

**INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPTS**

Volume 2 of a Thesis submitted by

*John Watt M.A., M.Ed., M.èS.L.*

in fulfilment of the requirements for the

Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the University of Glasgow.

Faculty of Social Sciences

Department of Education

September 1989

**BEST COPY**

**AVAILABLE**

Variable print quality

## INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPTS

1. Given the agreed guarantee of anonymity, it was decided to code transcripts as follows:

<u>Code</u>	<u>Interviewee Category</u>
AC	Academics
AD	Advisers
CD	Directors of Curriculum Development Centres
DS	Directorate Staff
HT	Headteachers
HM	Members of Her Majesty's Inspectorate/Scottish Education Department Officials
MS	Miscellaneous
PL	Politicians
TU	Teacher Union Officials

2. Some interviewees began the interview with a short preamble.
3. Blank spaces in the transcripts represent the deletion of names of schools, places, and individuals etc. which could indicate the interviewee's identity.
4. Interviews marked \* indicate that the interviewee preferred to speak at length in general terms from memory rather than answer specific questions.
5. Interviews marked \*\* indicate that interviewees sent written responses, because it proved impossible to meet face to face.
6. Lack of sequencing in the numbers of answers indicates that interviewees felt unable to answer certain questions.

1. The sources for introducing comprehensive education came from outside the school system. There was no desire among the grassroots to have it. Indeed it was widely seen as being inflicted on schools. We had no opportunity to discuss it, nor did we get any guidelines or time to make any preparations for its introduction. We were simply told that it was going to happen.
2. The main push was political. Prominent local politicians, responding to national policy, began to spout at meetings that this was the way to ensure maximum equality of opportunity. Comprehensive schools would remove existing barriers so that all children could get a good education. It was very much seen by teachers as a result of political pressure forced on them without any prior consultation or discussion. I do not recall any discussion taking place about the educational implications of comprehensive education. In retrospect, administrators and politicians had massive expectations of and confidence in teachers in the face of the stark realities of Scottish schools at that time. We were presented with a fait accompli, and then the whole world of education began to change more and more quickly. It was a case of too much too soon.
3. Neither as a student nor as a young teacher did I hear about the 1947 Report. It was never mentioned in my teacher training year, nor was the comprehensive school. As far as I was concerned, such schools did not exist. I was made aware that I was being



trained for a two-tier system - junior secondary and senior secondary schools. I would therefore doubt that the 1947 Report had any influence on teachers.

4. My opinion is that the overwhelming reason why comprehensive education became attractive in the 1960's was that more and more people - especially parents - began to perceive that the old system was both wrong and grossly unfair. I remember that a set of twins lived a few doors along from us, and at age 12 one went to senior secondary and the other to junior secondary. It caused a great deal of upset. Being told you were going to a junior secondary school was like being handed your death sentence. Another factor was that the post-war bulge was beginning to hit the schools and new buildings were going to be needed. Also it was a period of liberal thinking, a freeing and opening up of ideas which attacked many traditional beliefs.
5. The main implication of Circular C600 was the influx into many schools of a swarm of 'working-class' children the like of which teachers had never experienced. Many of them just could not cope. Because they saw their presence in the schools as being the result of an external dictat, teachers regarded them as rough diamonds, and treated them often with contempt. It was largely a social problem, unrelated to the pupils' actual ability. Middle-class teachers resented having to deal with children they thought should not have been there in the first place. The 'comprehensive' pupils were thought of as lacking in social graces, or not conforming to the accepted social conventions. Teachers on the whole, reacted badly and negatively to having to

deal with a mix of different types of children. What happened, of course, was that many of the 'poorer' children were allocated to lower-stream classes, and so were denied from the start the chance the comprehensive school was supposed to be giving them.

6. a) My recollection is that Inspectors had a very large role in promoting new ideas. Schools which were doing the 'right' things did well from their patronage. I am sure they were active in resource/equipment allocation, and in recommendations for promotion, although it was all done in a hush-hush way. They went round schools picking up and spreading good ideas.
- b) Local politicians gave comprehensive education a big push. Unfortunately, many of them were inarticulate and poor public speakers. I felt that, in this way, they unwittingly did a disservice to the publicity they were seeking for the comprehensive idea. Many established teachers regarded them as figures of fun and even ridicule.
- c) Certainly in the Glasgow context, Stewart Mackintosh was a very active promoter of comprehensive schools in public, and to the profession, whatever his personal feelings and motives may have been.
- d) There were few advisers at the beginning, but later on they played a large role. In fact they took over training from the colleges in some respects.
- e) The Consultative Committee on the Curriculum never seemed to play the role it should have. Her Majesty's Inspectors hailed its creation as the arrival of paradise as regards curriculum

development, but somehow the promise was never fulfilled. It was never seen as playing a leading role in things, rather it was somewhere in the background or in the wings. We all knew it was there, but were never sure what its function was. College lecturers and advisers made use of some of its better quality publications. Overall, it had a doubtful impact. Much depended on the commitment of its readership.

7. Without a doubt the major obstacle was the assimilation of junior secondary - type pupils and teachers into the senior secondary system. After years of tradition and familiar ways, it was suddenly a new ethos, and miracles were complacently expected from teachers who had no training for and experience of the new world. Many could not cope - this is an observation rather than a criticism. How could they have been expected to? Their outlook was fixed by tradition. What happened, not surprisingly, was that they fell back on the well-tried ways : thus there was a great deal of separation according to ability as judged from primary 7 reports, and very little integration. Classes were labelled and got matching reputations. Those which were extracted from the mainstream (i.e. senior secondary) courses got a raw deal. Some never got a chance from the start.
8. Headteachers had what appeared to be massive, if not total latitude, and many took advantage of their freedom. This accounts for the amazing diversity in school organisation, and also for the fact that some were really running senior secondary establishments with the junior secondary sections tacked on at the end. Every school was allowed to do its own thing. Every

headteacher interpreted the term 'comprehensive' in his own individual manner. There was a crying need for guidelines for staff to help them in what was for many a traumatic experience. This need was not apparently felt nor provided - at least to start with. No one had a plan. For such a major change there appeared to be no planning, no meetings, no discussion at a professional level. It was very much a case of : GET ON WITH IT LADS! The majority of courses and materials were hopelessly academic and unsuitable. Less able children were simply given a watered-down academic diet.

9. Comprehensive education, for the bulk of parents, was not an issue. They were not consulted. The main focus for meeting parents was the Parents Teachers Association, and most of these were entirely social or fundraising affairs. I do not recall any educational topic being discussed at any Parents Teachers Association meeting I attended. There was no formal or informal opposition that I can recall. Those who cared opted out into the private section.
10. a) As I said earlier, those who could afford to sent their children to private schools, or moved house to a more desirable area. I recall very well that primary schools in the King's Park area had 'transit' classes arranged from January of primary 7 for those pupils picked to attend the senior secondary school. The year it was revealed that King's Park was going comprehensive as many as 20-25 out of the transit class (approx 30-35) were booked in to go to fee-paying schools. So the concept of a social mix was very rarely put into practice. Having said that, some of the



housing estate schools were light years ahead of more established schools in terms of teaching style and ideas. They seemed to recruit younger staff with enthusiasm and interest, who created a positive ethos towards the children. I would say that, in my experience, it doesn't really matter where a school is located. What is important is the personnel within it, and how they see their job. It's the teachers that make a school a success - or not!

b) A few children were removed to the private sector, but never in such numbers as to make a dramatic impact on the state sector. So yes, comprehensive schools were deprived of some able children, but not to their overall detriment. As an external examiner for the Certificate of Sixth Year Studies I can guarantee that some of the ablest pupils I have met came from comprehensive schools.

11. Initially, there was no noticeable change in internal organisation. Classes were rigorously separated into senior secondary, junior secondary 1, junior secondary 2 classes. Even in senior secondary there was differentiation 2 language, 1 language and commercial/technical sections. Gradually the dividing lines were blurred as mixed-ability was introduced, but there was tremendous variety in how long it lasted. Also, other solutions (e.g. broad-banding) were widely employed. Some people regarded mixed ability grouping as 'doing your comprehensive duty', and were keen not to delay ability grouping for too long. In fact, my view is that comprehensive schools have reduced real opportunities for children. The option-column structure in secondary 3 is really a disguised channelling exercise in which

pupils are sieved into appropriate courses.

12. Colleges did not play nearly a big enough role in training as they could or should have. Not many staff - especially senior ones - had any experience of comprehensive schools, in fact they were keen to recruit comprehensive teachers when making new appointments. But a lot of college staff did not have much clue about what it was all about. In-service courses that dealt with changes in Scottish Certificate of Education courses or new syllabuses always pulled in the crowds, but I do not think that the college made a significant contribution to helping teachers to come to terms with the implications of comprehensive education. Colleges misdirected their effort. Comprehensive education and what it entailed did not figure prominently in subject department thinking. Most principal lecturers were steeped in an academic tradition, coming, as most did, from principal teacher posts in senior secondary schools.
13. a) Headteachers gave it a try in their own way. They had no choice. They may have paid lip-service to the philosophy but they gave it a go.  
  
b) The majority of teachers, in my experience, adopted a dog-in-the-manger attitude. They resented the enforcement with no consultation aspect of it all. Most never really took to it, though all sorts of efforts were made to make it appear as if they were complying. Real enthusiasts for comprehensive education were rare.
14. For the first few years, old practices hardly changed at all. It was very much a case of junior secondary and senior secondary

schools operating under one roof, or even on separate sites in some cases. Any change towards making organisational changes in line with comprehensive philosophy was very gradual and against the grain.

15. a) In secondary 1/2, there was always some attempt made to select out the ablest, whether in separate classes or by offering them Latin or German. Mixed ability was tried, but not very enthusiastically. Vestiges of streaming always remained, so that the best were not sacrificed in the interests of the majority. It was very rare to hear of mixed ability in modern languages in secondary 2, and by the secondary 3/4 stage, pupils had been sorted out into certificate/non-certificate groups, with little movement between them.
16. Teaching methods were definitely changed, the curriculum less noticeably. The crucial question is : WHO TAUGHT THE TEACHERS? Very few people in college or in schools would go the whole hog, so to speak, so that progress was at best cautious and halting. A big problem was that it took a long time for other things - materials, examinations - to change to fit in with the new philosophy. A real case of old wine in new bottles in many instances. It took 14 years for the Tour de France course to appear, after all!!
17. Again the answer has to be yes, teachers did change their outlook and approach, but only very very slowly. As a group they are probably more reflective now. But in all honesty, no really serious thought was given to what comprehensive education really

meant until Munn and Dunning in the late 1970's. The development programme was a catalyst to thinking on curriculum, methodology and assessment. The comprehensive question was a non-event which provoked different reactions for a decade. Only later did people even begin to come to grips with what it was. So, in my view, Circular 600 was not a turning point : Munn and Dunning was the first serious response to the issues involved.

18. The striking thing was that so many people thought there was no need for any fuss, as Scotland had so many comprehensive schools in any case. Even in the West, they could quote you many examples - Kilmarnock Academy, Dalziel High School, Uddingston Grammar School. They thought 'comprehensive' was just a name for what we already had in many of our schools. The other problem was innate in the Scottish tradition, i.e. a very definite perception of what it meant to be 'educated'. Everything was geared to providing an intensely academic education for the very able in a very formal manner. As a result, the comprehensive school, with its social and intellectual mix, was widely held to be a threat to an excellent tradition, and was then 'blamed' for everything, most notably the end of excellence. I suppose it depends on your view of the world: Christian humanity demands that the comprehensive school is the only right and fair system, but your conception of 'education' has to be much wider than the academic one to see the benefits. I think that comprehensive education demanded of the majority of staff that which they could not deliver. So the whole idea was founded on unrealistic expectations, even though for worthy motives.



20. A comprehensive school is one which gives genuinely equal chances to all its pupils. It has real freedom of choice. Staff, especially senior staff, must believe in the comprehensive principle and want to make it work. The school in all its internal aspects must be based on a comprehensive philosophy of education. The way teachers think of and treat pupils is absolutely vital for success.

21. The comprehensive school has not achieved anything like its potential for these reasons:

- the attitude of many teachers was wrong
  - there was no aim or sense of direction. You just muddled through in your own school
  - teachers did not grasp what was at the heart of the reform. They did not understand what they were supposed to be doing
  - the comprehensive ideal suffered from the deep conservatism and distrust of new ideals characteristic of teachers.
- Result? Many schools were comprehensive in name only.

1. A series of writers on education, going as far back as Dewey, had sown the seeds out of which the comprehensive movement was born. Then other people who studied education gradually came under the influence of such ideas. It takes a while for ideas to have an effect, but people become attracted by them, imbued with an enthusiasm. When they reach positions of power in the educational world later in life, the ideas are still with them, even if they are not sure of the exact origin any more. These writers' main contribution was that they created a climate of opinion. The Labour Party in England really caught hold of the idea and pushed it for a number of years. In fact, it's true to say that the entire British comprehensive movement was born in England and filtered up here. The process was also helped by the fact that it was the coming of age of sociology, which provided previously unheard-of insights into the effects on children of the education system and of their home background. Many professional educationists (directors, heads, teachers) also supported the movement. All these diverse elements fused to strengthen the initiatives which were taken.
2. It was a strand but no more. We should be careful not to exaggerate its influence. It was a major report which is constantly referred to and never forgotten, but its effect was on thinking rather than practice. It must be seen in the context of the immediate post-war period - a period of hope and optimism. It was well-written, had attractive ideas, and gained in popularity because parts of it were anti-establishment. It had

in fact very little direct effect. The main influence was from the people who were in positions of power in the 1960's - a period of idealism in education. That was what really got things going.

3. Such a major decision could not have been taken without a political input. But it is important to remember that, in the eyes of educationists, the move to comprehensive education had positive educational motives to ameliorate the system. It would never have gained any support in the world of education had people thought it was merely a political manoeuvre. Those who did support it saw it as having a certain revolutionary aspect.
4. The 1960's were characterised by the following aspects:
  - idealism was rife in education
  - the working class was changing its lifestyle to one of relative affluence
  - money was plentiful in society, (c.f. holidays abroad, private house boom etc)
  - people increasingly had consumer goods and wanted opportunities for their children
  - the whole youth culture movement burst on the world
  - education was seen as being able to give all children the prospect of a better future than their parents had had. It was seen as an instrument to change society for the better
  - feelings were running high against 11+, and condemning them thereby to an inferior education
  - also, at that time, many people who were being promoted to senior posts in the world of education were themselves of

working class background. They also believed that the educational system could provide more opportunities, and wanted to prove it.

5. Junior secondary schools disappeared or were amalgamated in larger secondary units. Teachers had to cope with a mix of ability, and teach subjects to some pupils who would never have been exposed to them before. Some children were also trying to do well out of an element of personal conviction that they could, now that they had the chance.
6. a) My impression is that people in key positions in Her Majesty's Inspectorate at the time were imbued with the idealism of the period, and thus were for the comprehensive movement. All Her Majesty's Inspectors must have been aware of the wastage and frustration caused by the previous system in their visits to schools. The key figure was Brunton, who, although not very inspiring to listen to, was extremely powerful. He was for it and he got his way.
- b) Local politicians were in favour, but more to be in time with the aspirations of their constituents, who saw education as important, than because they had been aware of what was actually involved in the changeover.
- c) It depended on age - the older ones were still influenced by wartime thinking (e.g. Hugh Fairlie studied under Godfrey Thomson). They tended to cling to the older style. Their younger subordinates were more idealistic.

- d) They appeared on the educational stage in the late 1960's. As a body they were not too important, but certain individuals were very influential e.g. Bill Gatherer. They would be generally supportive, but their posts were created at a time of expansion. They were like a kind of local authority inspectorate, whose posts were created for a variety of ad hoc reasons, mainly to help the Directorate with their increased responsibilities. The general feeling appears to be that the advisory service has not fulfilled the expectations placed on it at the time of its creation.
- e) Both the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum and the Scottish Certificate of Education Examination Board were bodies created to respond to the changes of the 1960's, of which comprehensive education was but one.
7. I do not really know. I think it varied from local authority to local authority.
8. My principal impression in talking to parents at school meetings was of the need to convince them that the move to comprehensive education would not have an adverse effect on standards. Many parents shared an optimistic belief in the power of education to realise their aspirations for their children.
9. Not as far as I know. They are remembered as having been bolstered and protected by the Conservative Party as places of excellence.
10. The educational theorists never liked the so-called 'ghetto'



schools, because inevitably they lacked a social mix, which was seen to be a desirable feature of a comprehensive school.

11. The main obstacle in my opinion was the intrinsic difficulty of making it work. People involved were not conscious of just how difficult it is to operate a comprehensive system successfully. You see, there was a common belief that the long tradition of omnibus schools in Scotland would ease the transition to comprehensive education, but there were still many problems to solve.
12. Yes, there was a fairly radical change - there were more resources for education, and many new purpose-built schools appeared.
13. Pioneering headteachers did try to implement the comprehensive ideals into their internal organisation. But streaming was the traditional Scottish response to grouping children. Thus it was that mixed ability was tried, but it never really happened with success. Even in 1974, as a member of the ----- committee, I saw many 'bottom' sections with distorted curricula, who were put into the hall or given a book when their teacher was off.
14. I would like to think it should be possible to continue to operate mixed ability sections until secondary 3, but I would respect the views of colleagues in subjects other than my own. But I think that to do it successfully, you would have to twist a few of your staff's arms, so that all pupils could get a chance.

15. On the curriculum, yes it had an effect. This was inevitable because of the wider ability groups. Syllabuses changed as well, and this coincided, for very good reasons, with approaches to teaching which were less vigorous, more appealing to the modern taste for relevance, and, as a result, easier to do. I mean, doing a twentieth century test rather than a classic.
16. a) A lot of older teachers were against the comprehensive idea. Those who were the right age left teaching. Not many actually sat down and asked themselves serious questions about their work, now that they were in comprehensive schools. Any change of approach that occurred was gradual.
- b) Both played a part by providing the help that teachers required to face the new challenge. Also money was available to fund in-service training, and teachers were quite willing to give up evenings and Saturdays to discuss their work.
17. It was readily accepted because it drew support from ideas which had been prevalent since Knox's First Book of Discipline. The tradition of the omnibus school was very strong up here.
18. The concept is encapsulated in the tradition of the 'lad o' pairs'. All had to get a chance, no matter what their social origin, but it is important to remember the corollary : after they had been tested and found wanting in academic terms, the system had no further use for them. This also goes back to Knox. The comprehensive school in that sense was something entirely new, because teachers had to deal with many children who did not meet academic criteria but still stayed on at school.

19. a) I would say that it is a school which brings together children from a fixed area of all social classes and of all levels of ability. It then organises itself in such a way as to give them all a chance to develop whatever capacities they may have. It does not value academic excellence alone, but only for those pupils who have it. Classes and courses should be flexible and give the opportunity for all talents to come to fruition.
- b) Most people in the 1960's would have agreed with all that I have said in my definition, but they had to settle for less than the ideal. They found the realities and practicalities of trying to operate the system either too hard or impossible given the circumstances in their own school. So they reverted to what they knew : streaming and grouping by ability, and almost hoped that comprehensives would go away. But they did not.
20. No it has not. The question is : would it have been had the economic climate remained favourable, and we had not had the various crises from 1973 onwards. Who knows? If it has not worked, where is the fault : is it something intrinsic to the comprehensive school, or has it something to do with the teachers? I cannot help feeling that they are key people in any educational change. The optimism that was there in the 1960's has fallen off. They feel undervalued by society. The comprehensive system was launched as 'the faith', 'the received wisdom', and many young teachers left this college imbued with it. But there was a conflict of interests : the new idealism versus the strong academic tradition and its reluctance to give up streaming.



The 1947 Report was a remarkable document but it is difficult to establish if it had any influence. It has been the source of much admiration in foreign countries, but its reception in its homeland was cool. I should say that it helped to keep ideas fresh, but probably only at Scottish Education Department/Her Majesty's Inspectors level. I shouldn't think it was read much by teachers.

The move to comprehensive schools was a political one on social grounds, but not divorced from educational considerations. Selection began to be seen as unsatisfactory and impinged on parents and families. Research began to demonstrate the unreliability of the IQ tests, and gradually arguments began to attack the basis of bipartism and the streaming to which it gave rise. All this fed into political notions of social unacceptability. For once the Labour Party had a policy on education in 1964. It should also be seen in relation to a general mood in society of opportunities, equality, women's movements. All very much anti-social class.

The Sputnik in the late 50's shook people out of their complacency. Education had to be taken seriously in the national interest. This led to a rash of curriculum development projects, initially to promote the ablest in maths/science/technology, but by the mid-60's it had become clear that the real concern was with the whole spread of ability (cf. Curriculum Paper 7).

Inequality in Scotland was perceived as less clear-cut. There was a notion that the system gave opportunity to those of ability. So it was

in a physical sense easier to introduce the comprehensive school in Scotland because of the existence of so many area schools in towns like Montrose. The whole notion had a familiarity about it, and only caused reaction in cities, where a previously segregated provision now had to be integrated.

Once implementation had been decided, Her Majesty's Inspectors began to react to problems as they came along. No clear concept or strategy was worked out in advance. They fostered the development of new curricula to make the theory work. The major question was : how do we deal with the less able pupil? (cf. Brunton, Integrated Science). The effect of this in a ragged way was to move towards a comprehensive ideal for secondary 1/secondary 2, but only there. The organisational change from streaming/setting to mixed-ability caused teachers through Her Majesty's Inspectors pressure to reappraise their former justifications. Many in fairness found them to be untenable. Teachers' perceptions of the kind of knowledge they should be concentrating on getting across gradually changed. Yes, people did begin to think move about what they were doing.

Although it was a Labour Party decision, Labour Councillors are notorious for being conservative. So the ball was not set rolling very fast. The approach of caution adopted by heads chimed in with that of many in the Labour Party. Hence implementation took place as, how and when those in key positions wanted it. I mean comprehensive education was either a radical change to and in educational provision or it was the setting up of new administrative structures. In the West of Scotland, there tends to be a top-down model of management with advisers and heads seen as servants of the Directorate. As a model, it is

effective in promoting administrative/structural change but often leaves what happens in classrooms untouched. The potential of advisers for curriculum development has never been fully realised. Often they operate as intelligent clerical officers who have a largely instrumental role. Those who took curriculum development seriously were an exception.

The Consultative Committee on the Curriculum is a pleasant talking shop. It provides papers and/or materials, but always to fit someone else's framework or educational scheme of things. It tries to be all things to all men. It is heavily government-controlled, and so its power to be genuinely innovative is limited. It operates rules of patronage with its bright members required to toe the line. It does not go in for critical analysis, and permits of no alternative perspectives on educational matters. Scotland's educational system suffers from the futile pursuit of the one, orthodox way of doing things. People look for the holy grail. Life is not like that, and so unpleasant realities and problems which don't fit neatly cause a wishy-washy compromise to be worked out. The feasibility studies in Munn and Dunning development which did throw up alternative perspectives were subjected to increasing government control through centrally-devised developments.

Headteachers and principal teachers have a tacit understanding about their respective areas of control : the former take administrative decisions which are not open to question, the latter in return get no interference in matters of curriculum, methods, materials. The influence of Scottish Exam Board is critical, especially in secondary 3/4 but also in secondary 1/2. Its omnipresence means that teachers feel compelled to keep an eye on the high flyers for later on. What is

expected by syllabuses in secondary 3/4 predetermines what you can do in secondary 1/secondary 2. This also explains the dire mess of so-called non-certificate course in secondary 3/4 especially after RSLA. Teachers in general feel no sense of responsibility for or duty to those pupils. Certificate pupils got all their time, attention and energies. Status in many schools came from which classes you taught, and how many passes you got. Hence lower achievers were placed at considerable risk.

Unless a specific effort was made to devise courses for non-certificate pupils, it was the end of education for them at 14. All that had happened was the 11+ had been moved up a few years. In a curious way, this constituted a negation of comprehensive education. Assessments were manipulated by computers. Scaling and standardising made options a farce and bewildered parents. A minority of schools attempted to do things in a supportive rather than in a judgemental way.

While mixed-ability teaching gradually did spread in secondary 1/2, it hardly ever touched secondary 3/4. Headteachers were of two broad groups : those genuinely ambitious and keen to be seen to be 'doing' comprehensive education, and those who sat back hoping it would go away, and waited to be told what to do. Many teachers faced much personal agony in a totally new context. They genuinely did not know what to do or how to cope. Comprehensive education suffered from the dominance in Scotland of an important, powerful but misguided idea : viz, any child has a fixed ceiling of ability. This invalid assumption had serious implications for schools organisationally and pedagogically. Variations in achievement cause teachers to invoke various levels of ability which are then used to explain present arrangements - mental capacity is a dangerous notion. People learn to differing levels for a whole variety



of reasons which have nothing to do with ability. The concept of a fixed level of ability has dogged the proper development of comprehensive education. The underlying principle has always been : find out the pupils' level, never take account of differences, and use appropriate strategies. That is why mixed ability groups, groupwork and individualised learning have largely failed : there has been a total lack of a proper conception of the nature of the differences between children. It's been very much a case of : here's a good idea, let's use it and make up materials to get out to schools. Critical analysis has not been applied in Scottish education to the extent that it should have.

There has thus over the period been an advance in rhetoric without a corresponding advance in practice in schools. People have groped around for fragmented ideas about what would be 'a good thing' to motivate pupils rather than search for answers in a coherent framework. The true implications of comprehensive education have been discussed and written about, but not seriously examined.

Equality of opportunity in Scottish education has been conceptualised in purely academic terms : a fairer start to get to the same goal (exams, success, status). The right-wing radical view of it (catering for all abilities as well as academic) merely makes respectable the essentially sorting mechanism implicit in the educational system. It legitimates slotting into social roles. A much more radical concept if required : criteria should be identified to say what should be included in the curriculum. Children should be made familiar with different options which will be available to them later in life. A common curriculum up to 16 should establish a familiarity with and the highest level of

competence of decided curricular areas for all children. It should be a general education which opens up the world for them. Comprehensive education should open up vistas to those children whose vistas are limited for one reason or another.

Comprehensive education has failed in Scotland because:

1. A vain search for one single solution to its implications has resulted in compromises which have tended to minimise the difficulties of implementation. Different interpretations must be found.
2. The assumption that pupils had an inherent capacity to learn. Not enough attention has been paid to the central concept of MOTIVATION despite all the rhetoric. The Scottish educational system tends to work to a preconceived model of ability and possibilities of pupil attainment.

PREAMBLE

In my opinion, the impetus for the comprehensive movement was primarily political, its being the natural 'end result' of agitation for secondary education for all, which had begun with the left wing of the Labour Party in the early years of this century. Up to the mid-1950's, I was not aware of any groundswell of pro-comprehensive feeling among secondary school teachers.

In Edinburgh, around 1952, there was no discussion of comprehensive schools - all the talk was of the Moray House Tests and how to refine and improve them. The focus was on improving existing selection procedures. The emphasis was on statistical technology, not on the social implications of a divided educational system.

Then, about 1955-56, comprehensive schools suddenly became a hot public issue. The work of Banks, Floud, Halsey stirred up a public debate, which began to challenge the conventional wisdom which has predominated hitherto and had been based on a Hadow/Norwood/Spens ethos. They had proved powerful, but gradually from then on, the tide of public opinion began to run against secondary selection. Especially vocal in this, in England, were the parents of children who did not make it to grammar school - usually articulate, aspiring and concerned people. Also, at the same time, secondary modern schools were preparing pupils for General Certificate of Education 'O' level exams. Some secondary technical schools were even teaching Latin and Greek, because they were required for University entrance.

Comprehensive schools were regarded by many as experimental, except by the Counties in England and the London Education Authority which to a great extent pioneered the genre. Professor Louwry's at the London Institute became a great campaigner after his son failed to get into a grammar school. Arguments also started to come from academic educationists with opinions on the left. Research studies, notably by Pidgeon and Yates, showed that 11+ exams had (as much as 20%) wrongly allocated children. Educational and sociological research was a very important component in moulding the mood of the times by producing impressive statistical arguments against the wrongs of selection. Certain ideas are taken up at certain times, they gain currency in the prevailing Zeitgeist. All the facts had been known for a long time, but the evidence began to be looked at differently because of the era. It was if you like, an age of improvement which had begun after the war and was now coming of age. Living standards, material acquisitions were all rising, and so were people's expectations. One of the most potent was an increasing belief in and demand for education because of the opportunities it was perceived to confer.

8. Comprehensive schools were welcomed in certain sections of the community because of the increased access to education they were thought to give. However, the old respect for selective education still lingered, and some people hankered after these days.
9. The main argument against private schools was political. There was a push for the abolition since they were seen to be out of place or even illogical in a state comprehensive system. But these schools had another role which is often not mentioned:



by creating an opportunity for some parents to 'buy' education, they stifled a possible vocal objection to comprehensives. The hottest arguments in my recollection were about what was going to become of the much respected senior secondary schools.

10. The whole question of catchment areas was stronger in Scotland than England because of its long tradition of all pupils going to the local school. So there was an historic acceptance and even expectation of going to the local school. Also, there was a traditionally higher proportion of pupils accepted into senior secondaries and, therefore, going on to university. The question of redistributing catchment areas therefore did not arise.
11. - Raising of the school leaving age complicated the switchover to comprehensive schools immensely
  - Staff shortage
  - A lot of inexperienced probationer teachers recruited in the expansionist period of 1967-74 (approx)
  - Above all, prevailing attitudes. My visits to schools (in mid 1970's) revealed a definite hierarchy of teaching subjects, and by implication, of the teachers. 'Senior secondary' staff treated 'Junior secondary' staff with varying degrees of contempt, regarding them as having an unacceptable ethos and approach to their work, and certainly having nothing to teach them. The impression was of staff separation rather than integration.
12. Senior secondary schools had an unmistakable aura about them, a reputation that they were proud of and were reluctant to

relinquish. This is still apparent today, sometimes for unexplained reasons (cf Parent's Charter in 1981 Act). Somehow the ethos is maintained, the identity is deliberately preserved. Thus, comprehensive schools, I would say, were expected by many people to fit themselves into the former tradition, rather than its attempting to adapt to the new ideas. Incomers therefore were expected to find a place in schools which deliberately stayed much as they always had been. The upshot was that you often found parallel schools with parallel pupil populations in one building. Sometimes the split extended to the staff. The traditional omnibus school with its rigorous separation according to ability seems to have served as the blueprint for the 'comprehensive school'.

14. The normal pattern is for a period of one year's mixed ability, followed, sometimes in secondary 2 depending on the subject, but certainly in secondary 3 by some differentiation. Visiting many schools, I was struck by the many variations. The amount and timing of differentiation is dependent almost entirely on the headmaster's views on the subject, rather than on authority policy. The key questions here are: when do you do it? On what basis? There is no system in the world known to me that does not eventually adopt a hierarchical arrangement of secondary pupils - even Sweden, which led the way in advocating comprehensive education. In any case, despite comprehensivisation, the degree of social integration achieved by the comprehensive school is questionable: as one colleague put it 'you can see the difference: watch pupil clusters at school intervals, and you can tell right away.' This fact is not to say that schools

should not play what part they can in trying to make up for deficiencies in pupils which are caused by a whole complex of social factors outwith their control. I am concerned that schools do not tackle this issue as much as they could or should.

15. a) Clearly it had an effect on some subjects e.g. classics. It also increased the accessibility of some subjects, notably aesthetic/practical, to many more children than before. The research done on secondary schools since comprehensive became established has shown two things:

i) Despite there being no selection test, input factors from primary reports play exactly the same role for the prediction of academic success at 16+

ii) Overall attainment by pupils is at least as high as it was in the bipartite system.

b) The major shifts in methodology have arisen mainly due to the advocacy of mixed ability teaching in secondary 1/secondary 2. My own view is that the biggest single effect of the advent of the comprehensive school is making 'Highers' and all that follows accessible to a far higher proportion of pupils than ever before. Previously, pupils were negatively debarred from that access, so to speak, by results of tests in the primary school. I think that the general atmosphere or ambiance of the comprehensive is less intense than a senior secondary. Consequently, more pupils may opt out, but to the extent that it has opened up the upper reaches of secondary education to youngsters who would never have got that length before, it has been a positive step.

16. a) Yes, I think there has been a rethink, largely due first to

comprehensive reorganisation then to the momentous effects of raising of the school leaving age. It's difficult if not impossible to quantify, but it would be helped as older staff retired, and younger ones got into positions of authority. There was a striving to find new ways of operating which were more in sympathy with a comprehensive system. This explains the relative acceptability of many new curricula and materials which appeared in the 1970's. There was a general welcoming of these, despite the criticism they evoked. There has been a gradual but inevitable recognition that schools have definitely changed.

b) There was a lot of involvement and activity in the in-service field. How effective its impact is another question, which is difficult to assess. It must have had some effect on some of the participants.

17. There is an in-built tension between the Scottish tradition in education and the concept of the comprehensive school. The striking feature of this tradition is the lad o'pairts, which is founded in the reality of Scottish life in the 18th and 19th Centuries. As a student at Edinburgh University, I still got 'MEAL MONDAY' holidays in the 1940's. But, in this venerated tradition, you either went on if you were able, or 'fell off the edge', so to speak, if you weren't. Few alternatives to academic education existed for those who could not cope with its demands, and the sacrifices expected. Scottish schools almost had a missionary purpose - SEEK OUT AND PUSH ON THE ABLE, AND, IF NECESSARY, BEAT (LITERALLY) THE KNOWLEDGE INTO THEM. THEY'LL BE GRATEFUL LATER. So the Scottish system was a paradox: socially



egalitarian but academically elitist. This ethos pervaded the consciousness of many people in Scottish education - almost inevitably, since they were its successful end products, those who became successful through progressive academic selection. The comprehensive school, theoretically at least, has less emphasis on selection, and a greater commitment to the average and less able pupils. But the conflict and tension between it and tradition are still present. Consider the number of people who misread the Dunning Report, and insisted on seeing its recommendations as creating 3 distinct groups' of pupils. That was not what was intended, at least by some on the Committee! The separatist mentality is never far away in Scottish education. The aim should be to keep pupil options open and maintain their interest.

18. Equality of opportunity in Scotland is best summed up in the lad o'pairts tradition - the emphasis on not allowing any barrier whatever to prevent the able succeeding. The rest? They were at worst forgotten, at best jollied along until they left. Concentration on bright pupils rather than honestly attempting to do one's best educationally for all pupils has long been characteristic of Scottish secondary schools.
19. The only characteristic that marks out a comprehensive school is its non-selective intake. Other characteristics derive solely from the prevailing educational philosophy of those who administer it. They determine what 'comprehensive' means for them. I think that this has been part of the problem. There has been a haziness about the definition of the term, a nebulousness,

a vagueness in official statements and expectations. It is, therefore, not surprising that such variety as does exist is there; nor is it surprising that many people fell back on what they were most familiar with.

20. In principle, nothing even achieves its potential, but there is now an awareness of such schools and attempts to improve provision in the interests of all pupils. Problems of curriculum and assessment are now being tackled seriously. There is a willingness to wrestle with problems.

1. Comprehensive initiatives started in some parts of England under pressure of events, with no encouragement from Central Government or Her Majesty's Inspectors. The agitation for comprehensives in the Labour Party was influenced by academic writings, and gradually it became an issue of contention. The London County Council and its Education Committee were important in institutionalising comprehensive schools; but it only made sense in certain circumstances. The National Union of Teachers were the footsoldiers of the campaign to kill off secondary modern schools and liberate the primaries from the pressures of the 11+.
2. The motives were a mixture, since education cannot be non-political, especially where major change is involved.
3. The policy became attractive in the 1960's because there was a recognition that the economy needed a Labour force with professional and technical expertise. The middle management/mass of workers model was obsolete and inappropriate. In addition, there was a need to educate people to use additional time gained from early retiral. The secondary modern school was a trap, whereas the grammar offered education and opportunities for all who got a place. Production industries were in decline, whereas white collar work was booming - clerical, administrative, social work, health, computer technology, travel business.
4. One of the main implications of the Comprehensive Circulars was the end of the headmaster in his traditional role of captain of

the ship. They foreshadowed a major recasting of roles in the education service: guidance came in; role of head of department expanded; concepts of management came to be used in education. There were also implications for what was now to be valued in education. It may be, however, that in the rush to establish themselves alongside grammar schools, new comprehensives emphasised competition to the detriment of the less able.

5. Yes, private and fee-paying schools did have an effect in some places, as they were - and still are - prestigious academic establishments with a social role of great significance.
7. The concept of equality of opportunity was both real and genuine for its advocates. It became simplified to making the opportunities as wide as possible, unrestricted by factors irrelevant to the final outcome. It came to be seen as a recognition of the fact that talent has many forms.
8. Scottish education has enormous variety of practice within its powerful omnibus school tradition. The individual power of heads and their senior staff is very great in determining what happens. I would, therefore, imagine that comprehensive education almost took as many forms as there were schools.
13. Yes, comprehensive education was one plank in a broader movement of innovation in social policy.
14. The main factors which influence social policy are attitudes of people in the particular service, and the resources released for



initiatives. Other things which aid the realisation of policy initiatives are:

- the existing structure has to be seen to be clearly breaking down
- the ideas have to be good, worked out on the ground rather than in the library
- some parts of the service have to be used as windows for change
- early research based on practice has to have been completed
- the innovation has to be widely disseminated
- the power structure has to be shaken.

15. Yes, comprehensive education was made attractive to the public but inhibited through under-resourcing. The change was pushed through and suffered the inevitable crude simplification of its basic principles. These then became the seeds of its discrediting in the public mind. As Tawney said: THE FATE OF REVOLUTIONS IS TO COIN WATCHWORDS FOR CONSERVATIVES.

16. I do not think that the autonomy of the teaching profession is important on the introduction of a new policy. It may be an obstacle to its complete acceptance.

17. Policy initiatives like comprehensive school clearly cannot hope to effect fundamental change in industrialised Western societies, since educational attainment is due to many factors other than the influence of schools.

18. The attempts to secure the support of teachers for the changeover

to comprehensive education were not universally adequate across education authorities.

20. Any major service/profession has many different, partly conflicting aims. These often constant opportunities for change, some of which are occasionally seized.

Two main groups of people launched the whole comprehensive issue. Firstly, educationists like Pedley were beginning to ask fundamental questions about the purpose of education and schools, and challenge the accepted notion that they had to be organised on tripartite lines. Sociologists were in addition providing convincing evidence about the effects of socio-economic factors on educational attainment. Then the politicians got a hold of these ideas and saw that there was much capital in these ideas, and that they had a genuine opportunity to do something important for education. Even the Conservatives by the early 1960's were accepting the inevitability of comprehensive education. It is of course a moot point whether the academics who were advocating change were politically-minded /motivated.

A basic problem in both Scotland and England was that the term 'comprehensive' was used very loosely. It needed and needs definition. It is used very casually - hardly anyone says what they mean by it. Then there were enormous controversies over the question of size - how big must a comprehensive school be? There is no doubt that selection at 11+ and transfer to a secondary modern or grammar school was a major issue, and profoundly affected both pupils and parents. Most pupils (and their parents) sent to modern schools immediately lost interest, unless they were some of the growing number who were being presented for General Certificate of Education 'O' and proving the selectors wrong. Reactions to the impact of the introduction of comprehensive schools depended on who you were. There certainly was a feeling that doors were being opened to all and sundry in one camp. But if you were in the other, and doors had previously been closed to you, you were delighted

at the opportunity you now had.

Comprehensive education has proved to be very pervasive, and there's no doubt it's here to stay. An interesting question at a time of falling rolls is this: how do you maintain a comprehensive structure in schools and preserve the principles on which these schools rest?

It also has to be said that in England at any rate, certain areas were ahead, almost pioneering, as far as comprehensive schools were concerned. Coventry is the home of the comprehensive school. Other areas were bastions of traditional elitist views e.g. Surrey. There is no doubt that those who adhered to the old selective order, at no matter what level in the system they worked, dragged their feet over comprehensivisation. This inevitably meant that the changeover took a long, long time. In Scotland, given its omnibus tradition and the greater incidence of Labour-controlled councils, the formal changeover was not so protracted. Also, all Scottish teachers were graduates - or most were. Nevertheless, the change to comprehensive education as the national form brought out people's educational/social snobbishness, and to some extent polarised positions ensued. Of course, the basic question is not about whether schools are called 'comprehensive', it is what happens to the pupils not only as they go through the system but also at home. That explains a lot.

The roles of the Inspectorate and the Directorate are complementary in ensuring that government policy is implemented. They are the agents of central government. The latter deal with the physical provision of the service, the former see to the implementation of educational aims. Curricula are developed by the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum

working parties, and Scottish Exam Board make up papers to examine them.

As far as those in schools were concerned, I would say that only a minority really faced up to the implications of comprehensive education; the others just did not confront the issues, with variable degrees of unwillingness of course. Tradition dies hard, and it takes years to change the workings of a 'set' environment which has functioned the same way for decades. Reluctance is all the more deep-seated if there is any attempt - real or imagined - to coerce.

The Scottish educational system is steeped in mythology. Despite all that is claimed for it in official accounts, some of the supposed characteristics are not as real as many believe them to be. The system tends to be isolationist, and in my view, has suffered very badly from the influence of the Church. One of the worst features is the Scottish Certificate of Education 'H' exam - it is questionable whether to force pupils to take 5 or 6 of these in two terms is educationally sound. What kind of subject grasp do you get in such a rush? It's the old breadth versus depth argument. The latter must be open to doubt? Certainly compared with General Certificate of Education 'A' level as a preparation for University work, the Scottish 'H' hasn't a look in. A study done recently in the Maths/Science facilities at St. Andrews suggests this to be the case.

What is also a moot point in the Scottish system is this: although most people subscribe to the idea of doing 'as much as they can for all' inherent in a comprehensive philosophy, and that the selective system was out of balance in favour of the few, it is inescapable that people in education still laud the able and are happiest working with and



promoting their educational progress. The others, the underdogs if you like, well I'm not so sure how much comprehensive education has helped them or changed what happens to them.

Several points should be made:

- i) most teachers do not think. Nor do they know how to manage a learning situation. They do not assess, they norm-reference pupils
- ii) following from i), they adopt a far too 'mechanical' approach to their job. By that I mean they want someone to present them with a package all the problems of which have already been solved, so that they can follow the instructions and teach it. Such an outlook is a major obstacle to progress
- iii) the power universities have in controlling both the curriculum and assessment methods used in Scottish schools should never be underestimated. There is a lack of trust in teachers to do internal assessment well.

It has always been a vital part of the consciousness in the Labour Party that education is a panacea and the key to future success. These feelings were particularly strong in the 1950's and 1960's. The movement towards equality, symbolised in the comprehensive school, was principally defined in terms of access, to be widened by removing the barrier of the 11+ or 'quali' in Scotland. I do not think people in the Labour Party gave much thought to what a comprehensive school actually was. It was almost as if what it was and what went on inside it were beside the point. Indeed, many people in the LP still shared the mentality which favoured streaming in order to select the able.

The anti-selection lobby was never so strong in Scotland. It was not a burning issue, although a few politically active teachers in the Educational Institute of Scotland made a point of referring to it whenever possible. Attention was mainly drawn to it in Scotland in a locally and pragmatically way in two main ways: parents whose families were split into junior secondary and senior secondary schools pestered their local Councillor; or they lodged appeals with the Director of Education for the Secretary of State to deal with if they saw their children about to be condemned to a junior secondary school.

The Labour Party is an essentially conservative organisation which has experienced an ideological divide over the comprehensive issue, a clash of cultures, if you like. There was by no means unanimity in favour of the all-through comprehensive school, although that was the theory.

The Scottish Education Department let some Local Authorities away with

murder, and were over-preoccupied with the plant and buildings side of things. There was little concern about what went on inside the schools, as long as it appeared that a comprehensive system had been created in terms of structure. This attitude on the part of the Scottish Education Department meant that Local Authorities had a considerable say in how things developed and a lot of them took advantage of the situation in a nice way.

I have no doubt that the pressure was entirely political. The word 'comprehensive' was a four-letter word in the profession, if not almost revolutionary. You must remember that most teachers do not think in theoretical or abstract terms, they just teach their classes. Also, to be fair, at that time there was a lack of a forum for discussing education and exchanging ideas, both in the educational and political world.

Politicians, both national and local, shouted about comprehensive education, more loudly if their constituents kept pestering them. Discussion took place in branch meetings, but you must remember that other issues predominated at that time e.g. housing. It would be wrong to imagine that comprehensive education was an all-consuming interest. Even at Scottish Labour Party Conferences, you can judge the importance attached to an issue by its position on the agenda paper. In all the years I have been at conferences, education never had key debate status. This is merely a reflection of the preoccupations of constituency branches.

My impression was that Directors of Education ran the show quietly in the background. At that time, Elected Members did not have the

mental equipment or the courage to challenge or criticise a report prepared by the professionals. Such documents went through almost on the nod, with minimal discussion. I also think that the Association of Directors of Education in Scotland had a strong perception of what was best in Scottish education, and so their approach was to accommodate the changes imposed but without destroying the tradition. I think that they made a nod in the direction of equality but did not take a radically innovative stance. Hugh Fairlie's famous two-tier system was sold as being a bold venture, when in fact it was a disguised attempt to retain selection.

I also think that local Elected Members in the party would see comprehensive education as being streets ahead of what they had experienced at school - the horrible junior secondary schools - so that they were right behind it without having much idea of what it actually meant. They relied on the professionals to make it work in schools, and so never interfered in how schools were run - that wasn't their sphere.

To appreciate the extent of the commitment of Labour councillors to comprehensive education, you must not lose sight of the fact that many in the West of Scotland were Catholic. It is said that a 'Catholic Mafia' in the council ruled Glasgow for years! For West of Scotland Catholics, the purpose of the education service was to create a Catholic middle class, by selecting the able and launching them into the professions. That is why St. Mungo's Academy and St. Aloysius for boys and Notre Dame were so revered, both by the Hierarchy and the Councillors. So Catholic Elected Members faced an ideological dilemma: subscribing on the one hand to promoting social justice, but at the same time not wishing to do anything which might damage the status of these



much respected schools which had done so much to educate able working class Catholic boys and girls. I think this explains the inordinate delay in abolishing the selective fee-paying schools in Glasgow. If they had really wanted to get rid of them, they could have done so much sooner. There was a reluctance of will. In fact, I think some of them - particularly the more educated who had their own children at these schools - took the view that comprehensive schools were the thing to create but they could happily co-exist with selective (on academic ability) schools. At the very least therefore, there was not a little ambiguity in the party on this issue.

There is no doubt that streaming was practised in so called 'comprehensive' schools for years, its continuation being explained away as due to the lack of proper accommodation or facilities or materials to do anything else. There was a lot of feetdragging. Teachers have an inherent conservatism anyway, but, to be fair, their training in college hardly equipped them to deal with the implications of comprehensive education. Most college staff had senior secondary experience only, and had gained their reputations as teachers of certificate classes who had done well at Scottish Certificate of Education exams. Remember, too, that college staff in the late 60's-early 70's were under a great deal of pressure, with huge classes of students. The message was to produce the finished product - people who could stand up in front of classes and teach. The colleges were like conveyor belts getting teachers out to fill the hundreds of vacancies due to comprehensive education and raising of the school leaving age. In Scottish education provision has always lagged behind aspiration and expectation of what could be achieved. That is why you should always pay heed to the context in which developments occur. To sum up: the ideal of comprehensive



education and the reality of its provision were separated by a gulf.

Very important for the context too is the fact that Scotland was a country with an international reputation for the construction of refined selection tests for the upper end of the primary school. Indeed, people like Thomson, McClelland and McIntosh devoted their lives to a scientific study of the subject. So equality of opportunity has to be set against that background - the whole object was to identify then promote the able. All the sociological evidence of unfairness came from England and its outcome - the comprehensive school - just sort of fitted into the way the Scottish system was rolling: the key points up here were the increasing unease about wastage in secondary schools. The 1959 Report, the failure of the junior secondary schools and then the evidence that some kids labelled failures at 12 were in fact passing the 'O' grade. I see Circular 600 as an attempt to rationalise provision, and as a solution to all these irritating problems. The difficulty was, I think, that the creation of the comprehensive school set up expectations of equality which the system did not deliver and possibly resulted in the same discrimination as before but in a more subtle way.

Finally, I think it is true to say that people in the Labour Party thought that the comprehensive school had arrived in 1965 with the publication of Circular 600 (many in the party had not even read it I am sure, by the way, even Councillors!), rather than realise the truth, that it was only at the start of its evolution. It was never taken seriously as a new approach to education, but left to operate at the level of assumption.

1. Let me say at the outset that Scotland was pulled along behind England in the matter of comprehensive education. The source of initiatives down there was the iniquitous 11+, and the mounting criticism of the tripartite system. Vernon and other reputable academics were producing statistics to show the thousands of children reckoned to be misplaced, and they began the push to end selective education because of its inherent unfairness and the anxiety it caused children and their parents. So the intense pressure began to build up in England, and Scotland followed on. You must remember that feelings were not quite so intense here for three main reasons:
  - 1) the social class aspect of going to grammar school was much more pronounced than it was in families going to senior secondaries
  - 2) social expectations were different here in Scotland
  - 3) 35% of Scottish children on average went to senior secondary schools, as against only 20% of English children going to grammar school.
2. A difficult question. It glorified the parish tradition and the lad o'pairs. There's a great danger of seeing that tradition through rose-coloured spectacles, and we should be aware of that. Yes, the Report was influential, but how? It influences through the language in which it was conched, and the almost biblical tone of some of the passages. It was paid attention to and quoted. It is arguably the best report on an educational topic even to have appeared in Scotland. In my opinion, the chapters

on the aims of education and the curriculum were probably more important than the section on the omnibus school. Also, a lot of what it had to say on exams adumbrated significant changes which came later. Of course, it appeared at a time of post-war idealism. You often find that important Education Acts and reports are animated by wars. Its source was the Advisory Council, and I think that one of the reasons why it did not have an immediate impact was that there was no Scottish Education Department member/assessor on it. As a body it was therefore relatively free of central control, with no inherent Scottish Education Department dynamic in it. There was no feeling that it was part of central policy in Scottish education. Her Majesty's Inspectors did not carry it around in their briefcases as 'the word'. So it represented an ideal to aim for sometime, rather than a statement of what was actually going to happen. Its contents were not 'pushed'. It is interesting to note how later Scottish Education Department committees always had Scottish Education Department representatives - this fact fuels my thesis of an increased central control in Scottish education in the 1960's and 1970's.

3. Primarily political. There was a sort of camaraderie built up during the war in which people of all social classes worked and pulled together. Thus the thrust towards egalitarianism which arose, and saw bi-partite/tri-partite educational systems as prime elements in reinforcing a class-ridden society. So socio-political reasons were paramount. There was no great groundswell in educational circles in Scotland because of:

- i) the higher percentage who 'got a chance' of a good education

ii) the long tradition of the omnibus school, to which all children went, even though on arrival they were rigorously streamed by ability.

So no, there was no outcry to end the bi-partite system. I don't think people thought it iniquitous. In fact, there was a sort of satisfaction with or even complacency about Scottish secondary education. There were 'cut off points' for senior secondary education which were adhered to, and accepted as right. People thought they were being fair to all pupils.

4. Every idea has its time. Trends occur in social attitudes. Sociologists gave both publicity and credence to their findings, and the psychologists were producing indisputable statistics. The result was that the arguments for comprehensive policy became difficult to resist. So evidence was piling up and political pressure was applied. Labour winning the 1964 Election capped it all.
5. In senior secondary schools the reactions were terror and a frisson of despair. Some senior secondary heads must have felt like a general who had had his horse shot from under him. The arrival of comprehensive schools was like sabotage. How were people going to cope? Who allowed these children near us? I think a lot of secondary teachers viewed the change in these terms. There was a need for a drastic and immediate re-ordering of attitudes. It is an open question whether it occurred or not. There would also be logistical problems (buildings etc) and financial ones (grants etc) for Directors of Education.



6. a) Her Majesty's Inspectors are shadowy figures who implement government policy
  - b) Local politicians were vocal and powerful, especially in areas which put up resistance
  - c) Directors were also powerful and persuasive people, who could shape developments
  - d) Advisers were not very involved, especially to begin with
  - e) The Consultative Committee on the Curriculum did not exist at the start.
7. The external structure was imposed on them by Directors. But, as for internal organisation, they used the considerable latitude they had to outwit government policy.
8. Middle class parents in Scotland were worried that the abolition of the senior secondary school would affect access to Highers, lower standards, and generally put their children at a disadvantage. Working class parents had no strong view one way or the other. They are not normally upwardly socially mobile, and don't know the ropes of the education service or how it works. They were unaffected, whereas middle class parents were sceptical or hostile. Probably the section of parents who were genuinely glad that comprehensive schools had arrived were the top end of the 65% of parents whose children would have gone to junior secondary school.
9. There was such a small number in the West of Scotland that they were no more than a fly in the ointment.

10. Area schools were seen as problems by thoughtful people. A large proportion accepted the Scottish tradition of all going to the local school. Only a small percentage of people were concerned by the problems posed.
11. Far and away the most powerful obstacle was staff attitudes. Powerful and determined senior secondary rectors thwarted attempts to introduce comprehensive school. One known to me divided his secondary 1 thus:
- TOP 20%        - streamed
- MIDDLE 60%   - mixed ability
- BOTTOM 20% - remedial/less able classes.
- Hence when Councillors asked if he was 'doing' mixed ability he could honestly say 'yes'. Such an approach was probably not typical, but it equally was not unique. Some variation on selection went on.
12. The omnibus school set up was certainly adopted widely, so by definition there was separation according to ability. Although 'comprehensive' became an 'O.K. - word' there was no conceptual analysis of the term. Of course, as Professor Joad would say, it all depends on what you mean by comprehensive. It was very much a label of approval which kept up the appearance of having a comprehensive system. But not many people took the trouble to look inside and see what was going on.
13. Much depended on the educational philosophy of the head and his teaching staff, especially to start with. More pressure to change was applied later as more knowledge and understanding of

the real implications of a comprehensive system became available. But developments were very gradual.

14. The theoretical ideal says that you should have mixed ability groups for secondary 1/secondary 2 and then have a regrouping once they have shown what they can do. The paradox however is that, in order to have true mixed ability you must first check the ability of each entrant then make a roughly equal scatter in each class. Random or alphabetic mixing is too chancy. I gather from the experts that in maths and french able children can be identified fairly early in secondary 1. Setting by subject performance is perfectly acceptable; grouping by general ability is not. The longer things are kept flexible and selection is deferred, the less likely you are to make mistakes. By the end of secondary 2, there has to be some teasing out in the interests of all children. I am against mixed ability till secondary 4.
15. Yes, but not to start with. Academic teaching of the 'chalk and talk' kind lasted for a while, but in the junior school mixed ability classes did cause some teachers to adapt their methods. As for the curriculum, it stayed very much in the comprehensive school as it had been in the senior secondary school. Only as experience of dealing with less able children grew did things change. Gradually relevance became the criterion. A lot of good curricular plans were misinterpreted: for example a lot of people thought they were doing a 'Brunton Course' if they added a bit of Retail Distribution to the existing curriculum.
16. a) Its arrival did cause some scrutiny to take place but later

rather than sooner. Complacency gradually gave way to questioning. It was a factor of age - older more 'set' people retired, and younger ones with idealism or out of sheer necessity began to look critically at what they were doing.

b) Many college people made a big effort, but a serious problem was that not many college lecturers had experience of the comprehensive system. To get experienced staff into college took a long time. Courses mounted tended to explain the theory, the rationale and its implications, rather than deal with the practicalities.

17. To some extent it was in keeping with Knox and the parish school tradition - all to one school. But, omnibus schools were organised on strictly bipartite lines. So Scottish schools were ostensibly democratic but, given the tendency to pick out excellence and promote the bright pupils, the system has a built-in contradiction. You couldn't get a much more meritocratic exam than the old 'quali', by which literally you 'qualified' for entry to a senior secondary school, and those who did not were rigorously excluded, or 'kept back'. It is not surprising that many of these 'rejected' pupils caused problems in junior secondary schools or primary departments. Also, school subjects are placed in an implicit hierarchy, and there's a split between academic and non-academic subjects. There's a feeling that time spent on the latter is time 'wasted', which could more profitably be spent on the former. Some teachers also have a strong desire to see their pupils studying the same course as them - I sometimes wonder if this is a sort of psychological desire for retrospective reassurance to bolster feelings of insecurity.



18. I remember seeing a cartoon at the time comprehensive schools were in the news. It showed two women talking and one said to the other: SEE THEY NEW COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOLS, WELL OOR MARY IS NAE GOOD AT MORE SUBJECTS THAN EVERY BEFORE NOO.' I think equality of opportunity in Scotland was seen in the sense of giving opportunities to the able to succeed, rather than in a broader sense of giving all pupils the opportunity to do what they can well. The paradox here is that the more you create or open up equality of opportunity, the more you run the risk of emphasising inequalities.
19. I would look for four factors:
- drawing pupils on an area basis
  - minimising social divisions between pupils
  - having mixed ability groups to start with
  - not streaming by ability at any point.
- b) I think a common conception of the comprehensive school was a simple one of all children going to one school, much as the omnibus school took all children.
20. No, the potential has not been tapped. Economic factors have prevented this, but as important an obstacle is the attitudes of people working in schools. Also, I feel that the continued existence of the independent sector has withdrawn a powerful and vocal section of parents who, given their interest and 'push', could have formed a powerful pressure group to improve the state system and make comprehensive schools work.

PREAMBLE

I have to say that in Lanarkshire comprehensive education had to be fought hard for, even within the Labour-controlled Council and the local Educational Institute of Scotland. It was real struggle, and occurred despite rather than because of Circular 600. There was a lot of hostility among teachers and headteachers who saw their comfortable empires and well-worn structures being undermined. Many professing liberals were basically hostile to the comprehensive concept. They eventually had to toe the line but they never really accepted it. Strong supporters in the Educational Institute of Scotland (usually also members of the Labour Party) had to try to influence an administration which was not favourable to the idea. The Director was hostile, and did not lead his Council. The Councillors were badly advised by the Directorate. There was a background of reluctance, though they all knew they could not in all decency oppose it. Hence, comprehensive education was seen as having been foisted upon people, and was thus not welcome. The result was that the whole system was subtly undermined from within schools themselves. It had to be made to work and many reluctant heads had their own way. It was a slow grinding process. People either could not or refused to conceive of its even being able to work. They foresaw what they liked and respected about Scottish education and schools being threatened, and the change of character that it would inevitably bring to schools, especially the older established ones. Keen teachers had to indulge in much bullying on issues like mixed ability groups, which were seen as a radical departure from the norm. So that any comprehensive advances made were totally dependent on individuals and their enthusiasm, rather than as a result of deliberate policy. It was a

power struggle between those who really wanted change on comprehensive lines, and those who wanted essentially and unaltered school with a comprehensive countenance.

1. I think Circular 600 came as a result of years of irritation and attrition by those with progressive minds in Scottish education. It all really started in 1945, and grew out of the spirit of reconstruction prevalent after the war. Eventually the clamour became so loud that the politicians could not ignore it.
2. The 1947 Report provided a focus for progressive educational thinking. It was favourable to the omnibus school in country areas and to schools of 600-700 pupils. From the time of that Report, the comprehensive idea was mobile and in people's sights as a possibility. I would say, however, that despite pressure from enlightened educationists in schools and Universities, it was never the basis of government policy. Bruce Millan was dead against it in the early 1950's. It was embarrassing to the Scottish Education Department that J.J. Robertson, a conventional and respected establishment figure, was propounding what they saw as radical ideas, but what in fact was happening was that he was honest enough to say what he believed in public.
3. Impossible to separate the two. Educational reform automatically has political overtones because the changes it entails affect the basic structure of society. The primary concepts were educational, but they were imbued with political overtones. I personally could not support a political movement that was not educationally sound. Of course, remember that the term 'social

engineering' was used as an excuse by opponents of the movement to discredit its educational intentions.

4. Secondary education had been a miserable failure for many pupils for many years. So many were effectively damned at 11+. They were the losers, and that became socially and educationally indefensible. Those who opposed it said it would damage the abler pupils. That was another excuse. You must remember that there were highly localised differences in the West of Scotland. Junior secondary schools were a disaster area - all the bad or unqualified teachers were intentionally sent there to keep them away from the senior secondary schools. Pupils were not learning, they were merely passing the time till the leaving date. Things were much worse in the towns. Things were much more socially identifiable there.

5. The teachers asked themselves how they were going to manage with low ability kids, since they had had neither experience or training for that kind of work. They were groping around trying to find a way of handling the situation as comfortably as possible, and of ensuring that the educational achievements of the able were left intact. They went through the motions of catering for the whole ability range in secondary 1. Most headteachers' principal aim was to ensure that clever kids got the teaching they deserved. It was certainly not to make comprehensive education work in any serious way. They were really in charge of academic institutions that were dishonestly called 'comprehensive'. Real comprehensive schools have the flexibility to allow children to get a real chance and move



classes if required. This rarely happened.

6. a) They were a mixed bunch with mixed attitudes. Dickson, who largely wrote the Junior Secondary Education Memorandum, was open-minded and honest. The Divisional Inspectorate were there to mediate between Central Government and Local Authority power, which in 60's and 70's was authoritarian. Thus, totally depending on the views of the Director of Education, local Inspectors could have an easy or hard task. They never got co-operation from the Director in Lanarkshire. He never replied to Educational Institute of Scotland letters, or Scottish Education Department ones, until forced to. He had total power and exercised it, giving his underlings no authority.
- b) It was a battle to get it accepted in Lanarkshire, a supposedly Labour-controlled Council. They had to be bullied to accept it. It was curious, but because of internal politics, they did not group themselves on party lines on the issue.
- c) The Director was opposed to it, his deputy was not, but the Director's word was law. His underlings had no power at all.
- d) Some of them were deep enthusiasts, right 'into' matters of curriculum and assessment. Their job was to go out and move teachers on the implications of comprehensive education. They were working to guidelines from the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum and Central Committees. They were change agents in effect.
- e) The Educational Institute of Scotland became a strong supporter when it became committed to comprehensive schools as a matter of

policy in the early 1960's. The Scottish Secondary Teachers' Association was definitely hostile, although it tried to pretend it wasn't.

7. A lot. There was little authoritarian direction from Directorate staff, only guidelines. No head as far as I know was ever in trouble because he was not implementing a comprehensive policy. This is what gave rise to the immense variety of school interpretations, and also to the blatant non-implementation that went on.
8. Many were delighted, and saw it as a real chance, especially for the children who would have gone to junior secondary school. It was an opportunity to prove what they could do. Now they would not be marked for life by the name of their school. Also, there was no compulsion to leave. Also, however, it must be said that some articulate parents were worried about the damage comprehensive schools might do to their able children.
9. Yes, they affected them, not by removing hordes of able pupils, but by making comprehensives feel the need to be competitive or lose esteem. It also meant that parents might remove the abler children to private schools because of what they saw as the 'decline' of a 'good' school with a long tradition after it 'went comprehensive'.
10. No. not that I am aware of, except in regard to its social composition.

11. The main obstacle was the hostile attitudes of heads and many staff. The best was not done for the less able pupil. Principal teachers refrained from taking the weakest classes. The best teachers did not see 'the thickies' if they could avoid it. There was grumbling about mixed ability. Most of the discontent came from teachers in mid-career at the time of the change. Remember there were many changes contingent on comprehensive schools - guidance, RSLA, Green Paper (where ordinary graduates and diplomates were held to be on an equal footing with Honours Graduates). All these led to much discontent.
12. I think there was a perceptible shift, but it came gradually rather than overnight. Schools are different places now as a result. To be fair, there was always a large group of staff totally committed to the less able child. The advent of the comprehensive school enabled them to find their feet, and extend the effectiveness of their sympathy for these pupils. Thus, strong and genuine efforts were made by some teachers to make comprehensives education work, even in the face of hostility to their ideas from their senior colleagues.
13. To start with there was no enthusiasm. The status quo proved rather rigid in the face of the winds of change. But the pressure increased gradually until it became too great to resist. At the lowest, the pupils became too much of a bloody nuisance, too restive to ignore. Coping strategies were called for. Colleges were nominally committed to sending out students to fit the system which was comprehensive (at least nominally) and not elitist/academic. Pressure from colleges in tandem with advisory

staff, plus an even-increasing pool of newly trained graduates caused a change in attitude, I am sure of that. When they got rapid promotion to principal teacherships, the changes became every more influential, the more so as their future career prospects would depend on their being receptive to an ethos of change.

14. A critical question. Much depends on the subject. In my own, in the hands of a good teacher, no differentiation is necessary in my view. For others - e.g. maths, mod langs - broad-banding would be a reasonable compromise. The basic issue is the freedom of teachers versus interference to get things done because of an educational philosophy. You should never ask teachers to do what you have not done yourself, and recognition should be made that all teachers cannot function in the same way. Flexibility is the keynote. My own view is that mixed ability classes can function successfully for secondary 1 and secondary 2, then some broad grouping is called for. I don't think you can risk bad work being done with kids in the name of an educational principle. Fanaticism is bad. Children must, however, have the opportunity to escape from the clutches teachers put them in.

15. Not as much of an effect on methods as I would have liked, and even less on the curriculum, apart from things like alternative syllabuses. Educational change is not teacher-proof. Even when you devise an open exam (like CSYS English) with total freedom for the teacher they work it to get the maximum possible marks for the least work. This is typical - teachers are besotted with exam success. This makes radical changes in what happens between



them and their pupils unlikely, if not impossible. Their conscientiousness in preparing pupils for exams is understandable: exams are thought to matter for pupils for the rest of their lives, and so teachers will not let them down. Exams are the key to occupational/social success. The 'Get them Through' mentality stifles creativeness and critical facilities in both teacher and taught. It will probably never die. In the late 1970's I conducted a survey of 5th year English teaching in a sample of 40 schools for the Scottish Education Department. I was struck by 2 things: the diligence of most teachers in preparing pupils, and how dominant the Scottish Certificate of Education 'H' exam is: it determines virtually all that happens in curriculum and methods, and not just in secondary 5. The strong elements of change have a much less perceptible effect on what happens in classrooms than you would expect, given the scale of the change. Teachers operate for the most part in old fashioned ways despite what they are nominally doing.

16. a) How effective are the structures of change in the actual work of teachers in classrooms? My answer would be at best variable.
- b) Advisers and committees they set up were potent in their effect, especially where advisers were good communicators, and had an educational philosophy that was in line with the comprehensive movement. A minority of teachers attended meetings then prosyletised to their colleagues. Even if only 10% of teachers attended courses and talks, they had a far from negligible influence on their less energetic colleagues by spreading the word.

17. It articulated in one sense with the lad o'pairts tradition - i.e. all are entitled to a chance irrespective of social background - to which there has always been a deep commitment in Scotland. But it was out of kilter with that other venerable aspect of Scottish education - respect for the 'high flyer', the man of scholarship who crowns himself with Highers, degrees and inspires others. There is an endemic respect in Scotland for academic success, and the positions in society it brings in its train. The comprehensive school cannot secure itself to that part of the tradition, for a decline in esteem for dedicated study leading to high academic achievement must accompany any true comprehensive philosophy of education. In a comprehensive school, less importance must be attached to academic success, it cannot be the major objective. To expect that of large numbers of Scottish teachers was naive.
19. A comprehensive school is one which takes all the pupils from a given area irrespective of their ability. Its aim should be to give every one a first rate opportunity to achieve whatever they can and to develop a whole broad range of abilities. A comprehensive school should always talk of abilities, not ability. All abilities should be held in equal esteem, and be treated as equality valid.
20. Nothing like it. Much still remains to be done. Teacher attitudes and teacher morale are both crucial, as is the outlook and approach of the headteacher. So much depends on him - as a quick survey of present day schools will tell you. Appointing committees have a lot to answer for. Nevertheless, the

effectiveness of schools now - with all their faults - is far greater now than it was 20 or more years ago. We could never go back to that system. For all the defects, the comprehensive system has one big advantage: as cherished notions are increasingly questioned, so the latent creative possibilities of the comprehensive philosophy become known, and possibly even take root. Given the right personnel, it's the only way forward in my view.

**PAGE  
NUMBERING  
AS ORIGINAL**



1. There was a great mass of sociological writing and a splurge of ideas about the effects of social class and the iniquities of divisive educational systems. I am sure this flowering of academic writing contributed greatly to the establishment of comprehensive schools. Of course, there was a political dimension, with many Labour-controlled councils adopting it as a matter of policy. No one, however, seemed greatly concerned to define the term 'comprehensive school', despite its obvious effect on policy initiatives. I am sure that Willie Ross was aware of the desirability of moving away from the educational apartheid which existed in the Scottish system, both from advice from civil servants and from his knowledge of schools, and the successes of some pioneering headteachers and Directors like Gardiner and Mackintosh in Glasgow. There was a strong professional consensus about how bad the selection at 12 was, and what a disaster the junior secondary school had been in the main.
2. The 1947 Report was a marvellous educational document which enshrined a marvellous concept of education. Its effect if any would be at Inspectorate or ministerial level. It did not figure very much in any discussion I was party to, until the Munn committee, when it was constantly being harked back to. As far as teachers were concerned, I would say that they had a greater sense of what type of system should NOT exist rather than of what should.
3. Motives were a combination of political and educational, with, as

I said, a very powerful influence on both by the enormous burden of educational/sociological publications from about 1956 onwards. I think the official/political stance is influenced by a confluence of factors - political parties, personal views, societal demands, personal views. These all play a part in shaping opinion, in creating an awareness of the need for change.

4. Again a confluence. Clearly it was crucial that Labour were in power, and their avowed social aims of equality and maximum opportunities for all fitted in with the spirit of the times.
5. Circular 600 caused widespread ANGST in the majority of the teaching profession. Most of them reckoned they did a good academic job with the above. Indeed, they had established outstanding personal records of helping pupils to pass Scottish Certificate of Education exams. Hence the comprehensive school turned the world as most teachers knew and understood it on its head. Its arrival was highly disruptive, and threatened the source of intrinsic job satisfaction for most teaching staff: doing a good professional job in helping their pupils to pass exams that would give them a secure future. The arrival of the comprehensive school was seen, therefore, as something akin to the invasion of barbaric hordes which caused teachers to revert to being liontamers. It was certainly perceived as posing a threat to the academic output of schools. Hence, the immediate response in the face of the 'fait accompli' was to segregate under one roof, to keep the rubbish 'out' and away from the 'cream'. The academic garden had to be cultivated inspite of a political decision. I don't think the Circular itself got people

excited. It was more press reports, staffroom gossip and social contacts that caused the big anti-comprehensive feeling which existed. There was no theoretical discussion about concepts like equality or equality of opportunity. Despite feelings of dissatisfaction about segregation at 12, there was not a widespread acceptance that the structural change involved in Circular 600 was the answer. The predominant thought in the minds of many was: quality has gone forever.

6. I could not really comment on each group individually. The extent of the commitment, the speed and extent of change at the end of the day depended on the usual key individuals, most of whom you have instanced. Despite all the conferences, talks, articles, and courses, it was up to you in your own patch.
7. My impression is that headteachers must have had almost total freedom to organise the curriculum and classes as they wished, given the wide variety in practice which occurred. It was only later that authorities took a stronger more interventionist line in these matters, notably after Regionalisation. Basically, the old divide into 'certificate' and 'non certificate' persisted for years, with one or two more enterprising schools providing 'bridge courses'.
8. There was evidence of public interest in the press and at any meetings which were called on the issues. Parental views were polarised round whether they were anxious about or welcomed the new system.

9. Private schools, except for the so-called local authority fee-paying schools, never caused a furore up here. Their numbers are so small as not to make any major impact on the state system - apart, of course, from in Edinburgh.
10. There was just an acceptance of area schools and the social composition of their population. There was never any question of bussing as in the States to redress the social balance. It simply was not mooted as a possibility. Even committed comprehensive advocates had no answer to the area school. Everyone just lived with the problem. It was a case of: you wanted a comprehensive system, well it's arrived; go on and tackle the problems for yourselves.
11. The biggest single problem was the teachers. They had no professional consultation in preparation for a change of such magnitude. No research was done, no attempt was made to study or learn from the experience of other countries. There was no advanced thinking, no agenda for a wide-ranging professional discussion of the issues involved. Teachers were dropped in it, to put it bluntly, by Government fiat. This is no way to treat people who regard themselves as professionals, hence, it is hardly surprising that a great many stuck to practices familiar and well-tried. It just was not properly thought through. Much was assumed by those in power. Scottish Education Department/Her Majesty's Inspectors expectations of the teaching force exceeded the realities of secondary school teaching. It was a political act, the educational consequences of which a) were not grasped b) were left to teachers to sort out. I am glad to say the approach



had improved immensely by the time Munn and Dunning came along with the feasibility studies and piloting work.

12. It virtually depended solely on the headteachers and his staff. Given that a majority view was that the comprehensive school was the beginning of the end of the senior secondary school and fine academic reputations, the natural response organisationally was to sort children out to preserve the highly intelligent ones and ensure that they did not suffer. So there were not all that many attempts to create integrated, comprehensive schools. The separatist mentality was strong, and this was an inevitable outcome of the manner in which the change was introduced: teachers were given no practical help for a totally new set of professional circumstances, so they fell back on what they knew and felt comfortable with.
13. A succession of public documents advanced the case for secondary 1/secondary 2 being a period of orientation and diagnosis, mixed ability classes and the common course. While a few enterprising authorities and schools did make serious attempts to implement these innovations. I suspect that not much went on in reality.
14. There were many conferences and talks on grouping children but in the end heads did what they wanted, so you had all manner of systems - mixed ability, setting, combinations of these, outright streaming, top/tailing etc. Again there was an absence of a clear and coherent policy.
15. I would take the pessimistic view. Some genuine enthusiasts - a

minority - saw the comprehensive school as a real professional challenge to which they responded in a positive way. The rest never got out of the certificate/non-certificate outlook on life. Brunton was never fully tried out in the spirit in which the committee intended. Raising of the school leaving age when it came along faced teachers with the problem that refused to go away - how do you cater in a meaningful way in curricular terms for non-academic pupils? The advent of raising of the school leaving age proved that the curricular, assessment and methodological implications of Circular 600 had either not been appreciated or not been addressed. Teachers were forced to cope with a new situation, and a lot of children were discontent and dissatisfied with the unpalatable fare that many schools were serving up. Schools did not speak to their condition. It would be nice to think that the structural change brought about by Circular 600 induced a large measure of professional self-scrutiny, but the reality was probably patchy and piecemeal. In the absence of a concerted national or local approach, and of a staff development programme, self-scrutiny was left to the conscience of the individual teachers. The result was a disastrous situation in the middle years of most secondary schools. Hence Munn and Dunning.

16. A combination of raising of the school leaving age, guidance and curricular changes, which went hand in hand with the move to comprehensive schools, convinced us all that there were problems. Whereas the junior secondary/senior secondary set-up could mask problems, or contain them, the comprehensive schools brought them out in the open. So the Munn, Dunning and Pack committees in the

1970's were the first systematic addressing of the issues that was compatible with a national comprehensive policy. Here for the first time was a public acknowledgement of an attempt to set minimum acceptable standards across valuable activities without putting a ceiling beforehand - a mammoth undertaking - and an attempt also to suggest a pedagogy to go with it.

17. I am not convinced by the term 'Scottish educational tradition'. I am uneasy about what is identifiably Scottish. Stewart Mackintosh saw the comprehensive school as 'the flowering of the Scottish tradition' - Perth Academy at its best made available for all children. The comprehensive school was the opportunity for a liberation of talent, the creation of an educational setting to develop children's capacities. I cannot see that this commitment was particularly Scottish.

Having said that there is a need to change Scottish educational practice from its cerebral and elitist mould, devoted to anachronistic exams, from its narrow concentration on those with ability. It would be nice to think that the comprehensive school provides an educational setting for the release of all talents. The cognitive aspect while important, should never be the exclusive purpose of a school. Pupils should enjoy school, enjoy extending their natural abilities, whatever these are. Of course, it's easy to postulate the ideal type of comprehensive school and rave on about what SHOULD happen. We must be realistic and take account of resources, parents, variable teacher commitment and the lack of suitable professional support for teachers asked to cope with change. The structure is

fantastic, there are plenty of teachers, and the public investment in education is massive. But, the Scottish conscience has been pricked: we have neglected average and less average pupils for decades. It is thus right that priority was given to Foundation level.

If we do not make a success of Standard Grade, then I think we shall have to re-examine our notions of compulsory schooling. We are at an educational crossroads: if we fail, technology will take over. The comprehensive school is facing its last major test: to cater honestly for all kinds in a comprehensive setting. I hope the professional will is there.



1. There is no sharp line of demarcation between educational and political, since both are blurred. Politics and economics deal with life. I would say, however, that the move was primarily political in the best and positive Christian sense, and it had positive repercussions on education.
  
2. A suspicion of the elitist system. My own dates back to University days in St. Andrews. I was a crofter' son, and was impressed by the articulateness and confidence of the English public school products. I felt I didn't have a chance, but then discovered that in written exams I did as well if not better than they did. I think the war accentuated and endorsed my suspicions. Although, some of the officers were first class, many were nincompoops. I'm afraid we in Scotland have not given up polytheism - WHERE YOUR TREASURE IS, THERE WILL YOUR HEART BE ALSO (Mat.6.21). The God we worship commands our allegiance. The god of Edinburgh is fee-paying schools. These elitist attitudes can be found in Glasgow too. I'm very cynical about the future of state education. Those in power just now are not at all motivated to improve state education. Remember Harold Nicolson's phrase: 'The English are more interested in intonation than education'. So the trauma of war accentuated it, and it re-surfaced in the mid-sixties. There was the rise of materialism which accompanied a political, social and religious ferment. People questioned old traditions. Note the reaction that has happened since 1970 - the very opposite of ferment - the reservoir of radical idealism has dried up. There has been a

swing from this towards a more secure, self-seeking conservatism. Trends do not happen overnight, they occur in the collective consciousness.

3. The inertia of British society's conservatism. There is a perpetual struggle between the two mighty opposites in British society - conservatism and reform - which interact like a see-saw or Cumberland wrestlers - when one is up the other is down. There was - and is - a dreadful shortsightedness of those in positions of power in the world's of politics and education. Few of them would endorse John F. Kennedy's view: EDUCATION IS THE BEST OF ALL POSSIBLE INVESTMENTS.
4. Individuals cannot really be separated from the general ferment. It was, in my view, an idea whose time had come - of Greek *chronos* (linear time) and *kairos* (the moment of truth, or the psychological moment). Of course, the comprehensive movement had its articulate leaders who helped it on its way to pick up adherents.
5. My experience was that the more sensitive and intellectual of them reacted positively. Radicals must be careful of condemning opponents simply because they hold different views. Some predominantly intelligent people can be very reactionary. Many good classroom teachers are fundamentalist in their educational philosophy.
6. I entered the arena more than most. Most people are schizophrenically split you know. They can be perfectly nice

with people they call friends, but don't care a damn about their less fortunate brethren. It all depends on what you think you have to gain.

7. Teachers had been used to having an elite in front of them, and so were faced with a desperate moral problem - what do I do with the less able? The tragedy is that it was not more widely recognised that everyone is potentially good at something.
8. Private schools were - and are - a deadly blight. If I were a benevolent and democratic dictator, I'd be terribly tempted to make them illegal and abolish them for good. We all have a sacred duty to be cynical. I came to hold this view having worked it out painfully and agonisingly, and having reached it gradually from what I have experienced and seen around me.
9. Even if the split still existed, it was most definitely a step in the right direction. I can't really comment because I wasn't a teacher. There is a difference between philosophy and pragmatism in education. Education properly understood is the liberation of the latent and innate potentialities within us - a Platonic view. The myth of the metals is not a contradiction, since Plato lived in a caste society.
10. The problem is basically economic - a limited number of people for a limited number of jobs. It is a myth that academic formal qualifications betoken ability or IQ. You can find well-qualified people who are incompetent as human beings, since they cannot make personal relationships. . . The ability to motivate

other people and relate to them positively, is far more important than academic qualifications or attainments.

11. They were in the arena. I think it really depended on their philosophy. People who pursue a selective system of education are not really interested in education in its real sense. Education involves the harnessing and development of the total intellectual vitality of a person and, by extension, of the nation.
12. Basically it is a more democratic society in Scotland than in England, but not completely so. There is a curious hidden democracy in the Scottish soil - the tradition of the lad o'pairts. You must be wary of being parochially Scottish. There is an elitist core which inter-marry and never get out of the stable. It's all so self-perpetuating.
13. Equality of opportunity? It's an ideological myth that more means worse - which was claimed at the time. Philosophy is much more important than pedagogy. You must give people time to develop. There was much crass lack of sensitivity and materialistic cynicism about the jibes that were made about comprehensive schools. There was a profound lack of intellectual grasp of the problem. It was a question of selfishness and segregation versus the future of the nation. A fundamental revolution for the good cannot be a retrograde or destructive step.
15. Yes, this was a strongly held view. I think that able pupils can



take care of themselves, but I am more interested in those who can't. What was needed was a broader view of what is meant by ability - a wide spectrum of differing talents, not necessarily judged by an academic criterion. Education is about the most important thing there is in life, and it is tragic that it is not regarded as being more important than it is by people who should know better.

18. There is a lot of ideological nonsense talked about the effect of comprehensive schools on university intakes. There has always been an inordinate emphasis on languages and classical education. There was an unintelligent, imperceptive attitude in the university. The decline of languages has nothing to do with comprehensive schools. The rise of the science of technology caused intellectual capacity to be judged on linguistic criteria only. You can't damn people's intellectual capacity because they express themselves infelicitously. There is much traditional snobbery. Classical education did not liberate as many people as is thought. I can think of many brilliant university professors who were as unliberated as you can imagine. Comprehensive education may mean a few infelicitous turn of phrase - but so what? Is that the most important thing? Surely the good of the nation, the good of humanity must take precedence. Comprehensive education is a revolution in the development of the intellectual vitalities of the nation - and it will take a long time to achieve.

SECTION A

1. The in-service 'explosion' in the 1960's occurred because there was a fairly sudden awareness in the Anglo Saxon world that secondary education for all had exposed curricula and methods in schools which had not changed since before World War 2. All was geared to the selective and academic. Content and pedagogy had not budged despite the political decisions to open up education to everyone. The real implications of secondary education for all gradually began to be realised, and raising of the school leaving age in 1972 really put the cat among the pigeons. Prior to that, there were strong forces for change in both primary and secondary sectors away from a didactic, teacher-directed approach, - Primary Memorandum, 'O' grade syllabuses, Certificate of Secondary Education Mode 3 etc - and a gradual but persistent attempt to encourage new methods. The ferment of this period of expansion and change highlighted the inadequacies of initial teacher training. Some teachers had been teaching the same things in the same way for 30 years! In my opinion, the James Report of 1972 made sweeping suggestions which had national repercussions, even though on a scale not remotely achieved. It began to change the climate of thinking and point people in the right direction. Teacher release and the Teacher Centre movement began to increase.
2. a) In the main initiatives for in-service came for Her Majesty's Inspectors, college staff and advisers;
- b) There was no overall planning machinery e.g. Diploma in Learning

Difficulties came via Her Majesty's Inspectors from 1978 Report on pupils with learning difficulties; Bachelor of Education came from colleges; Diploma in Educational Technology from an individual with foresight. Also, individuals like Gatherer and Flett in the East approached in-service in a much more systematic way.

3. The National Committee for the In-Service Training of Teachers ran from 1968-85 in terms of four years, with Robert Robertson and Malcolm Green as chairmen (1968-76; 1976-85). It had representatives from Local Authorities, College Principals, Universities, teacher unions' advisers and Her Majesty's Inspectors/Scottish Education Department. None was a Secretary of State nominee. I don't think it was a very contentious or effective body, although it assumed a more positive role under Green. It was set up to keep in-service under review, and issue the annual programme of national courses of about 25. (This has been pruned to 12 since the cutbacks in 1976). Incidentally, the Scottish Education Department has adopted an increasingly centralised role in its committees, notably the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum, in which there is pressure to toe the 'party line' or be dropped. Green's chairmanship has produced 2 good reports:

- on award bearing courses (3 tier);
- on the staff development of teachers.

The teachers' dispute has caused Scottish Education Department to sit on them. There is a need for a better planning mechanism for in-service, and for a body to keep it actively under review. The politicians need to be persuaded to systematise the structure of

award bearing courses, and to create the machinery to set up national committees. The National Committee for the In-Service Training of Teachers, like all committees, was a formal body, and its best work was done in sub-groups.

4. In-service provision was so diverse that, regrettably, it was not kept under as much review as it could have been. Colleges and authorities have tended to go their own way. So many agencies were involved. Occasionally, an attempt was made to gather information but not much was done with it. There were no facilities to analyse data properly. Now, machinery is beginning to emerge, and the national programmes is linked to priorities.
5. Topics covered on in-service courses have changed - e.g. computers, pupils with learning difficulties, management, guidance. Topics like these got prominence as it was felt necessary to push them. Subjects covered reflect the changing emphases in schools. To begin with, most work was subject/syllabus/exam based, a crop of courses with a narrow specific focus e.g. new 'O' grade course, Certificate of Sixth Year Studies. Of necessity, in-service mirrors changing market forces and school trends. Also, there has been a change in the type of provision: long residential courses of one week minimum's duration and summer schools have gone since the cutbacks. Now only courses with Authority backing go ahead. Another two points should be made:
  - a) local authorities now have their own in-service programmes which have developed since Regionalisation;



- b) teacher morale is not what it was;
- c) Since 1977 school focused in-service training has gained in prominence since Scottish Education Department retained college staff after cutbacks in initial training specifically to do school-based work. When your job is dependent on doing in-service in schools, you roll up your sleeves and get on with it. School focused in-service training has been a massive transformation, and worked well until the recent dispute.

## SECTION B

1. The in-service department was set up in 1962 by the Principal for reasons of a) farsightedness b) internal politics.
2. Yes, under my guidance the department had annual development plans and specific targets, which it presented to the Board of Studies.
3. Course planning varied with the type of course: for larger courses it was in the hands of a small selected planning group, for shorter ones the in-service department merely published what college departments offered when circulated. Planning groups were in my experience high powered - college/region/headteacher/Her Majesty's Inspectors. Strathclyde has never been keen on award - bearing courses. There are several reasons:
  1. a streak of anti-intellectualism at senior levels in the Directorate. I was once told 'WE DON'T WANT TEACHERS WAVING BITS OF PAPER AT US'. Senior officials are anti-qualification, and much prefer hard-nose practical courses rather than reflective, theoretical ones;

2. the cost, and the fact that such courses only benefit a small number of people. They would rather have lots of courses for lots of teachers;
3. Politicians put pressure on officials periodically, and ask what they are doing about certain topics of current interest e.g. Warnock, multi-cultural education. The Directorate attitude in the West is in marked contrast to the East, where priorities are decided, and those staff nominated to go on courses are expected to act as change agents.
4. Contributors to courses come from the 'old-boy' network. Usually they were people who had made an impact in their particular field. It is always easy to do this in Scottish education where the same stage army of participants is repeatedly wheeled into action.
5. All attempts by the Directorate to create formal mechanisms for consultation with the college fell by the wayside for lack of clear aims. There were twice-yearly meetings of Depute Director, College Staff, 6 Education Officers and Her Majesty's Inspectors, which were of limited value, and amounted to an exchange of views. The theory was fine: identification of in-service needs from Education Officers to college staff followed by an attempt to mount an in-service programme to meet the needs. The reality is this: the pressure of day-to-day life on Education Officers is so great from the Region, that they can live only a hand-to-mouth existence, in which in-service is relegated in the list of priorities. They operate in vague generalities rather than precise terms. Strathclyde Regional Council Education Dept. is

the perfect example of crisis management. As for in-service, much depends on the individual drive of and college connections established by individual advisers. A lot of what happens springs from private arrangements rather than overall planning. There is great fluctuation within and among Divisions, with no single person in an overall controlling position asking questions. Her Majesty's Inspectors have two role re in-service a) the formal planning/monitoring role and b) the useful informal one of mediating between college and region.

6. Courses which proved most popular were identified by topic and  
+  
7. department rather than type and duration.
8. The short answer is that only larger courses and national courses were evaluated by questionnaire and/or interview. Short courses were subject to the instant evaluation of market forces. With around 200 courses a year, at one point it would have been prohibitive in terms of cost and staff to undertake serious and systematic evaluation of them all. The evaluations made of longer courses were used for future course planning.
9. In the first phase of the Munn and Dunning Pilot programme, Scottish Education Department control was so tight that no other agency was consulted. It was intended to bring in colleges later. The Scottish Education Department/Assoc. of Directors of Education in Scotland held a conference in October 1982 at which I gave a talk on the in-service implications of Munn and Dunning. Thereafter there was college representation on the Joint Working Party Steering Committee, and in 1983-4, the college planned a

rolling programme of courses with the Region. This was hit on the head by the dispute.

### SECTION C

1. The impact of in-service over the period has been patchy. Some of it has been very good, and you can see its at work in schools. Other factors impinge on potential impact so that it is not possible to detect a simple cause and effect linkage. Headteacher and staff support is a crucial factor. It's all rather a slow business. The mechanism for linking off-school courses and what happens in schools is weak. There has been very little staff development of a serious or co-ordinated nature. Critical thinking about the concept is only beginning to emerge. Up till now a systematic approach to staff development has been alien to the Scottish scene.
2. The extent to which in-service helped teachers to scrutinise their ideas and approaches has been variable, for the reasons given in (1).
3. Teachers hardly even approached the College with ideas for in-service.
4.
  - i) Too blanket a condemnation. Some were theoretical, yes, but from others teachers departed clutching much helpful material with direct practical application in class;
  - ii) Yes, because of the lack of systematised staff-development. Initiatives after courses were left to individuals - you



either get enthusiasm or a wall of indifference;

- iii) People go on in-service courses for mixed motives. It tends to the most committed, extended professionals who participate, but clearly also they put their attendance to their own 'use', in a good sense.

5. Ideally good curriculum development precedes good in-service.

#### FINALLY

Schools are unquestionably better as a result of the in-service that has taken place. The amount and rate of exchange has been such that schools would have been in an unbelievable mess without what has been done. The question is: HAS THE IN-SERVICE PROVIDED BEEN AS EFFECTIVE AS IT COULD HAVE? A negative answer has to be given. In-Service and staff development have never really been tried. How can the in-service department 'deliver the goods' in terms of change in schools given the following inhibiting factors:

- ludicrous time devoted to in-service (e.g. 1/2 day in one session)
- hopeless underfunding (£350,000 in Strathclyde Regional Council compared with £1m in British Gas)
- over-centralised, top-down control, putting on what is perceived to be required in terms of courses etc
- lack of machinery for advisers and teachers to have a say in in-service provision
- lack of local provision based on local needs
- no co-ordination. Too many people involved with inadequate overall control
- patchy provision. Much depends on where you live

- voluntary nature of in-service, and lack of award-bearing courses with national prestige
- economic and political pressures keep in-service far down the budget. Labour councillors are anti-teacher, and tend to give priority to statutory obligations. Also, teacher unions have not given in-service nearly the backing they could/should have.

1. The political pressure gradually built up from the early 1950's. A lot of push for change came from Socialist Teachers' Groups who were concerned at the ludicrous and biased 11+ exam, and began lobbying education committees. The case for the comprehensive school was advanced on pragmatic rather than theoretical grounds. Stewart Mackintosh in Glasgow had a close knowledge of his schools, and so could promote those teachers who had the fire in their bellies. A lot of people were deeply involved in socialist thinking. Eventually the education committee took the decision to make all schools comprehensive, and Mackintosh had to scout round for people to do the job. Lanarkshire was much later in moving on the comprehensive school question, preferring to retain distinctions between pupils and their prestigious senior secondary schools as long as they could.
2. The report set the scene for eventual change. Its foundation stone was the concept of relevance. People began to refer to it long after its publication. It was not really discussed in educational circles. It looked forward to a new era, rather than being of its time.
3. I would say that, while there undoubtedly was a political element, the moves came from the world of education. The comprehensive school was seen as a sensible and pragmatic solution to an annoying problem - the iniquities of selection. The level of professional input was high.

4. It was a period of expansion in education c.f. Robbins Report. People began to express concern that working class youngsters were not getting into higher education in sufficient numbers. So 'further provision' at all levels was the watchword. Subject areas in schools also acted as pressure groups, and the Exam Board itself was the progenitor of much educational change during the period. It made a major contribution in innovations in curriculum and exam syllabuses, and, all in all, encouraged a more progressive outlook. The whole question of involving teachers in Consultative Committee on the Curriculum and Scottish Certificate of Education Examination Board panels was new. Prior to that, all was done by a small clique of Her Majesty's Inspectors, and ordinary teachers were not privy to their deliberations. Panels brought a new dimension of freedom and power to practising teachers. Nevertheless, the ethos of the time was success through education, and that meant passing exams. Remember also that a lot of innovation was landing on schools at a time of acute teacher shortage.
5. The major implication of Circular 600 was this: how would its contents and philosophy square with the prevailing views, feelings and commitments of those working in schools? The reaction of headteachers and principal teachers was crucial. Many subjects, notably maths and modern languages stuck out for selection and streaming by ability. So, I would say that the extent of the differences caused by Circulars 600/614 depended entirely on individuals - it made as much difference as their views allowed it to.



6. a) Some notable Inspectors e.g. Brunton were genuinely pro-comprehensive, and actively promoted it. Others, I am not so sure about, but they would have to since it was official policy.
- b) Elected Members and the Education Committee were dependent for their knowledge of what comprehensive education was all about on officials. Obviously, Labour Councillors would be more ardent in their support than Progressives, but their influence was marginal.
- c) The Directorate was absolutely overwhelmed by the rapidity of change at this period. They led a chaotic life to implement each one to the best of their ability. Given the pressure under which they worked, they had a purely administrative role in the process, one exception being made for Mackintosh in Glasgow.
- d) The Advisory service was seen as a necessary creation in the confluence of change at this period. The comprehensive school gave point to the need for advisers. They were close to teachers but not inspectorial figures. The hope was that they would promote and co-ordinate curriculum change, given their subject expertise.
- e) The Consultative Committee on the Curriculum has made a very important contribution to the changing educational scene in Scotland, but in a quiet and unobtrusive way.
7. In the main, headteachers had a good deal of latitude.
8. There was not much parental reaction in Scotland. After all, we had no equivalent of the Black Papers. There was, given all the

changes in education, a much greater attempt to involve parents, and tell them what was happening. Since horizons were expanding in education, which was regarded as a sound investment, most parents would be for it, probably considering that schools were so much more go ahead than in their own schooldays.

9. Not here, given the relatively small numbers involved, so that any creaming effect would be negligible.
10. Yes, it caused the obvious problem - lack of social diversity in intake. This problem has not been solved yet.
11. The major obstacle was undoubtedly the persistence of elitist attitudes among teachers, and those running schools. There seemed to be a false dichotomy between progress and a more egalitarian outlook. Many believed that the latter militated against the former. The power of attitudes of mind prevented a time comprehensive philosophy from being extended too far.
12. The extent to which the previous junior secondary/senior  
+  
13. secondary pattern was merged varied enormously. The extent of attempts to integrate various groups of pupils depended on how really comprehensive was the ethos of the school. Strict setting undoubtedly reinforced and publicised divisions.
14. Mixed-ability classes caused much discussion and controversy, and, over the piece, were not a success. It still has not been solved.

15. a) Yes, I would say that the curriculum, in terms of what is taught in individual subjects, has changed and this is undoubtedly due to the advent of comprehensive education.
- b) Yes, the arrival of the comprehensive school caused a pressure for changes in methodology - group work, audio-visual support, internal assessment, new exam techniques. A very, very gradual shift in emphasis from a norm-referenced approach to a criterion-referenced one.
16. a) Yes, a flood of new materials, courses, exams forced teachers to a recognition, if not an acceptance of the need to cater for a wider range of pupil ability. Despite the depth of their individual commitment, teachers did become concerned more with making their teaching relevant.
- b) Yes, Teachers Centres and in-service training went into a boom period in this era of 'all change'. In fact, staff could barely keep up with the explosion of knowledge. They provided essential and valuable back-up for hard-pressed teachers.
17. It was not all that far removed from the Scottish system, with its traditional egalitarianism built into the system from Knox through the parish school to omnibus schools in rural districts and county towns. So the comprehensive school did not mean very much of a quantum leap up here, except in inner-city areas, where social/educational rifts were more apparent.
18. I would say that the concept of equality of opportunity was given a great boost in Scotland from the mounting feelings at the

manifest unfairness of junior secondary schools. The idea was that all should be given a chance, a fair crack of the whip, once they were all at the same school, rather than exclude some on doubtful criteria. The aim was to treat pupils better, to show more concern for them all c.f. the introduction of guidance.

19. A comprehensive school is one which has the widest possible social range in its intake, provides the widest range of courses/subjects it can, strives to achieve high standards of teaching, and is concerned to secure parental involvement and develop community links.

20. No, the potential of the comprehensive school has not been tapped, for these reasons chiefly:

- the persistence of old attitudes has prevented the spread of the comprehensive principle
- schools are still largely isolated from their community
- the declining economy/financial cutbacks
- falling rolls, course engineering in the form of the Action Plan are gradually eroding the comprehensive principle
- Economics has taken over from education, ironically, in the name of increasing educational opportunity.



1. Omnibus schools were already popular in Scotland, but they were highly selective, however, in their internal organisation, but they were used by many to 'prove' that the comprehensive principle was already in operation.
2. The 1947 Report was welcomed by educationists, but shelved by the Scottish Education Department, elements of which were alarmed at some of its proposals. It did not fall on receptive ears where it mattered, and thus much of its thinking was kept from schools. The ideal of the omnibus school which it advocated was more suited to rural than urban areas of high population. You must be aware that, as well as a difference between town and country, there is also a difference between East and West in Scottish education.
3. The influence was undoubtedly political, of the Labour/socialist kind. The idea of the comprehensive school fitted in with the predominant view of society held by both intellectuals in the party and politicians. Such views would find a ready market in the West of Scotland, with its traditions of a more radical political climate.
4. The main thrust was political, although academics like Pedley and Simon had presented the educational case for the comprehensive school. The whole impetus came from England. Just like Education Acts, government circulars from the Department of Education and Science have a parallel which comes from the

Scottish Office. My impression was that a lot of people in Scottish education thought that the contents of Circular 600 would be welcomed, but when they read it, actually felt it to be an imposition on the traditional system. The resemblance they thought it would have to what existed already was not as great as many people thought it would be. I remember being at a talk given by Brian Simon at which he said that his research had led him to form the conclusion that only half the schools in Scotland were comprehensive. Most people in the audience thought that all schools in Scotland were.

5. The main implications were the end of control tests as a selection mechanism for secondary education, the death of the junior secondary school, and, for teachers, having to deal with a wider range of ability than they had previously.
6. a) In general, Her Majesty's Inspectors dutifully follow their political masters. A number of them did enter into the spirit of the comprehensive ideal. The main influence was undoubtedly Brunton, he had a strong determination to get his way, so that what he decided went through. He took the view that all secondary schools were more or less comprehensive. The working parties of teachers he set up were of considerable influence.
- b) Particularly in the West, Labour members threw their weight strongly behind the movement. All sorts of things were done in obedience to the gospel of comprehensive education. Directors of Education had to jump to attention because of large Labour majorities. Many things were done which were felt by many people to be vindictive rather than constructive or educationally

desirable. Nothing was approved that did not accord with the comprehensive movement. In Directors you had a tremendous variation - H.S. Mackintosh in Glasgow was a romantic socialist who preferred persuasion and the force of his personality rather than tough measures or revolutionary war techniques to get the point home. He revelled in seeing all children get the opportunity to develop. McEwan in Lanarkshire, on the other hand, was the arch-enemy of the comprehensive school, which he saw as a threat to the long-established senior secondaries with fine reputations.

d) Their ranks swelled in the 1970's, because so much in curriculum and assessment was changing in schools. I would say that their influence varied with the quality of the individual. Some were powerful and got things moving, others became bogged down in the routine of the office, and thus did not have much contact with schools.

e) It was a while before it made its influence felt. Its Reports tended to lay down a set of guidelines and plans of good practice in various aspects of comprehensive secondary schools. They could of course be totally neglected by practitioners, depending on their education philosophy.

7. My impression was that they had considerable freedom in running their schools. If there was any 'pressure', it came from the general climate of opinion in the period, but they were pretty well left to their own devices. I would say that, as a result, the first few years of comprehensive schools was a period marked by immense controversy and disagreement. Many regarded it as a

backward step which marked the end of a glorious era in Scottish Education.

8. Large sections of the population were not terribly impressed. There was no great rejoicing that education in Scotland was 'going comprehensive'. The only joy was over the disappearance of the junior secondary school, which was universally regarded as bad in principle, despite the fact that good work was done in some. Middle class parents were alarmed and suspicious, as were many academic-minded members of the teaching profession. Indeed, many never recovered. The advent of the comprehensive school was seen by many as the deterioration of fine senior secondary schools, which had existed for years. Many parents, including leading Labour Party members at local and national level sent their children to private schools.
9. I would not think that fee-paying schools prevented comprehensive schools from getting a substantial body of middle-class, abler pupils. The polarisation has increased because of the abolition of grant-aided schools, and of the illogical but pragmatically useful anomaly of the system - the Local Authority, fee paying schools, which were widely accepted as having a good educational ethos and corporate life.
10. Neighbourhood schools in cities are a dubious notion, and they never really had a chance of making comprehensive education work, given their catchment area. Many were doomed from the outset.
11. The attitudes of teachers and heads were the main obstacle. In



fact, any enthusiasm existed in only a few, and I think it would be very hard now to find anyone who would express satisfaction with developments in Scottish education since 1965. Almost all would say things are worse in 1985, that many ideas had been tried but had not worked. The hopes that came with comprehensive education have not been realised.

The Scottish Secondary Teachers' Association were against the development of comprehensive schools, but never made their opposition open, and the Scottish Schoolmasters' Association were very sarcastic about the idea.

The biggest obstacle to the proper development of the comprehensive school in my view has been the failure to come to terms with assessment and the national examination structure. There has been, and probably still is, a failure to realise that there must be a reconciliation between two things: the comprehensive school's professed aim of allowing each child to develop whatever ability it has, and society's demand for certification by bits of paper. I suppose Dunning was the first really serious attempt to address this question.

12. In the early years, there was hardly any change - 'cómprehensive' schools operated as senior secondary/junior secondary under one roof. Then 'O' grade was banded from 1973, and this led to a realisation that some pupils could get D or E bands. The philosophy was: PUT THEM ALL IN. GIVE THEM THE CHANCE - a reflection of the certification syndrome. In default of a proper assessment system, the criterion of success has become

undimensional. The criteria for success in a comprehensive school should be pluralistic. You cannot have equality of outcome with such diversity of input.

13. The main changes were:

- the Green Paper with the new promoted post structure in 1971 - especially guidance
- mixed-ability grouping of children and the common course
- a proliferation of courses for non-certificate pupils in the 1970's
- a gradual move towards formative rather than summative assessment.

All of the above were in line with the comprehensive ideal.

14. The approach to this question must be pragmatic. Mixed-ability classes in subjects like maths/modern languages are an absurd non-starter, and reduce teachers to nervous wrecks. Differentiation should be based on the time taken to reach the learning target. There are many lessons secondary schools could learn from good primary practice.

16. a) Much effort was put into course writing after raising of the school leaving age, but they had to certificate, and thus no credibility, however good they in reality were.

b) Both precipitated its development by providing a forum to discuss the problems that comprehensive schools had thrown up to be tackled. The comprehensive system uncovered problems to be solved as much by its failures in practice as by its promises in

theory. Teachers were looking to solve them in the interests of survival from day to day. I suppose the whole Munn and Dunning development programme is really the culmination of much teacher activity in the 1970's stimulated by Advisers and in-service work.

17. The existence of the omnibus schools made the transition comparatively easier here than in countries like England, France and Germany, which were long thirled to the selective system. Even so the Scottish educational tradition is one of social equality but academic elitism. The democratic tradition simply meant this: as long as you were bright academically as testified by exam marks you got all that was going, irrespective of your social origin.
18. There are two sides of equality of opportunity - for the able and for the not-able, at least by academic standards. I think this is incompatible with the comprehensive ideal as it was sold to the public in the 1960's - viz equality of opportunity for the academically able.
19. There are several types, and it is a question of whether any definition is factually accurate or an expression of an ideal form. I suppose the definition would have to include these points:
  - respect for all pupils as individuals
  - aim to bring out all their potentialities
  - ensure that all pupils can make a useful contribution to society

- a school which draws its pupils from a prescribed area.

What makes a comprehensive school unique is that it is unselective in its intake, excluding the above points, which all other schools would claim.

20. Only to a limited extent. Education, or the chance of one, has been opened to more pupils, and a number of disadvantaged children have gained. But the gains have not been as wide expected.



1. The whole 'movement', if I may call it that, came from England, and it was professional educationalists and/or sociologists who provided the impetus - Halsey, Floud, Pedley, Douglas etc. The Scottish answer to all this was: 'We've already got comprehensive schools, in fact we've had them for centuries'. That's why there was never such a public hue and cry here about the comprehensive issue. Of course, it is well-known that what many Scots were pleased to call 'comprehensive' schools were not so, in any real sense. In fact, the whole issue caused intense suspicion from senior secondary heads and staffs. I would say that it happened here because it was Labour Party policy in 1964, and politicians could turn to ardent advocates like Stewart McIntosh, and point to what could be done where there was a powerful belief in these schools.
  
2. Any influence it had remained at the level of thought rather than action. The post-war Labour administration had not got beyond thinking in segregationist terms (Wilkinson and Tomlinson quietly acquiesced in tripartitism). Up here, Godfrey Thomson and his Moray House Tests were widely acclaimed, and this was quite explicitly because they made a very good job of doing what a lot of people wanted - selecting kids for an academic education. (Thomson himself made no secret of this fact, and his work stemmed from his own experience as a boy of humble origin who had done well through the education system). His tests were used as an instrument for selecting more children to give them the opportunity of a good education. That's why the 1947 Report got

such a frosty reception, although it had been written by highly respected and very able people, who were not thirled to any political or educational philosophy, but weighed the evidence presented to them in a very objective manner.

3. A bit of both. Fundamentally, the Labour Party believed in the comprehensive school as a provider of equality of educational opportunity and as the nail in the coffin of private schools. Larger schools with better equipment and facilities would give a better chance to the less able child, while not harming the abler. There was also a (naive) view that the effects of the able would be beneficial for the less able. In some cases, if anything, the effect was the reverse of the good intentions, depending on the social composition of the school.
4. Education has always been important for the Labour Party (c.f. Fabian Society, Tawney etc), whereas the Tories have no belief in state education. Labour in 1964 seized the chance offered by their election victory to make secondary education for all a reality, and get rid one and for all of the dissatisfaction with segregation in the system both in England and up here, where there was a much higher acceptance rate in senior secondary school than the grammar school equivalent. The Scottish Education Department Publication 'Junior Secondary Education' in 1955 was an official attempt to raise the status of these schools, but it just could not be sold to the majority of teachers.

Scottish Education Department policy is generated either at the instigation of politicians if it is an electorally sensitive

issue like comprehensive education, or the Inspectorate if it is not. Her Majesty's Inspectors are able men in the main who, however, usually come from the ranks of secondary schoolmasters of academic distinction. To that extent they are limited in their view of the purpose of education which understandably they find it difficult to divorce themselves from national exams. Many were sent to inspect areas of the education service of which they had little or no knowledge and of which they seldom had first hand experience. They are consequently cautious and conservative in the advice they offer Ministers, never revolutionaries or tradition-breakers. In my view, the Inspectorate were not pushing for comprehensive schools. Rather any impetus (other than political) was coming from professionals increasingly angry at the obvious injustice of the control exam and the consequential junior secondary schools, and the raw deal many pupils got in them.

5. All in all the implications were fairly far-reaching, either for staff in senior secondary schools going comprehensive or in junior secondary schools being upgraded to comprehensive status. A lot of Scottish schoolmasters are quite happy to be left to teach what they like to as able pupils as possible, to turn the handle of the exam-preparing machine, hopefully managing to get some Advanced level or Certificate of Sixth Year Studies work thrown in if possible. They are then subject specialists in a narrow teaching sense, and not educationists in a broad philosophical sense. You can, therefore, imagine how horrified many of these conscientious people must have been at the thought of having to meet pupils of a sort that the system has previously

diverted from their experience.

6. a) They had to get on with it, but my impression was, initially at least, that they were preoccupied with the physical aspects of the change - buildings and teachers. I am not sure about the involvement in what could be called the educational or pedagogic side of the changeover. As I've said, they didn't really have much experience of what was involved because of their own education and training.
- b) The Labour administration was pro-comprehensive.
- c) Stewart McIntosh pushed anything that was new, but in the matter of comprehensive schools, he was wholeheartedly behind it. By comparison, McEwan in Lanarkshire had to be forced to accept it. In general Directors are usually cautious, and do not move very fast to embrace innovations.
- d) They were originally appointed as organisers of practical subjects. They did not do much you could call educational, but attended predominantly to the administrative side of the job - staff, new schools, promotions. That may have changed now with so many changes that have taken place. I've been away too long to know.
- e) A direct outcome of work started by J.S. Brunton, who, in my view, achieved more change in Scottish education this century than anyone else. He appreciated the difference between trying to get changes made through an Advisory Council which produced a dispassionate report of great depth in high-sounding prose, and getting it done through appointing practising teachers who have



professional credibility appointed to working parties for the views they hold and who will thus produce the 'right' report. This was a very progressive and novel view in Scotland.

7. Teachers 'bought' mixed-ability classes without adequate thoughts. It was sold to them as a fashionable but wholly untried pedagogic method. Indeed, many of its central difficulties have even now not been overcome.
9. They made no bigger difference than they always had.
10. Not really.
11. The main and enduring bastion against real change was the academic slant of many staff, whose aims were to preserve the academic distinction of established schools by securing good Scottish Certificate of Education exam results. This meant that the new comprehensives had to 'prove themselves' by doing likewise. In addition, the Labour Government did not put its money where its mouth was. There was nothing like the scale of provision that there should have been to accompany such a theoretically sweeping change. Many so-called comprehensive schools were awful, antiquated dumps. To really launch proper comprehensive education you need two things: people in key positions in the system who have the appropriate educational philosophy, and the cash to back them up in making it into a reality. In Scotland, there wasn't much of either. You only need to look at what happened to R.F. Mackenzie for proof.

12. So much depended on headteachers and whether they REALLY believed in comprehensive education and wanted to make it work IN ANY REAL SENSE. Inappropriate appointments were made to headships, and the corps of Principal Teachers in a school was an extremely powerful group, almost independent of the head, and with total control of subject teaching and organisation of classes. In some ways, heads were at their mercy on matters of pedagogy and methodology.
13. The head again. Of course, the local authority could issue memoranda and fiats, but in reality the running of schools was traditionally devolved upon heads. Thus, if you had an inspired one, with an educational philosophy and the ability to lead and convince his staff to have a go, then you had a good comprehensive school. Otherwise ----- well, the corollary is too obvious to need stating.
14. In subjects like languages, maths and science, segregation after secondary 2 is essential to give the high flyers their head. They must be caught young enough to allow them to blossom, for the sake of the country. The problem is that some teachers want to catch them even younger.
15. Not to start with. To make a success of a comprehensive school, there needs to be much more Froebel - inspired ideology i.e. discovery but guided learning with enjoyment, rather than a surfeit of academic slog. Also, teaching non-academic kids you must have highly qualified and dedicated professionals who have a faith in what they are doing. They can be no greater delusion

than to foist these kids who need so much on to young inexperienced staff. You also need new curricula at various levels and a different methodology in class from the usual didactic chalk-and-talk grind.

16. a) To be fair, they do as much as any other profession in the in-service line, but the willingness to attend was there as long as the courses were related to subject content or national exams. Anything other than that was viewed as frivolous and treated with scepticism.

b) Teachers Centres were a very sound development, and sprang from a recognition of the obvious - if you are going to sell change to teachers, it has a greater chance of success if it is sold by their peers. A top-down, academic lecture-type approach lacks credibility, and simply will not succeed. In any case, you can't hand down method. It must be shared, experienced and then learned. During the expansionist period of the late 60's and early 70's, a lot of our staff went out to teach in schools and teachers were invited to college to address students. The problem was this: they were usually excellent practitioners, and so we were keen to capture them for vacancies in subject departments, so that they were ultimately 'lost' to schools.

17. It was a novelty. Most Scots thought that the high schools and academies were training grounds for the able to ensure their smooth passage to university and the professions. Although as an Englishman, I have to say that the feeling in the Scottish educational world is much more democratic up here. There are closer and better relationships among all branches of the

service.

18. Equality of opportunity - educational or otherwise - simply cannot exist. It is pious to imagine that it can. Societal differences - job, housing, etc - are too great, so that there can only be a struggle towards the distant ideal of equality of opportunity, and schools are only one part of this struggle. Much depends on imponderable factors that cannot be quantified in any meaningful way. Even when factors are apparently 'proved' statistically, glib educational theories should always be set against the context of the real world. Innovations should never lose sight of this basic truth.
19. A school which takes in all children from a prescribed district, and treats them as individuals and with respect, regardless of their social background or academic ability. Its curriculum, methods of teaching and assessment instruments should reflect this broad approach and cater for all needs and aptitudes. A major problem is the lack of social mix in downtown city areas of dense population.
20. Twenty years is a short time in education, especially in Scotland with its centuries of tradition. Change comes slowly. There is much to be done before it can honestly be said that comprehensive schools are fulfilling their potential.



B      THE ADVISORY SERVICE

1.      I do not know whether the creation of an expanded advisory service was related to the introduction of comprehensive education, but it cannot have been coincidental. It was a panic response to the complexity of change which the education service had to cope with. I doubt if there was a clear concept of the advisory service function at the outset, except perhaps in Lothian where Bill Gatherer had a very clear philosophy. In the West, the service was always a reactive body, not one which led or directed on its own initiative.
  
2.      The main headings, I would say, which outline the advisory service functions are:
  - a)    giving a lead in curriculum development
  - b)    keeping schools informed and up-to-date on latest thinking
  - c)    responding locally to national developments
  - d)    giving advice/information to the Directorate
  - e)    arranging in-service training
  - f)    acting as an agent of quality control for subject departments
  
3. a)    The advisers were involved in decision-making in only a very limited way. They mostly respond to specific requests, arrange whatever in-service courses the Directorate require, and appear on working parties/committees at the suggestion of the Directorate staff.
  
- b)    Contact with Her Majesty's Inspectors was usually on a subject specific basis, but I was aware of a change of emphasis in the

period I was an adviser from consultative to directive.

c) Membership of national bodies in Scottish Education depended on individual patronage. If your face fitted you got invited. If it didn't, you didn't.

d) Relations with headteachers were a difficult area. You gave them advice on their departments, or acted as an agent for the principal teacher in matters of resources or timetabling. Heads called you in to help deal with problems in departments, or to set about coping with adverse Inspector's reports.

But you were always aware that the headteacher ran the show, and you were there at his bidding. Any influence you could exert was dependent on your personal relationship with individuals.

e) I personally had a lot of contact with principal teachers and spent a lot of time with them. I gave advice, ran in-service courses and tried to keep them up to date. Latterly, I spent most time with those who were willing to make use of what I could offer. I stayed away from those who would not change old practices.

4. Most schools had mixed-ability in secondary 1, and moved to some form of broad banded system either in secondary 2 or in secondary 3. Only a very small number of schools had streamed classes in English.

5. a) In the initial years there was no dramatic change to either the  
b) curriculum or to methods. Especially, but not exclusively, in senior secondary schools, an academic curriculum and formal

teaching practice exercised a strong influence. There was a very unobtrusive but powerful lobby to stick with the familiar. Hence, mixed-ability methodology was never properly understood, and less able children, especially in secondary 3/4 did not get a fair deal. People devoted their energies to coping with the new structure, rather than with its educational implications. It was only really from the late 1970's that people began to have an awareness of the processes involved in teaching, learning and assessment. Look at the date of the Standard grade courses - 1984! There was a gradual awareness of how children learn and of the inadequacy of old practices. Comprehensive education was certainly a catalyst in this growing awareness but other factors were involved as well. I often feel that a lot of good ideas which characterised the best junior secondary schools' work were lost when these schools disappeared.

Methods also took a long time to change - 10 years at least. A clear pattern of whole class teaching for survival was visible. There have been some changes, but even now there is still a mixture. Teachers think more actively now. Again, comprehensive education has been one factor, but there is a greater national impetus in education coupled with an imposition of ideas from the centre.

A lot of advisers restricted their school contacts to principal teachers. It was my experience that a lot of teachers wanted to keep up to date, but didn't always have access to innovative ideas or information - so a lot of people were outside your immediate contact.

6. a) I have grave reservations about Teachers' Centres. I think they

became their own places, with books and equipment, but technicians were more in them than teachers. They never became centres for professional development. So many have been closed on grounds of cost-effectiveness.

In service courses had pluses and minuses. They were valuable for those who went. There was a complete lack of overall co-ordination and planning. Courses obviously reflected the individual adviser's priorities and perceptions of what was important. The advisory service lacked flexibility and new blood. There was a lack of co-ordination at Divisional level. You had to bid in a lottery for in-service time. The advisers worked as individuals rather than as a team. You were pulled in so many different directions you didn't know whom to please.

7. Advisers had no clear role definition. I often found myself asking WHO AM I? WHAT AM I? The post had many inbuilt and - for me - unresolved tensions. You were a middle man, there to do the Directorate's bidding, but also you were a support and help to teachers. This caused conflicts, since the Directorate saw teachers as nuisances who always wanted things. The Directorate's principal concerns were the Scottish Education department and Elected Members. Another thing which was never clarified was the extent to which advisers should have an inspectorial function. You had no constructive opportunity to contribute to decision-making. You had to mount a personal lobby to exert any influence. You also had insufficient resources to make a genuine impact. Latterly I had £2,000 p.a. for 28 schools! It would have been better to have had nothing. The



expectations made of you by teachers far exceeded the reality of what you could realistically do for them. The major problem for me was that there was no overall strategy for the advisory service. They were 'lone rangers' who rode out and did their own thing. It was a disgrace that so-called subject specialists and experts were untapped as a force for real curriculum change.

8. There have been major benefits accruing from the existence of an advisory service. Departments were kept going and ideas were fed to them. Where good relationships with principal teachers were established, some good work was done. Because of the freedom you had, a lot of your work was hit or miss. Some teachers never appreciated the potential of the adviser. Also, a lot of advisers seemed there for life and never got down to grappling with real educational questions. Since there was no overall plan to work to, you were left to form your own job specification and order your own priorities.

SECTION A

1. a) The source of comprehensive policy initiatives was undoubtedly  
b)  
c) political, well informed by Inspectorate views of educational provision in the early 60's. My general impression was that the changeover was much more traumatic in England than in Scotland. Egalitarianism runs deep in Scottish society which is far less class-ridden and snobbish than English society. Private education is far less of an issue up here.
2. All major change requires money, and the 60's were the age of affluence. You cannot build bricks without straw. The time was ripe for major changes in society which had been building up since 1945. Minds began to open. In education, the Butler Act started a philosophy which gradually, over the years, seeped into the general consciousness - a fair deal and equal treatment for all. There is no doubt in my mind that RSLA in 1972 had a major impact on the moves to go comprehensive which had occurred a few years earlier.
3. Former senior secondary schools had many more problems than former junior secondary schools. After all, it is easier to teach a bright kid badly and get away with it. The major implication of Circular 600 and C614 was that many people whose sole experience was of able, selected pupils had to make a major professional readjustment. They had to ask themselves questions like: HOW DO YOU TEACH THESE PUPILS? HOW DO YOU MOTIVATE THEM? There were also physical problems with building and accommodation

but nothing on a scale to match the attitudinal ones.

4. a) I think that as long as our leaders continue to send their own children to private schools, while claiming to support state comprehensive schools, we have to ask important questions.
- b) Area schools in housing estates did have massive problems to overcome given the population they served.
5. I would say that the major problems which existed for the creation of a comprehensive system of education were:
  - parental attitudes, and their continuing habit of seeing 'education' as exam passes
  - a false middle class mythology about comprehensive schools as places seething with revolting masses of horrible, badly brought-up children
  - a fear that standards in comprehensive schools would not be as good as in selective schools
  - a lack of definition of exactly what was meant by comprehensive education, with the result that it was possible not to carry out its spirit in practice.
6. a) It was a long slow process of conversion from a segregated to a comprehensive system, and we still have a long way to go. But the physical reality of the comprehensive school is a major step forward, even if the amount of integration of pupils is in reality cosmetic. The separation of pupils according to ability continued for years. There has been a gradual erosion over 20 years. Almost by definition, the rate of change in education is slow.

7. I think the political conception of the comprehensive school was quite radical for the Scottish educational world, but since there has always been a tradition of egalitarianism here, it is a question of degree. The schools of John Knox and his educational ideas have to be seen in the context of the industrial society dominated by social advancement via educational success in exams. Even so, Scotland's record of 'writing off', the less able for decades is unenviable. Standard grade in the 1980's is an attempt to extend the tradition Scottish egalitarian philosophy by providing certification for all.
8. A comprehensive school should receive a totally unselected pupil intake. Teaching should take place in mixed-ability rather than selected groups. School monies should be shared evenly to benefit all pupils. The criteria for access to certification and all the school has to offer should be the same for all.

## SECTION B

1. The expansion of the advisory service in ----- was not directly related to the introduction of comprehensive education, but rather to the advent of RSLA and the availability of funds. Schools were under pressure and there was a fear: how to deal with ALL post-15 pupils.
2. Originally the advisory service had two faces: to advise the Directorate where schools were at, and to interpret policy for schools. Also it was primarily concerned with in-service training and curriculum development. Now the function is changing: there is pressure, both nationally and regionally, to



make its function more inspectorial.

3. a) Advisers got a minimum direction from the Directorate. You were trusted to get on with it and give reports and/or information when you were asked. The Directorate staff were too busy with administrative matters to have time to supervise advisers closely, or take much interest in what they were doing.
- b) Her Majesty's Inspectors provided direction and advice on national policy and the implementation of their own reports. They pointed in the 'right' direction, clarified and interpreted.
- c) Involvement of advisers in Consultative Committee on the Curriculum and Scottish Exam Board varied with the individual. Some were invited on to Consultative Committee on the Curriculum, and some worked for the Exam Board.
- d) My experience is that headteachers have a lot of autonomy. Nothing really happens unless the headteacher wants it to. Similarly, what a principal teacher can do is limited by the headteacher. They are subject to external pressures - Scottish Education Department, Directorate etc - and most turn to the adviser for help in responding to these pressures in terms of their own schools.
- e) Much depends on the size and composition of a department. A lot has to do with age and where the school is. My strategy has always been to use the good innovative people in a department, if the principal teacher is not co-operative.
4. a) I have been reasonably happy with the way children have been

<sup>+</sup>  
b) grouped. You have to deal in the art of the possible, and not demand/expect too much. There has been a general acceptance of the core + extension model of provision. I would say about 80% of teachers in my subject are at some point along that road.

5. The comprehensive school, and the package of changes that came in its wake, have had a considerable impact. There is a greater awareness of language levels, learning problems, motivation etc. A lot of developments have been born of teacher survival, but there has been a lot of professional interest and a genuine desire to do the best possible. There has been a welcome shift from didacticism. Equipment has affected methodology and computers will continue to do so. Also, field work has expanded in some subjects.

In general, most teachers want to keep up with new developments in their subject. If not, it is not always their fault. Sometimes obstacles - like time - are put in their way. It has not always been made easy for teachers to keep up to date, and I sometimes feel we have not helped teachers as much as we might to come to terms with the huge changes expected to them.

6. I think in-service training has had an impact on school practice, but possibly a lot has been lost on the way. There is no curriculum development unless things change in the classroom. In-service training was full of good intentions, but often obstacles out in the schools prevented ideas from taking root. I am not sure that 'training' teachers out of context in a big conference or meeting is the best approach. Working in schools

where the change is going to be implemented and with the people directly affected is probably better.

7. The main problems I have found in exercising the advisory function have been:

- the lack of time available to teachers for me to be a help to them
- dwindling finances in education
- the tendency for administrative matters to dominate educational ones
- the lack of secretarial assistance.

8. Yes, I think schools have benefited from having the services of advisers, despite the suspicions surrounding their ideas, which are sometimes perceived as a bit esoteric and remote from the classroom reality. An adviser can improve the quality of what a teacher does with his pupils, and provide back-up. Advisers get an overview impossible for those working in schools. They have time to sit back and reflect. Their approach, manner and personality are important, but they have an important role in extending the knowledge and vision of those who have to work in the narrow, blinkered and pressurised confines of a secondary school.

SECTION A

1. a) The source of comprehensive policy initiatives was primarily political. Divisions in society were seen to be unhealthy for democracy.
  - b) There were educational reasons as well as political dogma. Segregation by ability was seen as bad. There was a strong sense of an academic/non-academic split in Scottish schools, the able and the 'duffers'. Prevailing attitudes were intensely separatist.
  - c) Both educational and political moves were made to introduce the comprehensive school. There was unease about IQ tests and selection boards which operated on working out a figure for each child, based on performance in English, Maths and IQ tests. There was a good deal of arbitrariness about cut-off points. Gradually the misfits became apparent.
- 
2. It was a period of social and political change, in which all institutions were affected. The real furore about educational change occurred in England, and it then was brought up here, where no one wanted the system changed. An important factor was the election of a Labour Government in 1964. Equality, opportunity and chances were the watchwords.
- 
3. The immediate implication was the end of the junior secondary/senior secondary split in cities. Omnibus schools were unaffected. These were comprehensive schools already although



they were not thought of as that.

4. a) Cities were not representative of the best traditions in Scottish  
+  
b) education. Parents of high ability kids sent them to private schools if they could afford it, because the comprehensive secondary was seen as being disadvantageous to them. But, in fact, many private schools had nothing like the equipment and facilities that modern comprehensive schools had. Also, the quality of some of their teachers left a lot to be desired. The big drawback in area schools was the absence of a social mix.
5. The main obstacle was the hordes of traditional teachers with an academic outlook. They regarded the creation of the comprehensive school as a retrograde step since, in their view, education was only for the able. The comprehensive school was seen as a step in levelling down the standards and quality of Scottish education. Also many headteachers/principal teachers were nice people, but hadn't the experience or abilities to cope in the new set-up with all its pressures.
6. a) Old ideas persisted in the face of the new philosophy, so the junior secondary/senior secondary split was still visible. Although many people accepted that segregation was wrong socially, it was seen to be fair and right educationally, in order to save the able. Low ability classes got poorer teachers, and were affected first by any adverse circumstances - strikes, teacher shortage, etc.
- b) Internal organisational practices varied from school to school, department to department. Official policy was either not carried

out, or lip-service was paid to it. Headteachers and principal teachers were very powerful, and influenced a great deal of what happened.

7. a) The ideas of the comprehensive school fitted better in Scotland than in England. It was not so radical in theory in Scotland as it was in practice.
  - b) Equality of opportunity was seen in this way: if a pupil had ability, he would be developed intellectually. There was no idea or intention to attempt to cater for all-round development.
- 
8. a) A comprehensive school takes all the children from a defined area on a non-discriminatory basis. A sort of common course allows an initial period of orientation, in which pupils are screened for strengths and weaknesses and interests. As far as is practicable, pupils choose courses suited to their aptitudes. All sides of a child should be developed, and educational considerations should take precedence over administrative expediency. Parents should be actively involved in the school. Assessment should come from the curriculum, rather than the other way around.
  - b) The potential of the comprehensive school has not been tapped. Practice has not followed theory. Parents and teachers have not asked the basic question: what is the purpose of the educational process? Competitiveness has been encouraged at the expense of co-operation, and people in key positions have not had enough educational vision. The ideals of the 1945 Act have never been implemented. Children have not been valued for what they are, but measured by academic criteria, and compared to other kids in

consequence.

## SECTION B

1. If comprehensive education had not been introduced, there would have been no need to create advisers to deal with the curricular implications it brought in its wake.
2. The main function of the advisory service is to promote curriculum development, and to encourage teachers to an awareness of new developments, and assist them in implementing and evaluating them. Advisers should never impose, and always leave decisions to the professional expertise of teachers. You are also trying to improve the quality of the teaching force, by keeping them informed of local and national developments. You organise in-service courses, and act as a source of information. Also you act as a link between the authority and schools, and are the representative of the points of view of both. Finally, you keep headteachers aware of the place of your subject in the curriculum.
3. a) There were not enough meetings with the Directorate to discuss policy. We had no direct hand in policy-making. We were regarded as being able to utter points of view, but the real power lay with Education Officers.  
b) Her Majesty's Inspectorate links and co-operation became less and less after Reorganisation. The Director had a bee in his bonnet about advisers. He felt they were too big for their boots and that, together with Inspectors, were making policy. He wanted to

recast the advisory service in a mould which reflected his view of their function, not what they wanted to be, or thought they were. This merely led to clandestine meetings, but his action caused better resentment.

c) We had cordial relations with national bodies, but they were not very accessible. Advisers did a lot of work for the Scottish Exam Board and Consultative Committee on the Curriculum.

d) A minority were awkward but most were co-operative, and ready to seek my help. A small nucleus were really good, had some vision. There was also a small group of recalcitrants who gave you no co-operation at all. The rest were reasonably helpful, but you got nowhere if your view did not coincide with theirs. Heads had a lot of power to determine what happened in their schools.

e) I had cordial personal relations with all my principal teachers. Those who were keen on development were easiest to work with. Some wouldn't budge an inch, and resisted everything you proposed.

4. a) Like all impositions, mixed ability was grudgingly accepted and therefore badly done in the main.

b) In secondary  $3/4$  pupils were split into non-certificate/certificate sections, the latter usually grouped by ability in the subject.

5. a) The curriculum has inevitably been affected. Teachers have had to take cognisance of the need to change. The imperative has been there, but I'm not sure how much genuine willingness to



change accompanied it.

- b) Methods have also changed radically. The common course caused people to supplant the old academic approach with something more realistic and appropriate. Teachers, even the poorest, had to scrutinise their approach. But, of course, reactions to the inevitable change have been different.
  - c) Usually, only the keen teachers kept up with new developments. New ideas didn't get to those who needed it. Some teachers have not really moved an inch from their former professional practices.
6. a) In-service and Teachers' Centres played an important role in developments. They helped to get people to rethink, and made them aware of other people's problems, even if solutions were not always found to them. At its best, in-service training was inspirational, and helped to spread the word by showing that other people were innovative too, and were facing similar problems.
- b) Advisers played a vital part in organising in-service courses. Most of the in-service that occurred would simply not have happened without the impetus from the advisory service. They made it happen and got people involved. I remember the biggest problem in this regard was to persuade headteachers and Education Officers of the urgent need for in-service training.
7. The major problems I encountered as an adviser were:
- an unwillingness on the part of teachers to innovate, born of insecurity and a fear of not being able to cope

- headteachers who would not release the very people who needed to go to in-service training
- the amount of in-service provided at a time of major educational change was woefully inadequate
- competing with other subject advisers for in-service days at Pirniehall to secure accommodation, etc
- administrative problems like lack of secretarial assistance, and being expected to do menial delivery tasks to schools. That side of the work was too cumbersome.
- financial restrictions were imposed all along which severely curtailed what I could do for schools in terms of equipment, books, etc.

8. Despite the frustrations, there is no doubt in my mind that the schools have gained from having the services of advisers. They helped some teachers to do their job more effectively.

SECTION A

1. Comprehensive education was introduced as a Government initiative. The moves came from outside education in the world of politics. In -----, no thought had been given to or discussion held about the subject prior to Circular 600. The Directorate were willing implementers of Government directives. Although it was political, it was educationally justifiable in the hands of committed educationists who understood and accepted its underlying philosophy.
2. Comprehensive education gained popularity in the 1960s, as the pressure for change from an elitist system built up when previous attempts to cater for the 'lower strata' failed, e.g. Brunton. Gradually the idea gained ground of the same education for all. It was a noble idea which fitted in with the times. There also was a capacity for change in the 1960s. They were unsettled times. Secondary schools were seen to be lagging behind the primaries in the new modes of learning advocated in the Primary Memorandum. The move was to the individual and away from rote learning of facts. The old traditional system was being questioned.
3. The main implication of Circular 600 was to face the problem of integrating two different worlds: senior secondary schools went on a voyage of discovery with kids they had never seen, while down below in the junior secondary schools staff gobbled up the chance of making the transition the other way. The integration

was managed with differing degrees of success, and at different rates.

5. Obstacles to the introduction of comprehensive education were:

- pupil behaviour
- parental attitudes, ranging from apathy to pressure to preserve the secondary schools. People realised that you buy a house to get your kids to a 'good' school. There was a mismatch between what should have happened and what actually did. The incipient signs of the end of the possibilities inherent in comprehensive education were sadly obvious at its birth. The Bearsdens, Lenzie and Milngavie stayed the same and provided a cheap substitute for fee-paying schools. The academic held sway, even in ----- High School, despite being in a predominantly working class area.

6. The merging of junior secondary/senior secondary schools was not handled at all well, and was militated against by buildings, staff and pupils. There was resentment. Schools operated on the old criteria - black gowns, prize giving, etc. The ground rules did not change. Junior secondary schools were stuck on to senior secondary schools, and left to get on with it. Deep down, there was a reluctance to consider true integration of pupils of all abilities and no questioning of the underlying purposes of comprehensive education. Comprehensive schools sought to achieve respectability by all the traditional yardsticks.

7. The comprehensive school as it was envisaged in Circular 600 was the very antithesis of the Knoxian school which was highly



inegalitarian. There you had differentiated curricula, but only a minority of the pupils was successful. The comprehensive school was a radical attempt to find a curriculum of value for everyone but old attitudes and practices held sway. Equality of opportunity meant wider access to the privilege of academic success. There was an appalling prevalence of academic traditionalism, which was never really thrown off. People did not understand, or want to understand. Imagine a school I worked in having a 1st prize for remedial education! Some dreadful appointments were made to senior posts. Others were well-meaning people who did not understand.

8. A comprehensive school is one which does not overvalue the academic. In its ethos, every child moves comfortably in each other's company. It is a cliché, but true, that it is a community, a microcosm of society. Social consideration should feature. Some of the excellent concepts in the Ruthven Report should prevail. There was a report which admitted the academic bias in secondary education and tried to remedy it. Look what happened to its ideas.

The Scottish character and tradition in education have hampered the realisation of true comprehensive education. You are held in regard and rewarded for success with Scottish Certificate of Education classes: that's how teachers' reputations are made. You get no rewards for working with the less able. The sad but inescapable fact is that competition not co-operation is the name of the game. Common denominators between children become ousted by academic differences. It is too late to save comprehensive education. A good example is that people consider Jordanhill

College School as a good comprehensive school!

## SECTION B

1. In my view there was no connection between the advent of comprehensive education and the growth of the advisorate. They were recruited in the academic subjects to sort out curricular and teaching problems.
2. An adviser is first and foremost an enabler and a curriculum developer. He should be source of knowledge, an in-depth subject specialist. The prevailing concept of the role in Strathclyde is that advisers identify needs and fulfil them by getting outside speakers to talk to teachers. They respond to documents and implement the regional policy made up as a response to Consultative Committee on the Curriculum/Scottish Education Department policy statements. There is much less room for adviser initiative than there should be.
3. a) Divisional staff are merely representatives of the Region. The Region is God. Some people even think Dr Green is the Director of Education! In the old days, the Director in ----- was a slow thinker and a slow mover. Things were much more personal. You felt part of a team, and that your work was appreciated. You were allowed to develop your own subject as you liked. Now you cannot take the initiative - you are summoned and told what to do. Even your advice to schools is circumscribed by parameters imposed by Education Officers.
- b) Her Majesty's Inspectors are more remote than before, less fraternal. It is very much top-down, if pleasant. Her Majesty's

Inspectors look to advisers to implement national policy now.

c) Headteachers also are under pressure to do the 'right' thing. They now depend on you to help them do what the Director tells them to do. They want you to explain and help. Advisers are not their own men: they are servants of the Directorate.

e) Principal teachers are generally supportive. There was much kindred spirit, but varied enthusiasm. They also have to satisfy their superiors. It's DO AS YOU ARE BID RIGHT DOWN THE LINE, and everyone is happy, and all is well with education.

5. Curriculum and methods have changed, and for the better. At its best, things are much more geared to the whole range of pupils. At its worst, it is Scottish Certificate of Education domination, and accountability. There has been a move away from content to skills. The structure and approach is better. Assessment has proved a big bugbear. There has been an overpowering urge to prove what a child has learned by means of the excitement and enjoyment of learning. Teachers have to teach only that which can be assessed - even in the proposed Standard grade.

6. In-service training has had an effect rather than an impact. It was dreadfully under-resourced and therefore limited in scope. Even now lack of money means PRIORITIES, and some subjects are on a hiding to nothing.

8. Schools have benefited from the services of advisers, but their potential has been under-rated, and not enough advantage has been taken of them. They have not been given responsibility for

structure and organisation, and have not had much scope to act as professional thinkers. Many benefits have been theoretical: the structure has subsumed the substance of their contribution. An instrumental view of education prevails to the detriment of deep thinking about serious issues.



SECTION A

1. a) In the pre-war set-up there were two systems of senior education - the senior school or advanced divisions, located in one of the local primary schools. For both, there was the qualifying exam at 12, and the advanced divisions had specialist rooms (Art, Technical, P.E.) in which lessons were given by visiting teachers from the senior school. The school leaving age was then 14, and after advanced divisions, pupils got jobs in business, trades or became craftsmen, e.g. plumbers, joiners, etc. This system worked well, then after the war, the Labour Politicians began to advance a case for SECONDARY EDUCATION FOR ALL. Accordingly, in cities, junior secondary and senior secondary schools were sometimes sent to different schools based on their ability.  
  
b) The main moves came from politicians.  
  
c) A few people in education were agitating for change, but the vast majority were perfectly happy with the old, divided system.
2. Comprehensive schools grew in popularity because egalitarian philosophy, advocated largely by respected intellectuals, was attractive to people. It represented the possibility of a CHANCE FOR ALL, and also was a safety net for late developers, even though in the old system they could always transfer from junior secondary to senior secondary schools. It gradually became deemed easier to cater for all children in one building.
3. The main implication was perturbation at the loss of standards

that would ensue. Mixing pupils of wide-ranging abilities meant for many teachers that the convoy would now move at the rate of the slowest ship. It was widely believed that the new system would hold back brainy kinds. Some headteachers resisted all imposed attempts at integration under the banner of comprehensive education. Others were more honest and refused to do it.

4. Despite fee paying schools (which were so few in number that any creaming was minimal) and area schools in comprehensive schools (which nevertheless had a coterie of able pupils) the comprehensive system worked well.
5. Discipline was a major obstacle because, in a junior secondary school less able pupils were treated appropriately. In the comprehensive school they were lost in the big pool, and kicked over the traces to make their presence felt, and compensate for the lack of attention they got from most staff. They simply kicked over the traces to get some kind of social recognition. So the senior secondary/junior secondary blending process was far from smooth. The other major obstacle was the fiercely academic orientation of many heads and principal teachers. Many of these had made their teaching reputations on success in getting pupils through Scottish Certificate of Education exams. They were disinclined to have this reputation besmirched by 'the new lot'. So a major problem became finding work for them which was relevant and would motivate them. You could say that for years curriculum and assessment stayed untouched, while the secondary population had changed dramatically in character.

6. a) The previous pattern changed hardly at all, with streaming rife. There were very few headteachers or principal teachers with vision to really try to integrate all kinds of pupils. Separatism was widespread.
- b) Internal organisational practices depended entirely on the educational philosophy of the headteacher and his principal teachers. As I have said, not much changed, despite some new terminology which was really only window dressing.
7. a) In rural areas, it articulated very well, in urban areas it caused a nightmare. Glasgow underwent a painful transformation. Local schools in places like Inverurie or Peebles were representative of the best tradition in Scottish comprehensive education which did well by generations of people. Many boys and girls of very humble or working class background encountered in them people of all classes and, through their ability, went on to university and high academic distinction. These schools enabled clever pupils to rise through the social classes. The ethic was that hard work, coupled with intelligence led to educational/social success: there was no dubiety about the purpose of school - to study hard and pass exams in a competitive atmosphere. Then, this excellent system suffered at the hands of ever-keen egalitarian views which were emotive but not much else.
- b) Equality of opportunity is symbolised in Scotland in the lad o' pairts tradition - everyone with ability shall have no obstacles to academic success.
8. My definition of a comprehensive school would be one which had

the features of a school like Inverurie Academy - where miner's sons could become managing directors, judges, or university professors.

b) The potential has not been fully tapped because

- the wrong philosophy was adopted when the comprehensive school was introduced. There was insufficient recognition of competitiveness and academic success
- the curricular and assessment implications were not grasped
- the vigour and grip of the old senior secondary school were gone forever.

## SECTION B

1. The expansion of the advisory service in Glasgow was the idea of Dr Mackintosh, later taken on board by his successor. It was directly related to the spread of comprehensive education, and reflected a desire to give other subjects the benefit of the services of the former organisers in the practical subjects.
2. The main functions of an adviser are:
  - to lead curriculum development
  - to ensure an adequate supply of teaching staff
  - to make recommendations on subject promoted posts.
3. a) Before regionalisation, I had a close relationship with the Directorate. My job was to keep them informed of progress. We were in effect directors of our own subjects. We filled in our bosses on developments. Dr Mackintosh once said to me: YOUR JOB IS IN SCHOOLS, NOT BEHIND A DESK. We had to feel the pulse and push developments. After regionalisation, meetings and paperwork



increased. Education Officers, under regional direction, call the shots now. We have an altered relationship with them, and a much modified role in the education service.

- b) I personally worked very closely with the District Inspector. We had a cordial relationship. Recently pressure has been increasingly put on them by Scottish Education Department. Now they are under much stronger political direction, and have less room for manoeuvre.
  - c) Many advisers worked on Scottish Exam Board/Consultative Committee on the Curriculum panels, as a result of their subject expertise.
  - d) I saw headteachers individually and collectively. In general, I had good personal relations with them. Some of them were difficult men, and judged the adviser by what he said or did. Having said that, some advisers were not good at their job.
  - e) Again my relationship with my principal teachers were good - apart from the incompetent ones. I tried to create a sense of common purpose, of working as a team.
5. a) The curriculum was most definitely affected. Methods less so because they tended to be traditionally more informal.
- b) Good teachers have always scrutinised their approaches and kept up to date with subject developments. There is no doubt that the comprehensive school made greater demands on teachers. They had to be flexible. Poor teachers blamed Scottish Certificate of Education exams for their unwillingness to change.

6. a) I hope that all the effort that went into organising courses was  
+  
b) beneficial. Teachers are mistaken if they think that they have all the knowledge they need on graduation. I am sure that much of our work in organising these courses had a profitable spin-off.
7. My main problems were I had only two hands and not nearly enough time. All constraints on me were external - e.g. not enough money to do what I wanted always. Advisers nowadays feel very much more constrained in the present administration.
8. Undoubtedly! Advisers are friends at court, people you can turn to for advice and professional help. Essentially it is a public relations job, in which you have to go all out to create a happy atmosphere and carry people with you.

#### POSTSCRIPT ON REGIONALISATION AND ITS EFFECTS

Since regionalisation things have become much more remote and bureaucratic in the education service. Divisions are territorial outposts of the Region, which they must obey. Their former authority has been reduced, as has that of their staff. Permission has to be sought from Region for everything. The Region's size almost enforces the impersonal relationships which exist. Decisions are made by people who are totally unaware of local circumstances. Decisions are taken on political grounds (i.e. numbers and money), and consequently there has been a reduction in educational vision. The Directorate has reduced stature and has lost the respect of many people who work for it. It is much more subject to direct political control, and this has affected its

relationship with its schools. As for advisers, they have no say in policy. It emanates from Region through Education Officers, who increasingly control and lay the parameters for the advisory service. As such, advisers feel less in charge or control of what they are doing.

SECTION A

1. a) Comprehensive education was part of socialist doctrine, and also  
+  
b) some educationists were beginning to question the separating of children at the age of 12 into senior secondary/junior secondary schools. The Church had influence too. It was also central government's (and Scottish Education Department) policy to maximise opportunities for all, especially as it was widely believed that the junior secondary sector had failed.  
  
c) Moves to introduce comprehensive education were political, but marginally so. Politicians have the whip in education over major issues and there was a powerful ruling Labour Group in Glasgow. Politicians took hold of the educational evidence which was slowly mounting against selection at 12.
2. Changes in education are fashionable, and Scotland has never stood still in this respect. The whole of society was undergoing a fundamental change in outlook - distinctions between people had to be dissolved, and the social welfare of all had to receive attention. Education got caught up in the maelstrom of egalitarian philosophy.
3. The main implications of Circulars 600 and 614 were the curriculum, resources and staffing. The junior secondary schools began to disappear, and amalgamations of previously distinct schools took place. The aims of what was done began to be coloured by diversity. Unfortunately, the new schools came at a time of staff shortage, although money was plentiful and pumped



into the service on an unprecedented scale.

4. a) Fee paying schools did rob comprehensive schools of some excellent pupils, quite a substantial proportion of them. This caused resentment in the state schools.
- b) Area schools in housing estates were socially homogeneous and thus comprehensive in name only. Bussing wasn't on. Although some good work was done in some of them, they suffered worst at the time of staff shortages.
5. The major obstacle was the academic training and outlook of large numbers of teachers. They were not used to dealing with the whole spectrum of ability. Their world was pupils in serried ranks exposed to chalk and talk. There was a widespread belief that the existing system was good, and a lack of willingness to appreciate why it should be changed. Also, no one thought of preparing people for the new modes of work that would be required. It was imposed from above without much consultation.
6. a) The junior secondary/senior secondary split, which was seen as very convenient, remained essentially unchanged, despite outward appearances. Progressively, the boundaries became a little more blurred. The authority could have given a much stronger lead on how pupils could be integrated, rather than simply pronounce that concepts like mixed-ability and the common course 'had to happen'. Much was left to individuals, and for a whole lot of understandable reasons, they were not in a tearing hurry to make radical changes overnight.

7. a) Many people thought we have always had the comprehensive school  
+  
b) in Scotland, so the theoretical notion of maximising opportunities for all kids met the desired wishes of many Scots. The only caveat was: protect the able so that our standards do not suffer. So, in general, the comprehensive school as a provider of greater equality of opportunity was welcomed in Scotland.
8. a) A comprehensive school is one which maximises the potential and the educational opportunities of each individual child in it.
- b) Despite a spate of changes and reforms over the last 20 years, we are still a long way off achieving true comprehensive education. A large number of teachers have still not got round to scrutinising their ideas, let alone implementing them in the classroom. Changes in methods, curriculum and assessment procedures, all vital, were called for at a rate faster than most teachers could deliver. As a result, we have merely scratched the surface in our attempts to cater properly for all abilities in a human way. A resistance to change, and a drop in the overall quality of teaching staff, together with a changed attitude to the job on the part of many teachers, have all conspired to defeat the purpose of the comprehensive school.

## SECTION B

1. The expansion of the advisory service was a direct consequence of the curricular implications of the introduction of comprehensive schools. We were created to relieve Her Majesty's Inspectors and Directorate staff who were overwhelmed at a period of intense change.

2. Curriculum development, in-service training and acting as link.
3. a) In the early days, administration was tight and co-ordinated. Directorate staff had educational vision, and a will to implement it. In those circumstances, advisers had authority and were consulted regularly. They worked in tandem with the Directorate. There were priorities. We knew the way forward. We led developments in our subjects. Now it's a 'them and us' situation. There is no educational plan.  
  
b) The Inspectorate are much more distanced now than they were. Their profile is not so high and they are not so noticeable in the office. I think there has been an instruction to keep away from advisers.  
  
c) Advisers had to fight hard to get recognition, and it is only recently that this has happened. Our primary task is a consultancy one, but time and again we have been ignored.  
  
d) Many headteachers were supportive, receptive and appreciative of what I was trying to do. The majority were respectful. Others looked on us as local authority inspectors.  
  
e) I was fortunate to get the goodwill of many of my principal teachers. I was able to persuade about 90% of them to get involved in some working party or another. I allowed them to co-ordinate developments in our subject. The only problem was that they were seen by some people as forming a small oligarchy of adviser's henchmen.

4. a) Streaming and group by ability has never died, despite all  
+  
b) attempts to dislodge them in favour of mixed ability. Again, people were left to flounder. There wasn't enough direction from the centre. Too much was expected. Despite public pronouncements, many schools have not changed much and are still far from being comprehensive in practice.
5. a) There have been noticeable changes in both curriculum and methods. The rote learning, academic bias has gone, and the approach to pupils is much more pupil-centred. Then there has been worksheet revolution and audio-visual invasion. Perhaps the pendulum has swung too far, and a better balance is needed. Things like preparation and homework policy need examining.
- b) There are still quite a lot of backwoodsmen, certainly 30%. But  
+  
c) things are etter than they were. We are slowly winning the battle.
6. In-service made a significant contribution and impact, and reflected credit on all the work that was put in. My only criticism would be that it was not compulsory. You could opt in or not as you chose. Advisers played a key role in organising such work, in conjunction with keen teachers.
7. Earlier advisers were better organised and respected for their work. Politics have become increasingly involved, and now we are subject to Inspectorial/Directorate fiat. We are not involved in policy decisions, but relegated to an instrumental/administrative role. Things have never been the same since the clash with the



present Director. He wanted to reduce our power and status and things came to showdown. He retracted a bit after pressure. His whole approach is to create more power at the centre, and reduce it in the divisional staff. Part of the problem has been that senior appointments at Regional level have gone to men who have little educational vision and/or inappropriate training and experience for their remits. If they have a concern for education, they certainly keep it quiet. The result is that junior staff have no confidence in them or their apparent lack of commitment.

8. Schools have undeniably benefited from the services of an advisory service. They have provided an invaluable link between the Directorate and schools. They have helped to humanise the schools. The big problem is that it is a personnel job which runs the risk of being inundated with paperwork and other administrative chores. Also, now we have a much wider remit than purely our subject, and we are told much more what to do than we used to be.

1. a) Policy initiatives came from academic writing - Pedley - which brought widespread criticism of existing 11+ set up in England. Much parental pressure expressed through Labour Party conferences and resolutions. The main source of grievance was cases of wrong selection in England.  
  
b) - Largely middle class parents. Families split Grammar school/secondary modern schools, secondary modern schools competing directly with Grammar schools  
  
- The intellectual and education 'Left' in general.  
  
c) Educational - a general consensus about wasted talent and unfair selection. Parental pressure made this widespread feeling into a viable political issue.
2. The Butler Act was accepted as crudely apt in 50's and post-war aftermath. Labour Party in late 40's/50's built up national morale, and McMillan released high individual expectations, both of which led to 1960's optimism in a wide range of issues. Much comparison with Swedish models in the popular and quality press.
3. The immediate implications were mainly accommodation and rebuilding problems. The higher echelons of administration were totally absorbed in numbers, sites, forward planning - 'keeping afloat'. Setting and banding were seen as the answer to preserving the school's traditional purpose - selecting and grooming the 'children of parts'. There was considerable staff excitement about who was who, and what role they would take in

'new' schools. But, generally the old established order carried on as before.

4. The existence of fee-paying schools considerably stiffened resistance to comprehensive schooling - the ability to compete had been further eroded, the status of the comprehensive teacher vis-a-vis fee paying colleagues further downgraded. Area schools in housing estates had the most positive outlook to the general philosophy of comprehensive education. They felt the wider social problems of their pupils and had no deep academic pretensions. Staff tended to be younger, much better informed and ambitious to try out new ideas. Much of this spirit was, however, vitiated by headteachers who felt a moral duty to advance, by selection, those pupils who could escape from their environment by the ladder of educational enhancement. They felt they had to do their best for the 'decent' minority.
5. - The weight of conservative academic attitudes at every level in the education service, largely as a result of their own selective education and training. They had no philosophy of comprehensive education, and little academic knowledge about it. (cf. Clegg, Mason).
- The Scottish Education Department apparently impartial in doing their official duty, gave no lead. The early years after Circular 600 made hardly any impact, and its contents were largely ignored by many schools.
- No documentation, philosophy, strategy or summary of techniques were offered at headteacher level. Everyone largely went their

own way. No rationale or social/educational targets were set for comprehensive education. Everyone at headteacher/principal teacher level did his own thing, and set or adjusted his views to the physical exigencies of the situation.

- Selection based on ability remained the sole and universally accepted criterion for progression through the school.
- Total absence of technical advice and direction on
  - a) mixed ability teaching
  - b) uses of diagnostic and formative assessment
  - c) setting of cultural, athletic, social goals for pupils.

With a few notable exceptions, no one knew anything about comprehensive education.

6. a) The previous junior secondary/senior secondary pattern changed hardly at all. Setting was adopted almost universally, or the other favoured solution was broad-banding. The best aspects of in-service - projects, outings, concerts, field trips etc - largely dropped out of existence. The concept of the school as a whole, as an integrated community was never realised. Old traditions - projects, prize giving, GS continued, if somewhat diluted.

b) No one knew what a comprehensive policy was. Harold Wilson's phrase 'GRAMMAR SCHOOLS FOR ALL' with all its vagueness and inbuilt rejection of the majority reinforced what many heads actually did - selection from year 1, emphasis on classics and modern languages, all this continued unchanged.

The senior secondary school had opened its doors to 6/6 instead



of 1/6 of the local population. If you like, 15% became 100%.

A 3-part structure emerged: a) academic pupils, b) those who could do vocational preparation in Business Studies, Technical, Home Economics, Art, c) the also rans.

It should be noted that, as always, individual teachers frequently ameliorate the worst features in the b) group by solid didactic teaching and in the c) group by a genuine concern for personalities and a genuine urge to offer literacy and numeracy.

7. a) The system had been selective/hierarchical from at least the 19th century. The classicist/scholar was long recognised above all others. Ministers, lawyers and doctors were valued and respected professions, but open only to reasonable prosperity and considerable ability and initiative.

The 1960's system epitomises all this - names of schools, The University Bursary Competition as the apex of achievement for public/private sectors alike. The most revered teachers were the mini - or failed scholars who had great virtues. A desire for universal education was most definitely not one of them.

The Scottish attitude to education, in the general mind, has a false respect for learning. The learning itself - perhaps with reason - was vastly undervalued to the position or kudos that went with it. The universities pursued learning for its own sake, but apart from in medicine, what good did it bring to the ordinary citizen? The 'town and gown' tradition epitomised the uneasy alliance. Scots believe in reward and merit. The secondary school system favoured meritocratic selection and suited the middle class and upper working class sections of the community very well. The less educationally ambitious had all

their own defences against academic failure - 'book-learning', 'theory', 'stuffed with information', 'bampot'. I believe that the senior secondary/junior secondary divide suited the general attitude in Scotland. The Scot's belief in equality is rhetorical and polemical - we're a' Jock Thomson's bairns', 'brithers a' satisfied it fully. Scottish literature is full of this attitude of rewarded merit which, on occasion, is satisfyingly seen to come a cropper on occasion - 'House with Green Shutters', 'Justified Sinner', 'Weir of Hermiston', 'Gillespie'.

8. a) An area school with an area catchment concerned to benefit the social and intellectual wellbeing of all its pupils, within a developing community dynamic, in which the all-round (social, physical, cultural and mental) development of each pupil is set within a positive context for multifarious learning. It would be required through its headteacher and staff to develop intra- and extra school socio-cultural values and experience. It would be required to create a positive ethos of anti-classicism, anti-sexism, anti-racism. I believe that such values are compatible with strenuous individual effort in all fields through a system of accessible awards and gradings.

Although this is in some ways an ideal, some comprehensive schools have attempted to approach all or some of it. The comprehensive school requires to have ideals and a strong social base, otherwise it is nothing. The present trend is, of course, to a state dumping ground for those whose parents are too selfish, short-sighted, unworthy or just too poor to buy them the other elitist thing.

b) I cannot think of as single instance in which the potential of the comprehensive school has been tapped. No school has managed to engage, let alone galvanise, all of its pupils. The emphasis, even in those with comprehensive ambitions, has remained locked on the certificate pupils and success in Scottish Certificate exams. I believe that Standard grade - centrally devised and imposed - did offer, in good departments a possibility of a breakthrough. Others would argue that Standard grade realised the 'Grammar School for all' view, and 'deil tak the hindmost'. Some individual departments really tried hard, but about schools I am less sure. Strathclyde had some 'triers', but the best examples probably exist outside Strathclyde - Grampian, Lothian, Fife. In all schools, the academic/selective tradition especially in the upper school, has an ineluctable hold, and I doubt if this will change.

I believe that the abandonment of any kind of assemblies, and the pathetically narrow and inhibited base of guidance roles are two features which mark the demise of the comprehensive school as I have imagined it. Guidance teachers appear to have nothing to offer the school as a community, but merely a doubtfully successful school social work service.

I believe that the area comprehensive school could count strongly for positive social values and against the prevalent negativity of society - glue, vandalism, drink, psychological failure. Nevertheless, I have to admit that the hothouse academicism of the senior secondary has been variably diluted with no corresponding social/individual/compensations. All of this has been lost. The least able were patronized and nurtured socially and educationally in their own ghetto situation in some junior

schools; in others they were simply boxed off. A few comprehensive schools have attempted, through individual (remedial) teachers to integrate them across the curriculum. Too many schools in Strathclyde have neither the skills nor the commitment.

## SECTION B

1. I have never linked the advisory service with comprehensive education in any special way. There was no theory and practice of comprehensive education to be implemented. In 1978, a motion of mine that advisers should prepare a set of guidelines on mixed ability teaching was overwhelmingly rejected!  
  
Advisers as supervisors started in practical subjects as far back as the early 20th Century. Appointments in academic subjects were linked to the curriculum renewal movement of the early 60's. Advisers by and large had to walk a very wary tightrope with headteachers of so-called comprehensive schools. Most were trilateral schools, and headteachers entrenched in their attitudes. This was true still in 1974 when I became an adviser, and continued into the early 80's. The period 1978-82 was a watershed and 1984-86 could have initiated some real change.
2. a) To enable teachers to find a corporate identity and purpose so that they might participate actively in developing their own professionalism - teachers centres and school based in-service.
- b) To act on behalf of teachers as a resource person, and clearing house for curriculum ideas and materials.
- c) To act as liaison between Director's staff and schools and



subject interests. To inform Education Officers on Scottish Education Department/Consultative Committee on the Curriculum documentation, and so promote department interests.

Job descriptions, both before and after regionalisation, spoke of 'advising' and 'assisting' Director and his staff. Advice was never asked for, and assistance consisted of acting incidentally on preliminary working parties whose findings were absorbed and altered by later management papers. After Regionalisation, advisers operated at Warrant Officer/Staff Sergeant level - occasionally useful operatives in non decision-making roles. This got worse 1983-85. Most advisers thought they had been appointed to advise and participate at all levels at least as technologists. The continual tension between their own and the Education Officer's expectations made for widespread disillusionment and cynicism. Advisers finished up in the 'licensed fool' situation, whose only excuse for existence was to act as yes-men and sycophants.

3. a) After Regionalisation, an increasingly subordinate role. The advisory service was one of the new Director's first targets to ensure that his fiat ran through Strathclyde, and that non-democratic centralism was rapidly imposed. My sole 'major' involvement was a year's work on the Strathclyde Regional Council consultative document 1978 on Remedial education. It has never been implemented and its philosophy and whole drive ignored.
- b) Excellent relations with Her Majesty's Inspectorate 1974-82. Very full co-operation, discussion and mutual support, with genuine feelings of working together. But after FRAMEWORK FOR

DECISION, centralism and a strong degree of directiveness came. Thereafter, the adviser's role was reformulated, without consultation, as a local authority implementer of Scottish Education Department formulations.

- c) Excellent relations with national bodies up to 1982, but my experience of the Committee on Special Education Needs (1981-82) was that the committee was told what to do, their own feelings were bulldozed aside. Her Majesty's Inspector 'assessors' and Consultative Committee on the Curriculum appointed Chairman controlled all. The democracy of the 60's faded through the 70's and was buried in the 80's.
- d) An increasingly mutual, trustful and helpful relationship. The awkward individuals of the early 70's were replaced, and the findings of the 70's developed in fairly fertile soil at subject/department level. The role of advisers was increasingly welcomed. The main failure was the lack of a structure for the advisory service, and the total failure of various divisional officers to define and/or support the adviser's role. One complain from one headteacher resulted in new restrictions and an implied rebuke for all advisers.

Advisers suffered from management at its lowest possible level of shuffling indecision and its firm decision to retain superior status at the expense of open exchanges and 'upward influence'. This situation got steadily worse. There was a great fund of idealism and goodwill to be drawn upon among headteachers. They were left, either to take instruction, or gossip among themselves. They were managed as was the advisory service.

- e) Advice was occasionally sought directly by principal teachers. They seldom 'ran to the adviser', and stood largely on their own feet. What they appreciated was a good flow of information, regular opportunities to meet, in-service for their assistant principal teachers and staff and adviser visits to schools. This applies specifically to English 1974-83. Remedial specialists much appreciated opportunities to meet, and the setting up and maintenance of local curriculum groups. Much excellent work resulted. They deeply and rightly resented not having an adviser of their own. The adviser/teacher relationship was frank and friendly in a co-operative venture. All curriculum ideas were positively, if critically received, and most were taken up - mixed ability, group work, reading/writing development work, co-operative teaching, pupils with learning difficulties. The proportion of adviser's time to teacher need was, of course, ludicrous. I worked to a plan of critical association of personalities, dissemination of ideas, and voluntary participation. Much was left undone, and the awkward squad was largely left to follow on as they chose. Most of them actually did keep up, and surprised by individual and departmental initiatives.
4. a) Over the decade 1974-84, mixed ability in secondary 1 gradually moved from pioneer attempts to being the mode. Secondary 2 became mixed ability much more slowly, classics, maths and languages exerting a strong influence and disrupting the general trend.
- b) Mixed ability in English was much helped by adviser in-service and influence. A growing number of departments pushed it into

secondary 3 and even secondary 4 1974-84. Some excellent Consultative Committee on the Curriculum publications - Boyd, Burns, Liddell, Maxwell. English teachers in favour of mixed ability till secondary 3 but division of opinion at certificate level. Many good intentions were thwarted by the influence of headteachers and other principal teachers.

5. a) I think that the period 1964-84 has been one of continual change - or, as some would have it, disruption - in Scottish secondary schools. In general the change has been until recently based upon undirected and often misconceived responses to external pressures. Many headteachers/principal teachers felt they had to do something. Most credit should go to younger teachers who from the first felt the injustices and social tensions connected with streaming, setting etc. Many tried for years to effect structural changes but were blocked off by headteachers. Again the point that comprehensive education was brought in by legislation and without the pre-planning and general directions that the whole system desperately required.

Science always seemed to be ahead in trying to modify and stratify its curriculum and methods. They seemed to be abandoning a style when other subjects were catching up. Research at Stirling revealed that teaching to the centre of the class was very resistant to change.

Nevertheless, I believe that comprehensive education did lead to a rethink in almost all subjects and to a broadening and updating of content and approaches.

- b) The revolution in English was drastic and had various sources pre



1964 mainly South of the Border. The debate in the 1960's was openly 'English' (rules, grammar, accepted usage) v. English (developing personal experience and expression). Thus the swing (which I believe to be purely modish in some of its outcomes) in English went very far - and Standard grade syllabus has confirmed it. The undirected nature of change 1964-82 was anarchic especially in the whole school context; consider assessment. Unfortunately the pendulum under direct political control has now swung to total direction, albeit incorporating some good modern approaches.

Bullock (1975) was the best thing in English and language in education - a detailed, philosophic, thoughtful, radical and comprehensive guidebook which set English teachers and others thinking. Since then, we have been swamped by a constant stream of Consultative Committee on the Curriculum, Scottish Education Department and commissioned research papers.

- b) Ideas have been scrutinised to a considerable extent and at every level and, I believe, in all subjects. There was a great deal of broad liberal thinking but, because of superficial or virtually non-existent tinkering by Education Officers nothing serious was done.

The keynote of the years 1964-80 was the widespread and excellent pioneering by individual teachers, departments and schools, in every possible permutation. Consultative Committee on the Curriculum subject panels, Inspectorate and local groups made excellent progress. The Standard grade movement is a kind of summation of this, but it has the strong feel of the military taking over from a rather disorganised, although thriving, democracy.

c) In my own field there were always 30-35% of teachers ahead/abreast of developments. Many developments were pioneered in Glasgow to the best of my knowledge - co-operative teaching, remedial education. Much of this is summed up in our 1984 'The Philosophy of Remedial Education'. All remedial progress has been ignored or downgraded by the Regional Directorate since 1974 onwards. I should add that the percentage of misfits and ignoramuses among teachers was small - 15-20%.

6. a) Theory and practice on in-service provision has swung to some extent (1980-84) against college/centre courses in favour of school and department based in-service. The latter has enormous advantages of reaching all teachers and stimulating department initiative and discussion. Linked with the work of staff tutors much can be achieved. I believe that school based in-service has yet to be fully developed, with both school and divisional organisation to be built up and linked with some kind of teacher assessment. Again, it has to be added that this is a 'further tool in the centralist 'accountability' Joseph/Rayner style of getting value for money. It remains to be seen how much positive impact this will have.

Of teacher centre/college courses (1974-84) it could be said that they were largely for the enthusiasts, and that frequently teachers contributed as much as they got. College courses had a poorish reputation at the start of the decade, but latterly had a positive and growing reputation. Younger lecturers who had either prior or current school based research experience were seen to be tackling real problems, and handling the latest research with reasonable confidence. My own best experiences are

now, I fear historic. I refer to the regular 2-3 day residential conferences which I helped to run 1974-84. They were seminal for ideas and for individuals. They were, of course, part of the pioneering stage of the development with pioneers as speakers and leaders, and pioneers as course members. They represented a kind of renewal for which I think there should always be a place, but I fear they were born of times and circumstances which may have gone for ever. Some return some day to this kind of confident teacher-led exploration of problems will mark the restoration to maturity of our profession. (NB. Other professions still have it.) The Summer Institute Courses for English Teachers at Chester and various colleges should also be mentioned as a renaissance in Scottish English teaching which began in the 1960's and developed into the bureaucratic welter we now know. For happier phases to follow, there will have to be deep thought and commitment to ideals of pupil and teacher learning that transcend our current fixations with grade related criteria.

- b) Advisers played a major part in organising all such courses. I am committed to a full-time and established advisory service - the best teachers available promoted to positions where nationally and locally they can think, offer a lead, act as resource persons and influence policy. The advisory service like the 19th Century civil service was, and is 'unreformed'. Even so, the most telling courses in all subjects were in fact set up and run by advisers. I believe that college courses run in co-operation with advisers were much better than college courses per se. This was equally true of school (consortia) courses, some of which were disastrous in their amateurism. The notion of school-

focused in-service training run by headteachers is an exact parallel to comprehensive education - DO YOUR OWN THING WHATEVER THAT MAY BE. I believe that the 'middlemen' position of advisers and the (fewer and fewer) privileges of their professional position made them (1974-84) essential to the developing in-service movement. I believe that very little of the effort was directly linked to the success of the comprehensive school, but indirectly it had a powerful effect. Pioneers had platforms and there was wide-ranging if unco-ordinated discussion. Now, of course, it's back to school for all - including Her Majesty's Inspectors and their working parties who abandon normal life for processing and canning the ideas of 1964-84.

7. The overwhelming problem was that of convincing Education Officers of the need for change and for resources to achieve that change. There were no developed or regular exchanges on curricular matters, and limited success at Divisional level was brutally countermanded by Regional fiat. The only influence on Strathclyde Directorate was Scottish Education Department, and even here there were dreadful time-lapses and a strong feeling of foot-dragging. In my own special interest (Remedial education), I experienced, time after time, the reversal and elimination of goals to which I had worked and for which I had apparently won some support, e.g. appointment of principal teachers (cancelled after 1978), Advisory Unit in Language Difficulties (1982-83) cancelled by the Director; recognition of a role for remedial teachers (totally ignored in secondary 1/secondary 2 Report and in the prestigious report on social policy). All schools without a principal teacher Remedial Education (50% in Glasgow and 30% in



Scotland), and those which have one but no policy or resources to support them are abusing in quite a serious way the minds of 15-30% of their pupils, in addition to losing a genuine gateway to renewal of the curriculum. SENIOR SECONDARY EDUCATION IS DEAD. LONG LIVE SENIOR SECONDARY EDUCATION.

I had no real problems with headteachers apart from initial diffidence, mistrust and ageing intransigence, and virtually none with principal teachers. We trusted each other and enjoyed each other's contribution. There were, of course, snow drifts and rockfalls, but the glacier started at Education Officer level, and the north face was represented by the Director.

I should add that the advisory service was itself under attack in status and numbers 1965-85. Various papers promising restructuring disappeared out of sight. Numbers shrank steadily as local and national impositions mounted.

8. Enormously. The desperate problems of the best of schools is isolation (and self-congratulation). I think that at all stages the advisory service carried ideas, encouraged individuals and harassed the entrenched. Part of the harassment was through visits, but most effectively through courses and, signally through the dissemination of printed material. Advisers have some have sometimes been seen as a threat by some headteachers, but there was always a solid consensus with forward-looking headteachers. As I have said, the advisory service was unorganised and unco-ordinated - it's members in the main wished this to be so, but even so, it did in all subjects help to break the log jam of selectionist thinking that the proponents of comprehensive education hoped might come at a stroke in 1964.

The role of Advisers in the promotion system has been by and large positive. One aspect of this has been the dramatic contrast between headteachers 'safe' candidates and advisers' preference for classroom and curricular achievement. Again, however, the adviser role has been diminished. ORTHODOXY, CURRICULAR, POLITICAL AND RELIGIOUS NOW APPEAR TO BE A NEW AND WORRYING FEATURE OF THE COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL SCENE.

#### SUMMARY OF COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATION

A tentative conclusion is that comprehensive education was a failure, certainly not the renewed, dynamic system anticipated by its supporters. The academicism of the senior secondary school, slightly diluted without a corresponding social breadth for individuals, and the social/education/vocational breadth of the best junior secondary school was completely lost. The paternalistic, ghetto arrangements for the least able were much improved in the minority of comprehensives which have made a genuine structural and pedagogic attempt at teaching pupils with learning difficulties across the curriculum. In the majority ghetto conditions were replaced by total indifference and neglect. Overall, NOT A HAPPY PICTURE.

Why? Total failure of the Directorate to give a positive and continuing lead on a range of issues;

- a) the rationale and social spirit of the comprehensive school - equality of regard, community of spirit -both were totally neglected.
- b) failure to provide the necessary technical and structural advice on aspects like mixed ability teaching, diagnostic and formative assessment, setting out individual and social goals for all

pupils.

Minor attempts at change (1964-84) were conducted by individuals in an atmosphere of indifference and mistrust. The advisory service was divided on central issues also

- c) As a corollary of above, the entrenched views of headteachers/principal teachers with selection as their sole education tool, were allowed to continue covertly or overtly. The position of future Higher grade pupils remained as the consideration from secondary 2 onwards, with secondary 1 written off by too many as a 'sop to cerebus'.

The Scottish tendency of 'academic' drift and 'preferential' treatment for the clever were not replaced by any wider philosophy. The mere passing of an Act of Parliament was unable to influence established directors, headteachers, principal teachers, parents and press. Responsibility for official (Scottish Education Department, Consultative Committee on the Curriculum etc) attempts at curricular guidance was invariably handed to ignorant or indifferent assistant headteachers, or conscientious ones who were genuinely over-committed.

SECTION A

1. a) From 1964-66 the idea of comprehensive education emerged from the discussion on educational policy among members of local authority groups of panels. These were by no means national bodies, their main purpose was to help Directors of Education make decisions about the structures of secondary schools, resulting from which some authorities decided straight away to change all their secondary schools, junior secondary and senior secondary, into 6 year comprehensive, while others favoured the retention of lower schools from 1st year to 3rd year as feeder schools for the senior schools, made up from secondary 4, secondary 5 and secondary 6. Her Majesty's Inspectors sat on these panels and were very influential, eventually seeming to favour the 6 year schools. These decisions were not just important in themselves, but the decisions had to take notice of other problems like school buildings and equipment. In fact the first purpose-built buildings pretty well assumed that the ultimate decision would rest with 6 year schools. These were designed to accommodate classes secondary 1 - secondary 6 in the one school. One of the main impetus for the appointment of advisers by the Glasgow Local Authority was the need to appoint subject advisers who would make themselves responsible for the design, the organisation and the administration of the new secondary schools. The very first job the adviser got to do was to devise the lay-out of the accommodation allocated to their subjects in the schools.
- 1966 on: Glasgow, the first Local Authority to do so, appointed subject advisers at the end of 1966, and this decision in a sense



well-nigh forced the main decision about the type of secondary education to be provided.

- b) The principal advocates of the policy were Her Majesty's Inspectors, Directors of Education, the media, Consultative Committee on the Curriculum and working panels - national and local, professional associations, i.e. Educational Institute of Scotland etc.
- c) It depended largely on the individuals who were advocating the comprehensive policy whether the moves to introduce it were political or educational.

2. Comprehensive approach became attractive in 1960s:

- i) some local authorities adopted the system in early 50's.  
e.g. Glasgow
- ii) first examples of purpose-built and equipped schools completed and in use, e.g. Crookston Castle (1954) and St Augustine's (1954)
- iii) first Local Authority Teachers' Panel began operating in 1950's
- iv) in secondary schools, comprehensive education seemed to provide the answers to most of the problems of the junior secondary schools.

3. Immediate implications:

- i) end of 2-tier system in secondary schools
- ii) more presentations in Scottish Certificate of Education examinations
- iii) pupils could be in top-tier for one subject and bottom for

another

- iv) junior secondary schools absorbed into senior secondary schools, but junior secondary pupils remained submerged in junior secondary classes.

4. Problems of a) fee-paying schools and b) area schools. Both sets of schools made it very difficult to achieve a proper blend or mixture of all the pupils in the neighbourhood. It was also alleged that the fee-paying or grant-aided schools milked the top pupils of each age group. The pupils in the area schools could only have a limited type of cross-section depending on the social mix in the area.

5. Obstacles to introduction of comprehensive education in Scottish secondary schools:

- i) limited cross-sections of post-primary pupils, existence of fee-paying schools, existence of area schools in large Local Authority areas;
- ii) attitudes of some teachers opposed to comprehensive schooling resulting in a change of buildings only. 'Comprehensive' differed from school to school. Following change of buildings, the result was often two schools in one building, with junior secondary classes and senior senior secondary classes. Some teachers either failed to understand what was meant by comprehensive education, or refused to put it into practice. Some teachers were consistently opposed to the change to comprehensive schools. A fully comprehensive policy resulted in great stresses and strains on those responsible for the

timetable. Other innovations like mixed ability teaching groups called for new skills to be learned, and involved new methods of teaching including the important one of pupil-centred teaching - all resulting in more and more time having to be spent in preparation;

- iii) more responsibilities were added to those which teachers were accustomed to carrying out at a time when they were less prepared to assume them. Especially did this become true as it became obvious that some other changes had been coming about in the schools through the 20th Century. Modern problems of permissiveness and the erosion of Christian ideas subsequent to the transfer of the church schools (except for the Catholic ones) over to the state in 1918 resulted inevitably in these schools becoming in fact and in spirit non-denominational. Along with the disappearance of the religious character of the majority of the Scottish secondary schools, there also tended to disappear the moral values which church school and parents had tended to combine to uphold. Only a very small proportion of the Glasgow secondary schools, or at least the non-denominational ones are even timetabled for religious education, and that can be changed with a change of headteacher. When in recent years it became evident that the school would have to undertake the moral education of the children, a system of guidance was introduced to fill the gap. The Catholic schools had never ceased to provide the moral, personal, social and vocational guidance which now had to find its way into all the schools, in particular into the non-denominational ones, where the last

vestige of religious, moral and pastoral guidance had long since disappeared. Now new guidance courses had to be compiled to help the staffs to instil notions which had long ago disappeared from their ken.

6. a) Adoption of comprehensive ideas was very slow and in fact these were ignored altogether for some years. For long enough, in fact, little attention was directed towards these ideals, and the situation of the least able pupils was at first much worse than before. Very slowly, however, things began to change for the better, particularly when the introduction of the advisorate made it possible to introduce more and more in-service training and when, in addition, the establishment of new promoted posts (assistant principal teacher, guidance posts, assistant headteacher) made it possible to reward those teachers who were making genuine efforts to understand and implement comprehensive ideas. Headteachers, in particular, began to show their need and desire for opportunities to learn about the changes which had been arriving unnoticed. Now Her Majesty's Inspectors and the Local Authority advisers combined to provide courses of instruction, in particular courses aimed at senior staff to enable them to understand the new responsibilities they would have to assume if they were promoted to depute headteacher and headteacher. Eventually the junior secondary schools were abolished to be absorbed into the new comprehensive schools. At first, however, the pupils remained junior secondary pupils, especially since the new transfer at 12+ continued to be decided on the basis of the intelligence tests carried out in the primary school. It was some considerable time before the intelligence



tests were done away with and the whole intake from the primary schools began to be absorbed as mixed ability entry.

b) It follows from some of the statements in 5 and 6 (a) that to begin with the internal organisation of the secondary schools was based upon ideas which were opposed to comprehensive philosophy.

7. a) It follows from what I have already said that, to begin with at  
+  
b) least, the new comprehensive schools were really opposed to both the theory and the practice of comprehensive education.

8. a) A comprehensive school is one which accepts the pupils of the whole catchment area and distributes them in mixed ability groups throughout the first and second year. Equal opportunities for all the children are provided through the lower school, and this is ultimately continued through the upper school, with every pupil being given a full and free choice to follow the courses suited to his or her desires and aptitudes.

b) While a great deal has been done and done well, there is still much to be done before the comprehensive schools can be truthfully described as fully comprehensive.

## SECTION B

1. The advisory service and the comprehensive system of education were developed and expanded as complements of one another.

2. Main functions of advisory service with regard to secondary education:

a) keeping the Director of the Divisional Education Officer

well-briefed in the most up-to-date development of their subject areas

- b) providing full and effective in-service training
- c) providing administrative direction and inspiration for the subject panels
- d) providing full support for the work of the subject departments in the schools, and full support to the department heads
- e) keeping the headteachers reminded of subject developments
- f) advising the Directorate on questions of staff recruitment
- g) advising Director and headteachers re staff promotions
- h) liaison with other bodies, e.g. university departments; colleges of education; further education, industrial developments
- i) sitting in on selection boards to give expert and professional advice.

3. a) i) The Director left his advisers to make all decisions re subject area. He liked to be kept informed
- ii) Members of the Directorate sat in on general discussions, and left advisers to administer the ad hoc bodies arising
- iii) Sometimes the policy decisions stemmed directly from one of the advisers, and fulfilment or implementation was left to that adviser.
- b) i) Inspectors expected advisers to be available for advisers full discussions on any new matter of educational policy either local or national
- ii) one of Her Majesty's Inspectors normally sat in on subject panels and working parties

iii) advisers served alongside Inspectors on national working panels.

c) Advisers sat on main national bodies (Consultative Committee on the Curriculum etc) with full executive status, but under chairmanship of an Inspector.

d) Headteachers - mainly kept their options open with reference to advisers, but they did not hesitate to use the advisers in matters of curriculum innovation. Generally speaking, headteachers who were the slowest in making use of the advisers were also the ones who were slowest to appreciate the comprehensive ideals and to attempt to implement them. On the other hand, those headteachers who welcomed the advisers and sought their co-operation were also the ones who sought to initiate comprehensive notions into their own school structures.

e) Principal teachers were the slowest group to seek adoption of comprehensive ideas by their departments. They were among those most affected by the changes involved. They had arrived in their posts just as the comprehensive ideas of consultation and co-operation were being introduced, and preventing them from enjoying the overall role of authority to which they had been subject as pupils themselves.

4. Emergent patterns in grouping children within subject areas:

a) secondary 1/secondary 2. For long enough children continued to be selected according to their I.Qs in their primary schools, and so the classes ranged from top senior pupils aiming at Higher Certificate down to the least able who were

not considered fit for senior secondary work.

- b) secondary 3/secondary 4. These children continued to be classified in accordance with I.Qs, and their apparent fitness or otherwise for their secondary course.

By the late 70s and the 80s, however, a significant number of schools were enjoying mixed ability classification not only in secondary 1/secondary 2 but also in the upper school.

- 5. a) Effect on the curriculum. This could be most easily seen in the schools which were slowly introducing an ever widening curriculum especially in making it possible for boys to do courses in Home Economics and for girls to do Technical.

- b) Effect on teaching methods:

- i) opened the way to group teaching
- ii) opened the way to groups being taught by more than one teacher
- iii) pupils encouraged to learn rather than being taught
- iv) spread of continuous assessment

- b) Teachers' panels, in-service training and departmental discussions were used to assess and up-date the work of their colleagues involved in the work of innovation.

- c) Extent of updating within individual subject - not to a great extent except when encouraged by outside support, e.g. Inspectors, advisers etc.

- 6. a) Teachers' centres and in-service training courses played a very important role in helping to shape teachers' ideas, especially when the courses were residential. Teachers learned to discuss



methods and to assume an accountable attitude.

b) Advisers played the chief role in planning, organisation and supervision.

7. Problems encountered in exercising the advisory function in the context of secondary education - mainly breaking down prejudices, and winning support and co-operation of headteachers, principal teachers and assistant teachers.

8. Schools have benefited enormously from advisory service, although many teachers have been highly critical, almost hostile.

SECTION A

1. a) I do not honestly know what the source of comprehensive policy initiatives was, but I recall that when new schools were opened in housing estates, it was decided that they would all be area comprehensives. Crookston Castle and St. Augustine's set the pattern in 1954. However, within these schools, pupils were still divided into academic and non-academic groups. A frequent division was two language, one language and no language classes according to ability as judged by the primary school.  
  
c) There were advocates of comprehensive education among teachers, but not many. Politicians had a large input, and exercised a great influence.
2. I think the moves to comprehensive education were the result of a natural progression. Things were heading that way for some time. There was a lot of upset caused in families where some siblings went to a senior secondary school and some to a junior secondary school. There was a lot of resentment at the segregation. People wanted all pupils to have the same chance, and also to make provision for late developers. More and more children who were sent to junior secondary schools showed great aptitude.
3. The major implication of comprehensive policy was that teachers were faced with the problem of coping with the whole ability range, instead of only a part of it. What largely happened was that very little integration took place. It was very much a case of 'never the twain shall meet'. I always felt that the

atmosphere was better in new or purpose-built schools. Junior secondary pupils were still treated as less able, and senior secondary ones were regarded as the icing on the cake. It was as if senior secondary kids symbolised all the school stood for, and junior secondary kids were just nonentities. Junior secondary pupils got a much worse deal in the new comprehensives than they had in their own type of school. In the new set-up, they got no boost.

4. Fee-paying schools did cause some creaming, but it happened on a very small scale. People wanted their children to go to these schools for social reasons - the value of the old school tie - rather than strictly educational ones. As I said, the atmosphere and almost pioneering spirit of some of the area schools in housing estates was very remarkable. Clever working class children do exist, but so much depends on the attitude shown towards education by parents.

5. The main obstacle was that the outward change in educational provision (i.e. the creation of comprehensive schools) did not alter how teachers saw things. I must say I was sold on the old system. It was better for each type of pupil. Senior secondary and junior secondary pupils got better respective treatment in their own type of school. The junior secondary stigma was still there in the new comprehensives, for staff and pupils alike. Junior secondary staff were 'also rans'. Remedial education grew because the pace was never adjusted to suit varying abilities. The race was to the swift and academic. The common course was a failure. Pupils were streamed and categorised and, inevitably,

the less able were pushed down and out. The whole comprehensive thing was a good idea thwarted by the persistence of academic attitudes and outlooks. The organisational problems which came in the wake of comprehensive education (e.g. mixed ability classes, group teaching etc) were never tackled properly.

6. a) To begin with the previous senior secondary/junior secondary split did not change at all. Comprehensive education called for a major adjustment - seeing all pupils as having equal value irrespective of their ability. This never happened.
  - b) Internal organisation within schools varied. Some heads did try the new ideas out, others were hidebound. The old senior secondary ideas did not die out. The main push and effort went on academically able pupils.
- 
7. a) It was a new idea which pointed towards ending the blatant separation of children into sheep and goats. Segregation by ability was rife in Scottish educational practice. The training, background and experience of many heads and teachers militated against a more integrationist approach.
  - b) Equality of opportunity should have been interpreted much more widely than it was, i.e. opportunity to pass Scottish Certificate of Education exams. It should have contained broader social education. Any new ideas along these lines were usually only tried with less able children. Academic children were not allowed to 'waste' their time in any pursuit not directly related to passing exams. This view is still current, and it prevents much experimental work from taking place.



8. a) In a comprehensive school all children should be exposed to the same curriculum. No child should be excluded from any subject for the first two years. Differentiation by pupil choice should only come after a trial period. Pupils should get a real chance, and not be subjected to the pre-conceived ideas of staff.
- b) From what I have said, it should be clear that I do not think the potential of the comprehensive school has been fully tapped. Much more could be done.

## SECTION B

1. The advisory service was expanded at a time when education was undergoing a series of changes to bring it into the modern world. The role of the adviser was to introduce and encourage subject development, to keep teachers up to date with new ideas in their subject, and to undertake research and development.
2. The main function is to promote subject development and related in-service training. An important additional role is to act as liaison between teachers and members of the Inspectorate and the Directorate.
3. a) The Director was not very well informed about my subject, so I was relied on heavily. He never demurred at anything I wanted to do. I just got on with it, and he was happy to let me. Requests were passed on the nod. I had a good relationship with him and his staff.
- b) Again, I had a good relationship with Her Majesty's Inspectors. They involved me in pilot schemes at the time of Brunton course

development. Her Majesty's Inspectors are ideas people from the Scottish Education department who tell you the way things are going, and what has to be done about it. I frequently had to temper their theoretical ideas with facts from the real world.

c) Advisers worked for and in bodies like the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum and Scottish Education Board, but had absolutely no say in their decision-making.

d) On the whole, headteachers were very co-operative. Many of them hadn't a clue about my subject so they couldn't criticise. The main battle was getting them to accept that the subject needed more time than other options.

e) I got on well with my principal teachers. The only problem was with those who were poor at their job. We organised regular meetings, and they often met in area groups. I was also called in to help out with individual problems in schools.

5. a) The subject has totally changed. It is looked at from a different point of view. All the gadgetry has changed.

b) Methods too are much more elastic. the subject has stretched and is much freer and less regimented.

c) In general, teachers have shown a willingness to examine what they do, and keep up-to-date with new ideas.

6. a) The problem with in-service training was that there was no compulsion to attend. It was always the same ones who came. They gained from what was offered, but many others remained in an

under-developed state.

- b) The role changed dramatically when we ceased to be called organisers and became advisers. Our main pre-occupation then became curriculum development. In the Chapter 6 group of advisers we had a long tradition of helping teachers. This was a new facet for advisers in the academic subjects. They tended to lay on a great many courses. It was as if this was the thing to do. I was always much more circumspect, and only had courses or set up teacher panels when they were necessary.
7. The main problem was lack of time, and finding a balance between desk work and going out to schools. The most dramatic problem was a sudden loss of function after Regionalisation. Things became much more formal. The old family atmosphere had gone. Everything is now Region-controlled, and Divisions do what they are told. A good illustration is the fracas caused by the Director's dislike of advisers, and his desire to have them removed. He caused a great deal of resentment by his paper in which we were to become field officers. The status and power of advisers has been drastically reduced as a result.
8. Yes, schools have definitely gained from having advisers. We are a link with the top brass, are the voice of teachers and leaders of subject developments.

A

1. a) Comprehensive policy initiatives arose from several pressures which came together in Scottish education in the late 1950's. There was widespread disenchantment with the old group higher, and the secondary curriculum was very narrow. The educational lobby came from colleges of education and members of Her Majesty's Inspectors who were critical of the curriculum. The educational press criticised the junior secondary/senior secondary split, and the curriculum's lack of contemporary relevance. There was also social pressure from Local Councillors who saw the hurt caused in families by sending children to different forms of secondary education. The lack of egalitarianism was felt, as was the obvious wastage of talent, which had been adumbrated in the mid-50's. A common secondary education came to be seen as a cure or solution to social ills.
  - b) Members of the social/political lobby, encouraged by the findings of sociologists, created an anti-elitist feeling in order to try to bind up the divisions in society.
  - c) I would say that moves to introduce the policy were coloured by strong political/social dimensions, which interacted to produce pressure for change, and a belief that schools could be agents of social change. Post-war feelings of optimism gradually grew into a confident belief that social engineering through education would create a classless society.
2. The optimism of the mid-1960's, together with the election of a



Labour Government in 1964 seemed to create a conviction that change was possible, and that people could achieve what they wanted if they had the will.

3. The immediate effect of Circulars 600 and 614 was to cause contradictory reactions and impressions. The principal one was of shock, horror and fear. The junior secondary school had a dreadful image, even though some good ones existed. It was a poor cousin, with images of the staff as failed medical students and unteachable pupils. The sudden realisation was that senior secondary schools had 'got away with it' for years, but no more. The junior secondary school was seen to be the place for kids with no brains, and the curriculum some got as a result was appalling.

4. b) In the early days in schools in peripheral housing estates, there was a much greater social mix. There was also a sense of adventure among some staff - going out to the frontiers to create a new Britain in green fields. Some saw themselves as leading a crusade to fight ignorance. However, many staff did not feel equipped to face the educational implications of comprehensive education, so a great deal of streaming took place.

a) There were so few fee-paying schools in the West of Scotland, that they were not perceived as a drain on the comprehensives. I had no consciousness of them as superior or more important.

5. The main obstacles to the introduction of comprehensive education in Scottish schools, as I saw it, were these:

- some of the buildings and accommodation were dreadful. Staff

were expected to work wonders in outdated premises;

- although resources were plentiful, they tended to be spent on 'able' pupils;
- there was a long delay before teachers 'got the message' about what was really meant. There was much presumption about what comprehensive education was, and how easily it would happen. Circular 600 saw through a glass darkly. Few headteachers saw it as the dawn of a brave new world, or gave staff guidelines. Essentially, what happened was that individual interpretations of comprehensive education were grafted on to the senior secondary model. Some older staff never adjusted, and regretted the passing of the 'good old days';
- there was a massive lack of conviction about the whole idea and no real staff development attempted for years. So there was a continuation of a hard-bitten, 'old school' outlook. The comprehensive school was viewed as a creation of idealism and theorising by Her Majesty's Inspectors and politicians. It was seen as being externally imposed, and it created a new situation in schools into which many teachers were dragged, reluctant and screaming. You see, the dominant ethic of the senior secondary school was: IMPOSE. ACADEMIC LEARNING ON YOUNG PEOPLE AND GET HIGH STANDARDS AND GOOD SCOTTISH CERTIFICATE OF EDUCATION RESULTS BY SHEER HARD WORK. By comparison, the comprehensive school was seen as a bear garden, and the cry from staff was: I CAN'T DO IT. There was an enormous lack of faith. Attempts to introduce new approaches were taboo, and construed as the wild-ravings of people who did not work in a classroom. The comprehensive school was an instrument of political will, imposed in a top-

down DOWN manner, and certainly not in response to pressure from teachers. Most of them lived in a different educational world, through which the comprehensive school idea sent shock waves.

6. a) The physical change from the previous pattern of junior secondary/senior secondary school was effected fairly speedily. The organisational/structural transformation was relatively smooth. There was no outright opposition or statement of refusal. But inside schools it was a different story. The shift was very gradual. Staffs were forced into outward conformity. So all schools were said to be 'comprehensive'. The system was believed to have changed by the political and administrative masters. Internally, no one interfered with what happened.
- b) For many years, internal organisational practices continued unchanged.
7. a) The comprehensive school was, theoretically at least, in the mould of the strong Scottish tradition of the parish school, the school for the whole community. But there was an opposition between schools as institutions and places where an educational philosophy with resource implications is worked out.
- b) Equality of opportunity was observed in schools but not ubiquitously or in the same way. Visitors from England were often struck by how radical our tradition was.
8. a) A comprehensive school has to be a certain size, minimum 1200 pupils. The school management needs a conscious policy to

provide and review opportunities for all pupils, and develop a positive attitude towards them. It should offer a broad curricular menu to cater for all its pupils' aspirations and needs. It is a school which does not just espouse equality of opportunity, but matches its aims to its practice. Staff need to be aware of the process and management of learning. There has to be a professional consensus and a feeling of corporate response in the staff.

- b) The potential of the comprehensive school has not been fully tapped. there is still a long way to go. The attempt to alter the system was under-resourced. There was a lack of commitment, a timidity, a worry that schools would lose their seed-corn - the bright pupils. There were also a lot of jackanory courses.

## SECTION B

1. Comprehensive education did not create the advisory service, since superintendents in practical subjects had existed for several decades prior to 1965. But I would say that the introduction of comprehensive education resulted in an expansion of and greater coherence in the advisory service. This was an attempt to give support to staff on the ground, and improve the quality of teaching as a result.
2. For many years, advisers saw their own subject as the main vehicle for their efforts, but in recent years, the pressure has been to adopt a more transcurricular approach. The adviser's function is to promote curriculum development in his subject, and arrange appropriate in-service training in a whole range of



matters that affect it, e.g. assessment. He should also concern himself with the staff development of his teachers at all levels. There is also a pastoral function in being an adviser, especially when things are or get difficult. Setting up working parties of teachers enables the adviser to disseminate good practice, and indulge in some talent spotting. He can also liaise fairly easily with other important agencies in the education service.

3. a) In the old days, advisers had pull and were frequently consulted. Much depends on the principles and educational vision of senior staff in the Directorate. There has been a great deal of drift of late. Much depends on whether the Directorate see a positive function for the advisory service. Developments in recent years have led to feelings of a lack of accountability, and much pessimism and suspicion. In this part of the world the advisers are a centrifugal force. In other regions things are much better.
- b) I have always looked upon Inspectors as people with the broad picture, and have enjoyed many fruitful collaborative experiences with them.
- c) Advisers tended to be heavily involved in Scottish Examination Board or Consultative Committee on the Curriculum working parties, especially at times when their subjects were undergoing major changes.
- d) My experience has been that, in the main, headteachers have seen advisers as sources of help and information. Many of them used us to effect change or give advice about the situation in departments in their schools. The recent Area Curriculum

Planning Group concept has strengthened this aspect of the adviser's work. A small minority of heads had no belief in us, and accordingly did not seek to establish contact.

e) My best professional experiences were with my principal teachers. Setting up panels for them gave a direction and coherence to the subject, and gave us a platform through which to operate.

4. Classes were usually arranged in mixed ability groups in secondary 1/2 and certificate/non-certificate groups in secondary 3/4.

5. a) The introduction of comprehensive education has had an effect on the curriculum and methods. I have to say, however, that things have tended to move with the speed of a glacier. Everything in this area depends on the headteacher and principal teachers. Their inability or unwillingness to change can hold development up for a long time.

b) Again, teachers have almost been forced to re-examine their ideas and reappraise their approaches by the reality of comprehensive organisation, but as I said a moment ago, the speed of change has been painfully slow.

6. a) I would say that in Glasgow, teachers' centres and in-service training have had a major impact on what happened in schools, given the right attitude towards experimentation by staff in key positions.

b) Advisers were centrally involved in mounting these courses, but

again much depended on each adviser's enthusiasm and commitment.

7. I would see the main problems in being an adviser as:

- a lack of time to get on with the main part of your job. A lot of time has to be devoted to admin work
- a lack of expertise in some fields and having to identify and rope in others to help
- never enough resources
- the operation of the voluntary principle. You always meet teachers who least need you, and you have to rely on the cascade or multiplier effect to spread the word.

8. Schools have unquestionably gained from having the services of a professional advisory service. Advisers have had a crucial role in improving the quality of what is on offer in the comprehensive school in two key areas - the curriculum and staff. Advisers can potentially enrich both by carrying the good word around. They can also act as a pressure group for curriculum development and resources to enable better education to happen. They can catch the ear of the Education Officers. They can create a context in which teachers as a corporate body produce the ideas and materials to get the job done.

SECTION A

1. a) In my opinion, comprehensive initiatives started with the Butler Act. After the war, there was a strong liberal desire to create a new society, and banish divisions between people. The educational system had been a powerful factor in emphasising differences according to presumed ability. the phrase 'education according to age, aptitude and ability' enunciated the whole thing. Everybody was to have a right to education, and a right to have one. That small germ slowly began to grow in people's minds. The Labour Party was an important force in arguing for change along lines of a greater equality of opportunity. It was thus inevitable that they should advocate comprehensive schools.  
  
b) I would say it was an educational/social idea at base, which  
+  
c) needed political impetus to get it on the move.
2. All educational advance takes 20 years. It was fortunate that Labour won the election in 1964, and was thus able to see the policy to a successful end. But 1964 was only the beginning of a long struggle to get the comprehensive idea accepted.
3. The major implication was panic and confusion - a state of ignorance. No one had thought about it. There was no educational thinking went into it, nor any substantial preparation for the concept or its application in reality. All that happened was that all pupils went to one school, or a split-site school, and people were left to get on with it. This proved to be an initial death-knell, because comprehensive education was



a good idea which was badly managed. Even in 1986, comprehensive education has not really been given a fair try. We have had a physical shift, a name change, but this has not been matched by a parallel ideological/conceptual shift. An elitist, academic model of educational excellence still predominates. Sadly, many people in key positions in the service still think that what schools are for is to produce the best, and give a short-trousered version of the academic curriculum to the less-able.

4. a) Post-war housing policies hindered a truly comprehensive system. There was no social mix in the peripheral housing estates, despite the good intentions of the people who set them up.  
  
b) There are two schools of thought on private, either that you should ban them out of existence or deliberately set out to make state schools as good if not better. I take the latter view.
5. The main internal obstacle has been failure to adapt an academic/elitist curriculum and assessment system to suit the needs and abilities of the wide range of pupil ability. The necessary flexibility of approach has not materialised.
6. a) The common course and mixed ability classes made an important start in obliterating the divide. Organisational practices, however, have not gone in tandem. Official policy has not been carried out. It has been like saying: this wall can be painted, and you have a choice of three different colours, but it must be painted. Nobody thought that some people didn't want the old wall repainted in the first place.

7. In omnibus schools there was enshrined the best of the old Scottish dominie traditions. The seeds, the possibilities of comprehensive education were there but not realised, because all the thinking, resources and efforts were devoted to the lad o' pairts, and getting him to university. So the concept of the comprehensive school was radical in Scotland, in that most schools were socially comprehensive, but academically selective inside.
8. a) A comprehensive school is one which gives equality of access to education to every child, and regards every child of equal worth, irrespective of his ability. All children can achieve something.
- b) The potential of the comprehensive school has not been tapped - or anything like it, essentially because too many people who take crucial decisions still are governed by an academic outlook. 'Education' is seen as the creation of the young in our likeness. Academic pupils allow staff to bask in reflected glory, while the others are expendable. A powerful obstacle has been the 5 Highers-University syndrome, which has been responsible for concrete attitudinal walls.

## SECTION B

1. The expansion of the advisory service is undoubtedly linked to the growth of comprehensive education. The demands created by the implications of comprehensive education meant that more thinking people were required to meet with practising teachers.
2. Advisers are there primarily to help and advise teachers, to seek

out the best practice and make exemplars of it widely available through in-service training or inter-school visits. The adviser gets a unique overview, and can set up groups of enthusiastic teachers to promote developments in materials/teaching styles.

3. a) We had no influence on policy, but were seen as translators of it. We had meetings with Directorate staff, but they were principally to trade information. Mostly they were a waste of time. We also provided a link between Director and schools. We were the eyes and ears of the Directorate without being spies.
  - b) I had excellent relationships with Inspectors. They had an awareness, showed a willingness to co-operate in order to influence advisers and therefore schools. Inspectors had well-formed educational views. The adviser could resist this mould by pointing out what was possible. Advisers helped to temper the idealism of Inspectors with a leavening of reality.
  - c) Relationship with the main bodies in Scottish education were human. Views were exchanged. There was no hint of dogmatism.
  - d) Heads went from enthusiastic to a position well to the right of Ghengis Khan. Many exhibited an intolerant attitude to innovation. It was as if they possessed the Holy Grail, and knew it all. Some blocked all that was new. If I had taken the things that some heads said to me seriously, I would have packed it in long ago.
- 
6. a) The ripples begun by in-service training could not be ignored. Talking to other teachers and meeting other solutions to similar

problems engendered talk which led to some movement. Advisers were crucial in setting the training movement up.

7. The main obstacle was ill-informed criticism and hostility, and suspicion and cynicism. Most people eventually accepted, but with great reluctance.
8. Schools have undoubtedly benefited from the services of advisers but, sadly, the Director wanted to kill them off. Directorate staff operate at a bureaucratic level of administration, and take decisions on buildings, staff and supplies. They are too busy to be bothered about the education of children. Advisers are a necessary layer in the service; they monitor, inspire and motivate teachers to cope with the reality of education - schoolchildren. The tragedy is that those - or most of them - who hold top jobs in the education service at all levels have no educational philosophy or vision or, at best, an outdated one. Many appointments are not made on educational grounds, so that other criteria are allowed to dictate the outcome of interviews. The results in some cases are disastrous.



SECTION A

1. a) The original moves to create comprehensive schools were made in the U.S.A. Locally, things began to move in that direction when Dr Stewart Mackintosh set up panels of teachers to implement the Junior Secondary Memorandum in 1956. He was personally committed to the philosophy of education contained in that report, and to enable teacher development to occur. These panels began to work wholly on junior secondary work, but they gradually spread to looking at senior secondary work. They were attempting to initiate improvements in the environment for learning, to create new ways or modes of learning.
  - b) I would say that the sterling efforts of a few hard-working teachers got the whole thing going.
  - c) Originally, there were moves towards a comprehensive system without really calling it that. The politicians enthusiastically grabbed the idea from teachers, and made capital out of it. Having said that, a lot of people thought that the junior secondary/senior secondary structure was fair and the best way to organise education for the two types of pupil. There is a widespread feeling that junior secondary pupils got a better educational deal then than they do now in the comprehensive set-up.
- 
2. Comprehensive education became attractive in the 1960's because of our economic situation. There were very clear signs that industry needed more trained manpower in an expanding

technological society. That need was taken on board by politicians, and developed into a radical movement. The comprehensive school was thought to be the best way to create more qualified leavers and tap the pool of ability.

3. The immediate implications of the move to comprehensive education were a) staffing b) accommodation. It also meant the gradual disappearance of junior secondary schools, and the start of moves to find appropriate syllabuses in all subjects. For the majority of teachers, however, the major problem was how to deal with junior secondary pupils, the like of which they had not seen. Many 'comprehensive' schools were in essence the former senior secondary school, with the junior secondary grafted on but run as a separate institution. The children continued to be taught by the junior secondary teachers. The absorption of both junior secondary teachers and pupils was made very uneasily, and caused much private upset.
4. a) The small drift of some able primary pupils at 12 into fee-paying schools, for reasons of social snobbery largely, did not materially affect state schools. There was no mass exodus in search of the benefits of the old school tie.  
  
b) I would say that the comprehensive experience was much easier in area schools in housing estates. They were all or mostly, new schools with better facilities. Much, of course, depended on the quality and educational philosophy of the headteacher. Some of them had not one educational idea to rub against another, and were of the 'old school' brigade. Those who did have a sympathy for comprehensive education, saw it as providing working class

kids with equality of access to Scottish Certificate of Education courses.

5. The main obstacles were:

- buildings (many inadequate and obsolete)
- chronic staffing problems
- a quiet refusal on the part of teachers to cater for 'the junior secondary lot' who were held to be morons, and usually treated in a derogatory manner

6. a) It largely depended on the headteacher. There were massive problems in closing and absorbing junior secondary schools. The junior secondary kids were prevented from making too many waves in established senior secondary schools. For a number of years there were few perceptible signs of change.

b) Junior secondary and senior secondary pupils were usually kept separate, especially in Roman Catholic schools. Staff shortage militated against integration. The party line was 'PROTECT THE ABLE'. The staff situation was so bad that some teachers gave up under the strain and retired.

7. a) Comprehensive education did not articulate with the Scottish tradition at all. The traditional Scottish view is that a pupil is not worth a button if he cannot do a formal academic course and continue to higher education. Pupils with other abilities were not recognised by the system. Comprehensive education in many ways was a radically new concept which was not generally accepted.

- b) Equality of opportunity was largely seen as allowing more children to do the Scottish Certificate of Education exams. Formal teaching from 'THE BOOK' dominated, even in well-staffed schools. Traditionalists secretly waved two fingers at Her Majesty's Inspectors and advisers. People were afraid to stray from accepted ways for fear of harming Scottish Certificate of Education results, and the school's reputation. The best examples of comprehensive teaching were done in housing estates where the schools had to make their own tradition.
8. a) A comprehensive school is one with a caring environment in which a pupil can find courses suitable to his peculiar abilities and skills, not necessarily involving formal exams. But that definition was never put into practice.
- b) Most definitely not. I doubt whether you can honestly say that we operate a comprehensive system even today. The reasons are to be found both in schools and in society. Curriculum and assessment were simply never tackled earnestly. The comprehensive school was never really tried out, but merely assimilated into the academic tradition.

## SECTION B

1. The original superintendents' duties were with staff appointments, materials and new school building. They were local government staff with a teaching background. Stewart Mackintosh, as comprehensive education became inevitable, expanded the advisory service in order to harness the activities of enthusiastic teachers by co-ordinating their activities in working parties and making them official. In his view, they were



educational thinkers and leaders of curriculum development in schools.

2. Advisers must have the necessary status and power to be curricular innovators and designers. Essentially, theirs is a research and development function. They are on the interface between management and the schools. That's how it was in the old days. The present Director of Education has peculiar views, understood by him alone. He is not of the proper calibre to run the education service. He hates advisers, and wanted to remove them. He considers them an unnecessary item on the payroll. It is clear that advisers are not now expected to think or make a distinctive educational contribution. They have to do what tasks they are assigned, and keep quite. He has destroyed advisers as a breed.
3. a) Up till Regionalisation, I had excellent relations with the Directorate. After 1974 we had our decision-making role taken away, and had much of our budget control removed.
- b) Her Majesty's Inspectors are grovellers to central government. They now tell the Director what to do in his schools, and advisers are given dictats from him what to do and what to organise. They are now dogsbodies in a very clear and firm line of authoritarian management from Scottish Education Department through Her Majesty's Inspectors to local authorities. Curriculum development has been taken out of their hands completely.
- c) National bodies are responsible to the Scottish Education

Department which controls and manipulates their operations, however much they may claim to be independent. No decision making is allowed to run counter to Scottish Education Department or official thinking, which is made known by official leaks. Advisers have no power whatever.

d) I had cordial relations with most heads. They too have lost their power, and are subject to direct political control. When they had power, they could either tell you where to go, or act upon your advice and dictate a syllabus policy to their principal teachers.

e) I was out and about and in touch with my principal teachers. I involved them in decision-making and material writing and in the collective determination of a Divisional identity for the subject.

5. a) Initially, comprehensive education had no effect on the curriculum. It remained largely static till Standard grade came. The syllabus was the Ordinary and Higher grade and junior classes were a preparation for it. The power of the book, traditional teaching methods and the obedience to Scottish Certificate of Education exams all ensured that not much real change occurred.

b) The biggest changes which occurred were due to mixed ability and raising the school leaving age. Both of these caused a number of teachers to investigate other methods or listen to practising and successful principal teachers who became the alumni and cognoscenti. You had to change just to survive.

c) The role of the adviser was crucial in creating the environment

for teachers to keep up. It depended on his personality and the willingness of staff to co-operate.

6. a) Some advisers controlled in-service training, and it really took off. Others did not. Through the efforts of enthusiastic advisers, I would say that a lot of in-service work made a very considerable impact.
- b) Originally, advisers played a great role in organising in-service work. Now their role has changed to that of implementers of official policy.
7. I generated my own problems. I never found my staff anti-meetings or anti-development.
8. There are three aspects to this question.
  - from the adviser's view, schools certainly have derived benefit. They have been, on the whole, a fund of knowledge for and a considerable help to staff;
  - from the schools' view I think probably yes, but some heads were reluctant to release teachers for courses, especially after the Red Book;
  - since reorganisation, I am sure that the Director and his henchmen are slowly moving to dispense with the advisory service all together. Advisers are now local in-service wallahs whose function is obediently and passively to implement official policy as instructed.

SECTION A

1. The decision nationally was a political one, but in Scotland powerful inspectors like Chirnside and Gatherer encouraged local curriculum development by recruiting good practitioners into high-powered working groups in the new set-up of devolved central authority. The edge between politics and education was blurred. For myself, the move in a comprehensive direction was long overdue. Only a minority of teachers had strongly pro-comprehensive views amidst a predominantly conservative profession. I was aware of a nostalgia for the bipartite system with its junior secondary schools with their suitably limited targets for their 'limited' pupils. Many people felt there was nothing wrong with the 'good old days'. Very few people had a real conviction about the comprehensive principle. I wanted a job in a comprehensive school because I felt a freak at Jordanhill, out of touch with the real world.
3. The major implications of Circulars 600/614 for Scottish schools were quite simply that an entirely different attitude and approach was called for in curriculum, methods and assessment, and this in turn caused conflict and confusion among the teaching force.
4. Fee-paying schools were seen as a threat despite the fact that some of them did excellent work. Deliberately shutting them down is undemocratic. Besides, their existence creates a healthy rivalry. Area schools in housing estates were - and are - a fact



of life, and people in them have to get on with it.

5. The major obstacle to the introduction of comprehensive education in Scottish schools was undoubtedly that, to be introduced properly, it called for a complete reappraisal of existing ideas about the practices in education. Scottish teachers are not good recipients of change.
6. For a considerable number of years, old attitudes and ideas had a powerful influence upon what happened in schools. So there was very little integration of pupils of different abilities, and much sorting out/slotting into perceived ability groups. No radical changes were made to the curriculum or teaching methods. It was much much 'comprehensive' in name but 'two nations' in reality. Only in the last few years has there been any real attempt to come to terms with the educational implications of comprehensive schools.
7. There was - and probably still is - a lot of romantic twaddle talked and written about how egalitarian and democratic the Scottish educational system was, when in fact it was characterised by social and educational segregation with 'ability' as the criterion. I think that deep down the political decision was based on a desire to effect social engineering using education as the tool. To that extent, it was a radical concept for the Scottish educational tradition.
8. Essentially a comprehensive school should make provision for all pupils in a meaningful and valid way. It should never lose

sight of the individual so, from a base line of provision for all, there should be a wide range of branching courses suited to individual abilities/needs. There should be as much genuine pupil choice as possible, and far less channelling and sorting. What tended to pass for a 'comprehensive' curriculum was a 12-14 subject array, with guidance and social education stuck on or thrown in, through which all children were paraded in order to determine which ones had to be chucked out. So the potential of the comprehensive school has not been fully tapped for two main reasons:

- 1) people in important positions were unable or unwilling to grasp its real significance and implications. Responsibilities were not taken seriously.
- 2) even if they had been, nothing like the amount of money required to turn it into a reality has ever been made available.

Also, change in education takes a long time. It is still the case that many pupils are turned off by Xmas in secondary 1, and the proportions of students in higher education from working class backgrounds have not been radically altered. Add to that resource shrinkage, falling schools rolls, closures and Tory government policy, and the prospects for the comprehensive dream are not good.

## SECTION B

1. The expansion of the advisory service was related to a developing comprehensive system. It was no accident that a body of professionals was felt to be required to review professional practice, and provide support for the strains comprehensivisation

would induce in the profession.

2. Advisers are go-betweens, professional brokers. They relate/interpret national and local policy to the real world of schools and try to effect a match. They provide help and support in the form of materials, methods, resources, management ideas. They must develop the entrepreneurial skills of an ambassador. In fact, that is what an adviser is for me: an ambassador.
3. a) Advisers had personal access to Directorate staff, but were never real partners in decision making. Their opinions were seldom sought.
- b) Initially, relationships with Her Majesty's Inspectors were close and cordial, but they have gone steadily downhill. There is not the same freedom of information. They are now an undermanned and overworked group, charged with implementing official policy.
- d) Headteachers gave me personally no trouble. It was all down to relationships, and how you approach and treat them. Most regard you as useful and seek your help.
- e) Principal teachers are the advisers' real parish. Some - very few - are pains, but most are a friendly and helpful bunch, even if a little too resistant to change. In times of crisis, they regard you as their boss.
5. Yes, both the curriculum and teaching methods have changed, but gradually, as an awareness of the need to review and reappraise priorities grew. I would say that what teachers do and how they do it are much more relevant for pupils, even if there is still

much room for improvement. The barriers of subject empires have proved hard to break down. Teachers have shown an increasing willingness at least to listen to new ideas, even if they subsequently refute them. Teachers are much more professional about their work now, even if that means being conscious of the skills/abilities they lack. They are more aware of how children learn.

6. The impact of Teachers' Centres and in-service training could have been much greater than it was. Despite the honourable intentions of all involved, much was done in a very ad hoc, amateurish way. The Scottish Exam Board has a tremendous power for change and development. Lanarkshire's Curriculum Development Committees were headteacher run, and membership was by invitation. The former Director gave high status to 'rectors' who were expected to keep teachers in their place. It was seen as a perk to be on a Curriculum Development Committee. That said, some produced very good work and ideas. Their bulletins were looked at largely because there was nothing else. The system lacked the facility for constant dialogue and interchange of ideas that many teachers wanted and needed at a time of rapid change.
8. I think that if advisers went, they would be missed. Most advisers have made themselves useful, even at the level of being someone on a phone to talk to. As far as the Directorate is concerned, their existence has increasingly come to be seen as a luxury on the educational budget. Advisers have brought about some change, but no more than that, by using teachers as change



agents. It was a good idea to create an advisory service  
'independent' of both schools and administrators.

SECTION A

Scottish senior secondary schools in the late 60's manifested an ethos of familiarity and cosiness. Many ambitious parents sent their children to schools which had solid academic reputations. ----- High School is a good example of the comprehensive idea working well. It was a four year junior high school which had its status raised in the eyes of the local community through being made comprehensive. It had a genuine social mix. Comprehensiveness improved the provision the school could make, and with its new buildings it soon gained a good local reputation. Of course other schools, like ----- Grammar, 'suffered' by becoming comprehensive.

Hugh Fairlie was right-wing in his political views, an able and influential man who sold the two tier system to his Education Committee. Scottish education has always been geared to academic success, and the influence of the universities on the curriculum and teacher training has been enormous. There is a strong subject basis to secondary schools, whose primary role has been to produce good examination results. There was a totally unjustified assumption that going comprehensive would somehow lower standards.

The early 'comprehensives' were not much different from the previous junior secondary/senior secondary school system. Once in, pupils were separated by ability on the strength of sometimes dubious assessment practices. Real mixed-ability work has been rare. Changes have been evolutionary and slow, painfully so. Munn was essentially a conservative document, taking a pragmatic view, and advocating small,

realistic steps. Comprehensive education was a big step implying a quite radical change of outlook and approach in schools.

In practice, since comprehensive education has arrived, only small steps have been taken in the direction required. There has been an enormous gap between the theory or rhetoric and the reality.

That said, the comprehensive system is much better than the previous segregated model. Now everyone does have a fairer chance. The concept of comprehensive education and its implications were grasped only by a minority of thinkers in the profession. It has brought a wider range of courses and much improved school buildings. Many developments have taken place which have attempted to make the comprehensive school more meaningful for children who do not shine academically. But we really did not get our act together, especially for raising of the school leaving age. Teaching every day is a very demanding job. The number of really good courses to emerge is very few.

A comprehensive school serves a defined area, and takes in a range of pupils covering all social and ability groupings. The formal curriculum is not everything. A comprehensive school should take a broader view, and encompass the social and personal development of its pupils. It should deal with the world of work, without taking an overly instrumental role.

The potential of the comprehensive school has not been attained. The problem of catering for all abilities has never really been tackled seriously. The less able, in general, have been given a low priority. Teachers have never been given adequate time and help to come to terms

with innovation. As a result, they have had to make do with second or third best. It has taken years to address the crucial issues implied by a comprehensive system of education. The fact that Standard grade has still not happened in 1986 says a great deal. Massive changes took place in the 1960's which rocked the stability and security of the Scottish educational system. Many people felt lost. A few keen people grasped what was involved. Expectations were enormous: the reality of schools put limits on what could be asked.

## SECTION B

1. The expansion of the advisory service was related to some extent to the change in philosophy and outlook required by comprehensive education. Syllabuses were changing, and there was a demand for support for teachers in the form of in-service and curriculum development. Comprehensive education was only one factor, however.
2. The advisory service is essentially the creator and provider of in-service and curriculum development. It provides support for national projects and also generates divisional programmes for teachers. It identifies in-service needs, formally and informally. Advisers are key people for teachers. It is a communications role - both with schools, the Directorate (whom it advises on the curriculum/staffing/promotions) and outside bodies.
3. a) Advisers have very little involvement with the Directorate, and are on the periphery of decision-making. Their major impact is in schools.



- b) There is a close business-like arrangement with advisers. There are formal and informal discussions to discuss national policy initiatives, and matters arising from school inspections.
  - c) Some advisers worked closely with bodies like the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum and Scottish Education Board. It varied with the individual.
  - d) The relationship with headteachers depends on how the latter perceive the advisers. In general, I found they welcomed us, and saw us as confidants. We gave them an independent view of the strengths and weaknesses of departments in their schools. Only a minority did not respect us.
  - e) I had excellent and close relations with my principal teachers. Again, much depends on their perception of your role and value. The majority wanted to be kept up to date. I held regular meetings, and issued a bulletin. The extent to which advisers can, and did, impinge on the work on schools varies greatly. Awkward principal teachers were decidedly in the minority.
4. The general practice was to have mixed ability groups in secondary 1, setting in secondary 2 and certificate/non-certificate groups in secondary 3/4.
5. a) Comprehensive education has had major implications for the curriculum, but it has been a matter of degree.
- b) Methods have undergone a very gradual shift from the overtly didactic which predominated for many staff. Pupil participation has increased, but not necessarily in a sophisticated way. Staff

reluctance to change, coupled with a drastic lack of appropriate in-service have meant that all that could be hoped for was an evolutionary process of altering methodology. Innovation overload has resulted in much tokenism on the part of staff.

I would say that now there is a greater acceptability of change. Teachers still tend to be conservative, but they have moved a long way. There is a greater willingness to take a fresh look.

- c) There was a willingness by the great majority to keep up-to-date with developments in their subject, but it proved almost impossible because of the pace of change. There has been a need to keep up with new knowledge and skills in one's subject, and new educational skills. There has been an approximation to the comprehensive ideal, dependent on individual enthusiasm and/or factors internal to one's school.
6. In-service had a significant impact. There were two Teachers' Centres for 32 schools. The considerable in-service programme mounted was well-attended, and helped both with practical (materials) and more philosophical issues, e.g. assessment. The fact that teachers felt a vacuum when there was no adviser for 18 months illustrates what a major part the advisory service played in organising in-service courses.
7. The problems I encountered in exercising the advisory function were:
- the difficulty of putting on courses in school time, and not getting adequate staff release
  - a lack of flexibility in the educational system

- the influence of education cuts, and lack of sufficient resources for in-service in general
- the system did not adapt to the magnitude of the change to anything like an appropriate degree
- civil servants, Her Majesty's Inspectors, Directors etc underestimated the demands profound changes in education make in schools.

8. Even though there have been varying degrees of uptake of the ideas spread by advisers, the teaching staff is unquestionably better informed than it would have been without them.

STANDARD QUESTIONS

1. There was intense political pressure for comprehensive schools. To the best of my recollection, there was no educational pressure even as late as 1962. Some Labour-dominated authorities had already moved down the comprehensive road before Circular 600 appeared - Glasgow, East and West Lothian spring to mind - and comprehensive schools had already been erected. In the Inspectorate the issue of going comprehensive had simply not been discussed. A man called Sinclair, a young principal who is now in the Home and Health Department was given the job of drafting Circular C600. There was hesitancy, even alarm at its contents in some Inspectors. The general impression was that they did not want to get their feet wet in this new fangled idea.

2. The 1947 Report was influential - look how often it is still quoted. But you have to ask yourself on whom? After all, NEW WAYS IN JUNIOR SECONDARY EDUCATION appeared in 1962!

As an Inspector in the West, I was appalled by the general standard of junior secondary schools. The quality of the teaching was abysmal, the attitude of the staff cynical and despondent. The 1947 Report is one that is looked back to as a repository of quotations and of sound sentiments. It is those sentiments rather than any practical suggestions which made it ahead of its time. Its direct influence in the 1950's was, therefore, fairly slight, and it was neglected by the politicians. When the Labour Government got elected, people could start to say things in public that had had to be left



unsaid for years. Brunton was very impressed personally by the Report. He had quiescently been waiting his chance to move, and the 1964 election victory provided him with the opportunity he had been looking for. It is no coincidence that major developments in Scottish education postdate 1964! His righthand men were Dickson and Forsyth, who also were 1947 Report advocates. So, I would say that the 1964 Election gave a release to the subterranean influences the Report had already exerted. The climate in the mid-60's was propitious for its re-emergence as a guide to action.

3. Primarily political, with local political networks providing an important and influential backdrop to the national effort. The educational outlook at that time in Scotland was highly meritocratic: the omnibus school was thought to provide equality of educational opportunity, and also give its pupils a good education and chance to get on in the world.
4. A number of people in key positions in the educational system were brought into action by the election of a Labour Government. There was a sudden engagement of their educational sympathies and philosophies. Horrific stories from Her Majesty's Inspectors gathered on visits round schools had helped to contribute to a rising tide of criticism of junior secondary schools. Selection at 12 was manifestly unfair, and the 'education' some junior secondary kids were given was shameful. One teacher in a junior secondary school actually said to me: 'THEY'RE NOT WORTH EDUCATING SO I DON'T BOTHER. WE TALK ABOUT THE LOCAL TEAM MOST DAYS.'

There were also favourable factors in a society recovering after the economic difficulties of the post-war period. Socialist impulses of the Beveridge ethos were actually being translated into real and material benefits. There was affluence, opportunities to do well materially, and above all optimism. There was a release of an ideological thrust towards the utopia which had been promised in the post-war era of reconstruction, and the professionals responded immediately to it. The period was marked by excitement. Funds aplenty were pumped into the education service. The expectations of what the education service could do were quadrupled at least. It was to be a main plank in the reconstruction of the 'new society'. Also at this time, mainly from USA, there was an explosion of knowledge concerned with teaching and learning - the universities and colleges played a major role here in increasing the expertness of the teaching force. For the first time a technology of teaching was emerging. So there was in the mid-1960's a release of energy which had been unvoiced during the war, and frustrated and even silenced during the 1950's under the Conservatives. People could now admit publicly to being socialists. They began to get the jobs through which they could effect change - and that's what they set about doing.

5. The main implication for me - apart from the structural and organisational ones embodied in Circulars 600 and 614 - was the development of school subjects, and a growing expertise of the teaching profession at their daily tasks.

6. a) They had 2 roles:

i) To effect change in the subjects taught, and get people to think more seriously about curriculum development. The Sputnik really accelerated educational progress, and Bruner's writings were very influential on senior Inspectors. So they helped to reshape school subjects and curriculum content. The thought was all about giving all children for the first time a worthwhile education.

ii) The District Inspectors were quite explicitly instructed to push the comprehensive school with Directorate staff, and they came up against real problems - academic, senior secondary schools with top class academic and extra-curricular reputations. Her Majesty's Inspectors had a hard daily struggle of argument and persuasion, and met strong resistance from both heads and others in the community. They were the frontline troops in spreading the comprehensive word.

b) They were very powerful agitators for the movement, especially at local level.

c) Directors were, of course, under instructions from their Committees, and were much taken up with building briefs and capital grants. Remember that it was not just a matter of ideology; many of them wanted to see new schools buildings in their area, and Circular 600 gave them the opportunity. So many Directors did a reasonably competent job within the limits imposed on them without necessarily being wholeheartedly behind the comprehensive movement. Stewart Mackintosh in Glasgow was a powerful advocate, whereas Reith in Edinburgh was a member of the

old school, and reluctant to be pushed. Most of those who were ideologically opposed to comprehensivisation did not offer active resistance, but rather a passive reluctance to do anything very dramatic or innovatory.

d) Comprehensive education certainly led to the creation of an extended advisory service. Subjects like Home Economics, Business Studies and Drama gained a new status and respectability. School design was part of the new order, and advisers helped here as well as with their principal task: propagating new curricular ideas.

7. A great deal. Much depended on the posture they adopted to the innovation. Some were progressive and pioneering, having heard a clarion call from afar. There was a heady atmosphere of change. But the reverse is also true: other heads very much took the view that Circular 600 meant the death of their school, and were unmoved by or suspicious of the new ideology of education. Others again just found their way to it quietly, did their best to make it work, because that was their professional job, but had little understanding of what it was all about.

8. I would have thought that there was majority public acceptance of the new order, with strong protests being restricted to vocal middle class parents in areas with established senior secondaries. They would construe the change as retrogressive.

9. It depends on their frequency - Edinburgh was in the lead with Glasgow next. There was some flight of pupils to the private sector on comprehensivisation. Parents with middle class



pretensions preferred to do that than risk their children being subjected to what they thought would be second-rate treatment in their local comprehensive.

11. The main obstacle was conceptual poverty which existed at all levels in the Scottish educational system at the time. Directors, heads, teachers, colleges of education. Mixed ability classes and courses for less able pupils were a nightmare because there was a signal failure on all sides to grasp the essential and practical consequences of giving equality of educational opportunity to all children. The issues were just not tackled. It was very much a case of more of the same. Some of the writings by enthusiasts in magazines like FORUM were just meaningless to Scottish teachers. People simply did not see where to begin. That all pupils were in the same building seemed to suffice, so what happened was essentially what had always happened. A lot of people were honest about it, either saying they were bewildered and at a loss, or couldn't stomach some of the implications. Excessive expectations were made of teachers, given the realities of the Scottish secondary school.
12. The rigid divisions by ability went on, despite official exhortations to the contrary. Where mixed ability classes were tried, the usual compromise was to set in Maths and Modern Languages. There was a widespread inability to tackle mixed ability groups. Teachers hadn't a clue, and got no technology or support. The concept of pupil motivation as a key factor in learning was not even considered, but Scottish teachers continued to operate on the traditional assumption that all pupils want to

learn and will sit quietly and be taught as a class unit. The possibilities were not seen.

13. It varied from school to school. The same failure of perception was apparent, so not much changed in classrooms. Teachers hadn't enough time, classes were too big, their elders were sceptical in the staffroom, their training was inadequate. With all these counter factors, and with the relatively under developed professional expertise which existed in general throughout the profession, it's not surprising that there was not much internal change.
14. I am inclined to favour some differentiation at the top of the primary school, for at least some of the time. In secondary 1/secondary 2 the approach should be pupil-centred, with ability grouping for certain skills. There is much to be learned from good primary practice. Each subject should have a generous time allocation, and there should be block timetabling.
15. I would say that a social consciousness gradually crept into curriculum design and planning c.f. social education, social subjects, R.E. Also, the creation of the guidance structure enabled staff to relate to children on a personal basis, and I'm sure at least some of the appointments made in guidance went to teachers who were positively disposed to the comprehensive ideology. On teaching methods, I'm not so sure about change. I would have thought that genuine innovations in methodology were confined to the few rare enthusiasts. The majority of teachers continued to use didactic, expository methods with little

recourse to educational technology.

16. a) I think teachers indulged in a great deal of scrutiny, despite the criticisms made of them. A lot of thinking teachers tried a lot, and made some progress at their own rate. The good thing was that, by and large, they were actively involved in changes made.
- b) In-service training should have occupied a much more fundamental place than it did. As it was, it was a reaction or response to the changeover, rather than part and parcel of it. Admittedly, a massive effort was made, but it is a moot point whether the effect was commensurate with the energy expended. Given that it was voluntary and largely in the teachers' own time, it is doubtful whether it significantly affected thinking or practice.
17. It seemed to chime in with the omnibus or multilateral school. But the influence of the centuries-old lad o' pairts tradition, with its emphasis on the able, proved difficult to eradicate from the professional consciousness. The work of McClelland and McIntosh on the refining of selection procedures was influential in the minds of many, however inimical it may have been to the more innovative and progressive spirit of comprehensive education.
18. People in Scotland get very emotional about this. It started off as the lad o' pairts again, but I think that the arrival of the comprehensives may have contributed to broadening it out, so that it is now seen as giving all children a fair crack of the whip.

19. A comprehensive school is one which is institutionally and professionally designed and organised to give every pupil the best possible education suited to his individual abilities. It takes all comers irrespective of their mental capacities, and tries to bring these out without imposing prior ceilings of expectations. The attempt is made to remediate any educational damage a child may have suffered prior to its arrival in school. The key target of a comprehensive school is to awaken motivation in all pupils as a prerequisite of successful learning. It should also have a wide conception of education - education for life and citizenship of modern society. That is what the reformers intended.

20. No, it has not been. The comprehensive school could have been developed much more cleverly. Several factors - the economy, politicians and the professionals themselves - have militated against its potential being fully realised.



GENERAL PREAMBLE

You must remember that the present Consultative Committee on the Curriculum is a very different animal from the ones in the 1960's - it is highly co-ordinated, all the branches are tightly integrated into a structure, and its programme of work is well organised. The priorities are largely decided for each committee by its superordinate committees. HMDSCI Chirnside was a central figure in recasting the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum in the mid-1970's. His view was that there should be tighter control by the executive committee and upper committees, and that the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum should develop a system where each centre related in specific terms of the curriculum to the geographical area in which it was located. Each centre had main committee with a representative of the colleges, schools, local authority and Her Majesty's Inspectors. Chirnside did not want centres to be subject specific, but to have a general curriculum role. However, there were obstacles to realising this view: resources, human and financial, and the difficulty of encountering entrenched subject-oriented attitudes. Nowadays, I would say that centres play a more meaningful role. The range of subjects with which they deal has increased. Each one is much more than it ever was to its own environment, much more meaningful in terms of curriculum servicing. There is, in addition, a conscious attempt to establish cross-service functions - audio visual, information technology, evaluation, publications and information. The aim is increased coherence. The Consultative Committee on the Curriculum now utters what in effect are programmes of work which will be followed. It is more centralised, and thus has more impact. This general tightening up ensued from the

finding of the Fairlie Report in 1972, when the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum found itself in the embarrassing position of hardly having been heard of or paid attention to. All Committee on Primary Education/Committee on Secondary Education members are also Consultative Committee on the Curriculum members. It is much more integrated, and is a force for the good. There is a better, more professional approach now to the enormously complex task of stimulating good curriculum development. Establishing priorities and having a co-ordinated plan are essential.

Although in the 60's and early 70's things seemed looser, and centres were a bit more autonomous. I don't think the 'freedom' was as great as was claimed. Centre work was firmly related into general educational thinking and policy planning by careful Scottish Education Department scrutiny exercised through Her Majesty's Inspectors. Subject specialist Inspectors were much more powerful than they are now. There has been a gradual stiffening of the Scottish Education Department attitude to Scottish Curriculum Development Service, a gradual establishment of more control, an end to what James Munn referred to as our 'baronial period'. The brakes have been put on. This is more apparent now, in addition, given the desire of the present government to have a firm control of curriculum implementation and planning in its own hands. Look at the almost implanting or even imposition of the Munn & Dunning development programme! One is aware of obtrusive and objectional Scottish Education Department/Her Majesty's Inspectors control in order to effect rapid and efficient curriculum development. There is a danger here: the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum has inherited an advisory status, where it is given time and a context in which to investigate a problem, then give its advice and have it observed. The current

administration wishes to curtail both the time and consideration given to Consultative Committee on the Curriculum. The Scottish Education Department leadership of noticeably less attracted to the idea of consultation. The present Secretary seems to be in line with a Thatcherist outlook.

1. I think the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum is a particularly effective vehicle for promoting curricular reform. It is not immediately tied to executive action, and is relatively free from constraints. Its structure uniquely enables it to sound the opinions of the profession, and involve all its strata if it so chooses. It also incorporates close relations with a great many organisations related to education, and attempts to develop ties with industrial/parental organisations. Its antennae are wide. It also involves the profession in curriculum development. The consultation system gains reliable academic and research expertise. It is not too tied to the government, and exercises a greater liberty of discussion. There is now a much greater publication of its projects. Its members are not constrained to achieve the ends immediately desired by politicians. The current government climate wants to make all the committees technically effective.

2. In principle we work in a devolved system. The Consultative Committee on the Curriculum is not involved in implementation. Its role is exploratory/investigatory. It tries to go out to the frontiers to explore what can be done. It is difficult to be prescriptive, even if it wanted to be, in areas like social education, equality of opportunity for the sexes, multi-cultural

education. Development lines are difficult to define. Teachers tend to be sceptical of Consultative Committee on the Curriculum recommendations because i) they are seen as adding to their burdens, ii) kids already have a packed curriculum for Scottish Certificate of Education exams, which are important for their future. So advice is offered in a genuine attempt to give positive help to teachers. But the activity of formulating and implementing actual change within schools must be left to others. That is not the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum's role. The reality is that teachers usually are attracted by what is seen to be immediately and practically useful in the classroom. That is why there are fears that Education for the Industrial Society Project with its specific circular support materials will fade into oblivion because it has no specific locus in the school curriculum. It's very difficult to assess whether curricular reform proposals get to ground. All you can really do is publicise them as much as widely as possible. You find there is a considerable take up where teachers are interested and are keen to develop their own work. It takes 5-10 years for an idea to become operational in any meaningful way in schools. It will either be accepted as being of use or die. The 'Tour de France' project is a good example - a unique and vast attempt to penetrate the system with the maximum coverage and involvement of all concerned. Growth in teacher practice can only be gradual, since the curriculum of the Scottish secondary school is still determined from a fairly early stage by Scottish Certificate of Education exams. Unless a specific curriculum focus is useful to teachers at the chalk face, the impact and credibility of the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum are lessened. So that's



what teachers want, but that still does not in my view rule out a place for higher level reflection about the curriculum.

3. The Centres were set up in 1971 as a reflection of the current thinking, and on the impetus of National Committee for the In-Service Training of Teachers. They were seen as the major subject areas of that period. Colleges were used as a locus because of administrative convenience. The compromise solution was to make them a college adjunct rather than independent, since there were doubts about their status, function and actual performance.
4. The relationship between the Centre and the Central Committee was close. Each was pursuing the same course. The central subject committee sanctioned major projects, and the Scottish Education Department assessor went to the resource providers to get the money, if he supported the venture. So, all in all there was maximum communication and agreement between Centre and Committee.
5. I would say that Centres were created as a result of official self-questioning, caused by the difficulties and real problems schools were facing in the early 70's.
6. These duties are listed officially somewhere, but basically the function was to help service and support developments in schools, to organise and assist schools with their perceived curricular needs and difficulties.
7. The Centres did not define policy in relation to fundamental

issues in teaching - only provided some help to tackle them.

8. The responsibility could vary, but usually the main impetus for identifying areas of investigation came from the Central Committee, e.g. Tour de France, Non-Certificate French and German projects. Sometimes Centre staff could make suggestions.
9. Appointments to committees/working parties were made on the basis of contacts with teachers and Her Majesty's Inspectors' knowledge of good practice. Now it is much more formal: local authorities are asked by the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum to submit suitable names. Once the trawl is complete, the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum chooses the membership.
11. We engaged in very little evaluation. It seemed a low priority and, anyway, its very difficult to carry out. We didn't have the resources and manpower to do it. Most of our activities were not of a sort that demanded evaluation. In any case, around 1976-77, evaluation became a fad, the 'in-thing'. There was a sort of band-wagon effect, but where it was tried in education it caused a lot of upset because of conflicts of value between evaluators and those being evaluated. Evaluation has a varying degree of sponsorship in Scottish Curriculum Development Service.
12. This was one area which never really worked - our Centre was hardly ever used by teachers as a resource. It was impractical, give its location in Aberdeen.
14. The post-1976 revision in effect drew the whole structure

together in a much tighter format, with Consultative Committee on the Curriculum and Scottish Curriculum Development Service being the main branches. Under Consultative Committee on the Curriculum are Committee on Primary Education, Committee on Secondary Education and their respective committees. In Scottish Curriculum Development Service, DSC has become the Service Liaison Group, composed of Secretary of Consultative Committee on the Curriculum and the Centre Directors. It is the ultimate deciding force - the Steering Committee where it all happens.

15. The Rayner Committee was a government attempt to find savings in public money through streamlining the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum organisation (inter alia). It set a limit to our staffing establishment, and killed off the Aberdeen Centre. This left on the table the possibility of further centralisation. The actual cost of the service is no different and, in effect, Rayner has made precious little difference one way or the other. There certainly has not been anything like the degree of centralisation in the service that would have been dear to the bureaucrats' hearts. Massive savings have not been effected. What has happened is:

1) an expansion of curriculum coverage in the 3 remaining centres

2) the question has been raised, why one centre out of four?

My own view is that a dispersed service has merits. A very fruitful initiative currently happening is that Centres are trying to develop links with local authorities. This would be lost if we brought the whole service together in one place. Co-ordination of the service and its activities is much more

important than the geographical location of its Centres.

### SOME IMPRESSIONS OF COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOLS

I think comprehensive education was the result of an immediate political impulse with educational overtones, and a response to a groundswell of feelings about the unfairness of the segregated system. Obstacles in Scotland were not allowed to manifest themselves in the political attitudes of local authorities or opposition pressure groups. The main obstacle was teachers' perceptions, and it was a very powerful one. It was overcome by the imposition of a structure, otherwise nothing would have been achieved. For many teachers, the arrival of the comprehensive system was nothing short of traumatic, and was seen as foreshadowing the ruin of the Scottish educational system.

The major implications for schools were finding a meaning full curriculum for the wider range of ability, getting assessment instruments to match this, and the headache of grouping children into classes and how this should best be done. There were also, I think, major implications for teachers' sense of purpose and level of job satisfaction. What was required was the evolution of a whole new set of aims and objectives. Some subject teachers saw pupils who had previously never been in their class, and a vast range of attempts were made to achieve an appropriate form of internal organisation. Much was attempted, there was much controversy and polarisation of views. As far as methods are concerned, any change which occurred was slow. A big block was that there was no change in the Scottish Certificate of Education exams to match the changing pupil population. Banding the Ordinary grade was never a serious response. Exams continued to dominate, but they were designed for a minority, not the whole ability



range. Only latterly has Munn and Dunning begun to address this problem. Also, we have only had partial success in our attempts to provide support for teachers in terms of curriculum development and in-service training.

Can you have one framework for all? Some teachers are fighting Standard Grade, because it represents precisely that: the attempt to teach the unteachable and assess the unassessable. We have only really begun to scratch round the edges of confronting the sheer enormity of the task of changing the educational system at the level of its curriculum and practice, resourcing it and supporting it properly. Sometimes the only way to create a framework for change is to change national exams.

The comprehensive school articulated in one sense with Scottish tradition, in which entitlement to education is due to all, but the level of provision is decided by natural endowments. The comprehensive school gels badly with that, because its precept is that provision should be decided by the system. Nobody really bothered with the bottom 60% in Scotland for at least 20 years. Even England, with its imperfect Certificate of Secondary Education, made a better attempt. But fundamentally the comprehensive school was in line with the Scottish tradition of egalitarian access: go as far as you can, supported by the system to achieve academic success.

It is incredible that a system was created which was apparently democratic and egalitarian and yet two fundamental misapprehensions were made:

- (1) the enormity of the task of curriculum and assessment adaptation required by a comprehensive structure

(2) the monolithic, almost ecclesiastical, presence of the Scottish Certificate of Education exams was left intact, its value undiminished.

Twenty years on we ask has it worked? Nature/nurture arguments have raged, and with benefit in challenging the both of them. Powerful theoretical positions and assumptions associated with comprehensive education are now under challenge. Especially in a decentralised system, change takes place at a pace dictated by public and/or professional opinion, which means that the bureaucrats can sit back in their controlling position and approach innovative ideas or proposals for reform with a 'let's wait and see how it works in practice' outlook and attitude of mind. Also, members of Her Majesty's Inspectorate, given the attitude to the availability of public information, are portrayed as an inner corps of elite within the system, surrounded by an aura of secrecy, and basking in feelings of self-importance.

PREAMBLE

I should say at the outset that, in all my involvement in Scottish education, there have never been questions asked about the basis of the educational system. This was a given. Many people also spoke as if there was a general assumption that modern events were simply manifestations of the continuing development of a comprehensive system of education which has existed for centuries.

1. On the whole, the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum has been influential. It is best to see its work in two periods:
  - a) 1965-75: The series of curriculum papers produced by working parties of teachers and Consultative Committee on the Curriculum/Scottish Education Department officials served a useful purpose. In the context of that period, they were a useful vehicle. However, the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum as a body was not known by very many teachers, as the Fairlie Report rather embarrassingly showed. Thus, during its initial ten years, it was not a very powerful influence. It has limited impact, and was really an appendage of the Department.
  - b) 1976 onwards: The Consultative Committee on the Curriculum took on a different dimension, by exploring in depth certain areas of the curriculum. It adopted wider remits. Although it gives important advice to the secretary of State, its main thrust is through the Department.
2. I do not think that the Scottish system is decentralised. There

is no question at all that the Scottish Education Department exerts a powerful influence. Bodies like the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum/Scottish Exam Board have strong centralising effects. In my view, such centralising effects are on the whole beneficial. To promote curriculum development of national significance, you must have a top-down movement. This is not to deny that good curricular ideas and work are promoted in schools and from schools, but a strong centralist emphasis certainly helps to spread them through the system.

3. Centres have always serviced the Committees attached to them in very many different ways. The main difference now is that each Centre is responsible to more Committees than in the early days.
4. I think Centres were created as an implicit rather than explicit response to the advent of comprehensive education. They were located in Colleges of Education in 1971 to assist development in four main subject areas. There was a general awareness that the curriculum was in need of change, not just because of comprehensive education but other influences in the wider society. But the real impetus to change was raising of the school leaving age in 1972. The Centres were certainly created in anticipation of that political decision.
5. They support Committee decisions on the curriculum by devising and producing teaching materials. They provide curriculum development support. There is a strong administrative side to our work. We also have evaluation officers to monitor our work. We are concerned with the whole curriculum development process.



Ours is a process model - aims, objectives, content, methodology and evaluation. The materials we produce tend to be highly structured. We also support curriculum projects in schools, and liaise with local authorities and schools, who have the formal responsibility for curricular provision. Remember the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum can only offer advice. Finally, we also have an information service on curriculum development and related matters.

6. The stimulus always originated in the Central Committee, and it  
+  
7. was the Centre's job to translate their ideas into effective practice. Occasionally, we provided some ideas on style, but the Committee took all the important decisions. Since no single group or individual has a monopoly on wisdom, the approach was by co-operation and consensus. Care was always taken to have a high number of practising teachers on committees and working parties.
8. Appointments to Committees were made on the recommendation of Her Majesty's Inspectors or local authorities through their advisers. The Central Committee always decided on priorities. In the early days the Centres had very little contact with the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum. In fact, it would not be an exaggeration to say that the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum did not know what we were doing. There was considerable detachment between Consultative Committee on the Curriculum and the Centres. Her Majesty's Inspectors had a powerful voice in their role as assessors, as had College of Education staff.
9. I would say that the Centre spread ideas on curricular reform in

three main ways:

- a) Production of teacher guidance
- b) Production of pupil materials
- c) Information documentation.

In the early period (1970-77), the emphasis was very much on producing materials for instant use in schools. Teachers were in need of them, and were willing to try out what we produced, especially for junior classes and non-certificate groups.

In recent years, there has been less direct emphasis on materials and more on teacher guidance, the impact of which is difficult to measure. Our purview is now much more diffuse. I hope we are still as influential. But with projects like Education for the Industrial Society, our reach may have exceeded our grasp.

10. Yes. We have a full-time evaluation advisory service now.

13. a) The structural changes which now took place (largely argued for by A.D. Chirnside) in 1976 were a decisive turning point. We got more commitments and a much wider remit. The emphasis was to be cross curricular.

b) Committee on Secondary Education is the overarching Committee to which all subordinate committees must submit ideas. It is powerful and calls the shots. It decides which projects get priority - 10-14, equal opportunity, multi-cultural education. All important decisions are taken by Committee on Secondary Education and/or Consultative Committee on the Curriculum if there are disagreements.

c) DSC was an attempt to find a model of organisation for a co-

ordinated service. The intention was avoid the previous practice of a plethora of Committees, and also to involve local authorities and headteachers. In my opinion, the experiment has not been particularly successful.

14. Rayner was both important and unfortunate. It was undertaken principally for financial reasons. The nub was whether to have a single curriculum development centre or retain a diversity, and arguments were evenly balanced on each side. The final decision was for a devolved model with each Centre expanding its remit. So Rayner consolidated the curriculum development service, which now has to justify its existence. The paradox is that as the number of Centres has diminished the range and scale of work has increased. Remember that centre staff are employed by Colleges but look to the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum for their daily work.

#### COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATION:

15. The main obstacles to the institution of a comprehensive system of education were:
- a) The selective or academic tradition in which many schools had become sausage machines turning out generations of pupils with certificates to go into University, and had gained outstanding academic reputations in the process.
  - b) Housing policies which had created area schools in large housing estates with populations with many social problems.
  - c) Teacher opposition to the idea.
  - d) The cleavage between certificate and non-certificate pupils.

16. To the extent that one can generalise, I would say that comprehensive education has been a powerful influence in changing what happens in schools. Most professional people have striven hard to implement its principles, but the degree of ideological commitment to them has varied enormously with the individual.
17. a) Comprehensive education has undoubtedly had an effect on the curriculum. We are very gradually moving away from a subject-based approach, and thinking people look at curricular problems in a fundamentally different way. It has also affected the status of certain subjects notably Technical/Home Economics/Business Studies. Their status has been enhanced, and they get a fairer share of pupils now. But assessment of the curriculum has not properly been addressed. More has also been done for pupils with learning difficulties.
- b) Methods have been changed by the adoption of materials which almost force methodological reappraisal. Otherwise not much.
18. In-service education had an effect, and responded to a perceived need among teachers at a period of dramatic change on almost all fronts in education - Primary Memorandum, Exam Board, Consultative Committee on the Curriculum, Guidance, raising of the school leaving age. There was a consciousness of the need to introduce changes, and a willingness to face them. Equally the resources to finance them were more plentiful than at present.
19. a) Her Majesty's Inspectors were there to implement government



policy. They never openly denounced comprehensive policy nor overtly dissociated themselves from it, irrespective of what they felt in their heart of hearts. The Inspectorate in Scotland has tremendous influence and impact.

b) Directors of Education are important people in charge of a massive administrative machine.

c) Advisers are also very important. They have a crucial but difficult role in relation to schools. Much depends on their calibre and personality.

20. There is a very definite Scottish tradition in education. there  
+  
21. is a strong devotion to a general academic education in order to turn out rounded products at 18 which can then indulge in specialisation at University. There is also a vocational impulse without its being dominating.

The comprehensive school is really an updated version of the omnibus school turned into the national norm for secondary provision.

22. A comprehensive school is one which caters for the needs of all pupils. All pupils have some potential, and it should be the central task of the comprehensive school and its teachers to find out what that is - to uncover the divine spark if you like. Idealistically at least, a comprehensive school is the only 'right' kind of school. Only in that kind of school can the needs of all pupils be met. But to do this, the school needs to be a genuine comprehensive school, not something else which is merely called 'comprehensive'.

1. The potential of the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum as a vehicle for curricular reform is very great but it has to be said that the reality falls short. I rate it highly, in that it represents all levels and interests in the education service. The valuable thing is that it is notionally free from central and local government control, although aware of political pressures, provided the government retains its faith in quangos like the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum. As a vehicle for promoting ideas for curriculum reform, it is a very good thing. The reality depends very much on the regional authorities' support: they can make things happen, but are often bound by the cost implications of proposed reforms.  
  
Some would cast a sceptical eye of these thoughts, especially the view that the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum is free of national political concerns. It is held that the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum is very much open to Inspectorate influence. I personally value Her Majesty's Inspectors' involvement in the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum. It is a fair statement that the influence they exercise is educational rather than political, when they operate in committees and working parties. They are not merely agents of government control. They keep people alert to what the government is thinking about education. We have a situation where Her Majesty's Inspectors can function effectively alongside other colleagues in the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum structure. A good example was the Munn & Dunning development programme: most of the running in getting the curricular reform

underway was done by Her Majesty's Inspectors. An observer from Mars might be inclined to conclude that that I think that national curriculum development is in the hands of the Scottish Education Department and not the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum. An even more cynical observer might say the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum is a charade, and that all major education initiatives (Munn & Dunning, 16-18) are Inspectorate-led. It is a conceptually bad notion in this respect, however: that Her Majesty's Inspectors cannot fulfil its central function of monitoring and evaluating the system, while taking a leading role in changing its practices. You cannot be referee, coach and leading player all at the same time! A case in point is Grade Related Criteria - an idea born in, and promoted by, Scottish Education Department. The little teams of lecturers and teachers who made them up sometimes did so under protest, but they had no choice in the matter. So, the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum is potentially a good instrument, provided relationships with other agencies in the service are right. The reality, it has to be said, is not as happy as it might be.

2. We have a much less decentralised system than in England. I think this is an area in which we have the balance just about right. I would not like a highly centralised system where those with influence and power could impose their will and authority on the rest of the nation. The degree of autonomy enjoyed in England until Keith Joseph came on the scene acted against the good of the education of children in the main. An experimental school like Countesthorpe College is unthinkable in Scotland; we

don't tolerate that degree of idiosyncrasy.

3. The relationship between the Centre and the Central Committee was symbiotic. It was impossible to say where one stopped and the other started. In my time, we worked closely together with teachers and Her Majesty's Inspectors. Nowadays it's different. It is much more an executive arm of the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum, since we service more Committees than we used to. The closeness of relationships has gone, although the quality is still very good. Staff has increased in recent years from 2 1/2 at the start to 35. And my salary is relatively speaking lower than it was in 1973. Centre directors are a very exploited group!
4. The Centre was not set up specifically in relation to ideas about comprehensive education, but to ideas about involving teachers in the control of their professional destinies. A key factor was the setting up of Scottish Certificate of Education Examination Board - a devolution of power in the field of school education away from Scottish Education Department/Her Majesty's Inspectors towards teachers who were influential in the Board and its specialist committees. The Consultative Committee on the Curriculum was in some ways set up as a counterweight to the Board. The Central Committee on English was set up first by the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum, and the Centre was created to service it and to service the idea of curriculum development which was embodied in, and worked out by, the Central Committee - and overarching philosophy or set of principles about English teaching drawn from good practice. Hence, the famous



five bulletins which, I suppose, constituted a certain philosophy of English teaching. Teachers in local groups would work out the meaning of this philosophy in terms of their own teaching in schools. The Centre, in other words, serviced a centre - periphery model of curriculum development by doing 3 things:

- (1) spreading the Central Committee thoughts
- (2) providing a resource of information to draw on
- (3) serving as a central point to which groups could report their work and have it spread abroad.

The Centre was a facilitator in a process of curriculum development that involved communication and an exchange of ideas between the central agency and the periphery. It had to engage in creating an organ of communication, building up a library, and school-based in-service and development with one aim in view - identifying and promoting good quality English teaching. Comprehensive schools were only one part of the scene.

6. The Central Committee identified policy issues, although officers of the Centre took a full part in the discussions of the Committee.
7. Again, it was the Central Committee, as a collection of Her Majesty's Inspectors, teachers, officers, lecturers. I never felt decisions were being made for me.
8. In the early days, before there was an advisory service of any significance, it came from Her Majesty's Inspectors, who identified innovative teachers. Later, advisers took over this role.

9. Since I have now been around a long time, I can say that things have changed enormously, even if not always for the better. Other factors, though, have been involved in producing change, notably, advisers, college-based in-service training and Her Majesty's Inspectors.
10. We undertook no formal research, but plenty of M.Ed., M.Phil and Ph.D theses have informally assessed the extent to which centre ideas have been taken up by local groups. Our original documents continue to sell, if that's any indication.
11. It was used to a very great extent or a very limited extent depending on teachers, and its accessibility. Our skillful librarian has been kept exceedingly busy at all times.
12. Yes, much time has been taken up initiating and contributing to in-service work of many kinds. Our publications are intended to help in-service work.
13. a) After 1976, it got bigger. Much of my time is now spent on administrative/systems maintenance work, when in simpler days I would have give much more to development.
- b) We were distant from Committee on Secondary Education. They were our overlords rather than friends, bosses rather than colleagues. This came over in a certain sort of behaviour adopted. The feeling was that they were trying to establish a hierarchical relationship totally different from the one we had been used to. At the basis of this was the very necessary attempt to service

curriculum development over a broader range of subjects. it would be less than truthful to say that things always went smoothly.

c) The DSC/SC stage was a blessedly short one characterised by over-bureaucratic management structures. The disappearance of DSC simplified it all. It was supposed to function as a management committee of the service. It spent hours looking at the financial implications of proposals and practices to a point of painful silliness. Everything had to be costed in terms of manpower. Time and motion studies were impossible to work out accurately or realistically, especially since staff were involved simultaneously in so many projects. The whole exercise served no purpose whatever, and the eventual break-down was inaccurate and made no difference. It did not like the DSC at all. The SC was a remote body for me. It sat down to discuss the future of the curriculum development service without inviting any member of that service to participate in the discussion - hardly a good idea! So I didn't exactly have a love affair with the SC either!

14. The implications of Rayner were all splendid. It was supposed to look at government structures, whereas technically and legally we were college-linked. Rayner wrought simplifications which were all of immediate and perceptible good. The Centre grew, absorbing the Aberdeen Centre and the Callander Park support service in primary education. It meant a huge increase in the amount of administration for me. As things have turned out as a whole - if we were not so strapped for manpower, stretched and overworked - the outcomes of the reforms have been to the good of the education service as a whole. We now provide a better and

more comprehensive service. The loss has been the inability to spend time in schools. The function of any full-time curriculum development person must include substantial amounts of time at the chalk face. This has been rendered increasingly difficult if not impossible. No contact with kids is a bad thing.

15. The major obstacle was a conceptual one - people didn't believe in it. The attitude of most of my colleagues in ----- school as it went comprehensive was that it was mad, and mixed-ability teaching the maddest aspect of it all. Teachers thought that politicians and policy makers had taken leave of their senses. The kids thought the same way, interestingly enough. I remember a discussion with a senior secondary class I had. An uncouth youth called Johnny, who no doubt has since grown up to be a respectable citizen, was deeply antipathetic to the idea of comprehensive education on the grounds, as he put it, that 'ye dinnae want they Temple Hall Yobs hinging about the High School'. Pupils and staff had been brainwashed into thinking that they were a cut above the majority of the population. All other obstacles in my opinion were superable, even those of accommodation. The block was attitudinal and conceptual. 3D had now to be taken seriously. Teaching styles and techniques had to be adapted for a greater range of ability. The prevailing ethos in most schools was multilateral - senior secondary and junior secondary streams separated but under one roof. The latter you kept happy and quiet till they left school. I certainly did not know how to teach them, except by some kind of instinct and sympathy.



17. There was no suddenness. Effects became gradually and eventually visible. The Munn and Dunning reform is the system at last seriously coming to grips with comprehensive education. Now there are clear signs that the way youngsters are taught is a response to the realities of comprehensive schooling. The crucial thing is that schooling is no longer negatively selective. There is no deliberate shedding in the system as part of its ideology. All children are now, in theory at least, potentially educable. This is an essential part of the comprehensive principle, so methods must change to cope with a wider spectrum of ability.
18. In-service training had patchy success, both intrinsically and in its coverage, but without it we would never have got as far as we have.
19. All three have played important roles.
20. Equality of opportunity has always been perceived as a good thing. People believed in it, and in a continuum of general ability. So was born the notion that you give people a shot at things and if they cannot cope, they say goodbye to formal schooling. This is seen even in an enlightened report like Ruthven, with its period of orientation in which pupils are sorted out into their place in society. Another factor is that some people will exploit the opportunities given, others will not.
22. The answer to this question is A GOOD SCHOOL.

I think in the early days perceptions varied from those who saw it as a necessary element in a good, free, equal democratic society, to those who saw it as the latest fad which would go away, and when it didn't, it just had to be put up with.

1. a) In Dunbartonshire no one had been thinking seriously about comprehensive education. Not long after I came to the county, in fact, I attended the opening of Edinbarnet junior secondary school. It was very much a bilateral system of junior secondary/senior secondary that operated until the advent of Circular 600.
  - b) The directorate staff under my direction and through them the headteachers.
  - c) The education committee. You had to take them with you by discussion and persuasion.
  - d) Honestly educational, from our point of view, despite the issue of Circular 600. There was a growing realisation that on educational and social grounds it was the right thing to do. In my experience, educational initiatives rarely come from Education Committees, but rather from the ideas of officials or promptings in Scottish Education Department Circulars.
  - e) The 1947 Report was not very influential here in Dunbartonshire. But, personally, I read it just after I went into administration. It certainly influenced my thinking. Omnibus schools are an excellent concept in my opinion.
- 
2. a) It didn't just happen. There was a long maturing and gestation period. Remember it took from 1919-47 to raise the school leaving age to 15. So the move was a gradual process. The categorisation of pupils by promotion tests was coming to be seen

as wrong. There was discontent, because although teachers could pick out the 'high flyers', and those who were not very able academically, the ones in the middle were difficult to be sure about.

- b) We were broadly in favour of the changeover. The damnation of pupils at 12 was suspect, but some officials were possibly a bit hesitant about the new ideas, especially about incorporating former junior secondary pupils into the same school as others. The problem of the junior secondary school has always been with us. When I was at school it was known as the 'Supp'. If truth be told, it will never leave us. Where you had a small junior secondary and an active, interested headteacher all was well--- but they were few and far between. It was jolly hard going to make them work.
- c) By taking the Education Committee and Heads and their staffs with you---getting co-operation at all levels of the service. You have to lay the ground work for major educational change. You certainly don't achieve it by sitting in an office and issuing memoranda. You get out and talk to those people who are most affected - staffs, parents, etc. They are the people who have to make innovations work.
- d) The first priority was to get buildings ready, and then to hope you could staff them. You also had to secure Scottish Education Department grants.
- e) My job as Director was to create the best conditions for the headteacher and his staff to do their job.



- f) 1) By holding routine meetings to discuss problems.
- 2) I do not think Her Majesty's Inspectors were influential with respect to comprehensive schools. They never exerted pressure, but tried to persuade if they sensed resistance. You also got to see their reports on schools and what was happening in them.
- 3) They were easy to get on with. It was all a question of +
- 4) trust. I wrote reports to explain the changes that were happening to my Committee. A broad consensus approach was adopted.
- 5) By getting their publications discussed with Her Majesty's Inspectors, advisers teachers at meetings etc.
- 6) We eventually had a whole host of advisers, after starting with only 3 - Music, Art, PE. There was an expansion to the academic subjects. They exerted little influence early on with regard to policy on reorganisation. Their main function was to liaise with heads and principal teachers. They were the people on whom we relied to involve the classroom teachers. They could also give us feedback on what was going on in schools.
- g) On the whole, a very amicable one. There were frequent mutual discussions of problems. If there was any pressure, it was me who put pressure on them for more money for our building programmes. We never had to amend our comprehensive plans. Geographically, Dunbartonshire was a natural county for reorganisation, so our proposals went through 'on the nod' so to speak with the boys in Edinburgh.
- h) The main problems were buildings and money. Some parents were not happy about junior secondaries being absorbed into older

established senior secondaries, but not very often.

- i) No. It was a gradual process that just went on once it started, like a ball rolling. It was conditioned by the availability of proper buildings, which in turn was conditioned by money.
3. a) A combined association of education officials and headteachers.
- b) Without question the Director of Education working along with his Committee.
- c) I had 2 Chairmen - both quite different and both clever. They did not try to interfere. It was an amicable set up. You cannot afford to come the heavy hand with Elected Members. Direct confrontation with them is disastrous. At the end of the day, they will win, simply by virtue of the fact that they are Elected Members.
- d) Educational administration exists to make things possible in schools. Hence headteachers had total latitude. Visiting schools enabled me to get to know headteachers and discuss their problems, e.g. the common course. I had doubts about the common course myself. Most of the emphasis since reorganisation has been on the less able, and not enough on the able, since a prevalent view is 'they can get on without teaching'. This is open to question. Most headteachers sorted them out by Xmas, and this did not annoy me unduly, as long as sufficient flexibility was built in to allow movement up and down at later points.
- e) There are bound to have been those who felt strange at the adjustment to a wider range of ability. We must have sympathy for the difficulties many teachers must have had. There were no

loud protests that I can recall. We left most of the day to day working out of the policy to headteachers.

f) They accepted it in general, and took it on board all right. There were no violent protests, except where established senior secondary schools with fine academic reputations seemed to be threatened on merging with junior secondary school.

4. a) The increased ability range of pupils to be dealt with by staff. It obviously would mean a lot for principal teachers - devising courses etc. Keeping an eye on all types of ability, and deciding when to sort them out into ability groups.

b) Not really. There was some fuss over drawing up catchment areas for the new Douglas Academy. But this was the exception rather than the rule.

c) It is inevitable that in academic subjects there will be sorting out according to ability. Some wee souls just do not have it - you can't get rid of that, so in a comprehensive school you bring them together for as many subjects as you can, like Music, Art, PE, or by involving them in extra-rural work. But you'll never get rid of the division.

d) I like to think Pirniehall Teachers' Centre was successful in affecting teachers' work, or at least making them think.

e) We had Kiel of course, and then several pupils from Bearsden and Milngavie went to the big fee-paying schools in Glasgow. But not in sufficient numbers to materially affect our county schools.

5. a) It was easily accepted up here. We had for a long time been used

to the notion of one secondary school for an area. Junior secondary schools were a modern invention. Of course, omnibus schools separated pupils according to ability, but the idea of one school with many levels of ability was by no means foreign in Scotland, unlike in England where the grammar school held sway.

- b) I think it was seen as an attempt to give all children the opportunity to show what they can do. But equality of outcome never entered into it.....that's a delusion!
- c) Enough said. Dissension was inevitable given the training and academic upbringing most teachers had. Such things are difficult to dislodge.
- d) I find it impossible to talk of schools now as I have been retired for 12 years. Schools cannot be separated from society. We live in an imperfect world and we have all shades of teachers. It all comes back to them, doesn't it? On the whole, I'd say it was a good step, given a good headteacher and a hardworking staff who could achieve success.
- e) My impression is that people were still thinking in terms of the omnibus school, that is a junior secondary/senior secondary under one roof, certainly at the start. Ideas like the common course and mixed-ability classes only came later, as experience began to be gained working with pupils of varying abilities.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS

1. Gone for the area comprehensive secondary, which, as I have said, was the natural thing for the county. There would have been no conflict.



2. Junior secondary schools came into being because it was felt that lower ability pupils (as determined by control/promotion tests) were not getting suitable courses in higher grade schools. Junior secondary schools were a creation to bring about special and specific courses for pupils in the lower ability ranges and make them relevant. But they were only feasible in small units. They were killed by becoming too large. With the post war bulge it became apparent that junior secondary schools simply weren't working.
3. This was not, in my opinion, a widely-held belief, but a little bit of it persisted, and probably still does. Social pressure against learning or being 'a swot' is very strong in schools, especially in ones where the great majority are not able.
4. This is a tenable proposition. There were similarities, yes, but we still had our own distinctive features in the Scottish system - a broad general education leading to higher in secondary 5, with no early specialisation as they have in England. It's a disgrace. Education must be as broad as possible for as long as possible.
5. The Association of Directors of Education in Scotland had a say on certain issues, and it did act as a pressure group. But the Department were not seen as bogey men. We exchanged views, and our opinion was sought on major issues. I remember that, at our twice yearly meetings, comprehensive education was a controversial issue among the authorities, and differing views were expressed.

INTRODUCTORY PREAMBLE

There was literally no dissentient voice when the proposition to introduce comprehensive education in the 1960's came up. The notion can be traced as far back as Knox whose ideas merely reflected the social outlook of the period in which he lived.

Only 5% of schoolchildren in Glasgow attend private schools, but ideally education should take place for everyone in the same building. But provision has always been made for those who did not want to use state schools.

Education in this country was born and nurtured in the Church. In my view, comprehensive education is merely the present day form of Scottish education down through the ages, articulated by Knox and made possible by the Church.

The underlying principle - that all children should go to the one school - is still evident in rural Scotland today.

Education has been profoundly affected by progressive industrialisation through the centuries; the availability of money and the inclination to get education in order to 'get on' in life have proved a powerful combination.

The senior secondary/junior secondary split was the natural division after a test in final year of the primary school. It is important to realise that this division was not made on educational grounds, but for

lack of space. All children could not go to the same secondary school because the sites were too small. Nevertheless, what happened in effect was the creation of two worlds: the junior secondary became a pale reflection of the senior secondary, with much more emphasis given to practical work, art and music (indeed, some of the best work in these subjects was to be found in Glasgow's junior secondary schools because the teachers were free, and would get closer to the children and build up a more intimate relationship with them). Also senior secondary schools were staffed with Honours graduates, and Ordinary graduates usually worked with pupils in years one to three. It was unheard-of in my days as Director for Ordinary graduates to be heads of department in senior secondary schools. So much of what happens in schools can be traced to what Universities dictate. They are the cause of over-early specialisation and the neglect of the aesthetic elements, which are so important for an all-round education.

Senior secondary schools had a narrow, stereotyped curriculum. The school curriculum reflects what society demands.

As I said, the senior secondary/junior secondary split was convenient, and occurred because of the lack of sites and suitable buildings for the education of all pupils. Junior secondary education was always regarded as a second best thing. This had the effect of creating two nations of sheep and goats. The twain never met, and gradually in the post war years the recognition spread that such early segregation was bad, since in both cases numbers of children were condemned to an education ill-suited to their needs and aptitudes.

In my opinion, comprehensive education is education under one roof with

no division on the basis of ability or aptitude. Comprehensive education won immediate acceptance in Glasgow as it was assumed to be the proper way to proceed. Hence its introduction never caused the sort of battles which happened in England. The introduction of comprehensive education takes us back to a fundamental question: WHAT IS EDUCATION? The only answer, in my view, is that it is the enabling of a child to fulfil his potential whatever that is. The diversity of children in a school means that the criterion of success should not merely be an academic one. If we were a truly teaching profession, then we should be concerned with the education of the individual. Education has been interpreted too narrowly and functionally in my opinion.

I have said that there was general acceptance by everyone - officials, headteachers and their staffs, parents - of the introduction of comprehensive education. But an important point must be made here: arranging for all local children to receive their education in one building is easy, but what and how are you to teach? Teaching certificate pupils is easy. For teaching in a comprehensive school many teachers required a change of heart. Many reports on education (e.g. Brunton) make a clear cut between different aspects of education, but it is not like that in reality. The most important parts of education are immeasurable. What counts is the quality of the product. Teachers can do a great deal of harm to children without being explicit about it.

I would say about comprehensive education that we have the form of it, and that as time goes on, we are getting more comprehensively-minded teachers. Real change takes a long time. Comprehensive education has been an on-going process of adaptation. So much of what teachers can achieve is conditioned by the sort of homes their pupils come from.



That is why, as Director, I always sought as many ways as possible of involving parents in the education process. To be effective education must enter the home.

The 1947 Advisory Report is perhaps the best-written and far-reaching statement on education ever produced - at least this century - in Scotland. It has a liberality of vision which has not been achieved in schools, and will never be, as long as we have an unhappy profession.

Comprehensive education involves a change of outlook, a change of heart, a change of attitude. All teachers in Scotland have an academic outlook, as a result of their own school day experiences and their university and college training. As a result, the non-academic children (a term I have never been happy with) tend to get pushed out.

We must be aware of the criss-cross interaction between school and society. A school is only as good as its headteacher, whose job it is to set the tone and atmosphere.

#### ANSWERS TO SPECIFIC QUESTIONS

1. a) The post war policy sources can be traced back to John Knox and the First Book of Discipline.
- b) The Director of Education and his officials and members of the Education Committee.
- c) The support of all involved - headteachers, teachers and parents, not forgetting local inspectors.
- d) Unquestionably educational. This was the right thing to do.

e) This excellent and outstanding document confirmed a view of education that has existed in Scotland for centuries. It undoubtedly gave a stimulus to thinking about education on comprehensive lines, especially the curriculum.

2. a) Because there was a liberality of outlook. People had jobs and money. The prevailing spirit of the age was ripe for the introduction of comprehensive schools.

b) It was fully accepted with no disagreement over its principles. It was recognised, however, that there would be tremendous difficulties, especially with teachers and the attitudes picked up in their educational upbringing and training.

c) It created a flurry of professional activity to deal with the practical implications of comprehensive education. We had teacher panels meeting all over the place to stimulate discussion.

d) By convening meetings of headteachers, and by office staff visiting schools. I tried to visit at least one school a day during my time as Director. The purpose of the visits was not to coerce, but to praise and give encouragement. As a Director, you must count on headteachers to give a lead.

e) The Directors most important role is to create the right atmosphere in the education offices and in his professional team, and to be responsive to any requests from schools.

f) 1) Very closely.

2) Close co-operation at all times, with Her Majesty's Inspectors meeting us more than half way.

- 3) They always gave their general blessing to anything we wanted to do.
  - 4) It was always behind us - genuinely concerned about what was happening in schools.
  - 5) Little experience, since it only came into existence in 1965.
  - 6) Their essential function was to spread the good news and ideas about educational developments, and give the impression in schools that they were dealing with a generous authority.
- g) No, I would say that the relationship was essentially one where the two spheres of influence interacted.
- h) Inadequate buildings, chronic and perennial staff shortage and traditional attitudes among teachers. The latter we attempted to overcome by persuasion, and emphasis on examples of good practice.
- i) Yes, it had to be constantly adapted to meet new needs as they arose.
3. a) It really was a co-operative effort of all involved - Director and his staff, Her Majesty's Inspectors, and headteachers and staff.
- b) Weekly Directorate meetings, meetings with headteachers and meeting of advisers and their teachers. We relied on the former to stimulate developments in schools.
- c) Uniformly encouraging during my 25 years as Director. I was blessed with a succession of Chairmen who were all interested and backed us in what we were trying to do.

- d) Complete latitude to get on with it within the obvious financial resources. We encouraged them to report progress to us.
  - e) There was a generally good spirit abroad. The main involvement was through the panels, but headteachers were expected to meet with their staffs and spread the word, so as to obtain a general consensus on the basic principles.
  - f) It was accepted without criticism, and therefore, I suppose, widely accepted. It came as a great blessing for many parents, whose children now were not segregated or rejected at 12, and thus had more real opportunities in education to achieve what they were capable of.
4. a) To get on with job of making comprehensive education work, that is give a worthwhile education to all kinds of children.
- b) Not that I can recall. In any case, it had been happening since the 1950's with schools like Crookston Castle and St. Augustine's
  - c) You would really have to see headteachers for precise details, since there was no coercion on my part or that of my staff. The new outlook was welcomed and embraced generally by most staff, although it entailed a good deal of rethinking and posed a challenge - how do you effectively educate all children of widely divergent abilities in one building? I would say that the introduction of comprehensive schools changed the whole atmosphere in schools.
  - d) They had an essential function in developments, and allowed teachers to meet of their own volition, and use the generous resources provided by the Authority to assist them in their work.



They are the most important step that we took. Their impact on schools is difficult to assess.

e) They did not exert an overt influence. There was no criticism of their existence, nor did they criticise us. There was a mutual eligibility scheme for staff. It is true to say that in general very able children went to these schools, so local comprehensive schools must have suffered to that extent. Although they had some excellent teachers, who by dedication and hard work got creditable results for virtually all their pupils, they only had one criterion - academic success.

5. a) The immediate implication was a challenge to elitist views and notions of early specialisation and streaming according to ability. It also provided a chance for practical subjects and Music/Art to make a contribution to the education of all children.

b) Scotland has always been a poor country and had a divisive society. The concept goes back to Knox. Most people agreed with it in principle, but had to face the consequences of translating it into a reality in the classroom.

c) They did not in general, and to a certain extent still do not. There is still a lot of (dedicated and good) teaching for exams. This is a target for many teachers. I think the colleges have an important role here.

d) I do not think so, nor in a sense can it ever be, given the constantly changing nature of society. But unquestionably things are moving in the right direction. None of us have the answers,

but we know what we would like to see.

- e) People had a limited idea of what it really was at the outset. But I would say that the interpretation has changed gradually as teachers have got down to the job. There is still, despite all the difficulties, a general acceptance of the comprehensive school as being firmly within the Scottish tradition. Schools can only ever supplement the home.

#### POSTSCRIPT

I would say that the function of Association of Directors of Education in Scotland was to discuss questions of educational importance, and provide in-service training for education officials within a social context. There's a lot in the tinkle of a teacup to break down barriers.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS

1. I think you can rule out conflict with Secretary of State. I cannot recall any conflict of substance from that quarter at any time - and only then on funds and their availability, but not on matters of educational policy. I may say that Her Majesty's Inspectors were always with us, and my steps towards change were usually talked over with them at our frequent meetings.  
  
Remember that all of our new secondary schools built in the post war era prior to Circular 600 were community comprehensives. And never any objection from any Councillor on either side. I think Circular 600 encouraged us to extend and set up the comprehensive idea in manageable forms, e.g. the linking of senior secondary/junior secondary like Queen's Park/Battlefield,

Whitehill/Onslow Drive. Split schools were a bad idea on reflection. A comprehensive school as a manageable entity should be more or less under one roof, and give opportunities to pupils of all abilities to mix in playground, dining room, assemblies, extra-curricular activities, and subjects like Music, Art, PE. There should be an easy passage between streams as potential emerges - and, most important, one recognisable head. Remember that decisions made at 12 in the old junior secondary/senior secondary system made movement between pre-ordained sections and classes virtually impossible.

2. In the whole of my career I never knew of the Scottish Education Department to separate 'sheep' from 'goats', certainly not if this meant education in separate buildings. It certainly was a policy like this which operated in Aberdeen City where I was Director of Education for 2 years - a tidy, black and white division. Education was an industry in Aberdeen, with a good supply of highly trained teachers and the backing of an interested community.

Glasgow held different views, but in urban areas the junior secondary/senior secondary split had become so well entrenched that junior secondary schools became perpetuated. In these cases, the quality and views of the Director of Education assumed crucial importance.

3. I suppose the view existed among some that the senior secondary school provided a better ladder for the lad o'pairts to get to the top, at first sight at any rate. It would be no more than sensible that this view would be held. Admission to senior

secondary by having first attained the standard required could provide the necessary spur to aim higher, provided the home background was good.

But, in practice it all depends what kind of provision the comprehensive school makes to enable each pupil to achieve their potential. To run a truly comprehensive school, I used to say, is an exceedingly difficult business. Children tend to live up to teachers' expectations. Gifts and talents they unwittingly possess can easily become obscured. It is the teacher's job to reveal and encourage each pupil's potential to fulfilment. I think this would make schools much happier places. I hazard the view that many former junior secondary pupils have made their way in many walks of life, leaving some of their senior secondary peers behind them - not, of course, that this is the aim of comprehensive education or indeed of any education worthy of the name.

4. England had little if anything to do with developments in Scotland. I found the comprehensive schools I visited in England very good, because I wanted to be shown the best. They all had the good fortune to have enlightened heads and an effective administrative system. My objection - a real one - was their size. With a roll of 2400 a school can be successful if it is well run and offers a wide range of options to its pupils - a good criterion of an effective comprehensive school in itself. But the penalty is that it loses personality - the head doesn't know his pupils, nor do the staff know them or their colleagues, and thus all involved don't really get together and grasp what the school is after and act accordingly. I come down on a



maximum roll of 1000, minimum 800. Ways and means should be found to overcome the option problem. In the end a difficult - sometimes impossible - task, but well worth it.

1. a) I think the whole idea started with Dr. Hepburn, my predecessor, in the years between 1945-50. At that time local schools had junior secondary departments, and in Lanarkshire, we had the burgeoning East Kilbride to consider, I mean, what kind of educational provision we were going to make. In order to stimulate thinking on this, I wrote a memorandum which outlined a favourite idea of mine - a constellation of junior high schools round one senior high school with transfer by choice at the usual points. At this time you must remember that members of the Labour Party were not all died in the same wool. By the 1960's there were matters pressing on the Directors - raising of the school leaving age and the post war bulge. In Lanarkshire, we were concentrating on the design of schools much more than on the local pattern. We were also concerned to work out what would complement what we already had. The government was allocating millions to housing programmes, but less to education and health, spending on which was much more controlled. Together with my Chairmen, I cast around for a rationale for secondary education in the 1950's, before Circular 600 was issued. I was concerned not to go for comprehensive reorganisation 'hook, line and sinker', but to examine critically its later successes or failures. In any case, results in our secondary schools showed time and again that our selection procedures at primary seven were valid, and we also had a very fair appeals mechanism. Of course, the left-wing view in the Labour Party was that selection merely resulted in the self-fulfilling prophecy. I remember my Chairman and I went down to Hull to see that pioneering

comprehensive school called David Lister, with Rowe its headteacher - an ebullient man, but, with respect, rather a charlatan. The management of a comprehensive school is really a matter for the head and his staff, not for Directorate staff. In any case, I was much more impressed with our long standing Scottish system, with the Higher as its pivotal point, which militated against the formation of Sixth form colleges. In Scotland we had long realised that the academic, 5 'Higher' + university syndrome was not the only type of education, and we had official reports - e.g. Brunton - which showed that we were aware that education should be relevant to life outside, and that it was not a disgrace to take vocationally-orientated courses.

In rural areas in Lanarkshire we had omnibus schools like Biggar and Lanark, and in other areas we had some excellent junior secondary schools like Douglas Water and Motherwell Central, where a lot of good work was done by teachers who looked for success where it was - in their pupils.

Then of course 'Ordinary' grades came along in 1962 and suddenly educational results meant certificate passes only. My ideal would have been a system of middle schools to act a sort of shoehorn from primary to secondary where pupils could get lots of faster courses to determine what they could do, and then they would be free to proceed either to a senior high school or go to a college of Arts and Crafts of their own volition and without selection.

- b) Directorate staff and building/architects departments mainly, and
- + c) we always tried to take the Education Committee along with us.
- d) I wasn't conscious of any political push. My impression was that

the Committee and its Chairmen were disinclined to take political directives as relevant to education. The vast majority of them saw the Director of Education as the provider of advice and guidance on what was best for their County. All that mattered was that they were happy with how schools were in Lanarkshire.

e) Fellow feeling makes you wondrous kind, but I thought it was really a document calculated to inspire the classroom teacher rather than generate an upheaval in educational ideas or practice. In any case, it was pigeon-holed by the Scottish Education Department, and thus was left to the headmasters and staffs to consult if they wished.

2. a) Because without a shadow of a doubt it was Labour Party dogma and had been for a time. At last in Government, they got a chance to make it official policy. I well remember that at several meetings, Judith Hart was the chief proselytiser for it up here, despite the fact that she moved home from Lanark to Surrey, and sent her children to selective schools because she claimed 'Surrey has no comprehensive schools'.

b) Entirely favourable, as we were ahead of it in the thinking we were doing.

c) My Committee looked at the implementation of a pattern of comprehensive schools along the lines of Circular 600 and in the light of my memorandum. There was a special meeting at which my ideas were defeated by a resolution to go for all-through comprehensive schools. I learned later that the resolution was handed to my Chairman by the leader of the Labour Group as he walked through the door. It had been formulated the Sunday



before by a group of party members at an extraordinary meeting in a local cinema.

- d) It would best be described as 'catch as catch can'. The main things were to eliminate selection and amalgamate senior secondary and junior secondary schools. But we still retained it for screening purposes, to see what happened to this supposed intelligence level when it got to the new comprehensives. The other major thing was to create roofs over heads. The buildings aspect was inescapable in the whole thing. So, naturally, was acquiring the necessary grants to do it, once it had been decided that we were working to the Henry Ford Model of the all-through comprehensive school.
- e) My main job was, as I saw it, to get good schools designed, with proper facilities and staffing standards. I also wrote a memorandum on the House System as a necessary part of the comprehensive school. Notice I call it house-system and not guidance, because its aim was to create a community spirit. Form teachers were mentors and housemasters helped them by doing extra legwork and organising visits and speakers....that sort of thing. The full concept to my mind was never realised. What was originally conceived as providing social education, character building and personality development became at the end of the day a system of 'do-gooding' for the school dunces and misfits.
- f) 1) I didn't call heads to meetings very much - there was an association of secondary heads and senior secondary heads. Sometimes they had me along as their guest so to speak, but not often.

2) Her Majesty's Inspectors provided neither direction nor exerted any pressure that I was aware of. In any case, I made it clear that that sort of thing didn't happen - nor had it ever - in Lanarkshire. They probably peddled their ideas about mixed-ability and the common course around the schools.

3) On the whole, and apart from the comprehensive notion which

4) defeated the ideas in my memorandum, they were satisfied with my suggestions throughout my Directorship.

5. The Consultative Committee on the Curriculum was really only starting, but I did not pay very much attention to their statements.

6. We were very slow on this one in Lanarkshire, although we did have organisers in Music, Technical and PE. I always thought that they were not as much of a necessity when we were short of teachers. But, as staffing improved they became an essential part of the machinery. I saw them as field officers who dealt primarily with supplies and design, and reported on these to my Assistant Director (Secondary Education). In schools they took to do with the curriculum in discussions with heads and principal teachers.

g) The main arguments were about our demands for money. I found the Scottish Education Department very tight on money matters. The main aim was to create the places, the organisational pattern was achieved in the by-going as it were. We had about 1000 temporary classrooms in Lanarkshire schools when I retired. We had many meetings with them, sometimes on a Fair Friday - imagine that! I

always thought their attitude to money was summed up by the Song 'YES MY DARLING DAUGHTER', where the mother allows her daughter to go to the river but not to get wet: they wanted us to create a system of all-through comprehensive schools, but would not let us have enough money to organise it properly.

- h) There were none that I remember. It just went on once it started because it was the accepted thing. I suppose split-site schools created problems for those in schools, and occasionally my advice was sought. I always said secondary 1/2 in the annexe, secondary 3/6 in main building.
  - i) No there were no changes made that I recall.
3. a) The main one was for us on the Directorate Staff to work out the design and finance implications of the Committee's decision to accept a pattern of all-through comprehensive schools. Then it was up to the headteachers to get on with it.
- b) The Education Committee, after seeking my advice.
  - c) They were in general a co-operative and helpful bunch of people, but they were still determined to get their comprehensive policy through, irrespective of my thoughts on the matter.
  - d) No, it didn't really concern me what was happening in schools, so I purposely did not interfere or visit schools much. The one exception was my scheme for the staff structure and associated roles. Headteachers got on with their job as they wished.
  - e) I didn't really investigate how teachers reacted. But, I have a strong impression from comments made that many thought that the

move to comprehensive schools allowed 'the scruff' to enter schools and lower their tone. I think it probably had done this. It was very clear that, for some headteachers it was a change for the worse. Pupils became much more difficult to deal with, and the submerged tenth of parents caused a lot of problems with their kids who compensated for their educational failure by disruptive behaviour and vandalism. With them, no improvement was possible other than rebirth.

- f) No complaints at all, in fact ironically, we had more complaints and appeals about our selection procedures when we had junior secondary/senior secondary schools. Getting rid of selection was welcomed by parents because it ended the trauma it undoubtedly caused for many of them.
4. a) Getting adequate supplies and sufficient teachers to staff schools, and split site schools were the main and most serious problems.
- b) Not at all, except for split-site buildings.
  - c) I do not really know enough about that. This was really the headmaster's job and concern. I hoped they wouldn't do mixed ability in the main academic subjects - in PE/Art/Music O.K. Anyway, I did not see it as my job to issue directives. Headmasters were there to run the schools in their own way - that's why they were appointed after all.
  - d) They provided a meeting place for our subject panels and committees which did great work. I put a headteacher in charge of each because I thought somebody authoritative should be in



charge. They also were allowed to do things their own way. They published newsletters and booklets, some of which were the object of admiration at training colleges.

- e) I think they caused disappointment when they vanished - like Hamilton Academy and Elmwood - and lost their traditional reputation and standing both for teaching and extra-curricular activities.

I have to admit that I was not very sensitive to criticism - it was like water off a duck's back to me. There was no point in discussing it once the decision to go comprehensive had been taken. Discussion about disappearing traditions was futile in my view.

5. a) I think they were probably looked on as a new development of the omnibus school, of which we had had many for decades in Scotland. They certainly did not engender the bitterness that the extinction of the grammar schools did in England. I think comprehensive schools were seen as an extension of the familiar.
- b) Equality of opportunity? What's the difference between a pound of margarine and a pound of butter? I always resisted strongly the emphasis on thinking about equality. The proper criterion in my view is the appropriateness of the education a child receives to his social background, and what has gone before in the primary school. It must concern itself with his abilities and aspirations. A school is successful if it results in gracious living with no wants or harshness.
- c) Not very well. It called for a big adjustment for some of them,

and you always get teachers who are simply not interested, or don't know how to do their job. A lot of them were concerned only with subjects and facts, and didn't think that education can also be about things like personality, character in pupils.

- d) I don't honestly know, but I suspect that what was hoped for them by the theorists cannot possibly ever be hoped for given the way life is in a secondary school.
- e) I would say it was seen as a vehicle for providing an appropriate education for all children, with much greater emphasis on social education and things like that for the less able.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS

1. The Committee decided they wanted all - through comprehensive schools so that was that. There would have been no conflict, as we were already building up to it; so it would just have happened anyway.
2. General differences in ability have always been recognised and dealt with in the Scottish educational system. Advanced divisions became junior secondary schools in order to cope with the numbers. Junior secondaries were really an administrative convenience, a historical development of large advanced divisions and 'lost' primary schools. The creation of junior secondary schools was probably seen as progress at the time, since different levels of ability could be catered for in different ways - without, of course, implying anything nasty or elitist in saying that.

3. The pragmatists in the party took the view that when you had achieved selection by ability rather than by the amount in your purse, then you had attained social justice.
4. Yes, because of our long tradition of omnibus schools.
5. The Association of Directors of Education in Scotland was not involved in policy-making on great or controversial issues. We were advisers to our own authorities. It was a professional association for discussion/talks by people with ideas on education. Sometimes it was a useful body for talking initiatives in minor areas.

1. a) In the case of Renfrew, initiatives go back to September 1964.

With the post-war bulge coming through the schools and raising of the school leaving age on the horizon, we had the first real opportunity to examine the organisation of secondary education since 1923. Should we expand the selective system, go over to all through comprehensives or introduce a two-tier system? These were complex issues to which I took a pragmatic approach. The buildings you have really dictate policy. All-through comprehensive schools were an administrative decision by the government, and in Renfrew there was a gradual shift to that system as things developed. It took ten years, going step by step. The move caused difficulties and disquiet, but we took a gradual approach, keeping the overall aim in view. I advised my Committee in a series of memoranda written from 1964 onwards. Their purpose was to educate the Committee to an awareness of all the issues involved. My view was that all pupils should have equality in regard to the best teachers we had in fairness to them (pupils). All should have equal access to the best teachers we had.

b) Myself and my officials.

c) Chiefly the Education Committee, but it was guidance rather than support. I made recommendations and they had faith in my judgement. We had to face the reality of increasing numbers of pupils and inadequate staffing.

d) In Renfrew they were primary educational. I was never aware of any political groundswell in the county of Renfrewshire.



e) This Report was my bible. It appeared in the same year I completed my M.Ed. Its aims have not yet been fulfilled, it may take to the end of the century but it will come. You must remember that people's educational views are conditioned by their background. I was a pupil at an omnibus school in Maybole, and only went on with my education because my teachers advised it and my parents supported them. Omnibus schools had all the pupils under one roof: they were socially comprehensive but academically selective.

There was criticism of the primary transfer tests because they were too damned accurate. In Scotland there had always been a generous acceptance level into the senior secondary school. Contrast this with what happened in England, where you had the class-ridden grammar school, to which entry was based on how many places there were rather than who was fit for the courses. This accounts for all the pressure for comprehensive schools in England. In Scotland, selection at primary level owes much to the work of McClelland. His work remember was based on the promise of a group rather than an individual leaving certificate, so predictions had to take account of that. Most people were happy with the system of early identification of potential certificate pupils. McClelland's system was based on percentile cut-off points. But the 1959 Working Party Report (based on single highers on leaving certificate) and the introduction of the Ordinary grade in 1962 - a crucial innovation - both caused pressure for change within the world of Scottish education, quite apart from what was happening in the world of politics. There was a feeling of the need for change because the pupils consigned to junior secondary schools were not getting a chance, nor really

were those in the bottom streams of the senior secondary schools, and you had disaffected staff.

2. a) Because it was held to be educationally and politically appropriate in England. There was an awareness that the race was to the swift, and thus that in the educational system, there was an in-built social injustice. There was a strong consciousness down south that the school you were at was important. It has always struck me that wars always awaken feelings of injustice about the present system of society and expressions of hope for a new order. The Butler Act was premised on the view that all children should have the opportunity to get a secondary education. I remember that R.F. Mackenzie once described comprehensive education as 'Latin for the working class'. The Labour Party, therefore, had good and honest reasons and this, coupled with strong social pressure, created a good platform for the introduction of comprehensive education.
- b) Entirely favourable, because we were already doing it. The Scottish Education Department toned down the political intentions of the change in the way they worded the Circular, by using phrases like 'in the Secretary of State's view' etc.
- c) It did not have much effect in Scotland as a whole, as there was already a network of omnibus schools. The situation was different in the urban areas. Senior secondaries were full. Junior secondaries were created because there were enough pupils of that type to fill them, and make them viable units in the densely populated areas. In rural areas, like my native Ayrshire for example, you just could not have run a bilateral system. A

lot depended on who was in charge of the administration. Glasgow, for example, was run by politicians. It didn't matter if it was educationally sound, if they wanted it, they got it.

- d) In Renfrew, we tried to defer selection until 14 or 16, as pupils' ability emerged, but we never got to introduce a completely two tier system in the county because Willie Ross didn't approve our scheme. In order to make provision, a Director needed money, and they simply said no if it wasn't all-through comprehensive. Schemes were either accepted, rejected or sent back to be amended. No matter what the educational arguments which underlay proposals, power lay with the Secretary of State, to whom organisational criteria were the most important. With hindsight, incidentally, I think he was right: where you have the accommodation for an all-through comprehensive school, you should create one.
- e) My responsibility was to create change while trying to fulfil my own educational vision, in the knowledge that I might be wrong. It was a calling and I enjoyed it. My role was to guide my Committee towards changes that I thought were the right ones to make, but always to have the humility to accept their rulings if they disagreed with me. It was essentially a job of making recommendations to and steering the thinking of the Committee.
- f) 1) It was open communication down the line, with my issuing memoranda, arranging seminars, having frequent headteacher meetings and visiting schools.
- 2) I kept them informed of what we were doing, but they had no significant influence with me. I kept them on the fringes of

our activity. They were like parasites, picking up ideas as they went round schools and attended meetings, although, in fact, I was more often in schools than they were.

3) I saw it as my job to educate them, without that sounding +

4) patronising. I must say that in Renfrew the only sign of political influence was in the big burghs (Paisley & Greenock). In county areas they were Tory. There never was the feeling of my Committee toeing any party line which had been arranged before meetings. Things were done by debate and discussion, not by flexing political muscles.

5) They had nothing to do with reorganisation. Their concern was with the curriculum.

6) They also had nothing to do with reorganisation. Their sole function was curriculum development. They swelled growing points in schools, carried ideas around schools, organised meetings and training sessions for teachers.

h) There was not much opposition. I talked to my heads and staffs. The senior high schools were persuaded that they had to go along, while the junior high schools thought they were getting a good deal. I went out and explained my thoughts to parents' groups. You find that once people discover that your intentions are good, any resistance is gradually overcome. A major problem was buildings, and we refused to be rushed. So it took from about 1967-73 to sort out.

i) Yes, after the Secretary of State's reaction to our original proposals for reorganisation.



3. a) Myself and the headteachers without a doubt. My colleagues and I worked on the physical provision, and the headteachers dealt with the implications on the spot.
- b) The same as above - decisions were taken at levels of Director and headteachers, as distinct from an overall strategy followed by all involved.
- c) The power of decision making quite definitely lay with them. Their views were paramount. There were few differences of approach in all the Chairmen I had. They were there to reflect the wishes of their electorate, who were conscious and proud of Scottish education and its traditions, and wanted schools that could provide courses that led to highers. But in 1972 there was a perceptible change - the Committee became more politically organised, and less amenable to persuasion.
- d) Total. No directives were issued. In this regard I remember a statement made by a chairman of the Education Committee of Greater London Council at the outset of their introduction of comprehensive schools. He said to the heads 'TAKE THEM IN, AND STREAM LIKE HELL'. Personally, I am against rigid streaming too early, but also against prolonging mixed-ability longer than is necessary. After all, you cannot enter a carthorse for the Derby, nor ask a Derby runner to pull a cart in a field. But, you must do your best to blur the edges by settling for a compromise - banding. I never interfered with the inner running of the schools in the county.
- e) Their reactions were generally favourable.

- f) The only representations I remember were from the Catholic minority who came ready with a chip on their shoulder looking for the same privileges as non-Catholics. But, they didn't see the problems of organising a Roman Catholic school for 400-600 pupils! Then there were instances of burgh/parochial pride - 'we want a school of our own'. Any meetings with parents or Councillors were always open, and while they may have been uneasy, they generally accepted our honesty.
4. a) It didn't affect them all. It only would have if I had said that the recommendations contained in it had to be implemented. In general, heads ran their schools according to their own vision. I tried to influence their thinking, but never forced them to act against their will. The Machiavellian way to promote change is to set up working parties of heads or teachers of known opposing views. If some people could say 'look, we're doing it and it's working', it could shame the hardliners into reconsidering their position.
- b) Not really, except in Greenock. The main disagreements stemmed from drawing up catchment areas, and whether the schools should be four years or all-through comprehensive schools.
- c) In organisation of the early years yes, probably also in curriculum content. In teaching methods I'm not so sure.
- d) They had an important role in the development of curricula. We were probably in the van here, with Glenburn and Priory Park dating back to 1968. Then came the Robertson Centre which we converted after the education offices moved to Cotton Street.

- e) They caused us no problem - we just got rid of them. I was against them. I abhorred them. You were in effect fining parents because their children happened to be clever. So the decision was taken to phase it out in secondary 1 in the selective secondaries, and in the senior secondaries with their own primary departments.
5. a) It fitted in with the pattern of omnibus schools which already existed, the model for which can be traced as far back as Knox. But, I think many people had doubts about exactly what a comprehensive school meant. The omnibus school allowed each child to show what it could do, and reveal what talents and how many it had, and then selection was made accordingly.
- b) I think that despite all the writing and theorising, day-to-day pressures in schools forced one to be pragmatic and accept that there were 'one-talent' children and 'seven-talent' children, if you seen what I mean.
- c) There was a variety of reaction. They definitely were not keen on mixed-ability groups, particularly in the structured subjects. Their main concern was for the well-being of the ablest, hence many teachers worried about all the changes that they were being asked to make.
- d) I do not think that they are doing what they set out to do. You have a divided population especially in urban areas. The strength of the Scottish education system has always been that able working class children could rub shoulders with the middle-class children, and 'get on' by emulating their outlook and

manners and ways of speaking even. I think they are at an advantage in a selective school, because there they get their rough edges smoothed off. I worry about the influence of the peer group on the able child in area comprehensives. I think comprehensive schools have always been under a severe strain to provide the education and fulfil the promises envisaged for them. With rapidly shrinking rolls in the rest of this decade, the position will not alter - in fact the comprehensive schools will be under even more pressure.

- e) There were a variety of interpretations according to individual views. I do not think that some people actually sat down and worked out an answer or thought about what it meant.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS

1. Yes, but it would never have happened. Tory Secretary of State's generally did not interfere. A Tory Secretary of State in 1964 would have meant a complete 2 tier system in Renfrew with no all-through comprehensives. There would have been no straitjacket and much more room for experimentation.
2. The junior secondary/senior secondary occurred for hard-headed pragmatic reasons in urban areas. It was simply easier to organise the pupils in that way. In rural areas the position was different.
3. Yes it did in a certain number of them. Not many members of the Labour Party were out-and-out comprehensive protagonists.
4. Ideas don't just happen, they develop over a period and out of



the thoughts of men based on their environment. The best answer I can give you is the time was ripe for the idea of the comprehensive school. There was a gathering world movement towards it (e.g. Scandinavia, America/and of course in England), and the Scots married the comprehensive vision to practicalities. I mean - you couldn't have had a comprehensive school in Anstruther. So developments were conditioned as much by local considerations as anything else. In Scotland there has always been the view that education should not reflect social class, so I am sure we would have moved towards a comprehensive system very gradually in our own way. But, there was no groundswell in Scotland pushing or urging immediate change.

5. The Association of Directors of Education in Scotland exerted indirect influence behind the scenes. We were always consulted before memoranda or Circulars were sent out. We also reacted to their proposals, and on occasion gave them ideas or discussed ideas with them before they became official policy. A good example of this was guidance. Many of the ideas contained in the 1968 Orange Booklet were aired at meetings of Association of Directors of Education in Scotland and of its representatives with Scottish Education Department officials.

1. a) The source of policy initiatives can be traced as far back as 1945. The Labour controlled council planned schools - or at least new schools - on the omnibus principle.
- b) Education Committee and officials usually initiated policy.
- c) Far-sighted Labour councillors like Scanlon and Galpern who directed policy moves and won support for them.
- d) I would say about 2 - 1 educational, if I may put it like that. The moves were based primarily on educational arguments - after all, comprehensive organisation is the natural way to arrange secondary education.
- e) Since the decision in Glasgow had already been taken, both the 1947 Report and Circular 600 merely made official what had been going on for years.
2. a) It reflected the prevailing views in a materialistic and consumer-orientated society, in which people wanted their children to 'get on and do well'. But this wish fitted in perfectly with Glasgow educational practice, so that there was no great upheaval or trouble about it.
- b) The reaction of the education officials was entirely favourable. Every secondary school planned from 1949 was comprehensive, whether a new one or an upgraded old one. The whole process was finally completed in 1973.
- c) It merely consolidated and gave official government backing to

existing practice.

- d) By a massive building programme, and the introduction of such new concepts as the common course, mixed-ability teaching, and guidance. For a time there were both 4 and 6 year comprehensive schools, and tremendous pressure from parents to upgrade the former. The implementation of the policy also had implications for staffing in schools.
- e) In general, he gave professional advice on educational matters to the Education Committee, whichever party was in power.
- f)
  - 1) There were no disputes at the many meetings called to discuss the issue that I can recall.
  - 2) We had frequent meetings which were always characterised by 'partnership'. Members of the Inspectorate were also invaluable in providing us with feedback about what was happening in the schools - but always in a constructive way.
  - 3) Always a cordial relationship with local politicians.
  - 4) Likewise.
  - 5) Hardly any contact. If so, it had to do with the curriculum and course planning.
  - 6) There was so much coming out in the way of advice on the curriculum, assessment, guidance and raising of the school leaving age that we needed people who could act as a link with the people in the firing line. They 'gingered up' principal teachers and held meetings to promote staff development. They also ran in-service courses. We as officials also used their advice as subject experts in the planning of new schools.

- g) Scottish Education Department influence came through the Her Majesty's Inspectors, if at all, and then only in relation to the curriculum. The Scottish Education Department never exerted pressure on us as far as I can remember. Relations were close and characterized by consensus.
- h) The problem of 4 and 6 year schools, and the building programme in general. You were always constrained by the amount of capital investment you were allowed by the Government - and this depended on the economic climate of the country, and on whether educational matters were high on the list of priorities. Also, in Glasgow we had dreadful staffing problems over a number of years, especially in certain subjects. I should also mention one point: the problem of the range of teacher attitude. I don't mean to the idea of the comprehensive school as such, but rather to new ideas like the common course and mixed-ability classes. You see, they were worried about the justice in all this to the able child. In my view, the junior secondary/senior secondary split served the latter very well but the former very badly. On balance, I would say that the gains in adopting a comprehensive system of secondary schooling far outweighed the possible losses (i.e. not stretching the able pupils). At the very least, it was a move in the right direction.
- i) There were no dramatic changes in the sense of reversals. The move to complete comprehensive provision in the city 'just developed naturally', but obviously we had to take account of government policy e.g. guidance, raising of the school leaving age etc.



3. a) The Committee and officials worked in tandem in terms of getting the policy off the ground, but it was then left to headteachers and advisers to put it into operation in schools.
- b) Without doubt the education officials and the Education Committee in partnership.
- c) Their influence was always supportive and beneficial to what we were trying to do in the schools. The relationship was always harmonious.
- d) I would say not too much latitude. But, as long as what they proposed was not extreme, we allowed them to get on with it under the overall umbrella of our policy. Any headteachers continuing or introducing practices of which we disapproved would be given advice to get back in line.
- e) Teachers' reactions varied according to their own background, training and experience - and, not least, their age. Consultation with them was left to headteachers, principal teachers and/or advisers. We also formed joint Consultative Committees from time to time to find out how teachers were coping with the changes.
- f) Where there were no schools before they were delighted. But, there were always rumblings about changes in the procedures of established schools, especially those with a good reputation.
4. a) Remember it had been a gradual process over 30 years. The most immediate implications after 1965 were a total rethink of the curriculum and internal organisation of schools. Also, there were massive implications for buildings, supplies and staffing.

And let's not forget the need for in-service education on an unprecedented scale.

- b) Only in the older inner-city areas, where amalgamations or the closure of junior secondary schools came into question.

There were great problems caused by the social background of the pupils in many areas. Schools were merely a reflection of their catchment area, and a major problem was providing schools with sufficient numbers of able pupils. I would say that a comprehensive school is a natural form of schooling in rural areas or for a Scottish county town. But, you are in trouble in large cities with their social ghettos.

- c) I cannot really comment here.

- d) They played a very important role. The whole set up - Dundas Vale, then Woodlands - just developed without policy decisions. Money was made available. It seemed the obvious thing to do.

- e) Comprehensivisation had been moving on since 1945 as I have said. It was only when reorganisation on comprehensive lines became official policy that the crunch came.

The Tory Administration found a loophole - to continue charging fees, but for extra - curricula rather than educational activities. Opinion of course was sought on this, but it was allowed.

Then the Labour administration pushed through their plan to eliminate selection in all secondary schools. I proposed a plan whereby the 5 selective schools would be kept as city wide comprehensive schools, with the basis of selection being ability judged by the primary school. This was not passed, and a big

'stushie' followed. The High School disappeared, and the other four became comprehensive territorial schools. Many stormy parents meetings and Court of Session rulings on the way. There is no doubt that the existence of selective schools had an adverse effect on the ability composition of local comprehensive schools.

5. a) A natural form of schooling outwith large cities, but it posed problems there.
- b) It received greater stress after the war. People were or became much more socially conscious. They actively wanted opportunities for their children on an equal basis. There should be no denial of opportunity to anyone - but equality of opportunity for all.
- c) It took a long while to persuade a minority. Again I come back to the effects of training and outlook on attitudes to teaching and working with pupils.
- d) No, partly because of the way teachers are trained - they tend to be narrowly subject - orientated, and intent on getting kids through exams. (c.f. adverts for jobs in Public Schools - 'ability to help with games essential'.) Many are reluctant to step outside their subject. It was, therefore, the innovative and open-minded teachers who took up the challenge. Also, it must be stressed that comprehensive schools were - and still are - in difficulties because of the lack of parental support. Parental apathy kills educational hopes.
- e) A comprehensive school is a school which caters for all pupils in a given area, irrespective of their ability. The real

'educationists' in the profession did their best to ensure that the less able got a fair deal, but remember schools had variable proportions of these pupils - e.g. Shawlands + Possilpark. The common course, mixed-ability classes and exam reform were a help, and no doubt led to the findings of Munn and Dunning - with the philosophy that nobody is a failure.

#### ASSOCIATION OF DIRECTORS OF EDUCATION IN SCOTLAND

Good conferences, and consultative relationship with Scottish Education Department. The topics were basically educational. It was an influential body to which people listened. Above all, it was a useful forum for the exchange of ideas.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS

1. Yes, but there would have been no conflict with a Tory Secretary of State - except perhaps over the abolition of fee paying schools. Approval had been given for the building of comprehensive schools by previous Secretaries of State.
2. It is true that junior secondary schools in Glasgow had to continue until comprehensive school facilities became available, but I am not aware that Scottish Education Department policy post 1945 was deliberately to perpetuate the junior secondary/senior secondary school separatism.
3. A few individuals might have had this view, but Labour policy was fundamentally against selective schools, which were not seen to be conducive to the establishment of a classless or egalitarian society. They managed to secure a better quality of teacher by



virtue of their selective intake to the detriment of the rest of the secondary sector.

4. Circular 600 had a respectable Scottish percentage, dating back to the Advisory Council report of 1947 which advocated omnibus schools.

1. a) The earliest purpose-built comprehensive school in Glasgow that I can remember was Crookston Castle, which opened in 1954.  
  
b) Initiatives came from the Directorate staff and the Education +  
c) Committee. It was never a matter of political controversy in Glasgow. The move to build comprehensive/area schools first began to be considered when we had to provide new schools for the housing estates which were being built around the city. The local area comprehensive school seemed the natural development of the multilateral school which had a long tradition in Scotland in rural areas. This policy was then continued when we came to replace old schools e.g. Woodside, Bellahouston. Educational policy in Glasgow was thus always 'comprehensive minded', if I may use that phrase.  
  
d) The moves were primarily educational, since it was considered that comprehensive schools were the natural way to make secondary provision. The only thing I would add would be that Tory administrations were always less inclined to introduce change in the educational scene than Labour ones.  
  
e) Yes, I think it had some influence on individuals, but it was not widely implemented, despite being one of the finest educational reports this country has ever produced.
2. a) Because the damaging effects of selection had been made public by research, and had been made a political issue in the programme of the Labour Party.

- b) We were in favour of its content, since its proposals were in line with our thinking on educational provision.
- c) None of a dramatic nature. Its appearance gave us official government approval to continue the policy we had adopted.
- d) Gradually, as money became available.
- e) An important one. Since Dr. Mackintosh was very much pro-comprehensive, the notion of comprehensive schools had been so frequently discussed among ourselves and with our Conveners, that it had become assimilated into our educational thinking.
- f) 1) We had regular meetings with them and made regular visits to schools - as a matter of deliberate policy. There was a general acceptance of comprehensive schools among headteachers, although the older ones were against it. Equally, there were some very ardent advocates - Christie, Gardner and Macrae.
- 2) We had a very close working relationship. We worked as a team. This was a prominent feature of Dr. Mackintosh's policy.
- 3) We did most direct dealings with them through our Conveners,
- 4) with whom we had regular meetings. We had disagreements but we never fell out seriously.
- 5) Only very indirectly through the various papers it produced.
- 6) I would say that we kept a benevolent eye on what they were about. They were the former superintendents of practical subjects. The original reason for appointing superintendents was that it was felt that senior secondary headteachers were in general ignorant of the practical side of schools - art,

home economics, technical, domestic etc. - When the superintendents had proved such a success, we decided to spread the posts into the academic field. In general, the idea was sound, and in practice it was successful. They were able to keep the curriculum under review by setting up working parties of teachers. It was a very exciting time in education in the 1960's.

g) The relationship took place through the Inspectorate, who acted like liaison officers between central and local government. They were the mouthpieces of the Scottish Education Department, and promoted its policies through discussion and persuasion. They, together with subject advisers fostered educational and curricular developments in schools.

h) The biggest one - apart from government finance to build schools and older, outdated buildings which caused some headaches for a while - was the natural, almost in-built feeling of resistance among senior secondary staffs, especially those in promoted posts. They thought it was a retrograde step which entailed the loss of academic values and the academic tradition. For them, comprehensive schools represented a dilution of something traditional and good.

3. a) The Inspectorate and the Advisers.

b) 75% Directorate + 25% Education Committee, unless you had a particularly strong-willed Education Convener. In general, the Committee members had no interest in issues of educational policy or knew much about them. Nor were many inspired by political ideals. They were very content to implement what we suggested.



- c) Those with a strong personality had a very strong influence. Their decisions were almost always taken along party lines, and formulated in the appropriate party groups in control.
  - d) A great deal of latitude. This was a traditional feature of the Scottish system - the head was regarded as responsible for running his own show without outside interference. We generally left them to get on with it as they saw fit. If we discovered things weren't quite right, we could have taken a hardline but seldom did. Headteachers' loyalty was to their own schools, and they took the decisions about how they were to be run. In that sense, they were very powerful figures.
  - e) In general, I think teachers welcomed the move, although it is difficult to quantify reactions. They were brought into the process through advisers and their working parties set up to examine individual subjects.
  - f) Parents were very much a missing factor in educational matters during my time in administration. There were hardly any parental reactions to anything, except the abolition of fee-paying schools. In general, parents were very accepting of all we tried to do.
4. a) Teachers had to deal with a wider spectrum of ability than before. This meant that the predominantly academic content of their work needed broadened out to cater for all levels of pupil. Two groups of teachers in particular had to face major changes: senior secondary teachers dealing with the less able pupil, and junior secondary teachers facing certificate pupils. Mixed-ability classes posed a big problem. Changes in approach were

called for, and this proved very hard.

b) No.

c) What went on in schools was really decided by the headteacher. The extent to which radical change took place was a correlate of the degree of his commitment to comprehensive principles. The views of the man at the top decided whether comprehensive schools made a genuine attempt to cater for all pupils or were, in effect, multilateral schools.

d) They both had a very considerable effect. They were a significant and powerful element in secondary education at that time. They had a positive effect on morale because they gave the teachers the opportunity to discuss common problems and devise ways of tackling the.

e) Their very existence was a nonsense in a system of rate-supported, publicly-provided education. These schools had an entirely personal system of entrance tests in which we never intervened. They tended to have a narrow social spread in the pupil body. The social or class aspect was a very powerful factor in these schools. Although they were excellent schools with excellent academic records, they could not be justified. As an anomaly, they just had to go. It was a pity, but that was the way of it.

5. The traditional Scottish secondary school was multilateral, so the basic idea of all pupils going to the same secondary school was far from revolutionary in Scotland. The successive raising of the school leaving age, plus the post war population explosion

caused the separation into senior and junior secondary schools in urban areas. So that comprehensive schools were really going back to our roots - a reincarnation of burgh schools. But I do not think many were run as 'pure' comprehensive schools, but rather with rigid internal divisions of pupils into ability group.

- b) I think it was interpreted in this way: once a pupil had been put into a certain class, it would always be possible to move him up or down to another, should that prove more appropriate to his capacities. The operation of the principle of equality of opportunity allowed schools to cater for the individual talents and abilities of pupils as these emerged during their progress through school. It was a plus factor.
- c) I did not have much indication of how they really felt. As I have said, there was a euphoria about, education was exciting at that time. I would say most people made an honest start to comprehensive schools, provided always they had a headteacher who demonstrated leadership.
- d) Results were patchy, although there was no widespread feeling that it had been a horrible mistake. Most people felt the move was good.
- e) It was seen as a form of educational provision which gave the opportunity to create an environment in which individual pupils would realise their potential.

An indication of how people felt can be gained by a very controversial issue. We had a real stand-up fight with some headteachers over it. There was a feeling in the Directorate

that too big schools were undesirable. So it was proposed to have a constellation of four and six year schools. In four year schools, pupils would peel off to the six year one at end of secondary 2 and secondary 4. Given a continued staff shortage such as we had over many years in Glasgow, we felt that it was unrealistic to make all schools six year. But it turned out to be very hard on the four year schools, losing their clever pupils after two years or not having a senior school. They felt very much second-class citizens, hence the opposition.



19. I have never seen a comprehensive school as I would define it. A comprehensive school embraces all the children from a defined area and divides them into classes with no reference to general ability in the early stages. It organises its teaching for the varied needs of the pupil body, keeps options for them open as long as possible and actively enables them all to develop their varied talents. It delays decisions which close doors irrevocably by a scheme of planned procrastination. It should offer a smooth transition into life after school for its pupils, whether that is university, apprenticeship, a job etc. This is idealistic but nevertheless provides something to strive for. The word 'comprehensive' has never really recovered from the battering it took in the English media. We were far better off with regard to social mixing in schools in Scotland. A far larger number of children went to private or fee-paying schools in England, and far fewer got to grammar school than got to senior secondary schools up here. But having said that, the general acceptance of the comprehensive principle did not lead to a uniformity of outcome up here. Political ideology was adapted to a whole host of differing attitudes to and views of education. So although there was no vocal or overt opposition in the West of Scotland, many in education saw comprehensive education as the antithesis of meritocracy.

1. The Education Committee and the majority political group in power were the prime movers, and they met little opposition from other groups. Dumbarton - an odd amalgam of large burghs, small

burghs, a new town and county areas - went along with the spirit of the times. The people who played key roles in getting comprehensive schools off the ground were the Directorate backed up by the advisory service, and, of course, the headteachers, who gave us varying degrees of support.

2. The 1947 Report was a far-seeing document. It set up the junior secondary school. Structures are not all that important: people, their philosophies and attitudes are far more so. The philosophy of the Report is flawless, but in practice it set up the junior secondary/senior secondary split system in urban areas. Those who went to junior secondary were serving out their time - there was no parity of esteem, however much it was claimed to exist. The junior secondary school never worked. The Report was misunderstood, and made to suit each person's purpose. So, given this bad system of the chosen and the damned, I would say that the comprehensive school was a natural development in Scotland. Many schools had to be multilateral for geographical reasons - like Hermitage Academy. The multilateral school satisfied the Scottish public. In Scotland, locality and accessibility of provision have always been much more important than details of the internal organisation and practices of school. Parental needs were confined to the former.

3. I would say that the comprehensive school was a natural educational progression, but that external political factors expedited its arrival, and promoted it in the public mind. The demise of selection at 12 was a very powerful factor in its creation.

4. The 1960's was an age of egalitarianism or, 'Jock's as good as his maister'. Segregation in education ran contrary to the spirit of the times - senior secondary with the chosen few and the junior secondary, with the majority condemned to educational inferiority. It was the antithesis of opportunities and fairness for all. There were also practical factors - the post-war bulge was coming through schools, there was new school building undertaken to meet it. Existing buildings were hopelessly inadequate. So it was logical that area/locality schools should be the choice. In addition, there was a band-wagon effect - the comprehensive school was the fashionable thing to build.
- Scottish Education Department Circulars never initiate or lead the way in anything. It is dangerous to credit them with more power than they have. They appear long after initiatives have been taken by teachers/heads/Her Majesty's Inspectors. A Scottish Education Department Circular is best understood as the stamp of approval, an act of policy promotion, once it has been tried, tested and found to be possible. It prods the footdraggers. Circular 600 provided an external impetus to those who would never have embraced the principles of a comprehensive ideology. The Circular itself was not revolutionary or revelatory. It acknowledged that an uneven movement was at work at grassroots level, and sought to make it more even - in other words it legitimised much experimental work that had been tried by making it national policy, a policy which happened to coincide with prevailing attitudes in society at that time.
7. Headteachers had a lot, possibly even too much latitude, especially those in the established senior secondary schools, and

who were reluctant to have what they stood for harmed. The only direct instruction heads had to obey was 'NO SELECTION ON ENTRY'. Thereafter, practice varied with individual heads' attitudes and educational philosophy. Our view was not to create uniformity by fiat, but encourage change by examples of good practice, while keeping friendly relations. We needed the headteachers to work along with us.

8. There was very little adverse parental reaction. Those whose children would have gone to a junior secondary school welcomed the change to a comprehensive system; those with children in senior secondaries saw the comprehensive school as a threat to standards. Explanations given to parents at the time proved helpful in allaying fears.
9. The effect of private schools on comprehensive schools in the West of Scotland were marginal, especially in Dumbarton, where we had only two.
10. The area school did not cause problems. In some areas, notably Clydebank, comprehensive schools enabled provision to be offered where it had not existed before, and pupils had had to travel to complete their secondary education. What happened in Dumbarton re comprehensive provision took four forms:
  - 1) Existing multilateral schools like Hermitage Vale of Leven continued.
  - 2) Senior secondary schools like Lenzie, Bearsden, Clydebank High School became comprehensive.
  - 3) Old junior secondary schools closed and were absorbed into the



High Schools.

4) Completely new schools were built - Douglas Academy, in Cumbernauld New Town and several Roman Catholic schools.

11. The obstacles to comprehensive policy were practical rather than educational or theoretical. There was a fear of the unknown, a fear of levelling down, but at the same time an acceptance of the gradualness and inevitability of change. There was in some people a feeling that it wasn't going to make much difference.
12. The structures and internal organisation of schools changed to  
+  
13. greater or lesser degrees. The change from junior secondary/senior secondary or bipartite system occurred on proper, but the corresponding change in attitudes was slow. The split mentality took a long time to die - maybe it never really has. At all events, the big stick never produces good change in education - time, development and choosing the right people are much more likely to effect movement.
14. Differentiation according to ability is closely related to staff competence, and cannot be treated in the same way across all subjects. Mixed-ability work is much easier in English, Art, Music, PE than in Maths, French and Latin, Physics and Chemistry. All I would say is that differentiation should be deferred as long as possible, provided it is accompanied by management support, and does not actually damage any group of children.
15. Yes, Curricula and methods changed, but again there was a tremendous variation. Advisers and in-service courses did good

promotional work, but its effects are difficult to measure. Changes did occur, most notably and hurriedly after raising of the school leaving age in 1972.

16. Again changes in approach varied with the school and the individual, but a great many teachers stopped and thought. 'Aims and objectives' appeared like a rash in all sorts of publications - no bad thing. Gentle pressure for change was applied by Her Majesty's Inspectors and Advisers. But, nevertheless, people made their own response at their own pace. There was too much scope for the backwoodsmen, passengers and elitists to opt out. This latitude inevitably inhibited radical changes. But change did occur; in-service training with its infectious change of ideas played a considerable role. Besides, given that things have never been wholly static in education, a lot of people did respond positively.
17. The comprehensive school dovetailed amazingly well with Scottish practice and Scottish attitudes to education. As long as the lad o'pairts could still achieve the academic heights and go to University, then the comprehensive school would be fine. Also, there was the promise that the other, less able pupils were going to get a fairer crack of the whip - a notion entirely in keeping with our democratic outlook on education.
18. I would say that the comprehensive school put equality of opportunity - a centuries old characteristic of Scottish education - into operation. Equality of opportunity, or giving everyone the same chance at the start of secondary school, was a

naturally attractive phenomenon to the Scottish mind.

20. No, comprehensive education has many ideas embedded in it. Since we do not live in an ideal society, we can only strive to approximate to our ideals. Society has changed, prospects have changed, and so have attitudes. We cannot in education offer the same carrots, and the present government does not seem to be well - disposed to state educational provision. Resourcing the service has become an even more difficult task, a question of deciding priorities, rather than an equitable distribution of a plentiful fund. But, if you believe that education is a force for the good, then comprehensive education has made gains - guidance, Warnock, pupils with learning difficulties, modules - all these are positive steps to confront the real educational issues.

There had been a feeling since the beginning of the 20th century that the school system was grossly unfair. I think that the Trades Union Congress passed a motion in 1905 for reform, but the Labour Party has never really fully carried out the wishes of its intellectuals. There has been a dichotomy of feeling - the desire for social progress on the one hand, but a disbelief in the power of education to achieve it on the other. Nevertheless, I would say that there were various strands of discontent - Social, political and administrative - that precious talent was being cast aside. The call was for equality of opportunity. But I am sure that what people up here had in mind was something like the multilateral school, where pupils were streamed in descending order of intellectual ability.

You must remember that for a long time Directors of Education did not interfere in the internal workings of schools. Headteachers, particularly in senior secondary schools were almost autonomous. Their word was law, and they had a derogatory attitude to the so-called 'junior secondary' and 'modified' pupils. I remember that in Dumbarton, some actually refused to admit pupils from junior secondary schools who had been misplaced, or if they accepted them, put them one year behind those of similar age.

There was, then, a mounting feeling of dissatisfaction with junior secondary education, which, despite Scottish Education Department attempts, never achieved any status. Although junior secondary schools had some dedicated staff, a lot were dreadful - dilutees, failed students, uncertificated people. The odds were stacked against the



youngsters who couldn't get a fair crack of the whip. Nevertheless, I would say that, in the main, only junior secondary teachers welcomed the move to comprehensive education. Directors had mixed views: those in favour saw the 'comprehensive' school in multilateral terms. In the West of Scotland, in the areas you are studying, I would say that only Andrew Cameron and Stewart Mackintosh welcomed the move and did their best to make it happen. John McEwan in Lanarkshire was threatened with the sack if he failed to come up with a comprehensive plan, and John Bain also was subject to political pressure. Hugh Fairlie was exceptional in favouring a compromise solution - the two-tier system. This, of course, was politically unacceptable, and his plan was gradually dismantled.

Most parents accepted comprehensive education in Scotland, willingly or out of apathy. The only voices raised in objection were those of the articulate middle classes. Many Labour Councillors were also parents, and I remember one prominent Member, a Roman Catholic who lived in a large housing estate refused to send his daughters to the newly-built local comprehensive school, preferring a selective girls' school in Glasgow's east end. Headteachers - like teachers in general - displayed a reluctance to accept the comprehensive philosophy. Many of them silently defeated the aims of comprehensive education by employing rigid streaming for years. The grouping of children was an issue which caused divided views.

The selective school question really only arose to any significant extent in Glasgow. Although it aroused bitter feelings the number of schools in question was so small, that no serious halt was put on the changeover to a comprehensive system.

In the 1960's and early 1970's the Directorate let Elected Members deal with issues which they (the Members) thought important - bursaries, school camps, free meals etc - while they (the Directorate) dealt with what actually went on in schools. On education, most councillors didn't have a lot to say.

Basically, comprehensive education went against the best Scottish traditions - separating children on the basis of tested ability. There was a powerful if silent opposition to any notion of mixing different abilities in one classroom. Attention was traditionally given to the academically able; all the others got courses suitably 'modified'. When I started teaching, schemes of work were drawn up by principal teachers for Scottish Certificate of Education classes only, with the instruction to 'modify for non-certificate groups'. Also, it is human nature for honours graduates to prefer to teach the able - mirror images of themselves. So the comprehensive school was a new idea. On top of that, the building programmes were out of gear, so that the Directorate was caught on the hop. You must also beware of the much spoken-of 'lad of pairts' idea in Scotland. A lot of romantic codswallop is trotted out about this. Whatever was said to the contrary, compulsory secondary education had one aim - to create a reasonably literate and numerate work-force who would leave school at the earliest opportunity, with the system retaining the ablest to train for the professions. This idea has had very powerful and lasting consequences.

(Perhaps I should have added earlier that Glasgow was well ahead of other counties in the West of Scotland with regard to buildings. Its schools were planned on an area basis as early as the 1950's.)

Anyway, the major problem about comprehensive education was that the majority of the teaching force had not been trained to cope with what it entailed. The Honours Graduate fraternity, especially the classics and modern languages men, did not want to know. Many staffrooms had horrible arguments about what was going to happen, with the in-coming junior secondary pupils spoken of in most uncomplimentary terms. The trauma of raising of the school leaving age is still with us even now, though in less stark terms. Scottish teachers generally have always been apprehensive about teaching the dullards. Since 1965, there has been a gradual coming-to-terms by teachers with the mix of ability, but deep-down people still relish the prospect of Scottish Certificate of Education classes in secondary 4, secondary 5, secondary 6 and 1A, 2A etc when they see their new timetables each year. This is understandable, and has to do partly with background, training and human nature. It is fair to say that it is to some extent a function of age, but only a minority of teachers approach their job in a truly professional manner, giving equal concern to all pupils.

I don't want to attempt a definition of the term 'comprehensive school' as the ground is thick with shibboleths, but I would say that it should provide for the individual needs of all children in its care. All that has in fact been achieved by comprehensivisation is access to secondary education for all. Schools cannot remedy basic social wrongs and problems - housing, unemployment etc. I would also add that - unintentionally I'm sure - comprehensive schools harmed able pupils who did not receive as much pushing as in the past. They were not made to achieve as much, because for a while academic success was devalued. Recently, of course, there has been a revival of interest in Scottish Certificate of Education results, with league tables of schools

emerging. So, comprehensive schools eroded the traditional Scottish zeal for promoting children of academic ability. That apart, the faith that comprehensive schools could mend social divisions and cure a whole host of problems through education has proved misplaced.

You must of course set all these thoughts against the new situation in the mid to late 1970's. After Regionalisation, an attempt was made by Elected Members to redress the balance of power with the Directorate. They no longer were content to be left to deal with trivial matters, but wanted a say in how schools were run. The result has been much more political intervention, and an erosion of Directorate and headteacher power. The service responds much more to the prevailing political will than in the past, although the Directorate still has a professional input in terms of writing papers and putting up ideas for consideration by the Committee. In these years too, schools have been badly affected by falling school rolls and the loss of academic pupils to 'magnet schools'. Coupled with that, the general attitude of teachers in my opinion has declined. They are much less professional and much more openly anti-authority. The increased power of the teaching unions has meant that schools have been unable or unwilling to respond to the political will. The Munn and Dunning programme is a good example. It was a government initiative arising out of the three famous reports of 1977 to solve some of the problems thrown up by the decision to go comprehensive. But it brought out deep philosophical problems to which no one has really come up with an answer. Bruce Millan hesitated for several years, and the main stumbling block was Foundation Level and fears of labelling and rejection of the least able. This is not a popular view, I know, but I think that if the junior and senior secondary systems had been better articulated instead of distinct, there



would have been no need to have comprehensive schools. Munn and Dunning may yet prove a retrograde step, with F-level courses being not much more than watered-down C level courses. There is no point to me in having a balanced curriculum if that means that pupils are forced to do certain subjects because someone else thinks it's good for them. Pupils should be allowed to pursue what interests them in a real comprehensive system. The Action Plan and TVEI are attempts to do just that by producing a more pronounced vocational element into the curriculum. In that sense, they are against the spirit of Munn and Dunning. It would be a bad thing if schools could offer nothing other than 'Standard' grade courses. As I hinted earlier, the educational philosophy of the Conservative government has damaged the comprehensive principle of the area school. There are so many ways to avoid attending the local school now, and this, if anything, seems to be extending.

In general, Directorate staff and Elected Members rely on advisers to provide information about what is happening in schools. Advisers as we know them (as opposed to the former organisers) owe their creation to Stewart Mackintosh, who saw them as his profession arm and link with schools. It is a pity that their influence is not more uniform.

I would like to see advisers speaking more as inspectors, ensuring that authority policy is being carried out. The consensus of the ruling group should be enforced more than it is. Otherwise, what is the point in having a policy in print?

My main worry is about the possibilities of educational advance after the recent industrial action. The main thing is that relationships at all levels have been bruised and harmed-hopefully not permanently.

There is much more suspicion on all sides, and motives are always questioned. It is indicative that planned activities had to be written into the agreement - an acknowledgement that goodwill had gone. It is now going to be harder for all in the education service to put into practice a well-known fact: to achieve progress you must take people with you.

1. The main source of the comprehensive movement was the social thinking which took place after the war around 1945. The basic notion was one of equalisation, of democratisation. Educationists too were having an important input into these general feelings, and rooting for the comprehensive school. There was tremendous political enthusiasm for these ideas in Glasgow, and therefore political backing. The desire was to give everyone an opportunity to make the best of his/her talents.
2. The Report became like the Messiah, containing the message that was in tune with egalitarian philosophy.
3. Difficult to determine whether one was in the ascendant. I would say that educationalists of the left gave voice to what the politicians wanted to see happening.
4. Although the policy became attractive by 1960, Glasgow had had comprehensive schools since 1954. It all 'happened' around 1965 because the spirit of the times was ripe for change, the Labour Party was in office, and also, in my opinion, the creation of the Ordinary Grade exam in 1962 had made certificate success available to thousands of pupils, so education seemed an attainable good. It is not a coincidence that, on Her Majesty's Inspectors' initiative, the Exam Board and the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum were set up in 1965. I think a small number of influential Inspectors were really committed to the comprehensive ideal, and did a great deal to 'get things moving'.

5. The implications were enormous. Scottish secondary education has for years been geared to Scottish Certificate of Education exams as the gateway to a university education. The tradition was very much installed in the minds of many people. The result of this was that there were two parallel forms of secondary education - the academic, and the watered down academic for those deemed unfit to cope. Circular 600 implied a huge shift of emphasis, a whole range of abilities having to be catered for in one school, by one staff. This meant that there should have been a huge shift in emphasis in both materials and methods in order to break down divisions based on ability.
6. a) There was always a close and harmonious relationship between directorate staff and Her Majesty's Inspectors. We discussed Department circulars, but left their implementation to headteachers, apart from issuing occasional instructions or suggestions and ideas. But a lot of heads did not like some of our ideas, and I now think our management approach was not perhaps as tight as it could have been. We left a lot to schools, and did not offer much in the way of practical help. Her Majesty's Inspectors were also involved in discussions about buildings (amalgamating senior secondary and junior secondary schools) and, of course, capital grants. Remember also that you were not just mixing two types of school and their pupils, but almost two kinds of teacher as well. Her Majesty's Inspectors did a lot of work going round schools, and seizing on good ideas, like bees collecting honey. We in the Directorate tried to implement these ideas, but we failed the teachers. It was a slow grind.



- b) Advisers were really created as a response to the explosion in the world of education as the realities of comprehensive education began to dawn on people. It was felt that colleges of education weren't really providing much help or support for teachers. That's why advisers were created to get out into schools and help people. Methodology in the classroom was what needed changed; no point in buying new courses if you allow teachers to teach in the old way.
7. They had enormous autonomy. A few were go-ahead, but most were like sheep. By 1970, we still had a fair number of schools which had made no internal changes as a consequence of Circular 600. In a lot of schools, quite simply, nothing much different had happened. There was a new organisational structure externally, but internally the old love of streaming and separate courses still went on. Our approach to this rigid parallelism in thinking was to try to convert rather than force heads to comply.
8. Parental reaction was split. Those with kids who would have gone to a junior secondary school welcomed the move to comprehensive schools. Those more concerned about the educational progress of their children did not relish the prospect of what they saw as children of a lower calibre coming in and upsetting the apple-cart. Of course, there was a sizeable section of the general public who neither knew what was going on, nor cared.
9. No, there were too few of these schools in Glasgow, so very little creaming took place, certainly not enough to be of statistical significance.

The main concern was to make comprehensives as good as any other schools with a variety of courses to cater for the pupils as 'whole' human beings, as members of a community, and not just the academic side of their development - a monumental undertaking. A lot of the justification for fee paying schools is really social rather than educational in any case.

10. Yes it did. Bussing - a political non-starter - would have had to take place to achieve a social mix in some areas. Teachers had to accept the results of housing policy and the social realities that ensue. A lot of schools were 'comprehensive' in terms of the intake from their local area, but only in that sense. There was an ability mix, but not a social one.
11. The main obstacles I would see as
  - buildings
  - supplies
  - teachers (supply of and attitudes of)
  - the power of Scottish Certificate of Education exams.
12. Variable, depending on the headteacher's philosophy. I think it would be true to say that Circulars 600/614, The Green Paper, The Orange Book, and raising of the school leaving age provided the structural change necessary as a background for comprehensive education. How much practices in schools changed to match is a moot point.
14. Mixed-ability classes are the ideal. Only the cream of teachers can really operate these successfully. It's just not in Scottish

L

teachers' nature to mix abilities - at least for the large majority. So I would say that setting is best in subjects as a preferable alternative to streaming. It sort of weans teachers away from too rigid separations.

15. Yes, I think there were changes, but they were both gradual and  
+  
16. variable across teachers and subjects in their scope. Those who became involved in working parties, used teachers' centres and attended in-service courses, did develop and tried to spread the word. A lot depended on what position they held in school. Most of the best work was done locally. Teachers and others were far too far away from the classroom to be of much help. But, having said that, I think it is also true that teacher attitudes and capability have undergone a change.
17. It fitted in very well. The omnibus school of our county towns and rural areas provided us with a ready-made model.
18. Children know they are not equal, so the version of equality of opportunity which focuses on equal outcomes is nonsensical. It should be equal esteem for all pupils, not equal abilities. All should get a chance to show whatever ability they have, and be given credit for it. All sects or groupings, even Mensa, are artificial. But it has not been possible to eradicate the lad o'pairs concept in Scottish schools, I mean selection according to ability, or meritocracy.
19. A comprehensive school is one with a wide variety of pupils of  
+  
20. different backgrounds, potentialities and interests. It should

gear itself to them and not press them into its pre-cast mould. But since cities all over the world polarise themselves into different socio-economic groups which reside in different districts, it is in my view impossible to have a true comprehensive school in a large city. Since the comprehensive ideal is unattainable, we can only do our best, within the resources available, to approximate to it.



1. Comprehensive schools had been in existence long before the war. So it was not a new concept. In rural areas, all children went to the local school and were streamed. Only in towns were there junior secondary/senior secondary schools because of the large numbers involved.

Postwar there was an expansion period in education, an increased awareness that education was a good thing. There was a legitimate demand to improve the quality of education.

In England there was a great deal of discussion, whipped up by the media, of the 11+, and this became confused with the Scottish 'quali'. In Scotland 25-35% of children got into senior secondary schools, whereas in England between 8 and 15% got to grammar schools, depending on area. There were feelings of injustice, mention that the pool of ability had to be extended. Naturally people in Scotland thought they should have what the English had, despite the fact that chances were much better up here. Ambitious parents with aspirations for their children gradually brought the old system into disrepute.

The 1959 Report led to the success of Ordinary grade exam, and the demand from more and more junior secondary pupils to sit it. Teachers had a fear of junior secondary schools. They were motivated by a desire to teach their subject to the highest level, so most teachers in junior secondary schools wanted out as fast as possible. A lot of politically-minded teachers began to agitate for comprehensive schools, and others jumped on the band-

wagon seeing it as a means of increasing opportunities for themselves. A lot of thinking started before Circular 600. The English solution of large, all-through comprehensive schools was imported into Scotland as the right one, and adopted on a massive scale through Scottish Education Department control. There was no critical examination of it as a concept, other solutions were 'not on'.

The conversion was far easier for schools which saw themselves upgraded from their previous status. Senior secondary schools took what they saw as a downgrading very badly.

Circular 600 should be seen as a political decision taken to wrap up developments that were already occurring. It was not a significant statement up here.

2. There was not much discussion up here. Problems of staffing and uncertificated teachers ensured that it never became an educational issue for reasons of pure practicality. There was no discussion or debate in staffrooms. The main implication was how to deal with less able pupils. Only politically-minded teachers saw it as an issue. As for the politics in local councils, I'd say that Councillors put pressure on Directors in Glasgow and Lanarkshire, whereas in Dumbarton and Renfrew, Directorate staff took an educational lead in curricular matters. In the former areas professionals were pushed by strong Labour councils; in the latter, in the absence of a strong ruling group, the personality and educational arguments of the Directors were respected.

3. The 1947 Report was required reading at college, but made no great impact, except on those who were enlightened forward thinkers in the Directorate or at headteacher level. It was far too far ahead of its time to even hope to be implemented. Most teachers do not think deeply about education. They are happy to be given a syllabus and teach it. By and large they are conformists. If they are shown what to do, they are happy enough to go into classrooms and do it. Any groundswell of dissatisfaction leading to the introduction of comprehensive schools came only from a minority of teachers. Teachers accept change if it solves what they see as problems, not if it creates more.
5. The government willed the resource for such a building programme as took place. Most Directors took the money and developed programmes to their own benefit. They knew that if they went along with the comprehensive line they would get new buildings and good equipment which would give their area an educational facelift. There were resources on a scale never before seen in Scotland. Unfortunately, until Red Book came along (the result of pressure which had been building up since the famous 1961 Strike) staffing was a real headache.
6. a) Her Majesty's Inspectors addressed headteachers and Directors. They reviewed the progress of the new policy, and helped others as they themselves gained more knowledge and experience of what it entailed.
- b) By and large things operated in balance, as long as there was not a strong ruling group on the council.

- c) Generally, I would say that Directors felt that change was needed in the bipartite system, but they did not all agree that the 12-18 comprehensive school was necessarily the best solution. There was a fear of big schools.
  - d) Advisers grew out of the general expansion in secondary education of which comprehensive schools were only a part.
7. Headteachers attitudes to the common course and mixed-ability teaching produced many interesting conferences and seminars, as well as varying responses in schools - common course; common course - remedial pupils; broad banding; streaming; setting.) Maths and modern languages teachers provided strong anti-lobbies, because of the alleged conceptual difficulties inherent in these subjects. In general, persuasion and discussion were used to effect change, not jackboots. The change in fact took years to bite; it took a long time to devise materials and appropriate worksheets. Those who were enthusiasts like bulls in a china shop were the exception. It was not 'all go' to change by any stretch of the imagination. The lack of resources, staff shortage and the attitude of those in senior positions prevented rapid and radical change in schools.
9. Those who had ideas were encouraged in every way. Those who did not had no direction, and were left to their own devices.
10. Parents showed a mixed reaction. Schools thought to be excellent were seen to be threatened by the move to comprehensive schooling. I would say that roughly 70% of parents were for it, 30% against. Those whose children would have gone to junior



secondary schools were elated. The aspiring working-class parents were not happy, as they believed the best teachers were being spread more thinly, and thus their children would be deprived.

11. Trying to devise 'natural' catchment areas, especially in large cities, was an impossible task. Large housing estates exist - there is not much you can do to change that. In the West, private schools were so small as to have no effect on state comprehensives.
12. As for internal arrangements, much depended on the headteacher. There was a gradual weaning away from the academic selective outlook. There were at no time dictates to schools; the tactics used were persuasion, discussion and exemplification of good practice.
13. Yes, both were helpful in the general evolution, and contributed to the gradual change that took place. They helped in the search for answers to problems thrown up by comprehensive education. Gradually notions like worksheets, group methods, core + extension and reinforcement came into use. Much curriculum development was occasioned by raising of the school leaving age, which accelerated a movement that had been started by Sputnik. Jordanhill staff really could not cope to begin with, since most of their staff were recruited from senior secondary schools. So there was a significant change of approach. The important thing about in-service courses is that they are better for being locally organised with 'real' teachers in charge. This greatly

enhances their credibility and relevance. A teachers' centre should provide in-service, curriculum development and have plenty of resources.

19. There is no one Scottish tradition. Scotland was characterised by different organisational systems - omnibus schools, primary school with secondary departments, senior secondary/junior secondary schools. But one thing characterises them all - a separatist mentality, with fine gradations between levels of pupil ability. Even in senior secondary schools you had 2 language, 1 language and no-language courses. The comprehensive system has delayed division and specialisation, and thus has contributed a new look to secondary education.
20. The meaning attached to 'equality of opportunity' depends on who uses it. I would say it means that all children go to the same place and get the same chance. The Scottish system has always had a narrower definition of equality, and the possibility of transfer between courses. More equality was traditionally built into the system. Schools should give the opportunity to all pupils to develop their talents to the full.
21. A comprehensive school should have as wide a range of ability and social class as the area it serves. It should be a reflection of the local area. Its internal organisation should be such that crucial decisions about curriculum and exams are delayed as long as possible. The curriculum should be broad, and the school should be used as a community resource.

22. No, the potential has not been reached. Industry, the government of the day, the economic climate all put pressure on education, which is thus not independent. Currently the Manpower Services Commission with its emphasis on specific skills is threatening notions of broad, general education. Teachers also have not helped. Although some teachers are very good at their work, in general they have a narrow view of education. They have no other interest than in teaching their subject to the highest level. Wider concepts in education are just not taken on board. I often feel that ordinary graduates are preferable to honours graduates for the teaching required in a comprehensive school.

1. My impression was that the initiatives came from the local authority solely, and also that it all had to be done quickly. There was an urgency which suggested political pressure. The sudden conversion aspect came as a jolt to people in schools, most of whom had no idea of what comprehensive education was. Especially in senior secondary schools, no one was agitating for change.
2. My impression was that moves to introduce comprehensive education were primarily political, whatever the educational intentions were: the Directorate was following the dictates of the Scottish Education Department.
3. The 1947 Report is always described as seminal, but I had never heard of it until I moved into administration. It was never mentioned in schools. Any effect it had must have been on the upper echelons in the Scottish Education Department or Scottish Office. If it had any effect at all, it would have been at the policy-making level in education, not on ordinary teachers.
4. I would say that in the 1960's there was a growing awareness of the importance of education and the value of formal qualifications. It was a period of expansion and economic growth and aspiring parents wanted their children to have the best education they could obtain. Also, it was becoming realised that the qualifying exam system was iniquitous. It caused misery and heartsearching in many families where members faced the prospect



of being sent to different secondary schools. Those destined for the junior secondary school thought their future was blighted and they had been consigned to educational oblivion.

5. I would say that the Circulars 600 and 614 were accepted intellectually. People began to carp when their implications were grasped, and it was realised what it would mean in reality. In many schools the local authority schemes were hotly contested. In fact, there was much dissension around. Zoning arrangements proposed and their anticipated effects on schools were resented and opposed. There were worries about the viability of some proposed schools, and whether they would be able to produce 'a good top', given that they were so skewed towards working class children in some cases. It was soon realised, however, that it was a losing battle, and so people had to face the idea of implementing the decision quickly and in poor buildings in many cases. There was professional discussion of what was to be done, but there was a total lack of appropriate strategies and little conception of appropriate teaching methods. For many it was a real struggle to cope. You saw a whole spectrum of reactions, from well-meaning attempts to disinterest to active resistance, but very little genuine enthusiasm. Much of the thinking was naive and amateurish. There was a feeling that if all the kids wore the same uniform and you spoke a little slower for the less able you would continue much as before and you would have a comprehensive school.

6. a) I had no dealings with Her Majesty's Inspectors at all. They did not impinge on my world when I was in school.

- b) Local councillors spoke at meetings and generally took credit for the new advance. They saw it all very much in egalitarian terms, and were unaware of the difficulties involved or how unprepared the educational system at that time was to cope with the changes expected of it.
  - c) My recollection is that Directorate staff were totally preoccupied with the administrative side of things, and had no time to deal with the educational implications of it all, even if they had wanted to. You must remember too the state of the educational world at that time: there had been very little change in schools for years; nothing was questioned and established practices were accepted as the done thing. There was no tradition of in-service or curriculum development or discussion in education.
  - d) Advisers came much later. It was only in the 70's that they made any impact.
  - e) I was totally unaware of the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum as a body until I joined the Directorate. The ambitious teacher read their reports, but there was an assumption that the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum was really the Scottish Education Department, both remote from the everyday world of the classroom.
7. Without a doubt the major obstacle was the total lack of readiness of the teachers. Then there was staff shortage, uncertificated teachers, poor accommodation. Schools were dominated by a narrow academic outlook which derived from the fact that teachers had been trained by products of senior

secondary schools in college. Everything was directed towards Highers and gradual preparation for them, and you got bits of educational history and psychology thrown in. It all operated on automatic pilot, with no analysis of the teaching or learning process.

8. I do not recall directives as such to headteachers, or anyone instructing them what to do. There was discussion and much uncertainty. It was very much a case of national pointers which were left to individuals to implement. It was open to heads to put their own interpretations on things: some continued to stream from August in secondary 1 and nobody said a thing.
9. I do not recall any public outcry or hostility to the idea of comprehensive education as such; any displeasure arose from the practicalities as they affected individual families or communities e.g. closure of a small junior secondary school, or travel to the new school.
10. Private education has never been a factor in the West of Scotland, and the small number of such schools had no impact on comprehensive schools.
11. The process of change was slow but inexorable, and variable + 12. according to the individual. It was achieved by prodding teachers gently by outsiders - Her Majesty's Inspectors, advisers and college staff. Also, when in-service took off, schools started to get better - indeed there was a great ferment of activity in Teachers' Centres and Colleges in evening and on

Saturdays. Guidance and altered management structures changed internal practices over time. Ambitious teachers and those looking for help caused things gradually to veer towards a more positive outlook and approach. Things began slowly to move in the right direction. It was like a huge rolling stone which just continued once it had started. In-service, which moved things in the right direction, is now enshrined in teachers' conditions of service, surely a measure of its importance.

14. Reactions varied, so that it is very difficult to quantify. There was a widespread anxiety about the ability of the comprehensive system to produce well-qualified university students. A lot of people were glad to have the opportunity teach a type of pupil they had never seen before. How professionally people responded to the challenge, or how convinced they were of its merits were both highly variable.
16. Comprehensive education did cause changes in curriculum, methods  
+  
17. and approaches, but it was only one among many factors. Things are more relevant, more in tune with the real world, less didactic. The system is much fairer, but there are still fears for the able. Much of course depends on what you see as the function of a school - an academic hothouse? a reflection of a just society? etc. Raising of the school leaving age was another major event which focused attention on the curriculum methods and assessment, and generated intensive activity and preparation in working parties and panels. I would say that comprehensive education was one factor from the late 1960's onwards which emphasised the importance and heightened teacher



awareness of important educational issues. It made people think.

18. The comprehensive school was seen differently in rural and urban areas. In the latter it represented a major departure from established practice; in the former it hardly caused a stir, because these schools were comprehensive by force of circumstance. In Scotland there was less of a feeling that it was a new step.
20. The major point about a comprehensive school is that it represents an ideal which has to be translated into reality in local circumstances, which can determine the extent to which the ideal is realised. There should be no overt mechanism for selecting pupils either at transfer or in the early stages. All should have equal opportunities to go for qualifications and no selective devices should be allowed to prevent them.
21. Comprehensive education is not an issue now. I think there is a recognition that the system is fairer and statistically more pupils are attempting and passing national exams. No one would want to turn the clock back. Obviously, however, outside factors are important - housing areas, attitude to education, economic factors. Also, some schools are better run than others. The major problem still unsolved is how to deal with non-academic pupils. So, while more pupils get a fairer crack of the whip, things are far from perfect.

My recollection is that moves to introduce comprehensive education took place in Scotland at local authority rather than national level. First moves were made in post-war days, and a great deal depended on individuals, especially local councillors. The West of Scotland provides interesting contrasts in the way the old Counties went about comprehensive reorganisation. Glasgow had begun to build Comprehensive schools in the 1950's; Dunbartonshire, being smaller, tended to look to Glasgow; the situation in Lanarkshire was atypical, where the Director of Education was a powerful figure, permitting junior secondary schools to be built into the 1960's, with the result that many comprehensive schools in Lanarkshire started off as upgraded junior secondary schools with swarms of huts added on; Renfrewshire went for a compromise solution of junior high school/senior high school, which in retrospect has to be looked on as nothing but a delaying mechanism employed by a conservative Director of Education.

My opinion is that moves to introduce comprehensive education were both political and educational, but political more than directly educational. An important caveat to add here is that the Labour Party saw education as a major factor in achieving social change. The mid 1960's was a period of money and confidence. Compare that with the situation now, where politicians feel that education has failed to deliver the goods, and all their efforts are channelled into the Social Work Department to bring about improved social conditions. Also, it should be noted that the Conservative Party has only recently taken a distinct political profile on education. The Parents' Charter has been like a torpedo in the damage it has caused to the fabric of the comprehensive system.

Some, but only a minority of teachers, had formed a pro-comprehensive faction within the profession, but they tended to be those who were actively involved as party members at local level. A recent illustration of the results of political pressure for change at local level instigated by teachers was the setting up of the Officer-Member group which looked at secondary1/secondary 2. A politically active teacher complained to Councillors that the headteacher of his local secondary school was still streaming pupils, and this caused local politicians to take a greater interest in what was happening in schools.

The 1947 Advisory Council Report was a landmark in the world of educational reports, but its recognition and fame came much later. Some of the principles put forward in the Report were seized on early by men of vision like Stewart Mackintosh. The 1960's was a period of dramatic and rapid social change. There had been 13 years of Conservative government, and the Labour Party presented a vigorous and energetic image of a Party dedicated to achieving change. They wanted to seize on ideas that had been lying around stagnating for years, and put them into practice. It is also important to recognise that the pressure for change in the educational system was much greater in England than in Scotland, where there was a greater degree of satisfaction with the senior secondary/junior secondary set up. But as so often occurs, Scotland is obliged to follow England in matters of major national policy.

Members of Her Majesty's Inspectors then were much more influential than they were seen to be. They took charge of meetings and seminars with the Directorate and Headteachers. Their main task was to get people to translate policy into practice, and cut through all the local authority

waffle that they were doing it already or it could not be done. The Consultative Committee on the Curriculum was a very slow-moving body which was on the right lines but showed no conscious initiative to promote change. It tended in its Reports to endorse the best practice and make it available to a wider audience.

In regard to implementing comprehensive education, much - perhaps too much - was left to the individual headteachers. They all knew what was expected, but it is well-known that many principles of comprehensive education were flaunted, either openly or by ingenious disguise mechanisms. It is interesting to note that now there is much more direction of what happens in schools, but this has produced an even more marked resistance. The recent teachers' dispute says much about the implications of imposed change. Nevertheless, it is obvious in my visits to schools that much is still dependent on the kind and quality of leadership of the headteacher. This fact accounts for the astonishing variations in schools much more than the obvious differences in catchment areas. So, as regards the changes within schools consequent upon the introduction of comprehensive education, both the rate and extent were virtually decided by the headteacher and his staff.

Because the geography of Scotland dictated that secondary provision had to be provided in one school in rural areas, there grew up a smug feeling in Scotland that comprehensive education was nothing new. So the political principles on which comprehensive education was founded fitted the Scottish psyche more easily than the English. But the prevailing view within Scotland of its educational system was too facile. In reality, it was based on hard discipline. It was assumed that all pupils were capable of reaching the same level if the facts



were crammed in to them. The system categorised pupils, indicated where the ceiling was and where pupils stood in relation to it. There was little attention to the individual; instead pupils accepted the valuation their school placed on them. Indeed, the system discouraged or prevented children from showing what they could do, and devoted most of its attention to the academically gifted.

A comprehensive school should attempt to cater for all the needs of all the pupils in its community. Beyond this simple definition, it should provide educational opportunities all the way through the school, so that each pupil can reach whatever potential he has. Early categorisation of pupils should be avoided, with mixed-ability teaching being retained for as long as possible. Materials, methodology and assessment should be in line with a comprehensive philosophy. Although it means more work for the staff, individualised learning with a view to creating a greater stimulation of interest in the pupils, should be the aim as far as possible.

The potential of the comprehensive school has not been fully realised, although we have achieved much more than we have been given credit for. There is still a fair way to go before our schools are achieving the sort of approach I outlined above. There have been four principal inhibiting factors to the successful introduction of comprehensive education:

- the sheer difficulty of practising a comprehensive philosophy was underestimated
- the whole system has been under-resourced and suffered crippling cutbacks in expenditure
- the outlook and attitudes of a number of people in the

service

- innate forces of inertia and resistance to change which are found in any group, especially if there is a feeling that the new regime is being imposed.

1. Outside the four cities, all Scottish schools were comprehensive. Pupils who were not going on joined Advanced Departments of the primary school and left at 14. The first talk I recall of the term 'comprehensive' was in the late 50's and early 60's in Glasgow.
2. There was no demand for schools of this kind in the profession. Indeed, most teachers were very defensive, thinking that the education of the highflyers would be adversely affected by the influx of dunderheads, the invasion of undesirables which was widely expected when the comprehensive came. Scottish teachers are almost welded to subject teaching, and conceive of education as for the elite in terms of ability. There were, however, both educational and political motives for the change. New housing, a growing population, need for new schools, the problems of the junior secondary schools, and Labour Party policy all fused into a feeling that schools should be comprehensive. Politicians did not know then what a comprehensive school was, and they do not know now. They were inspired by a mistaken feeling that working class children were not getting a fair crack of the whip (every flower that could grow was nurtured in the senior secondary school) and left the professionals to get on with working out the nuts and bolts of the organisation. So, all in all, the case for the comprehensive school in the cities was inescapable.
3. The 1947 Report had very little effect on teachers in schools. It was the sort of thing you did essays on at Jordanhill.

People were aware of its existence. That's all. Very few teachers read it.

4. After Circular 600, schools changed in character, size, and catchment areas. There was an accommodation problem in some older schools. Primary - secondary liaison started up. The school population had representatives of all social classes and abilities, and teachers for the first time had to face up to the prospect of teaching pupils who would have no hope of getting a Scottish Certificate of Education pass. The feeling was that the best had to be done for them in terms of courses, as long as the interests of the able were not jeopardised. Remember that at that time the employment situation was better, so at least the less able could be more certain of a job at the end of it all.
12. Problems were worse in area schools in housing estates - there huge numbers left at the earliest opportunity, parental interest could not be guaranteed, there were large non-certificate numbers and very small certificate classes.
6. 1) We have always been lucky in Glasgow to have had very helpful Inspectors, and very good relations with them. They gave encouragement and help, passed on ideas in a free and frank manner, and gave fair if hardhitting reports on schools. They helped us find out about schools. They had a massive involvement in all aspects of education. They promote the educational policies of whatever party is in power. In general, they were in favour of it, but in private they expressed, a variety of views. Some thought it was a mistake, or at least not the answer for the



problems of the day.

- 2) Councillors were thirled to the comprehensive school and pro the abolition of privilege in any form. They believed that the comprehensive school would give all kids the change of a good education.
  - 3) Advisers had a key role. Much depends on the person. They are there to give a lead in curriculum development and expose principal teachers to good practice. They set up panels and offer help to people in the classroom. They met a lot of opposition because Scottish teachers have in the main a narrow academic view of education in which the passing of exams is paramount. Advisers had the unenviable task of getting them to break out of their conservative outlook and face up to new issues.
  - 4) Directorate staff are rarely seen in schools. They are administrators to make the service run smoothly. They know schools have problems but largely leave them to their own devices. Directives are not issued on educational matters, only Standard Circulars for administrative matters. Schools have a very difficult job, so administrators tend not to interfere.
9. Headteachers had complete authority. Some were autocrats. It was very much a case of 'YOU ARE RUNNING THE SHOW. IF THERE ARE PROBLEMS LET ME KNOW AND I'LL TRY AND HELP'. Directorate staff do not want to be on the school's back, yet they know a surprising amount of what is going on from advisers and Her Majesty's Inspectors, and what people say at interviews.

7. The main problems were:

- the splitting of pupils into those who CAN and those who CANNOT
- a narrow, academic elitism
- an overriding interest in SUBJECTS rather than EDUCATION in the round
- the idea that work that is not examined is not important.

10. Parental interest varied with the area. Senior secondary schools did not see the need for parental involvement. The extent was at the discretion of the headteacher.

13. It took a long time for changes to be noticed. Mixed-ability and the common course caused terrible problems. Group work was hardly tried. There was an invasion of worksheets which were hailed as the answer, but, in effect, detached the teacher from the class who ticked or filled in boxes. There were serious questions of discipline, class organisation and management. It was disorganisation without learning in many cases. It would have needed experienced teachers to cope rather than beginners, but a lot of the experienced ones did not want to know.

14. Teachers' Centres and colleges were packed day and night. Activity was frenetic. Enterprising headteachers and principal teachers met on an area basis. Some of the most thought-provoking work came from teachers in deprived schools, where sometimes better work was being done than in schools in so-called better areas. The extent to which in-service education is effective in promoting change depends on the leadership of

headteachers, and the willingness of their staff to identify problems and solve them in a constraint process of trial and error.

16. The teaching experience of a lot of staff was in senior secondary schools. The new cross-section of population in the comprehensive school caused concern. It was felt that the dire influx of junior secondary pupils would lead to the watering down of excellent schools. Vested interests played a big part. There was, however, an eventual, if reluctant facing up to the fact that comprehensive schools were here to stay, and we just had to get on with it. Although many heads had private reservations, they wanted to do what they could to help their staffs. Gradually, an awareness of the problems involved in the comprehensive schools emerged, and mutual learning by experience went on to try to make it come alive in schools.
17. Even when I became an administrator in 1973, a lot of schools had comprehensive facade, but inside operated rigid divisions and separations of pupils according to ability.
18. It's the old story - there are thousands of definitions, all different. I would favour mixed-ability in all subjects for secondary 1, with setting in French and Maths in secondary 2, with mixed classes for the rest. Pupils with learning difficulties must get special attention.
19. The main curriculum changes were new subjects, or changes brought about by new syllabuses/exams promoted by Consultative Committee

on the Curriculum/Her Majesty's Inspectors. Methodological changes varied enormously to the extent that headteachers and principal teachers were prepared to tackle the issues seriously, have a good go and learn by making mistakes. Those were a minority, even if sizeable. It also varied with the subject.

21. Outwith the four cities, comprehensive schools were the norm. They were new in cities, and thus required a major adjustment not just in physical terms but also in approach.
22. Equality of opportunity is difficult to realise. In Scotland, traditionally, there has been no barrier to the able child of humble social origin getting on if his parents wanted that. There has been a long tradition of working class children making good via selective schooling and university. Comprehensive schools came because the junior secondary had served its usefulness and they were going to make academic education available to all children who wanted it.
23. It is virtually impossible to have a comprehensive school in a city like Glasgow. Schools have been geared to exams for so long that teachers were never encouraged to think of successful alternative provision. Providing a reasonable education for all, facing up to catering for the wide range of abilities and talents is an enormous task.
24. No, it has not been tapped because:-
  - lack of resources
  - falling roles



- parental choice of school
- teacher attitude, militancy and morale
- discipline
- galloping unemployment
- changes in society.

1. The City of -----, which like so many other L.E.A's of the day, was not typical of Scotland. Thinking started in the middle fifties (a) as to how transfer between secondary and senior secondary could be made much easier. (b) how to diminish the effects of the Transfer Exam and (c) how pupils in the secondary schools could be given maximum opportunity for exam success.

The initiative was taken by the Directorate and as a result (a) pupils could be transferred to senior secondary during, but mainly at the end of secondary 1; not so often at the end of secondary 2; certainly in increasing numbers at the end of secondary 3. (b) With the co-operation of some secondary heads, provision was started to allow secondary 4 pupils to sit General Certificate of Education Ordinary levels.

This was the start of the educational initiative in an urban area to (i) considering eliminating the Transfer Exam and thus leading to comprehensive secondaries and (ii) by immediately greatly expanding possible transfer between secondary and senior secondary. This was seen as a way of expanding educational opportunity and also could have social benefits by a greater mix. (The problems were different in county areas where the local school admitted all pupils).

2. The 1947 Ad. Council Report was a brilliant document. Obviously, the references in it to 'omnibus schools' was important in the present context as was the discussion on optimum size of school. However, it was the intrinsic educational thinking which made many query what we were or should be trying to do, e.g. ('quoting from memory') - 'knowledge of a foreign language is no necessary

part of an educated man's equipment.' This was no criticism of languages, but pin pointed, - as did other quotations - the great difficulties in education arising from the fact that secondary schools were staffed by subject teachers who were departmentalised rather than by teachers who used their particular subjects to educate. (It is still with us!).

3. Primarily educational in my experience. Nevertheless I was conscious in the 50's of genuine concern among some politicians of the ridiculously low percentage of pupils admitted to Grammar Schools in many English Burghs and Cities. Inevitably this English influence led some politicians in Scotland to take up the cause. The all-through comprehensive became the panacea in the eyes of the political activists in this field by the mid-60's. Left to ourselves in Scotland I think there would have been more thought and experimentation in organisations like 'the Middle School', VIth Form Colleges etc but when the crunch came the Secretary of State said in effect no money for capital expenditure except for the 'all-through'.

So political decisions in Scotland, while they might have been considered right at the time were not, in my opinion, based on thorough examination if possible Scottish alternatives.

4. There are many factors which could be mentioned. Here are some.
- i) Rise of egalitarianism after the War.
  - ii) Some thought everyone should have a 'senior secondary' followed by a 'University' education. (Confusion here with 'equality of opportunity', which is basic, and had always been a stronger element in Scottish education than South of

the Border.

- iii) An outgrowth of egalitarianism was confusion about the social factor - e.g. accentuation of 'them' and 'us' - Despite the changing technological world with all its consequences, - which we now see - the Trades Union movement, which had great influence in the Labour Party and continued to fulfil its historic role, had no vision and didn't grow up. They wanted the opening-up of the existing educational pattern to all (my criticism of the Trade Union's in this context is not that they were wrong to advocate equality of opportunity for all - I applaud that - but I felt that they should have been arguing for equality of opportunity for a different kind of education) - instead of listening to those who foresaw the effects of technological development - including Harold Wilson!, and later Edward Heath. Those who wanted to consider what was involved in 'educational manpower' for the future were not listened to - and today we see the results, - yet the Trades Union should have been giving their minds to this problem and assuring access to a changing education rather than worrying about the 'special' - them and us - syndrome.
- iv) Increasing recognition of the importance of social education in the schools which is to be commended, and which many thought could only come about by having a 'social mix' in every school. Desirable - but organisationally a headache. (Dare I mention Easterhouse?).
- v) Some politicians thought that there would be a large and rapid increase in academic success. The point here is that as a nation we undoubtedly are 'under-achievers; - I am



generalising - but the educationist must ask himself in this context - is the 'all through comprehensive' the best organisational solution? And indeed what basic changes are necessary in the education which the schools provide?

vi) A small number of Secondary Heads wanted bigger schools - (Empire building?).

5. The immediate effect of Circular 600 in practice was 'all-through' - or else! This seemed strange to me in the light of some paragraphs in Circular 600. I argued the case strongly both with the Scottish Education Department that there were other options, taking into account problems in the educational, organisational, social and financial areas as well as in the time-scale of implementation. There was room for experiment. A political decision had been made at the highest level and that was that.

I am not saying that any of the options proposed would have been more viable in the long run, - I have no evidence.

Personally, I was very disappointed that in the Circular 600 meetings at St. Andrews House, Senior Inspectors despite references in Circular 600 didn't give some support to further investigation, but by then they obviously saw the issue as political rather than educational.

6. In implementing the 'all through comprehensive', - after the decision was made, the Inspectors played no significant part. The local politicians left it to the Directorate. The expansion of the Adviserate came later, and the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum did not make any contribution at that time.

7. Following on from 6 above the Directorate assumed responsibility for implementation, - with Authority approval as required, - and in doing so had innumerable discussions with headteachers who knew their own schools and their own staffs well.
- We jointly thrashed out broad guidelines in consultation, and within those the Heads were given a great deal of latitude e.g. in organising the 'common course', the continuation of 'mixed-ability' classes; subjects which should be 'setted' and when and for how long.
- It has to be remembered that there was a vast difference between the difficulties by Heads and staff in a down town secondary compared with a highly selective senior secondary which became an area school.
8. Public reaction was not great, especially after a decision was made. There were parents, some very articulate, who expressed doubts. There was perhaps a little more of this in the urban area than in county burghs where the public saw little change.
- With the willing collaboration of the local press and T.V., the Directorate did a lot of public relations work by series of articles etc. The Directorate also participated in many parents meetings at schools.
- All this was based not on should it be done - but how.
9. Not markedly. The fee-paying schools had always creamed off a proportion of able pupils by foundations bursaries etc and this continued. Others who were less able by-passed the comprehensives as they had previously opted out of the old secondary/senior secondary set-up.

The Directorate did have discussions with the Heads and representatives of the Governors of the fee-paying schools about matters of mutual interest, but as the private schools were not considering expanding, the net result was a continuation of relations as before, - which incidentally were good in the City.

10. Yes. Every 'area' school is different in an urban situation. If you want an acceptable mix or even 'the least-worst' mix you have to juggle with natural-boundaries. As the Authority was against the use of buses and this is an artificial expedient, there were one or two schools which had virtually no mix at all.

11. a) There were understandable 'staff problems'. Staff in senior secondary schools who for 20/30 or more years had been accustomed to teaching from an academic point of view had to adjust, and many did it very well. There was also the necessity to recruit the right calibre of staff for secondary IV, V and VI teaching in 'up-graded' existing secondary schools ('subject specialist', - despite what I have written above!).

In some cases, common course teaching was found difficult by teachers at the beginning, and not relished by some pupils - both bright and otherwise.

'Mixed-ability' teaching was found difficult in some subjects.

A rapid expansion of the Adviserate and collaboration with the local College of Education in in-service provision was of great value at this time and later. With the result many of the problems settled down in due course.

Having said that, it probably still takes a 'generation' before teachers as a whole really get the best out of a major

organisational change. This is no criticism of teachers, - far from it.

- b) The other difficulties arose in building expansion and the extension of available resources. These were temporary, and on the whole the schools ultimately benefitted. Unfortunately, the implementation could not be done quickly enough to give comprehensive education the best possible start every where throughout the area.

(Continuing fault of Governments - making decisions without the resources to implement them!).

- c) A bonus was that the ----- system was based on each comprehensive school having 3/4 feeder primaries and because we spent a lot of time in fostering collaboration the transfer from primary 7 to secondary 1 became very much easier than before.

12. All senior secondary and most secondary became the new comprehensives. A few of the smallest secondary schools were used as annexes etc until the building programme was completed and a few were closed.

The optimum size of the new schools was considered to be 1200.

13. I have already referred to the agreement with Heads about broad guidelines. Circular 600, as such, had little effect on our discussions. The statements in paragraph 6, e.g. were self-evident once the basic decision was taken.

14. Pupils are individuals with different abilities, interests, personalities and motivations, and a sound educational system



must take account of them. This should be easier in a good comprehensive school than in a primary 7 selective system, even with factors which I mentioned in answer to question 1.

15. a) The curriculum in these days is ever-changing anyway. (In the view of some of us not always quickly enough in what we consider to be the right direction). The advent of the comprehensive schools undoubtedly posed curricular problems, and I have little doubt that much good work done in schools today in various spheres was given an impetus by the major organisational change involved. To evaluate the actual impact is very difficult. There is time-lag between the need for curricular change and implementation. New reports on the curriculum are very often a summary of the very best current practice.

b) Undoubtedly. The emphasis on the 'academic approach' for many pupils was modified - to the benefit of quite a number of pupils. It should not be forgotten, however, that some changes in teaching methods in the '60's were due to other factors e.g. the Brunton Report.

16. a) Difficult to say to what extent, - but, no doubt at all that most teachers did question what they were teaching and how they were doing it. One of the sadder consequences was that a small proportion of teachers assumed everything old was bad, threw the baby out with the bath-water, and concentrated on 'new' and untried content and method.

b) In my experience Teachers' Centres were a great boon and well-used, while in-service training reached new heights during the

decade after 1965. The Directorate did all possible to see that both were used to the maximum possible.

17. As above, I would hesitate to generalise under the word 'Scottish'. Rural Scotland was accustomed to all pupils from an area attending the same school, and these secondaries had only to consider possible changes in internal organisation as a result of comprehensive education.

Urban Scotland had more difficult problems, referred to above, - social mix, unnatural boundaries, and at the end of the day, not the slightest possibility of every comprehensive school being considered of equal status, - particularly in the eyes of parents. This has been demonstrated recently as a result of 'parental choice'.

18. 'Equality of opportunity' was broadly speaking a traditional Scottish attitude. Headteachers, in the main and for a long time, had done a great deal for pupils of different abilities and types. Not only in encouraging academic success - the 'lad o'pairs', - but in directing pupils into a whole variety of careers and specific jobs.

Again, from what I have gathered, much more so than in England.

19. a) My definition - an area i.e. community school with the resources (staff and materials) to meet all the educational and social needs of all its pupils.

- b) This depended on whether one viewed the change from the political or educational stand-point. In my experience a lot of different benefits were expected from the change, - some emphasised social

rather than educational values; some saw it as reducing the importance of the academic, while others saw it as giving more pupils the advantage of an academic education, - and so on.

20. No. Not until 19(a) is achieved, - and that is impossible because of the necessity for education to keep changing to meet the basic needs of the day.

1. The move to comprehensive education had a political basis and  
+
2. was part of the education policy of the Labour Party which was in power in the mid-60's. The notion was imported into Scotland from England, where feelings were much stronger. There was a realisation that the secondary modern/junior secondary type of school was not fulfilling its purpose, and that its pupils were not being adequately catered for. The educational unrest was much more intense in England than in Scotland, partly because of the long tradition of omnibus schools in small burghs and rural areas.
3. The implementation of the excellent ideas in the 1947 Report was a disappointment. The educational world was not ready for them, given that it was preoccupied with post war problems - shortage of staff, huts to get roofs over heads, reconstruction.
4. The 1960's was a period of unrest - the 'swinging 60's' - where social issues were dominant, and people were full of optimism, and wanted to avail themselves of opportunities on a broad front.
5. The main implication of Circular 600 was the adoption in Scotland of the 'all-through' comprehensive school as the only acceptable model. In ----- the implication was the adaptation of the existing plant. With the opening of ----- school in 1987, the process of adaptation is complete - 22 years later.  
  
Also, the Circular meant a whole host of new ideas and concepts for senior secondary schools which had built solid reputations of



academic respectability over decades in the areas they served. Many of these ideas were beyond the ken of many staff whose background, education and training had fitted them for a selective system.

6. a) Her Majesty's Inspectors helped if asked, either to help senior secondary schools to adjust to an intake of 'thick' children, or junior secondary schools to cope with the demands of certificate work. They could not tell Directors what to do, only advise. In any case, all of the Inspectorate were not convinced themselves, so they gently nudged people in a comprehensive direction.
- b) Councillors were very committed especially in Labour controlled areas. They voted solidly on party lines.
- c) The Directorate had to implement a political decision in the light of their existing resources - human and physical, and cope with the problems thrown up - finance, staffing, buildings, morale. Many staff were never reconciled. They put a brave face on it, but in reality they hated it. I sometimes feel that the Directorate did not pay enough attention to the educational implications as they affected people in schools.
- d) Advisers, such as they were, tended to be used for field work in schools.
- e) The Consultative Committee on the Curriculum did not play any part in the shift to comprehensive education in my opinion. It was Inspector dominated and followed the mould set by HMSCi Pringle - groups of hand-picked professionals producing papers. It was - and is - linked very intimately with the Department, and

exercises much more control now than.

7. The main obstacles were:

- money
- staff (lack of)
- lack of clear guidelines
- confusion/resentment among staff
- lack of professional expertise to deal with the problems created.

9. Heads had too much latitude. They were as a result able to get round the introduction of comprehensive education, and discretely went about going their own ways. Some tried genuinely, but success was slow in coming. They, of course, had the problem of staff persuasion, especially with principal teachers. The Directorate was very patient.

10. Parental reaction was mixed, and any that came to the surface was usually in response to worry about how the change was going to affect individual families. Social factors were involved, and some vociferous opposition came from parents who felt anxious that their own children would suffer.

11. Private schooling is not really a problem in ----- . One beneficial effect was that some former junior secondary schools with a low public image gained enormously in stature and reputation. Some have become excellent schools.

12. The extent of internal change was dependent entirely on the

headteacher and his principals. It was, therefore, very uneven and patchy. There were tremendous variations among schools.

13. Reform came very slowly after many years. It was dependent on the availability of resources and the flexibility of staff attitudes. Real successes tended to be sporadic and localised.

14. a) Two thirds of heads were amicable to the change. '

b) Only half of the teachers were. There was never active staff hostility. But, it was more subtle and hidden. Comprehensive education upset the established routine of Scottish education with its classes of (mostly) receptive pupils working towards exam success and university or a career. It was devastating for some teachers. Didacticism was out; pupils with learning difficulties were in. Only thinking teachers tackled the real issues involved in applying the comprehensive principle.

15. Many schools operated on split sites for many years, and this facilitated the continuation of the junior secondary/senior secondary split. Many heads used the fact of separate buildings to separate pupils of different abilities. In many cases the comprehensivisation was cosmetic. People adjusted to the change to varying degrees and at varying pace.

16. a) Secondary 1/secondary 2 caused great difficulty. Much work done in secondary 1 was very poor. Some children actually went back on their primary 7 performance. Mixed-ability teaching never got off the ground; for many, it meant teaching to the middle. Setting was common in secondary 2. The techniques, materials and

willingness to experiment were missing.

- b) By secondary 3/secondary 4 the proximity of the Scottish Certificate of Education exams meant that pupils were sorted out into ability groups, usually called 'certificate' and 'non-certificate':

17. There was no lack of advice about how to change the curriculum and methods, but people who tried came under very strong pressure to change from colleagues and parental expectations for their children. Many see 'education' in terms of success in exams. Look what happened to R.F. Mackenzie in Aberdeen!
18. The extent to which teachers scrutinised their ideas and approaches to their work is seen by the fact that the Standard grade was introduced in 1984. There had been much groping around and struggling to find solutions for years - Certificate of Secondary Education, Royal Society of Arts, profiles etc. Gradually, opinion shifted from seeing academic excellence as the sole purpose of schooling. In-service and advisers helped here, but the crucial factor in any school is the quality of its headteacher and his department heads.
19. Whether the comprehensive school fitted in with tradition or not depended on geographical location to a great extent. In rural areas, there was not much change, much more in cities. Social attitudes and attitudes to education have changed and the comprehensive school is generally accepted.



21. The essential aims of a comprehensive school are, in my view:
- To eliminate separation in post-primary education by gathering pupils of the whole ability range in one school, so that by their association pupils may benefit each other, and that easy re-adjustments in grouping and in subject studied may be made as pupils themselves change and develop.
- To collect pupils representative a cross section of society in one school, so that good academic and social standards, an integrated school society, and a gradual contribution to an integrated community beyond the school may be developed out of this amalgam of varying ability and social endowments.
- To concentrate teachers, accommodation and equipment so that pupils of all ability groups may be offered a wide variety of educational opportunity, and that scarce resources may be used economically.
22. The Potential of the comprehensive school has not been tapped. Only now, twenty years on, are we really getting to grips with what was intended. The comprehensive principle has since been endangered by two important factors.
- a) Falling schools rolls
  - b) Parental choice, and the creation of 'magnet' schools.

#### ADES

1. I would say that ADES dealt almost exclusively with the logistics and administrative implications of comprehensive education and hardly considered the philosophical/pedagogical implications. Directors had their own educational views like everyone else.

2. ADES exerts influence by being consulted, and consulting with other bodies in Scottish Education.

1. The real background to the initiatives to create comprehensive schools was the general spreading of liberal ideas after the war which gradually gathered momentum and eventually assumed a bandwagon aspect. It became a focus for the aims of social 'do-gooders'. What positive advantages or benefits they achieved is a very open question, but certainly the optimism which characterised the 60's is long gone. The main emphasis came when the Labour Party (understandably) took these liberal ideas on board and made them policy - comprehensive schools were an example. I do not think that the Scottish educational world was ready for what happened as a result of the political push.
2. The 1947 Report was and is continually trotted out in educational circles. It made people think, but I see its links with the comprehensive issue as very tenuous. It was beautifully written, but lacked a set of concrete suggestions as to how some of its high-sounding and theoretical proposals could be made concrete.
3. Undoubtedly political. It just wouldn't have happened without the Labour Party pushing it so fiercely. Educational opinion was very divided, and public opinion was predictably divided on party lines. Many teachers I came into contact with were against it on educational grounds. The driving force for the movement was not coming from the chalk face, although it is probably true to say that those teachers who were in favour were politically motivated to at least some extent. At the end of the day, the force for most major educational changes has to be political.

4. Liberal social philosophy was in vogue in the 60's, but the most vocal clamour for change in the educational system was in England, not up here. It is, however, true to point out that the junior secondary school had been a dismal failure, especially in the large conurbations, less so in rural areas. It drew attention to the fact that the separation of pupils into two groups at 12 was wrong. But the selection issue was not so vital up here. Indeed, it was seen by many as very fair, given that a higher proportion made it to senior secondary schools than did to grammar schools in England. Also, most Scottish primary schools did a very good job in drilling the 3RS and preparing pupils thoroughly for the control test, so that all would have as good a chance of going to the senior secondary and hence getting a better education for life.
5. The major implications were administrative and logistic - buildings, finance etc. Again these were more acute in centres of dense population. All areas had to make an effort to make the proposals of Circular 600 come to fruition. There was a lot of local discussion about zoning and the names of the 'new' schools. Many parents were keen to get their kids to established former senior secondary schools (and were prepared to move house to guarantee that if necessary) rather than upgraded junior secondary schools.
6. 1) I always thought that only a small group of senior Inspectors - notably Brunton and Dickson - were really pushing the comprehensive issue. Brunton especially stood up for education against the Scottish Education Department - this is why he never



became Secretary as he had wanted. But District Inspectors were obliged to engage in discussions with heads and Directorate officials and push the new ideas. Their brief was to oversee the transition to the new system, and give advice both on administrative concerns and on the internal organisation of schools. Given their own background and views, I think many spoke of their commitment to the comprehensive philosophy with tongues in cheeks.

- 2) Labour councillors obviously said they were in favour of the change; Tory administrations were not. A lot depended on the political complexion of the education committee.
- 3) Directors who were not keen on the new ideas adopted delaying tactics and engaged in battles with their Committees. A good example was John McEwan in Lanarkshire. At the local level, Directors were chiefly engaged with the organisational/administrative features of the change rather than the educational implications. There was a wide division of opinion in the Association of Directors of Education in Scotland on the comprehensive issue, and no decision as a body was ever taken for or against it. It was a case of change occurring in an area at a pace proportional to the Director's personal commitment to the comprehensive idea. You pushed it if you felt like it.
- 4) Advisers inevitably spread from organisers of practical subjects to all subjects. As Professor Galbraith said once you start a change it snowballs. The advisory service was a natural development in a period of rapid educational change. My feeling was that they were good on the administrative/organisational side, but could not fulfil the hopes held out for them in

educational terms - their own training and outlook bedevilled the prospect of real change in schools. Also, they lacked authority, they could only advise. So much of what they said sounded fine in theory, but remained largely that, and we saw little materialising in reality that could be attributed to them. Much of what they advocated remained untried, except by a few enthusiasts, and was left as an open question. So much depended on their personality and approach, and their success in persuading heads and especially principal teachers to move.

7. The pace and scope of any shift to a comprehensive system was, I would maintain, virtually entirely dictated by individual headteachers. Some were radical, a larger number tried some things, and many effectively did not move an inch. It is questionable whether there is, or ever was, a real comprehensive school in Scotland. My impression is that for most people the omnibus school became the model, and what had been going on in rural areas for years was started in cities - all children at the local school, but strictly separated shortly after their arrival. It may be of course, that the comprehensive school as envisaged by academics and politicians just is not feasible in practice. My own feeling now is that it is not.
8. Parents were divided on the issue. Of course, many did not care one way or another. The others, mainly middle class were divided, either on political lines, or in respect of their own children: some were all for retaining the good old senior secondaries, others, whose children suffered under the bi-partite system, were all for the new schools. So parents had mixed

reactions and mixed motives.

10. Area schools, for so long the norm in rural areas did not cause problems there, but in inner cities and large council estates there must have been many difficulties for staffs and heads to face.
11. The single most powerful obstacle - buildings and finance apart - was one of attitude: a large proportion of teachers saw the move to a comprehensive system as foisted on them by those outside the profession who had not even begun to foresee the practical implications and educational difficulties which would flow from the political decision. There was widespread non-belief in the comprehensive school, and very little wholehearted acceptance of what it stood for. The feeling was that the change was too great and too rapid, and that clever children would be at a disadvantage. If anything this fear made teachers redouble their efforts to get as many pupils as could through Scottish Certificate of Education exams.
12. There was not a great deal of change from the old junior secondary/senior secondary pattern. To a fair extent the split was still apparent in the new comprehensive schools. The principal problem was (and is) that an appropriate curriculum for all pupils was never found. The idea that a subject should mean different things to different pupils was never grasped.
13. It is difficult to answer this question. Heads assured us they were doing the common course but the fact was that they were not.

They soon split kids up, some as soon as Xmas in secondary 1. Heads told good stories, but we all knew what was really going on. The common course just did not happen. Heads, as I have said, were crucial. They have long been regarded in Scotland as the power in their school. They all attended talks, conferences etc., but the extent to which they were induced to embrace change varied. In any case, the Directorate was no more sure of some of the new ideas than heads themselves. Some heads did not want to change, and for those who did, it was a case of trial and error, a bit at a time.

14. In my opinion, mixed-ability was a disaster. If it were socially acceptable, and if it were possible to know of child's approximate ability at the start of secondary, I would divide children into groups based on ability and give them all subjects, but at the level and pace they could cope with so as to maximise understanding. If you do not understand, you cannot learn and you fall behind.
15. Yes, the advent of comprehensive schools did have some effect on the curriculum and methods in schools. Teachers had to think about how to present their material if for no other reason than to survive. Some teachers - a minority - are thinkers and experimenters. The rest are there to do a job from 9 to 4, with as little outside interference as possible.
16. The advisory service gradually began to spread its wings, but the basic problem in my view was that teachers centres/in-service training were not sufficiently in the hands of the teachers



themselves. They were the province of advisers and colleges. Given that, all the courses and conferences and lectures did not have any widespread or lasting effects on practices in schools.

17. Scottish views on and attitudes to education have, whatever may be claimed in public, been conditioned by one powerful idea: SOUND DRILLING AND FACT-CRAMMING SO AS TO GROOM THE ABLE MINORITY FOR SELECTIVE SECONDARY EDUCATION AND UNIVERSITY. To that extent, comprehensive education was foreign to the Scottish educational tradition, which is traceable to Knox. Sure, the boast is of a school in every parish, but it was principally to promote the able once they had been identified.
18. Equality of opportunity is a fallacy. Equality of opportunity has always existed in Scotland - as long as you were bright, and wanted to take the opportunity that was there to do well at school and go on to university.
19. Essentially a comprehensive school takes all the children from a defined area and does not arrange them according to ability on entry. You really need to stop there, because thereafter it is up to the school, hence the variety. It would say, though, that in a comprehensive school the curriculum should be viewed in relation to 3 criteria: SOCIAL INTEREST, VOCATIONAL RELEVANCE, RECREATIONAL INTEREST. All subjects can be approached using these as guides for different ability groupings. The essential point is that the school should as far as possible fit itself to its pupils' needs, not the other way about.

20. If measured by what has been achieved in the first 20 years, the answer is an unqualified 'no'. The glaring injustice of a segregated system has been removed - or disguised? - to some extent. The basic question to ask is: did the comprehensive school ever have any potential anyway? They are certainly not working out in practice, whatever the reason. I would say even that certain pupils get a worse deal in comprehensives than they would have done previously. The profession was never sold on it to start with, and doubts have continued to grow.

#### ASSOCIATION OF DIRECTORS OF EDUCATION IN SCOTLAND

Comprehensive education was discussed at our conferences and in the Liaison Committee with Scottish Education Department. But, it was never an issue which was made a policy of the Association. Most members had to give to a go because it was government policy. The Association of Directors of Education exists to look after its members' conditions of service and to discuss current issues/trends in education as they affect them. Small committees, sub-groups are elected to study certain issues and report either to Association of Directors of Education or submit views to outside bodies. That is where they have some influence. They give ideas and views rather than make policy. Some of Scottish Education Department policy documents originated in Association of Directors of Education - The Green Paper (1971), the Guidance Pamphlet (1968), The Red Book (1973).

The Association of Directors of Education was (and is) not a body which concerns itself with the philosophy or theory of education. It is chiefly taken up with administrative and consultative pabulum. As education has become more complex, Directors have not had the time - even if they had the inclination - to get down to deep discussion about education. They have no time to distance themselves from the day to day exigencies of educational administration. The problem has been made even worse by Regionalisation. The present nine authorities are far too big to generate any meaningful educational philosophy. In early days smaller authorities could start local initiatives. I personally was comprehensively minded and was never regulated by official (Scottish Education Department) texts.

In Scotland, there was a smug belief about comprehensive education when it was introduced politically - many people said 'WE HAVE ALWAYS HAD IT'. What they meant of course was the common school, not the comprehensive school. The former was highly academically organised. The best comprehensive practice in a genuine sense has always been in the primary school. The unfortunate thing is that it has never carried over into secondary. Secondary education in Scotland has been bedevilled by a segregation of children into sheep and goats.

The 1947 Report is not well-known. In 1947 there were no means of filtering reports down to practitioners. It had a very limited circulation. Schools are also at a disadvantage by being split into departments. Teachers are differentiated by their craft - some are held to be more important than others.

How quickly comprehensive schools took root depended on which authority you were in. Some authorities were moving that way anyway. Scottish Education Department reports are usually obsolete at the date of their publication. They arise from a process of cultural osmosis. They are an attempt to make general what is the best educational practice at the time. Comprehensive schools are the natural way to organise secondary education. The English were miles ahead of us in getting the comprehensive school off the ground. Nothing good or profound in education terms ever came from the Scottish Education Department! They were barren of good ideas, so they picked them up from good examples in schools.

The main implications of Circular 600 were - buildings, transport, school closures and school building. The big questions for many people were: WHAT THE DEVIL DO WE DO? HOW DO WE CENTRALISE SCHOOL PROVISION? HOW, IN ADDITION, DO WE CATER ADEQUATELY FOR THE NON-ACADEMIC PUPILS?

Her Majesty's Inspectors are essentially like bees or pollinators of good ideas. A lot of them are meticulous administrators, but no great shakes on educational ideas. They become bogged down by minutiae.

Officials are permanently in post - councillors depend on public whim. Any Director worth his salt could wind the committee round his little finger. Directors orchestrate Committees if they know what they are about.

Directors did not react one way or another to Circular 600. They shrugged shoulders, and saw it as an arrival of the inevitable. They couldn't do much about it.



The latitude headteachers had depended on whether Directors took an authoritative or consultative line. By the 1960's, most adopted the latter approach.

I had many stormy meetings with parents - mainly those of a right-wing persuasion. They feared a reduction in standards. But those parents whose kids now had a chance of a good secondary education - i.e. Ordinary and Higher grades, heaved a profound sigh of relief.

It is difficult to say how many real changes in internal practice Circular 600 brought about. Scottish education has for many years adopted the policy of 'shaking the tree in the orchard', so that the weaker fruit falls off progressively leaving only the ripest fruit. Scottish schools have far too long concentrated on the able at the top end. The comprehensive school widened opportunities for all kids to get the chance of going for Scottish Certification of Education passes.

A comprehensive school is not - or should not be - about teaching people subjects. It is a working out in practice of involvement in a lot of activities. It is in essence a community of all sorts of different people with different talents. It should be inspired by a liberal educational philosophy, and expose children to a variety of experiences. It should provide alternative opportunities for children who are written-off academically.

The comprehensive school was undoubtedly a revolutionary concept in Scottish educational circles. It was the very antithesis of the Scottish Educational tradition. For generations, less able kids kicked their heels - Supplementary Courses, Advanced Divisions, junior

secondary schools.

After Brunton and the Ordinary grade, the comprehensive school was the inevitable institution to bring the two streams of ability together. That was its purpose - to integrate the school population into an organic whole.

The comprehensive school was hardly ever mentioned in Association of Directors of Education in Scotland, because Directors just got on with it, responding to Scottish Education Department directives as best they could, or got on in spite of the Department. They accepted what they had to, and make individual responses according to their areas and local circumstances. There was no time for deep philosophical reflection about education.

1. Comprehensive schools so-called came into being in 1965 after the Labour government took office and issued the famous Circular 600. I think their eventual creation as policy was the result of years of research into the question: what kind of secondary education should be devised to cater adequately for all children? We had had omnibus secondary schools for geographical reasons since the 1940's. Internal separation according to ability took place widely in these, and they were very successful - good exemplars of the traditional Scottish 'high school'. Advanced Divisions stuck on to primary schools were not nearly so successful. In densely populated areas, there were separate junior and senior secondary schools, to which pupils went after a 'clean cut' from their primary school at 12.
2. It didn't make a big impression in -----, or anywhere else for that matter. It wasn't written in a way which would inspire people. It was based on educational principles and a definite educational philosophy, and couched in high-flown language. It represented remote, academic theorising and looked good on paper, but found little favour with busy administrators whose job was to deal with the day-to-day realities of educational provision. I would say that its distance from reality resulted in its poor reception nationally.
3. Both. The Labour Party came to power. It was much stronger as a Party in England than Scotland at that time. So the major push came from South of the Border up here, and the Scottish party



followed suit, because it was party policy. In any case, the notion of all kids going to one school was much more revolutionary in England than in Scotland, which, as I have said, had operated that system for years, apart from in large towns. The lad o'pairts tradition which had a long heritage meant that up here there was no social prejudice in education. In general, in my view, Scots Labour politicians, even at national level, were not well versed in matters educational. A notable exception was Tom Johnston in the post-war era, who was ahead of his time.

4. Mainly because of political push, but it also fitted the prevailing societal ethos of the period i.e. expansion and opportunity. On the education side, the proposed comprehensive school in Circular 600 fitted well with what we had been doing in our 'high schools' for years - segregation of children according to ability within the school, naturally, with opportunities for the less able pupils to show their skills in sports or extra-curricular activities. These other outlets prevented the appearance of any intellectual snobbery.
5. The main implication without a doubt was getting the staff who had the skills to handle a broad spectrum of ability, and who could begin to pitch their teaching down to the least able. In a word, the question was one of adjustment to a whole new world that was opening up. The other undoubted problem was an expanding school population, but in -----, careful planning meant that our school building nearly always kept pace with house building, and we always offered teachers housing, so that we never had serious staff shortages as in other parts of the



country.

6. a) Her Majesty's Inspectors had no influence whatever in my view. They were supposed to supervise what went on. I had a friendly relationship with most of the ones I saw, never any animosity. I was never aware of their pushing a line, even on matters like comprehensive education, which was supposed to be national policy. In any case, many of them had no experience whatever of what they were inspecting, which meant that they had to look around for examples of good practice, if they could recognise it. I mean, would you send an Honours classics graduate to inspect a primary 2 class?
- b) I was fortunate with mine in ----- . Relationships were built up over time. They always trusted me and took my word, especially when I could back it with research findings, as I always tried to do. We had fights, but we never fell out. If they respected you, they generally were happy to trust your recommendations and take your word. As long as you consulted them on the local implications of any proposed prior to its becoming policy and could justify it, you were all right; the main thing was not to ignore their point of view, and you could then persuade them on any educational principle you wanted.
- c) They were there to run the system and make it work as we wanted it to work. Again, you made sure you took the local Elected Members with you to obviate awkward problems. I believed in operating as a team with my deputies and assistants, and thus delegated duties. This was good staff training. We always held weekly review meetings on Mondays, and took corporate decisions

as far as possible.

d) They were the subject experts we couldn't be, and were there to advise on subjects, as long as they were careful never to overstep a headteacher. If they did, we usually had to sort it out. Their main function was to advise teachers on matters of curriculum, assessment, methods, equipment, or they were called in on the planning of new schools.

e) As far as I'm aware, the Educational Institute of Scotland never expressed a view on comprehensive education. They were a body which we always consulted as appropriate.

7. It was up to them. That's why they were appointed and it's always been like that. We merely said: 'O.K. lads - it's comprehensive schools from now on'. All we controlled was staffing. As for internal organisation, we let them get on with it as they saw fit. They had a real say in picking their staff, and had virtually total control. That's the only way it can be done in my book.

8. It varied. Some were worried that schools with good academic reputations would not keep them in the new set-up e.g. ----- School used to rival top Edinburgh fee-paying schools in the Edinburgh Bursary Competition. Many people were uncertain what would happen when you brought in the mental defectives. In the case of the less able, there were two related reactions among parents: relief at the lack of stigma at 11+, but also apprehension that their son or daughter might not be able to make much of the chance they were being given.

10. No.
11. Many headteachers had their schools organised on academic lines in accordance with their own educational philosophy and upbringing. Hence the major obstacle was adjustment, especially in the major academic disciplines - classics, modern languages and mathematics. The problem was how would these teachers of one type of background cope with the curricular implications of this major innovation.
12. Not a great deal, and certainly not as much as articles in journals of the period suggested. In my view, it was very much a case of a continuation of what had gone before, despite all the talk. The introduction of comprehensive schools in Scotland meant a spread of the omnibus system. Segregation according to ability continued as before.
14. The nub of the matter is: the whole of secondary education should be concerned with fitting the curriculum to the child, but always allowing flexibility and chances of promotion/demotion for pupils as their strengths and weaknesses show. There must be a recognition of a basic truth: some pupils have ability, some do not. So schools should take them in secondary 1 and segregate them as their primary school said they were, and provide a suitable range of curricula, but allowing the flexibility I have already mentioned. It must be that way.
- 15.a) Not much, apart from a few new subjects or subject names. The content stayed much the same.



- b) Methods a bit more, because teachers had to come up with ways of teaching their subject to thick kids, especially in that nonsense the common course. That's a misnomer - you can't have 'common' subjects because abilities are not commonly held. The wide range of ability with which they were faced meant that teachers had to devise strategies to cope in their rooms in order to survive.
16. a) There was a perceived need for in-service training. I would say  
+  
b) that it did affect attitudes and approaches, albeit that it was only ever a minority of staff who went, either for genuine reasons or for the sake of their promotion prospects, or both. We were keen on Teacher's Centres in ----- . After all, it was a whole new era in education which called for in-service training, because much of what was happening was beyond the ken of most staff in post. They needed information and help.
17. Frankly, it was a tremendous struggle. Scottish teachers had been preoccupied with catering for brainy pupils for decades. 'Ability' was conceived narrowly as 'mental ability' (whatever that is). This was a new idea, for we had never really got down seriously to looking at and providing for many different kinds of ability. I think the aim of education in schools should be to look for these and develop them. The comprehensive system tried to get across the idea that one type of education - the academic - was not appropriate for all children, some of whom had one talent, others ten. It called for a new approach from staff, but I wouldn't say it was a radical development. It was merely asking teachers to consider a problem they should have faced years before.



18. It has always existed in Scotland, less so down south. Financial assistance was made available for the able poor, so that they could get a good education. The only people who stood in the way of equality of opportunity were parents. Much of the hot air that was talked about equality and equality of opportunity in the 60's was a lot of rubbish, especially the suggestions that comprehensive schools were the answer.
19. A comprehensive school is one which takes in all the pupils from a prescribed area and arranges an education for them suited to their ability, whatever that is, be it music, art, manual dexterity or 6 Higher passes in secondary 5 all at 'A'. Although it is one of the most vexing questions, schools must identify a whole range of abilities, and by constant reassessing, develop them as far as they can. This view just did not exist before, since 'mental' ability was the only credible one.
20. No, because we haven't really done what I said in my answer to the last question. We haven't really got over the barrier of discovering all the potential abilities of children. Many people are still thirled to academic notions and an overriding desire not to harm the able, rather than confront the education of other children. Separating children on academic criteria is endemic in the Scottish mind. Integration looks fine in theory, but its practical realisation, with the difficulties it caused when folk got down to it, made it, I fear, unacceptable to a great many.

The development of the comprehensive idea was a gradual process which matured over quite a long period but accelerated after 1945.

There is no doubt that the 1947 Advisory Council Report gave persuasive and concise expression to a number of educational ideas then current - the importance of the individual child irrespective of ability and the importance of aspects of education other than the strictly academic. The Report helped over a long period to develop a climate of opinion which was favourable to the creation of a comprehensive system of secondary education.

Many of these ideas were also current in Education Departments. Administrators with the Ed.B. degree, educational psychologists, organisers and the more progressive members of the Inspectorate shared these newer ideas, and did a fair bit to promote them in schools.

The Director of Education, in my experience, quickly learned, like a politician, to practise the art of the possible. In many instances, their educational ideas and ideals had to be adjusted to what would be acceptable to parents and their Education Committee in the area in which they worked. A Director could find it not only unproductive but also very damaging to his future effectiveness if he tried to insist on the introduction of ideas or an organisation which the authority and/or the local population considered unacceptable. This hard truth I can illustrate from the two Conservative areas in which I served ----- and ----- where the predominant interest was education with the utmost economy which implied an avoidance of change for change's sake,

the avoidance of expenditure on new materials or specialist teaching staff, and the avoidance of expenditure on a heavy school building programme. If you contrast this with the educational and political climate in, say, a city like Glasgow, you will appreciate that what might be regarded as desirable or practicable there might be regarded as the very opposite in a rural/agricultural county.

There is no doubt that the drive towards the introduction of comprehensive education in Scotland was almost as much political as it was educational. It was essential to have the national (but not necessarily the local) political climate propitious, otherwise Circular 600 could not have been issued. That Circular had enormous and lasting influence on the organisation of secondary education in Scotland.

When I went to ----- in ----- the organisation was very much as it had been in ----- 6 year secondary schools for all children in the immediate local area and 3 year departments for those pupils not aiming to take Scottish Certificate of Education Ordinary or Higher exams. Transfer tests (IQ, English and Arithmetic) were used as the basis for allocation to certificate or non-certificate courses in secondary 1. Those pupils with ambition at the end of their junior secondary course transferred to a 6 year school, but the choice of subjects at their disposal was limited. Standards at junior secondary schools were not as high as in 6 year secondaries. In the city of ----- there was ----- Academy, a highly selective school which took the top 20% of pupils as measured by the transfer test. With 700 years of tradition, it was highly regarded as a good school by local parents and politicians. Any suggestion to change its organisation was met with outright hostility. ----- had 6 year and 3 year courses, but it was denuded of pupils of



the highest ability.

In -----, the organisation of secondary education was dominated by a long-standing agreement of the education authority and ----- Academy, which admitted the top 20% of pupils from primary school in ----- nominated by the authority. Other pupils went to 3 year schools in ---- ----- and -----.

The memoranda I prepared advocated an organisation of 6 year comprehensive school for parts of the county outwith the city of Perth. I must emphasise that one of the ways in which the Scottish Education Department strongly influenced the provision and organisation of education was by control of finance and building programmes. There was an obligation to have building amendment plans approved in detail. This system of financial/buildings control brought central government pressure to bear on local authorities in the sort of provision they were allowed to organise.

There was little difficulty in accepting the idea of comprehensive education in small burghs like ----- or ----- . This was the same for all small burgh towns in Scotland from what I gathered from other directors. There was intense reluctance, however, to adopt a comprehensive pattern in ----- mainly because of the attachment to --- Academy and all it stood for. The Authority was merely reflecting the views of the parents of pupils and teachers in the school. I may add that some of them refused to speak to me for some years after reorganisation because I was held to have been responsible for advising the authority 'wrongly' to reorganise the Academy as a 6 year comprehensive school. Since 1968 there have been slight alterations to



the original plan: the arrangement with ----- has stopped, small four year schools have been upgraded to 6 year status and a new school has opened at ----- . Some of these have uneconomic classes in some subjects, but the authority is prepared to accept this in preference to bussing the pupils to central secondary schools.

In my view, the 1959 Working Party Report and the introduction of the Scottish Certificate of Education Ordinary grade exam in 1962 were very influential in leading on to the organisation of secondary education on comprehensive lines. One of the ultimate results was the unwilling decision by the education authority to close all secondary departments in the county and centralise provision. This proved unpopular with a considerable body of parents. Those content for their children to leave at 15/16 were also content to have them attend a local school rather than have them bussed to a central school or put up in obligatorily provided hostel accommodation at ----- Academy and ----- High.

The traditional function of the Director of Education is to advise his authority on educational and administrative matters. I have never been brash enough to claim to be an expert on every aspect of education. Insofar as I had an educational function, it seemed to me that I should act as a mediator between the authority and schools. In some cases, if I were fortunate, I could act as an enabler or a catalyst to ensure that educational progress was made without actually trying to impose it. I took the view that one of the main functions of a director, apart from running an efficient administrative machine, was to secure provision of such conditions - staff, buildings, equipment, materials - that effective education could take place. I saw it as my job to collaborate and discuss with headteachers but never to impose anything on them,

particularly in regard to the internal organisation or school curricula. It has always seemed to me that, while the organisation of secondary education is important, it is not of primary importance. I have known good senior secondary, junior secondary and comprehensive schools. Quality of provision depends on the quality of the headteacher and his staff. Given a first rate staff you can run a successful school in a barn. It always helps, of course, to have good physical conditions and an adequate supply of materials. The main function of a Director of education is to provide the best staff he can find and place them in the best physical surroundings for them to do their job.

1. Politicians nationally wanted to change so it happened. Ministers are advised by civil servants and Her Majesty's Inspectors. There was talk in the higher echelons of the service about the mess junior secondary education was in, and how unfair and divisive the qualifying exam was. I think this had some effect on what went into Circular 600.
2. The immense effect of the 1947 Report did not reach staffrooms, but it definitely was read by Directors and Her Majesty's Inspectors/Inspectorate. Teachers haven't time to read high-sounding reports. It caused a stir when it came out, but whatever effect it had was delayed. The agreement and acceptance of it were eventual rather than immediate.
3. If there was any feeling among teachers, a minority were solidly against junior secondary schools. There was some agitation among committed members of the Education Institute of Scotland and Labour Party for the comprehensive school, but no strong feeling among the majority of teachers for any change. Indeed, the majority would have been quite happy to let the old system go on. It suited people, and was widely accepted as right, just and generous. Remember a high proportion of pupils were admitted to senior secondary schools in Scotland.
4. If the Labour Party had not come to power in 1964, there would have been no comprehensive system in Scotland. I am sure of that. It was also a period of expansion and full employment.



Educational ambitions were fired, expectations were high, and 'opportunities for all' was the catch-phrase. So, quite apart from its being official policy, the inherent notions in the comprehensive principle made it an attractive concept anyway. Fairness and equality were the goals of social policy in the mid-60's. The mood in society at large was receptive to the idea of the comprehensive school.

5. The Circular did not have much effect to start with. Any action occurred at Directorate or headteacher level. Her Majesty's Inspectors discussed it with both these groups. It was either pushed from the top down, or not pushed at all, depending on individual inclinations. There were in the West four or five key schools - e.g. Glenwood, Crookston Castle, Cranhill, Knightswood. People watched their progress. If they had failed, the whole movement would have collapsed. They did not, and so provided encouragement to go on for the Doubting Thomases, of whom many existed.

6. a) Some of Her Majesty's Inspectors had personal qualms, but it was a national directive. They had to sell it. Their early concerns were with accommodation and buildings. Only later did they get involved in discussing the curricular implications.

b) In the Directorate, the rate of progress of the changeover  
+  
c) depended on two things: the strength of the Education Committee, and the charisma and personal views of the Director. The West of Scotland contained some interesting contrasts in this respect. Some were for, others were most vociferously against. They used finance as a delaying tactic, but in reality it was not a major



problem as it was calculated on pupil numbers. Buildings were much more a real headache.

- d) Advisers were not very influential. Some took their job seriously, others became effectively assistant directorate staff - deskbound. The service was created because the Directorate staff could not cope, given the massive expansion in the service. They were assistants to Her Majesty's Inspectors and Directorate staff in pushing changes in curriculum, methods, exam syllabuses, etc. To be fair, certain of them did a very good job and did have an impact.
7. My impression is that headteachers only ever got broad directives. They were simply allowed to get on with it, and make of it what they could.
8. Parental reaction - excluding a large number who evinced apathy - depended on whether they saw their own child gaining or suffering from the comprehensive school.
9. Certainly in the West, the number of private schools was so small that only limited creaming took place, and certainly not enough to have a huge impact on the comprehensives.
10. Area schools did pose problems but, as always, much depended on the headteacher. Social and housing policies vitiated the comprehensive notion of socio-economic balance from the outset. Educational institutions must live with this fact of life and get on with the job.

11. The basic obstacle was teacher opposition - not to the  
+  
12. theoretical concept of the comprehensive school, but to the  
+  
13. suggested internal organisational and pedagogical implications it  
entailed. There were widespread grumbles and dissatisfaction but  
no hue and cry. Immense diversity existed in internal practice:  
the whole spectrum was there, with only a few exceptional places  
really making any effort to translate the theory into practice.  
Mixed ability was tried after a fashion and for varying lengths  
of time. Group work hardly made any inroads in secondary  
schools. Teachers simply did not know how to cope with what was  
expected. Given their training, upbringing and previous  
experience and the views of their senior colleagues, this was  
hardly surprising. There were a large number for whom the change  
was unwelcome, and who just failed to adapt.
14. Many tried mixed-ability classes for a period varying from 6  
months to 2 years. Many favoured setting by subject from Xmas in  
secondary 1. Broadbanding was another compromise attempted.  
Scottish Certificate of Education exams and fears for the effects  
on the high flyers caused people to group by ability as soon as  
possible.
15. The effect of the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum was  
hardly noticeable at the start. The curriculum papers percolated  
to some schools and departments, but only slowly, and to some  
subjects not at all. The Scottish Certificate of Education  
Examination Board exercised a very overt control on what happened  
in departments. For some heads of department, success in  
external exams was their principal goal, and hardly anything

would distract them from that. This is not a criticism, just a statement of fact. Some teachers were very good at that kind of teaching, and had built up personal reputations on it. Teaching methods are still much as they were when I started teaching - expository and very didactic. One or two young teachers experimented with new methodology, but by and large it's still a case of teacher talks, pupils listen then write and learn at home.

16. A few teachers were immediately aware of the value of Teachers Centres and in-service courses. Others were dragged along on the band-wagon. Others didn't move at all. Some were unwilling to ditch the old until they were sure where they were going. You must never underestimate the feelings of confusion and bewilderment that were present in many schools. Comprehensive intakes upset the apple-cart quite dramatically. All in all, I would say that these courses helped to create an awareness of change, even if the recommendations were never tried out in the classroom. So much depended on heads, principal teachers and advisers. The role of Her Majesty's Inspectors in curriculum change was crucial. They are usually recruited because they represent the cream of the profession and are forward-looking pioneers. This gives them the authority to offer sound advice to Directors, Advisers and Heads. Most change over your period was Her Majesty's Inspectors influenced if not Her Majesty's Inspectors initiated.

17. In theory, the comprehensive school fitted perfectly with the omnibus idea operating in rural areas. Some of Scotland's finest



and proudest schools were these. They have hardly changed since comprehensive schools came. But in cities the story has not been so happy. In junior secondary schools, part of the trouble was that teachers had not found the right curriculum or the right way to teach less able children. All they got was watered-down senior secondary stuff, dominated by the text book. It was unbelievably boring and dull. Academic traditions in Scotland have proved very resilient and resistant to change. In the comprehensive school in the city areas, separation by ability had remained and teaching practice, especially for the least able has not much changed. Having said that, I would not wish to see a reversion to segregation into separate schools at 12.

18. I have always been sceptical about the concept of equality of opportunity. Up here it meant this in rural areas at least: you all went to the local school and those who did well academically got every encouragement to go as far as they could. Inequality and lack of interest are innate. You start with inequality and the education system makes it progressively worse. All comprehensive schools did was to create a safety-net for late developers and remove the stigma of separation at 12.
19. A comprehensive school should have the following characteristics:
- take all children from an area
  - have mixed-ability classes, at least to start with
  - avoid labelling or feelings of inferiority even when setting by ability
  - there should be a variety of good courses
  - methods should be geared to the population.



20. No, not by any means. Much remains to be done. We have paid lip service to terms like 'DEVELOP FULL POTENTIAL', 'CATER FOR ALL CAPACITIES AND INTERESTS'. Parental and teachers' attitudes are huge stumbling blocks. I am not at all sure that Munn and Dunning will take us much further either.

The 1947 Report could be said to be the start of the 'modern' period in Scottish education. Comprehensive education in Scotland is all about a physical reorganisation which remained without the support of an education theory to match. The 1947 Report has as its main legacy the establishment of a particularly powerful ethos of learning and a learning environment. It classified the secondary population in psychological terms, and laid down a curriculum to match the classifications. It also had things to say about methodology and teacher training. So the Report has some stature - though in my view much overrated - but it has nothing to do with comprehensive reorganisation. That came from ideas outside the world of education. The 1947 Report culminated in the Munn Report in 1977, that windjammer of 20th Century educational theory. That 30 year period forms a neat unit. In it were active the people who received their education in the 20's and 30's, with all its connotations of presbyterian morality and thriftiness. Munn did not represent a radical change in thinking. Its curriculum remains formal, its recommendations influenced by the thoughts of the Exam Board and the training and attitudes of its members. The puritan ethos has remained strong throughout that period, so that what I call the 'ghost curriculum' - social education, multicultural education - found it very hard to make inroads into the formal subject-dominated curriculum in schools. So the 1947 Report is a historical document which had a powerful influence in shaping ideas on schooling. It was the precursor of the omnibus school, not the comprehensive school. It advocates the classic division and segregation so noteworthy in Scottish educational practice. In effect, it tried to project into the second half of the 20th Century the 'best' ideas and

practices of the first half.

Stratification in any educational system emphasises differences between pupils, so the introduction of comprehensive schools in Scotland did not cause a big battle. It was interpreted as 'all kids under one roof'. That's all! There was from the 1950's onwards an ethos of separateness, even in buildings - junior secondary schools, 4 year schools, six year schools etc. This separateness is reflected in almost all the Reports and pronouncements of the time. But the same Reports (Junior Secondary Memorandum; Brunton; Ruthven) all acknowledged that the separated system was not having success. Many schools, despite a lot of good work, had a lack of status. Equality of opportunity depended on how generous an allocation of pupils was made to the resources available. It is worth noting that while 40% of children in West of Scotland went to senior secondary school, the comparable figure for the East was around 25%. That's why the really spectacular success of the Ordinary Grade in 1962 was chiefly due to a huge uptake in the East. This success began to happen as more and more four year schools were being built. It eventually made their headteachers push to have their status upgraded. So a lot of things were coalescing in the educational crucible in the years 1958-63. There was, in effect, an embryonic or incipient comprehensive system, then Labour came to power and that was it! Remember, of course, that many schools were organised on a multilateral basis.

John Brunton raised the morale of Her Majesty's Inspectors. He wanted to make them 'the spearhead of the teaching profession'. They were to assume a prominent role in curriculum development to take the place of their previous involvement in national examining. He instituted regular



conferences of Chief Inspectors so that they could participate in formulating policy. Their job was then to go out and explain/implement that policy in conjunction with Directorate staff and heads.

After Circular 614 and 600 (that's the better order in which to take them), Authorities were free to devise policy along the lines they already were going. It was only in 1968 that the firm political decision was taken that all schools should be comprehensive. So authorities decided policy on organisation, and members of the Inspectorate began to exercise influence on what was happening in the classroom. Circular 614 enunciated curriculum principles, courses and methodology. The Consultative Committee on the Curriculum was given the task of seeing to this. The term 'common course' was invented by the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum.

The Ordinary grade was born out of an increasing awareness of wastage in senior secondary schools, and of the inadequacy of the old Lower. Both of these started a development for greater academic opportunities and for a widened access to these. The creation of the Ordinary grade exam had a great influence on the development of, and trends in, Scottish education. Raising of the school leaving age, with its compulsion to stay on at school, increased the demand to 'have a go' at Ordinary grade. Raising of the school leaving age was a complication introduced into the slowly emerging comprehensive system before it got properly underway. Raising of the school leaving age revived interest in the old 3 year courses, but this time they were spread over 2 years, and had no certificate at the end. This one event started a train of events that culminated in setting up Munn and Dunning in 1974.



It is a feature of Scottish education that one single idea very quickly becomes a corporate idea, especially in the Directorate. The danger in this is, of course, massive uniformity. This is why there were moves to establish comprehensive schools long before Circular 600 in Scotland. It was politically suitable to socialist administrations in those authorities which had them. Education Committees are the political masters of the Directorate. I would say that Scottish Directors took benign advantage of their considerable powers at the time of comprehensivisation, but there were differences in emphasis: ideas in Glasgow, benevolence in Dumbarton, caution in Renfrew and delay in Lanarkshire.

Advisers were a creation of Her Majesty's Inspectors simply because there were not enough of the latter to do the job. Advisers started as organisers of the practical subjects; they began as purveyors of information and equipment, and then became curriculum developers. They became a pool of teaching expertise which was not tied to schools or the office, and did valuable work with working parties and teachers centres.

Appointments to headteacher are crucial. They have increasingly become involved in dialogues with Her Majesty's Inspectors. Towards comprehensive education they showed reserve rather than reluctance. That comprehensive organisation survived in Lanarkshire at all was due to Inspectorate and headteacher effort, because the Director kept himself remote from events. Political decisions produce educational/curricular principles which heads then have the job of organising as they see fit - hence the enormous variety between schools. As long as schools looked like comprehensive units, everyone was happy. There was no laying down of instructions. What happened depended on the

definition and interpretation of the heads and on what kind of staff they had. There is no doubt that Circular C600 disrupted the traditional pattern of doing things - terms like 'mixed-ability' and 'common course' assumed the status of professional four-letter words!! Changes in classroom practice have nothing to do with comprehensive education. They are related to resource provision, increased educational technology, succeeding generations of teachers with different training. Change is only relative. We have never really got to grips with mixed-ability teaching. It has become a mechanism for hiding teacher inadequacy. The certificate/non-certificate barrier continued to influence headteachers. At all times, but especially when money was tight or there were cutbacks, it was very much a case of protect the academic pupils, and allow the rest to take the brunt of the stringencies. Colleges of Education have never really taken up the challenge of methodology. Secondary methods have made pitiful advances compared with primary. Work on methods always happens or is discussed out of schools. Traditional subjects dominate the curriculum and there is a scant respect for theory among practising teachers. Authorities too have been reluctant to shoulder their managerial responsibility vis-a-vis teacher training. Teachers are not treated as intelligent human beings, but are left to grapple with change and sink or float, or worse, remain in a state of confused indecision as regards approaches and methods. This leads to a regrettable centralised control of methodology, with the only help available being Consultative Committee on the Curriculum advice or Inspectorate Reports. Most teachers in general are looking to be told what to do, very few are genuine thinkers and innovators. In-service training lacked fire and resources. The place for change is IN school. So in-service training had far less impact than it could or would have if Colleges and the Directorate had



responded to their responsibilities in that direction. Curriculum Development was taken up very late by Authorities - it wasn't until after Regionalisation that anyone on the staff had a specific curriculum remit. Advisers proliferated, but lacked co-ordination, and teachers dutifully adhered to schemes of work made up but hardly ever updated by principal teachers. Many schools have a lot of dogged footsoldiers on the staff - conscientious grafters but lacking in flair or good ideas. This is why genuinely beneficial innovations hardly ever spread, or do so slowly. It is a fact that in the 60's and 70's the over-riding responsibility for in-service training and methodology was never faced up to. The result was a feeble attempt to implement change from the top down, which encountered the well-known inertia and lack of drive in the teaching profession. Comprehensive education was the result of a quite clear political decision which, once taken, was then liberally interpreted. It was only later that the Labour Party tried to get a uniformly imposed system. The Directorate provide the system in physical terms, and do what they can to generate an exchange of ideas on educational matters. The actual organisation of education is handed over to headteachers. Curriculum methods and technology impulses arise from national initiatives usually. The methodological consequences of this way of working are not very successful, and it does not help to counter lack of expertise in teachers. In my opinion, the realisation of the management responsibilities for professional and staff development came far too late.

There are examples of successful and radical comprehensive schools in most Authorities in Scotland, but they are usually found in deprived or disadvantaged areas or sparsely populated areas. The senior secondary and the multi-lateral schools have served as models, so that many

schools are a variation on the junior secondary/senior secondary pattern which existed before. The vast majority of pupils reject schooling, only a minority go to school to learn. There have only been claims to having comprehensive schools, but a comprehensive philosophy acted out in real terms is hard to find. Societal factors are important here: young people are changing, schools operate in a completely different ambience in 1985 from that of 1965. If school is a whole educational experience, we have to ask if the comprehensive school is any longer the relevant educational institution to provide that experience. My criterion of a comprehensive school would be the success with which staff and pupils accept being there, and this has much to do with the value laid on education by society. Heads should ask themselves why some of their pupils misbehave in school, but are perfectly well regulated beings in a station or a supermarket. The answer has to do with the concept of PURPOSE. In a station or supermarket pupils know why they are there, their consumer needs are catered for and satisfied, and the building does not obtrude into their consciousness. Can the same be said of secondary schools, with their odd type of authoritarian contract struck with pupils? Schools take themselves far too seriously, and have not yet capitalised on the centrality of the key concepts of MOTIVATION and ENJOYMENT in the learning process. Having said that, most schools are far better and have much more talents within their walls than they think they have. They under-rate themselves, and are under-rated by society. Comprehensive education has given teachers and pupils the chance - as yet not taken up - of producing something unique. the real solution lies in the next curriculum for the majority of pupils, how it is organised and where it is taught. Comprehensive re-organisation and what it has achieved in schools has at best stuttered forward in places. Only bits of revolutions ever really succeed. Each



new official report from Scottish Education Department is best seen as a realisation of the system's inadequacies and failures:

- Report on Learning Difficulties (1978) was a response to the handling of the common course, or rather its mishandling
- The Munn & Dunning Reports were a response to the prevailing and persistent certificate/non-certificate divide in schools, and the related problems of inappropriate curricula and examinations
- The more recent Management Report is the official response to the obvious inadequacies in managing major educational change.

1. The political pressure to introduce comprehensive schools could not be ignored. There was a political intention and expectation which shaped education policy making at that time. The initial initiative was unquestionably political, and the educational system had to make a response to it. Having said that, it was not a bolt from the blue. It had already seeped into the bloodstream of the system. It was accepted by professionals, but at the same time not with sighs of relief or gratitude. There was overt discontent. That was the way things were going. An educational idea was put into sharper focus by politicians. Teachers were dissatisfied with junior secondary schools, but had not gone very far about devising alternatives to them. In many respects the senior secondary/junior secondary mould was set, so it needed political pressure to effect change.
2. So the moves to introduce comprehensive schools were politically inspired, but not solely out of political dogma and not with solely political intentions. The desired outcomes were educational - an improvement of the status quo, and better educational provision. It was a combination of educational improvement and social betterment. The psychology of the 60's was a more effective educational service which would have beneficial social outcomes. '
3. The 1947 Report was not a significant factor in the pressure for the comprehensive school. It was, in effect, shelved. Pressure came from elsewhere. If we had never had it, we would still have

had comprehensive schools.

4. The 60's was an exciting, inspiring era of optimism, confidence and economic growth. People were becoming prosperous and the education system was held to be able to promote social change. Indeed, it was seen as the herald of limitless advance. Education was to be a vehicle to transform society. The comprehensive school was to be that vehicle, even though educational opinion was divided on the issue.

6. a) Her Majesty's Inspectors had the job of encouraging and advising on change in the spirit of the comprehensive principle. But their role was never prescriptive. They had to take account of local circumstances, and get people to accept the bottom line - a comprehensive system. They discussed policy and drew attention to examples of good practice - mainly in conferences and working groups of teachers.

b) Local politicians were influential at Committee level, but behind the scenes. They never interfered in the internal life of the schools.

Many people bandied around catchphrases and slogans. Even the advocates did not have the measure of comprehensive education. Many naively thought that it was created at the stroke of a pen - and Bob's your Uncle. Hardly anyone was aware of the professional demands it would make on the educational service.

c) Education officials were very influential. They reacted to the practicalities, the logistics of the change - accommodation, staffing etc - the nitty-gritty, day-to-day reality of it all.



They were respected figures. Their job was to take the administrative steps necessary to bring about the changeover. They had to just get on with it as best they could, and work with headteachers. People like Fairlie, MacKintosh and McEwan were each influential in his own way.

- d) Advisers did not loom large in the picture. They were not rated highly. The Directorate set up the administrative organisation but advisers were given the task of coping with its implications in schools. They were a mixed bunch, who had not won their spurs and lacked status. I do not think they acted as change agents.
- e) The Consultative Committee on the Curriculum, set up in 1985, was a big disappointment in that it never addressed itself to the fundamentals of comprehensive education. Its members lacked insight and experience of the new system and so the overall input was poor.

7. The main battle was to get the concept of the comprehensive school and its implications accepted attitudinally by staff, and get them to alter their approaches. It was widely regarded as being in tune with the Scottish tradition - the Burgh School, but in reality there was a fundamental confusion of the multi-lateral school and the comprehensive school. This proved wholly misleading, because in reality there is a gulf between the two types. This confusion had two effects: it ostensibly took away the need for sharp educational debate, and falsely deluded people into thinking we already had 'comprehensive education' in Scotland. In my opinion, I would say that the main difficulties were:



- size, accommodation, merged sites
- the predominance of a parochial view of education, and the fear of many staff in senior secondary schools. It was never voiced openly so as not to appear to be in a vulnerable position - i.e. going against the tide
- widespread ignorance of the educational implications, even among so-called 'experts'. Basically, it was too much hassle to do what was required, so there were varying degrees of accommodation to the new regime.

8. The main implementers were Her Majesty's Inspectors, Directorate and Headteachers. An intentionally non-prescriptive management approach was adopted. All played a part in bringing about change. No one group was dominant in comprehensive development.
9. Headteachers had considerable latitude. This spirit of the autonomous headteacher was steeped in tradition, but many heads did not know the real score. They saw it in organisational/administrative terms more than as a change in fundamental educational concepts. Options were indicated to them but they went their own way, or what they saw was consistent with the new spirit. There was, as a result, a total lack of precision and definition. Organisational arrangements in schools were highly individual and varied, e.g. mixed ability classes could last anything from 6 weeks to 2 years! There was a lack of direction on content and approach. No one sounded any alarms on this fact, so there was no interference. So the new regime was not understood by the troops. We probably did schools a disservice by not being more emphatic and directive.

10. Parental opposition came from a small but vocal minority. There was general acceptance with individual reservations concerning individual children in individual schools.
11. People did not worry about private schools or area schools. They were accepted. The former were a marginal irrelevance in the West, and had no effect on the creation of a worthwhile comprehensive system. Only the purists would claim they were out of step with a true comprehensive system. As for the latter, they were were, and that was that. Staff did their best.
12. The organisational/administrative aspects of the change were considered to virtual exclusion of all else. There has been remarkably little educational change in the fundamentals of the system. There has been but a very gradual awakening to the need to take account of the implications of comprehensive education. Standard grade was conceived as an instrument of promoting good comprehensive practice. Current practice still leaves a lot to be desired. We are by no means there yet.
13. In-service addressed itself to the problems as best it could. But there was a dreadful lack of commitment to in-service. There was a take-it-or-leave-it aspect to a lot of what happened. Educationists, it was assumed, would adapt professionally, but in the event, they had little fundamental grasp of what it was all about. There was a poor translation of the philosophy into an educational reality with matching methods and resources. The financial austerity of the 1970's was a dreadful nail in the coffin of educational advance. High expectations were held, but

only a few lived up to them. In-service, despite its good intentions, did not have enough impact.

14. a) Some heads with charisma and vision were nothing less than pioneers. Others paid lip-service, if even that.

b) A fair number of teachers went through much nail-biting and trepidation. What else could you expect, given their background and experience?

15. Many 'comprehensive' schools had hangovers from the senior secondary/junior secondary days, and continued the split in the new set-up. Old views and attitudes persisted, and in some cases proved incapable of change. Guidance has helped blur the old times and introduce new concepts into secondary education.

16. Views on and practices of grouping children by ability are as varied as their holders - this is a notoriously contentious area, and it caused bitter arguments at all levels in the service.

17. a) There was no significant change in the curriculum for a while.

+

b) Some schools still have not adapted. Others have done so painfully slowly. What was being asked for was professionally beyond some teachers. Despite this, the lack of support and laissez-faire attitude adopted by those in management positions meant that the human resources (teachers) were not galvanised to deliver the goods. There was little management drive.

18. The comprehensive school has totally changed how teachers view



their work. There has been a perceptible attitudinal shift. the old preconceived notions about ability have been toned down. Pupils are given a chance. There is less pigeon-holing. The acknowledgement of the individual has been a big gain, even if the professional response has not always matched it. There is now a different view of children and how they learn. There is greater variety, sensitivity and flexibility. But despite the sympathy, we have not managed to get our act wholly together.

19. The political advocacy of the comprehensive school was a radical step, in Scotland, even though the politicians didn't really understand what they were advocating. In assuming the comprehensive school meant the same for everyone, they trivialised it and misrepresented it simplistically. Because of the lack of definition, many people got it wrong. False readings did much damage.
20. All pupils got a chance to do the same subjects now that the junior secondary/senior secondary separation had been ended. The misunderstanding of the concept of 'common course' has led to boredom for some pupils and failure for others.
21. A comprehensive school should enable all its pupils to achieve their potential in a real sense, without any sloganising. The workings of the school should be geared to that aim. That must be the bottom line.
22. We are now on the way to an understanding of what needs to be done in a comprehensive system, but we have not yet reached



anything like satisfactory and points. Expectations need to be defined, resources and time and effort harnessed to provide training. Above all, more rigorous management strategies are called for at all level.

INTRODUCTORY PREAMBLE

Members of the Inspectorate did not think comprehensive education was in any way controversial. Our main preoccupation was with its effects on secondary 1 and secondary 2. Comprehensive schools would have come anyway, as there were mounting suggestions that the system which existed previously was wrong. The main fault was that it was antiquated and was causing a wastage of ability and a non-realisation of potential which the country could not afford. It is best to understand the arrival of comprehensive schools as the logical outcome of a process of rationalisation of the system which had already begun prior to the issue of Circular 600. Labour Councils, of which Scotland had many, were in general if not entire sympathy with the idea, but of course different people had different ideas of how re-organisation was going to take place. The Circular has to be understood in a context of a) increased demand for secondary education in the country as a whole, b) an increasing awareness that the junior secondary school had not been a success - only a handful were doing work which could be called good.

1. I would say that comprehensive schools arose from suggestions in Departmental reports. The move was essentially an attempt to rationalise educational provision, and make it more uniform. Many local authorities had been pushing for it as well. In Scotland the switch to a comprehensive system was non-controversial, irrespective of one's own politics. It was part of a national consensus that education had to be matched to the needs of an industrial economy. The nation's human resources and potential had to be exploited to the full. Despite a certain

starry-eyed optimism which characterised the period, I would say that comprehensive schools were seen as the most efficient way to ensure the optimum use of the nation's resources.

2. The recommendations of the 1947 Report were set aside, not because they were necessarily opposed, but rather because the department had more urgent matters to attend to in the aftermath of the war. However admirable it was taken to be, the Report had to wait. It has always been referred to reverentially but never really taken seriously. Small parts of it have had some effect, e.g. the section on examinations.
3. I would say that up to 1964 the moves were primarily educational and social. Wastage had reached intolerable levels, and parents were affluent and increasingly ambitious for their children. The Labour Government was elected to power and seized the opportunity to make the comprehensive school the prevailing pattern, since this was its declared policy. I would say that this move was largely in keeping with the mood of society at that time. Circular 600 was much more positive than 10/65, indeed it contained some doctrinaire points. Many people in the Labour Party, especially those in the Trade Union movement, naively thought that a comprehensive system simply meant 'Ordinary grades for all'. The Circular was politically initiated without question. Ross and Judith Hart sent for the then Secretary of the Department and instructed him to produce it and what it had to contain. So there was a large Labour Party input. Drafts and redrafts were considered, Her Majesty's Inspectors were consulted, and the final version agreed. Like most Department



Circulars, it was an administrative document concerned with organisational matters.

4. Comprehensive policy became the 'in thing' because a) the wastage in secondary schools had to be dealt with, b) selection at 11/12 was regarded as anti-egalitarian. There were also societal factors which were in vogue: ambitious, affluent people, desirous of the maximum opportunities for their children, and a general belief among many that education was a force for the good. You must never forget that the introduction of the Ordinary grade exam in 1962 was perhaps the most momentous happening in post-war education in Scotland. It had quite unforeseen consequences. By lowering that academic hurdle, yet still retaining national recognition in the form of a certificate, it increased demand for, and expectations of, secondary education. That groundswell, together with parental objections to the unfairness of selection and its denial of opportunities, made comprehensive schools almost inevitable, and also meant that, by implication, there would be no widespread vocal objection to their introduction as a matter of national policy.

5. The Circular had greater implications in some areas than in others. It posed real problems for schools. Previously (for years) they had streamed children according to general ability. Suddenly they had much less information in their pupils and the question was: how are we going to find out the ability level of our new pupils? Primary-secondary liaison was minimal. Also teachers had to face up to a common course of subjects, so that



all children could get a fair crack of the whip in the period of orientation, so that a more informed choice could be made at option time. You can imagine how novel such an idea was to people thirled to putting secondary 1 children into 2 language, 1 language and no language classes.

6. a) District Her Majesty's Inspectors spent time discussing comprehensive proposals with local authorities and headteachers. The Inspectorate are essentially middlemen, apostles for government policy. They carry out the declared policy of their political masters, irrespective of their own views of it. I mean I sent my own children to a fee-paying school, as what I do and say as an Inspector and as a private citizen are two different things.
- b) I would say that especially Labour Councils certainly did nothing to impede comprehensive policy, even if some were not wildly enthusiastic about it.
- c) Directors had their own views as did Her Majesty's Inspectors, but they could see the reasons for it. Largely, they were concerned with the practical aspects and implications of implementing the Department's Circular - it was a case of 'how do we do this given our own area and its features?' There was no opposition: Directors took - and had to take - a strictly empirical and pragmatic view.
- d) Advisers had very little to do with comprehensive schools. The creation of the advisory service was helped along by comprehensive education. The main motive for making an advisory service was to modernise the curriculum; especially after raising

the school leaving age in 1972.

- e) The early remits to the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum were not concerned with comprehensive schools, e.g. Ruthven. The Consultative Committee on the Curriculum initially took the secondary curriculum divided into discreet subjects as given and investigated it as such.
- 7. Though it is difficult to generalise, I would say that rectors had a good deal of latitude. They were very powerful figures, almost like local Gods. Three heads stood out in Scotland - all from Glasgow - Christie who became a convert, Gardner, who was ideologically committed to comprehensives, and Macrae who genuinely believed them to be a good thing on educational grounds. They were headlinemakers in the early days - but I do not recall many heads with their fervour or beliefs.
- 8. The public and parents showed neither opposition nor enthusiasm. For the most part, those who took an interest were motivated by thoughts of their own children and how the comprehensive schools would affect them.
- 9. A certain amount of creaming took place in proportion to the number of these schools - only in Edinburgh did they exist in sufficient number to have any real effect. In the West their effect was negligible.
- 10. Area schools did cause problems. Their social composition caused teachers many difficulties - mainly concerned with interest and

motivation. Some schools were prestigious and those in down-town areas were less salubrious. Parents with ambitions for their children moved out, so the problems intensified. Those schools also tended to be the ones which had the highest concentration of children from families with social problems.

11. The main practical problems were of buildings, finance, and geography. But the biggest problem by far was the sudden shock to the elitist attitudes held by many teachers. So the common course was slow to start, but gradually gathered momentum. There really were enormous problems for some subjects - Maths, French, Latin. The problem was: how do you cater for the whole range of ability when your training and own schooling have led you to concentrate only on the able? The extent to which this was resolved varied enormously. It was an easier task in upgraded junior secondary schools which had a more positive approach, but in 'downgraded' senior secondaries it was a different story. People there were not exactly enamoured of the new ideas.
12. Comprehensive schools got rid of the distinction of separate junior secondary/senior secondary schools, but the division still persisted even though all pupils were in one building. The organisational change was not of itself sufficient to change attitudes. Headteachers merely replaced the control exam by streaming. Her Majesty's Inspectors had a fight to press for the common course, and the substitution of streaming by subject setting. Traditional ideas about how to organise pupils and general ability took a long time to fade; they proved very powerful and resistant to pressure to change.



13. A concerted effort was made by Her Majesty's Inspectors, Directorate and Advisers to persuade people to adopt a different outlook and approach in schools. The success as witnessed by changed practices was certainly slow to come and, in the end, variable, and very dependent on the willingness of the hearers to be shifted.
14. Selection according to ability was still going on in secondary 1/secondary 2 when I retired in 1974. This persistent trend worried us in the Inspectorate, even though it was a modified version of the strict selection which went on in the senior secondary. The most damaging effect of these practices was that they induced a loss of motivation in large numbers of pupils. It's a vexed question, because it has to happen at some point. It ought not to be left too late for the sake of harming the able. It also depends on the subject. In general, I would say mixed-ability should last one year, then some form of setting should happen in secondary 2. Group methods have proved largely impractical with large numbers. The perennial problem of the least able is still unresolved.
15. Over the years, the reality of the comprehensive school had some effect on the curriculum and methods. There was a general trend toward modernising what went on in classrooms and making it relevant. Guidance and social education also made an attempt to see pupils as social beings as well as being there to be taught.
16. Teachers had to change their ideas to survive. The arrival of comprehensive schools gave added urgency to curricular movements



that were starting up. The main thrusts were to make subjects relevant and increase pupil motivation. The range of ability pushed teachers to make some provision. Her Majesty's Inspectors involved in secondary education saw the curriculum as a priority and a major focus for their work.

b) Teachers' Centres and in-service training attempted to fuel the constantly changing scene in schools with ideas/materials etc. The Primary Memorandum philosophy began to spill over into the secondary school. But, in general, Her Majesty's Inspectors felt that ideas caught on very slowly, with only very few genuine and enthusiastic attempts to innovate being made. The age, upbringing, training, and experience of most Scottish teachers meant that a sudden conversion to the comprehensive philosophy of education was out of the question. You cannot teach an old dog new tricks overnight. Rome was not built in a day.

17. The comprehensive school articulated pretty well with the Scottish tradition of secondary education for all, which had been institutionalised in the 1945 Act. The comprehensive school is really the modern manifestation of the parish school - the aim is to give everyone an opportunity to show what they can do and make sure no barriers exist for the able to proceed as far as they want to go.

18. The notion in equality of opportunity is that you should provide an environment in which everyone has the best chance to develop whatever potential he has. All should have access to the same expert teaching, physical resources in the school and the same choices. Whether they in reality do is a moot point, but

equality of outcomes is a chimera.

19. There are almost as many definitions of a comprehensive school as there are people who attempt to define them. It is an area school which should provide everything that anyone could ever want. It should treat all pupils the same irrespective of race or creed, and should provide a range of courses at levels to suit all abilities. There should be an opportunity for all pupils to sample all subjects in school, at least initially. Thereafter, there should be a natural differentiation without labelling or feelings of inferiority. However, having said all that, the attempt to cater for and motivate all children is at variance with the experience of many schools, where the idealism and theory comes up against the reality of real teachers, real attitudes, human failings, tiredness, lack of resources, etc etc.
20. I do not know if the potential has been tapped. A transitional phase lasted into the 1970s. Raising of the school leaving age in 1972 - a political decision taken because of a feeling that if it wasn't done then it never would be - caused a major upset - even set-back - to comprehensive developments. Then successive financial cutbacks and increasing unemployment have altered the complexion of society and, therefore, set limits to what the school can do. The motive to reduce wastage and realise each pupil's potential still remains an ideal.

1. The main source was that it was stated Labour Party policy, and closely linked to that was the intense feeling of injustice in England, where only about 10% of the population got a grammar school place. This always bewildered me as a Scot brought up in a much more democratic and generous system, which recognised and promoted the able wherever they came from. A lot of pupils in England who had ability were being denied a proper education, and the divisions between grammar and modern schools were very sharp. Up here, we had had omnibus schools for years, apart from in cities and places like Fife, where Douglas McIntosh had pioneered the two-tier system. Circumstances and feelings then were totally different, and much more acute in England. Scotland changed to a comprehensive system because of all the agitation which occurred south of the Border. It was national policy. There was no Scottish initiative that I was aware of. Judith Hart and Jean Floud were good friends. All the academic writing, therefore, had a direct input at Ministerial level. So it just happened up here, without anyone particularly wanting it. It never acquired the political and unpleasant overtones here in Scotland. I would say that people just eventually accepted or accommodated to it. Even some Labour authorities, notably Ayrshire and Lanarkshire, dragged their feet. Neither Directors nor Councillors were all that keen to change. No individual or group stuck out as being dominantly in favour of the comprehensive school. No sign came to me that people were hell-bent on change in the Scottish educational world.



2. The 1947 Report was largely forgotten. There was much greater interest in Scotland in the development of the most suitable curriculum for different children than in grandiose schemes of educational theory. Besides the structure of Scottish education had long been accepted as fair, so notions of reorganisation did not find a ready market. Most Scottish teachers were steeped in the academic tradition, and their primary interest was in able pupils. This is hardly surprising, given their own schooling and the fiercely academic experiences of university and college. the changeover to the comprehensive system really called for a change of interest and outlook among teachers. But even in the first Consultative Committee on the Curriculum, and which was made up of people regarded as at the top of their profession, it was clear that such a change was a distant prospect.
3. It came from the politicians. Even though it was known that there was wastage in senior secondary schools, and that junior secondary schools had not been as successful as had been hoped, nevertheless the large majority of those concerned with Scottish education perceived the system as fair, or at least much fairer than the English one. Indeed, it is probably not an exaggeration to say that people thought it was far too generous in the number of pupils it admitted to senior secondary schools.
4. A mixture of political, social and educational reasons, but all from outwith the teaching profession at least in Scotland. As I said, I was unaware of Scottish teachers urging a change in the system.



5. The Circular caused enormous physical problems in some areas. It was like going into a shoe shop and not finding a pair to fit you. There were junior secondary closures, and the teaching profession was solidly against the middle school concept, so it had to be the 12-18 model of the comprehensive school. There were feelings - strongly expressed - of downgrading of some schools with fine academic traditions. Some teachers felt they would have to begin to work with both pupils and staff whom they considered as an inferior form of human life. As I have said, the primary interest was in academically able children, so there was no intrinsic interest in the comprehensive school or its corollary of giving the less able child a fairer deal. The comprehensive school was created in a professional atmosphere which lacked enthusiasm for its arrival.

6. a) Her Majesty's Inspectors had their private individual views about the comprehensive school, like all other groups, but like the good civil servants they are, they went round promoting government policy, and giving advice on how the proposals in Circular 600 could best be implemented in a variety of local situations. Their brief was to advise Directors and Headteachers. They also, later, organised conferences and seminars on the common course, and mixed-ability teaching, which caused a few headaches. They had the job of fostering a change of attitude and emphasis in the minds of those charged with running the service and providing secondary education.

b) Again Directors were variably committed to the new approach. Many of them - and their education Chairmen - were thirled to a selective system, having done well themselves out of it. I would

suspect that, outside the 4 cities, Circulars 600 and 614 made no significant difference to school organisation. In places like Berwick, Forfar, Dumfries, Stonehaven and Peebles, secondary schools would continue to operate as they always had done. Directors had to be seen to be activating the machine and implementing Government policy - i.e. have or create comprehensive schools.

- c) Local Authority Councillors did not have much impact to start with. They reflected the policy of the political party to which they showed allegiance, at least in public meetings and in the press. They also had their private views, like everyone else.
- d) Advisers would have mushroomed anyway as part of the conscious attempt to foster an interest in curriculum development and curriculum content. Remember that with Consultative Committee on the Curriculum Reports, the Scottish Education Department depended on local effort to get things going, and there was a limit to what Her Majesty's Inspectors and Directorate staff could do. Advisers were professional subject teachers chosen for their expertise in their area to get that local effort off the ground.

- 8. There was no public outcry in Scotland. Most Scottish parents traditionally leave educational matters to the professionals, apart from one or two articulate parents who voice a few grumbles from time to time. Again, having been through the system, most parents accepted it, and therefore thought that any change must be for the better.

9. The private sector, with the notable exception of the City of Edinburgh, has never posed a serious threat to state schools. they make no significant impact at all in the Scottish context.
10. It is a fact that area schools in large urban housing estates caused problems, but given a housing policy which creates single-class concentrations of population, this was a foregone conclusion. Everybody knew that schools in Barnton and Ainslie Park were not going to be the same. The education service just had to cope as best it could with these facts of educational and social life.
11. The main obstacles to my mind were:
- physical - buildings and accommodation
  - the expectations and interests of most of the teaching force
  - the perennial problem in Scotland of devising a suitable curriculum for the less academic youngster - a major problem up here for years
  - the dominance of Scottish Certificate of Education exams, whereby the education of all was dictated by the requirements of the top 30%
  - the value and respect traditionally accorded to academic excellence, and the corollary, under-rating other abilities by making assumptions based on a reading of general ability
  - the parental/home background of some pupils also hindered the realisation of their potential.
12. The comprehensive system almost completely changed the structure of secondary education, without a shadow of doubt.



13. Given what I said earlier, clearly the persistence of an elitist outlook was inevitable. Teachers found encountering some children traumatic. They had never known anything like it. They were bewildered and confused, and were being asked to rethink what they had accepted as normal practice for years. Although there was some initial enthusiasm for and attempts to initiate the common course and mixed-ability teaching, it soon became evident that most teachers, to get anywhere, had to group according to ability. They felt safer that way, and also thought it necessary to protect the interests of the able child.
15. A few subjects changed as a result of changes in exam syllabuses or of changes in content brought about by curriculum development. Teaching methods hardly changed at all in my view.
17. I suppose you could argue that, prior to Circular C600, the  
+  
18. Scottish system's rule of thumb was: identify the lad o' pairts and make sure he gets the best we can give him. There was traditionally little interest in the technical/vocational/aesthetic side of education. Anything which diverted attention from subjects of an academic nature was regarded as an unnecessary frill. The comprehensive policy entailed an attempt to redress the balance a bit, to tone down the overt elitism in the system, although even today it is an open question whether these issues have been properly resolved. As a teacher, you will know much better than I. Equality of opportunity, then, was essentially seen as removing irrelevant barriers to academic success for the able. Historically, an academic education - for which Scotland was renowned the world over - was seen as a means



of getting on in the world. A proud tradition indeed. But I do not think we can be as proud of the treatment meted out to those judged to be less able. There was no tradition of equality of opportunity in that sense. I think, at the very least, Circular 600 may ultimately have helped things a bit.

19. A comprehensive school is fundamentally one that tries to deal with all children of all abilities that live in a prescribed area, by devising and teaching appropriate courses. It is interesting to reflect that the word 'COMPREHENSIVE' never stuck here in school names. The terms 'ACADEMY' and 'HIGH SCHOOL' have been tenaciously retained. I think that is highly significant.
20. No, it could never be true, because of:
- teacher attitudes
  - the economic facts of life and their effect on resources
  - parental attitudes to education
  - outdated ideas on curriculum and assessment
  - inadequate provision for late developers and the less able
  - the Scottish tendency to write people off irrevocably before discovering their true potential, and yet time and again, school 'failures' do outstandingly well later in life.

1. Only a slick commentator would offer a view on this. Certainly the whole operation was carried out in tenacious, painstaking detail. The person who dealt with local authorities was Miss P.A. Cox. She certainly put members of the Inspectorate through the hoops. Debates with local authorities were detailed, protracted and sometimes fractious, but always open and polite.
2. I recall no reference being made to the 1947 Report at the time of reorganisation. It forms part of a long process of thinking which slowly wove itself into the educational consciousness. My view is that any effect it had was subliminal and generative rather than direct. It was never overtly or specifically brought up in debates at the time. It was grand in thought and word, but poor on ideas for the nitty-gritty implementation of its proposals. It had little effect because, when it appeared, it seemed unrelated to the Realpolitik of the times. The priorities of the late 1940's were real and practical ones. There was not much time for reading highly theoretical reports, however well-written.
3. The change to a comprehensive system was both major and national. Any big-scale change in any public service results from a confluence of ideas current at the time of the change. In this case, there was a confluence of educational and political will that the existing system was wrong for all sorts of reasons. My reading is that the politicians exploited the hard-running groundswell of public and professional opinion to try to achieve

a major philosophical and conceptual change in the way we looked at schools and education. It did not happen as a result of crude political manipulation: equal educational will meet equal political will. The Scottish Office must chime in with the policy of the Government in power. I would say that, in general, local authorities got their way in the matter of comprehensive reorganisation, as long as their proposed schemes were solid and feasible. As long as they satisfied the comprehensive policy, the Government did not obtrude overmuch in what happened.

4. 1960-70 was the comprehensive decade. In fact, it turned out to be the most momentous decade in Scottish educational history. Thinking was optimistic. Feelings were national. There was a widespread belief that targets could be set and attained using the education system as the vehicle. It was a period characterised by confidence: nothing was a problem, and any that came up could and would soon be solved. There was an optimistic belief in the economy of scale: the word 'all' loomed large in terms of provision. It was open admission for all, an equal deal for all, success for all. The whole move was sincerely social. Education took on a social, caring aspect. The development of guidance, and the sincere efforts at the time of raising of the school leaving age, are two examples. 'Comprehensive' has, therefore, a much wider significance than 'type of school'.

5. The main implications of Circular 600 were: HOW DO WE MAKE THE IDEAS HAPPEN IN SCHOOLS? The main areas initially which grabbed the minds of those involved were: admissions policies, definition of catchment areas, accommodation and building



difficulties, capital grants and, for those in schools, the major problem was the organisation of the curriculum in secondary 1/2. That's where the comprehensive principle of educational provision was given its first trial.

6. a) The role of Her Majesty's Inspectors was to interpret local  
+  
b) authority proposals for the Department, and Department policy for  
+  
c) the authorities. We advised on the timing, feasibility and quality of thought in comprehensive schemes. But it was a very difficult issue. There were difficult jobs to be done, and daunting issues to be tackled. My overriding impression was that, despite all the disagreements (sometimes heated) and differences of opinion, the level of co-operation between central and local government was high.
- d) Advisers, originally created to offer advice on how to teach the practical subjects in secondary schools, eventually were expanded and came in to exert an important and leading influence on curriculum development in all subjects. They were part of the vast educational growth of the period rather than a direct result of the introduction of comprehensive education. There was a national unevenness both in the speed and number which were created and in the contribution they made to general developments.
- e) The influence of the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum? Initially not very much. Such influence as it had was probably to help on the tide of the times. It was part of the welter of educational creation which characterised the late 60's and early 70's.



7. Educational authority policies were long on broad outlines but short on specific details. Hence the headteachers had a great deal of latitude in how they interpreted comprehensive reorganisation and implementation. In general, Directors of Education occupied themselves with practical details - money, buildings. Curricular implications were dealt with by headteachers, principal teachers, advisers, with members of the Inspectorate giving support in the form of ideas, recommendations etc. Something you should ask yourself is this: with something as vast as comprehensive education, should you nail it down in detail for heads, if you yourself are uncertain, or should you welcome a diversity of approach and encourage healthy experimentation?
8. Such parents as take an interest in education - the proportion does not vary significantly whatever the issue - were conscious of the social ethos of the time. They had definite aspirations for their children and believed that education could help them to achieve them. So I would say that those who wanted to see their children get on saw comprehensive schools as a great advance, and gave them considerable support. There was a doubting minority of parents, usually middle class and articulate, who were disposed to caution about the new scheme, especially if their children were very intelligent. They had reservations. But as comprehensive policy gradually became the declared way forward, acceptance followed and resistance faded.
9. Local authority fee-paying schools went through a very painful and traumatic transition. The thought of going comprehensive was

a real blow to all they had traditionally stood for. Resistance was very powerful, and understandably so. But they were an ambivalent anomaly in the state system and, logically, had to go. As for grant-aided and independent schools, they hardly made a dent in comprehensive provision in the West, given their number.

10. There were so many definitions of a comprehensive school that it is impossible not to square them with a non-selective intake. Engineering, bussing resulting from detailed socio-economic analyses of areas was politically a non-starter. So any problems in area schools arose not from the school or the comprehensive education philosophy it tried to implement, but from the balance or imbalance of socio-economic groups around it. The area school is an honourable concept with a long tradition in this country. Different schools pose different challenges. It is the professional responsibility of the staff to rise to them as best they can.
11. There was a fervent desire to usher it in on the part of Government, coupled with a hope and trust that a harmonious curriculum and methodology would develop to reinforce the educational philosophy which underpinned it. However, it is probably true to say that the enormity of the task of trying to move Scottish education to a position where all pupils got an equal treatment, where there was a merging of 'certificate' and 'non-certificate', was underestimated. Mixed-ability teaching and raising of the school leaving age turned out to pose very real problems in schools. Sincere attempts were made by some to solve the practical issues within the financial limits that

operated. But it took a long time for the full implications of what was involved in the changeover in terms of curriculum, pedagogy and assessment to percolate into the consciousness of those in schools at every level. Having said that, I would add that what happened shows that the only approach to major change in education is a gradualist one. The big stick gets you nowhere. There is only so much you can and should do at any one time. That is why the Munn and Dunning programme came when it did. It could not honestly have come much earlier. Major reorganisation like the move to comprehensive education inevitably results in a hiatus in development.

12. In some junior secondary schools very good things were going on. Some were awful places. Junior secondary schools showed a willingness to accept change, but in senior secondary schools the change of role and outlook required by the comprehensive system was asking a lot from some staff, the impossible for others. Circular 600 changed the pattern of provision in secondary education entirely and radically, but approaches within schools were slow to develop.
13. The organisational change went through quickly, but the adjustment in methodology, in outlook and approach was not there to match. There was an obvious dislocation, almost inevitable, I would say. Those in senior positions must be patient with the fumbings of those who are honestly trying to cope with a fundamental change in the way they see their job. Outlooks had been conditioned by personal schooling and subsequent training.



14. a) By far the most common arrangement in secondary 1/2 was broadbanding - a compromise between streaming and mixed-ability grouping.
- b) In secondary 3/4 the order of the day was certificate/non-certificate groups. The Macaulay Report in Glasgow was the first local authority policy document to face up to the question of curricular integration. A comprehensive school does not imply the same diet for all pupils till secondary 4. Discrimination according to talent is perfectly acceptable. The concept of grouping kids to provide an appropriate curriculum is segregation. Yes, but for good educational motives. Internal differentiation according to ability is not incongruous with a comprehensive educational system. Over enthusiastic egalitarians did the cause no good by publicly asserting that it was, and that all pupils should get the same.
15. There was more effect on organisation than on methodology. Those who tried to change often sweated blood. Others did not bother to try, well not really try. There was a lot of superficial change apparent.
16. a) There was a tremendous network of working parties. Teachers were prepared to attend meetings in school time and beyond it.
- b) In in-service training there were huge differences nationally. Jordanhill and Dundas Vale Centre were hubs of activity for the aficionados. An unusually high proportion of teachers in the West was involved. But I would hesitate to estimate the effect of all the effort. It certainly was not instantaneous. Advisers



had a good image at that time and were given a high public profile. They were concerned with practicalities, and the best of them gave outstanding examples of how a good adviser should go about his responsibilities.

17. Given that in Scotland we had a centuries-long tradition of provision for all under one roof, the comprehensive school articulated well with the system - at least conceptually. The idea that the comprehensive school was going to increase opportunities for more children to get access to a good education found wide attitudinal acceptance. People bitched about the realities of comprehensive provision, not the theory. The basic issue was that many said it was not feasible: there weren't enough resources nor teachers experienced in dealing with the whole range of abilities to effect the revolution required to make an idea which was totally acceptable work in practice.
18. The concept of equality of opportunity remains insufficiently addressed, even in 1985. An enormous error was made by those who equated equality of opportunity with an equal and uniform curricular diet and course provision. The concept was never really translated into action as it should have been. Many felt that, as long as all kids got in, and thus had the chance to sit Ordinary grades if they wanted it, we had a comprehensive system. That's essentially what it was.
19. a) The essence of a comprehensive school is the admission of all children within a natural catchment area. This must imply diversity. Mackie Academy is different from an area school in

Drumchapel or Easterhouse. Perfect socio-economic balance in a catchment area is unnatural and undesirable. Schools cannot relate to beautiful strategies of balanced class structure. Life is not like that. Schools must accept the reality of their geographical location and face up to the situation it creates by discharging their professional obligations. The success of a school depends on three things: where it is, the commitment of its headteacher and staff, and the extent to which it communicates with its immediate community. Definitions of how you operate a particular educational philosophy like comprehensive education are bound to differ.

b) There was a sincere belief in the minds of many that once all children were physically in one building, we were operating a comprehensive system. For a notable minority, it further resulted in an attempt to blur distinctions and provide undifferentiated courses in classes of mixed-ability. For the majority, such a notion was anathema. Accordingly, views became quickly polarised, and school provision reflected each: in one setting/differentiation was introduced as late as possible, in the other as early as the head and/or heads of department wanted. The idea that pupils were individuals with individual needs came late.

20. I think the term 'comprehensive school' should be ditched in 1985. We should devote our attention to creating a comprehensive SYSTEM of education, to which the secondary school is one contributory part. By fixing solely on the school, expectations were raised too high, and targets were over-concentrated. By

equating 'comprehensive education' with 'the comprehensive school' we bit off more than we could chew.



1. At the time comprehensive education was introduced, there was a vagueness about it all. Schools and teachers were isolated from educational decision-making which took place somewhere far removed their world. There was no developed educational press to speak of. We just learned it was happening, but few people knew really what it was about. It was all a bit mysterious. The decision to 'go comprehensive' was highly political, and most assuredly did not come from teachers. It was derived from political and social theory which was fashionable t the time, and was being pushed by left-wing academics. From the teachers' point of view, the new developments were looked down on, especially upgraded junior secondary schools, which never really lost their former reputations. Moves to introduce mixed-ability teaching and the common course came in the form of fiat from on high. There was no consultation, no in-service, so schools were left very much to their own devices to work out how to do things. I was conscious of all the fancy new talk and ideas coming from England originally and being forced on the Scottish system.
3. The 1947 Report is both related and unrelated to comprehensive education. Its influence is now rather than when it appeared. It was a staple text in Colleges and Universities in the 1950's. It enshrined a vision of the future, whereas the reality for most practising teachers was what your headmaster told you to do. It glorified the traditional omnibus school, and this model was widely used. Streaming according to ability was taken for granted as the reality in schools. That was how you organised



things. I have always thought that the main thrust of the Report is on attention to the individual, but achieved through strict differentiation.

4. Comprehensive schools got a great impetus from new building in post-war housing estates. It seemed the natural sort of school to erect, serving the area. Occasionally, appointments were made to them of educationally progressive headteachers like Macrae, Gardner and Christie who helped to spread an awareness of comprehensive ideas and prove that the comprehensive school could work.
5. There were many meetings in schools at which principal teachers were told 'you have to change lads'. It seemed that the ideas were crazy, revolutionary. All hell broke out, and people stomped out disgruntled and unimpressed at what was being proposed. A small minority of visionaries saw it as a chance to do something positive for less able children. There was the sudden birth of a flood of worksheets, with the emphasis on catering for individuals. But, in the main, teachers took very badly to the whole business, especially those in senior secondary schools. It quite simply disrupted their professional life. As most were attuned to homogeneity of class groupings, it was more than they could cope with. Things were not helped by the lack of discussion and preparation.
6. The major bones of contention were mixed-ability classes and the common course. Many different and erroneous approaches were instituted because the terms were never really defined at the

outset. Her Majesty's Inspectors acted as advisers and called together meetings, but even amongst them there was a variety of views.

7. The two main obstacles were old buildings, annexes, amalgamation of senior secondary and junior secondary schools - all of which happened because the Labour Party were in favour of the 'all-through' variety of comprehensive school; the other main obstacle was the upheaval and challenge to traditional teacher attitudes that came in its wake. It made many people discontent. Purpose-built schools probably got off to the best start as they had everything going for them in terms of accommodation and equipment.
9. Directors of Education were powerful where there was an absence of strong political feeling on the Education Committee. Then it was up to the educational/political inclination of the Director how far he pushed comprehensive philosophy in his County. A lot was left to individuals at every level. There was no coercion that I was aware of. The result was a great deal of misinterpretation - of Circular 600, of comprehensive ideology and of what a comprehensive school was.
10. Parental reaction predictably varied according to whether they saw the arrival of comprehensive schools as a gain or a loss to their own children.
11. a) Comprehensive schools were easier to set up in new housing estates. It is a very difficult thing to provide education in

relation to the requirements of a wide variety of pupil aptitude and ability. Often, the small academic top in these schools was singled out for special attention, with the consequent submerging of the former junior secondary kids. They got pushed out.

b) I would not have thought that fee-paying schools caused local schools to suffer. In any school a socially and intellectually leading group surfaces and is creamed off and becomes a privileged group - potential prefects in the old days if you like. I often think teachers liked to think that area schools were creamed simply because, from their perspective, they did not have enough bright children which, let's face it, most teachers find easiest to deal with, and from which they derive most professional satisfaction.

12. The speed of change varied with the institution and the educational outlook of its personnel, especially the headteacher and the principal teachers.

13. Teachers' Centres and in-service training had a place, but you must be careful not to overvalue it. Change in classroom practice is determined by more subtle factors than courses or lectures. You have to create a situation where teachers are forced to change, e.g. a new exam syllabus. With the comprehensive school, teachers began to scream for help with the difficulties they encountered, or basically wanted told how to survive in the classroom. But, of course, many teachers were not interested in learning new ways, and they continued to teach in the same old way to the middle of the class. As always, the better answers came later, as advisers, central committees, etc.



began to have an influence.

14. I would say that most teachers accepted comprehensive schools with reluctance and resignation, and endeavoured to get on with things as best they could. A small, but significant, minority saw it as a challenge, to which they responded positively and enthusiastically. Gradually, however, there was a swing of opinion in favour of the development, without methods having been substantially altered. As commercially and locally produced materials gradually became available by the mid 70's, discipline problems diminished as some attempts were made to tackle differentiated learning.
15. I tend to side with the cynics in terms of the success the comprehensive school had had in blurring social class/ability groups within it. The gap has not been closed. There has been no revolution. Divisions within the school based on ability became more marked as the pupils progressed through the system.
19. Differentiation became a dirty word for a time, but now we are coming back to it, with talk of special educational needs and individualised learning. The comprehensive movement has one fundamental flaw: its stress on equality in an egalitarian sense. That is sheer lunacy.
20. Equality of opportunity in Scotland has always been taken to mean that all pupils should have no barrier to aspiring to the highest academic possibilities if they have the ability - the usual route was via the 'quali', senior secondary school and university. In



that sense, I would say that comprehensive schools have set education back somewhat; the junior secondary children did not get as good a deal in the comprehensive school, and it has become harder for the able working class child to make his way without distraction.

21. For me, a comprehensive school takes all pupils of every social class and every ability range from a given area, and provides for them an appropriate education to bring out the best they are capable of intellectually, while trying to do what it can to close the social gaps which divide the pupils.
22. The comprehensive school has a long way to go before it realises its potential. The real revolution is only beginning now. There is still a necessity to provide a sufficiently broad curriculum at each stage (secondary 1/2; secondary 3/4; secondary 5/6) to furnish equal opportunities for all. In addition, teachers will have to educate themselves to a proper appreciation of the significance of social education.

#### CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE ON THE CURRICULUM

The first two Consultative Committees on the Curriculum were really counterweight to the creation of Scottish Certificate of Education Examination Board, and intended to provide a forum for a discussion and examination of the curriculum. They were very heavily Scottish Education Department appendages, with handpicked personalities representing the various sections of the profession. Also, the Department played a big part in the early central subject committees through the Inspectorate.

A major shake-up came in 1976 when an attempt was made to co-ordinate curriculum development and control the work of the central committee and their associated Centres, which had been set up in 1971. This saw the creation of Scottish Curriculum Development Service, Committee on Primary Education and Committee on Secondary Education. Then came the Rayner review in 1979; after which the Chairman of Consultative Committee on the Curriculum was no longer the Secretary of the Department. So, over the years, the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum has changed from being a filter for Scottish Education Department influence downwards to being a mechanism for reflecting the views of the profession upwards to the Secretary of the State. Remember Curriculum Papers 1-16 predate 1976. All Working Parties are nominated by the Secretary of State, not the Department. Since 1976 there have been discussion papers and position papers.

How efficient is the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum in promoting curriculum development? We know that ideas we put out have no guarantee of being read, far less implemented. The strategy since 1976 has been to influence subject Joint Working Parties through the Exam Board, and to provide materials, e.g. Heinemann Science, Tour de France. Also the tendency has been to go for a non-subject specific approach - social education, Education for the Industrial Society Project, multicultural education. This is an attempt deliberately to counter the academic/epistemological bias of school education, and bridge the hiatus between it and life. The Consultative Committee on the Curriculum adopts a permeation strategy, and relies on senior staff in schools to read and disseminate their documents. But everyone knows that things change slowly in education. A humorous illustration of this is the apocryphal story which went round the Department when Bruce Millan was

delaying in announcing the implementation of Munn and Dunning. The rumour was he was going to implement the 1947 Report!



1. Circular 600 was drawn up by Joe Kydd, an Assistant Secretary in Scottish Education Department Division I. The source of the whole comprehensive movement was predominantly political in a period of post-war expansion. Rationing and other unpleasant things associated with war had gone. The 1960's were happy marvellous days. It was a period of optimism and upswing. Liberal social philosophy was in the ascendant, and so things like social improvement, more equality, opportunities for everyone were in the air. The comprehensive school was thought to be 'a good thing' so it was pushed. Both Labour and Conservative people accepted it as 'right', apart from extreme right-wing Conservatives who tended to be landowners and sent their progeny to Eton or Fettes. They were massively neutral as a result, since what happened in state schools did not affect them. There were few educators who carried the torch for comprehensive education in Scotland. Many people up here felt we already had it. The perceived need was never as great up here as we had had burgh schools for decades in places like Brechin, Dunbar, Peebles. We never experienced anything of the bitterness associated with tripartism in England. So there was the feeling that we didn't really need it up here, and also a lack of conviction about the egalitarian notions that flew about at the time comprehensive schools were introduced. Really, comprehensive education reintroduced a perpetual problem that had been tackled by HMSCI Dickson in the Junior Secondary Memorandum in 1955 and Brunton in his Report of 1963: what do you do with the 70% of the school population who are not going to make their



way in the academic world? Although these reports were written sincerely and with humanity, our system has been characterised by a failure to address this problem seriously, and make good educational provision for these kinds. There was a belief for a long time that we had it right: The Highers were the thing. We took pride in our educational system and its highly educated products. There had been an inability to get at the key principle: do you provide education by social engineering or on the basis of people's proven cognitive skills? Now we have Standard grade as the current solution, and to be honest, nobody is really sure what is going on.

2. The 1947 Advisory Council Report infuriated influential members of the Scottish Education Department, so it was played down, and allowed to fade with the passing of time. It was not allowed to have any impact. Munn is a modern restatement of that Report but not so well written. Of course, Munn itself is outdated: the well-rounded, generally educated person is not what is wanted now. Look at the Manpower Service Commission with TVEI handing out money for specific talents! Specialism rules the day. The idealism which exuded from the 1947 Report lasted into the 1960's. It has now been ousted by cheapskate cynicism. We are a small nation who must create myths like the dominie and the lad o' pairts to survive. The Scottish educational system has never been thought out. It doesn't work like that. Much is achieved by chance. There is no overarching policy or philosophy acting as a guide to practice. Very little is thought out.

3. The moves were almost totally political. Teachers' opinions did

not really matter. They were not organised to give their opinion. John Pollock is the first person who has been able to do that for them. In Scotland, about six people take all the key decisions about education. Unless you get their ear you have had it. Comprehensive education was not put forward as a reasoned case with pros and cons, but because it was an idea arising out of the mood of the time which caught the imagination of those who matter. Politics are rarely carefully thought out. Many decisions are taken on the strength of 'throw away' lines.

4. The 1960's was a period of idealism and optimism. There was a - now incredibly naive - belief that all would be well in the best of all possible worlds just round the corner. Education, it was thought, would revolutionise society, and make a great impact. The phrases of the time were 'you've never had it so good', 'the wind of change', 'the white heat of technology'. It's so ridiculous in retrospect, but these were the ideas of the time. It's the same with Munn and Dunning: the idea of an agreed curriculum and exams for all had been pushed by the Educational Institute of Scotland (especially Kenny McDonald of the Salaries Committee) in the late 1940's, early 50's, but they had to wait till the mid 1970's to find a receptive audience. The Educational Institute of Scotland pushed for the Munn Committee and the Scottish Exam Board for Dunning.

5. The Circular had zero immediate implications in schools. People took up positions for and against the whole idea, asking 'what are we going to do?' Some had a real go at making it all work. There was a feeling amongst most conscientious people in schools



that something had to be done in response to this new thing called comprehensive education. There was much frantic activity in a sea of confusion because all the familiar things in the educational landscape had been knocked down or at least questioned. New concepts like curriculum development, guidance, in-service training all appeared and took their place in the new millennium. There was much activity but little serious thought as people scurried round trying to produce new teaching materials, because it was generally felt that this is what ought to be done. A lot of the curricular initiatives and resultant materials were severely behaviourist in conception. Objectives were the keynote to success in education. This deterministic philosophy was entirely wrongheaded in my opinion. Assumptions were made that because the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum was created with its panoply of committees that the management knew what it wanted or where it was going. In the event everyone scurried around frantically in a totally alien environment clutching at straws and any half-baked idea that sounded good as a possible solution to their current problems.

6. a) Her Majesty's Inspectors are centurions under direction to go out and get the troops into line and obey instructions. Since comprehensive education was new for them as well, many grouped themselves around their own discipline.
- b) Directors have a perpetual difficulty caused by their recruitment from schools: should they be educators or administrators? Or both? In my view, they always show the wrong side at the wrong time. In general, they went along with Circular 600 and 614 because they had no choice. They devised their own response,

which was conditioned by the political colour of their Council, building grants and the strength of their personal commitment to comprehensive ideas.

c) Councillors on Education Committees in general haven't a clue about education or what is going on in schools. They often don't read the papers for a meeting, and vote in accordance with the party line decided by the ruling group. What they do have is a gut feeling about what the people want.

d) Advisers were trying hard to establish credibility for themselves and their position, so they had to go along with it all. Indeed, they were in the front line of change.

e) The Consultative Committee on the Curriculum is an ineffective body of 'Uncle Toms' which is not very powerful in securing change. Indeed, people are appointed to it precisely because there is no danger that they will make waves or cause embarrassment to or unpopularity for the Central Government.

7. Headteachers had almost total latitude to do what they wanted. They probably did not get much advice, and were simply told to get on with what they knew needed to be done. Few had policies. MacKintosh in Glasgow created a quantum of enthusiasm and heightened his teachers' awareness; Cameron in Dumbarton was a warm genuine man who earnestly supported the move; Fairlie a missionary of the other McIntosh in Fife had his own special response; McEwan in Lanarkshire did not enjoy good relations with Central Government and took up a position opposite to them on most issues, including comprehensive education. So it was a



very person - specific atmosphere within which heads had to work.

8. Parents in general are apathetic to general issues in Scottish education. They only scream and shout when their own kids are going through the system. Getting people interested in education is an uphill struggle: take 3 examples:

1) The number of teachers who read the TESS

2) The coverage of education by the media

3) The fact that when Scottish education is on the agenda in the House of Commons, most MP's retreat to the bar, so that it's difficult to get a quorum.

Most people quite simply do not care about education. It is not a subject that arouses widespread discussion.

9. Private schools in Scotland are so small that they quite simply do not count in the broad picture.

10. Area schools raise the hot potato of social mixing. Trying to engineer social mixing doesn't work. Entrenched social separation is a fact of life. All the efforts came to nil. The naive expectations come up against the harsh realities of life, and die a death because certain things cannot be changed.

11. As I said, most people thought we had it anyway, but I would say that the major problem was the basic inability of people at all levels in the service to clarify what the central problems were, and come up with answers that would work in practice. In a nutshell that was the obstacle par excellence.

12. I have always asserted that painters and signwriters have done more for comprehensive education than educationists ever did. To a great extent there was a name change, but not much else. Pupils congregate according to ability, background and taste, and a government circular is not going to alter these patterns of association and social grouping. Those people in schools who did try to get something going came up against this all the time.
13. Grouping children according to ability is so ingrained in the minds of Scottish teachers that it has proved almost totally resistant to all attempts to get them to change their attitudes. A whole host of new names appeared from a Thesaurus of synonyms for streaming: SETTING, BROAD BANDING etc. People wanted a system of segregation by ability that was disguised by a label that appeared to be something else entirely. They wanted to continue the old prejudices but cover them up with an acceptably kind name that sounded the very opposite.
14. As a result, mixed ability classes and valid courses for non-certificate pupils had not a chance of securing a foothold in schools. Neither made any real inroads in Scottish schools. Examples of good practice were very rare. Differentiation according to what pupils are good at is a very powerful concept, hence most teachers believe in teaching homogeneous groups. It's quite simply easier anyway, and the vast majority couldn't begin to understand why they should change something that had worked for years.
15. Remember Lord Macaulay's pun: education is paedocentric. In

general, and again with one or two exceptions, the answer to both is no. Apart from one or two new subjects and/or new exam syllabuses the curriculum hasn't changed much and is still subject dominated. As for teaching methods, some people tried to change and stayed changed, others tried and swung back to traditionalism with a vengeance, and the rest never changed one whit.

16. The in-service movement and teachers' centres threw up a lot of good stuff, but a great deal was done quickly and without serious thought. Many cliches started to fly about, and you had to be heard saying them at the right time. You became very unpopular if you started to ask what they really meant if anything: 'discovery learning', 'language across the curriculum', 'social education' are some obvious examples. There is nothing so practical as a good theory, and much of what went on in Colleges had no theoretical basis, but as I've said, that is par for the course in Scottish education. Of course, a lot of people went through the motions of attending in-service training courses because it enhanced their promotion prospects.

17. I would say that the comprehensive school concept did articulate to a high degree with the predominant Scottish practice, outside the cities at least. Thus, Circular 600 merely rationalised national provision along the lines of the burgh school. It put a gloss of paint on much what happened already.

18. I have to say that the whole concept of equality of opportunity is weasel and wrongheaded. We have never had it nor wanted it.



People differ and are happy to do so. why should a pigeon-fancier or football fanatic go to the opera? Who has the right to enforce homogeneity? People did not know they were deprived till educationists and sociologists told them they were. I am not at the same time saying that Plato's myth of the metals or the Victorian ideal of each in his station are necessarily right either. Having said that, I would say that in Scotland the concept of equality of opportunity in educational terms meant this: all pupils entered the ring at even money and engaged in battle for the one and only opportunity going - academic success and the chance of a University place.

19. Whatever else it does, a comprehensive school must offer genuine choice in the curriculum to meet the differing aptitudes, abilities and interests of its pupils, who can contract out when they realise they have made the wrong choice. But choice is expensive: it's like the 'menu à la carte' or the 'menu du jour'. So idealistic concepts like comprehensive education are circumscribed by the harsh realities of running secondary schools with all the extraneous factors which surround them and affect what it is possible for them to achieve.
20. No, various people have struggled along the road in an attempt to tap its potential, only to be thwarted by economic barriers or starved of any real educational philosophy to serve as a basis for action. Solutions adopted are always similar to what the Americans did ten years previously: viz. modules and packaged learning.



What was surprising in Scotland was that Tories hardly opposed the introduction of the comprehensive school, and there were no public squabbles or wrestling about it. It just happened, but the fact remains that the principles of comprehensive education were hardly examined. Much was left to assumption. There was no genuine attempt to grasp and define the concept, or think about its implications in general terms. Despite the strong public backing of the idea by Her Majesty's Inspectors, there was no sense of critical detachment. Much passionate orating took place at conferences and seminars. Charles Forbes delivered some enthusiastic pronouncements, but no one really sat down and tried to work out the ground rules.

Two things led to the general acceptance of the comprehensive idea: a revolt against IQ exams, and a realisation that the bipartite system they gave birth to was plainly not working. Some of the former were phoney, and families and communities were split up by the latter. The whole junior secondary/senior secondary thing was against the proper social development of a civilised democracy. Some junior secondary schools were intensive belting establishments, with no suitable curriculum or properly trained staff. Those that couldn't get into senior secondary schools became primary headteachers. The whole question of less able children has never been properly faced up in Scottish education. That's why raising of the school leaving age was the greatest test of the comprehensive system. It hardly passed with flying colours. Schools simply could not cope. Raising of the school leaving age turned the tide irrevocably. Until then, no one was prepared to come out in public and question the foundations of the

system, or ask what education as a whole was about. Up till then, education was believed to be a good thing, a panacea even, and the more of it folk got the better. By the mid-1970s, a sense of physical and mental exhaustion had gripped the teaching profession. England had the Great Debate, and we got Munn and Dunning. Neither the individuals nor the reports they produced were commanding or authoritative. Despite being dull and lacking in substance, these reports are now gospel. They are a testimony to the fact that comprehensive philosophy had been loose and slack, and hence many interpretations had emerged. There was an amazing lack of uniformity for such a small country. The only thing that was generally accepted by all was a replication all over Scotland of the social coherence of the old small-town academies - the embodiment of the Scottish tradition in secondary education. But no one really got to grips with how properly to devise a suitable curriculum for all the children under the one roof. Mixed-ability classes come logically and inevitably from that idea - a comprehensive class in a comprehensive school. The big stumbling block was that there was no money to finance it properly, nor staff with the pedagogical skills to embrace it. In all the conferences the note was positive: it was an ethos of togetherness, of provision for all. Everything was wonderful, but no-one faced, or dared to face, the stark realities of the comprehensive innovation.

The comprehensive school came into being in an atmosphere of tremendous disciplinary tension. Guidance was hailed as the way to bring cohesion to the disparate groups in a comprehensive school. Guidance was seen as a social welding torch. But there was not only conflict amongst guidance staff about their *raison d'être* and purpose, but also enormous cynicism towards them from other teachers. It was brought in in too



much of a hurry. It was a good idea, and contributed greatly to the questioning of their job by teachers. Also, a lot of authorities blatantly used the guidance posts to poach teachers in times of chronic staff shortage.

The trouble with the comprehensive school was that most people agreed that it should be introduced, but no one had a clue about how this new creation would replace its predecessor. Everyone who had any feeling knew that the junior secondary/senior secondary perpetrated a sin in Calvinist terms, but, agreement that it had to go did not produce a similar uniformity of view about what should take its place.

There were also other problematic features around.

1. Catholic Labour Councillors and holy orders had found for the previous 40-50 years an efficient way to produce a Catholic professional class - selective Catholic schools. They enabled Catholic lads o'pairts to get out of the slums. The comprehensive school, and attempts to plead for integrated (i.e. non-religious) secondary education were seen by Catholics as undermining a system which had served the community well. Catholic Labour councillors thus found themselves in an ambivalent position: publicly they had to defend comprehensive schools, but privately they passionately believed in selective solutions.

2. Private schools were also an impediment to a totally comprehensive system. But a fair number of parents wanted them, and vested interest together with political sensitivity have

combined to ensure their continued, healthy existence.

3. Post-war housing policies had created and/or reinforced deep social divisions in densely populated areas. Poverty and wealth overlapped. Thus, genuinely comprehensive schools were just impossible in some places.
4. Many people in the system at the time of Circular 600 had perceptions about education which have to be explained in historical terms. They were suddenly surrounded by intense pressure to do an about-turn. All that they had been brought up to believe in was suddenly out of fashion, if not discredited. Authorities also realised that to get on with the Scottish Office you had to be obedient and show a willingness to experiment. The result was an inordinate and, in my view, imprudent speed in the way comprehensive education was introduced, which inevitably resulted for many people in a public adherence to it while harbouring private doubts. The comprehensive school was born into a social mood of expansionism and a political arena dedicated to blurring social divisions, and giving all pupils a fair share of everything.
5. Related to this is the fact that many people were promoted beyond their ability. The system simply did not have the 'right' manpower in schools in anything like sufficient numbers to man the changeover to a comprehensive system. Quick expansion inevitably leads to an unintelligent application of new ideas. The profession was quickly stretched and drained. Inexperience was enormous and widespread. Instability, uncertainty and



confusion were rife. Those prepared to identify themselves publicly and in their work with the comprehensive movement achieved rapid - sometimes meteoric - promotion.

Thus, to a great extent, comprehensive education did not have a chance. It was a historical accident, born far too early. The optimistic mood of the politicians was out of tune with the statistical facts and realities in most Scottish secondary schools. But the latter were completely ignored for political reasons, in the happy optimism that it would all work out.

One final point: in Scotland there has always been a pronounced and unquestioned ranking of people according to occupation, with the professionals at the top. Commerce, industry etc were seen as shady enterprises by comparison. Teachers and parents actively participated in and indeed encouraged this drive for the acquisition of professional status. The whole of the Scottish educational system was dedicated to promoting the professions as highly desirable ends - hence streaming, the classics, 'Highers' etc. To leave school and 'get a job', however respectable, was not on. Even in higher and further education, there was a hierarchy of respectability. You were judged by the course you did - medicine and law being the jewels in the crown. Into this very elitist scene came the comprehensive school, and everyone was disorientated first, then disillusioned. But, paradoxically, the comprehensive school still glorified a University education, even if it killed off Latin and Greek. All that the comprehensive school did was create more education for more people, in the belief that society's problems would thereby be cured. They were not, and disillusionment set in again in the

mid 70's. But the comprehensive school did not result in a fundamental questioning of the principles on which the education system was based. The confusion its birth caused was tackled by pragmatic solutions for survival rather than by long-term strategies of a serious educational nature.

#### POSTSCRIPT

Politicians are not interested in education, as it holds little prospect of career prospects at cabinet level. The result is that they talk in facile slogans about education, and have to be briefed by educationalists so that they can write an article or make a speech.

Education is an exclusive detached world, which resents interference or interest from outsiders. There is a very pronounced feeling that if you haven't been in a classroom you are not qualified to hold views on the subject. There is an anti-academicism in teachers, an unwillingness to question their assumptions or the philosophical basis of education. In a way, each person works out his own philosophy, and has the freedom to act it out in a democratic system with very few constraints and little accountability. Hence, people stutter to accommodate changes pressed on them from outside - or they do not. The result is that very few people in education know what they are about.

1. My honest view is that all the thought and discussion took place south of the Border. The 11+ was clearly unfair and divisive. A head of steam was built up down there, helped on by intellectuals like Pedley and Simon, and it came up here. I was teaching at the time in a Glasgow senior secondary school, and personally gave little thought to whether the system was fair. I like lots of others, was used to it, from my schooldays. There was a cosy feeling in Scottish education around 1960 - teaching in a senior secondary school presented no real problems. Even when I joined the Inspectorate, I was not conscious that they were in a ferment over re-organisation. I first began to think about it when I saw junior secondary schools - of which I had had no knowledge or experience - in Fife. By and large, it was all watered down senior secondary stuff, with brilliant teachers the exception. Also, the 'quali' had a restricting effect on upper primary work - all drilling facts without understanding in order to get to the senior secondary school and get on. If you went to a junior secondary you were a failure in everyone's eyes. Basically, teachers in junior secondary schools didn't know what to do with their pupils. In any case, the Primary Memorandum was all the rage at the time, and the comprehensive notion had no sympathy whatever in the ranks of the senior Inspectors I knew. Also, there was a great deal of fashionable talk from politicians like Judith Hart.
2. Not very. It was a difficult time for resources in the post-war period. In any case, a report like that needs support from the



educational establishment (i.e. the senior echelons of the Inspectorate) or political push. Robertson's report had neither. It came before its time in a sense, since tripartism was rampant in England after the Butler Act.

3. The politicians got the ball rolling, then people in education began to talk and write about it, and pretended they knew what it was all about. To be fair, some really did.
4. Opinions/moods in society were changing. The English educational system in some counties was abysmal. After the Butler Act, there was a genuine improvement down there, with more equality of opportunity than there ever had been. Then people realised they didn't have enough. There was never the same worry in Scotland - the system did well by the able kids - 35-40% got into senior secondary schools.
5. Confusion and chaos, both for teachers and Her Majesty's Inspectors, who did not really appreciate the far-reaching implications. The Circular disturbed the peace, if you like. Several interpretations were placed on the term 'on comprehensive lines' by Her Majesty's Inspectors - either that all children would not be exposed to all subjects that formerly only senior secondary pupils had, or the much broader view incorporating mixed-ability classes and the common course. Most of the educational establishment inclined to the former view.
6. a) After a hesitant start, they got their act together fairly quickly and started to go around and preach the doctrine



dutifully with, I have to say, varying degrees of conviction.

- b) Both followed their particular political party line.
- c) They had to take important policy decisions on how to make the Circular 600 proposals work - buildings, finance. But I think most of the ones I knew broadly supported the innovation because they were deeply unhappy about junior secondary education.
- d) There were hardly any advisers to start with. More posts were created as syllabus/examination changes were made. They were there to get things moving in schools.
- e) The 1960's was the hey-day for educational committees and panels. The Consultative Committee on the Curriculum was created merely to co-ordinate the whole enterprise - it was to oversee curriculum development at a time of rapid change.

7. Initially, headteachers had a great deal of latitude, with the result that there was a wide variation in practice. You had a spectrum, ranging from secondary heads who conducted their own tests in primary seven classes prior to transfer in order to grade pupils, to those like Macrae, Gardner and Christie in Glasgow who were converts, and tried to convince others of the value of the comprehensive school. But heads came increasingly under pressure from Her Majesty's Inspectors and Directorate staff, when it gradually came to be realised that little (if any) change had taken place in the late 1960's.

8. If your child would have gone to a senior secondary school it was regarded as a retrograde step, if he/she would have gone to a

junior secondary school, it was a wonderful thing. As a subject, education doesn't really 'grab' people, except when a school is threatened with closure, irrespective of how valid the reasons.

9. Not very much. The percentage of pupils going to these schools in Glasgow was so small that it had virtually no effect on the local comprehensives. Yes, there was opposition from fee paying schools and parents, but for social reasons, as they believed these schools genuinely offered a 'better' education than local state schools.
10. Not at the start, but then it very much depends on the area in question. Bearsden is not Drumchapel.
11. The chief one was the power of tradition - the widespread belief that the able child with hard work would be looked after by the system and get every chance. People were not sure about comprehensive schools, felt threatened by them. Neighbourhood school parents bought out, or exchanged for a council house in a 'better' area of the city. Hence ghetto schools were created, in which teachers had lower expectations of the pupils, and where there was anti-intellectual attitude among many pupils to bright kids.
12. There was some change, perhaps most notably that those who formerly would have been misplaced into junior secondary school got the chance to show what they could do - and many did.
13. The change was very gradual and built up over the years, so that

now what happens in schools is barely recognisable to practices say 20 years ago.

14. If I were a headteacher, I would allow as much differentiation as suited the abilities and inclinations of my staff. I am sure that mixed-ability classes in the early years are the right thing - theoretically - if you have a comprehensive school system. But a lot of headteachers either did not dare to push staffs, or did not want to because of their own beliefs. A basic question is: do you teach or entertain less able children? Much of the latter went on - it may well still go on. Remember the power of verbal reasoning quotient assessments by which pupils were put into class groups. I remember well encountering good scientists in middle of the road sets, who were there because of the supremacy of language awareness/ability as shown by these test. Such a system of allocation was and is indefensible.

16. a) It should have. In syllabus rather in the actual subjects taught. There was also experimentation with mixed-ability classes. But I don't think that there is anything necessarily wrong with 'the class teacher'. Even in senior secondary we had mixed-ability classes, the only difference was that there wasn't such a spread. In any case, you always worked to the top pupils, and quickly you made up your mind who would be 'dropping' your subject. All I can say is that if teachers didn't make some changes, their daily lives must have been very fraught indeed.

b) In-service teachers centres arose out of advisers' reactions to the ferment in schools. The upsurge of courses in the 1960-70s was a direct result of an attempt to fulfil a perceived need for



advice about and discussion on matters of curriculum and assessment.

17. QUOT HOMINES, TOT SENTENTIAE. Much depended on the extent to which individuals in schools adhered to traditional views of ability and of their subject.

18. In theory, it's an admirable concept, and I have nothing against it. But it is also a difficult one. Those who would have gone to junior secondary schools gained from its introduction, but I'm not so sure about able pupils in a place like, say, Drumchapel, where social conditions and parental attitudes to education may not always be favourable. When you travel widely you realise just how many Scottish people are outwith the main social stream.

19. a) A school in which all the pupils from a prescribed area are catered for, and where all their talents are developed, whatever these may be. Also, the school should as far as possible be a rehearsal for life. But I would make this point - much of value is lost if the school does not have a social mix.

b) Much the same as mine.

20. No - is any potential ever fully tapped? I would not go along with all the Socialist dogma that heralded their arrival - equalising society and all that. I consider myself a Liberal but not an idiot! In the final analyses, any school is only as good as its headteacher and staff.



1. a) I do not think Lanarkshire had made any moves or decisions about comprehensive schools prior to Circular 600 appearing in 1965. In fact, I recall several Lanarkshire councillors saying that their colleagues in Glasgow were of the opinion that Lanarkshire was lagging behind in this respect, and that it was time they 'got their skates on', and remedied this lack of progress.  
  
d) Political without any doubt. This is not to say that many in education didn't agree with it, but political agitation started it all off. I do not think that those in education would have moved so quickly if it had not been government policy.
2. a) There was a general dislike of the selection procedures in operation to get entry to secondary schools. We had a very complicated system in Lanarkshire, using Moray House tests to scale teachers' estimates, then take verbal reasoning quotient as worked out in primary 6/primary 7 tests (we always took the higher score of the latter); we then employed students from college to mark every paper for every child in Lanarkshire over a weekend in Rutherglen Academy. Then a rank order list was drawn up, calibrated in percentiles. Roughly the top 30% went to senior secondaries. Parents could (and did, usually for social rather than educational reasons) appeal. Out of about 9,000 transfers annually, 1,000 appeals were dealt with locally, and a further 100 by the Secretary of State - these were usually from keen concerned parents. Of course, you must remember that, geographically, Lanarkshire presented a variegated picture, from rural/country towns like Biggar and Lanark, to densely populated

industrial parts - Airdrie, Coatbridge, Motherwell, Wishaw, Bellshill etc. In the former you had to have omnibus schools, but even in these, children were separated into different courses according to their ability. In industrial areas, you had the senior secondary/junior secondary split. There was always the feeling among parents that if their child did not clear the hurdle into a senior secondary, they had slipped down a rung on the social ladder.

- b) The main reaction was that, given the facts of the county, a uniform provision of all-through comprehensive pattern was not on. Geography, existing buildings and the traditions of some fine schools made that impractical. Add to that the fact that the Government was urging a comprehensive system but not providing the extra money to make it a reality, over and above the normal capital expenditure grants, and you'll see that provision was of necessity makeshift. It was done on an area to area basis, as funds were made available. Dr McEwan wrote a series of reports on this subject for the Education Committee. So the abolishing of selection in Lanarkshire took a long time to achieve. Dr McEwan also did not necessarily accept that the 'all-through' system was necessarily the only one. He also proposed a system of junior and senior high schools, but the politicians had tunnel vision - it was 'all-through' schools and nothing other than that received consideration.
- e) Dr McEwan's main concern was to implement government policy with the least educational upset, and not to approach it 'like a cock at a groset'. The politicians wanted the officials to make the problems involved in the changeover to a comprehensive system

disappear. Dr McEwan went for a gradualist approach, especially given the long shortage of highly qualified staff, which he wanted to concentrate in the upper years of the senior high schools, and not allow their talents to be 'frittered away' on junior secondary pupils. He wanted them put where they would do the greatest good.

- f) 1) Directorate staff met heads on an informal, school to school basis, or through representations of the Lanarkshire branch of the Headteachers' Association of Scotland. Dr McEwan did not believe in formal meetings or seminars or symposia.
- 2) There were good relations with Her Majesty's Inspectors, who worked very closely with Dr McEwan, and shared his views on the transition.
- 3) Councillors were primarily interested in their local ward or +  
4) area getting rid of selection. They had to be seen to be doing their best for their constituents. To put it at its lowest, if they did not, it was a vote loser. Most councillors had tunnel vision about comprehensive schools, and accepted them because it was party policy. Very few considered the recommendations in Circular 600 dispassionately in educational terms, or considered any other system of organising schools.

g) The main problems were:

- money for new buildings and existing buildings to cope with the 'baby boom'
- the problems posed by the new town of East Kilbride
- temporary accommodation as a result. Remember it takes roughly 4-5 years from initial decision to build a school to



the official opening ceremony. We went through to Edinburgh on numerous occasions in deputations to present our case for more money. The answer was invariably 'no', because Scottish Education Department's hands were tied by the Treasury. There was very little discussion of educational matters as such - it was practicalities.

h) Apart from buildings, staffing, and staff dissatisfaction with small schools which offered neither 'good' pupils nor large responsibility payments.

3. a) Dr McEwan. He was the conductor of the orchestra, he masterminded the whole process, holding the balance between the Education Committee and headteachers. He was the general in command of the army, and he did not delegate much even to his senior colleagues. That was his way of doing things.
- b) Dr McEwan and the chairman of the Education Committee.
- c) A good deal, as there was a tradition of continuity of policy in Lanarkshire.
- d) Broad government/Education Committee decisions were laid down in circular letters from Dr McEwan. But what happened in schools was very much up to the head. The heads knew what comprehensive policy was, but it was their decision what they did in their own school. Dr McEwan never interfered with a head's internal organisation as far as I know. The result was, I imagine, a wide diversity of internal practice. I'm sure some heads thought comprehensive schools meant that all pupils should get two languages from now on, like Harold Wilson's 'grammar schools for



all' idea.

e) Very few steps at county level, with the exception of the advisers. They dealt with what was going on in schools, in conjunction with heads and staffs.

f) The general public was probably glad to see the end of selection at primary 7, which got a very bad press. Not so many parents actually cared what happened to their child in the new set up, so long as there was one school for all and no more junior secondaries. Only caring, involved parents looked further and questioned. I think the arrival of comprehensives was in the main greeted with relief, except for parents in some areas who saw it as the end of schools with long traditions and good academic reputations.

4. b) The main problem I recall in zoning arrangements was trying to persuade parents that an upgraded 3 or 4 year school would eventually be the same as the older-established senior secondaries, e.g. Braidhurst and Dalziel in Motherwell. In extreme cases like Clifton in Coatbridge, they withheld their children from attendance, such was the feeling. Most parents accepted the general idea that comprehensive schools were a good thing, until their children were going to an upgraded school, which was untried and which parents saw as inferior in the local community, especially if it had previously been a junior secondary school.

e) Hamilton Academy historically was 'the' school in the county. Both its primary and secondary departments were fee-paying in the

20's/30's, with a certain number of free places awarded on merit in entrance exam. Pupils came from all over the county to it. Fees went in 1945, but there was no intention to do away with its special status. For a while (1946-50) they set their own entrance exams, until these were superseded by the Moray House tests. There was a two way cut: parents living in Hamilton didn't have as high-scoring children as those in other parts of the County, but standards were still high. The top 20% of pupils in the County went there. It's not surprising that there was ill-feeling towards the school which typified not just selection, but super-selection. Demand for places was always greater than the places available. Politicians were pleased to see its demise, but the staff were deeply saddened. Elmwood and Our Lady's High School were also selective, and the main centres of Catholic education, but nothing near as selective as Hamilton Academy.

5. a) I cannot really say. The comprehensive system had the best chance in the new purpose-built schools - Caldervale, Garrion, Cathkin and Claremont. The will and the facilities were there at least from our side - the provision of conditions. But the desire to cater for the less able and interest them never really worked out, usually for reasons of staffing. I remember there was a furore over the employment of instructors with the Educational Institute of Scotland. The conditions in some of the older schools on split sites with old equipment or huddled accommodation must have caused the heads and their staffs problems.

## POSTSCRIPT

I'm sure the move was the only sensible thing to do. Junior secondaries generally did not work, despite the Scottish Education Department document Junior Secondary Education (1955). It just never stimulated the necessary interest. We had a lot of meetings, but it just fell flat. There were very very few kids who moved from junior secondary to senior secondary schools. Once they had made new friends, or felt it wasn't worth making the effort, they generally accepted their fate. At least in the comprehensives everybody had the same chance at the start.



1. It had all to do with the Labour Government who were aware of the need for, and developed, a theory of change. It was a bad system. Faceless people were sitting in judgement on children and deciding their educational future on highly dubious criteria. This paper led a campaign against the unfairness. The power of appeal was back to the same body. It was horrendous for parents. The process was worst in Lanarkshire, which operated an impersonal, sieving system.
2. All major change needs political involvement to get it through. But there was a mixture of motives, both educational and political. Educationists wanted more equality of opportunity to acquire success through the educational system.
3. I doubt very much if the 1947 Report exerted any influence. It's recommendation about desired size of school was certainly ignored. The ruling factor was economy - and larger schools were supposed to give greater choice.
4. The success of the Ordinary grade exam was a catalyst in making comprehensive reorganisation almost inevitable. Opportunity through education began to be valued as never before. Its availability was seen to offer greater chances than ever before, to create a fairer system.
6. a) Her Majesty's Inspectors were there to ensure that government policy was implemented and made to work. I do not think they had



much influence on what happened, especially to start with.

- b) For local councillors comprehensive education was a vote-catcher. They hadn't a clue about practice. They were totally attracted by the theory. They sold it to parents to get votes.
- c) Directors of Education played an important part in developments but they were bogged down in practical issues like building, resources, staff shortage. These overshadowed their working lives, and precluded their taking an interest in the content of education, or what was actually happening in schools. the quality of education children got was determined by where they lived.
- d) Advisers did not exist early on. They created links between directors and schools and promoted subject developments. They also got teachers' centres and resource centres going.
- e) The Consultative Committee on the Curriculum is supposed to be the Secretary of State's right hand. But in reality it is a weak body. It only gives advice and recommendations. Nobody needs to pay it any heed, and many did not.

7. The location of schools was a major obstacle. Many pupils in housing estates did not make use of the excellent facilities. Tension was also created by the size of some schools and the new posts which came in 1971.

Staffing was bad in the West.

But perhaps the major problem was that academics were put in charge of a good theory. Thus, in matters of internal organisation things broke down. People didn't know how to cope,

so genuine equality of opportunity never happened. 'Good' schools were assumed to be those with good exam results. Headmasters were jealous of their reputations. Only a few people - like R.F. Mackenzie - seriously examined the implications.

9. Heads had total freedom to organise their schools as they liked.
10. I would say that there was general acceptance of comprehensive education among parents, and relief that the junior secondary schools were on the way out. The reaction was good, in the main.
11. Private schools did cream the best talent but only in very small numbers. This caused resistance in Labour circles. There were many meetings at which public disquiet reached fever pitch. The upshot was to give a bad name to comprehensive education by claiming that it would destroy schools with a good academic reputation.
12. There were many more promoted posts, introduced to attract recruits by offering more money. Guidance also was a new concept. The academic outlook was strong, and so all change had to come up against it and was diluted - on at least its worst effects were.
13. In-service and teachers centres, with good advisory support, must have been of some help to those who attended.
14. The most that can be said is that heads and their staffs accepted the change with varying degrees of commitment. They resisted,

again to varying degrees, working with less able pupils, and the whole idea of raising of the school leaving age was a nightmare.

15. Comprehensive schools abolished the stigma attaching to the junior secondary school. They definitely reduced the former split. School 'success' was measured by Scottish Certificate of Education candidates (c.f. the banding of Ordinary grade). The form of organisation inside a school and how comprehensive it was allowed to be were decisions taken almost entirely by the headmaster.
17. a) There was a larger spread of subjects, new syllabuses, new techniques. All sorts of equipment came into vogue. More pupils got a chance to attempt subjects as never before.  
  
b) The effect on methods is more questionable. Many old practices persisted. Chalk and talk dies hard.
18. Gradually teachers were encouraged to try to make it work, if only to survive. There was a great increase in trips a broad, outdoor activities, school cottages, etc.
19. It was a revolutionary concept which changed the whole thinking from elitist - some will get a chance - to let's give them all a chance. It also got more pupils to stay on past the compulsory leaving age.
20. The lad o' pairts tradition never really changed. Opportunity was taken to mean going forward for exams and/or higher or further education. Late developers now had a safety net. they



didn't have in reality before. In the exam-ridden Scottish educational system, being 'educated' equals passing exams with success. Progress is marked by the number of exam passes you have.

21. A comprehensive school is one which has good links with its local primary and secondary schools. It must organise a two year general course with all children getting all subjects and a chance to show what they can do. It should capitalise on parental encouragement. Some form of setting by ability must come after secondary 2. This is natural. There should be varied extra-curricular life and good contacts with parents. It should be run in an open way, not autocratically.

22. No. The main inhibiting factors have been

- where the school was located
- the level of enthusiasm of the staff
- attitudes of parents
- changes in government policy in those 20 years
- lack of finance/resources
- inadequate curriculum and assessment procedures
- the overwhelming emphasis on vocational preparation in schools
- the separation of schools from the real world outside
- the domination of schools by universities.



1. The relationship between the Region and the Divisions in terms of the administration of the education service is that the region makes policy and the Divisions implement it. Occasionally, a strong Divisional representation can influence final policy.
2. In big issues, the Region takes decisions and the divisions, do their bidding. In many ways, the Divisions' hands are tied. Divisional Education Officers have jurisdiction only over matters which affect their Division. They are part of the Senior Management Team, but tend to be consulted only. They may be successful in getting policy modified. They are not like the formal Directors of Education in the old counties. They do not have anything like the same autonomy, and are directly accountable to the Region. If things go wrong, Region is down on them like a ton of bricks.
3. a) The Education Committee makes policy. Elected Members are influential. It is no exaggeration to say that if a councillor phones, everything is dropped to deal with whatever he has to say. They have a statutory power to change things. Depending on whether an issue is political or not, or even on councillor priorities/whims, decisions can be taken against the wishes of the Region. Politicians and the Regional Directorate are very close. Often discussions take place prior to Committee meetings. Councillors readily ratify proposals which do not affect them politically.  
  
b) Hence, the political dimension is very important in educational

administration.

c) I would say that Elected Members and officials have a mutual antipathy. There is a great deal of reciprocal suspicion - the professional experts versus the well-meaning but uninformed amateurs. This may be why elected members have been much more actively involved in the decision making process since regionalisation.

4. The priorities of Divisional staff are to keep Region off their back, hide errors and cover themselves. Apart from that, they get on with their separate remits.

At Region, the priorities are keeping the Divisions in line, and keeping and maintaining cordial relations with Elected Members.

5. Day-to-day life in educational administration is characterised by the following:

- a deluge of paper, much of it non-educational
- a plethora of meetings, a lot of which do not lead anywhere
- sending memos, to give information about what you are doing, or to cover yourself
- attending meetings with other, non-educational agencies
- a lack of time.

So officials lead a very busy life, although I am prompted to ask: busy doing what?

6. Priorities are different in administration. They will say they are concerned about education, and will be able to find an educational justification for what they do. But the structure of

the administration creates the priorities. Most directly educational issues are the responsibility of others. In general, I would say that the kind of things most administrators have to attend to do not allow them to concentrate on matters educational.

7. Only one Education Officer has any relationship with advisers. Some 'selected' advisers are called on to undertake additional duties for Education Officers who have no time to deal with them. In general, administrators have few dealings with advisers. They are left to provide support for schools. No-one calls them to account or monitors what they do. They are very autonomous. They are not given priorities and they make up their own schedule. In my opinion, the appointment of staff tutors has called the credibility of the advisers into question. Some of them have been edged out. Advisers get into a position that they are torn between schools and the Directorate, both of whose respect they seek, and they end up not knowing what to do or whom to please. They are primarily subject specialists who do their own thing because they have no policy guidelines.
8. Administrators do not know a great deal about the problems involved in running schools. Within certain parameters, that aspect is left to headteachers. It is very much a case of: GET ON WITH IT, AND LET ME KNOW IF YOU HAVE A PROBLEM. If administrators do not hear of problems, they do not exist. Schools and their problems rarely impinge on the administrator's reality and priorities. Supplies, buildings and finance rather than education is their concern. That is the enabling mechanism



for the service to run.

9. a) You can take initiative if you do not impinge on regional/Divisional policy.

b) There is little forward planning in educational administration. It is very much crisis management. Very little is thought out, especially not the implications of the decisions taken. Decision-making takes place on the spur of the moment. Attempts at co-ordination are made but are unsuccessful - there are monthly headteacher meetings (no agenda or minutes), but headteachers are aware of a lack of structure which the region seeks to impose on them. There is no discernible system. It's run by the seat of the pants. This leads to inconsistency, 'ad-hocery' and bad use of facilities and resources. Those who get are those who shout loudest. The whole system needs review.

10. Educational administrators rarely expose their own views publicly, especially on regional policy matters. The extent to which they set to work to see that policy is implemented or improved upon is questionable. As I said earlier, their remits and hectic existence preclude serious involvement in matters educational.



3. I would say that the educational aspect of the comprehensive movement was a forward-looking, romantic, idealism and that was there. But nothing would have happened if there had been no political input. Circular 600 came as a bombshell on the educational scene. Its implications were simply not grasped.
4. The main impetus for a comprehensive organisational pattern came, I think, from the realisation that there was a post-war bulge of children moving through the secondary system, and something had to be done to accommodate it. In my opinion, also, the switch in primary education was also a contributory factor. The Primary Memorandum introduced a liberalising influence which had to percolate into secondary schools. The whole emphasis was away from force-feeding in class and toward co-operation, investigation, projects, and group methods. Also, the selective system was obviously failing. Wastage occurred on an enormous scale. The discrimination was inaccurate, and as a result large numbers of children were written off as failures. Also to be taken into account is the fact that in the 1960's, people began to be more aware of their rights, much more self-assertive.
5. A lot of people kept their heads down and hoped comprehensive education would go away. But it didn't, and they had to discover ways of working it out.
6. As for the influence of various groups, Her Majesty's Inspectors

went around laying down the pattern reorganisation had to take in view of government policy; local politicians helped to a certain extent, but many of them had acquired social mobility through the selective education system, and found this a contradiction with the solid Labour party line. Advisers came late, part and parcel of the new thinking which characterised the 1960s. They were involved in spreading the word, so to speak. Circulars 600 and 614 caused total panic among the teaching profession. I remember that the Honours Graduates' Association found it totally impossible to grasp that henceforward children would not be streamed. Mixed-ability classes and the common cause were dramatic for people who had no background in catering for all children. Those in senior secondary schools had the whole basis of their work destroyed. A small minority of teachers accepted the challenge and faced up to it. Most asked: HOW THE HELL DO YOU DO THIS? They were desperate for knowledge, hence the explosion in ins-service training and Teachers' Centres. People were at a loss. They didn't know where to turn to for help and advice.

7. I think this depended on the Director of Education. Certain were tolerant of transitional arrangements that went on for a long time. A multilateral set up was adopted in many areas. Many headteachers claimed they operated a flexible comprehensive system, or offered practical reasons to prevent doing what they did not really want to do. There was immense ambiguity and disagreement about how to deal with pupils at each extremity of the ability range. To be fair, Glasgow and Lanarkshire had to cope with appalling staffing shortages. So, given the staff

turnover, most headteachers were primarily concerned to contain the situation on day-to-day basis, and had no time to sit back and consider fine points of educational theory. Most antagonism was in fact in schools that were comparatively well-off - usually ex-senior secondary schools that had been amalgamated with former junior secondary schools, which provided some grim staff tensions. Much clever management and tact was required to overcome this.

11. The main problem was one of staff attitudes. There was a dislike of change, of upturning established ways. There was also a lot of academic snobbery. A lot of people with Honours Degrees felt they should not be teaching illiterate pupils.
12. The general impression I gained was that there was not a great deal of integration of pupils within schools. In fact, strict divisions were maintained. It was a case of strict segregation within a single campus. There was an ethos of separateness. However, as older staff left and younger ones came along through the new training system, imbued with new ideas, and a greater sympathy with the comprehensive idea, they were prepared to have a go. Some saw it as a great chance for advancement. Those who were enlightened, especially headteachers and principal teachers, achieved a great deal, and much good work was done.
15. Teachers had to change simply because of the pressure that was put on them to change, e.g. science for the 70's. There was an upsurge of working parties of keen teachers. Some people made valiant attempts to come to terms with the full implications of



comprehensive education. But there were two big problems:

- a) the entrenched subject-orientation of many teachers
- b) national exams.

17. A lot of people thought that we had had comprehensives in Scotland for years. So to that extent it was not a revolutionary concept. All pupils going to the same school was not a revolutionary concept. Given the tradition of omnibus schools, there was very little objection to the idea of a comprehensive school, indeed there was pride in it. The worry and panic occurred when it was realised that the internal implications of Circulars 600 and 614 were radically different from the omnibus school pattern. The traditional Scottish solution of differentiating of children according to ability proved difficult to dislodge from the minds of those in powerful positions in the education service.

18. The lad o' pairts tradition ensured that all kids of academic ability had the opportunity to go to university irrespective of background. In Scotland, there is no doubt that equality of opportunity was seen in strictly meritocratic terms - viz: allowing the able children to get ahead. What was revolutionary, and even seen as a threat, was that the comprehensive school aimed to cater for the whole ability range, and treat the pupil as an individual. This notion was seen as the death-knell of academic excellence, especially in a country which had traditionally written off the less able in schools. So comprehensive theory was not really taken on board in Scotland. Even the meritocratic thrust towards increasing certificate



passes for all came up against the flower power - self-expression  
- anti-authority syndrome of the late 60s.

Comprehensive education must now be seriously in question. The conveyor belt system is over, the cafeteria system is in. The Open University has led to the modular idea - you do what you like when you like, irrespective of what you have achieved in the past. We are in the process of changing our values. The academic education - degree - safe job syndrome is over. Employers are not really interested in qualifications, but rather in personal qualities. The economic/financial situation of the mid 80s has ironically made some of the central tenets of the comprehensive movement of the 60's come to fruition.

I was Minister for Education responsible for all schools and further education in England and Wales. Some of your questions puzzled me on Scotland for, in the 1940's and 1950's I was always told by Scottish colleagues and friends that Scotland was showing the way to England in respect of 'all-in' schools, and that we in England were lagging behind.

You must not make the mistake of assuming that comprehensive education can be immediately introduced just by a political decision. The decision is, of course, very important, but practical difficulties and buildings were sometimes a stumbling block, especially when schools were bulging and financial cut-backs at the Treasury affected resourcing.

The moves to introduce comprehensive education were educational at first. Many early comprehensive schools were in areas which were not Labour-controlled. Later, it became a political issue, which was a great pity. The comprehensive school was very popular in the Labour Party - and universally accepted within it.

The main source of initiatives was the Labour Party Education committee set up by the National Executive. That Committee put pressure on Lord Butler in 1943 to re-word the 1944 Act - which he did. Other educational bodies were also active.

The aim in introducing comprehensive education as policy was, briefly, to give all children a chance and to end the 11+ exam. Long before 1964, it had been accepted as policy by Party Annual Conferences. Some local authorities were opposed to the idea, some in favour lacked the

resources to reorganise on comprehensive lines.

I still think that the most significant thing occurred pre-1944, when the deputation of which I was a member persuaded Butler to change his intention about the wording of the Act. As a result, there were not three prescriptive types of school.

George Tomlinson was an amiable sort of man but the comprehensive school had not seriously occurred to him as a possibility.

1. I first recall the issue being discussed and actively promoted around 1951-52. It got going long before we came to power in 1964.
2. There were both educational and political motives. A significant factor in Glasgow was that many leading politicians - elder statesmen - were involved in education in some way. Jean Roberts, Allan Young, Andrew Hood and Myer Galpern. They were strong personalities and carried a lot of weight and local respect. So an important factor was that the leadership in the local Labour Party ranks had a strong educational basis.
3. The war was important. Pressures for change and reform in societies often follow wars. In the period 1945-51, there grew up an anticipation of a better life. This was actively promoted by the Labour Party. The momentum for the comprehensive school started at local level in an attempt to eradicate the worst tendencies of class, to promote a more egalitarian outlook, to expand and equalise opportunities.
4. Local elected members played a strong part in Glasgow. There was a big Labour input and, as I've mentioned, they had a knowledge of the world of education.
5. a) Directorate staff were strong advocates of the comprehensive school.  
  
b) I was aware neither of opposition nor positive support. There



was no public clamour for it nor any outcry against it. Given that so many new schools had been opened in housing estates - often at incredible speed - the establishment of a comprehensive system caused few practical problems.

c) Again, I was not aware of any opposition, at least not outwardly. Remember that the arrival of comprehensive schools created promotion opportunities for teachers, and for the authority to make the 'right' appointments to senior posts when they could.

6. My impression is that it formalised to a large extent what was already there.
7. I think that the main change was that the junior secondary school got a formal upgrading in status, if only nominally, and senior secondary schools had to take pupils of a type of which they had previously had no experience.
8. Fee-paying schools were so small in number that they never caused any real obstacle to comprehensivisation, but they provided the only main opposition that I recall. Their existence is incompatible with the general concept of comprehensive education. The parents who sent their children to them, and the staff who worked in them, felt their academic dominance under threat.
9. No, schools were not used as testbeds for Labour Party policy. The advent of a Labour Government merely accelerated what would ultimately have happened anyway.

10. In Glasgow, they were very influential then. I think the strong Labour tradition of interest in education still lingers, despite regionalisation.
11. They are important, for they are the experts who help to formulate policy in line with political thinking. They have the knowledge of the system.
12. The comprehensive school fitted in well with the centuries-old tradition in Scotland of there being no barriers to receiving a good education.
13. Equality of opportunity is best summed up in the lad o' pairts notion - progress from humble origins to great positions through climbing the educational ladder, if you had the brains to do it.
14. Yes, a minority of the Labour Party did still cling to the selective (academically, that is) school as a good route of progress. Many were products of such schools themselves, and were reluctant to see their children robbed of the chances they themselves had had.
15. The area school did not cause problems as far as I know, certainly not in ----- . The only thing I recall being said was that some Catholic parents were uneasy about the pulling power of St Mungo's Academy and St Francis Secondary. Their sound academic reputations tended to rob some of the Roman Catholic comprehensives of a number of abler kids.

16. Only one obstacle - silent, behind-the-scenes opposition from those in education who preferred schools with good academic reputations, the so-called 'good' schools, and what they stood for. A certain number of people - in teaching and in the public - saw the arrival of the comprehensive school as firstly the product of an egalitarian philosophy which was a waste of time with certain sections of the community who couldn't care less, and secondly as a weapon which was going to be used to destroy or eliminate big senior secondaries (e.g. Whitehill, Shawlands) in the name of progress. I think there were more who held that view than thought comprehensive school was a good thing and keenly supported it.
17. The arrival of such a revolutionary change was bound inevitably to change teachers. But given their own training, the question is: TO WHAT EXTENT?
18. With the reservation that education cannot be isolated from other aspects of society, I'd say politics was very important in providing the impetus for change from the outside.
19. A comprehensive school is one which takes all the kids from the  
+  
20. local area and gives them an equal opportunity to develop their talents. No one should be rejected or feel failure in a comprehensive school. All this is easy to say, but how do you achieve these aims?

When you consider that inequalities in society are getting greater, and that the present Government favours parental choice and seems hardly to be 'pro' state schools or their improvement,

we have to ask what have comprehensive schools achieved?  
Whatever that is - and I am not really in a position as an  
outsider to say - their potential has not been and does not seem  
likely to be tapped. On that depressing note.....



PREAMBLE

There was no discussion of comprehensive schools initiated by the Director or the members of the Education Committee. In fact, the Education Committee was badly organised. I was part of a small sub-committee which suggested to the Director and his deputy that from 1952 onwards all schools should be secondary schools, and that the junior/senior secondary division should stop. There was a tremendous reverence for people in schools with Honours degrees, especially in classics, and if they had an Ed.B. they had the status of Gods. Most people had no experience of dealing with poorer kids, so they hid behind the safety of their office doors. My considered opinion is that the comprehensive in Glasgow was adopted as an expedient at a time of expansion and new house building in outlying schemes. The implications were not thought through, and once established, they were allowed to solve their own problems. This was done chiefly by keeping the same rigid distinctions between pupils in a single school as had existed between them in separate schools. Streaming and its associated feelings of rejection and inferiority went on as before.

1. In a sense the comprehensive school has its origins in John Knox's ideas, but it first was mentioned in Glasgow in the early 1950's. It was an idea of Dr MacKintosh's. Some Labour politicians were influenced by the writings of Tony Crosland.
2. The reasons why this type of school was pushed were primarily political and social. Councillors were being increasingly pestered by parents dissatisfied at the segregated system, and

their children's failure to secure a senior secondary place. The chill finger of failure at 12 was a very important factor in the impetus for the common secondary school. The Labour Party made propaganda out of the complaining parents. It was a chance to make real some of the great promises contained in the 1945 Act.

3. They helped to justify what Labour authorities were already doing, and thus promoted official party policy. But they managed only to get the schools established. The staff, some of whom became sudden converts because of the promotion prospects, muddled along, feeling their way, with no clear blueprint of a comprehensive school to work from. A comprehensive school should endeavour to provide education of a grammar school quality at all levels. The intention was to rid state education of the inferiority associated with the junior secondary school, or the secondary modern in England.
5. a) Directorate staff, especially Dr Mackintosh, were very enthusiastic. Although he tended to dissipate his energies, chasing several objectives at once. Other junior staff were left to sort out the nitty-gritty practical problems like staffing and buildings.
- b) The public was generally in favour of the comprehensive school.
- c) Some teachers were genuinely enthusiastic, but most were elitist-minded. There was no public resistance in Scotland - it was quiet and in the background. For some, the burdens proved too much.

6. The implications were disastrous to start with. Old buildings and annexes were a major problem. Things were rushed. It would have been sensible to follow the Fabian concept of the INEVITABILITY OF GRADUALNESS.
7. The change was not very great. Paradoxically, the change of structure was greeted by a desire to keep things much as they were in order to save the able kids.
8. The excuse that these private schools 'creamed' pupils away from the state schools was and is puerile. I think both kinds of school can co-exist. The selective ones can then act as catalysts, examples of excellence, of what can be accomplished with effort.
9. Yes. I am not an abolitionist. There was much hypocrisy in the party, much waving of egalitarian flags, much public mouthing of principles. Dan Docherty sent his kids to St Aloysius while killing off the High School. Sheer snobbery! Others moved house to be in the area of 'a good school'. The wholesale destruction of these five schools was wrong, but most Councillors never discuss or consider points of educational principle. Educational ideas are very limited among most local councillors, yet they can take important decisions.
10. If Elected Members are genuinely interested in education they can achieve a great deal. Most are not, and vote on party lines without much thought. They tend to become preoccupied with the administration of the system (attendance, welfare, meals etc) but



not its philosophical basis.

11. It is a myth that politicians initiate policy. It all starts with the Directorate staff. Things seldom come from the Committee. The professionals put up the ideas or suggestions for the Committee's consideration.
12. The ideas in Circular 600 were fine, but there was no preparation or intentional creation of an internal school organisation to match.
13. It was perceived as extending the opportunity of gaining Ordinary Levels and Highers to more pupils than in the past.
14. Party policy is one thing, your own children's education is another. It's hard not to be subjective here. A 'good education' usually was seen as the best chance to get exam passes in a school free from the environmental effects of deprivation. A school in the Calton is not the same as one in Bearsden.
15. To be a proper comprehensive school there must be as good a social mix as possible. Schools in areas dominated by a single social class tend to become ghettos, which reinforce the values and attitudes of that class.
16. The main problems as I recall were:
  - Accommodation
  - Staffing
  - Materials appropriate to all abilities



- Elitist teachers
- The reluctance of the establishment to push it
- People at all levels really did not know what it was about.

17. College of education staff were elitists too, refugees from the classroom many of them. Teachers were not prepared for major innovations, and also they had to confront too many changes one after the other. They were never allowed peace to settle down and get on with the job. Add to that the fact that they had not asked for the changes anyway, and you see that the chances of major changes in aims and approaches were limited from the start. Not much will be achieved in education while most major decisions which directly affect schools are taken by people who do not practice the craft of teaching.
18. Politicians pay the piper and so, to some extent, must call the tune. But they do not usually call a very loud tune. Party policy apart, politicians stumbled into comprehensive education, and were as much in the dark as those on whom they forced the change.
19. A Regional Council has no time to find out what is going on in schools. Virtually everything is left to the Head and his staff. Professional independence is still very strong among those in education. Policy ought to be carried out. There ought to be much more accountability - like headteachers on a 5 year trial period for example.
20. A comprehensive school is one which gives all pupils a grammar

school quality education, so that they can achieve whatever potential they have. The main reasons why the comprehensive school has nowhere near achieved its potential are:

- lack of money and resources to match the changes being asked for
- too much external interference
- lack of supervision of headteachers
- many teachers with the wrong outlook.

1. The debate about comprehensive schools took off in ----- in the mid 1960's. Much activity was generated, and debates were held at the instigation of the education working party of the Labour Party.
2. The impetus was primarily educational, but obviously there was a political overlay. Education and politics cannot be separated. Yes, political aspects were involved - inevitably.
3. There was a growing realisation of the inadequacy of the existing system, especially selection at 12 and rigid streaming. There was a gradual awareness that there are different kinds of ability and different rates of learning. Many factors exist which account for how a pupil performs at 12; hence to judge the whole person (i.e. accept or reject) on the basis of a couple of tests is hardly just. What happened basically was a division based on verbal reasoning quotient was made, and children were sent to junior secondary or senior secondary schools. These realisations in the educational world paralleled the liberal attitudes which were in vogue at the time in many sectors of society. Radical beliefs were expressed in equality, greater opportunities for all. There was a strong belief in education as a gateway to success.
4. The rate of adoption varied depending on the political colour of local councils. ----- (Tory) was very slow, for example. Hardly anything had been done in 1973 when the first Labour

Council took office. It was almost totally the Elected Members who pushed it against resistance from the Director and his administration. It was local politicians who took the initiative there, and argued the comprehensive case.

5. a) Most Directorate staff went along - they had no choice in the end. One or two offered token resistance; others kept quiet, because their own children were privately educated.
  - b) The parents of children at Corporation fee-paying schools were violently against it, as did those with children at the old senior secondaries with good academic reputations. There were many meetings with lots of hostile parents. The parents in less favoured areas were much more receptive to the new comprehensive scheme. It is always those with most to lose who are the most vociferous at moments of major change. Those with much to gain are quiet and supportive. The main group of parents to benefit were those in housing estates where former junior secondary and 4 year schools were upgraded as a result of comprehensivisation.
  - c) Teachers and heads had mixed reactions. Unions, especially the Educational Institute of Scotland, were in favour (Scottish Secondary Teachers' Association and Scottish Schoolmasters' Association less so). The heads and staffs of senior secondary schools were violently against it, either openly or in private. Those from less favoured areas like ----- were very enthusiastic. The movement was also helped by teachers in Educational Institute of Scotland/Labour Party working groups.
6. Government Circulars do not have as much of an impact as the



Scottish Education Department think they do. Although governments now are much more interventionist, in 1965 they were not. Circulars provide the impetus for change, create a climate of opinion. At the end of the day the detailed implementation is left to the Directorate staff. So much depends on them. Up to 1975, the big cities had powerful, all purpose councils. Much, therefore, depended on how much they actively pushed the comprehensive issue.

7. The persistence of selection was an issue which teachers kept raising as late as the mid-70's. Many heads were thirled to selection and streaming. There was much evidence of this in so-called 'comprehensive' schools, and also of the fact that all the attention and resources went to academic pupils first. The rest got what was left. The advisory service had a key role in promoting change and twisting the arms of reluctant headteachers. Each headteacher had a great deal of autonomy. Both this and selection are areas in need of examination, still, in 1985. Heads should be questioned on the extent of their commitment to comprehensives.
8. The concept of local authority fee-paying schools was abhorrent. Private schools are bad enough - at least people are free to pay to opt out. I have always been committed to reducing the private sector, and starving it of government resources. Comprehensive schools do improve with a more balanced intake of ability. It would be a very radical step to outlaw independent schools, especially in view of the European Court of Human Rights. We should do all we can to improve the state sector, and make life

as difficult as possible for the private. Both types of schools can co-exist.

9. No, I'd put it the other way. We were looking for schools to move into the latter half of the 20th century, to develop new images to replace their outdated ones. A comprehensive school does not mean that Greek, rugby or academic excellence come to be discredited. They were not intended to be clones of selective schools: the idea was to make the advantages, previously limited to a few, available for the many, and to try to get people to realise that there were abilities other than academic.
10. It varies, and depends on personalities. In Glasgow, Dan Docherty and Willie Harley had entirely different views and approaches. The former, for example, was not genuinely committed to abolishing fee-paying schools, since his own family was privately educated. The personal interests and views of the Education Committee Chairman are important. Strong personalities achieve much. Also important is the sort of relationship they strike up with the professionals, whose job it is to implement the ruling party's policy. They have to work out the detailed implementation. Strong Directors can also achieve a lot. Much depends whether one party has overall control.
11. Directors implement party policy and bring their professional knowledge of schools and education to bear upon it. Certain areas like the curriculum are left to them. That is their province.

12. Comprehensive schools fitted in well with Scottish tradition outside the cities. In urban areas there were problems - fee-paying schools, junior secondary/senior secondary schools. But really, comprehensive schools can be traced through parish schools right back to John Knox. Provision for all in education has a long history in Scotland.
13. Equality of opportunity in Scotland is enshrined in the law of parity of opportunity - there should be no barrier of any kind for able children to get a good secondary education, and go on to University if that is what they wish. The arrival of the comprehensive school meant that this opportunity was not offered once and for all at 12, but was there for all who wanted to avail themselves of it. The aim was also to try and create an awareness of abilities other than academic.
14. This view was undoubtedly true for some people in the Labour Party. Education was seen as the provider of a secure job and consequent social advantages.
15. Area schools and the drawing of catchment areas so as to get as good a social mix as possible were an enormous problem without a doubt, and must have created headaches for those in schools too. But falsely arranging catchment areas by devices like bussing was not on - politically or socially.
16. Selective planning of cities by successive administrations for social/economic reasons polarised populations, and created social apartheid which had obvious educational implications. That was



by far the biggest problem. Resources too, as always, and the switching of them for other purposes caused headaches. Finally, the attitudes of headteachers and staffs sometimes did not help to get the comprehensive movement well launched.

17. Yes, comprehensive schools have had this effect, but it is important to note that they are not only thing which have had an effect on teachers' views. Corporal punishment has gone, pupils are no longer assured of a job. An attempt has been made to update both curriculum and assessment. So there has been a shift, a positive one, but it has been gradual.
18. It is impossible to keep politics out of education, since it relates to the basic structure of society. There are political aspects to virtually all that we do. Politics has a very important role in changing things: it has power and finance. Political will is of paramount importance, as the present Tory administration illustrates well.
19. Politicians get a mandate from the electorate every four years, and should not ignore their representations and changing circumstances. The mandate is given on the strength of basic but general principles which we cannot forego, but we must listen to the professionals. Participatory democracy and progress by consent are the desirable goals. You cannot be outright dictators to the education professionals. You must rely on co-operation. As well as Directors, Her Majesty's Inspectors are a very influential group in Scottish education and see themselves as such, especially now that they have shed the inspectorial role



in favour of a wider role as agents of change.

20.a) The comprehensive school is an outdated concept in 1985. The community school is the one for the 80's. It develops naturally out of the comprehensive philosophy, and sees the school as a community resource, the core activity of which is educating people to pass exams and go to the University, but which provides for a wide variety of local needs as well - leisure, recreation, meetings, amateur dramatics, continuing education. But a definition of the comprehensive school would include these: an area school for local primaries; as wide a social mix as possible without being artificial; no rigid selection in the school; creation of appropriate courses which will allow pupils to develop whatever abilities they have.

b) No, because of inappropriate use of resources, a reluctant profession, the assisted places scheme, the economic climate and unemployment.

1. I can remember its being discussed as far back as 1952. The prime problem was selection at the end of primary education. When I started to argue for the abolition of selection, I got very few allies on the Education Committee - one vote, in fact, the first time I proposed it. The form of assessment used was much too unreliable. It only tested a narrow skill, and left wider abilities unexamined. The opposition to the new idea was for two reasons, I think: (1) it had always been done with a selection exam for years, (2) teachers didn't really know what to replace it with. In my opinion, it's crazy to rely on one exam taken on one day, as far too many other factors are involved. Comprehensive education became an issue principally because of the perceived injustice of segregation, and its inability to take account of factors like social background or adverse circumstances. Also, there was a gradual realisation that secondary schools did not allow a wide range of pupils' proficiencies to come to light. We really started it off with St. Augustines, which opened in 1954 as an experiment in comprehensive education. It eventually became a showpiece. There were many arguments about size, but a proper comprehensive has to be on the large side to have the flexibility necessary to cater for the diversity of needs and abilities, and to allow them to develop. The whole purpose of a comprehensive school is to ascertain the potential skills of its pupils before making irrevocable decisions about their future.

2. In the 50's they were most definitely educational. Politics did

not come into it. The aim was to create a broader, richer provision for all pupils in the secondary sector. The intention was to have mixed-ability classes, and leave grouping by ability till later. It only became political when the Labour Party made it declared policy, and it became a major part of their 1964 message to the electorate. So I would say that it really didn't start as a political issue, but it was one which got socialist backing.

3. For two main reasons. It was seen as a good way to establish fairness in the educational system, but it was also created to cater for the needs of a rapidly growing industrialised society - that is to increase the pool of trained manpower.
4. The Directorate staff were all for it, as was the Education Committee. There was never any opposition or disagreement on the fundamental questions. All were united in their desire to get comprehensive schools going. It would not be an exaggeration to say that Glasgow led the way in the West of Scotland with this new form of schooling.
5. The reorientation of the basic educational ideas of those teachers who were not generally in favour of comprehensive schools, and the gradual realisation that there would need to be a readjustment of teaching skills.
6. The Director of Education and his officials.
7. Maybe we failed there, in that they were not fully advised. They



were not taught what to expect. Once it had been explained to them, they were usually anxious to co-operate.

8. There was no outright trouble, but there was a feeling of unease among many teachers, of uncertainty about what to do.
9. a) On the whole, it led to a recognition of, and attempts to provide for, children who had abilities other than academic. The whole thrust was to get over the idea that academic ability was not the prime concern of schools.  
  
b) I'm not sure of the extent to which it did, but it was undoubtedly an improvement, mainly because the feeling of inferiority, rejection and failure at 12 had been removed. There was a change of outlook.
10. Not as much as people obsessed with equality claim. You see, there exists a very powerful feeling in Scotland that we still have a duty to look after our most able pupils. Although the Labour Party wants to abolish these schools, the feelings of parents were very strong. A concern for standards has led to an increased pupil roll at these schools, the fees of which many are willing to pay, or sacrifice to pay. This will never go away, so the Labour Party will never succeed in doing away with them. Given that they form such a small percentage of the total school population, they do not constitute an obstacle to the realisation of comprehensive state education. State schools must, therefore, prove themselves as good as fee-paying or academically selective schools.



12. Yes, eventually. It adopted the comprehensive secondary school as policy.
13. In general, the Education Committee accepted the ideas of the Director and his Convener who met regularly to discuss important issues. The Committee was not interested in educational philosophy or deep discussions about the aims of education. They were interested in the mechanics, the operation of the system. So discussions were about school meals, residential schools, art of music courses, finance, promotion of teachers.
14. Their chief role was to declare policy, and submit it to the Committee for consideration. There were never any fall-outs about fundamental educational policy matters, and the Committee in Glasgow was always exceptionally generous with the budget to schools.
15. Politics doesn't really enter into it. The political input into the education service is concerned with money primarily and what things a government regards as priorities. So the political effect is felt in financial cuts, teacher shortage, closures, modernising old or building new schools. The politicians provide the service and finance it. They do not interfere with the work of headmasters or teachers. The chief effect of politics on education is economic.
16. In a way, we always had comprehensive education in Scotland, or at least a modified form of it. I would say that comprehensive schools merely built on the traditions and experience of the

past. The arrival of comprehensive schools merely expanded the existing educational provision,- that's all that happened.

17. I would say that most people thought it meant the chance to develop whatever ability you had, to bring out whatever potential skill a pupil had.
18. A comprehensive school embraces all the children in a given locality from age 11-18 and encourages them to highlight first then develop whatever ability they have, and take it to the highest point possible. Such a school should seek to create a positive attitude to education and learning among its pupils, so that later in life they can indulge in adult education if they wish.
20. Not at all. They are constantly being refined and improved, and by experiment, teachers are coming to terms with the challenge they present. It is best seen as a gradual process of effecting improvements.

Comprehensive education, or the movement to establish it, had been on the go for many years before 1965, but it gradually gathered speed, and became increasingly political. It was already a fact of life in rural areas, so to that extent was not new for educationists. It was part of a movement to break-down social barriers, and it caused a great deal of sloganising. Labour Councillors and activists responded to a gut-feeling about the advantages the middle class were creaming off the education system, and appearing as a result to be better and superior to ordinary working class people. The simplistic remedy was seen to be to send everyone to the same school, and give everyone the same choice. But when questions began to be asked about details, things became vague, and started to run into the sand. So there was a strong sense of what it was that was intended to be achieved, but the subsidiary questions caused much less interest and, in fact, were not addressed. There was an unspoken assumption that once the structure had been established, all would be well. Because of the growing antagonism towards the 11+, politicians took a simplistic view - schools were either selective or comprehensive.

Comprehensive education was about education and politics. Educational experts armed with research data argued in favour of it, and to some extent it became the 'in thing', with many alleged virtues attributed to it. There was a pronounced tendency to regard it as a solution to so many other problems that were besetting the world of education at that time - remember it was a period of expansionist thinking, with pressure on buildings resulting from an increasing school population, and raising of the school leaving age on the horizon. So it is wrong, in my view,



to regard comprehensive education in isolation. People in selective schools regarded the arrival of some of the new pupils with horror, seeing them as hordes of unwashed and unable. Access to a broad range of pupils was not universally warmly received.

Once the politicians' keenness had cooled, comprehensive education came to be accepted by teachers to mean that all pupils would get a chance to make a go of the senior secondary course. It was very much a grammar school education for all. It suited teachers to use this interpretation because of their academic background. The concept of appropriate education for all according to aptitude and interest was not entertained. All the emphasis remained on Scottish Certificate of Education pupils for years, which is why the so-called raising of the school leaving age courses were such a disaster. There was, in fact, a wide-spread failure to face up to and find solutions to phase two of the reform - devising a comprehensive curriculum. What was achieved was largely a comprehensive structure in terms of buildings, but inside the curriculum was senior secondary. In my view, the rationale for setting up the Munn and Dunning Committee was based on a recognition that the fundamental issues implied by comprehensive education had been evaded. The Committee threw up awkward questions.

The change of government in 1979 caused a period of stalemate for the development programme for Munn and Dunning. Then the world picture changed, with massive youth unemployment and falling school rolls, and an increased emphasis on vocational training. Nevertheless, a comprehensive structure is here to stay, since both parents and teachers interests are locked into it. The idea of Area Curriculum Planning Group revived the comprehensive ideal. Decentralising tendencies, and



the emphasis on privatisation have tended to make the approach to comprehensive education inconsistent. Privatisation is implicit in the Conservative Government's intention to reduce taxation and local government and private expenditure.

Comprehensive education has two absolutely fundamental principles: parity of esteem for all pupils, implying parity of resourcing, and flexibility of provision. Having a six year comprehensive school is not the be-all and end-all. It is a means to an end. The essential is to fit the curriculum to the pupils, and not dragoon them into areas in which they have no interest. Appropriate curriculum content gives more chances of success. I think that in this regard, the theory behind Standard grade courses is a major step towards and comprehensivisation of the curriculum. Curriculum is more important than buildings, and I sometimes wish we should be getting education officers to concentrate on that which they know best. You do not need an education officer to deal with curtains and lavatories.

In the late 1980's we are completing the educational reform begun in the 1960's and are maintaining a direct line of continuity with it.

1. Initiatives for comprehensive education started in the 1960's, as far as I can recall, and stemmed from the different status given to junior secondary and senior secondary schools. The great divide caused a trauma for ambitious parents, who went to all lengths to push their children into a senior secondary school, and so get the chance of a 'good' education. Gradually, public opinion realised the system we operated was unfair and divisive. All sorts of subterfuges were undertaken to get children into a senior secondary school.
2. My strong feeling is that comprehensive education was pushed initially by a small group of politically active teachers - Pollock, Forrester, Lambie. Many resolutions at the Scottish Conference of the Labour Party in favour of comprehensive education were passed. The lead was then taken by the National Executive of the Party, and the view was pushed that education was a force for good, a force to bring about desirable changes in society. My view is that committed professionals were listened to with respect by politicians at national level, who then took up the crusade on their behalf. So, in my view, national politicians had been motivated by a small but powerful group of politically-minded teachers.  
  
There was thus a mixture of political and educational motives. The educational ones arose from mounting unhappiness at the school system, and they became fused with the political will to effect major change. The two sets of motives fused and interacted.

4. The part played in the comprehensive issue by Elected Members varied with the amount of control held at any one time by the party in power on the Council. For several years, Labour held a convincing majority, but there were times, particularly in the late 1960's-early 1970's when control was divided. So Members had increasingly to argue the broad policy issues underlying comprehensive education, most notably of course, their opposition to selective schools. An extremist push was given by a small group called the Glasgow Education Reform Society, of which I was a member. The main role of Elected Members was to argue to defend the policies they believed in, and take part in debates about the direction policy should take. Individual aspects were discussed and seminars were held periodically on educational matters.
5. a) Directorate staff were happy enough philosophically about comprehensive education, but less happy about its implications. I have a suspicion that many of them resented Labour Councillors' plans for their prized selective schools to which many sent their own children, incidentally.
- b) Parents, in my experience, were (and are) generally indifferent to change in education. A few articulate middle class parents were up-tight because they thought comprehensive education would ruin formerly 'good' schools, and make the whole system average.
- c) Most teachers welcomed the change on a philosophical level, but there was a lot of unhappiness about what was provided in terms of resources to find the change. Teachers accepted philosophically what was being attempted, but resented the



personal inconvenience to their established professional practice it caused.

8. Local authority fee-paying schools caused a significant obstacle to comprehensive schools, because they creamed off a proportion of able pupils, which thus distorted the spread of pupils in ordinary comprehensive schools. It also took away from them the very pupils who could provide leadership.
10. There is no doubt in my mind that Elected Members have a considerable, if not overwhelming, influence on educational policy, within the national framework, of course. They have a definite policy input. They deal with the various options put forward by the professionals. Papers are written, options are posed. Councillors have to weigh up the cost, consequences etc of proposed changes, and then take a decision. Very often, educational wishes have to be trimmed by the cost implications. The influence of Elected Members has not changed since Regionalisation, the main change has been that policy matters since 1975 have had to be agreed in an era of contraction, rather than the expansion which characterised the 1960's.
11. The Directorate staff are the people with information and knowledge. They are consulted by the Scottish Education Department and read all the recent documents on education. Much depends on the relationship which exists between the Director and the Convener of the Education Committee. This has a ripple effect on the community. Politicians must know the questions to ask the professionals. Ideally, there should be mutual trust and



respect. I would say, however, that since Regionalisation, things are much more bureaucratic, because of the size of Strathclyde. The Region is the overlord of the divisions, which have lost the autonomy of the former counties. So a Divisional Education Officer is not the same as the former Director of Education. The Divisional Education Officer is someone in charge of the day-to-day administration of the Division, and an implementer of regional policy decisions. Power has been relocated to the centre.

14. It is true that some Labour Councillors sent their children to private schools. The most famous example was Dan Docherty who was Convener at the time of the selective schools furore in Glasgow. But it must be stressed that only a minority did this. Many councillors who could have afforded the fees did not, on a point of principle.
16. The main obstacles to the introduction of a comprehensive system as I saw them were:
  - the existence of fee paying schools
  - the existing system which was seen to have served people well for generations
  - resistance from staff, especially in senior secondary schools who, while they did not sabotage moves, were quietly upset and unwilling to change
  - media criticism which, by championing disaffected groups, gave comprehensive education a bad name.
17. There is no doubt that there has been a change in the attitude of

teachers. This has accelerated as the older teachers have gone and younger ones come in. Over the period you are looking at, more teachers are now favourably disposed to the comprehensive idea.

18. The role of politics in initiating educational change is absolutely crucial. Politics is about managing society. Educational provision fashions society, and educational policy in a reflection of the priority it is given on the political agenda. The essence of politics is priorities. The kind of educational system we have and how it is resourced are political decisions of the first magnitude.
19. It is important that policy decisions, which are usually reached after a lot of debate and consultation, are imposed, unless someone can come and justify why they should not. Deviants should be brought into line. Departures should only be allowed if they can be justified.
20. A comprehensive school for me is one which is run on professional lines, properly staffed, serviced and resourced. The pupils follow a balanced curriculum which accords with the reasonable aspirations of the parents. All children should have an outlet for whatever abilities they have. There should be a reasonable discipline structure, and a good corporate life. The staff should show an open, out-going approach, and welcome contact with the community. Having said all that, I should add one caveat: the West of Scotland, with its areas of social deprivation and religious segregation, has probably been the hardest place in Scotland to try out comprehensive education.

An indication of Labour Party thinking and the general background to the motives for the introduction of comprehensive education can be gathered from a study of Party policy documentation through the later 'fifties and the early sixties', which shows very clearly that there was total agreement that equal opportunity was a priority objective, and that selective education was a barrier to equal opportunity. . One cannot divorce 'political' from 'educational' unless one takes an unacceptably narrow view of 'education'. There were no divisions of opinion within the Labour movement on the subject. It was probably once of the most universally agreed principles of the period. There was no division of opinion whatever between England and Scotland. . 'National policy' was determined by a U.K. based Party with no indication whatever of Scottish, Welsh or other differences.

There was no opposition in the Scottish Labour Party to the idea of the comprehensive school.

The Government decided to proceed by Circular because the changes proposed were administrative within the educational system established under previous legislation. It was never even mooted that new legislation might be considered.

Circular 600 articulated very easily with the Scottish tradition in education - much more easily than in England, given the tradition of one secondary school for all children in most areas outside the major cities. There was a very large base of existing schools which met the requirements of Circular 600.

Circular 600 was prepared in the usual way, that is to say normal civil servant preparation of draft guidance to implement government policy for



submission to the Minister for approval and/or amendment. I myself introduced the 'no streaming' concept; I was influenced by observation of the methods used in schools in Fife.

The implementation and implications of Circular 600 were largely matters which fell to officials at local authority level. Circular 600 certainly provoked interest, but no hostility or Parliamentary problems that I can recall.

The main obstacle to the implementation of Circular 600 was that the intake into schools would still be stratified according to social class, since it would relate to neighbourhood housing. (New York was 'bussing' its black and white children.) This has become obvious during the years.

As far as comprehensive education in the West of Scotland was concerned, only Glasgow presented a serious problem in two respects. First, and more serious, the acute need for new school building; second, the expected agitation from fee-paying schools.

Circular 600 was not regarded as a very radical concept in Scottish educational circles, but very radical in England.

The potential of the comprehensive school has not wholly been realised partly because of shortage of funding for adequate staffing to provide smaller classes and more specialist teaching. But they have done well.



1. Comprehensive schools started as a fetish imported from England. It was imported from there and forced on Scotland for national political reasons. Our own system was damned good, but certain Elected Members created such a great song and dance at almost every meeting that comprehensive schools were 'the thing'. Although the truth is they hadn't a clue what a comprehensive school was. They just got hold of a nice catchphrase.
2. The moves were unquestionably political. Scottish politicians wanted the same to happen up here as was happening in England. It came out of the blue.
3. Comprehensivisation was in the air. It was seen as a good and proper thing. The Education Committee was of a mind to change and that was that. No one had bothered to ask what the change would imply.
4. It all came up from England. Elected Members became infected with the party line, got it going in the Committee and was wholeheartedly behind Circular C600 when it came out.
5. a) The Directorate in my opinion was not very keen on comprehensive education. ----- had been brought up the old way. His training and upbringing was all against it. He taught in ----- and was then whisked into educational administration. He realised the Committee was for it, so he could do nothing. He and his staff dealt with the implications of the change.

- b) The public caused no hue and cry about comprehensive education in our county.
- c) Most of those in schools, from my recollection, buckled down and got on with it, although the old stagers did not welcome it with open arms. It was just accepted. I felt the old Scottish system was solid and good. There was not much wrong with it.
6. The main implication was expansion and expenses, and a whole series of new appointments in schools. Suddenly a lot of teachers fancied their chances in the new set up.
7. The change was fairly dramatic, at least insofar as all children now went to one school. I cannot comment on change within schools. That was very much left to headmasters and their staffs. The Committee took to do with buildings, finance, etc not what went on in schools.
8. Yes, fee-paying schools were an obstacle to some people in the Labour Party. I sent my children to ----- when it was selective. I thought it was a good school which would give them a good chance. I was right.
9. There is no doubt that many good schools suffered a change of character, and ceased to have the same importance in the eyes of local people. Glasgow High School was a fine school. Labour Party dogma killed it. The shift to uniform comprehensive education spoiled education by reducing it to its lowest common denominator.

10. At that time, local councillors were only influential in local matters. But comprehensive education was a national cliché. The Party was for it, so they all got a bee in their bonnet about it, and steam-rollered it through. Usually those Members from poorer areas like ----- were the most outspoken defenders of comprehensive education.
11. The Director of Education was a solid, sensible and approachable man. We took his advice.
12. The comprehensive school did not fit in with Scottish tradition. We had to alter everything. I did not think it was a forward-thinking step. I didn't think the old system needed changed.
13. Equality of opportunity was seen as an expression of an English desire for an egalitarian education system. Most Scots had bags of opportunities through education as it was. But there was this retrograde push to make us all 'Jock Tamson's Bairns'. Comprehensive education was going to be all things to all men.
14. Most certainly schools suffered. We had some damned good schools. Look at what happened to a fine school like -----, It went right out of the window. Local politicians did not realise the implications for some of our better schools. They did not fully realise what the implications of this essentially English idea were.
16. The main problems were:
- 1) some of the appointments that were made to posts of



responsibility

2) finance

3) buildings.

However, we took it on board quite smoothly, and changed progressively as money became available.

17. The rate of change among teachers was variable. They needed guidance with a whole lot of new ideas, some of which they saw as unwelcome. They were vastly inexperienced, and not ready for what was fundamentally a whole new ball game.
18. Major change in education always has a political element, usually emanating from or on behalf of the 'have-nots' of society.
19. The County Council found that it had to adopt this policy whether it liked it or not. Many people were forced to comply irrespective of their personal feelings. A lot of people had an elitist outlook without a doubt, but the voice of the Education Committee had to be listened to. But, in general, Directorate and Elected Members operated on co-operation and mutual respect in those days.
20. The arrival of the comprehensive school has meant a complete reappraisal of Scottish education, an unavoidable alteration to an excellent system. The general satisfaction with education in Scotland began to evaporate from then on. It upset the whole system.



1. The subject of comprehensive education appeared in the election manifesto of 1964, but the idea had been around for some time since the late 1940's and surfaced periodically when Labour was in Opposition 1951-64. The philosophy has a long history, and although it did not receive specific government recognition until 1964, it was well established policy in the party for years before that. The decision to build comprehensive schools in Glasgow was taken in the 1950's. The subject did not cause much argument or outcry in Scotland. The Scottish educational system was much less rigidly divisive, and there was a more generous allocation of pupils to senior secondary schools. So the split was not nearly so marked up here, and there was not the same acute political controversy. Arguments here centred on the logistics and details of how the comprehensive system would be implemented after Circular 600 was issued.
2. It is worth noting that there was never any question of introducing legislation to introduce comprehensive education in Scotland. Circular 600 started a general movement. It was a political decision based on feelings of disquiet about the existing segregated system in England, and Scotland's legislation had to follow suit, as usually happens in major education policy. My perception was that there was no question of any imposition of the new system on people who did not want it: it was not a case of our Party pushing empty political dogma without any educational foundation down the throats of people who did not care for it.

3. I suppose you can trace the origins of the common school at least as far back as 1945. In the post-war days, everyone was looking for a new society, with equality of treatment and benefits for all. Remember too that the country had suffered 13 years of Conservative rule, and was ready for a change. There was a general movement towards the welfare of all. Harold Macmillan's candy floss society - 'you've never had it so good', 'I'm all right Jack' - although divisive, in that some people were left at the bottom of the pile, had captured the imagination of everyone. Good things were available, and they had to be shared-out equally. Education was no exception. There were two aspects to this: a growing interest that all children should get the best chance to go to University, and also that a better-educated workforce would benefit society in the grip of the technological revolution.
4. Circular 600 was well received generally by Scottish Directors of  
+  
5. Education. The vast majority were in favour of its philosophy in principle, and so demonstrated no overt hostility to it. They did, however, show different degrees of enthusiasm, and produced varying reactions as to how it should be implemented. Elected Members, even in Tory areas, showed general agreement on the move to comprehensive education, and the general direction the government was taking. Parents split into two identifiable groups. Those - mainly middle-class - with children in established senior secondary schools were apprehensive about the prospect of their children mixing with or even being exposed to the children of 'the folk down the road'. But they were a minority. By far the majority of parents were in sympathy with



the changeover, although some division of opinion was evident, as in most other educational questions. The arguments in Scotland had to do, not with the principle of comprehensive education, but the problems thrown up by its practical application. The real problem for Directors and Education Committees was that we were asking for all-through comprehensive schools but were not prepared to give them any more money to solve the sometimes enormous difficulties with buildings that faced them. The money clause in Circular 600 was inserted to please the Treasury. To some extent, though, building problems were offset because plans were in hand for extensions to many schools anyway, because of the rapidly expanding population and the arrival of raising of the school leaving age. My recollection is that most meetings with Directors were cordial and, with a bit of come-and-go, we were able to accept their plans. Most of them, incidentally, put a lot of work into their submissions. Indeed, some of the Tory authorities were the most enthusiastic! Remember, of course, that at this time schools had to cope with reduced spending, teacher shortage, uncertificated teachers, and were quaking at the thought of raising of the school leaving age and its implications. Then there were all the changes in curriculum that were being advocated. A busy time all round.

Particular problems arose depending on the pattern of schools that were in operation at the time. The most acute problems were in the densely-populated counties of West Central Scotland, where two deep divisions were already there: junior secondary/senior secondary schools, Roman Catholic and non-denomination schools. In Lanarkshire there was a rash of 2 year and 4 year local schools. Talk of closure brought out local jealousy and

prejudice. In addition to that, the Director of Education was an impossible man to deal with at any level - very argumentative and awkward. This made dealings far from easy.

In Renfrewshire, the Director was an enthusiast of the two-tier system which he sold to his Committee, and genuinely believed it to be a comprehensive system. We, however, only ever saw it as an interim plan. They had the wrong schools in the wrong places, and then there were problems in the Greenock/Port-Glasgow area with building sites and the Catholic population.

In Dumbarton there were relatively few problems and a very co-operative Director. The only things I recall were the need to build more Roman Catholic schools and upgrading some of the existing old senior secondary schools.

In Glasgow, where in many ways they had taken positive steps to introduce comprehensive education years before Circular 600 appeared, the big stumbling block was the former fee-paying selective schools and their integration into a comprehensive system. There was a fierce local attachment to these schools, indeed some of the Councillors sent their sons to them. The Directorate adopted a very ambivalent approach throughout. To a lesser extent, there was also the problem of old established senior secondary schools with good academic reputations coping with a whole new scene in terms of a wider range of pupil ability.

6. Circular 600 changed the pattern of educational provision
- + without a doubt, the change being more noticeable in the inner
7. city areas. But the problem of social class, as well as internal divisions within schools still persisted, so it makes it very



difficult to say with certainty how much integration actually occurred. There was, for example, no or hardly any acceptance by the teaching profession of the common course, or the notion of fitting the curriculum to the pupils. So divisions were - and probably still are - prevalent in secondary schools. At school level, it was all dependent on the headteacher, his own commitment to comprehensive education, and the extent to which he could persuade his staff to change and carry them with him. The attempts at mixed-ability teaching and the common course ranged from half-hearted to hopeless, with one or two outstandingly successful exceptions. Circular 600, an attempt to blur divisions between pupils, did cause real problems for teachers. Members of the Inspectorate were in favour - they had to be, since it was government policy - and at that time at least were mostly able men and women. Nevertheless, their remoteness from schools led them to have far too high expectations of what ordinary teachers would or could do. Also, the curriculum papers emanating from Consultative Committee on the Curriculum probably also over-estimated the capacity for change within schools in the time scale they would have liked.

10. The relationship between a Director of Education and his Education Committee depends on the quality of the personnel in both. It's all down to personalities in the final analysis. There is usually some room for manoeuvre, but neither a Director nor an Education Committee can go against a government policy decision, or at any rate, not for a very long time. Reactions to such policy changes often depends on the political complexion of the Council in questions.

12. The idea of the comprehensive school fitted in with the Scottish tradition of egalitarianism in education, whether real or mythical, which can be traced back to Knox and his uninterrupted path from the parish school to University. But in reality, the Scottish system was deeply divided, so it is probably more accurate to say that the comprehensive school was attuned to widely held ideas about the Scottish educational system if not its actual practice.
13. Ideally, the comprehensive school should enable all children to develop whatever talents or potential they have, whether these can be measured by success in examinations or not. However, teachers and parents had a narrow, meritocratic perception of equality of opportunity - getting a foot on the ladder of opportunity and going as far as your ability (academic) would take you. So the ideal conception of the comprehensive school is much wider than the one held by many people. In effect, the advent of these schools put the possibility of an academic education within the grasp of more children than before.
14. I think there is an element of truth in this assertion. Many people in the Labour Party were - and are - deeply imbued with the Protestant Work Ethic, and are motivated by the desire to grasp opportunities. Most of them were able to do that through the educational system since they came from ordinary backgrounds themselves.
16. There was no hostility in general, but the problems were: resources, staff attitudes, the supremacy of national exams,

staff shortage, raising of the school leaving age and the implications of curricular change.

17. I think attitudes have changed over the years, but there are still deep-rooted pockets of resistance. The comprehensive school is a highly complex concept, very difficult to translate into practice. It is surely significant that many of its problems have still not been satisfactorily solved, even after Munn and Dunning!!
18. Politics provides the impetus to initiate policy change by first taking the decision, then finding the resources. Thereafter, the system takes over, takes the change on board and accommodates it to its practices. So politics is a catalyst, gives a stimulus.
19. While allowing for diversity, and differences of emphasis, and taking account of the constraints schools work under, a Region should go all out to see that its stated policies are implemented in all its schools. Any contrary policies uncovered should be changed or personnel persuaded to do so. Directorate staff and advisers should adopt a high profile in this respect.
20. A comprehensive school should have no selection of pupils on entry. It should keep the common course in mixed-ability sets for as long as possible. It should not categorise or label pupils, but should seek to identify pupils' potential abilities and develop these of whatever type they are. A comprehensive school should be a promoter of the full development of each of its pupils, and should not extol academic glory at the expense of



all else. Exams are not the be-all and end-all.

The potential of the comprehensive school has not been tapped. The ideal school does not exist. Schools are at various stages of approximation to an ideal. As comprehensive reorganisation spread, its implications become more apparent and, of course, more difficult to deal with. Old ideas and approaches die hard. Outside schools, the successive cutbacks in public spending coupled with increasing unemployment have inevitably affected schools, which are part of society and cannot operate in a vacuum.



PREAMBLE

Much of what happened in Renfrewshire had to do with the political set up of the Council. It was non-party. In the main, people were Conservative with Labour representatives coming from the big centres of population Greenock/Port-Glasgow. Convenerships were usually held by people from the so-called landward areas. The Labour Group was not as organised as elsewhere. There was no whip, no sense of discipline. The introduction of comprehensive education in this County was more complicated than in any other county. The Director - with whom I disagreed educationally - was able to get over the notion of his beloved two-tier system to the Education Committee, by persuading them that it was in line with comprehensive principles.

1. The majority of people involved in politics are not educationally aware. Education for all was adopted uncritically as a slogan, with no discussion of its finer points of implications in schools. In my view, the latter were evaded in Renfrewshire. In 1973, many schools were nothing like comprehensive, and Circular 600 was issued in 1965!
2. Educationists had argued the virtues of the case for years, and the main arguments were in line with Labour Party policy. the implementation of any major change has to be political, but a major stumbling block was (in this case) the lack of educational awareness amongst those who had the power to do something about it.

3. It had a lot to do with Harold Wilson's emphasis on the importance of science and technology as a means of social advance. He wanted more equality of educational opportunity, yes, but so that schools could make the most of the talented and able pupils from all sectors of the community, and harness their skills for the good of the nation and its economy. Equality in connection with comprehensive education has to be seen in this light.
4. The Director was deeply influenced by the philosophy of McIntosh in Fife. The two-tier system still enabled educational selection to take place and, above all, safeguarded the older established schools and allowed them to retain their academic reputations. The Director had a traditionalist, academic view of education, so he was not wholehearted in his support of the comprehensive idea, which he accordingly approached with reservations. As for the Labour politicians, they did not know the first thing about it, in general. Also, it was my impression that the Roman Catholic Hierarchy were not keen to see their schools adversely affected, and wanted them kept academic and selective. The two-tier system, though sold to the Committee as one way of introducing comprehensive education was, in fact, a twentieth century version of nineteenth century notions of academic elitism.
5. The main obstacles as I see it were:
  - the schools we had
  - lack of money
  - population distribution and a large influx of population into Renfrewshire in the 1960's

- lack of staff
- the overpowering desire of articulate parents to make sure that their kids got the 'best' education going, as long as other people's kids got the new 'comprehensive stuff'
- the educational philosophy of the Director
- the lack of force of the Labour Government.

7. In general, working class parents accept whatever education is provided, but the middle class at that time were increasingly aware of the highly competitive nature of the affluent society. Education thus had to fulfil the role of fitting their children for that society - so success in exams as a gateway to higher education was crucial. Education and housing are easily the two most emotive areas in local politics. Vocal, articulate and ambitious parents saw the arrival of the comprehensive school as a degeneration of all they thought best in Scottish education, and an unwelcome chance for their kids to mix with others from lower social classes.

8. Some wanted comprehensive schools - e.g. the heads and staffs of junior secondary schools that were to be upgraded. The heads of senior secondary schools just didn't want to know. Those who welcomed change, in other words, were those who stood to gain by it. In any case, as a teacher yourself, you'll be aware that the vast majority of those who work in schools rarely reflect on the broader educational or philosophical aspects of their job. They are primarily involved with their classes, their department, their head, their salary and promotion, and with getting on with the day-to-day job of teaching. This is a statement of fact,



with no criticism intended. That's the way schools are.

9. a) On balance, it has made a big change, mainly by ridding us of junior secondary schools, and giving some impetus to work for these children. Other schools fell into two broad categories vis-a-vis the change - they either adopted coping strategies, or fell to pieces in the face of the difficulties. A critically important determinant of the response adopted was the attitude of the head and his corps of principal teachers.

b) It is possible that the scale of real internal change was not as vast as was claimed. Schools - even senior secondary ones - were run as senior secondary and junior secondary departments for years, the latter receiving various degrees of neglect. This attitude still persists today. The traditional, 19th Century idea of school and the function of education is still with us, even if in a slightly debased form.

Notions of streaming still colour the educational philosophy and attitudes of many teachers, and colleges of education were then - and probably still are - staffed by lecturers who had worked almost exclusively in senior secondary schools. The power of the staffroom to disabuse keen or innovative young staff should never be underestimated.

10. While fee-paying schools didn't do much actual damage, they obviously didn't help. They had to go as a matter of principle.

11. That's probably true - and par for the course.

12. Very seldom do elected members affect policy. The all-through



comprehensive school was not actually adopted as policy in Renfrew till 1974, after years of delay. Vested interests and prejudice abound and exert all sorts of subtle pressure for the status quo.

15. Educational change can come from within the profession, e.g. Munn and Dunning proposals are a good example of an inbred push for change. But it can also come from wider society and its needs in a rapidly changing world. Remember, too, that politicians are rarely idealists - they must be sensitive to the views of the electorate. Comprehensive education became a political issue and part of the 1964 Manifesto because there was a groundswell of opinion in its favour in England, and an increasing awareness of the manifest injustice of junior secondary schools in Scotland.
16. In some ways, it does articulate with the myths of universality and the lad o' pairts. You could say that Knox's proposals were Circular 600 in embryo.
17. I would say that it was taken to mean the chance to develop ability in any sphere, irrespective of a child's social background.
18. A real comprehensive educational system is a pipe dream with segregated social living - Eastwood and Ferguslie Park is one obvious local example. That inescapable reality stands in the way of much social or educational advance.
19. A comprehensive school is a school that is willing to have a go

at teaching everything to all the pupils it has, in a way which is educationally valid, and does not engender feelings of inferiority through lack of any particular ability. (This is my instinctive definition - it would obviously have to be qualified in the light of reality.)

20. No, the potential of the comprehensive school hasn't been tapped, and it hasn't even scratched the surface or got down to basic questions. The main hurdles to be jumped are
- lack of resources; if Governments are really pushing comprehensive education, they they must invest massively in it. This has hardly happened.
  - There must be more social esteem for all in society. We are still too class-ridden in our outlook.
  - There must be more manifest respect for the value of education and what it can achieve.
  - Teachers must abandon outdated elitist attitudes.

PREAMBLE

The two-tier system was a joint idea of mine and the Director's, based on experiments in Leicester and Fife. We tried it in Renfrew as a solution to the changing circumstances in education in which we found ourselves. Bruce Millan was personally sympathetic to our scheme as an experiment only, and as a departure from his main thrust - the all-through comprehensive school. At all meetings with him at which we submitted our reorganisation proposals, his proviso was always that the County would ultimately switch to an all-through system in all areas.

1. Talk of change in education started in the early 1960's. The Primary Memorandum thinking was bound to have a knock-on effect on the secondary stage. It was an exciting time in education. The Brunton Report was all the talk, with its emphasis on giving all pupils a fair chance from scratch. The mood was anti-classification according to ability, but it hadn't quite gelled into a hard political philosophy. All these thrusts had to be weighed up. Late developers had never been taken up seriously. The theme was equality of opportunity, and the two-tier system was our answer, though it had its faults, chief among which was that it was divisive: it was geared to preserving academic pupils, so that inevitably junior high schools contained more pupils of middle and lower ability, and so lost out on local prestige.

2. Fundamentally it was political. In the Scottish scene, the comprehensive school was a continuation of the old omnibus school



of the small burgh. These schools were looked on with such regard as 'typical' Scottish secondary schools, that many people in Scotland thought we had comprehensive education anyway. In the English scene, the system was openly elitist and segregationist. Very few pupils got a grammar school education. There was tremendous confusion and dissatisfaction among parents - some in Scotland about junior secondary schools too, but nothing as vocal or as public - who began to ask: IS MY CHILD GETTING A FAIR CHANCE? More and more, the answer seemed 'NO!' and this is where the politicians took hold of the discontent, and offered a magical solution: the all-through comprehensive school, which would offer chances to children who had previously been denied them. In my view, then, an essentially English solution to an English problem became national policy too in Scotland, as it had to, and this just happened to suit those who wanted the qualifying exam and its resultant abomination - the junior secondary school - to go.

3. People were anxious about the massive school population resulting from the post-war bulge. Buildings were inadequate in quantity and quality. Also, more staff were needed c.f. The Jean Roberts Report and Special Recruitment Scheme which resulted from it.
4. As innovators, I doubt very much if Elected Members did anything. They reacted to propositions put to them by the Directorate. Then they indulged in wide consultation and debate. I would say in fairness that that particular Labour Government was both forward-thinking and well-meaning, and tried to have good relations with local authorities within government policy



parameters. There is no doubt in my mind that, at the time, Directors had an important influence on the Elected Members, especially if they were respected educationalists.

5. a) Change was generally welcome among the Directorate; it was a question of what form it was to take. But they had no power in the long run against a Government decision to go comprehensive.
  - b) There was no much parental reaction as I recall. Any objections were usually localised.
  - c) Heads and their staffs had to cope with a rapid succession of changes in a developing situation. They got very little preparation to start with. Genuine help came only later through advisers and in-service training. Incidentally, the Scottish Education Department Green Paper (1971) was introduced for reasons other than educational. I don't think it created the help expected of it, but rather added to an already confused situation.
6. The main implication was an organisational one - both for Directors (external factors) and heads (internal factors). Finance in general was quite generous from Central Government.
7. It is a simple fact to put all children into one school and call it a comprehensive. Whether by doing so you put a whole new face on secondary education is another matter. It is good that the dead-end junior secondary schools went, but I think that the process of readaptation was both painful and slow.

8. I don't think the former fee-paying schools constituted an obstacle to comprehensive education. The theoretical anti-private schools stance doesn't stand up in reality. State dictation impinges on freedom of choice in a democracy. So yes, both types of school can co-exist.
9. When the principle of comprehensive education was accepted, it was logical to eliminate schools like Glasgow High School. But, in my view, the political side did not realise the sensitivity of certain sections of the community. They used a sledgehammer to crack a nut. They moved too crudely, too fast.
10. In major decisions Elected Members have comparatively little influence.
11. Initiatives came from the Directorate, were discussed in Committee, and a decision was reached. I would say that the Directorate was influential as a starting point, then decisions were reached jointly.
12. The comprehensive school was not a totally new concept in Scotland. With the parish and omnibus schools, the tradition was already there. The seeds had been planted by Knox and his vision of well-educated socialism and they were grasped by people in the 1960s.
13. I think for a lot of parents equality of opportunity meant that going into the unknown was better than the prospect of junior secondary education. For those who thought at all, the

comprehensive school represented a vast improvement on the status quo.

14. For many political people in England especially, the comprehensive school was grasped as a political platform. Much more was made of it there for reasons I have explained, without deeply-held views about education necessarily being changed.
16. I would say that the major problem was a total lack of communication to parents. It was as if a political shuttlecock had been thrown over the net to them and they couldn't put it back, although they liked its colour. Also, it caused a split among teachers who had to adapt to monumental changes. The implications of the new ball game were massively disruptive to older people in schools.
17. Inevitably a great deal of reassessing of aims and approaches had to take place, e.g. the less able, mixed-ability classes, etc. Although it must be said that some of the educational concepts of socialist political philosophy did not work too well when they were translated into schools.
18. National political decisions, like comprehensive education always have a major effect on educational change. Whether the effect is always for the good is debatable. Elected Members tend only to influence smaller, more local issues, and I think their influence in these has been increasing since Local Government Reorganisation.



19. I think it is important that regional policy should be borne in more on the professionals, but such is the power and status of headteachers, that any attempts to 'interfere' are met with strong resistance. There is basically not enough communication, a weakness in offering help. People tend just to be left to get on with it.

20. A comprehensive school is part of an area and should project an image of importance of itself and its pupils. It should be a focal point of the community, and concern itself with a much broader range of activities than the merely academic. Broadly, it should attempt to cater as far as it can for all pupils according to age, aptitude and ability.

There are of course big variations among schools, and it has to be said that the comprehensive school has not had a very good image. The structural and organisational features of Circular 600 were implemented fairly quickly, but its internal implications were not, and resisted by many. Indeed, only now in the 80's can there be said to be a gradual awakening of what is required. My view is that the educational concept of the comprehensive school was not taken seriously for years. It was seen by many as a purely political concept - 'something that the Labour lot created'.



1. The Act of 1944 required secondary education for all, but did not prescribe any particular form of organisation for this purpose. A great variety of schools and schemes resulted with many different types of grammar and secondary modern schools. The decision about which type of school a child had to attend - and, therefore, to some extent his future job prospects - was to be made on the basis of a selection process carried out when the child was 11. There was, from the start, the objection that this was far too early and, of course, that children from middle-class families would be likely to do better in written tests than those from working class backgrounds. Methods of testing varied greatly from authority to authority, and the percentage of children who eventually were admitted to grammar schools also showed enormous variations across the country - 20% to 50% in some cases. Also more boys than girls made it to grammar school. Primary school teaching was often framed in such a way that pupils would be equipped to pass the 11+. They became cramming establishments. Some authorities decided early on that the right answer was the comprehensive school - school open to children of all levels of ability, in which children would come to follow different courses of instruction from the wide range available as their various abilities and interests became apparent. The comprehensive school would also produce a more varied and balanced community in which children of different in which children of different backgrounds and talents could learn to understand and live with each other.

2. There were both educational and political arguments in favour of the move to comprehensive secondary education. I really cannot say which predominated.
3. At first, there was a good deal of doubt in the Labour Party about the comprehensive school. This was particularly true in Labour-controlled authorities which had been at pains to create good grammar schools and increase the proportion of children to gained entry to them. But the comprehensive idea gained ground, steadily.
4. The pressures for the comprehensive school came from various  
+  
5. sources: the Education Committees of some Councils, the National Association of Labour Teachers and individuals like Alice Bacon and Fred Peart. Some notable academics like Pedley and Simon were also comprehensive school advocates.
6. The main aim was to achieve greater equality of opportunity and prevent the wastage of talent which occurred from treating 11+ 'failures' as incapable of further education.
7. A Circular was chosen to avoid unnecessary conflict with local authorities. In 1964, the Labour Government had a majority of only 3, and thus had to proceed cautiously.
8. Discussion on the comprehensive school among Ministers, as far as it occurred at all, concerned mainly the extent to which the comprehensive idea was gaining popular support.

9. The reactions to Circular 10/65 (and Circular 600 in Scotland) were: reluctant acceptance among Conservatives, elsewhere approval.
10. The chief obstacle was the hostility of those who had been educated at grammar schools - or whose children were being so educated. They took the view that the move to comprehensive schools was a change for the worse. As R.H. Tawney said, for some people it is not enough that their own children should receive a good education, they also want someone else's child to receive worse.
11. All I can say is that my impression from Scottish colleagues was always that Scottish educational thought had always been more favourable than English to a comprehensive approach in secondary education.
12. I was unaware of any Scottish opposition to the idea of the comprehensive school, at least among Labour politicians.
13. The comprehensive school was a radical and important concept. If we had remained content with a separatist system based on segregation at 11+, we should have produced an educational system which would have been wasteful of talent, unjust and perpetuated notions of intellectual and social snobbery.

The potential of the comprehensive school has not been fully realised - in human affairs one's hopes scarcely ever are realised. The obstacles were the continued existence of



selective schools and also the absence among teachers of real enthusiasm for the whole idea. It was often regarded in purely negative terms - i.e. the absence of the 11+ or the disappearance of secondary modern schools. It ought to have been thought of positively, as a way of promoting goodwill and understanding among children of different abilities and backgrounds. Nevertheless, the comprehensive principle did result in more justice and a better development of talent in our educational system. It should also be noted the children of immigrant families probably do better out of a comprehensive system since a large proportion of their parents are less literate and less educated than naverage. If we had not moved in a comprehensive direction, we should have produced a society in which there would have been serious and quite unjustified cleavages between various groups in the population. Even if the comprehensive school has not achieved full success, it has certainly been a move for the good.



1. My recollection is that initiatives really started in the early 1950's, when comprehensive education was adopted as Labour Party policy. From then on, at least in Lanarkshire, we who believed in it had a fight to get it through. There was strong opposition from the Director. He was evidently not keen, and resisted attempts to start it. Eventually, he was told plainly that if he was not going to move, the Committee would replace him by someone who would. Thereafter, there was a reluctant acceptance that this was how education had to be organised.
2. I would say they were educationally political. By that I mean that the decision was political, but it was taken for sound educational reasons.
3. Principally because the Labour Party made it an issue. Also pressure was coming from parents to Councillors about the 'quali' and the dreadful junior secondary schools. I remember sitting through appeal tribunals where parents, some in tears, put their case to the Members. The effect of that exam on families was hellish, to say the least. That just confirmed me in my view that selection had to go. Junior secondary education in Lanarkshire was a shambles, with one or two notable exceptions. These schools got a raw deal - very few resources, poor teachers, and pupils who had been told they were as thick as two short planks. Many were just holding operations, going through the motions till the kids could leave. So parents were desperate to avoid the stigma and shame attached to them and would have done

anything to get their kids into a senior secondary. In any case, the formulas used to work out the cut-off points were questionable, and teachers' estimates involve a subjective element. I did not think it was an exact science, even though the education officials tried to convince us it was fair and generous. The unfairness of it all and the pressure it put children and parents under were inexcusable in a democratic society.

4. Elected Members played a major part in keeping up the pressure on the Director. Nothing would have happened had they let up in their desire to see a fairer system established by comprehensive reorganisation.
5. a) There was a general lack of willingness to move, especially from the Director. The prevailing view was some kids are bright and others are thick, and that a divided system of secondary schools enabled the bright to be picked out and trained for greatness, i.e. a University degree. Also, they said it was easier to operate administratively.  
  
b) My experience was that working class families were right behind it for the opportunities it would give their children.  
  
c) Some teachers were for it, some were not. The younger ones in general were enthusiastic and willing to have a bash and remedy the failings of the old system.
6. The biggest implication was making comprehensive units, especially with several separate buildings. Accommodation, some

of it antiquated, and a persistent staffing shortage did not help. A lot of people in the older senior secondaries lost heart, and saw no point in being positive towards the new system. They saw it as a destructive force against all they believed in and had worked for.

7. a) Not very much to start with. Headmasters streamed like hell. In  
+  
b) fact, what happened inside a school depended on two things: the accommodation and the views of the boss. If he wasn't rooting for a comprehensive school, we were on a loser. Also, the suitability of the staff was crucial. Not all of them got right behind us either. In fairness, a few heads and staff were keen and did much under formidable handicaps. Overall, not much changed though.
8. Not really in Lanarkshire, to the extent that it did in cities like Glasgow and Edinburgh. Lanarkshire got rid of its fee-paying schools long before 1965.
9. Some said this, and it may even have been true, especially at national level. But local councillors in Lanarkshire did not for two reasons: they could not afford fees, and secondly their colleagues would have given them a really bad time. I do not think the facts prove the critics right here.
10. Elected Members are very influential, and especially when an educational official with power is not going to play ball. This influence has become even more strong since Regionalisation. Directors and their staff cannot dictate policy as much as they



did.

11. I would say they have a joint role with us. They provide the professional bit, we put in the ruling group view, and out of discussions and policy papers, an agreed policy emerges. It's much more time-consuming but everybody plays a part now. But in the mid-60's, Directors could virtually call the tune, as long as they did not act beyond their powers. Education Authority policy was effectively their decision alone, generally agreed to by Councillors.
12. I thought it was a chance to make an improvement to the 'lad o' pairts' tradition, with its emphasis on the bright laddie from a humble family. Here was an opportunity for the less well endowed to get a chance of something good out of education. I do not know if all the teachers shared that view of Circular C600, but that is what I took it to mean. Any change there has been in that direction has been slow. Resources haven't always been as plentiful either.
13. It was traditionally seen in terms of bright pupils: no expense or effort had to be spared to enable them to get on. I think comprehensive education may have been responsible for getting teachers to consider the education of other less able pupils more than they did before, I am sure that that has happened but perhaps not to the extent that we thought in 1964.
14. Yes, it was true for a few of them. There was some hypocrisy, but a poor view was taken of it, and a black mark put against



people. It's like paying for private medicine - a piece of nonsense.

15. It caused problems, because some catchment areas were poor and it was difficult to get a positive attitude to education in them. That's why we designated schools at the time of shortage to do something for these areas.

16. The main problems were:

- buildings
- teachers being in short supply and with outdated views and attitudes
- insufficient resources
- the attitudes of people in key positions.

17. Yes, because in effect they had to undergo nothing short of a revolution in thinking and practice. On the whole, they have come out of it well. If you compare primary and secondary schools today with those of even 20 years ago, there has been a vast improvement for the better. For all their imperfections, schools are far nicer places in 1985.

18. It is a major factor in getting the ball rolling, principally on matters of policy and resources. These two areas are the politicians' preserve, and they consult the professionals for the detailed workings out. They bring the policy to the professionals from their knowledge of the electorate's views.

19. They must go the whole road. Defaulters cannot be allowed to

circumvent broad policy statements. General policy must be adhered to, otherwise what's the point of making it in the first place. This is not to say that fringe variations cannot be allowed, especially in a large region with different features. Experiment within a policy framework is to be encouraged, and incorporated into policy if it turns out to be good. But basic planks of policy must be carried out.

20. It's a school that takes all kids from a local area at 12, and sends them out at 16, 17 or 18 equipped as well as possible to do whatever their ability allows them to. It covers all aspects of education, and does not concentrate on any one at the expense of the others. It is characterised by flexibility and choice, or as much as is possible. I am really worried that comprehensive schools will be weakened by falling rolls in the late 80's and 90's. This factor raises questions of economic and educational viability. A comprehensive school must offer a range of options. It's a hellish job trying to balance your educational philosophy in the face of economic restraints. What's the answer? You tell me!

- b) Not fully, but it gets a bit better as teachers get more experience of facing the challenges it offers.

1.-3. The whole question arose out of the formulation of answers to three questions:

- a) What kind of schools do we want?
- b) How can we cater for the post-war bulge?
- c) What kind of buildings will we need?

The result: COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOLS. It was a historical process, having its origins in post-war thinking on social policy, and in which Scotland followed England, where the problems outlined above were more pressing. The impetus came from Butler through Boyle to Crosland, by which time there was a band-wagon effect.

4. Elected Members came a poor third following the dialogue between the Scottish Education Department and Directorate Staffs. Most authorities in Scotland hadn't a clue about comprehensive schools, so Scottish Education Department went for the Counties that were easy to win over first. As long as people paid lip-service to the comprehensive ideal, the Scottish Education Department did not mind. Look at what the Directors in Lanarkshire and Renfrewshire got away with! Elected Members did not become actively involved until around 1971, when there was a polarisation of views. The local authority ex-fee-paying schools were regarded as jewels in the crown, especially by the Roman Catholic hierarchy, and Catholic Labour Councillors. Schools like St Mungo's and Notre Dame were seen as key vehicles in enabling Catholics to emerge from their historical proletarian roots, and to become professional people, especially teachers. In 1971 the Labour administration mounted a serious campaign to



abolish these schools which, they claimed, were incongruous with a comprehensive state system. The impetus though came from the Scottish Education Department. The Director was simply told to sort it out. The dominant figure in the Labour administration was Geoff Shaw, who was a charismatic figure with moral authority and no axe to grind.

5. a) On balance, the Directorate was pleased at Scottish Education Department pressure to go comprehensive, in my opinion.

b) Most parents simply didn't give a damn, unless they thought the implications would harm their own children's education.

c) My impression was that some teachers wanted it to happen, but their headteachers did not.

6. Some former single sex schools had to face up to teaching new subjects like Technical and Home Economics. Purpose-built schools were off to a flying start, but the older established ones really took the brunt of the change. It is not cynicism, but I think that if you change the system in a way which is to be truly beneficial, you create more promoted staff and more money. The reality was that most officials did not care what happened inside schools, as long as they were called 'comprehensive'. the name was all that mattered in most cases.

7. a) Not much to start with. The junior secondary/senior secondary

+

b) divisions remained intact. The point to remember is that the political battle had to be won first - make all schools comprehensive, then we can worry about the details of the



internal workings. The Scottish Education Department knew about raising of the school leaving age and the reorganisation of local government, but schools were left to their own devices.

8. No, because the classes of really able pupils just never went. So there was just an awareness of their existence, but no sense of loss or resentment. Yes, they can co-exist, but it is not really an effective system.
9. Wholeheartedly. The Elected Members adopted a very paternalistic attitude in the early 1970's - telling people where to live, where to go to school etc., and based their views on theoretical arguments of doubtful validity. Ordinary people were denied any influence over their own affairs. So yes, they were testbeds for Labour Party dogma, but the push came from the Scottish Education Department and the Directorate; Elected Members are never usually good at arguing or debating on philosophical or educational issues. They often do not have the inside knowledge or the interest to do so. All the educational moves in the comprehensive issue came from the Directorate.
10. Up to local government reorganisation, they had hardly any influence, because of the mystique of professionalism. Officials made policy and got it accepted by, in the main, third-rate Elected Members. Nowadays, a process of self-selection has occurred such that the calibre of all Councillors, but especially of Labour ones, has increased. They are now generally more able intellectually.

11. Directorate staff have also changed since Regionalisation because of the power of financial control and corporate management. They now have to argue the case for cash with other services. Accountability is more overt: are we getting value for our money in education? Good housekeeping has caused more of a balance now, with the result that the drive in educational terms is not present in directorate staff to the same extent as it was. I get the feeling that since the introduction of a comprehensive system, professionals secretly admit to a series of educational blunders and poor management, and always pin faith on the next initiative to sort the mess out. Of course, it never does, because there are never policy statements with targets to be met. Schools do not know where they are going, and are left to their own devices far too much. So much is then thrown on the shoulders of the individuals involved, with the almost inevitable variation in response.
12. The chief problem in comprehensivisation was the fanatical adherence to a false egalitarianism. Thenceforward, no child had to be labelled 'non-academic', so we got mixed-ability classes and the common course, with an educational diet cosmetically academic in nature to cater for all. Brunton and Ruthven were dropped or only implemented in a half-hearted fashion, the former because it created invidious groups, the latter because 'minority time' was seen as wasteful for Scottish Certificate of Education preparation. Even Munn and Dunning are only a half-way house to solving the real problems. Comprehensive education was sold on the wrong ticket. Its main benefit has been to give the opportunity of an academic type of education to a wider section

of the school population than before.

13. The concept of equality of opportunity caused much less concern in Scotland because the existing educational system was perceived to be satisfactory, especially with the long tradition of omnibus schools. The able were always catered for, and apprenticeships or further education courses were there for the rest. Equality of educational opportunity was seen to exist, even though for the vocationally inclined pupils secondary education was an irrelevance.
14. Yes overwhelmingly, but there were exceptions. ----- for example - but given half a chance, she would make a desert out of the Botanic Gardens if it suited the mood of the day.
15. Yes, it crushed the able, who were swallowed up among the less able majority.
16. The main obstacles were:
- Headteachers with an academic training
  - Lack of money
  - Lack of educational drive and conviction in the policy in schools
  - A Directorate staff conditioned to reacting rather than acting, and ill-equipped to dealing with the professional opposition of teachers.
17. This never happened for many years. Changes which took place were cosmetic. Munn and Dunning saw the first real attempts to



ask fundamental questions and come up with answers.

18. Politics is an essential part of the process, a trigger, but only on a gun that is already there, and on a bullet put there by someone else. In other words, it is one factor.
19. Quite far, as long as it has carried teachers with in in the earlier stages of policy formation. But caution is required as professionalism rules. Schools should be accountable, but so far authorities have tried either the dictatorial or the laissez-faire approach, since they are conditioned to view teachers as a rebellious lot that cannot be trusted. Her Majesty's Inspectors have given up on accountability - witness their bland published reports. Advisers' Reports on schools are little more than informed gossip which is used in an oblique and mysterious way.
20. a) An all-through comprehensive school is one which offers a full range of courses and subjects to pupils of a full range of ability in any community, because there is not built into the system any limiting hierarchies. It is also one which offers courses which are within the reach and interest of all its pupils. Hence it is sadly true that there is not one truly comprehensive school in Strathclyde!
- b) No! How could I possibly say an honest 'yes'? The question is rhetorical. The potential has not been tapped. Having said that, I would have to admit that a greater proportion of all pupils are more meaningfully educated, and the standard of education given to pupils of equal ability is much higher than it was 30 years ago.



1. The initiative for the introduction of the comprehensive school came from the Government. It must be remembered, however, that many secondary schools in Scotland, even some in the West of Scotland, were already comprehensive, in the respect that they accepted all pupils from their catchment area.
2. Circular 600 was, of course, a political decision, in that it was issued by a Labour Secretary of State in pursuance of the fulfilment of part of Labour's philosophy. However, it would probably be unfair to characterise the introduction of comprehensive education as a purely political act, because Labour politicians, many of them former teachers, sincerely believed that comprehensive education was superior, on educational grounds, to other forms of educational organisation. To ask if the decision was political is probably unfair to Labour politicians.
3. Many teachers and many parents were opposed to the introduction of comprehensive in the belief that it would damage the education of the brighter children. However, opposition in Scotland was very much less than it was in England and Wales.
4. The main internal change caused by the introduction of comprehensive education was the introduction of the 'common course' in the early years of the secondary school.
5. In my opinion, the reaction within the profession was about

fifty-fifty for and against. I trust that I am not being too cynical when I say that I detected a Pauline conversion to support for comprehensive education among many who were aspiring to headships.

6. Comprehensive education killed the junior secondary sector.
7. The following were regarded by various groups as comprehensive schools:
  - (i) a six year, 'all through' school with a first or first and second year common course
  - (ii) a six year school taking all the pupils from a catchment area, but streamed from first year
  - (iii) a three or four year school, not streamed or streamed as (i) or (ii).

In my opinion, only type (i) should properly be called a comprehensive school.

PREAMBLE

Comprehensive education was not a new concept in Scotland. Small secondary schools like McLaren High were really comprehensive and they worked for all their pupils. There was a social and educational mix of pupils irrespective of their ultimate career goals. Secondary education has never recovered from the decision raising of the school leaving age in 1947. It was never properly staffed. Most of our union's work was devoted to drawing the authorities' attention to the dreadful conditions of service in Scottish schools. It's always been expediency that has ruled - uncertificated teachers, designation payments - an attempt to keep teachers happy rather than solve deep-seated general problems. Comprehensive education was never really defined except in terms of non-selection for secondary education. Parents afraid to face the truth about the ability and prospects of their children liked the idea.

1. Comprehensive schools go back to the dissatisfaction and disillusionment with the junior secondary school which was a creation of the raising of the school leaving age decision in 1947. Some of them were dire places. The air of sheer dejection in staffrooms was unbelievable. Pupils and staff alike didn't try a leg. Gradually these schools became an embarrassment to educationists and politicians. So the 'comprehensive school' was adopted as a nice-sounding slogan in the absence of a real educational philosophy to deal with the problem.
2. Comprehensive schools were a political response to an educational malaise which was more pronounced and public in England than up



here.

3. The 1947 Report had very little effect. It was a good source of impressive quotations if you had to make a speech. Indeed some people looked on it as a Bible of educational wisdom.
4. The comprehensive school became attractive because all the social, political, and educational thinking in the 1960s made it almost inevitable. Brunton, Newsom, Robbins all were moving in an expansionist way.
5. The main problem was teachers in academic schools having to adjust to kids who used their fingers to count. Then there were housing estate schools and schools with split site extensions. Many people whose Scottish Certificate of Education presentation record in selective schools was excellent did not always get promoted posts in the new comprehensives. This caused a lot of bad feeling.
6. a) Her Majesty's Inspectors report to their bosses behind the scenes. Their influence is difficult to determine. Many blew with the political wind, especially if they wanted promotion. They picked up good ideas in one school and peddled them as 'the thing to do' in a school down the road.  
  
b) Local politicians were a mixed bag. Education committees never get down to the philosophical nitty-gritty of education. It's all about staffing, free meals, buildings, parents. They would all get a copy of Circular 600 in 1965. With so many demands on their time it's a certainty not everyone read it, and those who



did wouldn't fully appreciate what was involved. They are taken up with party politics mostly, and the day-to-day administration of the education service.

- c) Directors were absorbed in trying to implement government policy within their capital grants and building programmes, irrespective of whether they were educationally in favour of the move to comprehensive education. As it happens Glasgow's Director of Education was. The two most important people are the Director and the Chairman of the Education Committee. Much depends on the strength of their personalities.
  - d) Most advisers tried to do an honest job.
  - e) The Consultative Committee on the Curriculum was advisory, and that's how most teachers saw it. Its publications were not fed to people with power, so it was a permissive, take-it-or-leave-it attitude.
7. The major problem was that what happened in schools was a total contradiction of comprehensive philosophy: academic attitudes and approaches dominated sometimes from secondary 1.
9. Headteachers had very considerable latitude. They called the shots.
10. Only a minority of parents ever get worked up about education. The majority are either apathetic or trust the schools to do their best for their children.

11. Neither area schools nor private schools had any deleterious effect on the spread of comprehensive education.
12. Internal arrangements in schools didn't do much for less able kids. The feeling was that they had got their opportunity by coming to the school, and it was their fault if they did not take it.
13. In-service courses made an impact but not enough. Attendance was voluntary so you could opt out by doing nothing. It was ridiculous that you could leave Jordanhill and teach for 40 years without having to go to a single course.
14. a) Reactions to comprehensive education among heads and staffs were  
+  
b) largely a function of age, while everyone realised it just had to be lived with. Those looking for promotion couldn't afford to be apathetic.
15. The junior secondary/senior secondary divide persisted even in new comprehensive schools. The same old principle operated in different circumstances.
16. The grouping of children was at the discretion of the headteacher. You told the Director you were doing wonderful things and hoped he didn't look too closely. It is true to say that if you kept your school running quietly and did not provoke complaints to head office from parents or councillors, you were left to do as you pleased.

17. Yes, both curriculum and methods have changed markedly.
18. The extent to which teachers scrutinised their work practices varied. Many didn't like being disturbed from their cosy world, and put up silent resistance to change.
19. 'Equality of opportunity', like 'comprehensive education' proved a nice political slogan, but it presented a false image to parents. Real equality of opportunity - if attainable at all - requires positive compensation, external factors and parental interest.
20. A comprehensive school in West Central Scotland can only be educationally comprehensive, not socially as in non-urban settings.
21. The comprehensive school has not yet begun to develop the true potential of each child as fully as possible. The emphasis has been too narrow - school, academic achievement, qualifications, job. Other aspects of education have been ignored, or lip-service has been paid to them. Education should be a preparation for life in its totality.



PREAMBLE

The issue of comprehensive education occupied our 1971 Congress. A report written for that congress was defeated largely because of squabbling among a minority who were not in favour of the whole idea. They attempted to sabotage it. The committee set up to look into it was probably too late in tackling the issue. People had axes to grind at the changeover. Part of the problem was that the committee did not set out to give a definite view. So its report was not accepted as policy.

1. The moves to set up comprehensive schools were primarily
- + political, but had a strong educational element. Those who
2. advanced educational reasons were usually also motivated politically. The whole argument came from England. There was much less dissatisfaction up here. The educational reasons overtook the political ones on the media, and the whole thing became a national campaign. The system in Scotland was much less in need of rectification. The existence of omnibus schools had helped to avoid some of the problems of the situation in England. Only in West Central Scotland was the division between types of school more marked.
3. The 1947 Report had a seminal influence. Despite its restricted appeal, it stimulated thought and discussion. It really should have led to an exercise like Munn and Dunning, which came far too late. In Scotland there has always been a piecemeal approach to change in education. It is always ad hoc, in response to another crisis, never in the context of an overall picture. There is



also a marked discrepancy between theory and practice. However, no matter what change is introduced, most teachers give it a fair go. There is seldom vocal or organised opposition to change.

4. Politicians saw it as a good thing. Concepts like equality of opportunity were good vote-catchers. The fact that Labour was elected to office in 1964 was crucial, since for once it had an agreed educational policy. Comprehensive education was an act of faith for the Labour Party.
5. The previous existence of omnibus schools in Scotland meant that there were no drastic changes up here. Flexibility within schools and internal transfer between types of course were familiar, so comprehensive schools just increased that sort of flexibility. Undoubtedly, reorganisation was worst in the urbanised and densely populated West of Scotland, with all its junior secondary/senior secondary schools. There were staffing shortages and physical problems. Mergers and amalgamations made teachers feel vulnerable. But those in power took a sensible pragmatic view, and were cautious in their approach to internal organisation and curricular change.
6. All these various groups played their part in their own way, possibly with some dragging of feet, because they all had personal views. There was a wide acceptance that it had to be carried out, so people just got on with it.
7. The problems were mainly physical and logistic. There were pockets of resistance from headteachers and principal teachers,

especially in traditional academic subjects and in senior secondary schools. They dragged their feet and were reluctant to move faster than they were forced to. But hostility was not overt. Opposition was passive and dilatory. Unions were not enthusiastic but accepted it.

9. The tradition in Scotland is that schools have latitude about internal organisation. The head creates the ethos. In the mid 1960s, they were powerful men who were not circumscribed by as many rules as they are now.
10. In my view, most parents are apathetic about education except when their own children are involved. There was no overt opposition to the principle, but parents became involved on localised issues, or where they thought the education of their own children would be harmed.
11. Area schools caused an obstacle in the sense that the neighbourhood principle and the notion of social mix were broken. Social engineering to get a 'good mix' is wrong, and would have caused much heartache. Of course, this whole question of catchment areas and zoning is now academic, given the Parents' Charter. Local fee-paying schools presented problems of integration and also had social class implications for state schools, but much less in the West than in Edinburgh.
12. There was undoubtedly separation in the initial stages but this gradually altered. Division by ability was endemic in the omnibus school, but it did not upset children and families

because they all attended the same school. Initially, then, the change to comprehensive education was cosmetic. Absence of the opportunity to move stream, early labelling and premature commitment to certain courses were, and are, powerful features of the Scottish system. This is why there were so many squabbles over mixed-ability teaching and the common course.

13. My impression is that in-service courses were seen as helpful to younger staff. There is a tendency for teachers to think they have 'arrived' once they have graduated. Colleges of education were perhaps a bit slow in ensuring that teachers coming out of college were 'au fait' with the implications of comprehensive education for internal aspects of schooling.
14. The majority of heads and teachers accepted the change, but if there was feet dragging it was on ideological grounds - the main one being a fear of damaging able children. Setting and streaming were strategies for their protection. I would say that the principle was welcomed in Scotland, but there were many different interpretations of how it should be put into practice. Each had his own view of what comprehensive education meant.
16. a) The common course gave rise to difficulties. There was not enough preparation for teachers, so it took a long time for them to come to terms with changes which they saw as imposed. There was a wide variety of solutions in practice despite various pressures to conform.
- b) It introduced a bit more flexibility. The influence of Ordinary grade exams made itself felt in a massive increase in



presentations.

17. a) Curriculum and methods were affected but not just because of comprehensive education alone. The desire for qualifications made the curriculum wider and made it less formal in approach. There were considerable doubts and reservations about mixed-ability classes and group work. Some teachers thought both were non-starters.
18. There is no doubt that approaches changed, whether it happened consciously or unconsciously. People were gradually less inclined to trot out old notes. Worksheets and various bits of audio visual equipment became features of teaching. Some inroads into chalk-and-talk were made.
19. All pupils going to the local school had a long heritage in Scottish education, so that principle articulated with tradition. I am not so sure whether comprehensive education was seen by many people in education as a means of integrating pupils of different intellectual capacities and/or social backgrounds. This was difficult in Scotland with its long and proud tradition in secondary education of identifying and developing academic excellence with an eye on the university.
20. People did not think enough about what comprehensive education meant. Old ideas and ways of working die hard. Opportunity was favoured in Scotland, where the democratic tradition made the education system much less class-conscious than in England. Those responsible for providing education would have been hard



put to define comprehensive education. I think, therefore, that it was inevitable that academic criteria prevailed. Opportunity was seen in terms of late developers and exam success. Comprehensive education meant that pupils were no longer damned at 12 and slotted into a pigeonhole.

21. A comprehensive school should be comprehensive in the sense of providing a range of courses and opportunities as wide as possible. The optimum size of school needed to do this would be enormous, of course. It must also be related to its local community and be a community itself. The Parents' Charter has cut across some comprehensive principles. A social mix is important but it should not be done artificially. Ideal views of comprehensive schools must be modified in the light of the realities of local circumstances.
22. Nothing in education is ever finite, and it is important to keep things under constant review. So ideas about comprehensive schools have changed over the period. The main point I would make is that it was very clear that the implications of the introduction of a comprehensive system were not grasped. The Munn and Dunning exercise should have happened much earlier than it did.

1. The main influence was the Labour Party and some of its satellite groups like the Fabian Society and the Socialist Education Federation. These small groups, with a lot of teachers in their membership, were active in formulating policy statements for many years, notably from 1951 onwards, which were submitted to the Annual Scottish Conference. Also, university academics were writing influential works, and sociological research was uncovering statistical proof that educational segregation was at best chancy and at worst downright unfair. Momentum gradually increased and built up to a fair head of steam in the late 50s and early 60s. Of course the term 'comprehensive' was a fairly new creation, coming much later than the multilateral schools that had existed for years in Scotland. The 1945 Act, with its advocacy of senior secondary/junior secondary schools was a move away from the Scottish tradition of all children going to the one school. Once the issue became political, and especially after it was part of an election pledge, the band-wagon started to roll, and positions were taken up for good or ill. So we had moved from a question posed in the late 40s (should we go comprehensive?) through a period of debate in the 50s to a final position: comprehensive education was the thing.
2. The 1947 Report was well written and extremely important but in an unobtrusive way. It provided respected and respectable educational arguments. Reports must be seen as products of their time and as reflections of the membership of the committee that produced them. I would say that this report eventually increased

the educational arguments in favour of the comprehensive school, and was used to do that. Educational change is slow to have any perceptible effect. Teachers tend to be conservative and abhor rapid change. There is also an innate Scottish scepticism about Reports, especially if, as in 1947, they are idealistic or radical in emphasis. They are seen as being produced by people far from the classroom floor. For fear of the effect of pushing the pendulum too far and damaging the age cohort currently at school, the concrete outcome is usually a compromise with the status quo.

Remember too that educationists in the post-war period were preoccupied with many practical problems: building schools, recruiting schemes for staff - such idealistic and lofty prose would not find a terribly receptive audience.

3. A combination. Educational aspirations were there - equality of opportunity for all children, combined with fundamental political objectives, a classless society, equality, justice, anti-elitist views. The great white hope was to create a unified society. In the educational world in Scotland such objectives caused misgivings and mixed feelings, so strong was the lad o' pairts tradition.
4. There was a growing discontent with the 'quali', and increasing frustration at the obvious failure of the junior secondary sector. Some, to be fair, were very successful, usually in rural areas. Those in big cities in general were dreadful places. Support for selection was, of course, strong in senior secondary sector. The adoption of the comprehensive school as official



policy by the Labour Party in the 1960s gave the whole movement a massive boost. It was acceptable as a concept in Scotland, but there was never the same bitterness up here about the educational system as there was in England. We were already much more generous in the percentage of pupils we admitted to our senior secondary schools.

5. The obvious implication was that the comprehensive school had now been given government blessing and approval. Very powerful vested interests in the form of the existing system, however, clouded the issue. There were mixed views on accepting a wider range of ability, and little experience around of how to deal with it. It proved very difficult to eradicate the traditional Scottish tendency for teachers to concentrate and indeed lavish their thinking and effort on the interests of the best pupils who were being presented for Scottish Certificate of Education exams.
6. a) Inspectors were obliged to carry official policy out and get others to do the same. Some were genuinely enthusiastic and influential, others much less so.
- b) Councillors gave a strong lead in some areas, committed by the policy of their party and egged on by some of their constituents. In some places, they had to push unwilling or hesitant Directors of Education into action.
- c) Directors were much more powerful then, and many were slow to move, given their background and training. Some employed delaying tactics rather than outright opposition. So their influence was very mixed, but rarely positive or directive. Much



persuasion by committee was the order of the day.

d) There were few advisers to start with, mainly in practical subjects. Their influence is hard for me to assess. They were chiefly concerned with promoting change in schools through talking to teachers about new approaches.

e) The Consultative Committee on the Curriculum was not about comprehensive education, e.g. curriculum paper 2 was about giving a broader education for certificate pupils. But its work was part of, and it contributed to, the general desire for change. Later Consultative Committee on the Curriculum papers reacted to comprehensive education as it gradually became established. The main strand underlying all the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum publications paralleled that of comprehensive education itself - better provision for all. To that extent, the Consultative Committee on the Curriculum was a strand in the general movement.

7. Headteachers had almost complete latitude, unfortunately for those of us who wanted to see comprehensive education take off. Many existing heads had come up via the selective academic route. So the decision to go comprehensive was taken as bad news for the senior secondaries, but good news for the junior secondary sector, which had pockets of pioneering spirit and educational verve. But, in general, very little advantage was taken of the changeover, basically because it was not viewed as something positive. All sorts of talks by innovative, comprehensive heads were given, and authorities lashed out money of those with ideas. But there was no push or active enforcement at Directorate level.

The Circulars (600 and 614) had therefore limited application in reality.

8. Parental reaction was mixed. The furore caused in the town of Ayr is now legendary and well-documented. A bitter political fight ensued, and the Rector of the Academy left and went to Perth. There was a campaign on both sides conducted in the local press, with the Conservatives quoting the work of McClelland and McIntosh on selection. In general, though, I would say that majority public opinion was either for it or apathetic. Resistance came from middle class parents and Conservative pockets in the mainly Labour controlled West.
9. Private schools did not present a serious threat, given that 96% of all pupils in Scotland go to state schools. With such a small proportion going to the private sector, its influence can only be negligible.
10. The major problem was catchment areas of a homogeneous social kind. Comprehensive education was virtually killed at the outset in these places by the effects of post-war housing policy which had one well-meaning but blinkered aim: to remove people from decaying slums to new housing estates on the periphery of large cities. No thought was given to the long-term implications. Easterhouse in Glasgow or Craigmillar in Edinburgh are good examples. Some bussing went on on a small scale to combat these problems, but a lot of reasonable parents moved out to 'better' areas for the sake of their children. Hence the media term 'ghetto schools'.

11. In my view, the major obstacles were:

- Housing policy
- Inadequate buildings
- Under supply of facilities
- Accommodation and staffing
- The continuing social class divide which characterises Scottish society, for all it is claimed to be traditionally democratic. There is a real class divide apparent to anyone. The proof is all around, not least in education.

12. The attitudes of heads and their staffs meant that the division of pupils into ability group was the norm, and educational segregation on that basis was still going on when I came through here to see about my own children's education. There was little movement on teaching kids in mixed-ability classes. A very simplistic view was taken: as long as all pupils went to the one school and wore the same blazer, we had a comprehensive system. Some headteachers showed little willingness to move.

13. All I can say is that honest attempts were made to get people to introduce change - talks, seminars, bulletins, articles etc. It is impossible to quantify the success rate of the effort that was expended by a lot of people.

13. The main areas where movement was apparent were in mixed-ability grouping and the common course. But all was far too slow, and there was not enough of it. Most experimentation took place in junior high schools or upgraded junior secondary schools; very little was attempted in 'downgraded' senior secondary schools.



The physical and structural changes in the comprehensive set up were quickly established, or relatively so. The internal arrangements and pedagogical changes to match were very slow to get off the ground, or in some cases, just not tackled. There was a duality in some teachers and headteachers in that, while espousing the virtues of comprehensive schools in public, in private they still clung to the old well-tried paths with which they were familiar. Basically, there were three sorts of headteacher:

- the R F MacKenzies, who said 'we are having a comprehensive school, and to hell with everybody who doesn't accept it'.
- the older senior secondary men, who opted for a quiet life, avoiding the issues and leaving their staffs to do what they liked.
- the genuinely innovative ones, who tried to nurse the staff along but, because of the variable resistance they encountered, had to settle for more limited goals than they would have preferred.

14. In theory, there should be no streaming, and setting by ability should be delayed at least until secondary 3. You must allow for individual strengths, and the internal organisation must have flexibility to cope with both fast and slow developers. All early labelling is invidious, and must be avoided. In a sense, comprehensive education was introduced prior to any serious study made of how best to organise it. The cart was put before the horse. The same could be said of raising of the school leaving age in 1972 which, in my view, dealt comprehensive education a serious body blow. Just as some teachers were coming to terms



with the implications of Circular 600, WHAM! along came raising of the school leaving age and all its attendant problems, which simply were not thought through.

15. Yes, I would say that the enforced fusion of senior secondary/junior secondary groups was a mixing for the good, which eventually did bring about change, however reluctantly it was tackled. You must remember that many things happened under the name of comprehensive education which really came from the wider society.
16. a) Much pressure was exerted on many fronts to set them to undertake a scrutiny. In fairness, teachers were expected to cope with massive changes with paltry or non-existent help. Much was asked, very little given by way of assistance. Many established teachers, successful in their own terms, found they had to face a major transformation in their working lives. For those of set ways or fixed attitudes, it was a difficult if not impossible adjustment to expect them to make.
- b) In-service and Teachers' Centres blossomed in the late 60s and early 70s. But there was much suspicion in schools, where teachers, faced daily with the effects of the comprehensive revolution, were exposed to the trendy outpourings of college staff who did not have much credibility in their eyes. It's very easy to write jargon-loaded, theoretical exposés when your working environment is the sedate, sublime surroundings of a college of education. The teachers in the audience wanted practical help for a real situation. There was inadequate in-

service provision and it came too late.

17. Circular 600 was in accord at least in spirit with Scottish tradition. In my view, in the 40s and 50s, we had moved away from that tradition, so that Circular 600 pointed the national education system back in the right direction for the times. It embraced the 1947 Report's concepts, but gave them a 1960s flavour.
18. This concept was broadly acceptable to the Scots, but their educational outlook was heavily tinged with academicism. The fear was that the comprehensive school would damage the chances of the able, and so, although numerically more pupils did get a chance, 'chance' was defined in academic terms, i.e. the chance to sit Scottish Certificate of Education exams. Not enough was done for those pupils who could not reach Scottish Certificate of Education standard. Hence, it was unfair to make the direct comparisons that were made between the results of former senior secondary schools and the new comprehensives: but they were made nevertheless as exam passes counted towards the definition of 'success'.
19. A comprehensive school is one which takes all pupils from a defined catchment area and does not classify them at an early stage in their education, either according to ability or indeed any other criterion. The opportunities are there for all pupils to maximise whatever talents or capacities they may have. Regrettably, many people defined the term as simply getting them into one building and then put them in ability groups at the

earliest opportunity. There was a failure on the part of politicians and the powers that be to be content with that, to adopt a laissez-faire approach to the implementation of a nationwide comprehensive policy. There was no follow-up, which would have discovered that the professionals had failed to respond to the challenge of the comprehensive school. People were allowed to put their own interpretation on Circular 600 and how it should be implemented.

20. Not at all, primarily because of so-called 'ghetto' schools, economic factors which came increasingly to the fore from about 1973 onwards, and perhaps most of all because the educational thinking and practice to match the structural changes were very slow to develop. Look how many years it took for Munn and Dunning and the Act Plan to materialise! By the time serious thought was given to what it actually meant to be operating a comprehensive system, a great deal of damage had been done. Much was attempted, but left hanging in the air, half-done as it were. Not only was there a lack of money, there was a serious lack of expertise in professional quarters. Also, it is fair to point out that society expected education, comprehensive education in particular, to solve societal problems, like the maldistribution of wealth, unemployment, bad housing etc etc. Nowadays, the lack of job opportunities after compulsory schooling restricts what schools can hope to achieve. The equality of opportunity in life outside the school gates just is not there. The promises envisaged by the creation of a comprehensive system of education created the image of an ideal world, which is simply non-existent.



PREAMBLE

The birth of the comprehensive school in Scotland came at the end of a connected course of events, as I see it, from "JJ's" Advisory Council report which should have heralded the new epoch we are still seeking to establish, but proved unfortunately to be long ahead of its time. Its philosophical and pedagogic proposals provided the basis for a truly comprehensive school and common curriculum, and having rejected it, virtually root and branch, the Inspectorate then tried to salvage some of its ideas in a bipartite system which perpetuated the evils JJ wanted us to escape from. Then by a series of steps by which they sought to improve the position without seeing very clearly what they were about, they brought the Scottish system closer to the English model, thereby creating further confusion and internal contradictions. Then came Circular 600, which was to have brought about the great escape from all the internal conflicts and contradictions, but which to begin with did little more than house the two schools of the bipartite system under one roof - where that was physically possible - with a connecting corridor. But at least reorganisation on comprehensive lines provided the basis for the curricular and examination reforms which were needed to make a reality of the principles of the comprehensive school. Progress towards these reforms was painful.

\*\*\*\*\*

The Advisory Council Report of 1947 was well ahead of its time and James Robertson was a prophet without honour in his own land. As far as the Department was concerned, it was a dead letter. In my opinion, we might have had genuine comprehensive education earlier if its recommendations



had been adopted as policy. Its only belated practical consequences were to provide a rationale for an exam at the end of secondary 4, and to influence Inspectorate thinking on curriculum and methodology - but only for one section of the population - resulting in the Junior Secondary Memorandum in 1955. Official thinking in the Scottish Education Department until the 1960s centred on a highly selective education system with children differentiated physically by ability. My own feeling is that comprehensive education was taken to mean gathering all abilities under one roof and then differentiate between them as before.

The whole push was political from Willie Ross and the Labour Party. It seemed a sensible attractive idea in the mid 60s - cater for all, give opportunities to all. So in a sense, Circular 600 aimed at an ideal - a nationwide network of 6 year comprehensive schools operating a common course to allow children to discover their talents. But there was no precise definition of terms or outlining of a philosophy for the new scheme. Schools were left to interpret the loosely worded ideas for themselves, and translate them into organisational and curricular realities. That is why so many different patterns evolved. To a large extent, existing buildings determined the form comprehensive education took at least at the transitional stage, e.g. the two-tier system which perpetuated selection, which the comprehensive system was designed to eliminate. Burgh or omnibus schools were not affected much, as they had all local children anyway, arranged bilaterally into junior secondary and senior secondary 'mini' schools. It caused acute problems in the Western conurbation, where again existing buildings had to be fitted to new ideas, while waiting for new schools to be built on comprehensive lines.

The whole issue did not generate the same heat up here in Scotland. Our system, whatever its faults, was much more readily adaptable to the new system. Also, so many councils were Labour-controlled, and hence sympathetic. To be fair, Tory councils were won over. My overall impression was of not much opposition to comprehensive proposals which were seen as a rationalisation of existing practice to a very large extent. Such differences of opinion as occurred were mostly on political lines.

Inspectors have a job to do as civil servants, and so they had to support the 'nouveau regime' at least in public. I am sure there was unspoken opposition from many. In 1973, I remember being at a meeting at which J.F. McGarrity HMSCI said 'WE HAVE NO OBJECTION TO COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOLS'. Such a low-key statement seemed to me to sum up official thinking - not over-committed in reality. The Inspectorate is characterised by an innate conservatism, and likes to perpetuate its own influence. It never does anything too radical. Even when Scottish Certificate of Education Examination Board and Consultative Committee on the Curriculum were set up, they made a virtue of necessity and married both with their own men as 'external assessors'. Given such influence, and the educational background of people in senior positions in Scottish education, it is not surprising that reform takes place at a snail's pace.

Directors of Education had no choice - they had to submit plans for reorganisation on comprehensive lines. They accepted official policy with varying degrees of personal conviction, but abided by it as loyally as their existing buildings and capital grants would allow.



My impression is that most headteachers and teachers opposed comprehensive education, especially those in senior secondary schools. They had to accept the structural alterations associated with reorganisation, but internal arrangements reflected individual interpretations of comprehensive education. In effect, selection and streaming went on either openly or in disguise. There was very little clarification or guidelines for people. Die-hard traditionalists took a long time to be won over by more liberal ideas. There seemed to be general endorsement in principle of comprehensive education but with everyone doing their own thing in reality. There was a great deal of latitude, with Directors, heads and principal teachers left to decide for themselves. Many evaded the real purpose of the change, and went on as before for a long time. Streaming and selection were perpetuated with varying forms of common course or modifications of it. At all events, there was no sudden revolution: everyone played it in at his own pace. The sum total of Scottish Education Department responsibility was for building plans and giving grants.

In general, parents and the public made no hue and cry, except those middle class vocal parents with children at selective schools, who saw the change as harming the educational prospects of their own children. Selective, private schools form such a small proportion of the total educational system in Scotland that they do not pose a serious threat to the comprehensive system. The greatest threats to the comprehensive system came from within it. Curriculum and methods have undergone changes over the years - that was inevitable, given the attempt to cater for all abilities, but again, change came gradually rather than suddenly.

The concept of equality of opportunity was never clearly grasped. There was a misplaced complacency among Scots that they already had a comprehensive system and that, in fact, they had inherited a state system deriving from John Knox that was perfectly just and offered opportunity to all. This, of course, was a myth it suited people to believe and quote to all and sundry. In reality, the inherited system was highly selective and divisive, with a curriculum designed principally for the able aiming at University, with various watered-down versions for the less able, in the vain hope they would somehow be suitable. In my view, it was only with the Munn and Dunning programme that any serious, co-ordinated attempt was made to come to grips with the difficult problem of making valid educational provision for all. The Scottish educational system has for centuries been narrowly conceived on a limited concept of ability - academic ability, to which all other abilities were subservient. There was (and is?) a hierarchy of subjects, with teacher qualifications to match.

Comprehensive education was not a far-sighted reform. It was the consequence of a political decision prompted by strong, if confused feelings of unease at the blatant injustice of the system which had operated till the mid 1960s. The time had come, it was felt, to take steps to make it fairer. Making schools comprehensive was an essential precondition of making opportunities open to all. But the shake-up did not quite work out as its instigators had planned. Raising of the school leaving age in 1972 really got people thinking eventually, and culminated in the Munn and Dunning Committees, but for a long time the senior officials in Scottish Education Department were dead against radical changes in curriculum methods and assessment. It was only when the Exam Board was won over that movement occurred. Radical change is not for the Inspectorate - it's against their training and outlook.