised the belief that students would be able to advance their socio-economic position by merit. However, there was no equivalent tradition of the lass o'pairts. Until recently, debates about the myths which inform the Scottish educational system have failed to recognise that, "gender inequality is embedded within the structure and texture of Scottish education."⁶⁹ This gender bias in the Scottish educational tradition has led Paterson and Fewell to question the extent to which Scottish education was egalitarian.

The final aspect of the Scottish myth is the generalist tradition of the curriculum offered Scottish schools and Universities. This tradition has developed partly from the experiences of the leaving certificate after 1888. In the early 1950s the SED claimed that the certificate had been 'one of the strongest influences in the broadening of secondary courses.'⁷⁰ However, it also developed partly from Scottish university system. Donald Withrington observes that:-

It is frequently stated that one of the most distinctive characteristics of Scottish education, and especially of Scottish university education, is that it is generalist rather than specialist and that the essence of its intellectual tradition is to be found, in its universities, in that grouping of wide-ranging studies...which constituted and constitutes the ordinary degree.⁷¹

The classic account of the generalist tradition in the Scottish university system is George Davie's book *The Democratic Intellect*. Davie is concerned with the decline of the generalist tradition and specifically with the fate of philosophy in Scottish universities. In Davie's words:-

...the Scots had an almost religious attachment to their inherited ideal of a culture in which the general should take precedence over the particular and the whole over the part....⁷²

He identifies three major phases in the decline of the generalist tradition. The first was a report by the first University Commission in 1826. It comprised a "group of Scots who wished to impose southern standards."⁷³ The second phase ended with the passing of the Scottish Universities Act of 1858. Davie interprets this Act as further attempt to erode the distinctiveness of the Scottish university education. The final phase began with the Report in 1878 of another Royal Commission into the University education in Scotland. It ended with the 1889 Act. Davie contends "henceforward, the Scots, ...abandoned the attempt to regulate the higher education of their country according to their ideals."⁷⁴ The generalist tradition of university education in Scotland was not compatible with specialist approach favoured by the English Universities.

According to Davie, it was the role that philosophy played in Scottish university education which was crucial to the generalist tradition, and which distinguished it from university education south of the border. Philosophy was a compulsory subject for students in Scottish universities. There was also a philosophical element in other subjects such as mathematics and Greek.⁷⁵ The marginalisation of philosophy would therefore undermine the generalist tradition. Donald Withrington, while not denying that philosophy was a defining feature of the Scottish degree, questions the relevance it had for the majority of students. He argues that students on the whole did not follow a set curriculum. Rather, they took a range of classes each year, and not ones which were part of a set course. Therefore, "the traditional degree curriculum, with its strong generalist overtones, was apparently not a factor of much importance in the lives of either students or teachers."⁷⁶ What contemporary relevance does the generalist tradition have ?

If the defining characteristic of the generalist tradition is taken to be the compulsory

teaching of philosophy in Scottish universities then tradition no longer has any contemporary relevance. In Scottish Universities, philosophy has been marginalised in the sense that it is no longer a compulsory subject in the Arts degree. This definition is however too narrow. A broader perspective has to be adopted which incorporates other elements of the tradition.

The continued existence of the faculty entrance system has perpetuated the notion of generalism. Under this system, the entrance requirement of all courses offered in a faculty are the same. This system, Withrington believes, results in an "entry standard (which) represents a level of general education rather than specific high quality of attainment in any particular subject or subjects" and "brings with it ...very considerable choice in course choice."⁷⁷

In reality only a limited notion of generalism still applies to university education in Scotland. As with the other elements of the Scottish myth, reality is less important than what is thought to be true. Perceptions influence how policies are interpreted. The importance of the "Scottish myth" cannot be judged solely on the basis of whether or not it is a true reflection of reality. Rather, its importance should be assessed in terms of the validity it has for those with an interest in Scottish education and more generally, the credence it is given in Scottish society. The significance of the myths which surround this distinct identity is that Scots believe them to be true. Thus, everything that passes as 'reality' within the Scottish educational system should be examined. For Berger and Luckman reality is "socially constructed." In their words, "the man in the street inhabits a world that is 'real' to him, albeit in different degrees, and he 'knows', with different degrees of confidence, that this world possesses such and such characteristics"⁷⁸ How we understand the world is not a reflection of how the world is, rather it is formed on the basis of presuppositions. Thus, different cultures will produce different

realities.

What is arguably more important than whether or not there is any truth in the "Scottish myth" is the fact that it is used as an argument in relation to contemporary educational change. Myths such as the egalitarian nature of the schooling system in Scotland, the professional status of teachers, and the generalist nature of Scottish education, continue to have contemporary significance. This issue is examined in more detail below.

Education Policy-Making in the Scottish Context

Central Government has to deal with both institutional and administrative differences in how education policy is applied to the Scottish context. These differences are accentuated by the distinctive culture which informs the Scottish education system. The extent to which Governments have accommodated that culture, of course, has varied considerably. All Governments, at the very least, must pass separate educational legislation for Scotland. This is a consequence of the separate Scottish legal system. Also, Governments in order to implement their education policies, must deal with a distinctive set of institutions and operate within a distinct administration system. The fact that UK. Governments pursue their education policies in Scotland in an unique environment has certain implications for the policy process.

The relationship which central government has with the institutions and actors in the Scottish education system is territorially based. Such a relationship, Rhodes believes, gives rise to a "distinct network":-

...the territorial organisation of the centre provides the focal point for a distinct network which, whilst subject to UK-wide pressures, develops its own distinct policy instruments.⁷⁹

The territorial dimension facilitates the development of distinct policy networks within the Scottish education system. Keating and Midwinter have rejected the idea that the government of Scotland takes place within a Scottish political system because ultimately power lies at Westminster. Instead they describe the government of Scotland "in terms of a series of complex networks linking Scottish actors to one another and to non-Scottish networks. Some decisions are taken entirely within the Scottish networks. Others are taken at 'UK level' with Scotland providing the distinctive input."⁸⁰ The concept of networks is useful in the analysis of education policy-making in Scotland. This idea has been developed by McPherson and Raab. From their study of the post-war education policy in Scotland they developed the concept of the "Scottish education community." They explain that as the activities of the SED gradually expanded so did the importance of the Scottish education community. The SED became involved with "outsiders" and "collective action" developed across the policy community.⁸¹ Central to that community was a shared culture which drew upon the myths and traditions which inform the Scottish education system:-

Communities have their own moral systems of value and belief, their own procedures for recognising or excluding members, and their own internal relationship of trust and deference...the 'Scottish myth', traditional and popular view that has been taken of the egalitarian nature of Scottish society and of its realisation through the school system. This view was linked to issues of national identity, and it provided an ontological basis for a community of values and beliefs.⁸²

In what ways does the "Scottish myth" inform the beliefs and behaviour of those involved in Scottish education ? As we have seen in chapter 1, the period immediately after the Second World War, and perhaps even earlier as Paul Addison and Arthur Marwick have suggested, was characterised by consensus. Raab and McPherson have referred to the "generally non partisan atmosphere of policy making" within the Scottish Office.⁸³ Sir Charles Cunningham who was Deputy Secretary and then Secretary of the Scottish Home Department between 1942 and

1957 has remarked upon this "non partisan atmosphere."

I think that all Ministers in that period (1942-1957) were concerned to do what they perceived to be in the best interests of Scotland...and I do not remember any acute political controversy over Scottish affairs.⁸⁴

It was against this background that the Sixth Advisory Council in 1947 published its *Report on Secondary Education*. Gray et al have described the report "as a heroic attempt to adapt the Scottish inheritance of forms and ideas to the requirements of mass secondary education."⁸⁵ Moreover, they noted that the Council included an appendix which listed the "Scottish traditions" in both its primary and secondary report.⁸⁶ The 1947 report received strong support amongst the press and educational professionals. An editorial in the *Scottish Educational Journal* early in 1947 acclaimed the report:-

...the necessary radical reconsideration of the secondary part of the curriculum has been boldly faced and has been carried out comprehensively, with courage...The interest and the value of the report can hardly be exaggerated...we confidently hope and expect that much of the report will be presently accepted as the official policy for secondary education in Scotland.⁸⁷

However, for a variety of reasons, including the conservatism of the SED and lack of resources, the report's recommendations were not "presently accepted as the official policy." The policy of bipartite schooling remained for the next twenty years or so. Despite this, the report has generally be held in high esteem. In an editorial celebrating its twentieth anniversary *The Times Education Supplement (Scotland)* argued that it "remains the outstanding document produced in Scotland this century."

The interviews which McPherson and Raab conducted with leading Scottish educationalists of the post-war period revealed that the Scottish myth did influence their behaviour and attitudes. From these interviews, they were able to show that the higher echelons of the "Scottish education community" were responsive to that myth, and in particular to the myth of "lad o'pairs." Indeed, "many (of those

interviewed) thought their careers identified with the lad o' pairts."⁸⁸ In his analysis of the 1947 Advisory Council report, Northcroft noted that the attachment which council members had to the tradition of the omnibus school was probably due to the fact that they "were themselves, for the most part, the product of provincial small town Scotland...living proof to themselves of the enduring effectiveness of its apparent democratic ways..."⁸⁹

Evidence is provided by McPherson and Raab to show that there was a common career path amongst those interviewed. They refer to this as the "Kirriemuir career" i.e. careers that were predominantly rural in experience. This may help to account for the romanticised view those interviewed had of the "lad o' pairts." McPherson and Raab believe that in the 1970s social class had a greater influence on the performance of children attending urban schools than those attending rural schools. One reason for this was that more omnibus schools were more numerous in rural areas than in the cities. These schools would educate all children of the parish regardless of their social status, and thereby fostering a sense of community.

In practice those teachers given senior administrative promotion came from a narrow cross-section of the teaching profession. McPherson and Raab analysed teaching appointments to the Schools Inspectorate and found that teachers from senior secondaries were disproportionately represented relative to the size of the school population while teachers from junior secondary schools, primary schools and Catholic schools were under represented. Significantly, three quarters of HMI appointments from schools between 1945 and 1965 were from schools that catered for a population, of above average economic status. McPherson and Raab believe that this discriminative recruitment policy was a deliberate decision by the Chief Inspector. Teachers from selective schools in privileged areas could be trusted not to question the status quo.

Educational professionals and politicians in Scotland have attempted to modify the myth to justify new developments. In the early 1960s both those in favour of a bipartite school system and those who supported comprehensive reorganisation used the Scottish myth to justify their respective arguments. Those in favour of comprehensive education argued that reorganisation would be a logical extension of the democratic myth by increasing the number of omnibus schools. Advocates of selective schooling argued that comprehensive education was superfluous because Scottish schools were of a far higher standard than schools in England. In the 1960s the introduction of comprehensive education was perceived by some as an attempt to force unnecessary reorganisation on Scottish education. Moreover, it was a English political decision that ran against democratic traditions in Scotland:-

...many in the professional world of Scottish education argued that comprehensive education was more than a political incursion into a world where professional judgements should reign; it was an English political incursion that would never have arisen solely from the indigenous processes of Scottish society, education and government; it was a product of the political union.⁹⁰

Scots such as William Ross and Margaret Herbison were quite influential in securing Labour Party support for a policy of comprehensive reorganisation. Both were at the forefront of the campaign against selective schooling in Scotland in the 1950s. Margaret Herbison, who was Labour MP for Lanarkshire North and a former school teacher, actively campaigned against the selective schooling system. Indeed, McPherson and Raab have described her as "one of the champions of an end to selection."⁹¹ In a debate in the House of Commons in 1946, Herbison argued for "a common school until the recognised leaving age."⁹² For her the selective system was "ever so much worse than even the previous class distinction."⁹³

The fact that educationalists and politicians in Scotland can draw on a long historical tradition to substantiate the myth arguably increases its intellectual credence. The "Scottish myth" is sometimes used in a defensive manner. Moreover, there is a

tendency to cite it and the general distinctiveness of Scottish education against any threat of assimilation. R.D. Anderson asserts :-

...the link between "mythical" thinking and the resistance to anglicisation means that the content of the myth has changed over the years, reflecting the ways in which the two systems have actually differed at particular times.⁹⁴

A recent EIS circular on primary education criticised the relevance of national testing and a national curriculum on the basis that these reforms would undermine the egalitarian nature of Scottish education. The EIS conceded in the circular that there may be good reason to introduce such reforms in England and Wales, where educational standards are falling, but there was no such justification for their introduction in Scotland :-

The Government intends to impose national testing at P4 and P7- initially in English and Mathematics. The aim of such tests is not to benefit the children or to assist with teaching and learning. The intention is that the overall results will be reported to School Boards. This could allow pupils and schools to be compared. It undermines the tradition of equality of opportunity.⁹⁵

The substance of the argument was that national testing would undermine the egalitarian character of the Scottish education system. In an interview with a representative of the Association of Metropolitan Authorities (AMA) Ian Davidson, former Chair of Strathclyde Region's Education Committee, identified the elements of the Scottish myth which, in his opinion, continued to have contemporary relevance. It is worth quoting at some length the AMA's notes of the interview:-

He (Ian Davidson) saw significant differences still between north and south of the Border: in Scotland, there were: greater support for public services, a "collectivist mentality", and greater unselfishness...Both the Calvinist tradition and the aspirations of Roman Catholic immigrants from Ireland tended to self-improvement through education, and the myth of the "lad of pairs"...persisted powerfully. There also remained some respect for teachers within the community...⁹⁶

The examples above of how the Scottish myth has been articulated by some members of the "Scottish education community" are revealing. It is apparent that those interests represented within that community co-operate with each other in

order to maintain the "Scottish myth". It may be used as justification for two opposing opinions, but what is important is that, in order to strengthen their arguments, different interests will employ arguments which are specific to the Scottish context. This presents governments with problems when the centre's viewpoint runs contrary to the views of some or all of the interests of the Scottish education community.

In general, British Governments pursue uniform education policies in some areas, for instance the introduction of opting out by the Thatcher Government, and in other matters such as curricular issues the Scottish Office takes the lead. The extent to which the former is true depends largely on how high education policy is on a Government's political agenda. After the 1987 General Election education policy was a matter of priority for the Thatcher Governments. Education was an essential component of the social democratic consensus which Thatcherism sought to break up.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

¹ Davie, G. (1982) *The Democratic Intellect* p.xi

² Keating, M. (1985) 'Bureaucracy Devolved' *Times Educational Supplement* 5th May

³ For a more indepth discussion of the Code see Wilson T.(1983) 'A Reinterpretation of Payment by Results in Scotland 1861-1872' in Humes and Paterson (eds.) *Scottish Culture and Scottish Education 1800-1980* and Anderson R.D. (1989) *Education and Opportunity in Victorian Scotland*

⁴ Anderson, R.D. *op cit.*,p.104-105

⁵ *Ibid* p.108

⁶ *Ibid* p.107

⁷ Bell, R. and Grant, N. (1977) *Patterns of Education in the British Isles* p.41

⁸ Anderson, R.D. *op .cit.*, p.205

⁹ Humes, W.M. (1986) *The Leadership Class in Scottish Education* p. 48-49

¹⁰ Gatherer, W.A (1989) *Curriculum Development in Scotland* p.19

¹¹ McPherson, A. and Raab, C. (1988) *Governing Education* p.148

¹² Gatherer, W.A *.,op. cit.*, p.21

-
- 13 McPherson, A. and Raab, C. , *op. cit.*, p.150-151
- 14 Policy Statement by the Secretary of State for Scotland, 24 March 1983 para. 2.2 quoted in Mitchell, John (1988) *The Inspectorate's Role In Quality Assurance* p.118
- 15 Osborne, G.S. (1967) *Scottish and English Schools* p.59
- 16 Gatherer, W.A., *op. cit.*, p.24
- 17 Humes, W.M. *op. cit.*, p.88
- 18 *Ibid* p.89
- 19 Gatherer, W.A. *op. cit.*, p.51
- 20 *Ibid* p.48
- 21 McPherson, A. and Raab C., *op. cit.*, p.293
- 22 *Ibid* p.294
- 23 Raab, C.D. (1982) 'The Quasi-Government of Scottish Education' in Baker, A. (ed) *Quangos in Britain and the Network of Public Policy-Making* p.97
- 24 Harvie, C. (1977) *Scotland and Nationalism: Scottish Society and Politics 1707-1977* p.208
- 25 Editorial (1991) *Times Education Supplement (Scotland)* 8th March
- 26 Kellas, J. (1980) *Modern Scotland* p.30
- 27 Osborne, G. *op. cit.*, p.39
- 28 McPherson, A. and Raab, C. *op. cit.*, p.32
- 29 *Ibid* p.33
- 30 Anderson, R.D. *op. cit.*, p.1
- 31 Quoted in Osborne, G. *op. cit.*, p.6
- 32 Evans, K. (1975) *The Development and Structure of the English Education System* p.1
- 33 Davie, G. (1982) *op. cit.*, p.12
- 34 *Ibid* , p.xi
- 35 Osborne, G.S. *op. cit.*, p.209
- 36 *Ibid* p.209
- 37 See Chapter 1 in Anderson's *Education and Opportunity in Victorian Scotland*
- 38 McPherson A. and Raab C. *op. cit.*, p.394
- 39 Gray, J., A. McPherson and Raffe, D. (1983) *Reconstructions of Secondary Education: Theory, Myth and Practice Since the War* p.23
- 40 *Ibid* p.39

-
- 41 McCrone, D. (1992) *Understanding Scotland: The Sociology of a Stateless Nation* p.90
- 42 Saunders, L.T. (1950) *Scottish Democracy 1815-1840* p.241
- 43 *Ibid* p.243
- 44 For a detailed discussion see Meyer, J.D (1972) 'Scottish Nationalism and the Antecedents of the 1872 Act Education Act' *Scottish Educational Review* vol.14 and Anderson, R.D. (1985) 'Secondary Schools and Scottish Society in the Nineteenth Century' *Past and Present* No.109
- 45 Paterson, H.M. (1983) 'Incubus and Ideology: The Development of Secondary Education in Scotland 1900-1939' in Humes, W.M. and Paterson, H.M (eds.) *Scottish Culture and Scottish Education* p.199
- 46 Sanderson, M. (1987) *Educational Opportunity and Social Change in England* p.8
- 47 Chitty, C. (1992) 'The Changing Role of the State in Education Provision' *History of Education* Vol.21 p.3
- 48 *Ibid* p.3
- 49 Evans, K. *op. cit.*, p.9
- 50 *Ibid*
- 51 See Meyers, J.D. *op. cit.*
- 52 Paterson, H.M. *op. cit.*, p.199
- 53 Anderson, R.D. (1985) 'In Search of the 'Lad of Parts': The Mythical History of Scottish Education' *History Workshop Journal* No.19 p.98
- 54 Smout T.C (1986) *A Century of Scottish People 1830-1950* p.214
- 55 Kellas, J.G, *op. cit.*, p.55
- 56 McCrone, D. *op. cit.*, pp.88-89
- 57 Paterson, H.M. *op. cit.*, p.199
- 58 Comic, C. (1983) *Experience and Enlightenment: Socialisation for Cultural Change in Eighteenth Century Scotland* p.150
- 59 For a good discussion of the myth of the "lad o'pairs" see Anderson's article(1985) *op. cit.*
- 60 Anderson, R. (1989) *op cit.*, p.149
- 61 *Ibid*
- 62 *Ibid*
- 63 *Ibid* p.152
- 64 Anderson, R. (1985) *op cit.*, p.202
- 65 *Ibid* p.204.
- 66 McPherson, A. and Raab, C. *op cit.*,

⁶⁷ Gray et al, *op cit.*, p.43

⁶⁸ Quoted in Humes, W.H. (1983) The Cultural Significance of Scotland's Educational System in McCrone, D. (ed.) *Scottish Government Yearbook 1983* pp.152-153

⁶⁹ Paterson, F. and Fewell, J. (1990) 'Girls in their Prime: The Scottish Education Tradition' in Paterson, F. and Fewell, J. (eds.) *Girls in their Prime: Scottish Education Revised* p.2

⁷⁰ Quoted by McPherson, A. and Raab, C. *op cit.* p.86

⁷¹ Withrington, D.J (1992) The Scottish Universities: Living Traditions? Old Problems Renewed?" in Paterson, L. and McCrone, D. (eds.) *The Scottish Government Yearbook 1992* p.131

⁷² Davie, G., *op. cit.*, p.4

⁷³ *Ibid* p.6

⁷⁴ *Ibid* p.9

⁷⁵ *Ibid* p.13

⁷⁶ Withrington, D.J *op. cit.*, p.132

⁷⁷ *Ibid* p.139

⁷⁸ Berger, P. and Luckmann, T. (1967) *The Social Construction of Reality* p.13

⁷⁹ Rhodes, R.A.W. (1988) *Beyond Westminster and Whitehall* pp.280-281

⁸⁰ Keating, M. and Midwinter, A. (1983) *The Government of Scotland* pp.1-2

⁸¹ McPherson, A. and Raab, *op. cit.*, p.404

⁸² *Ibid* p.405

⁸³ *Ibid* p.156

⁸⁴ *Ibid*

⁸⁵ Gray et al *op. cit.*, p.314

⁸⁶ *Ibid*

⁸⁷ Quoted in Northcroft, D. (1992) 'Secondary Education and the Rhetoric of Change' *Scottish Educational Review* vol.24 p.77

⁸⁸ *Ibid* p. 409

⁸⁹ Northcroft, D. *op cit.*, p.90 Only four members of the Council had spent their professional lives in the west coast of Scotland. 11 members came from the Borders and the East coast.

⁹⁰ *Ibid* p.478

⁹¹ McPherson, A. and Raab, C. *op. cit.*, p.160

⁹² Barker, R. (1972) *Education and Politics 1900-1951* p.86

⁹³ *Ibid* p.88

⁹⁴ Anderson, R.D. (1989) *op cit.*, p.211

⁹⁵ Educational Institute of Scotland (1991) *National Testing: A Summary Leaflet*

⁹⁶ AMA (1991) *Education in Strathclyde 1991: A View from the Anglo-Welsh Peninsula* p.7

CHAPTER 4

THATCHERITE EDUCATION POLICY IN SCOTLAND : PART ONE

Introduction

The previous chapter demonstrated that in administrative, institutional and cultural terms the Scottish education system has its own unique features. The aim of the next two chapters is to relate Conservative education policy, as it was applied to Scotland, under the premiership of Margaret Thatcher, to the wider issue of Thatcherite statecraft.

At one level it seems quite reasonable to describe education policy during the time of the Thatcher Governments as radical in the sense of being both innovative and controversial. However, it is important to stress that it is also possible to identify examples of education policies which have been consensual. A number of areas were indeed almost entirely uncontroversial, and in the case of others, initial controversy gave way to acceptance. For the most part, these consensual and less controversial policies were introduced in the early years of the Thatcher Government, later and more controversial policies are discussed in the following chapter.

The introduction of some quite uncontroversial policies notwithstanding, Thatcherite education policy did become increasingly radical. Those more radical elements of Thatcherite education policy, which for the most part became evident following the election of the third Thatcher Government, are outlined in the next chapter. The one obvious exception to the consensual policies which were pursued in the early stages of the Thatcher Government was the 1981 Education Act. Due to its more controversial nature this policy is examined in the following chapter. During the period of the Thatcher Government three major curriculum reforms in particular met

with little resistance namely, the introduction of the Standard Grade, the National Certificate and the 5-14 Programme. Each of these is described and analysed below in an attempt to understand why they were relatively uncontentious. The chapter also examines the implementation of the Technical and Vocational Initiative (TVEI) where initial controversy gave way to acceptance.

Standard Grade

The Standard Grade was introduced as a result of recommendations by the Munn and Dunning Reports. These committees were established as a response to increasing concern about the nature of the curriculum and assessment policy in Scottish secondary schools. The raising of the school leaving age and the establishment of comprehensive schools had led to concerns about the nature and balance of the curriculum in S3 and S4. There was also concern about the relevance of the 'O' Grade examinations. The 'O' Grade was not introduced with the needs of the vast majority of pupils in mind. It was designed for high achieving pupils, and there was no distinctive Scottish public examination recognising the achievements of the vast majority of pupils leaving school at sixteen. In England and Wales the Certificate of Secondary Education (CSE) had been designed to cater for pupils in secondary modern schools while 'O' levels were geared towards grammar school pupils. Some Regional Authorities in Scotland such as Grampian had begun to offer a limited range of CSE to pupils.

The Munn Committee was set up in 1974 to review the curriculum. Its terms of reference were as follows:-

To consider how the curriculum in S3 and S4 should be structured in order to ensure that all pupils receive a balanced education suitable to their needs and abilities; to consider the implications of its findings for the earlier and the later stages of secondary education; and to make recommendations to the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum.¹

The Dunning Committee also established in 1974 was intended to :-

...identify the aims and purposes of assessment and certification in the fourth year in light of educational and social changes since the introduction of the Ordinary Grade of the Scottish Certificate of Education; to consider what form or forms of examination or assessment would be likely to meet the needs of the fourth year pupils of varying academic ability; to make recommendations for any changes in the present arrangements that might seem desirable and to consider the effect of such changes on the Higher Grade of the Scottish Certificate of Education and on the Certificate of Sixth Year Studies.²

Both committees included representatives from the Colleges of Education, the Universities, Scottish Examination Board (SEB), Education Authorities, Scottish Council for Research in Education (SCRE), Her Majesty's Inspectorate (HMI), head teachers and teachers. In addition the trade unions and industry were represented on the Dunning Committee. From this brief description of the committees' membership it is possible to see that the 'experts' were in preponderance. It is clear that the membership was in the main taken from within the educational community. This fact might explain the relatively uncontentious implementation of the Standard Grade. Indeed Donald McIntyre has argued that the Munn and Dunning Reports continued the general practice of establishing educational committees with specialist knowledge:-

Both of these Reports fit into the general pattern of Scottish educational decision-making. That pattern reflects the pervasive influence of committees of 'experts' who control not only highly publicised relatively general policy reviews such as these Reports, but also the more permanent structures such as the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum...³

The Munn and Dunning Committees invited evidence to be submitted. Evidence was received both in oral and written form from a wide range of educational and other interests. The Munn Report outlined four main sets of aims. It recommended that the curriculum should advance pupils' 'knowledge and understanding, both of self and of the social and physical environment'. Among skills to be developed should be those not just of a cognitive nature, but also those the Committee described as interpersonal and psychomotor. Schools should promote pupils'

affective development and should help in the development of pupils' capabilities to perform roles relating to work and social life. The Report suggested that a compulsory core curriculum should be developed. This curriculum would include seven areas namely, English, Mathematics, Social Studies, Physical Education, Science, Creative Arts and Religious Education. In addition, pupils could also choose to study from 'elective areas' which included subjects such as home economics, business studies and modern languages.

The Dunning Committee recommended that the 'O' Grade should be scrapped and should be replaced by a certificate which would be within the capability of a wide range of pupils. The certificate would be available at three levels- Foundation, General and Credit. The committee also sought to introduce an element of internal assessment. However, the main responsibility would still lie with the Scottish Examination Board (SEB). A switch from norm referenced to criterion referenced assessment was also proposed. ⁴

It is worth noting the manner in which these particular educational initiative were implemented. It was announced in 1979 that a series of feasibility studies would be undertaken to advise the Secretary of State for Scotland before the new certificate was introduced . An effort was made in these feasibility studies to involve schools and teachers directly. Indeed Pamela Munn and Sally Brown observed that:-

The experiences of the feasibility studies, in which teachers and pilot schools were involved on a substantial scale in curriculum and assessment developments, led to a decision in 1982 by the Secretary of State to press ahead with change.⁵

They claim that in the early stages of implementing the change teachers and the pilot schools made an important contribution towards the formulation of the policy. Malcolm Rifkind in his introduction to the Scottish Office publication, *Setting New*

Standards for All Scottish Pupils stressed the consensual nature of the Standard Grade courses which were to replace the 'O'Grade:-

Each 'S' Grade course has been developed by leading educationalists in full consultation with the main participants in the education services and the key bodies representing employers and the universities.⁶

Curriculum and assessment policy was developed through Joint Working Parties which contained broad representation including practising teachers.

The introduction of the Standard Grade was staggered. The first Standard Grade courses were introduced in 1984 with examinations being taken in 1986. Subjects included in the first phase were English, Mathematics, Science and Social and Vocational skills. The second phase started in 1986 and the final phase in 1991. The rationale behind the Standard Grade was that every pupil "would obtain recognition on the Scottish Certificate of Education for his or her achievements."⁷

There was also a change in emphasis in teaching styles. Increasingly pupils were able to gain accreditation for aspects of their course work such as practical assignments and projects. In line with this change, schools were given some control over assessment. In addition, pupils were able to take Standard Grade courses in more areas of the curriculum than was possible under the 'O' Grade. The changes suggested by the Munn and Dunning Reports were, A.D. Weir believes, "a triumphant restatement of the Scottish commitment to broad, general education and the community's belief in the value of certification."⁸

The Standard Grade did not originate with the Thatcher Government. The incoming Thatcher Government in 1979 inherited the recommendations of the Munn and Dunning Reports. The initiative for these Reports dates as far back as the SED circular which introduced comprehensive schooling in 1965.⁹ However, the

approach adopted towards the implementation of the Standard Grade differed from that favoured by the Thatcher Governments in some of educational initiatives it introduced later. The educational professionals continued to play a key role in the development of the Standard Grade after 1979. For this reason the content of the curriculum in Standard Grade courses has not been a controversial issue. This has not been the case in England and Wales where the content of certain National Curriculum courses such as History and English has been politicised (see below).

National Certificate

The introduction of the National Certificate is perhaps the most striking example that one can find under the Thatcher Governments of an educational policy which was able to gain widespread support. The proposal for a national certificate was first outlined in 1983 in the SED document *16-18s in Scotland: An Action Plan*. The assumption underlying the proposals was that existing provision of vocational courses and certificates for non advanced F.E. was complex and "bewildering." This concern was explicitly stated in the Action Plan:-

A coherent provision of education and training for 16-18 year olds, covering all levels of attainment and motivation and embracing schools and colleges, does not exist at present. At 16 years of age young people are faced with a bewildering choice from a large number of Highers and O'Grade courses, scores of certificates and diplomas awarded by different examining boards, and other forms of provision in industry and community.¹⁰

The Action Plan recommended that the existing system should be replaced by a modular system with a single accreditation system.¹¹ The introduction of the modular system was central to the proposals. The system was designed to be flexible. Each module would last forty hours. The nature of the modules varies widely. There are some which are general. Others are more specialist and are intended to be prepare students for vocational qualifications. Students take modules for a variety of reasons. Each module, whether it is devised at a local or national level, is developed to comply with national guidelines drawn up by the Scottish

Vocational Education Council (SCOTVEC). Each student is expected to achieve clearly defined goals. The student is aware of these 'learning outcomes' before he/she embarks on a module. The SED clearly stated that each module should have "clearly defined learning outcomes stating exactly what the trainee is expected to know and be able to do."¹² Assessment is both continuous and criterion referenced. That is to say students are not assessed by comparing their performance with others but rather against criteria which have been explicitly stated. Another feature of the accreditation system associated with the National Certificate is that assessment, with some external moderation by SCOTVEC, is done internally by those delivering the modules. This might be the school or the F.E. college. However, the National Certificate is awarded by a single national body namely, SCOTVEC. Under the modular system students can continue to take modules after they have left schools and therefore they can "add to (their National Certificate) as they progress with their studies."¹³

The implementation of the National Certificate proceeded in a remarkably consensual manner. Schools and FE colleges were quick to adopt the modular system. By 1991 it was estimated that there were some 2000 different modules on offer.¹⁴ Originally the SED had thought that only about fifty schools would participate in the reform and only a limited number of modules would be available. Initially FE colleges were seen as the main providers. However, modules were seen by schools as being one way to "meet the needs of growing numbers of S5 and S6 pupils for whom Highers were not appropriate targets."¹⁵ In particular, students did not have to commit themselves to year long courses.

The question which now needs to be answered is why was this reform able to gain the approval of the educational community? Fairley and Paterson believe that the fact the reform was "led by educationalists, specifically the Inspectorate" was

important.¹⁶ The assumptions underlying the National Certificate did not undermine the commitment to a broadly based education. This, Fairley and Paterson believe, contradicted "the dominant and narrow vocationalism of Lord Young's MSC (Manpower Services Commission)."¹⁷ The distinctively Scottish dimension to the reform facilitated its implementation. In the words of Fairley and Paterson:-

...The educational arguments for the reform thus were in practice inseparable from a celebration and defence of Scottish culture. And the acceptability of the reform was dependent on its being distinctively Scottish, in deliberate contrast to the uniformity of the British developments.¹⁸

The introduction of the National Certificate is an example of a policy initiative which sought to draw upon Scottish traditions to facilitate its implementation. Douglas Weir and Lesley Kydd have argued that the National Certificate was given:-

...a push from the Scottish tradition of using the area 'omnibus' or comprehensive school as the main vehicle for education up to 18 and even beyond at a time of demographic downturn with its implications for falling rolls.¹⁹

Concerns that the MSC was more anxious to solve problems south of the border also contributed to the appeal of the National Certificate. Moreover, there was also a feeling that the MSC presented a threat to the comprehensive schooling system. Added to this, Fairley and Paterson believe there was "a feeling that Scotland always had a better balance than England between the vocational and the educational."²⁰ It would appear therefore, that the uncontentious nature of this reform can be explained by the shared view of the Action Plan which prevailed within the educational community. The fact that the development of the reform was led by the Inspectorate helps to explain why it was able to secure the support the Scottish educational community. One could classify the Action Plan as an example of a policy which was negotiated through the Scottish educational community and therefore had a distinct Scottish dimension.

5-14 Programme

Another example of an educational initiative under the Thatcher Government which managed to command the support of educational community was the 5-14 Programme. In common with the National Certificate and the Standard Grade this initiative developed a distinctly Scottish dimension. The 5-14 Programme was announced on 3rd October 1988 by Malcolm Rifkind, then Secretary of State for Scotland, following consultation on a paper *Curriculum and Assessment in Scotland: A Policy for 1990s* issued by the SED in 1987. The consultative paper included proposals in three main areas namely, the curriculum, assessment policy and information for parents. Over 1,000 responses were received. In addition to the proposals for the development of "new guidelines for each of the subject areas for age group 5-14", Malcolm Rifkind also announced proposals for "parallel guidelines for parents, and a new pupil report card" and "the introduction of Scottish standardised tests in English and Mathematics in P4 and P7."²¹

The 5-14 Programme arose from concerns about the progress of pupils in primary schools and the early years of secondary school, the balance of the curriculum, and the nature of reporting to parents. After a review of the primary curriculum, guidelines were devised for each curricular area, containing specific attainment targets. Essentially the Programme provides an outline of what should be taught between P1 and S2.

It is possible to identify two distinct approaches to educational policy within both the consultative paper and the announcement made by Malcolm Rifkind. The first has more in common with the development of the educational initiatives described above. Under this approach educational policies developed a distinctive Scottish dimension, thereby increasing the chance of such policies being implemented relatively uncontroversially. The curriculum proposals, and specifically the 5-14

Programme, developed in such a fashion. In his announcement Malcolm Rifkind indicated that responsibility for the development of the Programme would lie with the educational professionals:-

The Scottish Consultative Council on the Curriculum (SCCC) will be asked to undertake the work of curricular review and development. A committee, chaired by Her Majesty's Senior Chief Inspector of Schools,...and including representatives of the SCCC and the Scottish Examination Board, will be set up to co-ordinate the whole curriculum and assessment programme.²²

In contrast to south of the border the Government decided not to legislate for a core curriculum. Moreover, in Scotland the Government involved existing educational quangos in the development of the reform. Indeed it has been claimed that the SCCC was "skilful in playing to the feelings of national identity."²³ Teachers were also represented on the Review Development Groups which were part of the 5-14 Programme. In other words the reform was handed over to the educational professionals, thereby almost certainly ensuring that it would be regarded as an consensual initiative.

This is profoundly different from the situation in England and Wales where the Government abolished the existing relevant bodies and replaced them with working parties chosen by the Secretary of State for Education. The Government did not establish any Scottish counterparts to the National Curriculum Council and the Secondary Examination and Assessment Council. Robert McCormick maintains that "this seems symptomatic of a greater trust of the educational establishment in Scotland, resulting in the use of existing mechanisms such as the CCC for developing curricular policies."²⁴ In Scotland the Government intended to involve educational quangos such as SCCC, SEB and SCOTVEC; teachers; Education Authorities and parents. This was, W.A. Gartherer has commented "a means of establishing agreement nationally on the curriculum."²⁵ Similarly Mary Simpson, in an article reviewing the 5-14 Programme, has argued that the manner in which the Government sought to improve quality in education in Scotland was distinctive:-

In Scotland, the means are demonstrably educational and rooted in principles which have been evolving within the educational community during the past 20 years.²⁶

The *Times Education Supplement (Scotland)* was able to claim in an editorial that: - "Educationally, the reforms had been widely welcomed. Only the unnecessary intrusion and distraction of primary tests have obscured the message."²⁷ Criticisms of the Programme focused on the lack of funding and the pace of the reform, rather than its educational objectives.²⁸ Indeed, one of Strathclyde Region's chief education advisers referred to the 5-14 Programme as a "golden opportunity."²⁹

The second approach is evident in the Government's proposals on assessment. This is a very different style. Here, as Gartherer notes, "the tone is no longer conciliatory or consultative."³⁰ The point to emphasis at this stage of the argument is that in this particular aspect of assessment policy there was no attempt to comply with or exploit the Scottish traditions in order to facilitate its implementation. This more controversial approach was particularly evident in the Assessment of Achievement Programme and national testing. The controversy surrounding these initiatives is discussed in more detail in chapter 8.

The Development of TVEI : Conflict and Consensus

TVEI is a Government programme which aims to promote technical and vocational education in schools and colleges. The Initiative has two main elements namely, the common core and options. When taken together these two elements usually account for 30% of the TVEI student's timetable. Typically, the core in Scotland includes areas such as work experience, careers education, personal and social development and information technology. Options would comprise those subjects chosen by the student to satisfy their interests and needs, such as catering, textiles, computing and business studies.³¹

The announcement that TVEI was to be introduced in Scotland was a clear indication that the Government intended it to be a British reform. However, the general reaction to this announcement was one of hostility. Concerns centred on the involvement of the MSC in the secondary curriculum and the potential threat this involvement posed for the maintenance of the comprehensive system. It was feared that the reform would allow the MSC to interfere in curricular matters and lead to the curriculum becoming geared to employers' needs. However, there was also a number of criticisms which were articulated in the Scottish context. Bell et al have identified three such criticisms. Firstly, there was a feeling that the MSC was too centralised and preoccupied with the English scene. This led to English solutions being imposed in Scotland. In the words of Cathy Howieson, the reform "bypassed the SED and was run by an Agency which regarded Scotland merely as another region within its overall structure."³² Thus, the decision to go ahead with TVEI in Scotland appeared to be a direct challenge to the Scottish educational community. Secondly, Bell et al argue "there was a strong feeling in Scotland that England had never taken on the comprehensive ideal."³³ The last dimension to Scottish criticisms was that the introduction of the Standard Grade and the implementation of the Action Plan meant that TVEI was redundant in Scotland.

TVEI was only implemented in Scotland after extensive negotiations took place between Convention of Scottish Local Authorities (COSLA), the Secretary of State and the SED. In order to implement the reform the Government had to accept that TVEI should be adapted to suit Scottish circumstances. Consequently in some important respects TVEI developed along distinctive lines in Scotland. Frank Pignatelli, Strathclyde Region's Director of Education, described Local Authorities' reluctance to participate in the first year of TVEI as 'Caledonian caution':-

...it is an indication of what might be termed 'Caledonian caution', a concern to ensure that participation in the initiative would not compromise Scottish educational developments, or breach educational principles which had been established in Scotland as a result of experiences gained in attempting to introduce vocational elements into the curriculum of Scottish schools during the 1960s.³⁴

The reform was extended to Scotland only after COSLA secured a commitment from the Government that TVEI would complement both Standard Grade and the Action Plan. This ensured that TVEI would have a distinctive Scottish dimension. Thus one could argue that the introduction of TVEI has facilitated the development of the Standard Grade and the Action Plan by bringing additional resources to schools as well as helping to develop thinking about curriculum content and teaching approaches. Bell et al believe that one of the most noticeable features of the reform in Scotland has been that it is "more fully assimilated into the educational mainstream than seems to have been the case in England."³⁵ Indeed, Mary Pirie has reported that TVEI Scotland has an obligation to ensure that the reform and other educational developments are compatible:-

Part of the national work of TVEI Scotland is to consult and confer with the SED to ensure that the necessary linkages of TVEI with other curricular and examination structures are formed.³⁶

A year after TVEI got underway in England it was extended to Scotland. The reform was introduced in stages starting with five projects in 1984 in Glasgow and Renfrew Divisions of Strathclyde Region, Fife, Dumfries and Galloway and Borders Regions. The extension of TVEI to all schools was announced in the White Paper *Working Together- Education and Training-* in the summer of 1986. By 1987 projects had been started in all Regions except the Island Authorities and in all Divisions of Strathclyde Region.

Participating authorities identified typically between three and five schools and colleges and a cohort of about 200 to 250 students taken from each of the five

consecutive year groups to be involved. Most students would enter the programme at the start of third year. All projects have to cater for students of all abilities and comply with equal opportunities in terms of gender, race and disability. It is hoped that the Initiative would offer students of all abilities the opportunity of 'a more relevant curriculum and preparation for adult and working life'³⁷ However, in reality the Initiative has had a limited impact on students who are academic high achievers. This is largely due to the nature of S5 which, because of the 'two term dash' for Highers, already has an overcrowded timetable. It was stated from the outset of the Initiative that the pilots were intended to be evaluated, and that authorities had to set aside a sum of money to fulfil this requirement. In addition to these local evaluations the development of the Initiative was also assessed at national level. A number of studies assessed the development of the pilot projects.³⁸

The curriculum followed by TVEI students was intended to be broad and balanced. In addition, there had to be a recognised national certificate at the end of TVEI modules. National Certification modules made a significant contribution to the development of the Initiative. Black et al have stressed that " a unique feature of TVEI (has been) that it has adapted assessment innovations such as the National Certificate and Standard Grade to meet its own needs."³⁹ However, the relationship between TVEI and National Certificate has not been one sided. Weir and Kydd have argued that TVEI gave many schools and students "a taste for the National Certificate" and this in turn increased the popularity of National Certificate modules.⁴⁰

A peculiarly Scottish dimension which emerged in the Initiative was the notion of enhancement. TVEI funding could also be directed into established areas of the curriculum such as English, music or geography. Such funding was to be used to enhance the technological dimension to the subject or to change teaching methods.

The research conducted by Black et al found that more than 80% of teachers 'claimed that TVEI had encouraged innovation in teaching- learning strategies in their schools.'⁴¹ Such strategies might include more group work or learning outside of the classroom. Significantly they found that in the Certificate of Sixth Year Studies (CSYS), Higher and 'O'Grade courses only about 40% of teachers claimed to be employing innovative teaching strategies. However, 75% of teachers providing TVEI core courses, National Certificate and 'S' Grade claimed to be using innovative methods. The notion of enhancement originated in Scotland and was introduced later into English projects.

Initially it had seemed that the Government was intent on forcing through a uniformly British initiative. The proposals drawn up by the MSC had bypassed the Scottish educational community. Moreover, they were not devised with the Scottish context in mind. However, it is evident that TVEI did develop a distinctive Scottish dimension. Objections from within the Scottish educational community forced the Government to reconsider how the Initiative would be introduced in Scotland. Concessions had to be made to the Scottish context: the most important one being the commitment that the Initiative should be compatible with the National Certificate and the Standard Grade. The criteria set out by the MSC were sufficiently broad to ensure that there could be wide variation in the nature of TVEI projects. Indeed a feature of the Initiative has been the extent to which projects have been able to reflect local circumstances.⁴² In order to secure educational change the Thatcher Government had to secure the support of the Scottish educational community. This consensus was helped to ensure that the Initiative to develop a Scottish dimension.

Conclusion

The analysis in this chapter indicates that one should be careful not to assume that all educational initiatives under the Thatcher Government were controversial. The clue to why this was the case lies in the policy making process and specifically with the role that educational professionals had in this process. The proposals for the introduction of the Standard Grade originated as far back as 1965 and therefore cannot be regarded as a Thatcherite initiative. However, the reform was implemented under a Thatcher Government. The establishment of a series of feasibility studies in which the educational professionals had a key role indicated that the Government did not wish to undermine the consensus which had developed. The development of the National Certificate and the 5-14 Programme both had significant input from the educational professionals. Initially the same cannot be said of TVEI. It was regarded as an British policy. However, the Initiative which was eventually implemented was rather different in character from that intended by the Government. In order to be implemented the policy had to be adapted to the Scottish context. The professionals were able to adapt the Initiative to meet national and local needs.

The first thing to emphasise is that these reforms were all negotiated within the Scottish educational community. Even in the case of TVEI, against the original intentions of the Government, the Scottish educational community was able to secure a significant input in the development of policy. This helped to guaranteed that the reforms would be perceived as consensual. Secondly, these reforms in some way all had a Scottish dimension. The role which the Scottish educational community had in their development ensured that the Scottish context was taken on board. Ultimately, this facilitated the incorporation of the reforms into the Scottish educational system.

Why, then, was so much of Thatcherite education policy prior to 1987 consensual? One argument might be that there was a cross party recognition of the need for educational reform. James Callaghan in his Ruskin speech in 1976 had stressed the need for greater accountability and the need for curricular change. Concerns about the nature and balance of the curriculum in Scottish secondary schools pre-dated the Thatcher Governments. The Thatcher Government, therefore, did not have to challenge the educational professionals early on because they were willing to accept curricular reform. However, the 1981 Act was a warning to the professionals of what they could expect if the Thatcher Government decided to pursue more controversial and ideologically motivated policies. It could also be argued that, in their early days, the Thatcher Governments were pre-occupied with macro-economic concerns rather than the social spheres. As we have seen in chapter 2 Thatcherism became increasingly pre-occupied with social concerns after 1987. A third argument could be that Scotland was unimportant politically to the Thatcher Government and therefore a marginal concern. It was not until the third Thatcher administration when a Thatcherite, Michael Forsyth, became education minister that the most radical and controversial policies were introduced.

However, in reviewing Thatcherite education policy one must be careful not to overstate its consensual nature. It is possible to identify two approaches to education policy in Scotland under the Thatcher Governments. The first is the rather more consensual and non controversial approach which was evident in initiatives such as the Standard Grade and the 5-14 Programme. The second approach was driven more by ideological concerns and consequently was more controversial. Policies were not negotiated within the Scottish educational community prior to their implementation. This approach was increasingly evident in the later stages of the Thatcher Governments.

Notes and References

- ¹ Quoted in Kirk, G. (1982) *Curriculum and Assessment in the Scottish Secondary School: A Study of the Munn and Dunning Reports* p.12
- ² *Ibid*
- ³ McIntyre, D. (1978) 'The Politics of Educational Review' in McIntyre, D. (ed.) *A Critique of the Munn and Dunning Reports* p.1
- ⁴ For a more detailed discussion of the move away from norm referenced assessment see Drever, E. (1988) 'Criterion Referencing and grade Related Criteria: The Experience of 'S' Grade' in Brown, S. (ed.) *Assessment: A Changing Practice*
- ⁵ Munn, P. and Brown, S. (1985) 'The Changing Face of Education 14 to 16' in Brown, S. and Munn, P. (ed.) *The Changing Face of Education 14 to 16: Curriculum and Assessment* p.3
- ⁶ Rifkind, M. (1988) 'Introduction' in SED, *Setting New Standards for All Scottish Pupils*
- ⁷ *Ibid*
- ⁸ Weir, A.D. (1988) *Education and Vocation 14-18* p.50
- ⁹ Fairley, J. and Paterson, L. (1991) 'The Reform of Vocational Educational and Training in Scotland' *Scottish Educational Review* Vol.23 p.73
- ¹⁰ SED (1983) *16-18s in Scotland: An Action Plan* p.26
- ¹¹ For a fuller discussion of how the National Certificate is assessed see Black, H. (1988) 'The National Certificate' in Brown, S. (ed) *Assessment: A Changing Practice*
- ¹² SED (1986) *16+ in Scotland: The National Certificate* p.1
- ¹³ *Ibid*
- ¹⁴ Fairley, J. and Paterson, L. *op. cit.* p.71
- ¹⁵ Weir, A.D. *op. cit.* p.68
- ¹⁶ Fairley, J. and Paterson, L. *op. cit.* p.71
- ¹⁷ *Ibid* p.72
- ¹⁸ *Ibid* p.73
- ¹⁹ Weir, D. and Kydd, L. (1991) 'The National Certificate and Highers: A Case of Market Forces' *Scottish Educational Review* Vol.23 p.16
- ²⁰ *Ibid* p.73 Also see Weir (1988) *Education and Vocation*
- ²¹ Scottish Information Office (1988) 'Secretary of State Announces Conclusions over Curriculum and Assessment Proposals'
- ²² *Ibid*
- ²³ Pickard, W. and Munro, N. (1990) 'Guidelines, not Tramlines' *TESS* 14th August

-
- 24 McCormick, R. (1988) 'National Curricula North and South' *Scottish Educational Review* Vol.20 p.98
- 25 Gatherer, W.A. (1988) 'Two Voices' *Scottish Educational Review* Vol.20 p.100
- 26 Simpson, M. (1993) 'An Intelligent Agenda' *TESS* 30th April
- 27 *TESS* (1991) 'The Politics of 5-14' 22nd November
- 28 *TESS* (1991) 'Pace of Reform Challenged' 20th September
- 29 *TESS* (1991) 'Broad Aims Endorsed' 20th September
- 30 *Ibid*
- 31 Howieson, C. (1989) 'The Impact of the MSC on Secondary Education' in Brown, A. and Fairley, J. (eds) *The MSC in Scotland* p.74
- 32 *Ibid* p.76
- 33 Bell, C., Howieson, C., King, K. and Raffe, D. (1989) 'The Scottish Dimension of TVEI' in McCrone, D. (ed) *Scottish Government Yearbook 1989* p.94
- 34 Quoted in Weir, A.D., *op cit.*, p.66
- 35 Bell, C. et al, *op cit.*, p.96
- 36 Pirie, M. (1989) 'Current Developments in TVEI in Scotland' *Scottish Educational Review* Vol.21 p.60
- 37 Bell, C. et al, *op cit.*, p.93
- 38 See for example work conducted by a team of researchers at SCRE -Black, H. et al (1988) *The TVEI Pilot Curriculum in Scotland*; Black et al (1989) *The Classes of '88*; Black et al (1990) *TVEI- The Teachers' View*; Black et al (1990) *An Accepted Part of the Landscape*
- 39 Black, H., Malcolm, H. and Zaklukiewicz (1988) *The TVEI Pilot Curriculum in Scotland* p.9
- 40 Weir, D and Kydd, L., *op. cit.*, p.15
- 41 Black, H., Lyon, M., Malcolm, H., Thorpe, G. and Zaklukiewicz, S. (1990) *The Impact of TVEI : A Summary of Three Reports to the Training Agency by SCRE* p.5
- 42 For a fuller discussion of the extent of local variation in TVEI pilot projects in Scotland see Paterson, L. (1993) 'Local Variation in the Scottish Pilot Projects of the Technical and Vocational Initiative' *Research Papers in Education* Vol. 8 No.1

CHAPTER 5

THATCHERITE EDUCATION POLICY IN SCOTLAND: PART TWO

Introduction

The previous chapter demonstrated that some quite significant areas of Thatcherite education policy were dealt with in a consensual manner. This chapter analyses some of the more controversial policies introduced by the Thatcher Governments. For the most part, these policies were introduced during the third Thatcher administration. As suggested in the previous chapter, the relatively consensual nature of large areas of education policy before 1987 may have been due to Thatcherite statecraft concentrating on the economic aspects of the social democratic state. In the third term of the Thatcher Government there was a clear shift of emphasis to the social components of the social democratic consensus. What were the implications for the Scottish education system and educational policy-making in Scotland of the shift in focus of Thatcherite policy? Did education policy become more centralised under the Thatcher Governments? Or was it the case that Thatcherite education policy sought to accommodate the institutional and cultural differences which exist in the Scottish system?

To answer these questions it may be helpful to look at the elements which underlay Thatcherite education policy and then to investigate how these were applied to the Scottish context. The discussion in the first section of this chapter draws heavily from the English context where some of the more radical aspects of education policy were first developed. The second section looks specifically at the Scottish context. The next part of the thesis analyses the reactions of both educational professionals, specifically the teaching profession, and of parents to the manifestation of these elements within the Scottish system.

Elements of Thatcherite education policy.

Choice

The importance of "choice" to Thatcherite education policy has been commented upon by a number of writers. Geoffrey Walford, for example, believes that the desire of the Thatcher Governments to promote "choice" in the maintained schooling system was part of a wider aim to privatise that system.¹ Denis Lawton has argued that the "choice" :-

...is a fashionable slogan word in the rhetoric of the New Right, some of whom claim that more choice automatically means better quality: another assumption is that because some kinds of choice are desirable, then all (at least most) kinds of choice should be catered for.²

Stephen Ball notes that "parental choice has been one of the fundamentals of Conservative education policy since 1979."³ Reflecting on Thatcherite education policy Leslie Bash has argued that "the belief that consumers should have choice has underpinned key aspects of ...educational legislation."⁴ However, defining exactly what "choice" meant in the educational context is problematic. The key to understanding why choice was such a crucial element of Thatcherite education policy lies in the values with which it was associated with it. "Choice" was presented by the Thatcher Government in a positive manner. This positive interpretation of "choice" can be explained by the close relationship between "choice" and morality in Thatcherite education policy. The morality had two dimensions, namely political and personal.

The attempts by the Thatcher Government to promote choice were part of the wider objective of creating a "market" in education. Such attempts were a consequence of Thatcherites' rejecting the ideas of social justice which underlay post war social democratic legislation. The paternalist tendencies of the post war education policy were rejected in favour of the "market". Christopher Knight claims that in education policy the Thatcher Governments rejected "One Nation" philosophy.⁵ It was not

immediately obvious, however, that a Government led by Margaret Thatcher would reject the social democratic assumptions which underlay post war education policy. The decisive turning point was the 1981 Cabinet reshuffle which removed a number of prominent Wets. Knight believes that it was the unwillingness of Mark Carlisle, then Secretary of State for Education and Science, to embrace Thatcherite policies that led to his removal from cabinet:-

Mrs. Thatcher decided that Carlisle's commitment to One Nation conservatism and his Cabinet opposition to monetarism did not fit him to take part in the new way forward.⁶

It soon became apparent that the expansion of consumer choice and market forces were to be essential components of this "new way forward." Significantly, education policy during the period of the first Thatcher Government was not a matter of priority. The Downing Street Policy Unit's remit between 1979 and 1982 did not include education policy. There was also little discussion of education policy at Cabinet level.⁷ Denis Lawton believes that the arrival of Keith Joseph at the Department of Education and Science (DES) marked a shift in Thatcherite education policy:-

An essential difference about Joseph's policies was that he rejected the status quo and sought radical change. He was an enthusiast for the operation of the market, even in education, and admired the writings of Hayek and Friedman who both had objections to the principle of state controlled education.⁸

The importance which Thatcherites placed on the rights of the individual rather than society as a whole led them to reject the egalitarian objectives of the Butskellite education policy. In this respect Thatcherite education policy moved away from the essentially non-partisan Tory education policy of the post war period, epitomised by Sir David Eccles (Minister of Education 1955-1964) and Sir Edward Boyle (Shadow Education Minister 1965-1970), towards a view of education influenced by the ideas of the New Right. The Thatcherite concept of the "market" system in education is discussed in more detail in the section below on competition. It is necessary at this stage, however, to make some preliminary comments on the role which choice

played in the " market."

One of the fundamental principles of the market is that individuals are free to pursue their own self-interest. In the context of education, the pursuit of self-interest requires that parents are free to make their own choices. Parents act as an agent for their child and are therefore acting in the interests of another individual. In the words of Ruth Jonathan words, "parental rights are grounded in their duties of trusteeship ...in serving the actual and future interests of their children."⁹ In order to create the conditions which would allow parents to choose the schools their children attended or the way they were educated, Government had to introduce policies which explicitly sought to alter the role that parents had in the education system. Changing the role that parents had in the education system was a pre-requisite to the creation of a "market" system.

As education policy developed under the Thatcher Governments, it became increasingly apparent that the aim was to introduce "choice" into the education system to an extent which had not previously existed. Until the 1980s parents were restricted in their choice of school for their child. The school which a child attended was determined by where that child lived rather the wishes of parents. Thatcherite education policy set out to widen the options open to parents. Hence the introduction of the Parents' Charter and the Assisted Places Scheme. Andrew McPherson suggests:-

The Government soon realised...that parental choice pointed the way towards a much more radical policy for reconstructing the boundaries between private responsibility and public provision. Part of the attraction of parental choice was that it diverted from the Government all the blame for school closures and the differential distribution of provision. Furthermore Government could increase the numbers of parents apparently subscribing to the new philosophy by raising doubts about standards and doubts about the capacity of LEAs to ensure delivery of quality in every school.¹⁰

The second dimension of the concept of "choice" advocated by the Thatcher Governments was that of personal morality. Thatcherites had little or no time for those who squandered opportunities or were unable to take full advantage of the opportunities presented to them. Roger Dale labelled this attitude as "anti-Universalist and anti-social democratic" on the grounds that Thatcherite education policy placed great weight on the concept of "deservingness" rather than egalitarianism.¹¹ By "deservingness", Dale was referring to the desire that Thatcherites have to reward "the talented and the successful, the intellectually and the morally deserving."¹² Such people, Thatcherites argued, act as an encouragement for others who will see the rewards of hard work and self-discipline. By definition, therefore, there must be those who are undeserving. In accepting such an argument Thatcherites found themselves explicitly endorsing selectivity and, if one was to continue the argument a stage further, social stratification. What was important was the individual's propensity for self advancement and this could only be achieved through hard work and individual freedom. The moral values Thatcherite education policy sought to advance Stewart Ranson has argued "encourage an active polity whose members are conceived not as passive, dependent, creatures but as agents reflecting upon and actively developing their interests."¹³

Some indication of the emphasis that a Thatcher Government would place on the use of education policy as a means of promoting its vision of morality was given while Margaret Thatcher was Secretary of State for Education and Science (June 1970–February 1974). She became responsible for education policy at a time when some Tories had started to question the consensual policies followed by Eccles and Boyle. Doubts were being openly expressed about the success of comprehensive reorganisation, doubts which Margaret Thatcher shared. Shortly after taking her post at the DES she issued a circular which removed the obligation from local education authorities (LEAs) to submit plans for comprehensive reorganisation. This circular

was the first explicit indication that Margaret Thatcher intended to break up the political consensus that had existed in education in the 1950s and 1960s. What she, and like minded Conservatives such as Rhodes Boyson and Keith Joseph, wanted to prevent was full scale comprehensive reorganisation. As Education Secretary she was determined to protect the grammar school.

Interestingly, Gray et al have noted that the introduction of comprehensive reorganisation "was less bitterly disputed between the Scottish Labour and Conservative Parties."¹⁴ This is a view shared by Bruce Millan who was the minister in the Wilson Government responsible for the implementation of comprehensive reorganisation in Scotland:-

...I think that even in the Tory areas, the education committees were basically in favour of it (comprehensive reorganisation) as well. This was the difference between Scotland and England. It didn't become a party political issue at local level. I'm not saying that there weren't odd arguments. But you didn't have, in Scotland, the kind of situations that eventually led to the attempt at compulsory reorganisation in England, where local authorities, strictly for political reasons, were standing out against the Government...I would say that there some Tory-controlled authorities that were among the more enthusiastic about reorganisation...¹⁵

For Margaret Thatcher and like minded Conservatives the collectivist, universalist provision of education developed during the post-war Conservative and Labour consensus, was too closely associated with socialism; for this reason it was something that a Thatcher Government would work against. In a speech to the Conservative Party Conference in Blackpool in October 1975 Margaret Thatcher hinted at what was later to develop into the moral dimension of Thatcherite education policy:-

...our education system used to serve us well. A child from an ordinary family, as I was, could use it as a ladder, as an advancement, but the Socialists, better at demolition than reconstruction, are destroying many good grammar schools. Now this is nothing to do with private education. It is opportunity and excellence in our state schools that are being diminished under Socialism. In a Socialist society parents should be seen and not heard.¹⁶

This quote epitomises the Thatcherite approach which developed towards personal morality and education. It is interesting to note that there is some convergence between the competitive individualism which Thatcherite education policy sought to advance and one dimension of the "Scottish myth", namely the emphasis "on individual achievement at the expenses of others." In the words of H.M. Paterson:-

The class oriented nature of Scottish schooling is seldom noted...there is a considerable amount of evidence to show that, if Scottish schools were ever democratic, they were democratic in a particular way which emphasised social division, competitive liberalism and individual achievement at the expense of other."¹⁷

Thus a theme common to Thatcherite education policy and a version of the "Scottish myth" was a commitment to an education system which is meritocratic.

When Margaret Thatcher talked of individual advancement and the role that grammar schools had in this advancement, she was articulating the concepts of deservingness and selectivity, which were central to the Thatcherite interpretation of morality. It is also apparent that any education legislation initiated by a Thatcher Government would place great emphasis on enhancing the position of parents in the education system, and that to achieve this end legislation would prescribe that professionals had to take the wishes of parents on board.

The reason Thatcherites placed so much importance on the grammar school is found in the emphasis which they placed on individual advancement and effort. Woods explains:-

...the belief in individual effort and achievement that found its expression in the grammar school undermined the one nation concept with its harmonisation of all interests based on social justice. The desire to encourage individual effort was part of a larger concept of personal freedom. Freedom was necessary for individuality to develop. It embodied the need to make choices, to be responsible for personal and family decisions, to achieve personal goals. Morality and individuality were inextricably united. "Morality" she said recently "lies in the choosing between feasible alternatives. A moral being is one who exercises his own judgement in choice on matters great and small." If he cannot do this "his moral facilities atrophy, and he becomes a moral cripple."¹⁸

Thus the rights of the individual and "morality" are inseparable. Moreover, it is the individual who should be responsible for making his/her own decisions and achieving success. Government must step back and allow individuals room to make their own choices. In terms of education policy, this argument amounted to a rejection of the comprehensive education system.

One of the claims of the Thatcher Governments was that they had improved the rights of the individual in a number of areas including the extension of share ownership, allowing council tenants to buy their homes, and in education enhancing the position of the consumer. There was a belief that a free individual was one who was free to make choices. The implication of this argument for education policy was that the monopolistic comprehensive system had to be broken up if the conditions for free choice were to be created. One mechanism for transforming the schooling system was the introduction of competition.

Competition

The second aspect of Thatcherite education policy was competition. Competition implies introduction of "market" forces to education. Parents become the consumers, and the schools become the producers which would compete for the right to educate the child. In this context parents would be free to make their own decisions about where and how their children are to be educated. The intention was to extend market forces into a sector that had traditionally been excluded from the rigours of competition and thereby widen the opportunities for choice. It was this mindset which led the Thatcher Governments to make parental choice the cornerstone of Conservative education policy between 1979 and 1990. The assumption was that comprehensive education had reduced choice. The egalitarian principle crucial to maintaining comprehensive education was rejected. Instead, an education system

was advocated which would be able to respond to the wishes of parents. Stephen Ball makes the point that for parents to be able to choose there had to be diversity:-

Choice is only real if there are diverse products to choose from. The argument would be that if all schools are comprehensive, all giving the same service, then there is no choice. Any attempt to make the provision of schooling equal for all, the same for all, would confound the market. The control and determination of school provision must be taken out of the hands of the government and left to the market.¹⁹

Such sentiments were consistently displayed throughout Margaret Thatcher's ministerial career. In a debate on education in the House of Commons in May 1971 she explained that parents should be free to choose how their children are educated :-

I am anxious to keep a thriving independent sector. I never want to be Secretary of State for Education when there is a monopoly of education in the public sector. I am not afraid of competition from another sector. I always think it is remarkable that although people are allowed to spend on alcohol, tobacco, cars, better houses, better clothes, better holidays, some people wish to preclude them from spending on the education of their children.²⁰

The thrust of Margaret Thatcher's argument was that education should be a commodity which is bought and sold in the market place. It was the Government's duty to create the environment favourable to the promotion of competitive forces. This belief had a significant impact on the course of Thatcherite education policy. Proponents of the market believed that Government's role was to ensure that the basis on which individuals compete was fair. By allowing individuals to pursue their own interests in the market place others will benefit. There will be a greater choice and variety in the products available and the producers will attempt to fulfil the needs of the consumer. The pursuit of self interest is not a negative phenomenon. Instead, it benefits those who participate in the market place and society in general.

Thatcherites argued that social democratic legislation had marginalised the position of the consumer. Schools were to be seen as economic institutions rather than social institutions. This shift in emphasis changed the nature of the relationship between schools. Schools were no longer to be linked to the (local) education authority in an

interdependent system. Instead, they would have to compete with each other. This in turn would encourage schools to strive to improve the quality of education in the hope of attracting more clients.

The 1988 Education Reform Act epitomised the free-market thinking of the Thatcher Governments. The significance of the Act has been commented on by both political scientists and educationalists.²¹ Major reforms introduced under the Act included a national curriculum and associated national testing; local management of schools (LMS); provisions allowing state schools to opt out of local authority control, and the establishment of City Technology Colleges (CTCs). These reforms fundamentally altered the nature of central-local relations in England and Wales. The powers and responsibilities of LEAs were significantly altered in a bid to enhance consumer choice and stimulate competition. Stephen Ball concludes that the "key provisions of the Act replace the principle of equal access to state education for all, with the principle of differentiation in the market place."²²

The significance of free market philosophy encapsulated in the 1988 Education Reform Act was profound. The environment in which schools operated became more competitive. The problem which faced Thatcherites was that it was very difficult to create a real market in education while government was still operating a comprehensive education system. There were some areas where government could introduce competition. Open enrolment, opting-out, local management of schools in England and Wales were all designed to increase choice and encourage competition but they did not alter the essential nature of the education system. It was still one in which the majority of children received their schooling in the state schools.

The power that the LEAs had in the education system was an obstacle in the path of government's attempts to create a market system. The reduction of the role of the

(local) education authority become a stated objective of Thatcherite education policy. Legislation was passed in Scotland and in England and Wales which reduced the powers exercised by local authorities in relation to the provision of education. The attack on the local education authorities was more pronounced south of the border. Under the terms of the 1988 Education Reform Act English and Welsh authorities had to operate schemes of local management which transferred many of the LEA functions such as staffing matters to school level.

The approach to public policy adopted by the Thatcher Governments was informed by their own brand of free market thinking. In education policy the notion of collective state provision, which did not allow individuals to pursue their own interests was rejected, in favour of a system which sought to generate an "enterprise culture." Ultimately, Thatcherites wished the market to replace the concept of collective state provision of schooling. This shift must be placed in the broader perspective of Government attempting to reduce the role that it has in the Welfare State.

The extent to which "market forces" operate in the education system depends largely on the behaviour of those who participate in the market. If the consumer, who in the case of education, is the parent, is unwilling to adopt that role, then the attempts by the Thatcher Government to introduce market forces would prove largely unsuccessful. Chapter 8 investigates parental reaction to Thatcherite education policy in Scotland.

Financial

The financial dimension to Thatcherite education policy was related to the aim of making schools operate in a competitive environment. In a market situation, schools could not be protected from the decisions of the consumers. Stephen Ball has argued

that in a real market the choices of consumers or parents would impinge directly on schools. In his words "a real market is driven by reward and by failures."²³ "Good" schools would flourish while "bad" ones would go to the wall. The terms "good" and "bad" were used in an unproblematic way, by the Thatcher Governments. It appeared that the Thatcher Government thought a "good" school was a popular one, whereas a "bad" one was unpopular. The consumer of a service, in this case the parents, must be able to influence the fortunes of the producers namely, the education professionals.

The first step towards this end was the introduction of the Assisted Places Scheme. The scheme in England and Wales made provision for high achievers in the state maintained schools to transfer to selected private schools. However, as Geoffrey Walford notes because of the commitment to egalitarianism in Scotland, "the idea of basing APS (Assisted Places Scheme) on selection would have been politically suicidal for the Scottish Conservative MPs."²⁴ In Scotland the scheme was presented as enhancing parental choice. Walford believes that this led to a greater range of schools being involved in the scheme and a greater degree of flexibility for "schools in selecting pupils for assistance."²⁵ Indeed almost the entire independent sector is included in the Scottish scheme. However, despite these differences, the schemes were a clear indication that the Thatcher Governments regarded private schools as superior to comprehensive schools, at least for academic children. Parents could chose, with some financial assistance from the Government, to send their children to private schools. Walford maintains that Assisted Places Scheme was the first sign that the Thatcher Governments were intent on "privatising" education:-

The Assisted Places Scheme was thus a key element in the government's privatisation strategy for education...Schooling thus took a step towards becoming just another consumer product, where parents were consumers choosing between different suppliers on the basis of needs and desires.²⁶

The scheme created pressures within the education system. To a greater extent,

comprehensive schools found themselves competing with private schools for pupils. The Parents Charter reinforced this development in education policy.

The decision to allow individual schools in England and Wales to control their own budgets was the next step the Thatcher Government took towards increasing accountability in the education system. The logical conclusion of this policy was that schools in the maintained sector would close if they failed to attract sufficient pupils. The Government encouraged parents to become directly involved in the running of the school and to demand a better standard of educational provision by the education authorities. Moreover, Government policies aimed at introducing parental choice meant that parents sitting on a school's governing body in England or Wales or parents on a school board in Scotland (although to lesser extent) could question a head teacher on how the schools budget was spent and thus hold him/her personally accountable. If the education professionals refused to cooperate then parents had the option of opting-out of (local) education authority control. In this way (local) education authorities were pressurised into becoming more accountable to parents.

Following the education legislation of the third Thatcher Government, (local) education authorities had to rethink their relationship with parents. It was no longer possible for the professionals to influence the education system to the extent they had done so previously. Central government was sending local authorities the message that they should either endorse the education policies increasing parental choice and introducing market forces, or run the risk of having the maintained schools removed from their jurisdiction.

Conclusion

The three elements of Thatcherite education policy outlined above are interdependent. It would not be possible to create a market in the education system without

introducing measures which would allow schools a degree of financial independence. To Thatcherites, morality and choice are inextricably linked. An individual, they maintain, will only develop into a moral being if he/she is free to make his own decisions.

What these principles amounted to was an attempt by the Thatcher Government to bring education under more central control. To achieve this end the Government had to challenge the local authorities' traditional management of education provision at the school level. As Andrew McPherson points out, this brought the Thatcher Governments into direct conflict with comprehensive schools, local authorities and even Scotland:-

In the medium term, Labour-controlled EAs (Education Authorities), comprehensive schools and Scotland are all targets. There is an explicitly avowed political aim in the Conservative attack on local authorities...Education is the largest local authority responsibility. The most striking examples of non-Conservative education policy are at local level. Scotland offers a flourishing counter example to the Conservative policy that favours selective schooling.²⁷

It is therefore necessary to analyse how these elements of Thatcherite education policy were introduced to the Scottish context.

Thatcherite education policy in Scotland

Choice

It was argued above that "choice" was central to Conservative education policy between 1979 and 1990. Government policy stressed individual freedom and aimed to enhance "consumer power." These themes played a major role in the attempts made by the Thatcher Governments to transform the education systems in Scotland, England and Wales. The moral values which were associated with the extension of "choice" were part of a wider desire to transform the social order. The new role envisaged by Thatcherites for parents and the educational professional was

particularly apparent in the Parents' Charter introduced by the Thatcher Governments and the School Board (Scotland) Act 1988.

Parents' Charter in Scotland

The intention behind the parental choice legislation was to give parents more control over their child's schooling and thereby introduce an element of choice into the system. The 1979 Conservative Manifesto stated:-

Extending parents' rights and responsibilities, including the right of choice, will also help raise standards by giving them greater influence over education. Our parents' charter will place a clear duty on government and local authorities to take account of parents' wishes when allocating children to schools, with a local appeals system for those dissatisfied. Schools will be required to publish prospectuses giving details of their examination and other results.²⁸

The result of this election promise was the Education Act 1980 which applied only to England and Wales and the Education (Scotland) Act 1981. Both Acts gave parents the right to request that their child attend a particular school. Education authorities had a legal requirement to accept such requests and could refuse only under exceptional circumstances. Further, parents could appeal to a statutory appeal committee if their request was denied. Education authorities also had to provide parents with information on the criteria used to select pupils in schools which were over subscribed; about the school their child attended; or indeed any other school they enquired about. Adler et al, however, demonstrate that this is where the similarities between the two Acts end. They pin-point five important areas where the Scottish and English legislation diverge. Under the provisions of the 1980 Act every parent was allowed to choose a particular school and give their reasons for this choice, but the Scottish Act gave parents the right to choose without stating their reasons. Adler et al argue :-

The significance of the distinction is that the reference to reasons in the English legislation serves to qualify choices while the absence of any reference to reasons in the Scottish legislation suggests that the fact of choice is really all that matters.²⁹

Secondly, although on the whole, statutory exceptions to the (local) education authorities' duty to comply with a parents' choice of school, were similar in Scotland and England, in the former they were far more specific. Indeed, "not only were the grounds for refusal more narrowly defined, the standards of refusal were actually higher."³⁰

The third difference Adler et al point to concerns the Acts' provision for a parent's right of appeal. In Scotland, if the decision in the appeal committee goes against the parent he/she has a further right of appeal to the sheriff. There is no equivalent provision in the 1980 Education Act. It is of course the case that sheriffs are independent of the education authorities, unlike the appeals committee. The Scottish legislation also sets out the duties of the appeal committee in a more clearly defined manner.

The final difference noted is that where a successful appeal is made Scottish education authorities must review "the cases of all parents in similar circumstances who have not appealed, and if decisions are unchanged, it has to grant a further right of appeal."³¹ The English legislation contains no such provision.

From the above account, it is clear that the Education (Scotland) Act places parents in a more powerful position in relation to education authorities than the 1980 Act does. There are several reasons for this. In England parental choice was an important issue in the 1970s. The 1974-1979 Labour Government had acknowledged this by drafting legislation to strengthen the rights of parents in England, although it did not do so for Scotland. In face of increasing pressure from the Labour Opposition and parent bodies to introduce measures which would establish a parents' charter, the incoming Thatcher Government decided to use the draft Labour Bill as its starting

point for legislation in England and Wales. The Scottish Office, however, was starting with a clean slate as regards parental choice legislation.

Adler et al maintain that the opinions of those ministers involved in drafting the legislation shaped the Scottish and English Acts. The Secretary of State of Education and Science, Mark Carlisle, did not have the same degree of commitment towards parental choice as the Scottish Minister Alex Fletcher. Carlisle did agree with the concept of parental choice, but he believed that there were strict limits to how far the government should go in attempting strengthen the rights of parents. Government should not, for instance, question the education authorities' role of delivering and planning schooling within a local community. Alex Fletcher, in contrast, was a fervent supporter of parental choice and believed that government should do everything in its power to increase the influence that parents had over education authorities.

Clearly there was a "Scottish dimension" to the parental choice legislation introduced by the Thatcher Government in Scotland. Conservative Scottish Office ministers had been able to extend the principle of parental choice further than their counterparts south of the border. The Scottish Act was different from the 1980 Act but these difference did not originate in any attempt by the Thatcher Government to accommodate the distinctive elements of the Scottish education system. Rather, differences existed because of differing political circumstances in England and Scotland. It was not possible to give parents in England such wide-ranging powers as parents received under the Scottish legislation. On the one hand, in England legislation had to be rushed through to meet demands for parental choice and, on the other hand, the Scottish Office minister overseeing the drafting of the 1981 Act was an enthusiastic supporter of parents rights.

For these reasons the 1981 Education (Scotland) Act came closer to the Thatcherite interpretation of parental choice than the 1980 Education Act. The most important component of the Thatcherite interpretation was the emphasis placed on the freedom of the individual to make his or her own decisions. Admittedly, both Acts were drafted with the same objective in mind but it was the Scottish legislation which protected to a greater extent the rights of the parents. The 1981 Act was designed to produce, as indeed was the 1980 Education Act, a:-

...shift away from some of the central concerns of a collective welfare orientation towards those associated with an individual client association. The encouragement given to individual choice, the matching of pupils with the schools selected by their parents and the introduction of quasi-market forces into education have imposed constraints on authorities' attempts to achieve an academic and social mix, set the upper (more crucially) lower bands on school intakes and school rolls, achieve an efficient use of scarce resources, and promote equality of opportunity.³²

The Scottish legislation may have given parents stronger rights than their counterparts in England and Wales but the Government could not force parents to exercise these rights. In contrast to the situation in England where parent bodies had been demanding more rights for parents for some years, there was no widespread interest in parental choice in Scotland until the 1981 Act put it on the political agenda. Initially, parents were reluctant to use the powers given to them. As Adler et al explain :-

There was less public concern in Scotland with educational standards or with the introduction of comprehensive schooling and less support for an attack on collectivism in practice or for the espousal of individualistic ethic. As a result, the Parents' Charter did not immediately take root in Scotland, and although there were some disputes in authorities that rigidly adhered to the catchment area principle, they were spasmodic and localised.³³

Scottish parents, at least initially, were reluctant to increase their involvement in a education system which they regarded as superior to the English system. Comprehensive schooling was generally held in high esteem in Scotland. Research by McPherson and Willms on comprehensive reorganisation in Scotland has demonstrated that in the later stages of reorganisation:-

...the standards of attainment rose, particularly among females of lower socio-economic status (SES). The rise was faster than could be accounted for by the rise in SES. Inequalities of attainment associated with SES varied between communities but, overall, they declined for both males and females...the longer that either creamed or uncreamed school had been established as comprehensives the higher was their average attainment.³⁴

In the light of such evidence, and also of the evidence presented in chapter one from the British Social Attitudes Survey, it is difficult to argue that comprehensive reorganisation was not working in Scotland. As far as the majority of Scots were concerned, the education policies which had developed from the social democratic consensus had been on the whole successful. It was perhaps not surprising then that the moral dimension of Thatcherite education policy, and in particular the concepts of deservingness and selectivity should meet with opposition, or at the very least with indifference from Scottish parents.

Why, then, did the Thatcher Government decide to introduce such a radical Act at a time when it was pursuing relatively consensual policies in other areas of education policy? Adler et al have argued that "it is somewhat ironic that, although the primary impetus for parental choice legislation came from England, the Scottish legislation appears to establish stronger rights for parents."³⁵ The role of Alex Fletcher, the Minister responsible for the parental choice legislation in Scotland, was significant in understanding this apparent irony. As we have seen above, he was a strong supporter of parental choice and, as Adler et al note, "it was clear that he did not trust the education authorities."³⁶ In contrast, Mark Carlisle who was responsible for the legislation south of the border, did not show the same degree of commitment to the principle of parental choice. Specifically, Carlisle wanted to ensure that any parental choice legislation did not lead to inefficient use of resources. The English legislation was less prescriptive because Carlisle was willing to allow the LEAs "to implement the legislation on good faith."³⁷ One could also argue that because parental choice had been on the political agenda south of the border throughout the 1970s, the

incoming Thatcher Government felt the need to introduce legislation as soon as possible. It was responding to a perceived need within the party for legislation to enhance the rights of parents. The Conservative Party Manifesto for the October 1974 election contained a commitment for a Charter of Parents Rights, and twice during the period of the 1974-1979 Labour Government Bills were introduced by Conservatives which drew upon the Charter.³⁸ Generally, however, the first Thatcher administration had little time for educational matters. As mentioned above the Cabinet rarely discussed educational matters in the early years of the Thatcher Governments. Much of the Government's time was taken up with economic concerns. The most radical and controversial educational initiatives were undertaken after 1987.

School Boards (Scotland) Act 1988

The introduction of school boards to Scottish school in 1988 was another example of the Thatcher Government attempting to increase the powers of parents at the expense of teachers and education authorities. Again, as with the parents' charter, there was a strong moral element underlying the School Boards legislation. The intention was to alter the relationship between parents, teachers and education authorities. This was to be achieved by giving parents executive powers in the running of schools. Parents were thus to be encouraged to take on responsibilities, which previously lay with the education authorities. This was part of the Thatcher Governments attempts to make individuals responsible for their families, rather than relying on the state.

The 1987 Conservative election manifesto for Scotland promised to "improve the management of schools, increase local autonomy and give parents and other local interests a more important role in the running of their school."³⁹ Legislation was to be introduced which would amount to "a major reform of schools councils so that

they will be equipped in co-operation with headmasters and teachers to assume advisory and executive responsibilities in the running of schools."⁴⁰ There are obvious similarities between the Education (Scotland) Act 1981 and the School Boards (Scotland) Act 1988. Both challenged the comprehensive schooling system and the position of the professionals within that system. The significance of the School Boards Act was that it gave parents a direct say in how comprehensive schools were to be run. Prior to the introduction of school boards Scottish schools had no equivalent to the English governing bodies.

In recognition of the fact that school boards were a major new initiative in the Scottish system, the Scottish Office initiated a consultative exercise before the School Boards (Scotland) Bill was introduced on the floor of the House of Commons. In August 1987 the SED (Scottish Education Department) issued a consultative paper on school boards to education authorities, school councils and other interested parties. The Scottish Office received 7,600 responses. Research by the EIS (Educational Institute of Scotland) has shown that the vast majority of the responses were critical of the government's plans and in particular of the proposed "ceiling" powers which allowed boards to directly control the school budget and to appoint and dismiss staff without consulting the local authority. Aileen Fisher has stressed that opposition to the Government's proposals was drawn from not just the education professionals but from all sections of Scottish society :-

Organised parental opposition in the form of action groups- the most notable being the Lothian Parents Action Group and Education Alert, based in Aberdeen- gave public voice to the Scottish commitment to a strong State education system. An independent survey of parental opinion by the Lothian group found less than 1% of parents in favour of the Government's plans. Adverse submissions were also made by the teachers' and head teachers' unions, the local authorities and the churches. The STUC forecast that "The plans will set parent against parent, school against school and parent against teacher." The Church of Scotland, condemned the proposals as "likely to lead to a divisiveness among all interested parties and to produce increasingly adverse effects in those sections of the community that most need special provision and protection." The Catholic Education Commission also expressed concern over the unlikelihood of boards having the necessary

experience and expertise to fulfil their duties. The most heavyweight opposition came from the General Teaching Council for Scotland...While accepting increased consultation in principle, the GTC unequivocally rejected almost all other proposals which, it was submitted, would "represent an erosion of professionalism, some of them will not work in practice and some are constitutionally unsound."⁴¹

The Government's response to the consultative exercise- *School Management: The Government's Conclusion*- was announced in January 1988. Significant changes had been made to the original proposals. The "ceiling" powers were dropped and if school boards wanted to increase their basic powers a ballot of all parents with children attending the school was necessary. In addition, the roles envisaged for boards in the appointment of staff and in curricular matters were reduced. The extent of opposition to its consultative paper had forced the Scottish Office to drop its most radical and controversial proposals. Although there was a general consensus in favour of dismantling the school councils system, it was clear that parents and the education professionals did not want what the Government was prescribing in its place. A common argument was that school boards would undermine the principle of partnership which was so important to the Scottish education system. The adoption an executive rather than a consultative function by parents would weaken the principle of partnership.

Even with the concessions made by the Government in response to the consultative exercise, the School Boards (Scotland) Act still significantly altered existing relationships in the Scottish system. Section 2, 3 and 4 of the Act set out the composition of the boards. Each board was to consist of between 5 and 13 members (see table 5.1). Parents were to be elected in a secret ballot by the majority of parents. Staff of a school would also elect representatives to sit on the board. There was also provision for co-opted members to sit on the boards. In denominational schools, the relevant church had to nominate a co-opted member. The head teacher has only advisory status on the board and does not have a vote. The Act also stated

that local authorities must provide boards with sufficient funds to cover administrative costs, to train board members and to enable the board to carry out its delegated functions.

Table 5. 1 Composition Of School Boards

Number on Roll	n Parent Members	n Staff Members	n Co-opted Members	Total
Single Teacher	3	-	2	5
1-500	4	1	2	7
501-1000	5	2	2	9
1001-1500	6	2	3	11
over 15000	7	3	3	13

Source: Scottish Local Government Unit "Opting-out" & the School Boards (Scotland) Bill

School boards have the right to ask education authorities for any information concerning specifically, their school and generally, the authority's education policy. In addition, under the provisions of the Act, Head Teachers must provide the board with an annual statement on the level of attainment in the school and a report on the school's policy on uniform, the curriculum, assessment, discipline and rules. The Head Teacher is also required to gain the board's approval on the school's per capita allocation. School boards also have powers relating to appointment of senior staff members namely the head teacher, depute head and assistant head teachers. The board may add names to the short list but it cannot remove names from the list for these posts. Pupils and staff of the school, except the head, are excluded from appointment committees. The Act also envisages that school boards will promote contact between the school, parents and the wider community.

Section 15 of the Act deals with the delegation of functions to boards. There are certain functions, however, which may not be delegated to boards. They include the employment and dismissal of staff, appointing the head teacher, depute or assistant head teachers, regulating the curriculum, assessment of pupils, merging with another school, and determining admission policy of the school. A board can approach a

local authority for more powers, and if the authority refuses it can hold a ballot of parents. If the majority supports further delegation and the local authority still refuses to comply with the board's wishes, it can appeal to the Secretary of State. The sort of additional powers which a board may wish to take on include maintenance of school premises, determining the format of reports to parents and responsibility for changing the use of the school premises outside school hours.

From the discussion above of the powers and duties of boards, it is evident that the School Boards (Scotland) Act was directed at parents and not the professionals. Indeed, there is an argument that in the words of Willis Pickard:-

Parent power, as expressed through the creation of school boards and their supposed input to the curriculum, has two virtues to Mr. Michael Forsyth. It underlines his belief that education, like soap flakes, can be regarded as a consumer product. It also meant to act as a counterweight to the power of organised teachers, who had the temerity to challenge and come close to beating the Government.⁴²

Scottish teachers had been involved in a long and damaging industrial dispute with the government in 1986/87. Parents and teachers had united against the Government during the dispute. The Scottish education minister, Michael Forsyth, wanted to prevent such a potent partnership developing against the government in the future. What the School Boards (Scotland) Act did was to provide parents with the opportunity to exercise a degree of executive power over the running of schools. In terms of the moral element of Thatcherite education policy, the Act was designed to advance the notion of individual responsibility. Individuals, in this case parents, were encouraged to share responsibility for their child's education with the professionals. School boards were intended to enhance the position parents held in the education system and to reduce the influence teachers, head teachers and the education authorities had over the planning and delivery of education at the school level.

Competition

Self-Governing Schools etc, (Scotland) Act 1989

The Self-Governing Schools etc, (Scotland) was introduced with the intention of introducing an element of competition in the state sector. It was regarded by the Thatcher Government as the logical extension of the parent's charter and the Assisted Places Scheme. By allowing state schools to opt out of local authority control, the Government hoped that parents would move away from the established comprehensive school system towards a more selective system where schools were influenced by market forces.

The Act contains three main initiatives: the establishment of self-governing schools, establishment of companies to manage further education colleges, and the introduction of testing in primary schools. Clause 1 of the Act states that "schools which transferred from the management of the education authority to that of a board of management" were to be maintained by the Secretary of State not by the education authority. Moreover clause 21 explicitly states "all the education authority's rights, powers, duties and liabilities...shall by virtue of this section be transferred to the board of management".

The Thatcher Government questioned the assumption, inherent in Butskellite education policy, that (local) education authorities should be primary agents in the planning and delivery of education at the school level. Thatcherite education policy rejected the notion that education authorities were better placed to plan and deliver the schooling of children. It did so for two reasons. First, education authorities were responsible for running the state education system. After comprehensive reorganisation, authorities strove to create a system where all schools offered the same kind of schooling and the same standard. Thatcherites argued that the comprehensive system reduced choice and that government should remedy this

situation by encouraging diversity. Secondly, under the Thatcher Governments the emphasis in education policy switched from using the education authorities to initiate change, to focusing on the school and parents as the mechanism for change. According to a Centre for Policy Studies publication:-

Grant maintained schools will break the LEA monopoly of state schools. Freed from the frustrations of local authority interference, heads and governors will be able to shape their schools as they see fit. They will choose and appoint the teachers. They will allocate funds where needed, e.g. on books and equipment, and apply for the supports and the services which they (not local authority administrators) consider best for their schools. They will be able to develop the character of their schools, unhindered by continual requests for form filling and interference from the town hall.⁴³

For these reasons the Thatcher Government felt that allowing schools to opt out of local authority control would not only increase parental choice but perhaps more importantly introduce an element of competition between schools.

Under the present system schools are answerable to the local authority but under the opting out legislation schools become answerable to the Secretary of State. What is not clear from the legislation is the extent to which schools will be under the control of central government. Professor Alan Alexander, the Strathclyde Business School fears that :-

Opted out schools may have a honeymoon of independence but it will not last. Direct grant funded schools are open to direction by central government.⁴⁴

There were many similarities between the Self-Governing etc, (Scotland) Act and the provisions in the 1988 Education Reform Act which enabled maintained schools to opt out of local authority control. For instance, both self governing schools in Scotland and grant maintained schools in England and Wales would receive an annual grant from central government. Also a board of management in self governing schools and the governing body in grant maintained schools would assume responsibility for every aspect of the school including the budget. If a school was to

adopt self governing status, however, the parents involved in the running of school would be assuming control over many areas where currently they have no or very little input. In contrast those schools which opt out of local authority control south of the border will have already have experience of operating under local management of schools. Specifically, they will have experience of financial and staffing delegation. Scottish schools cannot draw upon equivalent experiences.

Primary Testing

Only one paragraph was devoted to primary testing in the Self Governing Schools etc (Scotland) Act (Part III para.69). It empowered the Secretary of State to introduce regulations which would enable education authorities and self-governing schools to conduct testing of primary pupils and for the Scottish Examination Board (SEB) to prepare, distribute and monitor tests. The controversial nature of the Self-Governing Act, and in particular the controversy that surrounded the introduction of opting out, meant that primary testing received relatively little attention.

The Scottish legislation on primary testing differed from the English proposals. In Scotland only primary 4 and primary 7 would be tested on Maths and English (8 and 12 years old), whereas in England 7 and 11 years were to be tested. This was because of the later date of transfer to secondary school in Scotland. Children in Scotland would not sit tests at 14 and 16 years old.

It was clear that teachers and parents had doubts about introduction of testing (see chapter 7). The main fear was that schools would be compared on the basis of the results of the tests. Schools would then have to compete for pupils on the basis of these results. The intention was to use testing as a means to introduce market forces into the state sector. It was related to the wider vision Thatcherites had of a education system where the parent is the consumer and schools the producers which compete

to educate the child.

Financial

The significant initiative which was introduced in this area was not the result of legislation introduced by the Thatcher Governments. Rather, the decision to introduce financial delegation allowing schools more control over how resources are spent was taken voluntarily. Strathclyde Region was the first authority in Scotland to introduce a scheme of financial delegation. Other education authorities have now followed in Strathclyde's footsteps namely, Highland, Central and Dumfries and Galloway. Strathclyde have called their scheme Devolved Management of Resources (DMR). Strathclyde's Director of Education, Frank Pignatelli, openly stated that the scheme was introduced to pre-empt any that the Thatcher Government may have imposed on Scottish education authorities. In the words of Frank Pignatelli, DMR aims to:-

...maximise the potential benefits of decentralising control while minimising the dangers inherent in the mechanistic approach being adopted south of the border...When the Scottish Office come along with a proposals for local management of schools, I want to be able to say we have got a very detailed pilot scheme and (I) want to be allowed to develop it.⁴⁵

Strathclyde introduced DMR in 1990. Initially only six groups of pilot schools were included. Each group consisted of a secondary school and its feeder primaries. One group was taken from each of the six divisions in the authority. By the 1992 the scheme included roughly a quarter of the schools in the authority and by 1994 all school will have some degree of financial delegation.

Strathclyde were keen to emphasise the differences between DMR and LMS, the version of devolved management operating in England and Wales. DMR was specifically designed to avoid the problems which LEAs in England and Wales were

experiencing due to local management. The principle differences are set out in the table below.

Table 5.2 Comparison of LM and DMR

English Scheme: LMS	Strathclyde: DMR
Budget Delegated to school governors	Budget delegated to head teachers
75% of above sum is derived on the basis of pupil roll, weighted by age	No slavish use of pupil weighted formula
Schools must pay actual salaries from delegated budget.	Scheme based on average regional salary
Promoted staff costs must be paid from formula driven budget.	Separate provision to pay promoted teachers' salaries.
Non teaching posts at the discretion of governors.	Existing levels of non teaching staff used as baseline.
Very little money held back for contingencies.	Strathclyde as a large authority can offer realistic protection against emergencies
Recognition but no protection for socially deprived areas.	Additional money allocated to cater for diverse nature of region.
Fuel cost based on rigid formula	Fuel costs based primarily on real consumption with safeguards for exceptional circumstances.
English authorities only now beginning to computerise systems despite long pilot.	Administrative/Finance Officer and in some cases extra clerical staff as well as fully computerised system in place at start of pilot.

Source: AMA Report Education in Strathclyde 1991 p.16

It seems apparent that Strathclyde Education Authority deliberately set out to adapt the concept of financial delegation to the Scottish context. It is perhaps worth elaborating on some of the more important differences mentioned in the table above. Three main differences will be briefly discussed namely, the role of parents; the funding arrangements for schools and lastly, staffing.

Role of Parents

DMR and LMS envisage different roles for parents. The roles of the school board in Scotland and the governing body in England and Wales differ markedly. In the Strathclyde scheme the responsibility for the school's budget has been delegated to

the head teacher not to the school board. It seems likely that this decision was taken because of the doubts that the region had about the long term future of school boards. In England and Wales, it is the governing body which is responsible for expenditure incurred by the school related to staffing, capitation and premises. In addition, governing bodies now have powers to hire and fire staff, as well as decide upon promotions for teaching staff. In contrast to the situation in Strathclyde Region, many areas south of the border which, prior to the 1988 Education Reform Act, were the responsibility of the local authority, have been delegated to schools.

There is a school of thought amongst commentators on Thatcherite education policy which stresses the essentially political nature of financial delegation. The implications which the policy of local management have for the role of parents have also been interpreted in a political manner. Mike Bottery has noted that the policy of local management which attempts to get parents more involved in the running of schools "is a standard one of free market theorists."⁴⁶ The motivation behind the policy was to increase the involvement and responsibility of parents which would in turn enhance the democratic control over the education system. Arguing along similar lines Stephen Ball claims of LMS that "in strict Hayekian fashion the role of parent is shifted from that of ratepayer to that of client."⁴⁷ Similar sentiments were expressed by the historian, Brian Simon. He notes that the policy of LM, and financial delegation in general, was introduced by the Thatcher Government with the intention of creating a market in the education system.⁴⁸ The extension of parental powers was an essential component in achieving that end:-

To make a reality of this market, to enhance the power of the consumer, the Education Act included a set of sections designed to enhance the reality of parental choice.⁴⁹

DMR does not enhance the role of parents to the same extent as LMS has done. If Strathclyde Region had introduced a scheme of financial delegation which devolved budgetary matters to school boards rather than to head teachers, then the authority

would have been undermining its own powers. One consequence of LM has been to reduce the influence which local authorities have in the running of schools under their control. There has been a shift in the balance of power away from the LEAs towards parents or "consumers." Given Strathclyde's own interest in maintaining its position in the education system, it would have been surprising if the education authority had introduced reforms which would ultimately undermine its own position.

Funding Arrangements for Schools

A major difference in the way schools are funded under DMR and LMS derives from the latter's use of formula funding. This system of funding has been applied to all LMS schools regardless of size and extent of financial delegation. South of the border at least 75% of a school's budget is determined by the number of pupils. Each pupil, for the purpose of the formula is then weighted according to age groups. In 1993 this percentage is set to increase to 85%. LEAs do have some room for manoeuvre in determining the formula which is to be applied to schools under their control. They can, for instance, decide the weighting allotted to each age group. Typically, it is the oldest pupils who attract the most money under the weighing system. The LEA must, however, devise its formula in the knowledge that it must be approved by the DFE.

The Thatcher Government claimed that the pupil-driven element of formula funding would give "schools...a clear incentive to attract and retain pupils."⁵⁰ The funding arrangement introduced in the 1988 Education Reform Act, together with the parental choice legislation which introduced open enrolment, has created a competitive environment in the comprehensive schooling system in England and Wales. Schools now have financial reasons for competing with each other for pupils. From the research he has conducted into the repercussions which the policy of LMS, Stephen Ball has concluded that:-

...in some areas schooling will become a cut throat business as schools with spare capacity attempt to market their services in direct competition with one another. But clearly the DES are expecting that some schools will not survive in the market place. In effect 'the weak will go to the wall', some schools will lose numbers to the extent that they will be no longer viable and will close. Exactly the same principle which operated in the first term of the Conservative Government with regard to British manufacturing industry will be applied to schools.⁵¹

The funding arrangements which were set up by Strathclyde Education Authority for those schools with DMR were distinct from those being applied to schools in England and Wales. Strathclyde made only limited use of the notion of weighting pupils according to age and distributing funds accordingly. Moreover resources did not follow the pupils to the same extent as under the schemes of LM drawn up by authorities south of the border. This diluted the effect of financial delegation in the education system. Although those schools in Strathclyde included in the DMR pilot did not operate to the same extent in a business-like fashion, Pamela Munn maintains that there is an argument that "devolved management ...provides the opportunity for schools and colleges to sink or swim by their own efforts."⁵²

What Strathclyde Education Authority did was to establish a far less rigid formula for funding schools. Unlike the situation south of the border, a school's formula allocation was not non-negotiable. Schools are free to petition the authority, through the Divisional Officer, if they consider their formula allocation to be unfair. In response to such petitions the Education Authority may then amend the school's formula allocation. Another unique feature of Strathclyde's formula is that it has diverted extra resources into "Areas of Priority Treatment." Schools in these areas receive extra staff and additional supplies allowances.

It would be misleading to assess the impact that formula funding has had for schools in England and Wales in isolation. This initiative was one component of the policy of local management which was introduced in the 1988 Education Reform. In this Act, the Thatcher Government explicitly passed a series of ideologically

motivated policies. Taken together these policies, which included opting out and LMS, fundamentally altered the nature of the comprehensive schooling system in England and Wales. The Thatcher Government was intent on restructuring the system of comprehensive schooling. This process of restructuring, although informed by the same ideological principles which were evident in the 1988 Education Reform Act, did not follow exactly the same path in Scotland. Specifically, the Thatcher Government did not introduce an initiative equivalent to the policy of local management in Scotland. One can only speculate why this was the case. One possibility is that it was due to the fact that school boards were only introduced in 1988 in Scotland. However, it is unlikely that Strathclyde would have introduced a scheme of financial delegation if the Thatcher Government had not introduced LMS in the 1988 Education Reform Act.

Staffing

The final area of major difference between DMR and LMS concerns the issue of staffing. One of the main criticisms made of the LM schemes is the basis on which schools receive funding for teaching staff. The Thatcher Government stipulated that the amount schools receive to cover teaching costs should be calculated from the average cost of teachers' salaries in an authority rather than the actual cost. As a result those schools with more experienced staff are unlikely to receive sufficient funds to cover the actual teaching costs. Thus, those schools in socially deprived areas which may have received extra staff would be disadvantaged because the formula makes no provision for such circumstances.

Strathclyde Education Authority deliberately set out to try to avoid the problems that LEAs encountered in relation to the funding of teaching staff in schools. Under DMR promoted posts are a separate charge to the authority. Thus schools do not benefit financially from appointing an unpromoted teacher to a senior post. Schools

also only have to pay the authority an average charge for each teacher.

Conclusion

The agenda for educational change under the Thatcher Governments arose from the perceived need by Thatcherites to break down the post war social democratic consensus. The Thatcher Governments attempted to overcome what they regarded as the dominance of the producer interests in the education system. This primarily meant reducing the role which teachers had in the education service. The corporatist structures which had developed in the post war years in the education system were to be dismantled. The local authorities were also targeted by the Thatcher Governments. The post war objective of establishing a comprehensive and interdependent system of schooling was replaced with the Thatcherite objective of creating a differential competitive system where schools are semi-autonomous institutions. The education policies pursued by the Thatcher Governments were informed by the ideas of the New Right. Within Thatcherite education policy it is possible to identify an ideological dimension. If one looks at what was arguably the most ideological piece of educational legislation introduced by the Thatcher Government, namely the 1988 Education Reform Act, it is possible not only to identify policies which are associated with New Right free market thinking but also policies which encapsulate the beliefs of traditional Conservatism.

Many of the most controversial policies introduced by the Thatcher Governments were designed to enhance the role of parents in schools. Parental choice legislation, the School Boards Act and the Self Governing Schools etc (Scotland) Act would, if fully implemented, redefine the role which parents had in the Scottish education system. The problem which faced the Thatcher Governments was that they could not force parents to exercise their new rights. The next section examines the reactions of teachers and parents to Thatcherite education policy and their attitudes to the Scottish education system.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

- ¹ Walford, G. (1990) *Privatisation and Privilege* p.79
- ² Lawton, D. (1992) *Education and Politics: Conflict or Consensus ?* p.84
- ³ Ball, S.J. (1990a) *Politics and Policy-Making in Education: An Exploration in Policy Sociology* p.61
- ⁴ Bash, L. (1989) 'Education Goes to Market' in Bash, L. and Coulby, D. (eds) *The Education Reform Act: Competition and Control* p.22
- ⁵ Knight, C. (1990) *The Making of Tory Education Policy in Post-War Britain* p.137
- ⁶ *Ibid* p.146
- ⁷ *Ibid* p.141 and Lawton, D. *op. cit.*, p.39
- ⁸ *Ibid* p.40
- ⁹ Jonathan, R. (1989) 'Choice and Control in Education: Parental Rights and Social Justice' *British Journal of Educational Studies* vol.37 p.326
- ¹⁰ McPherson, A. (1989) 'Social and Political Aspects of Devolved Management of Scottish Secondary Schools' *Scottish Educational Review* Vol.21 p.89
- ¹¹ Dale, R. (1983) 'Thatcherism and Education' in Ahier, J. and Flude, M. (eds.) *Contemporary Education Policy* p.162
- ¹² *Ibid* p.163
- ¹³ Ranson, S. (1990) 'From 1944 to 1988: Education, Citizenship and Democracy' in Flude, M. and Hammer, M. (eds.) *The Education Reform Act 1988: Its Origins and Implications* p.10
- ¹⁴ Gray, J., McPherson, A. and Raffe, D. (1983) *Reconstructions of Secondary Education: Theory, Myth and Practice Since the War* p.232
- ¹⁵ Quoted in McPherson, A. and Raab, C. (1988) *Governing Education* pp.379-380
- ¹⁶ Thatcher, M. (1977) *Let Our Children Grow Tall: Selected Speeches 1975-1977* p.35-36
- ¹⁷ Paterson, H.M. (1983) 'Incubus and Ideology: The Development of Secondary Schooling, 1900-1939' in Humes, W.M. and Paterson, H.M. (eds.) *Scottish Culture and Scottish Education 1800-1980* p.205
- ¹⁸ Woods, R (1981) 'Margaret Thatcher and Secondary Reorganisation 1970-1974' *Journal of Education Management and History* vol. 13 p. 54
- ¹⁹ Ball, S.J. *op. cit.*, p.61
- ²⁰ *Parliamentary Debates*, 17th May 1971 cols. 66-72
- ²¹ There is now an extensive literature on the origins and impact of the 1988 Education Reform Act. Rao, N. (1990) *Education Change and Local Government: The Impact of the Education Reform Act* and Maclure, S. (1992) *Education Reformed: A Guide to the Education Reform Act* are good starting points. For a detailed account of the origins of the Act see Simon, B. (1990) *Education and the Social Order 1940-1990* chapters 10 and 11. Chitty, C. (1989) *Towards A New Education System: The Victory of the New Right ?* also examines the origins of the Act. One of the most informative accounts of the impact of the Act is Bowe, R., Ball, S. and Gold, A. (1992) *Reforming Education and Changing Schools: Case Studies in Policy Sociology*.

-
- 22 Ball, S. J (1990b) *Markets, Morality and Equality* p.4
- 23 Ball, S.J. *op. cit.*, p.63
- 24 Walford, G. (1988) 'The Scottish Assisted Places Scheme: a Comparative Study of the Origins, Nature and Practice of the APSs in Scotland, England and Wales' *Journal of Education Policy* vol.33 p.147
- 25 *Ibid*
- 26 Walford, G. (1990) *op. cit.*, p.72
- 27 McPherson, A, *op. cit.*, p.92
- 28 *The Conservative Election Manifesto 1979* p.7
- 29 Adler, M. et al (1989) *Parental Choice and Education Policy* p.50
- 30 *Ibid*
- 31 *Ibid* p.51
- 32 *Ibid* p.220
- 33 *Ibid* pp.39-40
- 34 McPherson, A. and Willms, D. (1987) 'Equalisation and Improvement : Some Effects of Comprehensive Reorganisation' *Sociology* vol.21 p.509
- 35 Adler, M., Petch, A. and Tweedie, J. (1987) 'The Origins and Impact of the Parents' Charter' in McCrone, D. (ed.) *Scottish Government Yearbook 1987* p.304
- 36 *Ibid*
- 37 *Ibid*
- 38 *Ibid*
- 39 *The Conservative Election Manifesto 1987: The Next Moves Forward* pp.18-19
- 40 *Ibid*
- 41 Fisher, A. (1988) 'The Day the Ceiling Crashed to the Floor' *Forum* Vol.30 p.78
- 42 Pickard, W. (1988) 'Curriculum and Assessment in Scotland: The Political Context' *Scottish Educational Review* Vol.20 p.86
- 43 Quoted in Walford, G. *op. cit.*, p.96
- 44 *Times Educational Supplement* (1989) 'Schools to Opt-out' 29th October
- 45 *Independent* (1990) 'Scotland Budget for Changes in Funding' 21st June
- 46 Bottery, M. (1992) *The Ethics of Educational Management* p.106
- 47 Ball, S.J. (1990b) *op. cit.*, p.19
- 48 Simon, B. (1992) *What Future for Education ?* p.146

⁴⁹ *Ibid* p.152

⁵⁰ DES (1988) *Education Reform Act: Local Management of Schools Circular 7/88* para. 105

⁵¹ Ball, S.J. *op. cit.*, p.9

⁵² Munn, P. (1992) 'Devolved Management of Schools and FE Colleges: A Victory for the Producer Over the Consumer ?' in Paterson, L and McCrone, D. (eds.) *Scottish Government Yearbook 1992* p.144

PART 3 Reactions to Thatcherite Education Policy

CHAPTER 6

A STUDY OF HEAD TEACHER AND TEACHER ATTITUDES TO THATCHERITE EDUCATION POLICY IN SCOTLAND: METHODOLOGICAL PROCEDURES

Introduction

This chapter outlines the methods used to examine the reactions of head teachers and teachers to Thatcherite education policy and, more generally, the attitudes of these professionals towards the Scottish education system. Mention is also made of the approach adopted in the analysis of parental reaction to Thatcherite education policy. The chapter does not discuss the broader methodological issues of the concepts and hypothesis which were articulated in the first part of the thesis. Rather, it sets out to explain and reflect upon the methodological approaches which were used in the fieldwork.

The question which researchers must ask themselves before conducting research is what is it meant to find out? Once the researcher has answered this question, s/he will have a clearer idea of what are the best research methods to employ. The chapter, therefore, opens with a discussion of the aims of the fieldwork in relation to the first part of the thesis. The discussion will then move to the location of fieldwork. The selection criteria employed will also be examined. The third section of the chapter outlines the focus of the case study and discusses the limitations of the methodological approaches which were used. The penultimate section outlines the data which were used in the analysis of parental reaction to Thatcherite education policy. The chapter concludes with a discussion of some of the difficulties of conducting research into Thatcherite education policy in Scotland.

Aims of Fieldwork

The identification of research questions and hypotheses enables the researcher to focus his/her effort; in other words, it should allow the researcher to set the limits of the

research. The main purpose of the fieldwork was to pursue empirically the research questions and hypotheses examined in the first part of the thesis. This process involved testing the validity of the questions and hypotheses which had been formulated.

The fieldwork had four broad aims. At the macro-level it sought to analyse the implications of Thatcherite statecraft in Scotland in a specific policy area namely, education. The intentions were to identify the kind of problems which the Thatcher Government experienced in implementing education policies in Scotland, whether these problems were in any way unique to the Thatcher Governments, and if so in what way? The fieldwork sought to establish the extent to which the education policies pursued by the Thatcher Government after 1987 were seen to represent a distinct break from those pursued by previous Conservative Governments.

The second aim was to examine what reaction, if any, there had been to Thatcherite education policy amongst educational professionals in Scotland. In an earlier chapter it was argued that the Thatcher Government through its later education policies had sought to advance certain ideologically driven principles. Given that one of the most distinctive aspects of Scottish civil society is the education system, what implications, if any, did the introduction of such principles have for the implementation of education policy in Scotland? The focus of the fieldwork was therefore upon education policy and how it had been implemented by the Thatcher Government in Scotland.

The perceptions that teachers have of policy will influence the extent to which policy objectives are achieved. Despite the attempts of the Thatcher Governments to marginalise the position that teachers have in the policy process, they continue to have an important role. Raab has argued that "partnership in education has also included teachers." They are partners in three different respects:-

...as ... part of the process of policy implementation; as individuals whose practices aggregate to become policy; and as actors in organisations and in policy networks that represent a professional interest in the policy process.¹

The purpose of the fieldwork was not to evaluate the actual effect Thatcherite education policy had on Scottish schools; rather it sought to monitor perceptions. The objective was to gain an understanding of how teachers regarded Thatcherite education policy. Both teachers and head teachers participated in the fieldwork. The fieldwork was attitudinal and concentrated on how teachers and head teachers perceived Thatcherite education policy.

This leads into the third aim. This was to assess the extent to which the distinctive traditions and myths which allegedly pervade the Scottish education system have any contemporary relevance for head teachers and teachers. It would then be possible to assess the significance teachers' reactions had for the policy process. It was decided that teachers and head teachers would not be asked directly about the myths and traditions which inform the Scottish education system. The intention was to assess the extent to which without prompting these myths and traditions informed their arguments about Thatcherite education policy.

The fourth aim was to explore the implications of the approach by the Thatcher Government in education policy for the policy process in Scotland. This involved considering the extent to which Thatcherite education policy was "successfully" implemented in Scotland? The obstacles faced by the Thatcher Government were of particular interest. In common with any government, the Thatcher Government had to deal with distinctive Scottish institutions and traditions. The research was directed at determining the extent to which these were mobilised against the Thatcher Government and more specifically the education policies that it introduced.

The next step was to decide how best to operationalise these aims and decide where the fieldwork was to be based. This process was influenced by the kind of methodology which was envisaged. At an early stage it was decided that the research should use both qualitative and quantitative procedures. Every methodological procedure has its limitations. Ideally, research should employ as many methods as possible. This was one reason why a mixed methodology was preferred. The intention was that the qualitative research could be used to complement and inform the quantitative research. Neither was considered the more important. Both provided invaluable data. The section below explains how the location of the fieldwork was decided.

Location of Fieldwork

Clearly, the location of the fieldwork was restricted by the constraints of time and resources. Such limitations meant that a sample drawn from all of the regions/ island authorities in Scotland would not be possible. It seemed sensible to concentrate the fieldwork in one of these regions. This would not only reduce the sample to a manageable size but it would also allow investigation of how a particular education authority had implemented Thatcherite education legislation. Moreover, this would lead into the wider issue of whether, as a consequence of Thatcherite education policy, the education authority had changed its approach to school management. Or it may be the case that there was no change in the role that the education authority envisaged for itself ? In other words is there any evidence of the education authority rethinking its approach to how education should be delivered ? To what extent has it taken on board the elements of Thatcherite education policy which were discussed in the previous chapter namely choice, financial and competition ?

Three criteria were used to determine which region would should be selected. The obvious one, which has already been mentioned, was that it should be fairly easy to

travel to. The second criterion was that the region should have a sufficiently diverse socio-economic structure. This would ensure that the sample did not favour, on the one hand, those schools which serve predominantly middle class areas and on the other hand those that are situated in relatively deprived areas. The third criterion was that the region should have a sufficiently large number of schools. It was important to ensure that there was diversity in the size of schools in the sample. With these criteria in mind the region chosen was Strathclyde. It might be useful at this stage to give some background information on Strathclyde Region.

Some Background Information on Strathclyde Education Authority

Strathclyde's scheme of devolved management has already been discussed in the previous chapter. The leading role that Strathclyde Education Authority had adopted on devolved management was another attraction of studying schools in that authority. However, other characteristics were also important in the choice, such as diverse socio-economic structure. Strathclyde Education Authority is the biggest in Western Europe. Almost half of the population of Scotland live in Strathclyde Region, some 2,400,000 people. The Region is divided into six geographical divisions: Argyll and Bute, Ayr, Lanark, Dunbarton, Renfrew and Glasgow. There about 200 secondary schools, 1,000 primary schools and 12 Further Education colleges. About a third of these schools are Roman Catholic. The remainder are non-denominational schools. Approximately 350,000 children attend schools under the Region's authority. The Council spends over half of its total budget on education.

It is important to recognise that Strathclyde Region is atypical in some ways. Firstly, as mentioned above, Strathclyde Education Authority is the largest in Western Europe. However, the fact that almost half of Scotland's population lives in the Region is important in assessing the extent to which the results of the fieldwork reflected what is happening in Scotland as a whole. Secondly, it is also worth noting that there is a very

strong commitment to the Labour Party amongst voters in the Region. At the last Regional elections in May 1990 the Labour Party polled 52.3% of the vote and won 90 of the 103 seats. Across the regions the party secured 42.7% of the vote.² Thirdly, in recent years the education service of Strathclyde Regional Council has undergone significant change. The catalyst for this change was the report commissioned by Strathclyde Education Department from Birmingham University's Institute of Local Government Studies (INLOGOV). The changes which resulted in response to the INLOGOV report did make Strathclyde untypical of Scottish Education Authorities. Strathclyde was taking the lead in adapting to the changing environment in the Scottish education system under the Thatcher Governments. One of arguments advanced within the Education Department in support of the changes which were being implemented in response to the INLOGOV report and specifically the introduction of Devolved Management of Resources (DMR) was that they were an attempt to pre-empt more prescriptive changes which the Government may introduce. Thus, if there was any truth to this argument the other education authorities would have to follow Strathclyde's example at a later date. This provided an interesting context in which to conduct the research. Moreover, we can rely upon a study of Strathclyde to inform our understanding of the politics of Scottish education generally.

The main finding of the INLOGOV report was that Strathclyde Education Authority was too large and unmanageable. Other criticisms made were that the education service was bureaucratic and lacked strategic management. The authors of the report recommended that the education service should be more responsive to local needs and concentrate on areas of strategic concern such as quality assurance. Further, the local authority should re-assess its role in the provision of education. The report stated:-

The challenge of the Education Department is to change its emphasis from administrator to managing the service. This our central conclusion.³

To achieve this end structural change would also be required. Five depute posts were created to enhance the managerial aspect of the education service namely, quality assurance; planning and resources; educational development; personnel and further education. The structural recommendations were part of the wider desire to change the culture that existed in Strathclyde Education Department. This process would involve redesigning the role of the education authority. There were references in the report to the enabling role which local authorities should adopt:-

The new local government strives to enable enterprise in community and economy.⁴

In the past, authorities had seen their role as that of the provider instead of an enabler. To achieve this change in role, it was argued, the education authority would have to change from administering the education service to managing it. In order to manage the education service, Strathclyde Region, would require a mission statement. One criticism made of the education department was that it lacked "...a clear statement of mission about what it is trying to achieve."⁵

It is worth noting that there were some similarities in the rhetoric of the INLOGOV report and the terminology of Thatcherite education policy. Specifically, references were made in the report to performance indicators, quality assurance and accountability. These principles were particularly evident in the 1988 Education Reform Act. Philip Drake, Depute Director of Education with responsibility for Quality Assurance was able to take some pride from the fact that Strathclyde Education Department was the first in Scotland to endorse quality assurance. He also showed an awareness that quality assurance was being pursued by the central authorities:-

Quality assurance is a new concept in education but we will become increasingly familiar with it. Strathclyde was the first authority in Scotland to adopt the theme...Significantly, a recent advert for posts in Her Majesty's Inspectorate listed quality assurance as an important element in the job specification.⁶

The INLOGOV report provided an indication there had been a shift to a managerial philosophy in Strathclyde's approach to education. This shift had also been apparent in education policies introduced by the Thatcher Government. Charles Raab noted that in recent education policy:-

The common culture now being sought is less the philosophy of education than a philosophy of education management.⁷

Similar arguments have been articulated by Stephen Ball. He maintains that under Thatcher Governments there had been a:-

...wholesale reworking of the framework of public debate within which education is talked about and assessed in this country. Notions like equality and opportunity have been replaced initially by standards and quality and more recently the ground has shifted again to efficiency and value for money.⁸

The decision by Strathclyde Education Department to implement most of the findings of the Birmingham Consultants was an indication that the policy agenda in Strathclyde incorporated some of the themes of Thatcherite education policy.

Focus of Fieldwork

The next stage in the fieldwork was to decide who was to participate in the research and how participants were to be selected. The potential area of research was massive. It was decided at an early stage that pupils and parents would not be included in the fieldwork. This decision was primarily taken to ensure that the amount of fieldwork planned would be feasible given the constraints of time and resources. Also, there had been no in-depth study of how teachers had reacted to Thatcherite education policy. The prospect of conducting a study which concentrated on teachers' attitudes seemed initially daunting in itself. A strategy had to be developed which would obtain the most desirable sample. It seemed sensible to conduct the research at school level. By focusing on individual schools it was possible to investigate how central government initiatives were interpreted and implemented at the "chalk face".

Some of the most radical legislation passed by the third Thatcher Government was aimed at schools and how they were run. The introduction of school boards and opting out marked a clear change in direction of education policy. The parental choice legislation which had been introduced in the early 1980s had arguably more of an impact on local authorities than teachers (see chapter 5). The ability of local authorities to control the intake of schools had been severely curtailed. The legislation that was passed during the third Thatcher administration continued to promote the role of parents in their child's schooling. The difference was that this legislation aimed at the professionals' role in schools just as much as at the position of the local authority. In light of this development, there was a need to investigate how the educational professionals at school level perceived Thatcherite education policy and specifically school boards and opting out.

One important reason, therefore, for studying the reactions of the professionals in schools was the attack that Thatcherism had launched on professionalism in general. The professional status of teachers and their role in the education service was something that the Thatcher Government attempted to challenge. Thatcherite education policy aimed to marginalise the position of teachers in the education service. There was a shift in decision-making processes from teachers to parents. This was almost inevitable for two reasons. Firstly, the enhanced role given to parents under Thatcherite education policy meant that teachers found their professional status challenged. Secondly, after 1987 the position of teachers in the policy process had been re-defined. This was a consequence of the Thatcher Government rejecting corporatist modes of decision-making educational policy making in Scotland which were evident in its early stages. Chapter 4 discusses in some detail this more consensual approach to education policy and specifically the role which teachers and the educational professionals in general had in the corporatist mode of decision-making.

Potentially, a study of how teachers reacted to Thatcherite education policy in Scotland could inform the analysis of the problems which the Thatcher Government experienced in the government of Scotland. However, assessing the extent to which teachers reacted to Thatcherite education policy in a manner that was distinctive to the Scottish context really requires gathering evidence from outwith Scotland also. The research, however, aimed to investigate the implementation of Thatcherite education policy in Scotland and in two policies specifically namely, school boards and opting out.

Selection of Schools

Very rarely are researchers able to include the whole population in their research. Selection criteria have to be imposed. There are various methods available to the researcher such as simple random sampling, stratified sampling and cluster sampling, each of which has its advantages and disadvantages. Given the size of the education authority in which the fieldwork was being conducted, it would be impossible to go to every school and involve every teacher and head teacher in the research. The starting point of the selection was the full population. A stratified random sample was used to select those schools which were to participate in the research. This method was chosen in preference to simple random sampling. The danger was that a simple random sample could produce an unrepresentative set of schools. For instance the sample may not include schools with rolls of under 800 or it may contain a disproportionately high number of schools located in relatively prosperous areas. If the latter occurred then the fieldwork would fail to give sufficient insight into how those schools in the poorer areas had reacted to recent reforms.

A series of selection criteria was imposed on the population to produce a sample. The first decision taken was to concentrate on secondary schools. Restricting the research to only secondary schools had both advantages and disadvantages. There were two

main advantages. The first was the research would be more focused and as a result it would be easier to concentrate on those aims outlined in the first section of the chapter. Secondly, it would be possible to conduct more in-depth analysis of the participant schools. If primary schools had been included in the sample the research would have probably had to concentrate on head teachers only rather than include teachers as well. It would also have been very difficult, given the constraints of time and resources, to conduct the fieldwork in both sectors. The obvious disadvantage was that it would not be possible from the fieldwork to draw any conclusions about how head teachers and teachers in primary schools had reacted to Thatcherite education policy.

The selection of schools was made with three factors in mind: the size of school, the catchment area of the school and whether the school was denominational or non denominational. The secondary schools in Strathclyde Education Authority were divided into two groups according to whether they were denominational or non denomination. In total 40 schools were chosen from the two groups in the same proportion to the whole population (see appendix 1). Approximately a third of the schools were denominational. The selection of schools was also informed by the other selection criteria. Efforts were made to ensure the sample contained schools in varying socio-economic contexts. In particular some schools, roughly a third of the sample, were selected because they were in Areas of Priority Treatment. The sample also included schools with a range of sizes. A third of the sample, 13 schools, had 800 or fewer pupils in 1990; 8 schools had between 800 and 1000 pupils; 12 schools between 1000 and 1200 pupils and 7 schools more than 1200 pupils.

A quarter of the schools which agreed to participate in the fieldwork were denominational (appendix 1). This was a slightly lower proportion than in the original sample. The fieldwork schools also came from diverse socio-economic areas and represented a range of the school sizes referred to above. The next section of the

chapter outlines the methods which were employed to obtain the data from teachers and head teachers. It also includes a discussion of how the data were analysed.

Head Teacher Interviews

The next stage of the fieldwork was to gain access to the selected schools. In an attempt to maximise the numbers of schools which would agree to participate in the fieldwork permission was first sought from Strathclyde Education Department. The Department stopped short of asking heads to participate. Rather, it made it clear that it had no objections to the research but left it to individual head teachers to decide whether or not to participate.

Head teachers in 29 of the 40 selected schools agreed to participate in the fieldwork. The interviews were conducted over a six month period. A list of the participating schools is given in appendix 1. The respondent schools were broadly representative of the original sample. Roughly a third were denominational schools. The schools also came from a mix of socio-economic areas.

It was decided to use qualitative methods in the research of head teachers' attitudes. Semi-structured interviews were conducted. There were two main reasons for deciding to use this approach. First, it was important to gain the trust of the head teacher. A crucial aspect of qualitative research is the relationship that develops between the researcher and the participant. Successful research requires a relationship that is based on trust. Conducting face to face interviews with the head teachers increased the likelihood of establishing such a relationship. Once contact had been made, heads would perhaps be more likely to agree to other research being carried out in their schools namely, a questionnaire to teachers (see below). The second reason was heads might be more forthcoming in their views in a face to face interview than in a questionnaire. It was also possible in an interview to investigate in greater depth the

views of head teachers. It was also decided that the interviews would be non-attributable. It was hoped that heads would then speak openly on often quite sensitive matters. After much thought it was decided not to tape the interviews. The intention was to create a research environment where heads were mostly likely to express openly their views of Thatcherite education policy in general and of Strathclyde Education Department in particular. At the start of each interview heads were asked whether they would agree to quotes being selected from the transcript without them editing it. Without exception those heads interviewed did not wish to edit the transcript. The decision not to ask heads to edit their transcripts was taken to avoid perhaps lengthy negotiation between the researcher and the interviewee.

Semi-structured interviews were chosen in order to facilitate comparisons between head teachers. Two policies were investigated in the interviews namely, school boards and opting out. There were two main reasons for concentrating on these policies. First, it was the Thatcher Government's intention that these policies would change significantly how comprehensive schools were run in Scotland. The introduction of school boards altered the nature of the relationship which existed between parents and the educational professionals. The opting out legislation was to enhance further the role that parents had in schooling. It was crucial for the Thatcher Government, if its education policies were to succeed, that it secured the support and active involvement of parents in its policies (see chapter 8). If the Government was to achieve its aim of re-structuring the Scottish comprehensive system the active involvement of parents in the running of schools would be required. This was why the school boards and opting out legislation were of extreme importance to the future of comprehensive education in Scotland. If parents were reluctant to step into the new role laid out for them in the school board and opting out legislation, then it seemed unlikely that the Thatcher Government would successfully implement its policies. For this reason, it was decided to concentrate on these two education policies of the Thatcher Government.

The time at which the policies became legislation was also important. The School Boards Act was passed in 1988 and the Self-Governing Schools Act in the following year. There was, therefore, the possibility of studying how these policies were being implemented at the school level shortly after they had passed on the statute book. The purpose of the interviews was not only to find out the attitudes that head teachers had to Thatcherite education policy but also their views on how it had been implemented in Scotland.

A copy of the interview schedule is included in appendix 2. The interviews were conducted over a six month period from October 1989 to February 1990. The interview schedule was not always strictly adhered to. Often heads wished to discuss developments which were of particular interest to them, but which lay outside the immediate remit of the interview, such as primary testing and DMR. Unfortunately heads were not asked for their subject area. However, this omission did not impede the analysis. The intention of the schedule was to serve as a reminder of the main themes being investigated. These are discussed below.

The head teacher interviews touched on four main themes. The first was the nature of parental participation in schools. The heads' views were sought on whether or not consultation had been adequate prior to the introduction of school boards legislation. Heads were also asked how involved parents should be in the running of schools. Another area of interest was how successful heads thought parents were in exercising their enhanced role. In light of the fact that Thatcherite education policy had allowed parents stronger rights than ever before, did heads feel that parents were exercising these rights? A number of questions were asked which related to this theme. For instance heads were asked to discuss their views on the inbuilt parental majority on

boards, and whether or not they supported the "floor" or the "ceiling" powers outlined in the SED consultative paper *School Management: A Consultation Paper*.

The third theme tackled was the professional status of the head and specifically how the role of the head had changed as a consequence of the School Boards (Scotland) Act 1988 and the Self Governing Schools Act 1989. Parents, through their representatives on boards, had an executive role in the running of the school. What implications did heads think that school boards would have for the way in which schools run ? Questions were asked which related to the powers of boards such as their ability to review the school's per capita allocation. One reason for investigating this theme was the emphasis which had been placed in myths and traditions which pervade the Scottish educational system on the professional status of teachers and head teachers.

The next step was to explore the role the board saw for itself. To what extent did the board, in the opinion of head teachers, exercise the powers available to it ? Did the board tend to delegate to the Head ? Was there any evidence of the board wishing to extend its powers ? Had the board, for example, shown an interest in the school opting out of local authority control. The final theme was community schooling. Insight into how heads viewed the state system of education was gained through the responses that they gave to questions on opting out.

By exploring these themes in the interviews it would be possible to answer the research questions posed in the first section of the chapter. Of particular interest was the language used by heads in their conversation about school boards and opting out. One aim of the fieldwork was to assess to what extent, if any, the Scottish educational traditions held sway in the educational community. This was borne in mind when the interview data were analysed. Was there any evidence of heads articulating their

arguments in the Scottish context ? An indication of this for example might be that they refer to the apparent lack of demand in Scotland for opting out.

As mentioned earlier, the interviews were not taped. Quotes were taken down in the interviews and notes were written up immediately after. The advantage of not recording the interviews was that heads would talk more freely about their school boards and the local authority. The interviews produced a substantial amount of data. The next task was to analyse this material. The analysis of the interview data was a process rather than a stage in the research. The approach was not dissimilar to that adopted by Stephen Ball in the qualitative research he conducted for his book *The Micropolitics of the School*. He explains:-

The mechanics of analysis involve a literal manipulation of the data. This is part of getting intimately familiar with the data. When working from documents, observation notes and interview transcripts the first stage of the process is familiarisation. The reading and re-reading of material in order to know what is what and where everything is. It is surprising how often, particularly with interviews, that reading the transcripts draws attention to issues that passed by almost unnoticed in the interview itself.⁸

What happened in this analysis of the text was that sections of text were associated with certain themes such as anglicisation and professionalism. Once the process of familiarisation was complete it became apparent that often the comments made by head teachers were either implicitly or explicitly "nationalist," in the sense that the comments were set in the Scottish context. Chapter 7 explores these comments and the rest of the fieldwork in greater depth.

Survey of Teachers' Attitudes to Thatcherite Education Policy

The second component of the fieldwork was a survey of teacher opinions. In common with the head teacher interviews, the intention was to assess perceptions that teachers had of Thatcherite education policy, and in particular, their attitudes to opting out and school boards. This section of the chapter is divided into three parts. The first section

examines the composition and selection of the sample. The second explains the structure of the survey and finally the analysis of the questionnaire data is discussed.

Selection of Survey Sample

The question of which teachers should participate in the survey was a difficult one to resolve. There were basically two possibilities. Either the questionnaires could be sent to schools other than those which were to be visited to interview the head teacher, or they could be distributed in those schools where interviews had been conducted. The first was ruled out on the grounds that the response rate would probably be poor. The latter was in fact chosen for two reasons. Firstly, before questionnaires could be distributed the approval of head teachers would be necessary. Their approval was more likely to be given if they had already had contact with the researcher. The assumption was that sending questionnaires to the schools where the head had been interviewed would increase the chances of his agreeing to co-operate in the teacher survey. This assumption was justified: of those heads interviewed, none refused to allow the distribution of the questionnaire. Indeed, many recommended that their staff should complete the questionnaire.

Heads were asked to pass the questionnaires on to teachers for completion. A further selection criterion had to be applied to reduce the number of teachers participating in the research. If every member of the teaching staff in the selected schools were included in the sample, it would be too large. The sample would have included over a thousand teachers. One possibility was to pass a number of questionnaires to the head teacher and ask him to distribute them randomly amongst the teaching staff. The main drawback of this approach was the head teacher might choose the teachers purposely rather than select them randomly. To get round this problem it was decided to ask only principal teachers to complete the questionnaire. The assumption was that this would reduce the possibility of heads selecting the respondents. It also reduced the population

size. In addition, by including only principal teachers it would be possible to include teachers from a range of subject areas.⁹ In total, 317 teachers were selected and 136 responded.¹⁰ This gave a response rate of 43%. Questionnaires were returned from 9 schools with a number on roll of 800 or less pupils; 8 schools with between 801 and 1000 pupils; 5 schools with between 1001 and 1200 pupils; and 7 schools with more than 1201 pupils.

It should be noted that there was some selection bias in the sample of schools participating in the survey because of head teachers. Only those schools where the head had agreed to be interviewed were included in the sample. As mentioned above, a quarter of the schools which agreed to participate were denominational. This was slightly less than the proportion of denominational schools included in the original sample. Also the proportion of schools in APT was slightly less than the proportion included in the original sample. 22% of schools in the original sample were located in APTs compared with 17% of those schools which participated in the fieldwork.

Heads were asked to distribute the questionnaires to teachers and return the completed ones in a pre-paid envelope. They were not always diligent in returning the questionnaires. In some instances all that was required was a follow-up telephone call to the head. Table 6.1 compares the characteristics of the returns with the known characteristics of the sample. The response rate of teachers in schools located in APTs was higher than those teachers in schools not located in APTs. 60% of teachers in the former returned questionnaires compared with 40% of teachers in the latter. The higher response rate of teachers in APT schools would compensate to some extent for their under-representation in survey sample because of selection bias. Teachers in denominational schools had a slightly higher response rate than their colleagues in the non denominational sector. This also compensated to some extent their under-representation in the sample due to selection bias. Analysis of the responses in terms of

size of school indicates that those schools with between 1001 and 1200 pupils were under-represented in the sample. However, the returns are spread across schools of differing sizes.

Table 6.1 Analysis of Response Bias

Selection Criteria	Total in Sample	Number Returned	Response Rate
Socio-Economic Factor			
Located in APT	46	28	61%
Not in APT	271	108	40%
Religious Affiliation			
Denominational	58	28	48%
Non Denominational	259	108	42%
Size of School			
800 pupils or less	72	35	49%
801-1000 pupils	80	34	43%
1001-1200 pupils	60	18	30%
1201 pupils or more	105	49	47%

Structure of Questionnaire

The first step was to decide what format the survey should take. It was important that the structure of the questionnaire was compatible with the research aims. Although it was important to collect some factual information from the respondents, this was not the main propose of the survey. Rather, the survey concentrated on asking respondents their perceptions of Thatcherite education policy. A decision was taken to include only a few factual questions. Appendix 4 includes a copy of the questionnaire sent to teachers. The respondents were, for example, asked whether they had been members of a school council or were currently members of a school board. Three types of quantitative data were collected from the survey. First, as already indicated, some background information was sought. In retrospect data should also have been collected

on gender. However, this omission did not impede the analysis. Secondly, a number of closed questions asked teachers their views on a range of issues related to school boards and opting out. The final type of data was that collected from open questions.

In order to achieve the research aims it was important not only to gather data on the perceptions of teachers, but to obtain if possible, an insight into what shapes these perceptions. A questionnaire that was composed entirely of closed questions such as "do you approve or disapprove of school boards", would only be of limited value in this respect. What was required were comments on a range of issues. To overcome this difficulty it was decided to use some questions as prompts. After some closed questions, respondents were asked for additional comments. The intention was that the respondent would give fuller responses if, after specific questions, additional comments were requested. In addition a number of wholly open questions were included.

The questions asked in the survey were related to the same themes which were explored in the head teacher interviews namely: parental participation; functions of school boards; professional status of teachers and community schooling. This would allow comparisons to be made between the attitudes of head teachers and teachers. The questionnaire was divided into eight main sections with questions on the membership of school boards; staff relations; powers of school boards; consultation with parents; function of boards; extent of consultation prior to legislation; opting out and effects of school boards and opting out. A number of questions was asked in each of these sections.

Analysis of Survey Data

Different methodological issues were encountered in the analysis of the survey data from those met in the process of analysing the interview data. In particular, having

several types of data presented problems when it came to analysing it. The survey, as mentioned above, yielded three types of data namely, the responses given to the closed questions; the written comments offered by teachers in response to the additional comments prompt; and lastly the replies to the open questions which were not preceded by closed questions.

The analysis of the data gathered from the closed questions was relatively straight forward. Here, the SPSS program was used. It was possible to do complex statistical analysis of the data without too much difficulty using the SPSS package. It would also have been possible to categorise the written comments and use the SPSS program to analyse them. This process, however, would restrict the analysis to a quantitative approach.

The large number of comments, over five hundred in total, meant that it would have been very difficult to do anything other than very rudimentary analysis by simply scanning the comments given in the questionnaires. The solution was to use a text retrieval program in the analysis of the written comments.

Text retrieval programs, unlike SPSS, are used less commonly by social scientists. These programs allow the researcher to search for specific words or key phrases in the text. The searches can become quite sophisticated. The ORACLE program which was used to analyse teacher comments was able to do proximity searching. Instead of calling up every section of the text that contained the words specified by the user it only retrieved those sections where the words were used within a distance prescribed by the user. For instance it was possible to search for the words Thatcherite and opting out where they appeared within five words of each other. This increased the likelihood that the words were mentioned in the same context in the text retrieved.

Prior to entering the written comments to the ORACLE programme, the comments were categorised according to a series of concepts such as professionalism, Thatcherism, anglicisation. This process involved adding in brackets after each comment the concept or concepts it referred to. Thus, the reading process conducted in the analysis of the interview transcripts also played a part in the analysis of the survey data (see above). It was therefore possible to search for quotes conveying the same concepts in addition to key words within the comments. The text retrieval and SPSS programs were used in conjunction. The advantage of doing this was that the findings yielded by the statistical analysis of the data could be substantiated by quotes found by using the text retrieval package.

The approach adopted in the analysis of the qualitative data yielded from the survey was different from the one employed in the analysis of the interview data. There is no one way of analysing qualitative data. The text retrieval package perhaps lends itself more easily to the analysis of qualitative data taken from surveys. What the package cannot do is search for concepts. For instance a teacher may have referred to school boards being irrelevant to the education system in Scotland. Although the teacher in this example did not explicitly refer to anglicisation this is one of the concepts that is being articulated. The researcher, therefore, still has to go through the process of familiarisation and classifying the comments. The advantage of a text retrieval package is that it allows the researcher to access without any great difficulty text on related subjects.

Parental Reactions to Thatcherite Education Policy

The final component of the case study was parental attitudes to Thatcherite education policy. Chapter 8 explores how parents in Scotland reacted to Thatcherite education policy and what implications their reactions had for policy-making. One of the main questions asked in the chapter is to what extent parents in Scotland supported the

education policies introduced by the Thatcher Governments. At an early stage of the research it was decided to concentrate only on the educational professionals in schools. This was partly because to include parents in the fieldwork would have had implications for the analysis of teachers' and head teachers' opinions. It would not have been possible to conduct such an extensive analysis of the professionals' attitudes. The decision was also taken partly because research was being undertaken by other researchers into parental reactions to Thatcherite education policy. It seemed sensible therefore to make use of existing research on parental attitudes and concentrate on an area where little research had been conducted.

The chapter draws together available research on parental attitudes to school boards and opting out. Three studies were particularly informative in this respect. The first was the *Talking About Schools* survey of parent attitudes conducted on behalf of the SED, by the MVA Consultancy. The data were analysed by a team of researchers led by John MacBeath at Jordanhill College of Education. It consisted of a survey of 3,351 parents throughout Scotland. In addition, some 100 in-depth interviews with parents were carried out. This survey has been criticised for being uncritical of the Government education policies. The remit given by the SED to the MVA Consistency was to:-

1. ascertain parents experience of, and opinion on, the education provided by schools their children attend.
2. obtain parents' views on how the provision and manner of delivery of education could be improved.¹¹

The findings of the survey were published in four reports namely, *What Makes a Good School ? ; Teacher and Head Teacher; Relationship between Home and School and Learning and Teaching*. A wide range of themes was investigated in the survey including parents' perceptions of the relationship between the home and school; the role of teachers and school and discipline.

The second survey that the chapter draws upon is research conducted by the Scottish Centre For Research in Education (SCRE). This was the first study of school boards. The project, commissioned by Dumfries and Galloway Education Authority, involved a study of seven pilot boards set up by the Region prior to the passing of the 1988 School Boards (Scotland) Act. The research team investigated the extent to which school boards had changed the relationships between parents and the professionals. The survey therefore provided some insight into the impact that school boards had on the parental community.

The last major survey referred to was conducted by the pressure group, Parents' Coalition. This survey has been criticised for being too critical of Government policy. However, their evidence is noteworthy because the group conducted the largest survey to date of parental attitudes in Scotland to national testing. It conducted a small scale survey of parental attitudes towards school boards in 1989 and again in 1991. Of particular concern were the functions that boards had adopted, and the relationship that boards had with the wider parental community. Questionnaires were sent to the parents of the 120,000 children in primary 4 and primary 7. In total replies were received from 60,000 parents. The responses were roughly balanced between the two stages.

In addition to the surveys mentioned above, other research was utilised including data from MORI opinion polls. The obvious limitation of using only existing research was that often it was not directly relevant to the analysis. There was, however, sufficient material to judge how parents in Scotland had reacted to Thatcherite education policy.

Some Problems in Conducting Research Into Thatcherite Education Policy In Scotland.

The case study concentrated on the implementation of education policy in Scotland and on two policies in particular namely, school boards and opting out. The fieldwork was

very much a "bottom up" analysis of education policy. The intention was to analyse the perceptions teachers and head teachers had of Thatcherite education policy. The nature of the research was influenced by the relatively new development in education studies of policy sociology. Jenny Ozga has noted that until recently the politics of education had been a neglected area of research.¹² A similar argument has been articulated by Charles Raab. He maintains that political science has neglected education as an area of policy studies.¹³

One of the problems encountered in the case study was that there had been very few systematic studies of education policy under the Thatcher Governments by political scientists. The work conducted by Stephen Ball, Clyde Chitty and Brian Simon amongst others did, however, have a strong political dimension.¹⁴ In the opening paragraph of his book, *Politics and Policy Making in Education: Explorations in Policy Sociology*, Ball makes the political nature of the analysis explicit:-

...Policies project images of an ideal society...to a great extent I am concerned here to relate contemporary education policy to the kind of ideal society projected by Thatcherism. (In terms of social and economic policy I take Thatcherism to be a specific and stable ideological system). *author's brackets*¹⁵

In Scotland, despite the importance that education has for national identity, the study of contemporary education policy has also been neglected by political scientists. One of the few works is by Andrew McPherson and Charles Raab.¹⁶ In their book *Governing Education* the analysis does not extend to the education policies pursued by the Thatcher Government. There have been several articles in the Scottish Government Yearbook and the Scottish Educational Review which have examined the politics of educational reform in the 1980s.¹⁷

At one level the apparent lack of research on the politics of education in Scotland presented a practical problem. There have been relatively few attempts to incorporate the study of education policies in Scotland into the literature of political science. This

was perhaps surprising given the ideological dimension to Thatcherite education policy. The research conducted by Stephen Ball, Clyde Chitty, Denis Lawton, Roger Dale and Geoffrey Walford amongst others has concentrated on the politics of education change in England and Wales under the Thatcher Governments. The passing of the 1988 Education Reform Act led to a growth of interest in the politics of Thatcherite education policy in England and Wales. This did not happen to the same extent north of the border. There are, however, some notable exceptions. For instance, the work conducted by Adler et al in parental choice and education policy in Scotland assessed the implementation of parental choice legislation and the impact that this legislation had on the comprehensive system in Scotland. One of the issues addressed in research by Colin Bell and David Raffe on the implementation of TVEI in Scotland was the extent to which the "Scottish dimension" had shaped that particular policy. The researchers claim that Manpower Services Commission, which was funding the research, was uncomfortable with this aspect of the research and "one that the MSC politically and organisationally found hard to accommodate."¹⁸ It seemed apparent that there a need to explore how Thatcherite education policy had been implemented in Scotland and the repercussions this might have for the government of Scotland. Moreover, there was also a need to try to understand the implications which the continued existence of a distinctive Scottish education system had for policy-making. In what ways, if any, was the implementation of education policy distinctive in Scotland?

NOTES AND REFERENCES

¹ Raab, C.D. (1992) 'Talking Networks Seriously: Education Policy in Britain' *European Journal of Political Research* vol.21 p.86-87

² The complete results for Strathclyde were Labour 52.3%; Conservative 16.6%; SNP 21.3%; SLD 5.8%; Green 2.0%; Ind 1.8%; Others 0.3%. The Labour Party's second best result was in Central Region where it polled 45.8% of the vote.

³ INLOGOV (1991) *A Report on the Education Department in Strathclyde Region* p.15

⁴ *Ibid* p.11

⁵ *Ibid*

-
- ⁶ Drake, P. (1992) 'Quality Assurance' *Times Education Supplement* 6th March
- ⁷ Raab, C. D. (1992) Parents and Schools: What Role for Education Authorities ? ' Munn, P (ed) *Parents and Schools: Customers, Managers or Partners ?* p.18
- ⁸ Ball, S. J. (1990) *Markets, Morality and Equality* Hillcole Group Paper 5 p.21
- ⁸ Ball, S. J. (1991) 'Power, Conflict and Micropolitics' Walford, G. (ed) *Doing Education Research* p.182
- ⁹ Insufficient data were provided by respondents to the question which asked "Of which department are you Principal teachers ?" In total 55 teachers, 40%, did not answer this question. However, the valid cases indicate that a wide range of departments were included in the survey. The department represented are Home Economics (7); Modern Studies (4); History (6); Physics (7); Physical Education (3); Biology (4); English (4); Business Studies (7); Geography (4); Guidance (5); Technical Education (2); Modern Languages (8); Learning Support (3); Chemistry (2); Mathematics (7); Art (2); Speech and Drama (1); Music (2); Religious Education (2); Computing (1)
- ¹⁰ The number of questionnaires distributed to schools varied according to the size of the school. Those schools with 800 or less pupils received 8 questionnaires; between 801 and 1000 pupils 10 questionnaires; between 1001 and 1200 pupils 12 questionnaires and over 1200 pupils 15 questionnaires.
- ¹¹ MacBeath et al (1991) *Talking About Schools: Main Findings* p.2
- ¹² Ozga, J. (1987) 'Studying Education Policy through the Lives of Policy-Makers: An Attempt to Close the Macro-micro gap' Walker, S. and Barton, L. (eds) *Changing Policies, Changing Teachers: New Directions for Schooling* p.138
- ¹³ Raab, C. D. (1992) *Where Are We Now: Some Reflections on the Sociology of Education Policy* p.2
- ¹⁴ Ball, S.J Simon, B. Chitty, C. have all written on the political dimension of Thatcherite education policy.
- ¹⁵ Ball, S.J. (1990) *Politics and Policy-Making in Education: Explorations in Policy Sociology* p.3
- ¹⁶ McPherson, A. and Raab, C.D. (1988) *Governing Education: A Sociology of Education Policy Since 1945.*
- ¹⁷ See for instance Adler, M., Petch, A. and Tweedie, J. (1987) 'The Origins and Impact of the Parents Charter' in McCrone, D. (ed) *Scottish Government Yearbook 1987* ; Fairley, J. and Paterson, L. (1991) 'The Reform of Vocational Education and Training in Scotland' *Scottish Educational Review* vol.23; McPherson, A. (1989) 'Social and Political Aspects of the Devolved Management of Scottish Secondary Schools' *Scottish Educational Review* vol.21; Bell, C. et al (1989) 'The Scottish Dimension of TVEI' in Brown, A. and McCrone, D. (eds.) *Scottish Government Yearbook 1989*
- ¹⁸ Bell, C. and Raffe, D. (1991) Working Together? Research, Policy and Practice. The Experience of the Scottish Evaluation of TVEI in Walford, G. (ed.) *Doing Educational Research* p.140

CHAPTER 7

REACTIONS OF EDUCATIONAL PROFESSIONALS TO THATCHERITE EDUCATION POLICY IN SCOTLAND

Introduction

This chapter has three principal aims. First, it analyses, on the basis of the data yielded from the fieldwork, the attitudes of head teachers and teachers to Thatcherite education policy and specifically to the principles outlined in chapter 5. The second aim is to examine how head teachers and teachers reacted to the implementation of Thatcherite education policy. The third is to consider the implications for policy-making in Scotland of perceptions which head teachers and teachers had of Thatcherite education. The central argument of chapter 3 was that the significance of the myths which permeate the Scottish system is that Scots believe them to be true. This chapter will investigate to what extent this was so amongst the head teachers and teachers who participated in the fieldwork. To what extent did teachers and head teachers articulate their views in "nationalist" terms? In other words, did teachers and head teachers contrast the distinctive Scottish education system with the English system. Also, did they refer to traditions and myths associated with the Scottish education system. The chapter is divided into three main sections. The first concentrates on the perceptions of head teachers, the second on the perceptions of teachers and finally the implications for policy-making of the reactions of the professional educationalists are considered.

Perceptions Of Head Teachers

The previous chapter explained in some detail the approach used to analyse the attitudes of head teachers. The task now is to describe and interpret the findings of the fieldwork. It was argued earlier that a distinctive culture or ideology permeated the Scottish education community. The principal components of this culture were: the

generalist tradition; the acceptance of the authority of teachers; and a strong belief in community schooling. In light of this distinctive culture how, in the opinion of head teachers, had the Scottish education system changed during the period of the last Thatcher administration ? This question raises two important issues.

First, what impact, if any, had Thatcherite education policy had on the distinctive culture of the Scottish system ? In particular, what arguments did head teachers present in relation to Thatcherite education policy ? Secondly, the nature of such arguments are crucial to the analysis of head teacher perceptions. In other words to what extent, if at all, did head teachers engage in "nationalist" discourse in relation to Thatcherite education policy ?

One might expect that if head teachers were to articulate "nationalist" views it would be in relation to the myths and distinctive aspects that allegedly pervade the Scottish education system. This section examines the comments made by head teachers in relation to the distinctive aspects of the Scottish education system identified in chapter 3. The number of heads adopting a particular position has been indicated in the discussion to demonstrate how typical heads' comments are. For instance the number of heads who opposed Strathclyde's scheme of devolved management, or who directly mentioned that parents in Scotland trusted the educational professionals, has been indicated. The comments have been selected to reflect the kind of arguments articulated by head teachers. Care was taken to ensure that the comments reflected the range of arguments which emerged from the analysis of the interview transcripts. The concept of community schooling is discussed first.

Community Schooling

Was there any evidence of head teachers referring to the concept of community schooling ? If so, in what context was it mentioned ? Not every head teacher explicitly expressed support for the community school but their reaction to opting out in

particular suggests that they implicitly supported the community school. Some heads 12 in total, however, did explicitly indicate a preference for the community school. The comment made by one head was indicative of the arguments articulated by this group:-

Education is a community resource... and vast educational resources need to be planned on a community basis. I would reject any attempt to introduce market forces or individualistic education (to Scotland).

This head teacher made a connection between one of the key themes of Thatcherite education namely the market and the concept of community schooling. In his opinion the desire to introduce market forces was not compatible with the notion of community schooling. Similar sentiments were expressed by another head teacher:-

It is the local authority's duty to provide education to a particular area ...opting out would make nonsense of forward planning.

In the opinion of this head teacher one of the most important policies introduced by the Thatcher Government namely opting out would undermine the local authority's ability to organise education on a neighbourhood basis.

Most commonly, those head teachers who favoured the community school made this commitment explicit in the context of opting out. Broadly speaking, heads interpreted the provisions in the Self Governing Schools etc, (Scotland) Act that allow schools to opt out of local authority control as politically motivated. Two heads expressed concern at the apparent attempts by the Thatcher Government to marginalise the role which local government had in schooling. Moreover, they had particular concerns about the possible implications such moves could have for community schooling. Local government had a crucial role in the continuance of the community school. The Act had more to do with reducing the role that education authorities had in the provision of education:-

Opting out is a political value judgement aimed at undermining local government...education as a result is open to manipulation from the centre.

I am very much opposed to opting out. It is a way of removing influence from the local authority and increasing (the influence of) central government

Some heads, five in total, did explicitly state their opposition to opting out in "nationalist" terms :-

It (opting out) is designed for favoured schools in certain favoured areas. The state system of schooling has been targeted by the (Thatcher) Government and its educational philosophy runs counter to the best interests of Scottish education. It is undeniably superior to the English system. The Government has manipulated the facts to imply that standards in Scottish education are falling.

Similar sentiments were expressed by two other head teachers. Again opting out was perceived to be irrelevant to the Scottish context:-

Opting out will have no effect (in Scotland) unless schools are pushed towards it by government. If a Conservative Government is returned there will be a move to grant maintained schools which is not characteristic of Scottish education.

(Opting out and school boards will be) ...detrimental to comprehensive education and the improvements made to education standards in recent years. They are an attack on comprehensive education and Scottish education in general. Government reforms will cause great difficulties in areas where there is a great deal of deprivation.

Two head teachers focussed on the apparent lack of demand in Scotland amongst parents for opting out:-

School Boards and most parents in Scotland are not interested in the opting out legislation.

There is no demand in Scotland for opting out. I suspect it (Scottish education) will become more like England where schools with problems opt out to avoid closure.

Heads endorsed the community school for a number of reasons. One reason was the belief that local authorities had used the community school to maintain equality of provision. One head explained why he was opposed to schools opting out of local authority control:-

It is the duty of the local authority to give education to a particular area and opting out would make nonsense of forward planning. Equality of provision would be undermined and the whole social strategy of Strathclyde (Regional Council) undermined. If parents have a selfish view about deprived areas and see more spent per pupil in deprived area they may opt out because they think they would get more (resources).

Two of the quotes above also indicate that some heads were troubled by the possible implications opting out could have for the distribution of resources within the schooling system. Another head shared this concern :-

(Opting out)... sets schools in middle class and upper class areas as magnet schools. This is to the detriment of schools like mine in socially deprived areas.

One head stressed the importance of planning:-

Schooling is too important to be left to chance. There is a need to ensure that state education is maintained to render public schools unnecessary.

Interestingly this head used the term "public schools" as it would be used south of the border. In the Scottish context this term would refer to those schools which are under education authority control rather than to private schools. Quotes from other head teachers indicate that some were troubled by the implications opting out could have for the community school :-

(Opting out is).. very divisive. It sets school against school, teacher against teacher. A school serves a specific area and is a public servant. There is a need for the best infrastructure behind a school. This is lost if schools are independent.

The other reason offered by some heads, 11 in total, was that they were fearful of the effects opting out might have on comprehensive schooling. In the words of two heads:-

Opting out harks back to the old grammar school system. Michael Forsyth would be glad to see an opted school even if it was badly run. (Opting out is) ...an attack on comprehensive education.

There is a powerful argument for the state area comprehensive.

It was evident that some head teachers considered that the education philosophy of the Thatcher Governments ran counter to the idea of community schooling which, in their view, had been successfully applied to the Scottish education system. Only two head teachers supported the provisions introduced by the Thatcher Government which would allowed schools to opt out. While supporting the right of schools to opt out of local authority control, these heads did not think it likely that their schools would opt out. Both were heads of schools with rolls which had recently fallen to below 500 pupils. The majority of heads who discussed opting out did so in the context of the concept of community schooling. This policy was perceived, by head teachers, to be a particular threat to the continuance of the community school. The most vigorous condemnations of opting out were made by those heads who whole heartedly supported the community school. Further, heads did not appear to want the role of the local authority in education to be reduced. This attitude therefore placed head teachers at odds with the Thatcher Government

In summary there were two main 'nationalist' arguments against opting out. First, there was no demand in Scotland for opting out. In this respect the policy had not evolved in response to the needs of the Scottish education system. Head teachers felt that the local authority should continue to be responsible for the delivery of education at school level. Secondly, the possible creation of self governing schools was criticised, by some heads, on the grounds that such schools could not be easily assimilated into the Scottish education system. Their main concern was that opting out would have implications for the continuance of a system of community schooling. In particular it would make rational planning of schooling very difficult.

Status of teachers

Without exception every head teacher mentioned the status of teachers. Their main concerns were that the Thatcher Government had actively attempted to undermine the position of the professionals in the education system and the consequences this had for professionals. The status of teachers was most frequently mentioned by heads teachers in relation to school boards. This was perhaps not surprising given that the creation of school boards had altered the nature of the relationship between education professionals and parents. One of the main reasons advanced by the Thatcher Government for the introduction of school boards was that boards would make the professionals more accountable to parents. There was an obvious parallel here with the situation south of the border.¹ The Government had increased quite substantially the responsibilities of governing bodies. One justification for doing so was to improve "accountability" in the education service. The 1988 Education Reform Act introduced a number of measures that were intended to make schools and the educational professionals more accountable. For example information on the performance of schools was to make publicly available.

The potential involvement of parents in areas where they previously had no involvement such as in the interviewing of senior staff and reviewing the school's per capita allocation heightened head teachers' awareness of the role they have as professionals in the running of schools. How head teachers perceived school boards influenced the extent to which they employed arguments centred on the professional status of teachers. Therefore, before examining head teachers' direct comments about teacher status, it would be helpful to know what they thought about boards in general.

What is especially interesting about the quotes below is that they do not regard the introduction of school boards into Scottish schools as an indigenous development. In

other words, the decision to introduce boards was not made by the "Scottish education community" in response to the needs of the Scottish education system. Rather, it was thought that school boards had more in common with the English education system than they had with the Scottish system. Further the first two quotes suggest that the decision to introduce boards may have had more to do with political concerns than with educational ones :-

The decision (by the Thatcher Government) of what was going to happen was not one of consensus. School boards were an imported idea from England and the whole school board issue was intrinsically linked with the fate of Paisley Grammar. It was a whim of Margaret Thatcher that school boards were launched when she discovered that Scottish schools had no board of governors.

I have suspicions that school boards and opting out may be aimed at bringing Scotland in line with England. Such (Thatcherite) reforms could be politically motivated.

School boards obviously bring Scotland more in line with the English governors system

Obviously school boards have brought Scottish education into line with the English system.

Quite possibly the original proposals for the establishment of school boards, presented in Michael Forsyth's consultation paper *School Management and the Role of Parents*, continued to influence the views of head teachers even after the most radical of the original proposals had been dropped by the Government. One indication of this was that, two years after the consultative paper was issued, the majority of heads could still remember the main proposals of the paper. Of these proposals the two that concerned heads the most were the proposals to allow boards to directly control the school budget and to give boards full responsibility for the appointment and dismissal of staff without consulting the local authority. The powers originally envisaged for school boards were very similar to those currently exercised by governing bodies in England. The consultation paper succeeded in creating the impression amongst heads

that decisions taken by the Thatcher Government concerning the Scottish education system were being influenced more by what was happening in England than in Scotland. Indeed one head teacher expressed his concern that under the Thatcher Governments "education policy had moved in parallel with England" rather than responding to the needs of the Scottish system.

This impression, of Thatcherite education policy in Scotland being shaped by developments south of the border, was heightened by the lack of consultation with head teachers prior to the introduction of school boards to Scottish schools. One head explained that "consultation had been adequate ...but (Government) did not take any notice." This impression, in turn, intensified fears that the creation of school boards had more to do with bringing Scottish education into line with England than with improving the Scottish education system. A significant number of heads, ten in total, felt that, in the words of one head, "School boards were thrust upon head teachers and I am not convinced that school boards are going to bring about improvements in Scottish education." Another head stated "I am unhappy at the lack of consultation (with head teachers) before school boards were introduced."

The perception that by introducing school boards the Thatcher Government had anglicised the Scottish education system arose for two reasons. First, the similarities that existed between school boards and governing bodies suggested that the Thatcher Government was intent on anglicising Scottish education. Secondly, the fact that some heads felt there had been insufficient consultation prior to the introduction of school boards created the impression that boards were being imposed on the Scottish education community by the Thatcher Government.

Some head teachers were clearly concerned about the impact that school boards could potentially have on the Scottish education system. Without exception all the head

teachers interviewed referred to the concept of professional status in one respect or another. Significantly, every head mentioned it in the context of the potential damage that "amateurs" namely, parents could do, even with the best motives in the world, to the education system. As one head argues "amateurs should not have a say in the work of professionals." He continued "(Giving parents an inbuilt majority) was all part of the government's theme of inviting amateurs to have a say over professionals." It was apparent from the comment made by another head that he did not believe that parents should have an executive role in the running of schools. He believed that parents could "interfere" in educational matters:-

I believe in the good sense of parents to leave the professionals alone to do his job and the car mechanic to do his job. Teachers should be the same. If they interfere (you may)...get a ping pong situation between the head teacher and the School Board which the school would need to appeal on.

Allusions were also made to other professions :-

I do not tell a factory manager how to run his factory so parents should not do the same in education.

Of those Heads interviewed seven made a direct reference to the fact that parents in Scotland trusted the professionals to take decisions affecting their child's schooling:

They (parent board members) are aware that their knowledge is limited and have to accept expert advice.

The average Scot knows it is best to rely on the professional (in education).

For many historical reasons professionals (in the Scottish education system) are trusted by parents to get on with their job.

Historically parents were not involved in education. This was very much a Scottish thing. The professionals knew best and parents accepted this.

The parents on my school board are willing to act as a rubber stamp.

I am blessed with a good school board that does not interfere (in educational matters) and simply rubber stamp my decisions. In this school the board is supportive (of the head and staff) and do not want to be involved in educational decisions.

The school boards does not see their role to interfere in educational matters and it rejects the managerial role the (School Boards) Act envisaged. (It is) ..happy to leave educational matters to the professionals. Parents have no expertise and no time to look for additional powers.

Some Heads discussed teacher status in more specific terms. It was mentioned in the context of the composition of school boards:

Nonsense to talk in terms of partnership and yet give parents a majority (on school boards).

Strathclyde Regional Council employ professional to make decisions (in schools). Nonsense to let parents decide on this matter (review of the school's per capita distribution).

It is a reflection of the status of teachers in the government's eyes (that parents have an inbuilt majority on boards).

The status of teachers was also mentioned in response to the question of whether or not Heads should have the right to vote on school boards. Two Heads replied by claiming that their status vis-a-vis parents had been undermined because they did not have a vote. This view, however, was not shared by the majority of head teachers. The impression given by some head teachers was that they did not want the right to vote on school board matters because, in their opinion, the school board was unlikely to go against the advice of the head teacher:-

If I had a vote my status as a professional adviser would change. In any case the school board has only voted on a handful of occasions. It is quite happy to take head teacher's advice.

I feel that as head teacher I have ample opportunity to put my point of view and the school board is willing to accept my advice.

A voting situation where parents have not taken head teacher advice has not arisen.

.. my school board are very willing to be guided by the head teacher and traditionally, parents look to professionals.

The quotes above indicate that some heads did not wish the right to vote because they felt that the board's powers were very limited and in such circumstances were happy with the advisory role that the School Boards (Scotland) Act 1988 gave them. In total seventeen Heads openly stated they would be against the Head being allowed to vote. Further, evidence of this was found in the comments that some heads offered on their role if the remit of boards was widened. In particular, some head teachers expressed concern about boards being able to rule upon curricular issues:-

I would want the vote if it (the school board) goes for more powers and a veto over curricular matters.

I would want a veto on curricular matters but not necessarily on staffing ones.

One might assume from the comments above that these head teachers would question the right of school boards to make curricular decisions for the school. It had traditionally been the head teacher who was responsible for co-ordinating curricular issues within the school.

Head teachers also referred to the professional status of teachers in relation to the new role that parent board members had in interviewing candidates for senior posts. Under Section 11 of the School Board (Scotland) Act 1988 representatives of boards are entitled to membership of the interview panels for senior posts namely, head teacher, depute head and assistant head teacher. Prior to the 1988 Act parents had no say in who was appointed to these posts in the school. This was in contrast to the situation south of the border where governors were responsible for the staffing of schools; in Scotland staffing was the responsibility of the educational professionals. As a result of the School Boards Act parent board members could add names to the short list. A

number of head teachers, ten in total, were critical of this development. Some regarded it as an attack on their professional status and specifically the traditional authority of the head teacher in Scottish schools. They criticised parental involvement in the interviewing process on the grounds that parents were amateurs:-

Parents are patently not suited to that job (interviewing for teaching for teaching posts). At least councillors are elected and not just sitting in on interviews simply because their child is at that school.

With the best will in the world how are parents able to appreciate a good interview. Their judgement is based on the person rather than the teacher or educator.

Amateurs should not have a say in the work of professionals. Obviously it depends on the quality of the school board whether or not its involvement has a detrimental effect. It depends how well qualified the board is and its relationship with the head teacher. I am worried considerably about the appointment system and school board powers may mean (that) we go back to something like the bad old days where decisions are made by amateurs. That is the councillors.

Another head was concerned about the implications school boards, and specifically the effect that the role parents now had in appointing senior staff would have for Scottish education.

Appointment procedures and school boards in general are a government manoeuvre to distract parents from the real problems and to undermine state education in Scotland.

Significantly in those five schools where boards had been involved in appointing senior staff parents appeared to have recognised their "limitations" in performing such a function. They tended to turn to the head teacher for advice:-

The rector's role is crucial here. I am nursing my board and they are quite humble about their knowledge of the school.

One head claimed "school board members asked for the advice on the questions to ask and accepted this advice." Another head also gave parents sitting on an interview panel a list of possible questions. Some heads clearly found it difficult to sit back and allow parents to ask any question they thought might be relevant. Paradoxically, one head

was enthusiastic about the role that boards had in appointing staff yet curiously he stressed that he was the chair of the panel. In this school parents had to justify asking a question to the head before asking it to a candidate. Another pointed out that in his school "...parents were very concerned about the appointment system."

Thatcherite education policy sought to advance the interests of parents, in the role as consumers, in the education system. The School Boards (Scotland) Act was an attempt by the Thatcher Government to redefine the role that Scottish parents had in schools. Head teachers were conscious that they had, in the words of head, "two masters" or "two countervailing forces" and that he ran the danger of being in the middle and ending up "with the blame." Similar sentiments were echoed by another head :-

(School Boards)... increase accountability but this raises a problem. The head teacher is responsible to two different groups- school board and Bath Street (head quarters of Glasgow Division of Strathclyde Education Authority). In this respect the administrative running of the school is more difficult.

Another recognised that "parents are the consumers and I am accountable to them at the end of the day." The enhanced role of parents was noted by all heads. Thatcherite education policy had changed the nature of the relationship between parents and the head teacher. It had brought parents formally into the decision-making process in schools. Prior to this Act parents did have a consultative role however this changed as a result of the 1988 legislation which sought to make the professionals in the education service more accountable. The implications of this for pupils concerned one head:-

Yes, professionals should be accountable but a lot of time is spent on school board work. (I am)...not sure to the gain of pupils. There must be another way of establishing accountability.

For two heads this enhanced role had made itself apparent in the relationship that boards had with the education authority. The boards could act as a pressure group on behalf on the head:-

Parents, unlike the head teacher, can challenge Region policy. They are the consumers.. (I) encourage them to ask things that a head teacher can't.

School boards are useful as a pressure group when I have got problems. For example in Business Studies the word processors were delivered late so it lobbied the Director of Education.

As a consequence of legislation introduced by the Thatcher Government heads recognised that the manner in which schools operated had changed. However much parents had been involved prior to the legislation passed by the Thatcher Government this involvement had been consultative and largely defined by the education professionals. This was no longer possible by the late 1980s.

In Strathclyde Region, head teachers also faced the prospect of their role being redefined as a result of Devolved Management of Resources (DMR). During the course of the interviews some heads, eight in total, referred to Devolved Management of Resources, Strathclyde Regional Council's version of devolved management. On the whole these heads were enthusiastic about DMR particularly about the prospect of having a say in the appointment of all teaching staff in the school :-

I am looking forward to it on the grounds that it is better for the head teacher to make expenditure decisions on educational grounds than someone at the centre on other grounds. Schools have different priorities.

At present I can't take on the staff I want...and the candidates are wished on me due to authority pressure.

(It is) Ridiculous when the Region is trying to increase accountability and quality control that head teachers still have no say in unpromoted posts.

I would like more say in staffing. It's only fair that if I'm held responsible for what is happening in (the) school that I should also be responsible for staffing.

Another head welcomed the prospect of a 'staffing agency' emerging as part of the DMR scheme, "I'm not opposed to Strathclyde's idea of a staffing agency where

individual schools go to the agency with their specifications for a teacher." There were, however, some heads who expressed concern about Strathclyde's scheme. One head felt that DMR was " Strathclyde's attempt to forestall opting out" and that the "...disadvantages outweighed the advantages." Two heads were especially critical of the LM (local management) schemes that were in operation south of the border :-

DMR in concept, at least, reduces central control. LMS and DMR are very different. In Scotland there are guarantees that you do not get the situation where (governing bodies) can hire "cheap" staff and get rid of more "expensive" staff.

I am concerned about the situation in England where staffing is decided on formula...(and it is possible to) ...replace an experienced teacher with two inexperienced teachers.

DMR therefore increased the responsibilities of the head teacher for the running of schools. Thus in Strathclyde heads faced a situation where not only was their relationship with parents undergoing change but also their relationship with the authority was changing.

The authority traditionally placed by parents in head teachers and teachers was clearly something that some Heads wished to maintain. There was a consensus that it was the responsibility of the Head to ensure that parents continued to have confidence in the professionals. This view was not influenced in any way by the character of the school.

In summary then, those comments given by heads which either directly or indirectly referred to teacher status were conditioned by the importance they attached to professionalism. Often the reference was made to the fact that parents on the whole were happy to trust teachers to run the schooling system. Admittedly one cannot ignore the vested interest of Heads in maintaining the status quo, but the justifications they offered to maintain the status quo are of significance. The emphasis Heads

placed on the role of the teacher in the education system gave an insight into the nature of the Scottish educational culture. Parental involvement was, of course, welcome but all executive and managerial responsibilities in the running of a school would remain the remit of the professionals. The findings indicate that on a number of occasions Heads defended the status of teachers on the grounds that traditionally in Scotland parents had respect for teachers and had confidence in them. This general acceptance of the authority of teachers was seen as a Scottish phenomenon .

Generalist tradition

The third component of the Scottish educational culture articulated in the arguments of head teachers was the generalist tradition. In common with earlier comments made by head teachers on community schooling, some referred to the generalist nature of the school curriculum as something which was characteristically "Scottish":-

The Scottish system is still the best. S5 and Highers are broadly based. It is important to have adaptability.

In particular two Heads felt that the introduction of a National Curriculum in schools south of the border was an indication that the English education system was moving in line with Scottish practice :-

The English curriculum has been brought in line with the Scottish curriculum. A core curriculum has always existed in Scotland though not formally.

The curriculum in England has been brought very much more in line with Scotland.

The unwillingness of parents in Scotland to become involved in curricular matters was also referred to. One head felt that school boards were "pushed" by the government to extend their powers:-

The (Thatcher) Government has embarked on a journey with school boards, opting out and primary testing. I am not sure where it will end...The Government's intention is to empower parents to run the whole school and this means that Government pushed school boards to become involved in the curriculum.

Another head identified the "width of the curriculum" as one of the defining characteristics of the Scottish education system. Interestingly, it was in the context of parental involvement in the financial running of the school that head teachers most frequently referred to the generalist tradition. There was some concern that if a school was experiencing financial difficulties parents could be tempted to reduce the number of subjects offered, in order to make savings. This would, in turn, undermine the generalist nature of the school curriculum :-

The per capita allocation is dependent on curricular decisions. It is therefore impossible to separate the two.

(Parents reviewing the per capita allocation) ...could cause difficulties as it might interfere with the curriculum. The decisions taken by the school board may have repercussions on other subjects. For instance an increase in computer money would reduce the resources available to other departments.

If you have a school board with strong views (on the per capita allocation) this could have implications for the curriculum.

Initially parents do not have enough knowledge and do not understand the modern problems of schooling such as the Standard Grade. The school budget is seen in simplified terms, after all they are lay people. There is a danger that because their education revolved around text books, they will be reluctant to spend money on more modern methods or discriminate against expensive subjects such as home economics, technical education and art.

This (financial powers of school boards) is a sphere of worry because of (the boards' remit to review) the per capita. Once the school board has got control over the per capita it has got control over the curriculum. The board could say no money for art.

If you give the board financial powers (it will have) got control over the curriculum. If the school board considers matters of staffing then that also leads into the curriculum because it may have to decide between employing a music teacher or an English teacher.

Another head rejected the notion that it was desirable to label subjects as "expensive" or "inexpensive". The involvement of parents in the financial running of the schools meant that this could happen. There was a danger that school boards would allow economic concerns rather than educational concerns to determine the school's

curriculum. In general head teachers made the assumption that the head in consultation with his staff should have the final say over curricular matters. Further, head teachers did not believe that parental involvement in the schools' curriculum would present them with any problems because of their relationship with the school board. Thirteen heads commented that their boards recognised the role that the head teacher had as a professional in financial and curricular issues. Indeed one head stated that difficulties would only "arise if parents were not on the same wavelength" as the head teacher. Several heads were not unduly concerned because they thought they could control their school board. As one head explained there would be no problem "if the board was handled correctly."

The generalist nature of the curriculum was referred to in the context of the comments that heads made about boards reviewing the per capita allocation of the school. There was a reluctance by head teachers to allow boards to become involved in curricular matters. Those heads who did not oppose such an involvement did so on the grounds that any effect boards would have would be marginal. Some heads were confident that they could "handle" their boards. It was more common for heads, however, to refer to the professional status of teachers in their arguments against the role that boards had under the terms of the School Boards (Scotland) Act than to refer to the generalist tradition. This was perhaps not surprising given that the establishment of boards had enhanced the position of parents in the running of schools.

Perceptions Of Teachers

The extent to which the perceptions of teachers were influenced by the distinctive culture which pervades the Scottish education system is now considered. By answering this question it will be possible to investigate whether head teachers and teachers had a shared view of education policy under the Thatcher Governments. Did teachers and head teachers articulate similar arguments in relation to Thatcherite

education policy ? The survey of teachers concentrated on two specific reforms introduced by the Thatcher Government namely, school boards and opting out. The section below considers the extent to which those teachers who participated in the survey employed "nationalist" arguments to criticise these Thatcherite policies.

The arguments of teachers were found to be both explicitly nationalist and implicitly nationalist. In the former, teachers contrasted the distinctive Scottish education system or Scottish society with the situation south of the border. In some instances teachers' arguments referred to traditions and myths associated with the education system and more generally Scottish society but did not compare these to the situation in England. One question in the survey asked teachers directly if they thought Thatcherite education policy had anglicised Scottish education . Of those teachers who responded to the survey 50%, 66 teachers, agreed with the statement "They (School Boards and opting out) are an importation of English concepts to Scottish education". A further 50% did not agree with this statement.² This suggests that teachers were divided over the issue of anglicisation. Was it the case that these two camps had opposing views of opting out and school boards ? To answer this question the statistical information yielded by the survey together with comments of teachers will be utilised. Three elements of Scottish educational culture are analysed in turn namely, community schooling, status of teachers, and the generalist tradition. Each element will be analysed in terms of the explicitly nationalist arguments employed by some teachers but also in terms of the implicitly nationalist arguments used by some teachers. It may be the case that while some teachers do not explicitly refer to anglicisation they still employ educational arguments that are related to the Scottish context.

Community Schooling

The concept of community schooling was addressed in two ways in the survey. Firstly, teachers were asked their views of proposals in the Self Governing Schools

etc (Scotland) Act that allowed schools to opt out of local authority control. Secondly, in light of the legislation on school boards and opting out their views were sought on the role of parents in schools. The school board legislation redefined the role which parents had in schools. Parents now had the opportunity to become far more involved in the running of schools. This could in turn have implications for a system of community schooling. Thus it would be possible to argue that the extension of parental powers could undermine the concept of community schooling. Parents might adopt an insular view of education, taking the view that the interests of "their" school are paramount and then pursuing these interests to the detriment of other schools. This statement may be too simplistic but it brings out the argument that the changing role of parents may have implications for community schooling.

Opting Out

The vast majority of teachers opposed the provisions in the Self Governing Schools etc (Scotland) Act which allowed schools to opt out of local authority control. Table 7.1 shows that over half the sample, 62% agreed with the statement "there is no demand for opting out in Scotland" and 67% teachers thought that one consequence of schools opting out would be to undermine comprehensive education.

Table 7.1 Teachers' Attitudes to Opting out

Question	Agree	Did not agree
There is no demand in Scotland for opting out.	62% [82]	38% [50]
Opting out will destabilise comprehensive education	67% [88]	33% [44]

A strong relationship was found to exist between these two attitudes. Many teachers had reservations about the introduction of opting out in Scotland and had concerns about the implications such a policy might have on comprehensive education. Overall, 51% of teachers agreed with both statements. One teacher remarked:- "(Opting-out)

will be the end of the state system as we know it." Other teachers expressed similar concerns about the future of the comprehensive system in Scotland:-

Unnecessary is too weak a response. Opting out represents a tremendous threat to state education.

(The opting out provisions are) similar to a two tier national health service, ... Plus there will be a dramatic increase in financial commitment offered in the first few years for parents.

Opting out could in certain circumstances lead to the disintegration of the state education system.

I feel it (opting out) will have a detrimental effect on state schools.

The comments above indicate that some teachers felt that if schools were to opt out it would put into question the continuance of the comprehensive system of schooling which existed in Scotland.

In response to a question which asked teachers how they "regarded the proposals in the Self Governing School etc (Scotland) Act that allow state schools to opt out" only 11% of respondents, 14 teachers in total, felt the proposals to be necessary. Only four teachers adopting the minority position provided comments. One commented "(There is) no reason why (opting out) proposals should apply across the UK." However, it is clear that two of the teachers who supported the proposals had doubts:-

I don't really approve but realise that there should be freedom of choice.

It should be unnecessary but it could well be that certain schools would provide more for their pupils if they opted out. That is surely the aim of education.

The other teacher believed that the Act "gives schools the freedom of choice." The vast majority 82%, 106 teachers, considered the proposals were unnecessary. Nine teachers replied that they did not know whether opting out was necessary or not. Two teachers explained why they were uncertain if state schools should be allowed to adopt self governing status:-

Opting out could be used for good or bad depending on the circumstances.

More local autonomy could in some ways be to the advantage of individual schools in allowing them to prioritise needs.

Table 7.2 Relationship between opting out and demand in Scotland

There is no demand in Scotland for opting out	Opting out proposals are necessary	Opting out proposals are unnecessary
Agreed	14%	70%
Did not agree	86%	30%
Column Total	14	106

$$\chi^2=16.83 \quad p=0.00022$$

Table 7.2 examines whether or not teachers views on the necessity of the opting out proposals were associated with how they judged the relevance of opting out. It shows that there is a statistically significant relationship at the 0.001 level. Those teachers who felt that the opting out proposals were necessary tended to reject the notion that Scottish education had been anglicised. 86% of teachers who supported the opting out proposals did not think that English concepts had been introduced to Scottish education. Conversely, those teachers who thought that there was no demand in Scotland for opting out were more likely to regard the proposals as unnecessary. Indeed the majority, 70%, of teachers who opposed the proposals questioned their relevance to education provision in Scotland.

One teacher was fearful that opting out would "polarise" comprehensive schools in Scotland:-

(Opting out) will simply polarise state schools into ghetto areas. Schools seen as "good" schools may opt out because parents at that time want to. The whole business of state education is to provide equal opportunities for all children. Opting out merely encourages snobbery and "superior" attitudes amongst people. Schools which opt out will be looked upon favourably by this (Thatcher) government since they must be seen to be successful. Money will inevitably be siphoned off from the total budget. The present system is underfunded. Opting out will not provide any long term answer to this problem.

This fear was shared by another teacher:-

Opting out could destroy the state provision of education. If taken to extremes (it) could lead to state responsibility only extending to "ghetto" schools in city centres

The comments of some teachers indicate why in their opinion there was no demand in Scotland for opting out. One teacher referred to the achievements of the comprehensive system in Scotland :-

The policy (of opting out) is quite inappropriate for Scotland where 99% of children attend state run comprehensives and where a significantly higher proportion of school leavers go on to higher education, which should be taken as an indication that a state run comprehensive system actually does work.

Others questioned the relevance of opting out to the Scottish education system:-

(Opting out is an) irrelevant concept based on the perceived need of English society. (It is) of no value to Scotland.

Once again, there is no evidence of any wish to opt out- not even on school in the whole country (Scotland), the legislation is unnecessary.

I feel that opting out is a non-issue in Scotland. The only schools (that are) likely to profit from opting out are those threatened with closure.

(Opting out represents) the application of English law to the Scottish situation (and is) an anathema to many teachers.

The quotes above reveal that some teachers thought opting out had not been introduced in response to a perceived need in Scotland. One might therefore expect teachers to feel that the Thatcher Government had not taken sufficient account of the views of those interested parties in Scotland before introducing such a policy. One teacher commented, "Consultation as I understand it did not take place." This concern over the lack of consultation by the Thatcher Government was reflected in teachers' responses to the question, "Was there adequate consultation or not prior to the introduction of the Self-Governing Schools Bill ?" The vast majority of teachers 74%, 97 teachers, replied that consultation had been inadequate. Only 10% of respondents felt that consultation had been adequate. Another indication of the apparent lack of

consultation was found in the reactions teachers gave to the question "Do you feel informed about the financial repercussions of your school opting out?" Significantly, teachers felt uninformed about the financial repercussions for their school if it opted out. Table 7.3 reveals that over 50% of teachers felt uninformed.

Table 7.3 Financial Repercussions of Schools Opting Out

Response	Frequency
Well informed	7% [9]
Reasonably informed	38% [50]
Uninformed	51% [68]
Don't know	5% [6]
Total	133

The perceived lack of consultation by the Thatcher Government intensified the feeling that opting out had been introduced by a Government which did not take account of the distinctive Scottish educational culture. Evidence of this was found in the analysis of the relationship between whether or not teachers thought that English concepts had been introduced by the Thatcher Government to Scottish education and their views on the extent of consultation. Table 7.4 suggests that there is a relationship between teachers' judgements on whether the level of consultation was adequate prior to the introduction of opting out and their perceptions of anglicisation. Just over a half, 56% of those who felt that consultation was inadequate thought that English concepts had been introduced.

Table 7.4 Relationship between Teachers' perception of anglicisation and consultation prior to opting out proposals

School Boards and Opting out have introduced English concepts to Scottish education	Consultation was adequate	Consultation was inadequate	Don't know
Agreed	25%	56%	33%
Did not agree	75%	44%	67%
Column total	12	97	21

$$x^2=6.55 \quad p=0.03779$$

The doubts some teachers had about the relevance of opting out to the Scottish educational scene were intensified by the perceived lack of consultation prior to the introduction of the proposals. Further, a strong relationship existed between, on the one hand the views teachers held on the extent to which opting out had been introduced in response to demands in Scotland and, on the other hand their opinions on the future of comprehensive schooling system if schools were allowed to opt out of EA control. Opting out was perceived by many teachers as a threat to the idea of community schooling.

Extension of parental powers

This section investigates the extent to which the extension of parental powers that resulted from the 1988 School Boards (Scotland) Act was perceived by teachers as a threat to the concept of community schooling. Through the establishment of school boards, the Act had increased the role that parents could potentially have in the running of schools.

Table 7.5 Attitudes to School Boards

Question	Frequency
School boards are necessary as presently constituted	12% [14]
School Boards are unnecessary as presently constituted	88% [105]

Table 7.5 presents teachers' views on the issue of school boards as constituted under the conditions of the 1988 Act. Only 12% of teachers felt that boards were necessary as presently constituted. The one teacher who explained why he/she felt that school boards were necessary argued that, "parents should have a say in the running of schools." The vast majority of teachers, 88%, did not consider that boards were

necessary. One teacher explained, why, in his/her view, school boards were unnecessary:-

In a well financed, well staffed school system in a progressive country like Scotland...School Boards would be fine but in the present disaster it is irrelevant and will tinker only with fundamental flaws in our system.

In addition, teachers were asked their views on the extent of powers that School Boards should have. They were asked if they supported the "floor" and "ceiling" powers outlined in the SED's consultative paper on school boards. In retrospect the phrasing of the question which asked teachers if they supported the "floor" proposals was rather ambiguous. Some teachers may have opposed these proposals because they wanted boards to have more powers.³ 22% of teachers supported the "floor" proposals, with 55% (72 teachers) rejecting the proposals. 30 teachers replied that they were not aware of the proposals. Fewer teachers, 14%, were willing to accept the "ceiling" powers. 66%, 84 teachers, opposed the introduction of ceiling powers for School Boards. 20% of teachers were unaware of the nature of the "ceiling" powers.

Was there an association between the views that teachers held on the issue of the opting out and their views of school boards ? Table 7.6 shows that a statistically significant relationship did exist. The vast majority of those teachers, 95%, who felt that school boards were unnecessary also thought that opting out was unnecessary.

Table 7.6 Perceptions of School Boards and Opting Out

	Opting out proposals are necessary	Opting out proposals are unnecessary
School Boards are necessary as presently constituted	58%	5%
School boards are unnecessary as presently constituted	42%	95%
Column Total	12	95

$$\chi^2 = 30.13595 \quad p = 0.00000$$

The consensus amongst teachers therefore was that both these Thatcherite reforms of the Scottish education system were unnecessary. Further evidence of the extent to

which teachers opposed both opting out and school boards is shown in table 7.7. The relationship between these two issues was found to be statistically significant. This table shows that teachers who questioned the necessity of school boards tended to doubt the relevance of opting out in the Scottish context. 65% of teachers who regarded school boards as unnecessary questioned the relevance of opting out proposals to the Scottish context. In contrast, 29%, of teachers who questioned the necessity of boards agreed that there was no demand in Scotland for opting out.

Table 7.7 Perceptions of School Boards and Demand for Opting Out

There is no demand in Scotland for opting out	School Boards are necessary as presently constituted	School boards are unnecessary as presently constituted
Agree	29%	65%
Did not agree	71%	35%
Column Total	14	102

$$\chi^2 = 6.71697 \quad p = 0.00955$$

One explanation of the relationship between the views that teachers expressed about school boards and opting out may be that some teachers considered the introduction of school boards to be a pre-requisite to opting out. The connection between these two reforms was made explicit in some comments:-

(The) cynical view is that a school board is a necessary pre-requisite to opting out; which may be what the government intends all along.

I feel that, shortly, many boards are going to see that they are doing practically nothing, except write letters to the authority about the state of the building and/or playground and these are largely ignored since the authority has no money. I am slightly fearful that this frustration may lead the odd one or two to think about taking everything into their own hands and opting out.

Other teachers' doubts were a consequence of the apparent lack of consultation by the Thatcher Government and more specifically dissatisfaction at the consultation process embarked on by the SED prior to the introduction of boards. In the words of one:-

(The Thatcher) Government appeared to ignore the wishes of many involved or with interest in education, including parents. (There was) much concern over possible "power struggles of boards which had ceiling powers. (This would) do little to address education's real needs.

Another teacher questioned the nature of the consultative process, suggesting that central government had no real intention of responding to concerns expressed:-

The present (Thatcher) governments minions in Scotland showed that they had their minds made up long before the (SED)consultation period had ended. As ever with the present Tories they always know best.

Similar sentiments were expressed by other teachers :-

You only had to look at the first report and the final report to see how little change there had been.

The (SED) consultation process was an insult, the need for change had to come within the parent body. It did not, it was purely political

I suspect they (the Thatcher Government) ignored advice which did not suit their plans.

(The SED consultation on school boards was) pathetic. The move in my opinion was and is totally political with the main hope, on the part of the (Thatcher) Government being that the type of person on board would be middle class, a Tory voter who would support Tory policy for opting out of the state education system.

To what extent did Tory voters in the sample "support (the) Tory policy for opting out of the state education system ?" Of those 95 teachers who provided data on their political affiliation only 15 were Conservatives.⁴ Of this small group 8 supported the idea of schools opting out of EA control; 3 felt that the opting out proposals were unnecessary and two did not know.

Doubts were expressed by a number of teachers about the relevance boards had to the Scottish context. One teacher explained:-

There was no perceived demand for boards, and if that had been taken account of then we (Scotland) would not have them now.

These comments would seem to indicate that some teachers believed that the Thatcher Government had failed to take sufficient account of concerns expressed by those with an interest in the Scottish education system. This concern manifested itself in the

connection that many teachers made between anglicisation and their view of the SED consultation process.

Table 7.8 Perceptions of Anglicisation and Consultation

School Boards and opting out are an importation of English concepts to Scottish education	Consultation Process instituted by the SED prior to the introduction of School Boards Bill satisfactory	Consultation Process instituted by the SED prior to the introduction of School Boards Bill unsatisfactory
Agreed	21%	58%
Did not agree	79%	42%
Column Total	19	81

$$\chi^2=10.54283 \quad p=0.00117$$

Table 7.8 examines whether or not teachers' views of the consultation process were associated with their perception of anglicisation. The relationship was found to be statistically significant. Over half of those teachers, 58%, who felt that the consultation process had been inadequate thought that English concepts had been introduced to Scottish education. However, a sizeable minority, 42%, thought that consultation had been inadequate and rejected the notion that the introduction of school boards and opting out had anglicised Scottish education. It was not possible to examine the views of this group in any great detail because very few provided comments. However, one teacher wished to see more discussion, "Not enough discussion at national or local level." Another felt that, "most consultative processes carried out by the SED are unsatisfactory." The apparent unwillingness of the Thatcher Government to take on board the concerns expressed by those who had contributed to the consultation process may account for the perception that some teachers had of the Scottish education system being anglicised.

Table 7.9 explores whether or not views on the necessity of school boards were associated with their perception of anglicisation. A relationship which was statistically significant to the 0.01 level was found to exist between the views that teachers held on anglicisation and their opinions on School Boards. 55% of those teachers who

thought that school boards were unnecessary also thought that English concepts had been introduced to Scottish education. However, 45% of teachers who were opposed to boards did not think that Scottish education had been anglicised. Again there were very few comments from teachers in this minority group. Three teachers preferred that parental involvement should be through the parent teacher association or "larger parent groups":-

(School boards are) useful but not necessary as parent teacher associations fulfilled many of the possible useful functions of boards. The benefit of parent teacher associations was that schools elected them voluntarily rather than by government edict.

Parent teacher associations showing genuine interest in all school activities would be better.

The relationship between a school and its parents can be effectively developed through contact with larger parent groups such as parent evenings, open nights and social events.

Clearly, these teachers questioned the introduction of school boards. Another felt that boards would just add, "another layer of bureaucracy." With so few comments it was not possible to establish if there was any pattern to the comments made by those teachers who did not agree with the notion that the introduction of school boards and opting out had anglicised Scottish education.

Table 7.9 Perceptions of Anglicisation and School Boards

School Boards and opting out are an importation of English concepts to Scottish education	School Boards are necessary as presently constituted	School Boards are unnecessary as presently constituted
Agreed	21%	55%
Did not agree	79%	45%
Column Total	14	106

$$\chi^2 = 6.19924 \quad p = 0.01278$$

The existence of a sizeable minority in table 7.9 which opposes school boards but does not think that Scottish education has been anglicised suggests that teachers opposed boards for a range of reasons and not just that they were irrelevant to the Scottish context. Some teachers did however clearly perceive school boards to be an "English" phenomenon :-

Classic situation in which the solution to an English problem is foisted on Scotland where the problem did not exist thereby creating a whole batch of problems.

There appears to be little doubt in this teacher's mind that school boards were not relevant to the Scottish education system. Another commented:-

I do not believe that the (Thatcher) Government understood the Scottish education system. In a "Reporting Scotland" interview, Mrs Thatcher was taken aback to be told that we (Scotland) had no board of governors...

This teacher questioned the Thatcher Government's awareness of the distinctive nature of the Scottish education system and specifically its knowledge of how schools were managed in Scotland. This concern was also apparent in some of the general comments that teachers offered about the consequences of schools boards and opting out. Some teachers made reference to the political nature of Thatcherite education policy and the consequences which this had, in their view, for the Scottish education system. One teacher referred to the lack of electoral support in Scotland for the education policies that had been introduced by the Thatcher Governments:-

They (Schools boards and opting out) represent a political view of the management of education in Scotland which the majority of people in Scotland do not support. They will effect no improvement in provision.

The political nature of Thatcherite education policy in Scotland was also mentioned by other teachers:-

They (school boards and opting out) appear to be based in dogma rather than the improvement of Scottish education.

(School boards and opting out are) an attempt to destabilise Scottish education.

I feel the whole idea (of school boards and opting out) is political and uneducational. Surely the idea of state education should be fair education for all.

There is some evidence, therefore, from the comments of teachers that some questioned the relevance of school boards and opting out to the Scottish educational context. These policies were not perceived to be indigenous developments. They were perceived to be not relevant to the Scottish education system. Indeed the evidence suggests that the introduction of school boards and opting out stimulated nationalist arguments amongst teachers.

To sum up, teachers, on the whole, employed three arguments against the introduction of boards. Firstly, that they would undermine the notion of community schooling. Secondly, that boards could be a prerequisite to opting out. Thirdly, that boards were not relevant to Scottish education. This perception was heightened by the apparent lack of consultation, by the Thatcher Government, prior to the introduction of the School Boards (Scotland) Act at Westminster. Similar arguments were used by teachers to oppose opting out. Some felt that opting out would undermine the system of community schooling which existed in Scotland. Others argued that the decision to introduce opting out had not been in response to a perceived need in Scotland. A consistent theme of the arguments presented by teachers in relation to the notion of community schooling was they tended to be nationalist; either explicitly in the sense that they referred to anglicisation or implicitly by setting their arguments in the Scottish context.

It was not possible to investigate the views of those teachers who did not agree that Scottish education had been anglicised in the same depth as those teachers who agreed that English concepts had been introduced to Scottish education. Broadly speaking, those teachers who did not agree that Scottish education had been anglicised were less inclined to provide comments.

Generalist Tradition

The School Board (Scotland) Act allowed parents, for the first time, executive involvement in the day to day running of schools. This involvement extended to reviewing the per capita allocation of the school which could potentially have implications for the curriculum offered in the school. The head teacher must gain the approval of the school board for the division of the per capita allocation between subjects. The involvement of parents in areas of school life such as review of the per capita allocation may be criticised in "nationalist" terms because of the perceived threat to the generalist nature of the Scottish education system. One might also expect teachers to consider the extension of parental powers as a threat to professional status. It should be noted that the decision was taken not to ask teachers directly about the generalist tradition or any other traditions and myths which pervade the Scottish education system. The intention was to assess the extent to which teachers drew upon these traditions and myths in the comments they made without being prompted. How did teachers react to the potential involvement of parents in curricular matters ?

The majority of teachers disapproved of the provisions in the School Board (Scotland) Act 1988 which allowed boards to review the per capita distribution of the school. 72% of teachers, 91 in total, disapproved. Only 27 teachers, 21%, approved of boards reviewing the distribution of the per capita. 8% of teacher replied that they did not know. The consensus amongst those teachers who opposed boards undertaking this task was that the financial powers of boards would have implications for the nature of the curriculum offered by schools. Interestingly, teachers did not explicitly articulate their concerns in "nationalist" terms. On the whole their concerns centred on the marginalisation of the position of the educational professional:-

The distribution of the per capita is not a matter that boards have any competence in commenting upon.

If the board takes the advice of the head teacher (on the per capita allocation), then there is no problem... If non-specialists have to decide who gets what without the guidance of the head teacher...real problems arise between departments canvassing for extra cash.

Teachers were also asked whether or not they thought "that the board's powers relating to finance may have implications for the curriculum offered by the school." 66% of teachers thought that there would be implications for the curriculum. Only 15 teachers, 12% in total, disagreed, with 23% of respondents replying that they did not know.

Table 7.10 Board's Influence on Curriculum

Question	Yes	No	Don't Know
Do you think that the Board's powers relating to finance will have implications for the curriculum offered by the school or not?	66% [84]	12% [15]	23% [29]

The comments provided in response to this question show that a large number of teachers did have concerns about the narrowing of the curriculum as a result of the involvement of boards in financial matters:-

Those who control finance can always influence decisions; if the board thinks the curriculum should stress certain areas they could direct resources into these areas. The Scottish Consultative Council on the Curriculum (SCCC) curricular proposals should help prevent loss of balance.

Some parents may say "I am in favour of spending money on computers, but not on areas like lifestyles or multicultural education." Any effect at board level would obviously effect the planned curriculum.

Subjects not favoured will be squeezed out by reducing finance.

Could seriously affect some departments. The board may think that music, drama or art are unnecessarily expense cut them from the curriculum, more abuse of power.

...subject based view of education will prevail based on the perception of what will help pupils to be more marketable. The broader aims of education will suffer, less marketable areas of the curriculum will suffer.

The relationship between whether or not teachers approved of boards reviewing the capita distribution and whether or not they thought that board's powers would have implications for the curriculum is tested below.

Table 7.11 Financial Powers of Boards

Question	Board's powers relating to finance may have implications for the curriculum	Board's powers relating to finance may not have implications for the curriculum
Approve of boards reviewing the per capita distribution.	14%	79%
Disapprove of boards reviewing the per capita distribution.	86%	21%
Column Total	78	14

$$\chi^2 = 27.11376 \quad p = 0.00000$$

The table shows that there was clearly a statistically significant relationship between the views which teachers held on these two issues. Teachers who thought that the powers boards have relating to finance could have implications for the curriculum tended to disapprove of boards reviewing the per capita distribution. 86% of those teachers who thought that the remit of boards could have implications for the curriculum disapproved of boards reviewing the school's per capita allocation. Conversely, 79% of those teachers who did not think that the remit of boards would have implications for the curriculum approved of boards reviewing the per capita allocation.

The extent of teachers' disapproval was brought out in the comments made by teachers in response to the question asking for their view on the impact which the board's financial powers could have for the curriculum. The comments of teachers indicated that some teachers were concerned that the board's financial powers could reduce the breath of the curriculum. However, the significant point is that in contrast

to the comments made on opting out and the constitution of boards teachers did not explicitly articulate their concerns in "nationalist" terms.

Status of Teachers

How did teachers perceive their status in contemporary Scottish society ? To become a teacher requires extensive knowledge and training. Professionalism and status are inextricably linked. The danger, therefore, is that if the contribution of teachers is seen to be reduced or undermined in any way teachers may feel marginalised. Thus from the perspective of teachers, it would undermine their traditional position of "high" status in Scottish society.

The majority of teachers did not consider the provisions to allow schools to opt out or the introduction of school boards as a threat to their professional status. In total 37% of teachers agreed with the statement that "school boards and opting out would undermine the status of teachers," with 63% not agreeing. The comments, however, indicate that some teachers perceived school boards to be a threat to their professional status. In a number of respects boards were thought to undermine the position of the teachers in the provision of education. Teachers most frequently mentioned their status in relation to the composition of school boards and the role that boards had in the appointment of senior staff. All but two of those teachers who felt their status had been undermined disapproved of the parents having an inbuilt majority on boards

Table 7.12 Perceptions of anglicisation and parental participation

School Boards and opting out are an importation of English concepts to Scottish education.	School Boards & opting out will introduce a welcome element of parental participation	
	Agreed	Did not Agree
Agreed	16%	61%
Did not Agree	84%	39%
Column Total	32	100

$\chi^2 = 19.96500 \quad p = 0.00001$

Table 7.12 explores teachers' views on the nature of parental participation in schools and their views on whether or not school boards and opting out had anglicised the Scottish education system. A relationship, which was statistically significant to the 0.001 level, was found. 61% of those teachers who did not think that school boards and opting out had introduced a welcome element of parental participation thought that English concepts had been introduced to Scottish education. 84% of those teachers who thought school boards and opting out had introduced a welcome element of parental participation did not agree that English concepts had been introduced. Thus, the table shows that teachers' perceptions of parental participation were associated with their perceptions of anglicisation. Further, evidence of this association was found when teachers views of anglicisation and the composition of school boards were investigated. The data presented in table 7.13 shows a relationship between a belief in anglicisation and attitudes to the composition of school boards. 60% of those teachers who disapproved of the inbuilt parental majority on boards thought that the Thatcher Government had introduced English concepts to Scottish education. In contrast, the majority of teachers, 85%, who approved of the parental majority did not agree that English concepts had been introduced. The evidence presented in tables 7.12 and 7.13 suggests that how teachers regarded the new role allotted to parents was related to their stance on the issue of anglicisation.

Table 7.13 Anglicisation and Composition of School Boards

	Approve of parental majority on boards	Disapprove of parental majority on boards	Do not know
School Boards and opting out are an importation of English concepts to Scottish education.	15%	60%	50%
School Boards and opting out are not an importation of English concepts to Scottish education.	85%	40%	50%
Column Total	26	91	14

$$\chi^2 = 16.4289 \quad p = 0.00627$$

Table 7.13 explores whether or not a relationship existed between teachers' opinions of the composition of boards and their perception of anglicisation. A statistically significant relationship was found to exist at the 0.01 level. A sizeable minority who disapproved of the parental majority on boards did not feel that the introduction of schools boards and opting out were an importation of English concepts. However, 85% of those teachers who approved of the parental majority on boards did not think that Scottish education had been anglicised, whereas 60% of those teachers who disapproved of parents having an inbuilt majority on boards felt that Scottish education had been anglicised.

Although the majority of teachers did not feel that boards or opting out would undermine their professional status, their comments indicate that there was concern amongst some teachers about the role parents could potentially adopt. In particular there was concern about those parents involved in school matters who had no expertise. Review of the comments that teachers offered in response to the question relating to parental representation on boards reveal the nature of teachers' concern :-

Parents do not know the system and cannot possibly understand all the complexities. Taken to its logical conclusion should we for example have boards taking decisions by inbuilt majority on the diagnosis of doctors.

The feeling that we are under pressure to achieve "desirable" goals from parents who do not understand our problems increases our feeling of insecurity.

In my experience parents' view of school problems are extremely naive. Rarely more than their memoirs of their own school days distorted by time. On many occasions their narrow views prevailed (in school board) discussions. Tending to be concerned more with their own children. Always a latent distrust of teachers.

Too many people who do not have a great knowledge of education or even what goes on in education have a say in what we do in education such as Michael Forsyth, councillors, school boards.

I do not feel that School Board members have sufficient knowledge of current educational developments. They do not have specialist knowledge

What the quotes above reveal is that some teachers clearly felt that, by allowing parents an inbuilt majority, the Thatcher Government had marginalised the position of teachers in the management of schools. Parents were regarded as amateurs who had little or no expertise in education matters.

The other area where the issue of teacher status was most frequently mentioned was in relation to board members being represented on the interview panels for senior posts. One question in the survey asked teachers to comment "on the provisions in the School Board (Scotland) Act which allow school board members to be represented on interview panels for senior posts." Of those teachers who replied 70% expressed some concern about parent members of boards being involved in interview selection of senior appointments. Only 13% supported the idea that parent members should have a say in such appointments. The principal objection made by teachers was that parents were not qualified to perform such a task. Some teachers felt that school board members should not be involved in any capacity in appointing staff on the grounds that it should be left to the professional educationalists:-

Do boards have the expertise to make proper decisions ?

Interview panels should consist of professional educationalists only.

Absolute nonsense. Parents do not have the necessary knowledge and understanding to establish any form of 'professional' judgement, or to make any form of comparison. How are they able to understand the comments made by the applicants and how can they judge them ?

I do not think that parenthood is a suitable criteria for assessing the suitability for interview panels members. Many parents know little of current educational developments and as such cannot make nor should not make judgement on candidates' suitability.

I am concerned about lack of professional insight.

I think that it is ludicrous that a lay person can have a say in these (senior) appointments.

Two teachers made allusions to other professions:-

If I put myself on an interview panel for a doctor all I could contribute would be how I reacted personally to the interview. My ability to relate his (sic.) suitability from a medical point of view would be almost nil. In the same way members of school boards who have little knowledge of education, of what goes on in schools, of how schools are managed must find themselves in the same boat.

Potentially disastrous, would you select a brain surgeon ?

Some teachers also noted that under the legislation teacher board members were excluded from sitting on interview panels:-

This (parents on interview panels) may be OK, but again, parents have no real knowledge of the internal workings of a school or what sort of person would be best to fill a particular job in the school. Also teacher members of the board who have such knowledge are barred from sitting on interview panels. Once again, that puts us (teachers) in our place.

Ridiculous ! They (parents) have very little idea. Anyway, why not include staff school board members in such panels ?

Others did not object to parent representatives sitting in on interviews but objected to them having voting rights :-

(School board members should be) represented on interview panels...Input from parents always useful. Voting rights, no. education specialists should decide on candidates suitability for the job.

They (school board members) should only be there as observers and join in discussion afterwards. (They should) not have voting rights.

Provided board members are there as observers it could be satisfactory...with voting powers I would be very much opposed. what do they know about who is best for the job ?

I do not mind parents having representatives, providing they are non voting or are significantly outnumbered by the professional local authority representatives.

Teachers on the whole had deep reservations about the new role of parents. They had doubts about whether school boards and opting out would " introduce a welcome element of parental participation" in the running of schools. 32 teachers, 24%, agreed with this statement . Almost three quarters of teachers, 76%, did not agree with this

statement. One teacher explained why s/he did not think that either opting out or school boards would "introduce a welcome element of parental participation":-

There would have been better ways to address the issue of parental involvement and to look at schools where there was no parent teacher association...to involve the parents who wish to avoid all contact with school would have been more important.

Another thought:-

Parental participation in schools is always welcome such as through PTA, learning support and other ways, but I do not feel that parents members of boards are necessarily involved in the day to day pattern of our schools. They "sit over" the school rather than be involved in the practicalities.

Further, evidence of the teachers perceiving the extension of parental powers as anglicisation was found in their attitudes to the composition of school boards. The majority of teachers, 70%, opposed parents having an inbuilt majority on boards. 19% of teachers agreed that parents should be in the majority in boards. Teachers' perceptions of anglicisation were influenced by their reaction to the composition of boards. 42%, 55 teachers in total, believed that Scottish education had been anglicised and disapproved of the parental majority.

Most commonly, on this issue of parental representation on school boards, teachers expressed concern in their comments about the marginalisation of teachers' role in the running of schools. The tendency was to present this aspect of Thatcherite education policy in a negative manner. The concepts of professionalism and amateurism were raised frequently. The new role of parents was questioned by a number of teachers:-

Parents do not know the system and cannot possibly understand all of the complexities. Taken to its logical conclusion should we for example have boards taking decisions, by inbuilt majority, on the diagnosis of doctors.

Parents have the power top influence decisions without expertise...Parents do not necessarily have a long term interest in a school's well being.

Executive control is complicated and frankly, too important, to be entrusted to amateurs. Parents have a vital advisory role which can be developed with or without school boards.

There was less evidence in the comments that teachers offered on the composition of schools boards of explicit "nationalist" arguments. Although one teacher did indicate the s/he "was slightly worried about the development (of school boards) into English style board of governors."

Head Teacher and Teacher Reactions' to Thatcherite Education Policy: Implications for Policy Making In Scotland

This final section of the chapter considers the wider implications of head teacher and teacher perceptions of Thatcherite education policy for policy making in Scotland. This raises a number of issues. Did teachers and head teachers have a common perception of Thatcherite education policy ? To what extent was this perception influenced by the Scottish educational traditions ? Did the education policies introduced by the Thatcher Government accommodate the distinctive Scottish education system ? What were the implications for the Thatcher Government of the ways in which teachers and head teachers reacted ?

The argument that under the Thatcher premiership Scottish education was anglicised relies upon the distinctive nature of the Scottish education system. In one way or another, those who maintain that Scottish education had been anglicised have relied upon the assumption that Scottish education system has a distinctive educational culture. Significantly, one cannot categorise those who employ this line of argument into distinct political camps. The "nationalist" perception of education has been utilised by politicians and educationalists across the political spectrum. For example the education think tank of the Scottish Conservative Party challenged Michael Forsyth, the Scottish Education minister, over his stance on the use of examination league tables. It reported to the Minister:-

The government in Scotland should distance itself from any concept of league tables between schools. This is an English concept ...which is an unhelpful and unsophisticated notion when applied to the Scottish educational scene.⁵

The members of this committee had adopted a "nationalist" argument to criticise government education policy in Scotland. The introduction of league tables was judged to be against Scottish educational traditions.

Writing in the Observer Jim Martin, General Secretary of the EIS, noted that a "process of assimilation" was underway in Scottish education:-

...there are numerous other examples of the way in which Scottish education is undergoing a process of assimilation...Educational change must go on, but it must be founded on meeting the needs of the Scottish people.⁶

Implicit in his argument was the assumption that Thatcherite education policy had failed to accommodate the distinctive features of Scottish educational culture. It seems apparent therefore that those interested in educational reform in Scotland are aware that in Scotland the educational system is different from the English system. Moreover, there is a tendency to use the distinctiveness of the Scottish system to argue against Government education policy. To what extent, was this the case amongst those head teachers and teachers who participated in the fieldwork ?

It emerged from the analysis of head teacher and teachers' perceptions that those policies which run counter to the notion of community schooling were more likely to stimulate explicitly "nationalist" arguments. The evidence suggests that these arguments were articulated in response to the nature of Thatcherite education policy namely its ideological dimension. One of the themes of Thatcherite education policy was to promote competition. This theme was apparent in the "parental choice" legislation introduced by the Thatcher Government. Policies such as opting out were intended to extend the influence of parents in the education service. This would

inevitably have implications for the comprehensive system of schooling based around the concept of the community school that existed in Scotland.

Local authorities, as a result of Thatcherite legislation, found their role in the delivery of education redefined. The discretion allowed to local authorities in education policy had been reduced. This was a consequence of the changing nature of central-local relations under the Thatcher Governments. Local authorities were faced with a government intent on reducing public expenditure. Moreover, they also had to deal with a government which had a clear agenda in education policy. Commenting upon the first two Thatcher administrations Gerry Stoker has argued, "the (Thatcher) Government has been concerned to redirect policies in education to meet its perception of what is required in a changing industrial society."⁷ This observation had even more relevance to the third Thatcher administration.

The attempts by the Thatcher Government to redefine the role of local authorities also contributed to professionals using "nationalist" arguments. A crucial policy in the transformation of central-local relations, that the Thatcher Government hoped to achieve, was opting out. Evidence was presented above which suggested that for many teachers and head teachers opting out was regarded as a threat to the system of community schooling. Moreover some teachers set this perceived threat in the Scottish context. Opting out was judged to be irrelevant to the Scottish education system: there was no apparent demand for it, and it would not be easily accommodated within the Scottish education system. The instability that this policy might have caused to the community schooling system was identified as a potential danger by many teachers and head teachers. Thatcherite education policy sought to change the role that local authorities had in the provision of education. Ultimately, it was intended that the local authorities would adopt a strategic role rather than that of the provider. Increasingly, it was hoped parents would adopt responsibility for schools rather than education

authorities. It would therefore become increasingly difficult, if not impossible, for local authorities to oversee redistributive issues with system. Strathclyde Region, for example, operates a system where the education authority is able divert additional resources into Areas of Priority Treatment. Schools in these areas received additional staff, supply allowances and English as a second language is protected. Policies such as opting out and financial delegation would put into question the ability of local authorities to continue such initiatives.

The fears that teachers and head teachers had for the future of the comprehensive system in Scotland were intensified by the apparent lack of consultation undertaken by the Thatcher prior to the introduction of both the school board and opting out legislation. This finding is in line with Stoker's argument that between 1979 and 1987, "The centre has pursued strategies premised on control and direction rather than consultation and negotiation."⁸ The adoption of such an approach by the Thatcher Government in the formulation and implementation of education policies in Scotland presented it with particular problems. The education community employed arguments against Thatcherite education policies which were distinctive from those employed in the British context. The distinctive nature of these arguments was revealed by the comments made by teachers and head teachers; in the sense, that arguments were articulated in the Scottish context. Claims that Scottish education had been anglicised were a consequence of the strategies used by the Thatcher Government. Moreover, the vast majority of teachers and head teachers did not feel that there had been adequate consultation by central government prior to the introduction the School Boards (Scotland) Act 1988 and the Self-Governing Schools etc (Scotland) Act 1989.

The school board and opting out legislation was felt, by head teachers and teachers, to be out of step with public opinion in Scotland. The Thatcher Governments developed a reputation of being sensitive to educational matters in Scotland. Education policies

had not been filtered through the 'Scottish education community' Charles Raab refers to the Thatcher Governments commanding education policy:-

In recent years, however, government has preferred to command rather than negotiate or to bargain policies with partners, or others, although it still relies on outsiders to implement them.⁹

This rejection of corporatist modes of decision making was reflected in the responses given by teachers and head teachers to their involvement in the consultative processes embarked upon by the Thatcher Government prior to the introduction of school boards and the opting out provisions. The consensus was that the views of those parties with an interest in Scottish education, and more generally the distinctive aspects of the Scottish education system, had not been accommodated. Instead the Thatcher Government had sought to pursue similar political principles in education policy both north and south of the border. This strategy presented problems for the Thatcher Government in the Scottish context. It ran the risk of creating the impression that central government was intent on anglicising the Scottish education system.

The reactions of head teachers and teachers demonstrated that the approach adopted by the Thatcher Government to education in the UK. presented it with problems not faced in other parts of the UK. In Scotland the continued existence of a distinctive education system influenced the kind the arguments which were articulated in response to Thatcherite education policy. It was not uncommon for teachers and heads to defend the status quo in nationalist terms. There was little doubt that the professionals recognised that Scotland was different and this led some to discuss policy initiatives introduced in explicitly nationalist terms. Moreover there was also evidence of implicitly nationalist arguments being used particularly in relation to the professional status of teachers and the generalist tradition.

The nature of head teachers' and teachers' reactions was indicative of the problems that the Thatcher Government faced in the implementation of its education policies

north of the border. During the final administration of the Thatcher Government there was a growing tendency for education policies which had not been negotiated with the Scottish education community to be introduced. This kind of approach helped to stimulate opposition which focused on the notion that Scottish education was being anglicised. It has been shown that the teachers and head teachers on the whole opposed the introduction of school boards and opting out by the Thatcher Government in Scotland. The values and beliefs which they claimed would be undermined, such as comprehensive schooling and the professional status of teachers, were allegedly accepted in Scottish society. This issue was investigated by Andrew McPherson and Charles Raab. They examined the Scottish education community:-

...at micro-level and in historical depth to show its moral systems of values and beliefs, the way in which persons or groups were recognised or excluded from membership and the deference operated to constitute the community and to enable it to function in the policy process.¹⁰

Schools and parents would share assumptions about the kind of education system that should be offered. The existence of common values put serious constraints on how successfully the Thatcher Government could implement its education policies. Rhodes and Marsh have argued that:-

The existence of a policy network, or more particularly a policy community, constrains the policy agenda and shapes the policy outcomes.¹¹

Change may occur but the existence of a policy community places serious constraints on the extent of change:-

....the existence of a policy network or policy community acts as a major constraint upon the degree of change...policy networks foster incremental outcomes, thereby favouring the status quo or the existing balance of interests in the network.¹²

This in turn would facilitate the development and continued existence of partnership between these two parties. This partnership was challenged by the Thatcher Governments. The intention was that parents would no longer be partners but managers in the schools. The notion of accountability permeated education legislation.

The traditional professional role of teachers in schools was challenged. The introduction of 'market forces' would, it was argued Thatcherite, make the education service more responsive to demands of the consumer. The professionals, in such a system, would have to take notice of the wishes of the consumers.

Central to the comprehensive system of schooling was the notion of equality of provision. There is little doubt that the majority of head teachers and teachers supported the comprehensive system of education that existed in Scotland. This had obvious implications for the Thatcher Government. It sought to introduce policies which, if successfully implemented, would change the nature of that system.

The ability of the Thatcher Government to implement its later education policies was curtailed because these policies did not initiate gradual change which was relevant to the Scottish context. Rather, the Thatcher Government intended that its policies would result in the transformation of the education service in line with its ideology and political objectives. This succeeded in creating the impression that the initiatives introduced by the Thatcher Government were not evolutionary, or had not been developed in response to the problems facing the Scottish education system. What separated the Thatcher Government from previous Conservative administrations in Scotland was not that it faced accusations of anglicising the Scottish education system. Rather, it was the degree of antagonism and resistance that the Thatcher Government faced in implementing its education policies in Scotland. This argument is developed further in the next chapter which analyses parental attitudes to Thatcherite education policy in Scotland.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1 The 1986 Education Act revised the composition of the governing bodies. The representation of parent governors was increased. The Act also increased the powers and responsibilities of governing bodies. Bodies had to provide parents with an annual report outlining what it had done in the past year. Governing bodies were given powers over the curriculum and the running of schools. The 1988 extended governors' powers over appointment and dismissals. Governing bodies were also made responsible for ensuring the school conformed to the requirement of the National Curriculum. The 1988 Act also introduced provisions that would allow schools to opt out of local authority control.

2 Respondents were asked whether or not they agreed with this statement. It is not possible to say whether those respondents who did not tick the box disagreed or failed to provide a response. The term did not agree is used wherever respondents were asked to respond in this manner.

3 A crosstabulation was carried out between these two questions. It appears that a few teachers misinterpreted the question. Of those teachers who replied to both questions 6% opposed "floor" powers but supported "ceiling" powers. 47% of respondents, 60 teachers, opposed both "floor" and "ceiling" powers. 6% supported both "floor" and "ceiling" powers. 17% supported "floor" powers and opposed "ceiling" powers. 20% of teachers were not aware of either proposals. 5% fell into the 'others' category. For instance this group included 2 teachers who were not aware of the "floor" proposals but rejected the "ceiling" powers.

4 Too few teachers answered the question, "If there was a general election tomorrow how would you vote ?" to produce statistically significant results in the crosstabulations. Conservative 15 teachers; Labour 34 teachers; Liberal Democrat 12 teachers; SNP 17 teachers; do not know 13 teachers; missing values 40

The Conservative teachers were divided on a number of issues. For instance on the question of whether or not consultation prior to the introduction of school boards have been satisfactory 6 teachers agreed that consultation had been satisfactory, 7 teachers disagreed and 2 did not know.

5 *Times Education Supplement [Scotland]* 10th October 1992

6 Martin, J. (1990) 'Class War' *Observer Scotland* November

7 Stoker, G. (1988) *The Politics of Local Government* p.139

8 *Ibid* p.140

9 Raab, C (1992) 'Taking Networks Seriously: Education Policy in Britain' *European Journal of Political Science* Vol.21 p.87

10 *Ibid*

11 Rhodes, R.A.W. and Marsh, D. (1992) 'New Directions in the Study of Policy Networks' *European Journal of Political Science* vol.21 p.190

12 *Ibid* p.198

CHAPTER 8

PARENTAL REACTIONS TO THATCHERITE EDUCATION POLICY IN SCOTLAND

Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to assess the reactions of parents in Scotland to Thatcherite education policy. The chapter opens with a brief discussion of the differing contexts against which the reactions of parents were set in Scotland and England. The analysis of parental reactions is important for two reasons. Firstly, the examination of social attitudes in Scotland, and specially of attitudes towards comprehensive education in chapter one, demonstrated that the terms of educational debate in Scotland were distinctive. Of particular interest is the extent to which the attitudes which were prevalent in Scottish society influenced the behaviour of parents in relation to Thatcherite education policy. With this in mind the second section examines parental reaction towards the introduction of school boards, opting out and national testing. The chapter closes with a discussion of the implications of parental reactions in Scotland for educational policy-making. The "successful" implementation of policy was dependent on the extent to which the Thatcher Governments were able to secure the active support of parents. The previous chapter presented evidence which suggested teachers' and head teachers' perceptions of Thatcherite education policy were shaped by the "Scottish myth." If there were common assumptions between parents and educational professionals about the kind of education service that should exist what implications did this have for the Thatcher Governments ?

Differing Contexts of Parental Reactions in Scotland and England

It is important to be aware of the differing background against which the reactions of parents were set in England and Scotland. One of the main themes of Thatcherite education policy was parental choice.¹ It has been argued earlier that the role of parents in schooling was redefined to that of the "consumer". One implication of this changed role was that parents enhanced their position in relation to the professionals. If

the parents were "consumers" then the professionals were the "producers" who had to respond to "market forces". Schools had to satisfy the demands of parents. The attempts by the Thatcher Government to promote parental choice in education was part and parcel of a wider desire to make the education service more accountable to market forces. This enhanced role was stressed by government ministers. The following quote from Michael Fallon, the former education minister (1989-1992), encapsulates the objectives of Thatcherite education policy:-

These measures (move to push more money down to school level) reflect our determination to ensure that all state schools, not just those that have opted for grant maintained status, become more independent of their LEAs. School governors and head teachers, who are best placed to respond to the demands of pupils and parents, will now have control over their own resources, both staffing and financial. This is essential if they are to satisfy their customers.²

In England and Wales, the Thatcher Governments were able to present their policies as enhancing parental choice in a populist manner. Education policies were introduced in face of growing concerns about standards of schooling in English and Welsh comprehensive schools. Concerns had been heightened by the annual report of the HM Senior Chief Inspector in 1991. The report was critical of standards of reading and writing in schools in England and Wales. On the standards of reading in primary schools the report stated, "the fact that there are unsatisfactory standards of reading in one in five schools is seriously worrying."³ More generally, it concluded that "too many do not read well enough."⁴ Ministers were openly critical of the standards of schooling in the primary sector in particular. LEAs were criticised for the standards of reading and writing in their schools. Kenneth Clarke, Secretary of State for Education (1990-1992), thought "there were worrying weaknesses in pupil's basic knowledge of maths, science and basic reading skills."⁵ Kenneth Clarke claimed the National Curriculum would improve standards of schooling in England and Wales:-

There is no doubt that the National Curriculum will have a significant effect, over time, in raising standards if we apply it and test the pupils properly.⁶

As shown in chapter 5, parents were encouraged by Central Government to become more involved in the day to day running of schools. They were urged to question the role of the professionals in schooling. The 1986 Education Act enhanced the powers of governing bodies and the 1988 Education Reform Act extended further the powers available to them. In Scotland too the Thatcher Government sought to advance the principle of parental choice. The 1981 Education (Scotland) Act gave parents the right to request that their child attend a particular school. This Act went further than the equivalent legislation to promote parental choice in England and Wales.⁷ The School Boards Act (Scotland) 1988 gave parents an executive role in the running of schools, a significant change from their previous consultative role. The Self Governing Schools Act extended the role of parents even further.

Parental choice legislation in Scotland was introduced against a different background. In Scotland there was no equivalent debate about declining standards of state education system. Echols et al noted:- "Unlike in England.... standards of attainment were not an issue."⁸ Nor was there "any general crisis in confidence in Scottish schooling."⁹ The Scottish Secondary Teachers Association (SSTA) has also argued against some aspects Thatcherite education policy on the grounds that it was formulated with the intention of improving the allegedly declining standards in English schools and as such was irrelevant to the Scottish context:-

All we have seen from the protagonists of opting out seem to be some largely unsubstantiated claims of "failing standards". Most of the evidence where any has been produced has been highly questionable statistically, or has been based upon allegations against particular, English, local authorities. There is no evidence whatsoever of serious deficiencies in the Scottish system which will be remedied by opting out.¹⁰

Great controversy surrounded the announcement by Michael Forsyth, then education minister, at a parent conference in 1989 that research conducted indicated that a quarter of all primary schools children were "having considerable difficulty with basic elements of numeracy."¹¹ Evidence of falling standards was taken from two surveys

which were part of the Assessment of Achievement Programme conducted in 1983 and 1988. The aim of the Programme was to provide information on pupils' attainment in certain key areas at a national level. It was seen as being distinct from national testing which the Government intended to use to inform parents and teachers of the individual achievements of students. According to Brian Semple the AAP had 2 main functions. The first was to provide data on 'what pupils know and can do at selected stages in their education, in curricular areas judged to be of fundamental importance. Secondly, the Programme was intended 'to provide comparison of standards of performance over time.'¹²

In the late 1980s controversy surrounded the work conducted under auspices of the Programme. Heated debate surrounded claims made on the basis of information collected under the Programme that standards in mathematics had fallen in primary schools. These claims were based on research conducted by a team of researchers at Northern College of Education, Aberdeen, which was intended to produce profiles of performance at P4, P7 and S2 in various aspects of mathematics.

In both surveys nearly 9000 children were given written and practical tests. Criticism of the AAP findings was led by Andrew McPherson, director at the Centre for Educational Sociology at Edinburgh University. McPherson argued that the research did not support the claims which had been made. He had a number of concerns about sampling bias. For instance the 1983 sample was 'upwardly biased' and that "such a bias would increase the scores of 1983 P4 and P7 samples relative to the population."¹³ McPherson also questioned the lack of detail provided in the Interim Report. Indeed the results were available before details of sampling had been released. McPherson argued that:-

It (the Interim Report) lacks the technical provenance normally supplied in a research report to enable others to judge the validity of the results. What is more, I was told that the researchers had been instructed to say nothing to

anyone outside the AAP about the design and the conduct of the 1988 research. This on a public document, launched to the accompaniment of a Scottish Office Press Release, that the Minister himself presents as a product of independent researchers !¹⁴

Another criticism made of the research was that it had been underfunded and the lack of resources had placed serious limitations on the Programme. In a letter published in June 1989 Lindsay Paterson argued for more money to be directed into the Programme to ensure that surveys were " technically beyond reproach."¹⁵

The debate about the AAP was largely conducted by educational researchers in the columns of the TESS. A series of articles and letters appeared in early 1989 either criticising or defending the Programme. In one article published in the TESS Andrew McPherson argued "there was no reason to think that standards have declined."¹⁶ Sally Brown, Director of the Scottish Council for Research which advised the AAP, responding to the criticisms made in McPherson's article, stressed that the project was designed to monitor performance not "to explain test scores or changes in scores."¹⁷ This point was also put by the co-directors of the AAP mathematics survey.

AAP was a very controversial initiative. Leading educationalists had grave doubts about how the Government would use the information gained under the Programme. It was feared that the Government and specifically the education minister, Michael Forsyth, was intent on using the AAP data to argue that standards were declining and that the introduction of national testing was necessary.

Parental Reactions to Thatcherite Education Policy

The cleavage which exists between Scotland and England on the issue of comprehensive schools might imply that policies which are perceived to be a threat to the comprehensive system of schooling will be met with more hostility north of the

border. In the previous chapter, it was argued that teachers and head teachers in Scotland strongly opposed policies which were perceived to undermine the concept of the community or comprehensive school. Significantly, this opposition frequently took a "nationalist" form. One might also expect parents in Scotland to adopt a similar stance. The evidence in chapter 6 indicates that, of the education policies introduced by the Thatcher Government in Scotland, it was the legislation introduced to extend the role of parents, and in particular opting out, which was perceived as a threat to the comprehensive system. What then were parents' reactions to the School Boards (Scotland) Act and the Self Governing Schools etc (Scotland) Act and specifically to the school boards, opting out and national testing ?

School Boards

Although a comprehensive study of parental attitudes to Thatcherite education policy has not been conducted, a number of studies have touched on this issue. In the late 1980s the Scottish Education Department commissioned the first national survey of parental opinions on schooling in Scotland. Although the survey did not include any direct questions on school boards or opting out, it still offers an insight into how parents in Scotland perceived the Scottish education system in the late 1980s. The survey explored a number of issues including discipline, what makes a good school, and the schools' relationships with parents.

The evidence from the study suggests that parents in Scotland appear to welcome the opportunity to decide which school their child attends. MacBeath et al conclude "...that parents value the opportunity to choose a school."¹⁸ The vast majority of parents, 92%, agreed with the provisions in the 1981 Education (Scotland) Act which allowed them to have a say in where their child was educated.¹⁹ The principle of choice in this context appears on the whole to be supported by parents. MacBeath et al found that some parents did refer to the "community" or "neighbourhood" school. They state:-

The principle of choice while broadly welcomed, was seen by some parents as presenting them with a dilemma because it was in conflict with the idea of the neighbourhood school....The principle of choice tended not to be exercised except in cases where a school was manifestly failing in some way.²⁰

Although the researchers were not concerned with the extent to which parents' comments about the community school were set in the Scottish context, some findings are pertinent to the argument here. References made by parents in the *Talking About Schools* survey to the community school were not set explicitly in the Scottish context. The significance of such references was that some parents recognised that parental choice did threaten the existence of the community school. One parent is quoted saying:- "I have mixed feeling about it. It's a good idea but it could be detrimental to the community as a whole."²¹ Another parent stated :-

You always just put your kids to the nearest don't you ? I mean where I work it's a much better school. They're always doing things- going on trips, parties at Christmas, that sort of thing....Up here there's nothing, but you have to send them there because if you didn't you'd be separating them from their pals.²²

The sentiments expressed by this parent are in line with the findings of Adler et al. which indicated that the vast majority of parents, some 90%, sent their child to the neighbourhood school. There was a general reluctance within the parent body to abandon the notion of community schooling. Indeed the majority of parents did not appear to have exercised their right to send their child to a school outwith their locality.

Turning to the issue of the extension of parental powers in school management, it is interesting to note that in this area parents in Scotland appear to have reservations about their new role. However, it should be recognised that parents on the whole appeared to support the creation of school boards. A number of studies have been conducted into parental perceptions of school boards.

If parents were eager to exercise the powers given to them under the terms of the School Boards (Scotland) Act 1988 then one might infer that they endorsed this

particular aspect of education policy. Successful implementation of policy hinged on securing the support of parents. Only with the backing and more crucially the active support of parents would it be possible to successfully implement policies which sought to enhance the role of parents in schooling. To what extent did school boards succeed in stimulating parental participation in school matters? Boards were established by the Thatcher Government in order to increase parental involvement in schools. Pamela Munn has argued that increased involvement was to be achieved primarily in two respects. Firstly, parents through their school board could request a wide range of information from both the head teacher and the LEA. Secondly, it was hoped that school boards would provide another line of communication between the school and the wider parental community.²³

Initial evidence, presented by Munn and Brown, indicated that boards had been relatively successful in alerting parents to their existence.²⁴ They conclude, however, that "the most worrying feature of ..(the) data is that parents feel that boards are achieving nothing and are going nowhere."²⁵ One of the achievements identified by the researchers was that parents had shown an interest in boards. A further achievement was the opening up another line of communication between parents and schools. Reflecting upon the pilot scheme Pamela Munn concluded that "Boards were generally perceived as a good thing even if direct contact between parents and boards was limited."²⁶ The conclusion one can draw from Munn and Brown's evidence is that parents in general supported school boards.

This conclusion is substantiated by the limited opinion poll evidence available on school boards. A MORI poll in September 1990 asked the question "to what extent would you support or oppose the setting up of school boards to run individual schools?" Of the 819 respondents 14% strongly supported the setting up of boards and 30% tended to support boards. 17% of respondents neither supported nor

opposed boards, with 17% tending to oppose them and 14% strongly opposing boards.²⁷ Although this poll evidence suggests that the introduction of boards was welcomed, the wording of the question is problematic. It is unclear whether the respondents were being asked for their views on whether school boards should exist or whether they were being asked if school boards should *run* schools. Clearly, the latter was not possible because of the limits placed upon the boards' remit by the legislation.

The recruitment pattern also provides an indication of how boards were perceived by parents. Comparison of the number of schools with boards in March 1990 and October 1991 reveals a significant decline in the number of boards. In March 1990 in Lothian 243 of the region's 313 schools had boards.²⁸ In October of the following year 198 of these schools were due for election. 81 of these schools failed to attract sufficient nominations to hold an election. In Grampian 70%, 267 schools, failed to secure sufficient applications to arrange elections in October 1991. Throughout Scotland, 40% of school boards did not receive enough candidates. By January 1992 a number of boards had been disbanded because of parental apathy. Across the country boards were not re-formed. In Central Region 5 boards were disbanded, 15 in Fife, 52 in Grampian, 31 in Lothian, 82 in Strathclyde, 1 in Orkney and 20 in Tayside.²⁹ Exactly why the number of school boards has declined is difficult to say. It is however possible to identify some possible explanations.

The Depute General Secretary of the Educational Institute of Scotland, Fred Forrester, believes that parental participation in boards has waned because parents in Scotland do not want to run schools:-

When it came the mid term elections the Government thought we'll really get parents interested. Disaster ! Even less boards existed after the 1991 mid term elections than in 1989. So some parents who had become involved got fed up. There are two views as to why they basically got fed up. One view is that boards do not have enough powers. Give them more powers and parents will come...That's basically the Government view. The other view is that parents basically do not want to run schools. They want schools to be run but they want

information. They want to be able to go to schools and receive regular reports. I think the second is very definitely the case in Scotland. The view of parents is that they pay someone else to run the schools.³⁰

One must guard against making the assumption that parental involvement is a prerequisite to a "good" education system. It may be the case that parents did not consider their involvement necessary. This may have been the case with school boards. One of the main findings of the *Talking About Schools* survey was that parents were on the whole happy with the Scottish education system. Parents may have chosen not to become involved in school matters through the school board. It is quite possible that some parents were involved in Parent Associations or Parent Teacher Associations rather than the school board, while for others the only contact may be parent evenings. Further, there was evidence to suggest that schools had succeeded on the whole in keeping parents informed:-

...Most parents felt that they had been kept well informed by the school, the main avenue being standard letters and newsletters. The large majority of parents had some personal contact with teachers at least once during the school year, but for some the standard letter and school report was the only channel of communication between them and their children's teacher.³¹

Attitudes of parents to the professional status of teachers might also have been a contributory factor. Perhaps the most interesting findings of the *Talking About Schools* survey are those relating to parental perceptions of teacher status. MacBeath found that parents were on the whole supportive of teachers;-

Teachers tended to be seen as doing a hard job in a social climate where they were given increasingly less respect by their pupils and by the public at large. The job had, in the view of many parents, become less and less attractive to qualified people.³²

Indeed, "...the more contact (that) parents have with teachers the higher their view of teachers' professionalism."³³ A number of factors were found to influence the views that parents had of teachers. Those parents who had stayed at school beyond the statutory leaving age or had gone to college or university had a higher regard for teachers. The same was true for those parents who had attended a recent parents'

evening. Thus, the evidence from the MacBeath et al survey suggests that parents in Scotland had a high regard for teachers .

If parents in Scotland held teachers in high esteem, how did they react to their new role in the running of schools ? The M.V.A survey indicates that most parents did not want to be involved in the day to day running of schools;-

Most parents did not seek the power to influence unduly the way the school was run on a day-to-day basis, nor did they feel that parents ought to play a central role in that.³⁴

In total, only 39% of parents felt that they should be involved in how their child was taught, with 57% holding the opinion that parents should not be involved.³⁵ Significantly, 62% of parents thought that teaching should be a professional matter.³⁶ Such findings suggest that parents in Scotland are reluctant to extend their role into the classroom, and provide added weight to Munn and Holroyd's finding that parents do not wish to be involved in curricular matters. In general, parents hold the opinion that teachers decide how to teach not the parents. Such sentiments were expressed by Judith Gillespie, spokesperson for Lothian Parents' Action Group. Commenting on the findings of the MVA survey she stated:-

The survey completely and absolutely vindicates what we have been saying, that parents want involvement without the crucial decisions- 'leave it to the professionals, but involve us. All the way down the line it (*Talking About Schools*) supports the status quo.³⁷

Significantly, Munn and Holroyd found that parents were reluctant, to become involved in "professional areas" :-

...some teachers and headteachers would like the boards to take more of an interest in curriculum matters. Parents and co-opted members are reluctant to do so preferring to leave this area to the professionals. It is paradoxical that the professionals, who might be expected to be suspicious of parental "interference", want the board to take more of an interest. Parents who might be expected to take an active interest (even though they have no statutory power over the curriculum), are reluctant to do so.³⁸

The general reluctance of parents in Scotland to extend their involvement into areas that traditionally have been regarded as requiring professional expertise is crucial when one comes to consider why boards have not sought to increase their powers. Boards can apply to the Secretary of State to extend their powers under the conditions of the school boards legislation. By July 1992 no school boards had requested to extend their role by seeking discretionary powers over school finances and teaching staff. Judith Gillespie claimed that the education minister, Michael Forsyth, had failed to take account of the views of parents in Scotland:-

Back in 1988 when over 8,000 people replied to the original consultation on school boards, they said that they wanted to be involved in education but not in a formal managerial way.³⁹

The experience of school boards in Scotland suggests that parents were reluctant to extend their role in schools beyond that of consultation. Parents did support the establishment of boards but they did not wish to see boards adopting a role similar to that of governing bodies in England and Wales. This raises the issue of to what extent did governors in England and Wales exercise the powers made available to governing bodies under the Thatcher Government. What separates parents in England from their counterparts in Scotland is the degree to which the former have adopted the managerial role envisaged by the Thatcher Government for parents. This was borne out by a study of governing bodies conducted by the National Federation of Educational Research.⁴⁰ The authors of the study commented that :-

One in three governors representing all the schools likened the governing body to a board of directors of a limited company. While some called it a 'small' company, others pointed out that in the case of larger secondary school with full delegation the 'company' was certainly not small.⁴¹

The comments below are illustrative of the views of some governors. These governors were keen to stress the decision-making role of governing bodies:-

We are in overall control- we are the body that makes decisions and determines policy. We have to know what is practicable, available and above all desirable.⁴²

Our role is to determine the policy which the professionals put into practice and to be concerned with the important decisions, not the day-to-day ones.⁴³

Further evidence of governing bodies becoming involved in executive matters in schools was found in their attitudes to the role of governing bodies in staffing matters. The majority of governors supported the involvement of governing bodies in such matters.⁴⁴

What the *Talking About Schools* survey reveals is that parents in Scotland were on the whole supportive of the Scottish education system. In contrast to south of the border, there was no equivalent debate about standards in Scotland. Parents remained on the whole supportive of teachers and recognised their professional status. One might expect this to influence the relationship between parents and teachers. The *Times Scottish Education Supplement* commented that:-

The survey of parental opinion about schools inspired by Michael Forsyth has backfired. It was designed to complement the former Education Minister's radical reforms but instead concludes that parents are happy to leave education to teachers and there is overwhelming support for the difficult work they do. In effect, it is a massive vote of confidence in the present system. There is little evidence of parental support for school boards or opting out, although the survey omitted questions on both. And neither is there any major concern about falling academic standards or indiscipline.⁴⁵

In the same article attention was drawn to the fact that "teachers and parents share similar views about increased parental involvement."⁴⁶ This raises an interesting and important question which is addressed in the final section of the chapter namely did parents co-operate with the education professionals to oppose any elements of Thatcherite education policy? The findings of the *Talking About Schools* survey and the research conducted by Munn and Holroyd suggest that parents were reluctant to adopt an executive role in schools. Further, on the whole parents recognised the professional role of teachers and did not want to impinge on areas of professional expertise. One of the key mechanisms intended by the Government to increase parental involvement in schools was the creation of school boards. Given the apparent unwillingness of parents to have anything other than a consultative role in education

there appeared to be little chance of the Thatcher Government achieving its objective of transforming the role that parents had in the running of schools by creating school boards.

Opting Out

Further evidence of the commitment to comprehensive education which existed in Scottish society can be found in the attitudes Scots had to opting out. In sharp contrast to England, where 143 schools had opted out of local authority and 446 schools had been involved in the process of opting out by April 1992, in Scotland only 5 schools, all of which were primary schools, had initiated the grant maintained process and no schools had opted out.⁴⁷ Halpin et al have calculated that by January 1992 9% of secondary schools in England had embarked on the process eventually leading to self governing status.⁴⁸ Their findings also lead them to conclude that if one school opts out, other schools in the locality are more likely to initiate opting out procedures.⁴⁹ Several reasons are offered by the researchers as to why schools in England have opted out. For some the threat of closure was the deciding factor. However, the main reason was found to be the financial benefits which would result from the school adopting grant maintained status.⁵⁰ The nature of these benefits have been identified by Tony Busher and Marianne Colemann. Their research on the financial implications of opting out has led them to conclude that "GM schools receive explicit preference in the allocation of capital programmes and also benefit from one-off transitional payments."⁵¹ Given that the same financial benefits were offered to schools which opted out in Scotland it is significant that opting out has failed to have any equivalent appeal for parents and head teachers in Scotland.

One can only speculate as to why parents in Scotland have not welcomed opting out. It seems likely that the strong commitment to comprehensive schooling in Scotland would be one factor in any such explanation. Another possible explanation may be

related to the policy of local management in England and Wales. Schools south of the border are responsible to a far greater extent for running their own affairs. The experience schools have gained operating independently of the local authority may have led some to consider opting out.⁵² In Scotland, until recently only in Strathclyde region had an equivalent scheme in operation. DMR (Devolved Management of Resources) Strathclyde's scheme, however, does not allow schools to run their own affairs to the same degree as LMS does (see chapter 5). One could therefore argue because comprehensive schools in Scotland have not had the experience of extensive financial delegation that schools are less likely to opt out.

Opinion poll evidence provides a further indication of the opposition that existed in Scotland to opting out. In November 1990 MORI poll included a question on the issue of opting out.⁵³ 32% of respondents strongly opposed schools opting out of local control and 28% tended to opposed opting out. 17% of respondents either strongly agreed or tended to agree with opting out. The fact that no schools in Scotland have so far opted out of local authority control suggests that parental opinion on this issue differs between Scotland and England.

National Testing

National testing was another policy which ran into trouble in Scotland. The manner in which parents in Scotland reacted to the introduction of testing provides further evidence of the differing perceptions Scottish and English parents have of schooling. It is important to understand the context in which the Thatcher Government introduced testing to schools. It was argued earlier that testing was introduced in part in response to concerns about declining standards in schools in England and Wales. A *Times Scottish Education Supplement* editorial commented that the Education Secretary in England had "already shown how easy it was to play the populist card."⁵⁴

Testing was first introduced in the 1988 Education Reform Act. The intention of the Thatcher Government was that it would be used to monitor the standards achieved in the national curriculum. Governors and local authorities had to ensure that the national curriculum was implemented in all maintained schools. The legislation made provision for children to be tested in certain core subjects of the national curriculum at the ages of 7,11,14 and 16. The results of tests were to be made public. The Thatcher Governments argued that this would give parents access to not only information on their child's but also the school's performance. The 1988 Education Reform Act also introduced local management. Under formula funding, schools received most of their funds on the basis of pupil numbers. This measure, together with the policy of open enrolment, meant that governing bodies were anxious to use favourable test results to "market" their school.

Sally Brown has argued that there were "obvious parallels with England and Wales" over national curriculum and national testing.⁵⁵ In Scotland testing was intended to monitor standards of achievement in the 5-14 programme.⁵⁶ Testing south of the border as we have seen was linked to the national curriculum. The policy of national testing in Scotland was, she maintains, "still distinctive."⁵⁷ This was largely because of the distinctive administrative structure of Scottish education. The main difference she identifies was the nature of the legislation which introduced national testing in Scotland. The Self-Governing School etc (Scotland) Act included only one paragraph on testing. This was in sharp contrast to the 1988 Education Reform Act which set out the national curriculum and testing in 25 sections. The Scottish legislation was, in the words of Brown, "meagre and permissive...in comparison with England and Wales."⁵⁸ It is worth stressing that the legislation passed by the Thatcher Government which introduced testing into Scottish schools was not so clearly defined as equivalent legislation south of the border. It was not introduced in conjunction with local management. Formula funding and specifically the pupil driven component did not

apply to Scottish schools. Schools in Scotland were therefore cushioned from the effects of parents using test results to influence their choice of school. The Thatcher Government also did not legislate for the introduction of a national curriculum in Scotland.

The policy of testing was different in Scotland. Children would sit tests in primary 4 and primary 7 and tests would be conducted only in language (English or Gaelic) and mathematics. Teachers would be free to choose from a range of tests those they deemed most appropriate for each child. Each child is required to sit four separate "units." The differences between testing in England and Scotland was noted by the TESS which stated that "there were differences which protected Scottish sensitivities, at least in the minds of Scottish Office ministers."⁵⁹ However, the lack of consensus surrounding the merits of testing has led both parents and education professionals to question its validity:-

It was clear, however, that teachers and interested parents were concerned about the nature and purpose of the tests. Many thought that they were part of Michael Forsyth's plan as education minister to elevate public accountability at the expense of professional commitment.⁶⁰

The compulsory nature of testing was criticised by parents, local authorities and education professionals. A number of authorities allowed parents to write letters withdrawing their children from tests. In the first year of compulsory testing tests were carried out on only 30% of eligible pupils in Scotland.⁶¹ Only two regions (Borders and the Western Isles) carried out compulsory testing. However, a report by Borders Regional Council on testing cast doubt on the usefulness of testing:-

Those most involved in the testing programme-parents and teachers- are overwhelming of the view that the government has not succeeded in the objectives it had in introducing the testing programme...a continuation would not be in the educational interests of the pupils.⁶²

Parents had exercised their right to choose how their child was educated in a rather different fashion to that expected by the Government. How widespread was this

parental opposition to compulsory testing? The pressure group Parents' Coalition has conducted the largest survey to date of parental attitudes to testing. The survey was aimed at parents of 120,000 pupils in primary 4 and primary 7. The Borders was the only region which did not participate in the survey. In total, replies were received from nearly 60,000 parents. The proportion of replies was roughly balanced between the two stages of schooling. A representative of the Coalition claimed that the Government had been hostile to their survey:- "The Government has obstructed us all along the way, and not just by mild obstruction either but by debasing our standing."⁶³ Parents were asked for their opinion a range of issues related to testing. The table below shows the responses of parents in Scotland to the questions posed by Parents' Coalition.

Table 8.1 Parental Attitudes to Testing : National Survey Results

Question	Yes	No	Don't Know
Should national testing be compulsory in P4 ?	16%	71%	13%
Should national testing be compulsory in P7 ?	28%	57%	15%
Are national tests a good use of teachers' time ?	18%	65%	18%
Should parents have a right to withdraw their children from national testing ?	79%	16%	5%
Should a pupil's national test results be included in his/her school report ?	45%	48%	7%
Should a school's collective national test results be reported to its school board ?	35%	52%	12%
Should a school's test results be published in national league tables ?	17%	71%	12%
Should tests in primary schools be diagnostic ?	65%	25%	9%

Source: Parents Coalition Survey "National Testing Explained" December 1991

Nearly 80% of parents thought they should have the right of to withdraw their children from tests. Parents had done so on a large scale throughout Scotland. The survey indicates that parents in Scotland have very serious doubts about the nature of testing introduced by the Thatcher Government. Such doubts had caused parents to boycott national testing. This boycott was supported by the main teaching unions in Scotland.

Relationship between Parents and Educational Professionals in Scotland: Implications for Thatcher Government.

The nature of the opposition to testing in Scotland was distinctive. The alliance which developed between parent pressure groups, teaching unions and local authorities over the issue of national testing was an indication of the strength of feeling that existed amongst parents against this particular education policy of the Thatcher Government. The intensity of opposition the Thatcher Government faced when it attempted to implement the policy in Scotland was unique. This opposition was given an added dimension because the consensus against testing extended beyond the teaching profession and local authorities to parents. Public opinion had been successfully mobilised against the Government, making it very difficult to implement the policy. In March 1991 The *Independent's* education correspondent wrote:-

While seven year olds in England and Wales prepare for their first national tests next month, Scottish classrooms are emptying as a tripartite alliance-unimaginable in England- of parents, teachers and local authorities fights against early arrival of universal national testing... The testing row is further example of the Conservatives' failure to sell their consumer-led education revolution in Scotland.⁶⁴

Parents' bodies and school boards united with the main teaching unions and local authorities to oppose the policies of the Thatcher Government.

In contrast to the situation south of the border, the Government had dramatically failed to mobilise parental opinion behind testing. It is difficult to explain why the policy of national testing in particular should have stimulated such a response from Scottish parents. The trust that parents have in the professional judgement of teachers might help to account for their reactions. What appeared to be distinctive about parental opposition, however, was the extent to which the policy of national testing was judged to be at best irrelevant, and at worst detrimental to the education of primary school pupils in Scotland. The rationale for national testing was that it would increase accountability in the education system. Schools' test results would be published.

Parents in Scotland opposed the principle of testing advanced by the Thatcher Government.

The education correspondent of the Scotland on Sunday observed that :-

...members of the Parent Coalition met the EIS and COSLA officials to agree a common approach (in their opposition to testing.) Both the coalition and the EIS are pressing local authorities to encourage parents to withdraw their children from testing.⁶⁵

In an interview Fred Forrester claimed the relationship which the EIS had with parent pressure groups had been closer as a result of the campaign of against national testing.⁶⁶ The union had links with the Scottish Teacher Parent Council, Parents Coalition, Lothian Parent Action Group and other groups. The General Secretary of the Scottish Secondary Teachers Association, Alex Stanley stressed that in recent years parents had been "very good allies":-

Over the years parents have been very good allies. Even when we have been in dispute with the Government between 1984 and 1986 the parents were very much on our side. There is no doubt of that.⁶⁷

Parents in Scotland reacted in a number of ways to Thatcherite education policy. They welcomed the introduction of school boards but did not seek a managerial role in the running of schools. Parents did not want to challenge the role of the professionals in teaching their children. However, there was an expressed desire that parents should continue to be involved in a consultative capacity in schools. The failure of a significant proportion of school boards to attract sufficient candidates to replace those board members standing down after two years implies that parents did not necessarily see their involvement in school being through boards. Turning to opting out and national testing, it is evident that there was a general consensus against these policies. Both of these policies failed to win the support of parents. The opposition to its education policies presented the Thatcher Government with particular problems. Parent pressure groups and professional bodies mobilised public opinion against Government education policies.

Evidence suggests that parental reaction to Thatcherite education policy in Scotland was distinctive. In particular over the policy of testing the Government faced the combined opposition of the parental community and the educational professional. One can speculate that this was the case because of the distinctiveness of the Scottish education system. The words of one parent who voted Conservative exemplify the problems which the Thatcher Government faced in Scotland:- "(I oppose the governments' attempts) to impose a foreign system on Scottish education for political, not educational advantage."⁶⁸ The myths and traditions which surrounded the Scottish education system continue to influence the kind of arguments that were employed against Thatcherite education policy.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

¹ For a more detailed examination of parental choice see chapter 5.

² DES Press Release 127/91

³ *Standards in Education 1989-1990: The Annual Report of HM Senior Chief Inspector of Schools* p.2

⁴ *Ibid*

⁵ DES Press Release 'Tests of 7 Year Olds Reveal "Unacceptable" Variations' 19th December 1991.

⁶ DES Press Release 'Kenneth Clark Announces Further Action to Improve Reading Standards' 9th July 1991

⁷ For fuller discussion of parental choice legislation see chapter 5.

⁸ Echols, Frank, McPherson, A. and Willms, J.D (1990) 'Parental Choice in Scotland' *Journal of Education Policy* vol.5 p208

⁹ *Ibid* p.218

¹⁰ SSTA (1990) *Opting Out ? Why the SSTA says NO.* p.2

¹¹ McLeod, D. (1989) 'A Mathematical Exercise Which May Not Add Up To Much' *Scotsman* 28th August

¹² Semple, B. (1989) 'The Assessment of Achievement Programme' *Scottish Educational Review* Vol.21 p.123

¹³ McPherson, A. (1989) 'What Decline in Primary Mathematics Achievement ?' *The Scottish Educational Journal* Vol.72 No.3

¹⁴ *Ibid*

¹⁵ Paterson, L. (1989) Letter to TESS 23rd June

-
- ¹⁶ McPherson, A. (1989) 'Twists in the Number Game' TESS 21st April
- ¹⁷ Brown, S. and Thorpe, G. (1989) Letter to TESS 28th April
- ¹⁸ MacBeath, J. et al (1989) *Talking About Schools: Main Findings* p.4
- ¹⁹ *Ibid* p.4
- ²⁰ *Ibid* p.5
- ²¹ *Ibid* p.5
- ²² MacBeath, J. et al (1989) *Talking About Schools: What Makes A Good School* p.3
- ²³ Munn, P. (1991) 'School Boards, Accountability and Control' *British Journal of Educational Studies* Vol. 39 p.181
- ²⁴ The first study of School Boards and their effect on the education system was undertaken by the Scottish Centre of Educational Research (SCRE). This research was undertaken by Pamela Munn and Sally Brown for Dumfries and Galloway education authority. It involved a study of seven pilot school boards set up by the authority prior to the passing of the School Boards (Scotland) Act 1988. The research was not intended however to "...question the desirability of school boards".
- ²⁵ Munn, P. and Brown, S. (1990) *Pilot School Boards: First Impressions* p.20
- ²⁶ Munn, P. (1990) *Pilot School Boards: Parents' Views* p.5
- ²⁷ MORI asked respondents "to what extent would you support or oppose setting up school boards to run individual school ?"
- ²⁸ Briggs, S. 'Parents Shun School Revolution' *Scotland on Sunday* 6th October 1991
- ²⁹ Munro, N (1992) 'School Board by-elections collapse as apathy reigns' *Times Education Supplement [Scotland]* 10th October
- ³⁰ The interview with Fred Forrester was conducted in April 1992.
- ³¹ MacBeath, J. et al , *op. cit.*, p.14
- ³² MacBeath et al, *op. cit.*, p.30
- ³³ *Ibid* p. 32
- ³⁴ MacBeath et al (1989) *Talking About Schools: Learning and Teaching* p.3
- ³⁵ *Ibid*
- ³⁶ *Ibid* p.4
- ³⁷ Quoted in Henderson, D. 'Parents Reject Forsyth's Revolution' *Times Scottish Education Supplement* 20th October 1989.
- ³⁸ Munn, P. and Holroyd, C. (1989) *Pilot School Boards: Experiences and Achievements* p.5
- ³⁹ Cited in Briggs, *op.cit*

- 40 The research involved sending a questionnaires to 43 governing bodies 21 primary , 20 secondaries and 2 special schools]. In total 258 governor participated in the research. The intention was to explore their views on the functioning of governing bodies. In addition nine case study schools were selected.
- 41 Baginsky , M. et al (1991) *Towards Effective Partnership in School Governance* p.8
- 42 *Ibid*
- 43 *Ibid*
- 44 *Ibid* p.123
- 45 *Times Education Supplement Scotland* 20th October 1989
- 46 *Ibid*
- 47 The data on England and Wales was calculated from information given by the Association of County Councils. The five schools in Scotland which have initiated opting out proceeding and the results of the ballots are given below:-
- Holm Primary (Orkney)** Eligible to vote 74 Total Vote 72 Rate of Participation 97%
Yes Vote 8% (6) No Vote 92% (66)
- Scared Heart (Girvan)** Eligible to vote 114 Total Vote 82 Rate of Participation 72%
Yes Vote 44% (32) No Vote 46% (46)
- Willowbank (Glasgow)** Eligible to vote 229 Total Vote 145 Rate of Participation 63%
Yes Vote 19% (27) No Vote 81% (117)
- London Street (Edinburgh)** Eligible to vote 186 Total Vote 118 Rate of Participation 70%
Yes Vote 90% (106) No Vote 10% (12)
- Dalmuir Primary (Clydebank)** First Ballot Eligible to vote 232 Total Vote 13 Rate of Participation 6% Yes Vote 18% (9) No Vote 82% (9)
- Second Ballot Eligible to vote 232 Total Vote 146 Rate of Participation 63% Yes Vote 6% (10) No Vote 94% (136)
- Two ballots were held because of an error in the ballot paper sent out in the first ballot by the Electoral Reform Society.
- 48 Halpin, D. , Fitz, J. and Power, S. (1992) *The Early Impact and Long-Term Implications of Grant Maintained Schools Policy* Paper Presented to Seminar Organised by Policy Analysis Unit, University Of Warwick p.5
- 49 *Ibid* p.6
- 50 *Ibid* p.7
- For a detailed analysis of those schools which have opted out in England see the press release issued by Local Schools Information on the 19th February 1992 entitled *Opting-Out 1988-1992: An Analysis*. It concludes that the Department of Education had spent over £30 million in additional expenditure in implementing the policy of opting out. It also noted that a significant proportion, 37%, of schools where a ballot on opting out had been held were grammar schools.
- 51 Busher, T. and Colemann, M. (1992) *The Financial Implications of Mass Opting Out* p.17
- 52 The Major Government explicitly stated in its recent White Paper *Choice and Diversity* that LMS was a stepping stone to schools adopting GM status.
- 53 The exact wording of the question was "To what extent would you support or oppose encouraging schools to opt out of local education authority control ?" A 5 point scale was used ranging from strongly support, tend to support, neither support nor oppose, tend to oppose and strongly oppose.
- 54 Editorial *The Times Scottish Education Supplement* 1st March 1991.

⁵⁵ Brown, S. (1990) 'The National Curriculum and Testing: Enlightened or Imported ?' *Scottish Educational Review* p.69

⁵⁶ For a more detailed discussion see chapter 4. In November 1987 the Secretary of State for Scotland, Michael Rifkind, launched the 5-14 Programme. The Programme amounted to a major review of the curriculum ; assessment in primary schools and the first two years of secondary education; and procedures for reporting to parents. National guidelines were introduced in three major areas namely, English language, Mathematics and Assessment. The March 1992 edition of School Board News claimed the Programme had four aims namely, "...to put in place a nationally agreed curriculum for the 5 to 14 age group; improve how pupils progress is assessed; introduce national testing in English and Mathematics which will act as a benchmark against which to monitor pupils progress and to improve communication between parents and schools about what is taught and about their children's progress."

⁵⁷ Brown , S, *op. cit.*, p.69

⁵⁸ *Ibid* p.71

⁵⁹ Pickard, W. 'Why Scotland's Parents Rebelled' *The Times Educational Supplement* 22nd February 1991 p.15

⁶⁰ *Ibid*

⁶¹ *Scotland on Sunday* 6th October 1991.

⁶² *Ibid*

⁶³ *Times Educational Scotland Supplement* 'Three out of Four Parents Reject Tests' 27th March 1992

⁶⁴ Braid, M. 'In Scotland They'll Just Stay At Home' *Independent* 14th March 1991

⁶⁵ *Scotland on Sunday* 6th October 1991.

⁶⁶ Interview with Fred Forrester conducted April 1992

⁶⁷ Interview with Alex Stanley conducted April 1992

⁶⁸ Braid, M. *op. cit*

Part 4 Implications of Thatcherite Statecraft

CHAPTER 9

IMPLICATIONS OF THATCHERITE STATECRAFT IN SCOTLAND

Thatcherism and the Government of Scotland

In part one of the thesis it was argued that the Thatcher Governments departed in some important respects from traditional Conservative statecraft in Scotland. The analysis of Thatcherism, "British" Conservatism and Scottish Conservatism established that differences existed and continue to exist, between these three variants of Conservatism. These differences, in turn, had implications for the ways in which each of these brands of Conservatism would deal with the government of Scotland. The Thatcher Governments had a distinctive approach to the government of Scotland.

Two, not unrelated, elements of Thatcherism led the Thatcher Governments to be at odds with both "British" Conservatism and Scottish Conservatism on the issue of how Scotland should be governed. The Thatcher Governments introduced ideologically motivated policies. In particular, Thatcherites were intent on undermining the social democratic consensus which had been established in the post war years and they questioned the assumptions which underlay the welfare state. Paul Wilding has argued that collectivism especially was challenged by the Thatcher Governments:-

The welfare state, is above all, an experiment in collectivist politics. Thatcherism pronounced it to be an experiment which had failed.¹

The ideology of the New Right was influential in the Thatcher Governments' promotion of market capitalism and the enterprise culture. State industries were privatised. The notion of the internal market in the National Health Service was pursued. Education was to be made more responsive to client wishes. Increasingly, the language of the market was employed in social policy. Schools were to be run in a businesslike fashion and were encouraged to compete with each other for their clients.

In line with this emphasis on the market and enterprise culture Thatcherites maintained that a dependency culture had developed in certain areas of British society. The welfare state, it was argued, had corrupted individuals. They had become too dependent on state handouts. Thatcherite ideologues believed that individuals should be free from state interference to maximize their opportunities.

The second element of Thatcherism at odds with British Conservatism and Scottish Conservatism was the attitude it had towards change. The crucial point was that change did not have to be organic in nature. One of the fundamental objections which Conservatives who advocate organic change have to policies which are ideologically driven is that such policies could lead to radical and potentially damaging change. By endorsing ideological policies which challenged the conventional wisdoms of the post war period such as collectivism and corporatism. Thatcherites were challenging the notion that change should be organic.

The adherence of the more paternalist "British" Conservatives and some Scottish Conservatives to tradition and organic change has repercussions for the way in which Scotland should be governed. Both would recognise that Conservatism in Scotland may have to associate with a different set of institutions and traditions from Conservatism in England. Both would contend that Conservatives aim to conserve, not to embark on radical programmes of change. Societies should be allowed to evolve and not be artificial constructions. If change is to be organic in the Scottish context it must be relevant to the distinctive institutions and traditions which exist in Scottish society.

The attitude that Thatcherites had to the Union and more generally to the constitution also separated them from other variants of Conservatism. The view which Thatcherites had of change is crucial to understanding their stance on the constitution. In contrast to

traditional British Conservatism, Thatcherites believed that the constitution was not something that should be defended solely on the grounds that it was the product of generations of experience. Nor was it something that should conserve rather than initiate change. Such views allowed the Thatcher Government to use constitutional conventions to introduce policies which may be perceived to be radical or ideological.

The constitution was used by the Thatcher Governments to pursue ideological ends. For Thatcherites the constitution offered central government the opportunity to implement its policies throughout Britain; for them the importance of the Union did not lie in the provisions for the continued existence of distinctive civil society in Scotland. A different kind of Unionism was advocated and the constitutional implications were of secondary importance.

One other point concerning the Thatcher Government's attitude to the Union is worth reiterating. The moves which were made under Margaret Thatcher's premiership towards increasing central control also influenced the attitude of the Thatcher Governments to the Union. The introduction of legislative devolution might have hindered central government in introducing uniform all-British policies that ran counter to the dominant opinion in Scotland. The Thatcher Governments steadfastly refused to consider any moves towards legislative devolution. For them such a reform of the constitutional relationship between Scotland and England would marginalise Scotland, in the sense that central government would find its ability to introduce uniform policies reduced.

The refusal to concede to demands for a Scottish Assembly was indicative of the approach advocated the Thatcher Government to Scottish politics. Thatcherite statecraft marginalised the Scottish dimension and significantly it failed to understand the implications this would have for the Conservative Party in Scotland and for

implementation of public policy in Scotland. Throughout the 1980s the Conservative Party increasingly found itself out of step with politics north of the border. No Government in the post war period had to face such a stark division of electoral loyalties within Britain. As the number of Conservative MPs representing Scottish constituencies fell, the number of Conservative MPs representing English and in particular southern English constituencies rose. In contrast the Labour Party had throughout the 1980s consolidated its electoral position in Scotland.

While the Thatcher Governments portrayed themselves as implementing radical change, a major concern in the debates on Thatcherism has been the extent to which change occurred. There are essentially two views. On the one hand there are those commentators who emphasis the radical nature of Thatcherism and on the other hand, there are those who doubt the coherence and consistency of Thatcherism. Commenting on pre and post 1979 politics Savage and Robbins have argued, "there are many areas of continuity and similarity between the two periods."² Reflecting upon the Thatcher years, for instance, David Dutton believes that the 'Beveridge system' is one area where Thatcherism did not affect radical change, despite its rhetoric:-

Though the Thatcher Government has spoken of the need for the individual to stop turning to government for a solution to all his problems, and while there has been some movement towards a more selective provision of welfare benefits, the fundamental structure of the Beveridge system remains largely intact...³

The crucial point is that despite the ideological rhetoric of the Thatcher Governments certain areas were characterised by continuity. These areas of continuity and the fact that "crucial ruptures...were actually initiated during the so-called Social Democratic consensus: abandonment of full employment, public expenditure cuts and privileging the fight against inflation" led Jessop et al to qualify "any argument that there has been a radical break between a social democratic era and the present Thatcherite ascendancy."⁴

In reality, the impact of Thatcherism was limited by what Marsh and Rhodes have described as the "implementation gap". As seen in chapter 2 this gap was a consequence of the Thatcher Governments' approach to policy making. In certain policy areas there was a failure to consult and negotiate with those interests affected. Some policy areas were characterised by continuity rather than radical change e.g. environmental policy. Government experienced difficulties in implementing its policies. It has been argued that a major implementation problem in Scotland for Thatcherite statecraft was the Scottish dimension to policy making. By failing to consult and negotiate with the "Scottish educational community" over certain education policies the Thatcher Government was perceived to be implementing policies which were not relevant to the Scottish context. The introduction of policies which were perceived to be not relevant to the Scottish context ran the risk of sparking off "nationalist" opposition.

The judgement that Thatcherism had led to radical change may have been due to commentators placing a greater emphasis on the legislation enacted by the Thatcher Governments and its intent rather than on the actual impact of that legislation. The Thatcher Governments, as Marsh and Rhodes argue, successfully introduced a large amount of radical legislative initiatives but they were less successful in implementing these initiatives. They make a crucial distinction between the legislation passed under the Thatcher Governments, much of which was radical, and the policy "outcomes", where much less change had occurred.⁵

The emphasis placed on social policy during the last Thatcher administration compounded the problems the Thatcher Government faced when dealing with Scottish matters. Administrative devolution had been developed to accommodate the institutional and social differences which exist between Scotland and the rest of

Britain. This is not to suggest that, all post war Conservative Governments with the exception of the Thatcher Governments, consistently sought to accommodate the distinctive social institutions in Scotland. What separated the Thatcher Government from previous Conservative Administrations was the extent to which the former overlooked the fact that Scotland was different, especially in its civil society.

Despite the increasing centralisation of Westminster's powers over the past century, Scotland has still retained a largely distinctive civil society. In particular, the myth that Scottish society is more egalitarian than English society has continued to influence how certain policies are regarded. This myth is at its strongest in the Scottish education system. Consequently, policies which are perceived to undermine the egalitarian nature of the Scottish system are more likely to stimulate "nationalist" opposition. The arguments against elements of Thatcherite education policy, such as opting out and national testing, were nationalist in the sense that they referred to the myths and traditions which pervade the Scottish education system. The connection that Scots make between their national identity and the egalitarian myth is crucial to understanding why policies which are judged to be socially divisive are more likely to be met with "nationalist" opposition. The evidence presented in chapter 7 indicated that policies which were thought to undermine the notion of community schooling were more likely to stimulate "nationalist" arguments.

Earlier Conservative Governments made a significant contribution to the development of a system of administrative devolution which accepted the existence of Scotland's distinctive social institutions. The existence of this separate administrative structure has helped to reinforce the Scottish dimension to political debate north of the border. This is especially true in social policy. Keating and Midwinter have argued that:-

...Scottish education policy is largely self-contained, as is policy on social work services. UK departments are kept informed of developments and ideas are exchanged but there is little joint policy-making.⁶

The examination of consensual Thatcherite education policy in chapter 4 indicates that during the early years of the Thatcher Governments major curricular initiatives were "largely self contained." At least initially this description could not include TVEI. However, in order to facilitate its implementation the Government had to allow the educational professionals to adapt it to the Scottish context. The most controversial piece of educational legislation passed in the first Thatcher Administration was the Education (Scotland) Act 1981. It has been argued in chapter 5 that this Act could be described however as something of an aberration in early Thatcherite education policy. There are two significant points to make in relation to these consensual educational policies. Firstly, they were negotiated within the Scottish educational community which ensured that the initiatives would be perceived as consensual. Secondly, the initiatives all had a Scottish dimension. The involvement of the Scottish educational community in the development of these initiatives guaranteed that they would be relevant to the Scottish context.

However, during the last Thatcher Administration education policy was increasingly no longer "self-contained." The Thatcher Government pursued similar education policies in Scotland and England to a greater degree than previous Conservative administrations. Consequently, tensions emerged between the approach adopted by the Thatcher administrations in the government of Scotland and the approach favoured by more paternalist Tories. The appointment of Michael Forsyth, an avowed Thatcherite, to the Scottish Office education team in 1987 was symbolic of this change in approach to education policy.

Not only does the Scottish education system have an unique administrative and institutional arrangement within the UK but a distinctive culture also informs that system. That culture is based on a number of myths and traditions which contribute to the distinctiveness of the Scottish education system and more generally to Scottish national consciousness. The Thatcher Government had sought to introduce ideologically motivated policies in an area where Scotland was particularly distinct from the rest of Britain. A number of themes became apparent in Thatcherite education policy such as competition and choice. Similar themes were pursued in both Scotland and in England. Given that education was an area where Scotland had a distinctive system both in terms of administration and culture, what problems did the Thatcher Government encounter in implementing policies that were not generated from the Scottish context ? If the education legislation passed under the third Thatcher Administration was influenced by the desire to promote certain political principles rather than seeking to accommodate the distinctive elements of the education system how did the educational professionals in Scotland react ?

This last question raises a series of other questions. Was it the case that the education professionals in Scotland opposed Thatcherite education policy or was there a general acceptance of the initiatives which were being introduced ? If there was opposition, what was the nature of the opposition ? In other words did it focus on the perception that Thatcherite education policy had failed to accommodate the distinctive education system that allegedly exists in Scotland ?

The interviews conducted with head teachers and the survey of principal teachers provided evidence of a consensus against Thatcherite education policy. The notion of "anglicisation" was referred to in four specific areas: the creation of school boards, opting out, devolved management of resources, and the involvement of school board representatives in the appointment of senior staff. For teachers in particular, this

party recognition of the need for educational reform and in particular the need for changes to the curriculum. Secondly, the first Thatcher Administration was pre-occupied with the economy. Thirdly, Scotland was not important politically. During the third Thatcher Administration education policy became an increasingly contested area. Educational policy was driven by ideological concerns and therefore was more controversial. Moreover, educational professionals found themselves marginalised in the development of policy. To what extent was Thatcherite education policy after 1987 able to deliver change ?

If the Thatcher Governments were to implement their policies successfully they had to secure the active support of parents. One of the stated objectives of Thatcherite education policy was to redefine the role which parents had in the schooling system. Ultimately this could only be achieved if parents were willing to exercise their new rights. The Thatcher Governments had stressed that their education policies were designed to meet the wishes of parents and to ensure that parents could have their child educated as they thought fit. The role of parents was to be enhanced at the expense of the interests of the educational professionals. In relation to school boards, the Government had to revise its original proposals in favour of a more limited involvement for boards in the running of schools. Also no schools have opted out of education authority in Scotland

There were indications that the Thatcher Governments had misjudged the reactions of parents in certain policy initiatives. The decision by the Thatcher Government to introduce testing to Scottish primary schools highlighted the problems faced by a Government which pursues education policies that are not specific to the Scottish context. The evidence shows that parents in Scotland were opposed to testing. Significantly, an alliance emerged between parents and the professionals in Scotland. Parents were prepared to support the position adopted by the teaching unions on this

perception had been intensified by the apparent lack of consultation prior to the introduction of the school boards and of opting out legislation. Both principal teachers and head teachers defended the tradition of community schooling in the most "nationalist" terms. Specifically, the introduction of opting out and the extension of parental powers were perceived as undermining this tradition. Thus, teachers did refer to the traditions and myths that allegedly pervade the Scottish system. Particular policies were seen as a threat to such myths and traditions. This approach was also adopted by parents in Scotland, and was most explicit in the opposition voiced about the introduction of primary testing.

In the light of the findings of the fieldwork, to what extent was Thatcherite statecraft able to bring about change in Scottish secondary schools ? The idea of Thatcherite statecraft securing substantial change has to be assessed critically. The first point which should be made is that not all education policy introduced under the Thatcher Governments was controversial. For the most part, the consensual initiatives were introduced in the early years of the Thatcher Government. It is here that the Thatcher Governments were able to affect the greatest change. The introduction of the National Certificate proceeded in a remarkably consensual manner. In particular schools and FE colleges were quick to adopt the National Certificate. This initiative had the widespread support of the educational community. The Inspectorate had a leading role in development of the National Certificate. The distinctively Scottish dimension to the reform facilitated its implementation. Indeed as Fairley and Paterson noted "the reform was implemented swiftly and extensively."⁷ The approach adopted by the Thatcher Government in its early years, with the exception of the 1981 Act, was not characterised by a failure to consult and negotiate with concerned interests. The implementation of policies proceeded in a consensual manner. The question arises why this approach was adopted ? In chapter 4 several factors were suggested which could account for the consensual approach. Firstly, it could be argued that there was cross

issue. The policy of testing clearly did not have the approval of parents. It seemed apparent that Thatcherite education policy, in this instance, was out of step with public opinion in Scotland. In formulating their education policies the Thatcher Governments failed to accommodate the stronger commitment which exists in Scotland towards comprehensive education. Consequently policies which were perceived to undermine comprehensive schooling were more likely to meet with opposition in Scotland.

However, Thatcherite education policy was able to secure change in Scottish secondary schools. Parents, through the establishment of school boards, were given the opportunity to be involved in the day to day running of schools. Parental choice legislation also significantly enhanced the position of parents *visa a vis* the professionals. The amount of change has certainly been less than the Thatcherites and in particular Michael Forsyth would have wished, but they were able shift the terms of the debate. It was the political agenda of Thatcher Governments which shaped that debate. The educational professionals had to respond to educational initiatives which would undermine their position in the educational system.

Thatcherism: The Implications For Future Conservative Governments in Scotland

What are the implications for the nature of Conservatism in Scotland, in the light of the experiences of the Thatcher Government ? Thatcherism appeared to challenge the distinctive cultural perceptions which exist in Scottish society. In consequence the relevance of Conservatism to Scottish politics was questioned. The apparent unwillingness of the Thatcher Government to adapt its policies and approach to the Scottish context caused problems for Scottish Conservatives. They had to face claims that the Conservative Party was an "English" party or that it was anti-Scottish. Such claims were difficult to refute. The poor electoral performance of the Conservative

Party under the leadership of Margaret Thatcher, particularly in the 1987 General Election, reinforced the perception that the Thatcher Government was intent on introducing policies which did not have popular support in Scotland, thereby creating the perception that Thatcher Governments were anglicising Scottish society. Scottish Conservatives found it difficult to alter this perception of the Conservative Party in Scotland. This was reflected in the pattern of electoral support in Britain under the Thatcher Governments.

It has been suggested above that Thatcherite statecraft in Scotland was able to affect less change than its ideological rhetoric might have implied. To what extent did the Scottish dimension inhibit the implementation of Thatcherite policies? The problems the Thatcher Governments experienced when implementing their education policies are particularly instructive. The distinctiveness of the Scottish education system presented specific problems. The fact that the Thatcher Governments failed to appreciate the importance of institutional and cultural differences between Scotland and England suggested that opposition to their education policies would be particularly intense. It is perhaps not surprising therefore that one of main accusations voiced against Thatcherite education policy by the "Scottish education community" was that it had led to anglicisation. The Thatcher Government were not the first government to experience such accusations in relation to education policy. What was different was the intensity of such claims. This was due to the fact that the approach the Thatcher Governments adopted in social policy was different: they were more intent on introducing uniform policies throughout Britain which were guided by ideological concerns.

The opposition which the Thatcher Governments experienced to their education policies in Scotland furthers our understanding of the problems that Conservative Governments face in the implementation of public policy in Scotland. The nature of the

opposition to Thatcherite policies was influenced by the perception that government had not been willing firstly to consider how such policies would be perceived in Scotland and secondly then to change its policies accordingly. The perception was that Thatcherite education policy in Scotland was guided by certain political principles rather than the desire to ensure that the reforms were relevant to the Scottish education system. This created problems for those Scottish Conservatives who did not endorse Thatcherism. Tensions emerged between those Conservatives who advocated that education policy in Scotland should reflect the distinctive education system and the Thatcherites who rejected this notion.

One consequence of the approach adopted by the Thatcher Governments to the government of Scotland was the growing difficulty some Scottish Conservatives found experienced in reconciling their Scottish identity with their British one. Although Conservatives throughout Britain share certain basic tenets, Conservatives in Scotland have to operate in a different political context. This is something that Conservative Governments should take on board when formulating policy which is applied to the Scottish context. If government fails to do so then it may face increased opposition to its policies. This was the reaction that the Thatcher Government faced to some of its education policies and in particular to the introduction of primary testing. By neglecting the Scottish dimension, the Thatcher Government had galvanised the opposition it faced. Parents, opposition politicians and the educational professionals expressed common criticism of testing. This criticism was often expressed in nationalist terms. Thus, pressure groups in Scotland were able to rely on parental support in their campaign against the introduction of testing.

Prior to the removal of Margaret Thatcher as Prime Minister and leader of the Conservative Party there had been much speculation as to whether or not a new leader would change the Conservative Party's approach to the government of Scotland.

There has been conflicting evidence about the extent to which, if at all, the Major Government intends to reassess the situation. In an interview in the *Glasgow Herald* shortly before the general election John Major argued against any moves to introduce legislative devolution. Referring to the devolution proposals that were being advanced in Scotland, Major maintained that "it would be an immense loss for the UK if we were to go down what I believe is the short-sighted route that some are proposing."⁸ He claimed that present proposals were misleading and would result in the end of the Union:-

In many ways they (devolution proposals) are intellectually fraudulent and they are positively damaging in that the effect of them will be to accentuate concern and bitterness and lead to separation.⁹

John Major appeared to share the views of his predecessor on the issue of legislative devolution. He adopted a line of argument which was frequently used by Thatcherites when they were asked about constitutional reform namely that the kind of devolution which mattered was not legislative devolution but rather "devolution to let people make up their own minds."¹⁰

There was, however, some indication that the style of Conservative statecraft under the premiership of John Major would be different from that of the Thatcher Governments. Major went to some lengths in the interview to show that he was aware that Scotland is different:-

If you go to Scotland there is no doubt about the Scottishness of Scotland. They may be part of the UK but the Scots are as Scottish today, I dare say, as they were in 1707; there is no doubt about that.¹¹

The comments made by John Major suggest that he would favour a change in style in how Scotland is governed. More recently there has been some indication that the present Conservative Government will be more conciliatory when dealing with Scottish matters. In his first speech as the Scottish Office Minister for Constitutional

Affairs Lord Fraser conceded that the Thatcher Government had been "insensitive" and "arrogant" in Scotland :-

We (Conservatives) have to acknowledge that there have been times when we have been clumsy, insensitive and even arrogant.¹²

Is it the case that the governance of Scotland has entered a "post Thatcher" era ? Lord Fraser did hint that this might be so. He recognised that the introduction of the poll tax a year earlier in Scotland may have alienated Scots. The message of the speech was that the Major Government had the opportunity to make a fresh start in Scotland and to rectify the image which the Conservative Party had gained north of the border of being an English party.

At the 1992 Conservative Party Conference in Brighton, the Secretary of State for Scotland Ian Lang gave a speech which strongly defended the Union. Significantly though the speech stressed the "Scottish dimension" to the Union:-

Since the General Election, the Prime Minister, my colleagues and I have been engaged in a far-reaching exercise of stock-taking, seeking ways of strengthening the Union. We have ranged far and wide and the process is continuing...But I want to make clear one thing clear. Taking stock isn't an exercise with a beginning, middle and end. The Government will always have the Scottish dimension right at the heart of its thinking. The Government will continually strive to prepare Scotland for the challenges of the future. Scotland will be placed to meet those challenges as a full and equal partner in the Union.¹³

The findings of the "stock-taking" exercise were published in the White Paper *Scotland in the Union: A Partnership for Good* in March 1993. The proposals made are modest in nature. The second reading of Scottish bills will be debated in the Scottish Grand Committee rather than at the House of Commons. However, any votes will still have to be taken at Westminster. Also, responsibility for training and the Scottish Arts Council will also be transferred from Whitehall to the Scottish Office. Among the other suggestions made in the document is that government offices where possible should be relocated to Scotland. The document was an attempt by the Major

Government to appease nationalist demands and present the Union in positive terms.

In his introduction the Secretary of State for Scotland, Ian Lang argued:-

But it is right that from time to time, all aspects of the way the Union works should be considered and that improvements be sought. Such a process is essential if the Government are to address the sense of unease which has coloured some Scots' perception of the Union. The Union is good for Scotland but that does not mean that it cannot be made better.¹⁴

There is a general concern throughout the document that the Scottish dimension to Government has to be highlighted more. In the closing chapter it is stated that, "the proposals in this White Paper are designed to improve the visibility of government in Scotland."¹⁵

However, it is too early to say whether or not the Major Government will depart significantly from the approach adopted by the Thatcher Governments to the government of Scotland. The signs are that the language adopted may be more conciliatory and that there is a greater awareness of the need to avoid alienating the Scots any further. In this respect the Major Government would be closer than the Thatcher Governments to the views of One Nation Conservatives and traditional Scottish Conservatives. The real test, however, will not be whether or not the Major Government adopts a more conciliatory tone but whether this is followed through to the policy process. Will it introduce policies which accommodate the distinctive attitudes and institutions which exist in Scottish society? In education policy, with the possible exception of national testing, this does not appear to have happened. The Parents Charter introduced by the Major Government sought to advance some of the same principles as Thatcherite education policy such as choice and accountability. The Major Government has also made moves to introduce delegated management into Scottish schools. The scheme outlined by the SED in consultative paper *School Management: The Way Ahead* has many similarities with the system of delegated management which was introduced in England and Wales by the 1988 Education

Reform Act. For example, the paper proposed that formula funding should be introduced into Scottish schools and that bursars be appointed to support schools in financial and administrative aspects of delegation. There are, however, also some significant differences. Responsibility for the school budget will be delegated to the head teacher and not the school board. In England and Wales, it is the governing body that is responsible for the budget. It is unclear from the consultative paper what the exact role of the school board will be.

The initial indications have been that the Major Government has accepted, in face of intense opposition, the need to re-assess the policy of national testing in Scotland. A consultative paper, *5-14 Development Programme: Arrangements for National Testing*, was issued by the SOED in May 1992. One proposal included in the paper was that pupils would no longer be tested at P4 and P7 but "when the teachers' own assessment indicated that the pupil had largely achieved the attainment targets at one level."¹⁶ Pupils who therefore had not yet reached the first level would not be tested.

If the new Conservative administration is serious about adopting a more sensitive approach north of the border it must reduce the opportunities that educationalists and politicians in Scotland have to use "nationalist" arguments. Given the Major Government's adherence to the principles which underlay Thatcherite education policy there is every likelihood that such arguments will continue to be employed by educational professionals in Scotland against the education policies introduced by the Major Government. The Scottish education system and the myths and traditions which inform that system are still a crucial part of the Scottish national identity. One possible way for the Major Government to appear more sensitive would be to introduce education policies which are perceived to be relevant to the Scottish context. In particular, it should recognise that Scots have a strong commitment to comprehensive

education and aim to introduce policies which at the very least do not undermine the comprehensive system.

There has been little sign that the Major Government will adopt this approach. The continued adherence to the principles which underlay Thatcherite education policy means that the Major Government is unlikely to alter the perception that grew under the period of the Thatcher Governments of the Conservative Party being an English party. This perception is even more unlikely to change in light of John Major's stance on the issue of legislative devolution. The Major Government will find that to talk in more sensitive terms is not enough. If Conservatism is going to have renewed appeal in Scotland, Conservative Governments will have to undergo change in substance and not just a change in style.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

¹ Wilding, P. (1992) 'The British Welfare State: Thatcherism's Enduring Legacy' *Policy and Politics* Vol.20 No.3 p.201

² Savage, S. and Robins, L. (1990) 'Introduction' in Savage, S. and Robins, L. (eds.) *Public Policy Under Thatcher* p.1

³ Dutton, D. (1991) *British Politics Since 1945: The Rise and Fall of Consensus* p.87

⁴ Jessop, B. et al (1984) *Thatcherism: A Tale Of Two Nations* p.40

⁵ Marsh, D. and Rhodes, R.A.W. (1992) 'The Implementation Gap: Explaining Policy Change and Continuity in Marsh, D. and Rhodes, R.A.W. (eds.) *Implementing Thatcherite Policies: Audit of an Era* p.170

⁶ Keating, M. and Midwinter, A. (1983) *The Government of Scotland* pp.23-24

⁷ Fairley, J. and Paterson, L. (1991) 'The Reform of Vocational Education and Training in Scotland' *Scottish Educational Review* Vol.23 p.71

⁸ *Glasgow Herald* 3rd March 1992

⁹ *Ibid*

¹⁰ *Ibid*

¹¹ *Ibid*

¹² *Glasgow Herald* 'Tory 'New Deal' for Scotland 4th July 1992

¹³ Quoted in *Eastwood Blue Print* 'Secretary of State for Scotland's View on Union' No.5 Autumn 1992

¹⁴ Lang, I. (1993) 'Introduction' in *Scotland in the Union: A Partnership for Good*

¹⁵ *Scotland in the Union: A Partnership for Good* p.39

¹⁶ Scottish Office Education Department (1992) *5-14 Development Programme: Arrangements for National Testing*

Appendix 1

SELECTED FIELDWORK SECONDARY SCHOOLS

The schools in bold are denominational. The astrix denotes schools which are in Areas of Priority Treatment (APT)

Abronhill High	John Paul Academy
Airdrie Academy	Lenzie Academy
Bannerman High	Lochend Secondary*
Barrhead High	St. Andrew's R.C. Secondary *
Bearsden Academy	St. Brides High
Bellahouston Academy	St. Columba's R.C. High*
Bishopbriggs High	St. Leonard's R.C. Secondary
Blantyre High *	St. Mirin's and St. Margaret High
Bocclair Academy	St. Mungo's Academy
Braidhurst High*	St. Ninian's High
Castlehead High	St. Patrick R.C. High
Cathkin High	Shawlands Academy
Coltness High	Smithycroft Secondary*
Cumbernauld High	Stonelaw High
Clydebank High*	Uddingston Grammar
Dalziel High*	Victoria Drive Secondary
Eastwood High	
Garrion Academy	
Greenfaulds High	
Hillhead High	
Holy Cross R.C.	
Holyrood Secondary	
Hunter High	
Hyndland Secondary	

SCHOOLS WHICH PARTICIPATED IN THE FIELDWORK

Airdrie Academy

Bannerman High

Barrhead High

Bearsden Academy

Bellahouston Academy

Bishopbriggs High

Boclair Academy

Braidhurst High

Castlehead High

Cathkin High

Clydebank High

Coltness High

Cumbernauld High

Dalziel High

Eastwood High

Garrion Academy

Greenfaulds High

Hillhead High

Holy Cross R.C

Holyrood Secondary

Hunter High

Hyndland Secondary

Lenzie Academy

St. Andrew's R.C. Secondary

St. Brides High

St. Mungo's Academy

Smithycroft Secondary

Uddingston Grammar

Victoria Drive Secondary

Appendix 2

HEAD TEACHER INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Profile of school

1. What is the school's current roll ?
2. Is the school's roll falling, rising or fairly stable ?
3. How many members of teaching staff does the school have ?
4. What are the catchment areas for the school ?

Mechanics and Composition of School Boards

1. How many nominations did your school receive from parents to sit on the school board ?
2. What percentage of those parents entitled to vote exercised their right to vote ?
3. How many nominations were from parents who had been actively involved in the PTA/PA ?
4. What co-opted members does the board have ?
5. What are the occupations of the parent members of the board ?

Powers of Boards

1. What is your reaction to the fact that parents have an inbuilt majority on the boards ?
2. Did you support or reject the original "floor" proposals that were outlined in the SED consultative paper in August 1987 ?
3. Did you support or not the "ceiling" powers in the same consultative paper ?
4. In your capacity as Head, do you think that you should have the right to vote on the board ?
5. How do you view the boards remit to review the per capita allocation ?
6. Do you think that the powers boards have relating to finance will have implications for the curriculum, or not ?

Extent of consultation prior to the School Boards Act and the Self Governing Schools Act

1. Were you consulted prior to the School Boards Act for your opinion by your professional organisation, Division, Region or SED ?
2. Were you consulted prior to the passing of the Self Governing Schools Act for your opinion ?

Opting Out

1. How do you regard the proposals in the Self Governing Schools Act that will allow state schools to opt out of local authority control ?
2. Has the school board discussed opting out ?
3. Do you consider it likely that your school will opt out in the foreseeable future ?

* In addition to the questions where time permitted Heads views on local management of school and in particular Devolved Management of Resources (DMR) were sought.

Appendix 3

QUESTIONNAIRE TO PRINCIPAL TEACHERS

I should be grateful if you would answer the following questions. In some of the questions you are asked to write, in others you are asked to tick boxes. In some questions you may tick several statements which you agree with.

If there is insufficient space for your answer to any one question please use the page at the back of the questionnaire.

Of which department are you Principal Teacher ?

Membership of School Boards

1] Were you ever, in your capacity as a teacher, a member of a School Council (tick as appropriate) ?

Yes

No

2] Were you elected, in your capacity as teacher, to the school board ?

Yes

No

3] Did you nominate yourself, in your capacity as a parent, for membership of a school board ?

Yes [please go to question 3ii]

No [please go to question 4]

Not Applicable [please go to question 4]

3ii] Were you elected, in your capacity as parent, to a school board ?

Yes

No

4] What is your reaction to the fact that parents will have an inbuilt majority on school boards ?

Approve

Disapprove

Do not Know

Additional Comments:-

Staff Relations

5] What implications do you think school boards will have for staff relations with the head teacher ?

Beneficial Detrimental Do not Know

Additional Comments:-

6] What implications do you think school boards will have for staff relations with parents ?

Beneficial Detrimental Do not Know

Additional Comments:-

Powers of School Boards

7] Did you support the original "floor" proposals which the SED suggested in its Consultative Paper of August 1987 ?

Yes No Not Aware of Proposals

8] Did you support the original "ceiling" proposals which the SED suggested in its Consultative Paper of August 1987 ?

Yes No Not Aware of Proposals

Consultation with Parents

9] In your view, was consultation with parents over pupils' progress adequate, or not, before 1989 ?

Adequate Inadequate Do not Know

Additional Comments:-

Functions of School Boards

10] In your view, are school boards as presently constituted necessary ?

Yes No Do not know

Additional Comments:-

11] Do you think that the head teacher should have the right to vote on the school board ?

Yes No Do not know

Additional Comments:-

12] Do you approve or disapprove of the provision in the School Boards Act that will allow boards to review the distribution of the school's per capita allowance for the coming year ?

Approve Disapprove Do not Know

Additional Comments:-

13] Do you think that board's powers relating to finance may have implications for the curriculum offered by the school or not ?

Yes No Do not know

Additional Comments:-

Extent of Consultation Prior to Legislation

14] In your view, was the consultation process instituted by the SED prior to the introduction of school boards satisfactory or unsatisfactory ?

Satisfactory Unsatisfactory Do not know

Additional Comments:-

15] In your opinion, was there adequate consultation or not prior to the introduction of the Self Governing Schools [etc] Act ?

Adequate

Inadequate

Do not Know

Additional Comments:-

16] Do you think that you have been sufficiently briefed about school boards or not ?

Yes

No

Do not know

17] Please comment on the provisions in the School Boards Act which allows school board members to be represented on interview panels for senior posts.

Opting Out

18] How do you regard the proposal in the Self Governing Schools [etc] Act that will allow state schools to opt out ?

Adequate

Inadequate

Do not Know

Additional Comments:-

19] How well informed or not do you feel you are about the financial repercussions of opting out for your school ?

Well Informed

Reasonably Informed

Uninformed

Do not Know

Additional Comments:-

Effects of the Introduction of School Boards and Opting out

20) In your opinion what are these reforms likely to have on the education system ?
[You may tick several boxes you agree with]

- i) School boards will increase the accountability of schools and make more responsive to the community.
- ii) Undermine the professional status of teachers
- iii) They will introduce a welcome element of parental participation
- iv) School boards as presently constituted have no real powers
- v) They are an importation of English concepts to Scottish education
- vi) There is no demand in Scotland for opting out
- vii) To survive in the long term school boards must be dynamic not static and assume more responsibilities and powers.
- viii) Opting out will destabilise comprehensive education
- ix) None of these

b) Please add any other comments about the effects of recent reforms.

21) If a general election was held tomorrow how would you vote ?

Conservative	<input type="checkbox"/>	Green	<input type="checkbox"/>	Labour	<input type="checkbox"/>
Liberal Democrat	<input type="checkbox"/>	SNP	<input type="checkbox"/>	Do not know	<input type="checkbox"/>

22] In the following space, please express any other views about school boards and opting out which you feel may be relevant ?

Bibliography

The bibliography contains articles, books and official publications which are quoted in the text or which have informed the discussion. Selected newspaper articles are referenced.

Addison, P. (1975) *The Road to 1945* (London: Jonathan Cape)

Adler, M. and Raab, G. (1988) 'Exit, Choice and Loyalty: The Impact of Parental Choice on Admissions of Parental Choice on Admissions to Secondary Schools in Edinburgh and Dundee' *Journal of Education Policy* Vol. 3 No.2 pp.155-179

Adler, M., Petch, A. and Tweedie, J. (1987) 'The Origins and Impact of the Parents' Charter' in McCrone, D. (ed.) *Scottish Government Yearbook 1987* (Edinburgh: Unit for the Study of Government in Scotland)

Adler, M., Petch A., and Tweedie J. (1989) *Parental Choice and Education Policy* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press)

Anderson, R.D. (1985) 'In Search of the 'Lad of Parts': The Mythical History of Scottish Education' *History Workshop Journal* No.19 pp.82-103

Anderson, R.D (1985) 'Secondary Schools and Scottish Society in the Nineteenth Century' *Past and Present* No.109 pp.176-203

Anderson, R.D. (1989) *Education and Opportunity in Victorian Scotland* (Oxford:Oxford University Press)

Aughey, A. (1983) 'Mrs. Thatcher's Philosophy' *Parliamentary Affairs* Vol.36 pp.389-416

Balfour Report (1954) *Royal Commission on Scottish Affairs Report* (Edinburgh: HMSO) Cmd 9212

Ball, S. J. (1990a) *Politics and Policy- Making in Education: Exploration in Policy Sociology* (London: Routledge)

Ball, S.J. (1990b) *Markets, Morality and Equality* Hillcole Group Paper No.5 (London: Tufnell Press)

Ball, S.J. (1991) 'Power, Conflict and Micropolitics and All That !' in Walford, G. (ed.) *Doing Educational Research* (London: Routledge)

Baginsky, M., Baker, L., and Cleave, S. (1991) *Towards Effective Partnerships in School Governance* (Berkshire: National Federation for Educational Research)

Bash, L. (1989) 'Education Goes to Market' in Bash, L. and Coulby, D. (eds) *The Education Reform Act: Competition and Control* (London: Cassell)

Bell, R. and Grant, N.(1977) *Patterns of Education in the British Isles* (London: Allen & Unwin)

Bell, C., Howieson, C., King, K. and Raffe, D. (1988) *Liaisons Dangereuses ? Education - Industry Relationships in the First Scottish TVEI Pilot Projects* (Edinburgh: Centre for Educational Sociology)

Bell, C., Howieson, C., King, K. and Raffae, D. (1989) 'The Scottish Dimension of TVEI' in Brown, A. and McCrone, D. (ed.) *Scottish Government Yearbook 1989* (Edinburgh: Unit for Study of Government in Scotland)

Barker, R. (1972) *Education and Politics 1900-1950* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)

Barry, N. (1987) *The New Right* (London: Croom Helm)

Bennett, R. (1977) 'The Conservative Tradition of Thought: A Right Phenomenon' in Nugent, N. (ed.) *The British Right* (Hants: Saxon House)

Berger, P. and Luckmann, T. (1967) *Social Construction Of Reality* (London: Penguin)

Beveridge, C. and Turnball, R. (1989) *The Eclipse of Scottish Culture: Inferiorism and the Intellectuals* (London: Polygon)

Black, H. (1988) 'The National Certificate' in Brown, S. (ed.) *Assessment: A Changing Practice* (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press)

Black, H., Malcolm, H. and Zaklukiewicz, S. (1988) *The TVEI Pilot Curriculum in Scotland* (Edinburgh: SCORE)

Black, H., Malcolm, H. and Zaklukiewicz, S. (1990) *TVEI-The Teachers' View* (Edinburgh: SCORE)

Black, H., Malcolm, H. and Zaklukiewicz, S. (1990) *An Accepted Part of the Landscape* (Edinburgh: SCORE)

Black, H., Lyon, M., Malcolm, H., Thorpe, G. and Zaklukiewicz, S. (1990) *The Impact of TVEI: A Summary of Three Reports to the Training Agency by SCORE* (Edinburgh: SCORE)

Blanchard, T., Lovell, B. and Ville, N. (1989) *Managing Finance in Schools* (London: Cassells)

Blake, R. (1985) *The Conservative Party From Peel To Thatcher* (London: Methuen)

Bogdanor, V. (1976) 'Education' in Blake and Patten (eds.) *The Conservative Opportunity* (London: Macmillan)

Bogdanor, V. (1979) 'The English Constitution and Devolution' *Political Quarterly* Vol.50 pp.36-49

Bogdanor, V. (1979) *Devolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

Bogdanor, V. (1980) 'Devolution' in Layton-Henry, Zig (ed), *Conservative Party Politics* (London: MacMillan)

Bottery, M. (1992) *The Ethics of Educational Management* (London: Cassell Educational)

Bowe, R. and Ball, S. with Gold, A. (1992) *Reforming Education and Changing Schools: Case Studies in Policy Sociology* (London: Routledge)

- Boyce, D.G. (1988) *The Irish Question and British Politics 1868-1986* (London: Macmillan)
- Boyson, R. (1978) *Centre Forward: A Radical Conservative Programme* (London: Temple Smith)
- Brehony, K. and Deem, R. (1990) 'Charging for Free Education: An Exploration of a Debate in School Governing Bodies' *Journal of Education Policy* Vol.5 No.4 pp.333-345
- Brown, S. (1988) 'So What Has Changed ?' in Brown, S. (ed.) *Assessment: A Changing Practice* (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press)
- Brown, S. (1988) 'Assessment: Looking Forward or Falling into the Pitholes of the Past ?' *Scottish Educational Review* Vol.20 no.2 pp.89-93
- Brittan, S. (1989) 'The Thatcher Government's Economic Policy' in Kavanagh, D. and Seldon, A. (eds.) *The Thatcher Effect* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Broadshank, K. and Anderson, K. (1989) *Educational Administration* (London: Longmans)
- Brown, P. and Sparks, R. (1989) *Beyond Thatcherism- Social Policy, Politics and Society* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Brown, S. and Munn, P. (ed.) (1985) *The Changing Face of Education 14 to 16: Curriculum and Assessment* (London: NFER-Nelson Publishing)
- Brown, S. (1990) 'The National Curriculum and Testing: Enlightened or Imported ?' *Scottish Educational Review* Vol. 22 No.2 pp.68-77
- Bryce, T. (1992) 'The 5-14 Model: Stops on the Way, If Not How To Travel ?' *Scottish Educational Review* Vol.24 No.2 pp.105-110
- Budge, I. and Unwin, D.W. (1966) *Scottish Political Behaviour: A Case Study in British Homogeneity* (London: Heinemann Educational Books)
- Buchan, J. (1929) 'Conservatism and Progress' *Spectator* 23rd November pp.754-755
- Buchan, J. (1985) *The Kirk in Scotland* (Dunbar: Labarum Publications)
- Buchan, J. (1939) *Sir Walter Scott* (London: Cassell)
- Buchan, J. (1947) *Memory Hold The Door* (London: Hodder and Stoughton)
- Bulmer, M., Lewis, J., and Piachaud, D. (eds.) (1989) *The Goals of Social Policy* (London: Unwin Hyman)
- Bulpitt, J. (1982) 'Conservatism, unionism and the problem of territorial management' in Magwick, P. and Rose, R. (eds.) *The Territorial Dimension in United Kingdom* (London: Macmillan)
- Bulpitt, J. (1986) 'The Discipline of the New Democracy: Mrs. Thatcher's domestic statecraft' *Political Studies*, Vol.34 pp.19-39

- Burch, M. (1984) 'Mrs. Thatcher's Approach to Leadership in Government: 1979- June 1983' *Parliamentary Affairs* pp.399-416
- Busher, T. and Colemann, M. (1992) *The Financial Implications of Opting Out* (Northampton: University of Leicester)
- Campbell, R.H. (1979) 'The Council of Ex Secretaries of State for Scotland and Industrial Policy 1941-1945' *Scottish Industrial Review* Vol. 2 pp.3-10
- Checkland, S. and Checkland, O. (1984) *Industry and Ethos: Scotland 1832-1914* (London: Edward Arnold)
- Chitty, C. (1989) *Towards A New Education System: The Victory of The New Right?* (London: Falmer)
- Chitty, C. (1992) 'The Changing Role of the State in Education Provision' *History of Education* Vol.21 No.1 pp.1-13
- Clarke, J., Cochrane, A. and Smart, C. (1987) *Ideologies of Welfare: From Dreams to Disillusion* (London: Hutchinson)
- Coffield, F (1989) 'Caught in the Act: ERA 1988 - ?' in Coffield, F and Edward, T (ed) *Working Within the Act : Education Reform Act 1988 -?* (Durham: Education Publishing)
- Comic, C. (1983) *Experiences and Enlightenment: Socialisation for Cultural Change in Eighteenth Century Scotland* (London: Hutchinson)
- Cooper, Lord (1991) 'The Scottish Legal Tradition' in Meston, M., Sellar, D.H, and Cooper Lord *The Scottish Legal Tradition* (Edinburgh: Saltire Society)
- Coopers and Lybrand (1992) *The Future of Local Education Authorities* (London: Association of County Councils)
- Coulby, D. (1989) 'The Ideological Contradictions of the Education Reform Act' in Bash, L and Coulby, D (eds.) *The Education Reform Act: Competition and Control* (London: Cassells)
- Corr, H. (1990) 'An Exploration into Scottish Education in Fraser, W.M. and Morris, R.J. (eds.) *People and Society in Scotland: Volume II, 1830-1914* (Edinburgh: John Donald)
- Curtice, J. (1990) 'One Nation' in Jewell, R. (ed.) *British Social Attitudes 1988-1989* (London: Macmillan)
- Daiches, D. (1964) *The Paradox of Scottish Culture: The Eighteenth Century Experience* (London: Oxford University Press)
- Dale, R. (1983) 'Thatcherism and Education' in Ahier, J. and Flude, M. (eds.) *Contemporary Education Policy* (London: Croom Helm)
- Davie, G. E. (1982) *The Democratic Intellect: Scotland and Her Universities in the Nineteenth Century* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press)

Deem, R. (1990) 'The Reform Of School Governing Bodies: The Power of the Consumer over the Producer ?' in Flude, M and Hammer, M (eds.) *The Education Reform Act 1988: Its Origins and Implications* (Barcombe: Falmer)

DES (1988) *The Education Reform Act* (London: HMSO)

DES (1988) *Circular No.7/88. Education Reform Act: Management of Schools* (London: HMSO)

Department for Education and the Welsh Office (1992) *Choice and Diversity: A New Framework for Schools* (London: HMSO)

Dicey, A.V. (1927) *The Law of the Constitution* (London: MacMillan)

Dicey, A.V. and Dicey, R.S. (1920) *Thoughts on the Union Between England and Scotland* (London: MacMillan)

Dickson, H.T. (1977) *Liberty and Property: Political Ideology in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson)

Dickson, T. (1989) 'Scotland Is Different, OK ?' in McCrone, D. , Kendrick, S. and Straw P. (eds.) *Nation, Culture and Social Change* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press)

Dowding, K. (1992) Choice: Its Increases and its Values *British Journal of Political Science* Vol.22 pp.301-314

Drever, E. (1988) 'Criteria Referencing and Grade Related Criteria: The Experience of the Standard Grade' in Brown, S. (ed.) *Assessment: A Changing Practice* (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press)

Drucker, H., Dunleavy, P., Gamble, A., and Peele, G. (eds.) (1983) *Developments in British Politics* (London: Macmillan)

Durham, M. (1989) 'The Right: The Conservative Party and Conservatism' in Wright, A. (ed.) *Party Ideology in Britain* (London: Routledge) pp.49-73

Dutton, D. (1991) *British Politics Since 1945: The Rise and Fall of Consensus* (London: Basil Blackwell)

Eccleshall, R. (1984) 'Conservatism' in Eccleshall, R. et al *Political Ideologies: An Introduction* (London: Unwin Hyman)

Echols, F., McPherson, A., Willms, J.D (1990) 'Parental Choice in Scotland' *Journal of Education Policy* Vol.5 No.3 pp.207-222.

Edgell, S. and Duke, V. (1991) *A Measure of Thatcherism: A Sociology of Britain* (London: HaperCollins Academic)

Elliot, W. (1927) *Toryism and the Twentieth Century* (London: Phillip Allen and Co)

Elliot, W. (1932) 'Scottish Politics' in Duke of Atholl et. al. (eds.) *A Scotsman's Heritage* (London: Alexander Maclehose & Co.)

Elliot, W. (1951) *Presidential Address at the Sir Walter Scott Club of Edinburgh* 18th January

- Evans, K. (1975) *The Development and Structure of the English Education System* (London: University of London Press)
- Fairley, J. and Paterson, L. (1991) 'The Reform of Vocational Education and Training in Scotland' *Scottish Educational Review* Vol.23 pp.68-77
- Fenwick, I.G.K. (1976) *The Comprehensive School 1944-1970: The Politics of Secondary School Reorganisation* (London: Methuen)
- Ferguson, W (1968) *Scotland: 1689 to Present* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd)
- Findlay, I. (1973) *Education in Scotland* (London: David and Charles)
- Fisher, A. (1988) 'The Day the Ceiling Crashed to the Floor' *Forum* Vol.30 No.3 pp.77-78
- Fisher, A. (1990), 'Letter From Scotland' *Forum* Vol.32 No.2 pp.45-46
- Fox, L. et al (1988) *Making Unionism Positive: Proposals for a Tory Agenda for Scotland* (London: Centre for Policy Studies)
- Gailey, A. (1988) 'Failure and the Making Of New Ireland' in Boyce, D,G. (ed.) *The Revolution in Ireland 1879-1923* (London: Macmillan)
- Gamble, A. (1988) 'Economic Decline and the Crisis of Legitimacy' in Graham, C. and Prosser, T. (eds.) *Waving the Rules: The Constitution Under Thatcherism* (Milton Keynes: Oxford University Press)
- Gamble, A. (1988) *Free Economy and Strong State: The Politics of Thatcherism* (Basingstoke: MacMillan)
- Gamble, A (1989) 'The Politics of Thatcherism' *Parliamentary Affairs* Vol.42 No.3 pp.350-361
- Gatherer, W.A. (1988) 'The Two Voices' *Scottish Educational Review* Vol.20 no.2 pp.100-102
- Gatherer W.A. (1989) *Curriculum Development in Scotland* (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press)
- Gibson, J. (1985) *The Thistle and the Crown* (Edinburgh: HMSO)
- Gilmour Report (1937) *Committee on Scottish Administration Report* (Edinburgh; HMSO) Cmd 5563
- Gilmour, I. (1977) *Inside Right* (London: Quartet)
- Golby, M. (1990) *The New Governors Speak*, Exeter Paper in School Governorship No.1 (Devon: Fair Way Publications)
- Graham, C. and Prosser, T. (1989) 'The Constitution and The New Conservatives' *Parliamentary Affairs* Vol.42 No.3 pp.330-349

Gray, J., McPherson, A. and Raffe, D. (1983) *Reconstructions of Secondary Education: Theory, Myth and Practice Since the War* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul)

Gray, J. (1990) 'Conservatism, Individualism and Political Thought of the New Right' in Clark, J.C.D. (ed.) *Ideas and Politics in Modern Britain* (London: Macmillan)

Greenleaf, W.H. (1983) *The British Political Tradition: Volume Two The Ideological Heritage* (London: Routledge)

Griffith, D. (1991) *Politics of Health* (Glasgow: Pulse Publications)

Hall, J (1989) 'Local Management of Schools' in Coffield, F and Edward, T (eds.) *Working Within the Act : Education Reform Act 1988 - ?* (Durham: Education Publishing)

Halpin, D. and Fitz, J. (1990) 'Researching Grant Maintained Schools' *Journal of Education Policy* Vol.5 No.2 pp.167-180

Halpin, D., Fitz, J. and Power S. (1992) *The Early Impact and Long-term Implications of the Grant-Maintained Schools Policy* Paper Presented at a Seminar Organised by Policy Analysis Unit, Department of Education, University of Warwick 4th March

Hanham, H.J. (1965) 'The Creation of the Scottish Office 1881-87' *Juridical Review* pp.205-244

Hanham, H.J. (1969) 'The Development of the Scottish Office' in J.N. Wolfe (ed.) *Government and Nationalism in Scotland* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press)

Harvie, C. (1977) *Scotland and Nationalism: Scottish Society and Politics 1707-1977* (London: George Allen)

Harvie, C. (1981) *No Gods and Precious Few Heroes* (London: Edward Arnold)

Harvie, C. (1983) 'Elliot and the Politics of Adventure' *Weekend Scotsman* 9th April

Harvie, C. (1989) 'Grasping the Thistle' in Cargill, K. (ed.) *Scotland 2000* (Glasgow: BBC Scotland) pp.1-35

Hayek, F.A. (1986) *The Road to Serfdom* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul)

Henderson, D. (1990) 'Faint Praise From Forsyth Condemned' *Times Education Supplement Scotland* 21st December

Heseltine, M. (1987) *Where There's A Will* (London: Hutchinson)

Heseltine, M. (1990) 'Devolution: Questions Only Tories Can Answer' *Scottish Conservative* No.3 p.12

Hewitt, M. (1992) *Welfare, Ideology and Need: Developing Perspectives on the Welfare State* (London: Harvester Wheatsheaf)

Hogg, Q. (1947) *The Case for Conservatism* (London: Penguin)

- Holmes, M. (1989) *Thatcherism: Scopes and Limits 1983-1987* (London: Macmillan)
- Hondreich, T. (1990) *Conservatism* (London: Penguin)
- Hood, C., Huby, M. and Dunsire, A. (1985) 'From Growth to Retrenchment ? A Perspective on the Development of the Scottish Office to the 1980s' in McCrone, D. (ed.) *The Scottish Government Yearbook 1985* (Edinburgh: The Unit for the Study of Government in Scotland)
- Hoover, K. and Plant, P. (1989), *Conservative Capitalism in Britain and US* (London: Routledge)
- Howieson, C. (1989) 'Impact of the MSC on Secondary Education' in Brown, A. and Fairley, J. (eds.) *The MSC in Scotland* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press)
- Humes, W.M. (1983) 'The Cultural Significance of Scotland's Educational System' in McCrone, D.(ed.) *Scottish Government Yearbook 1983* (Edinburgh: Unit for Study of Scottish Government)
- Humes, W.M. (1986) *The Leadership Class in Scottish Education* (Edinburgh: John Donald)
- Hunter, L. (1968) *Scottish Educational System* (Oxford: Pengaron Press)
- Huntington, S. P. (1957) 'Conservatism as an Ideology' *American Political Science Review* Vol 51
- Hutchinson, I.G.C. (1986) *A Political History Of Scotland, 1832-1924: Parties, Elections and Issues* (Edinburgh: John Donald)
- INLOGOV (1991) *A Report on the Education Department in Strathclyde Region* (Birmingham: University of Birmingham)
- Jackson, P. (ed) (1985) *Implementing Government Policy Initiatives The Thatcher Administration 1979-1983* (London: Royal Institute of Public Administration)
- Jenkins, P. (1989) *Mrs. Thatcher's Revolution: The Ending of the Socialist Era* (London: Pan Books)
- Johnston, N. (1980), 'Constitutional Reform: Some Dilemmas for the Conservative Philosophy' in Layton-Henry, Zig (ed), *Conservative Party Politics* (London: MacMillan)
- Johnston, N. (1990) *Reconstructing the Welfare State: A Decade of Change* (London: Harvester Wheatsheaf)
- Jonathan, R. (1989) 'Choice and Control in Education: Parental Rights and Social Justice' *British Journal of Educational Studies* vol.37 pp.321-338
- Jones, B. and Keating M. (1988) *Beyond the Domsday Scenario* Strathclyde Papers on Government and Politics (Glasgow: Strathclyde)
- Jordon, A.G. and Richardson, J.J. (1987) *British Politics and the Policy Process* (London: Allen and Unwin)

- Jordon, G. and Schbert, K. (1992) 'A Preliminary Ordering of Policy Network Labels' *European Journal of Political Research* Vol.21 pp.7-27
- Kavanagh, D. (1987) *Thatcherism and British Politics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Kavanagh, D. (1985) 'Whatever Happened to Consensus Politics ?' *Political Studies* Vol.33 pp.529-546
- Kavanagh, D. and Morris, P. (1989) *Consensus Politics from Attlee to Thatcher* (London: Basil Blackwood)
- Keating, M. (1976) 'Administrative Devolution in Practice: The Secretary of State for Scotland and the Scottish Office' *Public Administration* Vol.54 pp.133-145
- Keating, M. (1983) 'Devolution and the Parliamentary State' in Judge, D.(ed.) *Politics of Parliamentary Reform* (London: Heinemann)
- Keating, M. and Midwinter, A.(1983) *The Government of Scotland* (Edinburgh: Mainstream)
- Keating, M., Midwinter, A. and Mitchell, J. (1990) *Government and Politics in Scotland* (London: Macmillan)
- Keating, M. and Jones, B (1991) 'Scotland and Wales: Peripheral Assertions and European Integration' *Parliamentary Affairs* Vol.44 No.3 pp.311-324
- Keegan, W. (1984) *Mrs. Thatcher's Economic Experiment* (London: George Allen and Unwin)
- Kellas, J. G. (1980) *Modern Scotland*, 2nd edition (London: George and Unwin)
- Kellas, J. G. (1984) *The Scottish Political System*, 3rd edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Kellas, J.G. and Madgwick, P. (1982) 'Territorial Ministries: The Scottish and Welsh Offices' in Madgwick, P. and Kellas, J.G. (eds.) *The Territorial Dimension in United Kingdom Politics* (London: Macmillan)
- Kendrick, S. and McCrone, D. (1989) 'Politics in a Cold Climate: The Conservatives Decline in Scotland' *Political Studies* Vol.37 pp.589-603
- Kenneth, B. (1962) 'Education in the Century of the Reformation' in McRoberts (ed.) *Essays on the Scottish Reformation* (Glasgow: Burns)
- Kirk, G. (1982) *Curriculum and Assessment in the Scottish Secondary School: A Study of the Munn and Dunning Reports* (London: Ward Lock)
- Kirk, R. (1954) *The Conservative Mind* (London: Faber and Faber)
- Kogan, M. (1985) 'Education Policy and Values' in McNay, I. and Ozga, J. (eds) *Policy-Making in Education: The Breakdown of Consensus* (Oxford: Pergamon Press) pp.11-23
- Kogan, M. (ed) (1984) *School Governing Bodies* (London: Heinemann)

- Knight, C. (1990) *The Making Of Tory Education Policy in Post-war Britain* (Lewes: Falmer Press)
- Lane, T. (1983) 'The Tories and the Trade Unions: Rhetoric and Reality' in Hall, S. and Jacques, M. (eds.) *The Politics of Thatcherism* (London: Lawrence and Wishart)
- Lawson, A. (1989) 'Mair Nor A Rouch Wind Blawin...' in McCrone, D. and Brown, A (eds.) *Scottish Government Yearbook 1988* (Edinburgh: Unit for the Study of Government in Scotland)
- Lawton, D. (1992) *Education and Politics: Conflict or Consensus ?* (London: Falmer Press)
- Lawson, J. and Silver, H. (1973) *A Social History of Education in England* (London: Methuen)
- LeGrand, J. and Robinson, R. (eds.) (1984) *Privatisation and the Welfare State* (London: Allen and Unwin)
- Lindsay, T.F. and Harrington, H. (1979) *The Conservative Party 1918-1979* (London: Macmillan)
- Local Schools Information (1992) *Opting Out 1988-1992: An Analysis* Press Release 12th February 1992
- Loney, M. (1986) *The Politics of Greed: The New Right and the Welfare State* (London: Pluto Press)
- Loney, M. (ed.) (1987) *The State or the Market: Politics and Welfare in Contemporary Britain* (London: Sage)
- Lowe, R. (1988) *Education in the Post-War Years: A Social History* (London: Routledge)
- McAllister, I and Rose, R. (1984) *The Nationwide Competition for Votes* (London: Frances Pinter)
- MacBeth, A. (1985), 'Government of Scottish Education: Partnership or Compromise' in McCrone, David (ed.) *Scottish Government Yearbook 1984* (Edinburgh: Unit for the Study of Government in Scotland)
- MacBeth, A. (1990), *School Boards: From Purpose to Practice* (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press)
- Maclure, S. (1992) *Education Reformed: A Guide to the Education Reform Act* (London: Hodder & Stoughton)
- McCormick, N. (1970) *The Scottish Debate* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- McCormick, R. (1988) 'National Curricula North and South' *Scottish Educational Review* Vol.20 no.2 pp.97-99
- McCrone, D. (1992) *Understanding Scotland: The Sociology of a Stateless Nation* (London: Routledge)

McCrone, D. , Kendrick, S., and Straw, P. (eds) (1989) *The Making of Scotland: Nation, Culture and Social Change* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press)

McFarlane, E. (1990) *Protestants First: Orangeism in Nineteenth Century Scotland* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press)

MacIntosh, M. (1987) 'Past Imperfect Future Conditional' in Cargill, K (ed.) *Scotland 2000* (Glasgow: BBC Scotland)

McIntyre, D. (1978) 'The Politics of Educational Review' in McIntyre, D. (ed.) *A Critique of Munn and Dunning Reports* (Stirling: University of Stirling)

MacKay, Lord (1991) 'Forward' in Meston, M., Sellar, W. and Lord Cooper *The Scottish Legal Tradition* (Edinburgh: Saltire Society)

MacKenzie, M.L. (1988) *Scottish Toryism, Identity and Consciousness: A Personal Essay* (Edinburgh: The Scottish Tory Reform Group)

MacKenzie, M.L. (1989) *Scottish Toryism and the Union: A Phenomenological Approach* (Edinburgh: The Scottish Tory Reform Group)

McLean, M. (1988) 'The Conservative Education Policy in Comparative Perspective' *British Journal of Educational Studies* Vol.36 No.3 pp.209-217

McPherson, A. (1983), 'An Angle on the Geist: Persistence and Change in Scottish Educational Tradition' in Humes and Paterson (eds.) *Scottish Culture and Scottish Education* (Edinburgh: John Donald)

McPherson, A. and Willms, D. (1987) Equalisation and Improvement: Some Effects of Comprehensive Reorganisation in Scotland *Sociology* Vol.21 No.2 pp509-539

McPherson, A. and Raab, C. D. (1988) *Governing Education: A Sociology of Policy since 1945* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press)

McPherson, A. (1989) 'Social and Political Aspects of the Devolved Management of Scottish Secondary Schools' *Scottish Educational Review* Vol. 21 No.2

Marquand, D. (1988) *The Unprincipled Society: New Demands and Old Politics* (London: Fontana Press)

Marquand, D. (1988) 'The Paradoxes of Thatcherism' in Skidelsky, R.(ed) *Thatcherism* (London: Chatto and Winds)

Marsh, D. and Rhodes, R.A.W. (1992) 'Implementing Thatcherism: Policy Change in the 1980s' *Parliamentary Affairs* Vol.45 No.1 pp.32-52

Marsh, D. and Rhodes, R.A.W. (1992) 'The Implementation Gap: Explaining Policy Change and Continuity' in Marsh, D. and Rhodes, R.A.W. (eds.) *Implementing Thatcherite Policies: An Audit of an Era* (Buckingham: Open University Press)

Marwick, A. (1964) 'Middle Opinion in the thirties: Planning, progress and political 'agreement'' *English Historical Review* vol.LXXIX no.311 pp.285-298

Maxwell, S. (1985) 'The Fall and Fall of Toryism in Scotland' *Radical Scotland* June/July pp.7-9

- Meston, M. (1991) 'Scots Law Today' in Meston, M., Sellar, D., and Lord Cooper *The Scottish Legal Tradition* (Edinburgh: Saltire Society)
- Meyers, J.D. (1972) 'Scottish Nationalism and the Antecedents of the 1872 Education Act' *Scottish Educational Review* Vol. 14 No.2 pp.73-92
- Miller, W. , Brand J. , and Jordon, M. (1981) 'Government Without A Mandate: Its Causes and Consequences for Scottish Self-Government' *Political Quarterly* Vol.52
- Miller, W. (1981) *The End of British Politics ?* (Oxford: Clarendon)
- Minford, P (1990) 'Ideology and Pragmatism in Economic Thatcherism' in Clark, J.C.D. (ed.) *Ideas and Politics in Modern Britain* (London: Macmillan)
- Minogue, K. and Biddiss, M. (1987) *Thatcherism: Personality and Politics* (Basingstoke: MacMillan)
- Mitchell, James (1990) *Conservatives and the Union: A Study of Conservative Party Attitudes to Scotland* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press)
- Mitchell, John (1990) 'The Inspectorate's Role in Quality Assurance' *Scottish Educational Review* Vol. p.117-121
- Munn, P. and Brown, S. (1985) 'The Changing Face of Education 14 to 16' in Brown, S. and Munn, P. (eds.) *The Changing Face of Education 14 to 16: Curriculum and Assessment* (Winsor: NFER)
- Munn, P. and Brown, S. (1988) *Pilot School Boards: First Impressions* (Edinburgh, SCRE)
- Munn, P. and Holroyd, C. (1989) *Pilot School Boards: Experiences and Achievements* (Edinburgh: SCRE)
- Munn, P. (1990) *Pilot School Boards: Parents' View Spotlights No.22* (Edinburgh: Scottish Council for Educational Research)
- Munn, P. (1992) School Boards, Accountability and Control in *British Journal of Education Studies* Vol. 39 No.2 pp.173-189
- Munn, P. (1992) Devolved Management of Schools and FE Colleges: A Victory for the Producer Over the Consumer? in Paterson, L. and McCrone, D. (eds) *The Scottish Government Yearbook 1992* (Edinburgh: Unit for Study of Government in Scotland)
- Muir, E. (1982) *Scott and Scotland* (Edinburgh: Polygon)
- Northcroft, D. (1992) 'Secondary Education and the Rhetoric of Change' *Scottish Educational Review* vol.24 no.2 pp.76-92
- Norton, P. (1984) 'Mrs. Thatcher and the Conservative Party: Another Institution Handbagged ?' in Minogue and Biddis (eds.) *Thatcherism: Personality and Politics* (London: Macmillan)
- Norton, P and Aughey, A. (1981) *Conservatives and Conservatism* (London: Temple Smith)
- Norton, P. (1982), *The Constitution in Flux* (Oxford: Robertson)

- O'Day, A. (1977) *The English Face of Irish Nationalism* (Dublin: Gill and Macmillan)
- O'Sullivan, N. (1976) *Conservatism* (London: John Dent and Sons)
- Oakeshott, M. (1991) *Rationalism in Politics and Other Essays*(Indianapolis: Liberty Press)
- Osborne, G.S. (1967) *Scottish and English Schools* (London: Longmans)
- Parry, R. (1988) *Scottish Political Facts* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark)
- Parry, R. (1987) 'The Centralisation of the Scottish Office' in Rose, R. (ed.) *Ministers and Ministries* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- Parry, R. (1991) 'The Scottish Office in the 1980s' in Paterson, L. (ed.) *The Scottish Government Yearbook 1991* (Edinburgh: Unit for the Study of Government in Scotland)
- Paterson, F. and Fewell, J. (1990) *Girls in Their Prime: Scottish Education Revised* (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press)
- Paterson, H.M. (1983) 'Incubus and Ideology: The Development of Secondary Schooling in Scotland 1900-1939' in Humes, W.M and Paterson, H.M. (eds.) *Scottish Culture and Scottish Education* (Edinburgh: John Donald)
- Paterson, L. (1991) 'Ane End of Ane Auld Sang: Sovereignty and the Re-Negotiation of the Union' in Brown, A. and McCrone, D. (eds.) *The Scottish Government Yearbook 1991* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press)
- Paterson, L. (1993) 'Local Variation in the Scottish Pilot Projects of the Technical and Vocational Educational Initiative' *Research Papers in Education* Vol.8 No.1 pp.47-69
- Phillips, K. (1977) 'The Nature Of Powellism' in Nugent and King (eds.) *The British Right* (London: Saxon House)
- Pickard, W. (1988) 'Curriculum and Assessment in Scotland: The Political Context' *Scottish Educational Review* Vol.20 pp.83-86
- Pilling, G. (1986) *The Crisis of Keynesian Economics: Marxist View* (London: Croom Helm)
- Pirie, M. F. (1989) 'The Current Developments of TVEI in Scotland' *Scottish Educational Review* Vol.21 No.1 pp.58-61
- Pottinger, G. (1979) *The Secretaries of State for Scotland, 1926-1979* (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press)
- Pring, R. (1988) 'Privatisation' *Education Management and Administration* Vol.16 pp.85-96
- Punnett, R.M. (1983) *The Anglo-Celtic Partisan Divide: Regional Representation in Parliament, 1888-1983* Strathclyde Papers on Government and Politics No.16 (Glasgow: University of Strathclyde)
- Pym, F. (1984) *The Politics of Consent* (London: Hamish Hamilton)

- Quicke, J. (1988) 'The New Right and Education' *British Journal of Education Studies* Vol. 36 No.1
- Raab, C. D. (1980) 'The Changing Machinery of Scottish Educational Policy Making' *Scottish Educational Review* pp88-97
- Raab, C. D. (1982) 'The Quasi-Government of Scottish Education' in Baker, A. (ed.) *Quangos in Britain and the Networks of Public Policy-Making* (London: MacMillan)
- Raab, C. D. (1992) 'Taking Networks Seriously: Education Policy in Britain' *European Journal of Political Research* Vol.21
- Raab, C. D. (1992) 'Parents and Schools: What Role for Education Authorities ?' in Munn, P. (ed.) *Parents and Schools: Customers, Managers or Partners ?* (London: Routledge)
- Raab, C. D. (1992) 'Where are we Now: Some Reflections on the Sociology of Education Policy' *Paper Presented at ESRC Seminar, University of Warwick.*
- Ramsden, J. (1988) 'Conservatives Since 1945' *Contemporary Record* Spring pp.17-29
- Ranson S. and Stewart, J. (1988) *The Changing Government of Education* (London: Allen and Unwin)
- Ranson, S. (1990) 'From 1944 to 1988: Education, Citizenship and Democracy' in Flude, M. and Hammer, M. (eds.) *The Education Reform Act 1988: Its Origins and Implications* (London: Falmer Press)
- Rhodes James, R. (1977) *The British Revolution* (London: Allen & Unwin)
- Rhodes, R.A.W. (1988) *Beyond Westminster and Whitehall: The Sub-Central Government of Britain* (London: Allen & Unwin)
- Rhodes, R.A.W. and Marsh, D. (1992) 'New Directions in the Study of Policy Network' *European Journal of Political Science* Vol.21 pp.181-205
- Riddell, P. (1985) *The Thatcher Government* (London: Blackwood)
- Riddell, P. (1988) 'Holding Course for the 1990s' *Financial Times* 10th October
- Riddell, P. (1989) *The Thatcher Decade: How Britain Has Changed During the 1980s* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell)
- Robertson, J. (1990) 'Walter Scott and The Crisis of Unionist Patriotism' *Radical Scotland* Vol.46 August/September pp.26-29
- Rao, N. (1990) *Education Change and Local Government: The Impact of the Education Reform Act* (London: Rowntree Trust)
- Rose, R. (1982) *Understanding the United Kingdom* (London: Longman)
- St. John Stevas, N. (1984) *The Two Cities* (London: Faber and Faber)

Sallis, J. (1988) *Schools, Parents and Governors: A New Approach to Accountability* (London: Routledge)

Sanderson, M. (1987) *Educational Opportunity and Social Change in England* (London: Faber and Faber)

Saren, R. and Trafford, V. (eds) (1990) *Research in Education: Management and Policy* (Lewes: Falmer Press)

Saunders, L.T (1950) *Scottish Democracy 1815-1840: The Social and Intellectual Background* (Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd)

School Boards (Scotland) Act (1988) (Edinburgh: HMSO)

Scotland in the Union: A Partnership for Good (1993) (Edinburgh: HMSO)

Scotland, J. (1977) 'The Educational System' in Underwood, R (ed.) *The Future Of Scotland* (London: Croom Helm)

Scott, P. H. (1981) *Walter Scott and Scotland* (Edinburgh: William Blackwood)

Scott, P. H. (1991) *Towards Independence: Essays on Scotland* (Edinburgh: Polygon)

Scott, Sir W. (1981) *The Letters of Malachi Malagrowther* (Edinburgh: William Blackwood)

Scottish Education Department (1977) *The Structure of the Curriculum in the Third and Fourth Years of the Scottish Secondary School* (The Munn Report) (Edinburgh: HMSO)

Scottish Education Department (1977) *Assessment for All* (The Dunning Report) (Edinburgh: HMSO)

Scottish Education Department (1982) *The Munn and Dunning Reports Framework for Decision: A Summary of the Government's Proposals for Implementation* (Edinburgh: HMSO)

Scottish Education Department (1983) *16-18s in Scotland: An Action Plan* (Edinburgh: HMSO)

Scottish Education Department (1986) *16+ in Scotland: The National Certificate* (Edinburgh: Scottish Office)

Scottish Education Department (1987) *Curriculum and Assessment in Scotland: A Policy for the 90s, a Consultative Paper* (Edinburgh: SED)

Scottish Education Department (1987) *School Management and the Role of Parents: Consultation Paper* (Edinburgh: SED)

Scottish Education Department (1989) *Talking About Schools: Findings of the Survey By MVA Consultancy* (Edinburgh: HMSO)

Scottish Office (1989) *School Boards Information Pack* (Edinburgh: HMSO)

Scruton, R. (1980) *The Meaning Of Conservatism* (London: Penguin)

Self-Governing Schools etc, [Scotland] Act [1989] (Edinburgh: HMSO)

Semple, B. (1989) 'The Assessment of Achievement Programme' *Scottish Educational Review* Vol. 21 No.2 pp.123-125

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

Simon, B. (1992) *What Future For Education?* (London: Lawrence and Wishart)

Skidelsky, R. (ed.) (1988) *Thatcherism* (London: Chatto & Windus)

Smith, M.J. (1992) 'CAP and Agricultural Policy' in Marsh, D. and Rhodes, R.A.W. (eds.) *Implementing Thatcherite Policies: Audit of an Era* (Buckingham: Open University Press)

Smith, T.B., (1957) 'The Union 1707 as Fundamental Law' *Public Law*

Smithers, A. (1990) *Teacher Loss* (Manchester: University of Manchester Press)

Smout, T.C. (1977) 'The Scottish Identity' in Underwood R. (ed) *The Future Of Scotland* (London: Croom Helm)

Smout, T.C. (1986) *A Century of Scottish People 1830-1950* (London: Collins)

Stoker, G. (1988) *The Politics of Local Government* (Basingstoke: Macmillan)

Tomlinson, T.R.G. (1989) 'The Schools' in Kavanagh, D. and Seldon, A. (eds.) *Thatcher Effect* (Oxford: Clarendon)

Thatcher, M. (1977) *Let Our Children Grow Tall: Selected Speeches 1975-1977* (London: Centre for Policy Studies)

Urwin, D. W. (1965) 'The Development of Conservative Organisation in Scotland Until 1912' *Scottish Historical Review* Vol 44 pp.55-75

Urwin, D. W. (1966) 'Scottish Conservatism: A Party Organisation in Transition' *Political Studies* Vol. 14 pp.22-40

Waine, B. (1991) *The Rhetoric of Independence: The Ideology and Practice of Social Policy in Thatcher's Britain* (London: Berg Publishers)

Walford, G. (1987), 'How Important is the Independent Sector in Scotland ?' *Scottish Educational Review* Vol.19 No.2 pp.168-121

Walford, G. (1988) 'The Scottish Assisted Places Scheme: A Comparative Study of the Origins, Nature and Practice of the APSs in Scotland, England and Wales' *Journal of Education Policy* Vol.3 No.2 pp.137-153

Walford, G. (ed) (1987) *Doing Sociology of Education* (Lewes: Falmer Press)

Walford, G. (1990), *Privatisation and Privilege in Education* (London: Routledge)

Walford, G. (ed) (1991) *Doing Educational Research* (London: Routledge)

- Ward, H. and Samways, D. (1992) 'Environmental Policy' in Marsh, D. and Rhodes, R.A.W. (eds) *Implementing Thatcherite Policies: Audit of an Era* (Buckingham: Open University Press) pp.117-136
- Ward, J.T. (1982) *The First Century: A History of Scottish Tory Organisation, 1882-1982* (Edinburgh: Scottish Conservative and Unionist Association)
- Warner, G. (1988) *The Scottish Tory Party: A History* (London: Weidenfield and Nicolson)
- Webb, K. (1977) *The Growth Of Nationalism in Scotland* (Glasgow: Molendinar Press)
- Weir, A.D. (1988) *Education and Vocation 14-18* (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press)
- Weir, D. and Kydd, L. (1991) 'National Certificate and Highers: A Case of Market Forces' *Scottish Educational Review* Vol.23 pp.13-22
- Willetts, D. (1992) *Modern Conservatism* (London: Penguin)
- Wilson, T. (1983) 'A Reinterpretation of Payment by Results in Scotland 1861-1872' in Humes and Paterson (eds.) *Scottish Culture and Scottish Education 1800-1980* (Edinburgh: John Donald)
- Wistow, G. (1992) 'The National Health Service' in Marsh, D. and Rhodes, R.A.W. (eds.) *Implementing Thatcherite Policies: An Audit of an Era* (Buckingham: Open University Press)
- Withrington, D.J. (1983) 'Scotland a Half Educated Nation in 1834 ? Reliable Critique or Persuasive Polemic ?' in Humes and Paterson (eds.) *Scottish Culture and Scottish Education 1800-1980* (Edinburgh: John Donald)
- Withrington, D. J. (1992) 'The Scottish Universities: Living Traditions? Old Problems Renewed ?' in Paterson, L. and McCrone, D. (eds.) *The Scottish Government Yearbook 1992* (Edinburgh: Unit for Study of Government in Scotland)
- Woods, R. (1981) 'Margaret Thatcher and Secondary Reorganisation 1970-1974' *Journal of Education Management and History* Vol. 13 No.2 pp.51-61
- Wragg, E.C. (1988) *Education and The Market Place: The Ideology Behind the 1988 Bill* (London: National Association of Teachers)
- Wright, A. (1989) 'Endpiece: Ideological Politics Now' in Livey, T. and Wright, A. (eds.) *Party Ideology in Britain* (London: Routledge)
- Young, H. and Sloman, A. (1986) *The Thatcher Phenomenon* (London: BBC)