RESEARCH ARTICLE

RETHINKING SCHOOL CURRICULUM AND SOCIAL CHANGE

*Dr. Vikramendra Kumar

Department of Sociology, Delhi School of Economics, University of Delhi, Delhi, India

ABSTRACT

Contemporary discourse about curriculum includes recognition that curricula can be analyzed at many levels and from many positions. 'By curriculum I mean what students have an opportunity to learn in school, through both the hidden and overt curriculum and what they do not have an opportunity to learn because certain matters were not included in the curriculum'. Nevertheless, the value of the term 'hidden curriculum' is that it draws attention to interpretations that have received little recognition in explicit curriculum discourse and which may serve as alternatives to the 'preferred meanings'. Differences in outcome are expected but are viewed as the inevitable result of variations in ability and motivation. The belief is that the system is fair as long as equal opportunity is guaranteed. However, critics have suggested that beneath the 'façade of meritocracy' lies a system which reproduces and legitimates existing economic inequalities (Bowles and Gintis, 1976, p. 103). Others, while sharing a concern about the political dimensions of education, have cautioned against a deterministic view of education which ignores the contradictions and contestation which occur within the school (Apple, 1982). A more complete understanding of how ideologies work in schools requires examination of day-to-day school life (Apple and Weis, 1983). The central themes of this paper will not be dictated by the alleged boundaries between 'foundational' disciplines in education, nor by an unexamined division of the tasks of education and educational research between 'practitioners' and 'theorists', or between 'practitioners' and 'policy-makers'. On the contrary, one of the tasks is to demonstrate, through careful research and scholarship across a range of fields of practical, political and theoretical endeavor, just how outmoded, unproductive, and ultimately destructive these divisions are both for education and for educational research. These are enduring themes in this paper touching upon some of the central questions confronting our contemporary culture and, some would say, upon the central pathologies of contemporary society.

INTRODUCTION

Patterns of interaction among the students seemed to be heavily influenced by gender. The most frequent boy-to-girl interaction was verbal or physical 'hassling' (Griffin, 1983). Girls rarely initiated interactions with boys and generally responded to hassling by acquiescing, ignoring or separating from the boys. Interactions among boys tended to be physical and combative, with much public clowning. In contrast, girls' interactions with each other were mostly cooperative, verbal and private. The interactions among students differed based on the participation styles of the particular students, but the aggressive actions of boys and the non-assertive behaviour of girls were the characteristic patterns observed. There were examples of resistance to the pattern of male domination, particularly among girls with higher skill levels, but participation in co-educational instruction did not change the overall pattern of male domination. The interaction patterns exhibited in the education setting did not differ substantially from those in other instructional settings (Everhart, 1983).

Corresponding author: **Dr. Vikramendra Kumar,**
Department of Sociology, Delhi School of Economics, University of Delhi, Delhi, India.

However, the research indicated that assumptions that co-educational education system would change traditional gender relations were naive (Griffin, 1989). The research also revealed a need to understand how teachers as well as students understand gender. Teachers tended to respond differently to the different groups of students (Griffin, 1985b). Even if there were only a few 'machos', junior machos' and 'wimps' in a class, they received most of the teacher's attention because they were involved in more class disruption. The teachers believed that the wimps, who were the most visibly ridiculed by other students, brought the teasing on themselves. On occasion teachers attempted to distribute participation among students or to intervene in inequitable student interactions. These efforts produced changes in student behaviour, but repeated reminders were required to sustain the changes. Teachers expressed reservations about whether or not student sex typical behaviour could be changed and viewed non-conforming behaviour as a problem. Griffin (1989) has recently suggested that efforts to attain sex equity by mixing boys and girls in co-educational classes and training teachers to use different methods were simplistic and ineffective. She states that 'though grouping by abilities, using a variety of teaching styles, avoiding sexist language, and restructuring game play all are excellent teaching strategies, they also are

superficial changes without an accompanying shift in how teachers conceptualize gender and the role of education in gender construction.' There is little indication that the underlying conceptualizations of gender are changing in education programmes. Patriarchy and the oppression of women are supported education, curriculum and culture ideologically not only by gender differentiation but by compulsive heterosexual relations (Rich, 1980). Femininity and masculinity are socially constructed gender ideologies which serve to constrain individual choices. The reactions of teachers and peers to the 'wimps' and 'overaggressive' girls illustrate the power of these constraints. The gendered social structures in education affect the lives of both men and women while contributing to the maintenance of institutionalized heterosexual relations and a sexual division of labour that is the foundation of patriarchal power (Hall, 1988).

Schooling is not merely an academic experience; it is an intensive experience in institutional living (Silberman, 1971). The routines and rituals of daily life in the school constitute important social practices which communicate basic principles and assumptions about the culture. The messages are powerful because they are pervasive and continuously repeated. The fact that the messages remain unspoken and unacknowledged may make them even more powerful by making them seem natural and inevitable. The behaviour of teachers and students is often the expression of tacit beliefs that are so 'taken-for-granted' that they cannot be recognized or verbalized. A major value of the research on the hidden curriculum is that it may provide a mirror in which educators can see their own programmes. The hidden curriculum in education seems to endorse a meritocratic ideology in which status is dependent on effort and ability. Consistent with this view, quality instructional and competitive experiences areprovided only for the highly skilled athletes while other students are urged to try harder. This meritocratic ideology is complemented by a technocentric ideology in which ends or goals are unexamined and attention is focused on the development of increasingly effective means for achieving the goals. This technocentric perspective views the body as an instrument to be trained and manipulated for the sake of performance or appearance. Images of the body and social relations within education classes differ by gender and race and reproduce practices which contradict the assumptions of equal opportunity underlying the meritocratic ideology.

Changing the hidden curriculum is a difficult task because it requires changing behaviour that is habitual and reflects deeply held beliefs. The task often involves transforming not merely the programme or the school but challenging existing social conditions which contradict principles of democracy and justice. This is not easy, but as Giroux (1981, p. 218) states, 'while it would be naive and misleading to claim that schools alone can create the conditions for social change, it would be equally naive to argue that working in schools does not matter.' Research on the lived culture of the school reveals contradictions and resistance that can serve as the starting point for emancipatory education. Emancipatory education is based on the belief that education is a dynamic process in which students and teachers are active agents in the creation of the social conditions of their lives (Greene, 1978). Within the constraints of culture, context and biography, individuals have the power of choice. The actions they choose have the potential to modify the constraints. That is, people, individually or collectively, can reinterpret experience in order to change their circumstances and possibilities. Within such a

conception the goal of education is to encourage critical reflection and self-awareness, thus empowering teachers and students to create a better, more just society. Emancipatory pedagogy requires that students be included in critical discourse in which assertions about knowledge and values are viewed as problematic (Cherryholmes, 1988). The basic premise of proposals for critical pedagogy in education is that teachers and students should examine social issues related to education and question taken-for-granted assumptions and practices. In a discussion of approaches to critical pedagogy a word of caution seems necessary. A focus on pedagogical change creates a risk that the political nature of the current reality will be ignored. Educational reformers often portray teachers as the source of problems in the school system and direct their reforms at the improvement of teacher performance. Critical theorists need to avoid this trap of blaming the teachers and to work with teachers to empower them to effect changes in the social structure of schools. Griffin (1985c, p. 165) suggests, 'if there is to be real hope for change, it lies not in finding the right pedagogical stuff but in acting on the right political stuff.

Tangible social contradictions such as those highlighted by the nuclear threat, environmental concerns, ethnic differentiation and challenges to different examples of cultural imperialism and the modern phase of the women's movement became a major aspect of social and intellectual life in the 1960s and 1970s. They contributed to the emergence of new forms of intellectual understandings; ideas which found their way into the frameworks which have acted to challenge the dominance of conventions of the meritocratic and competitive ideology. For example, the 'new sociology of education' of the 1970s introduced questions and ideas which challenged the status of a value free notion of education. Apart from highlighting issues of 'winners' and 'losers' of the schooling process this emerging tradition placed important research questions on the academic agenda. These questions offered insights into the significant points of intervention in the curriculum process, intervention in terms of: What counts as worthwhile school knowledge? How is school knowledge organized? How is what counts as school knowledge transmitted? What kind of cultural system does the structure of the curriculum legitimate? Whose interests are served by the curriculum structure? This critical tradition of educational scholarship was able to open the way to attention being turned to the structural elements of the social form which are produced, reproduced and transformed. Subsequent work has extended the analysis such that other issues about the curriculum can now be thought about in a systematic way. For example, theories of knowledge form introduced questions about the relationship between theory and practice, the balance between mental and manual, and concrete and abstract factors. Theories of knowledge content introduced a focus on the balance between the science and the arts, and the self-conscious recognition of the need to represent a range of social perspectives (for instance, is the curriculum one that looks out to other cultural traditions or is it always drawn inwards?)

Literature Review

The curriculum is defined in its widest sense, and it refers to programs of teaching and learning which take place in formal settings. Examples of formal settings are schools, colleges and universities. A curriculum may refer to a system, as in a national curriculum, an institution, as in the school curriculum,

or even to an individual school, as in the school geography curriculum. The four dimensions of curriculum are: aims and objectives, content or subject matter, methods or procedures, and evaluation or assessment. The first refers to the reasons for including specific items in the curriculum and excluding others. The second refers to the knowledge, skills or dispositions which are implicit in the choice of items, and the way that they are arranged. Objectives may be understood as broad general justifications for including particular items and particular pedagogical processes in the curriculum; or as clearly defined and closely delineated outcomes or behaviors; or as a set of appropriate procedures or experiences. The third dimension is methods or procedures and this refers to pedagogy and is determined by choices made about the first two dimensions. The fourth dimension is assessment or evaluation and this refers to the means for determining whether the curriculum has been successfully implemented. A range of issues have been surfaced and debated in relation to these four dimensions.

Understanding the contextual complexities of curriculum development is one thing, having a new curriculum adopted by teachers is another. We know that the history of curriculum innovation is littered with the corpses of 'failed' attempts to change teachers' practice. In the case of the education curriculum it has had to be 'approved by' tertiary faculty in addition to teachers in schools. The attempt should be made to incorporate teachers' and academics' ideas and opinions into the development of the study designs by having both teachers and academics as members of the writing teams and by the use of an extensive consultation process with schools and tertiary institutions. In this process draft versions of the study design were distributed to schools, colleges and universities and meetings were arranged to discuss reaction to the draft documents. Part of the initial resistance of some teachers was a reaction to the general philosophy of the curriculum studies itself and represented a desire to maintain a meritocratic form of curriculum in the post-compulsory years of schooling.

Changing the curriculum is not without implications for the tertiary programmes which prepare the teachers to teach in the post-compulsory years of schooling. There is a two-way interaction between the tertiary institutions and the new curriculum. The secondary school curriculum in education had been influenced by the visions of education which are championed in the tertiary institutions, and, as indicated earlier, the curriculum in education attempted to incorporate the best of the old curriculum into a broader more culturally related new syllabus. On the other hand, the tertiary institutions will need to respond in terms of adaptations to their programmes if they are to prepare teachers who are competent to teach the new curriculum. Programmes which remain examples of the propagation of the 'divided curriculum', which continue to graduate teachers who champion fragmented specialized knowledge, individualism, competition, a meritocratic view of society and knowledge of the body as the body of knowledge for education will create considerable difficulties in terms of implementing the new curriculum. A new teacher education capable of adequately preparing teachers to teach will need purposefully to contextualize education within the contemporary culture, to integrate the biological-physical and the sociocultural. It will need to be a biosocial curriculum. We acknowledge the contribution of the emergence of the critical tradition in curriculum theory. This work has provided us with a new language with which to think

about and act on the curriculum; words such as 'equality', 'relevance' and 'social responsibility' have formed the lexicon of our curriculum vocabulary. There is a strong interaction between curriculum and assessment; the main characteristics of the latter being: criterion-referenced; dependence on teacher assessment; comprehensiveness, in that all the intended learning outcomes are assessed; formative and summative with neither dominating the other; and target setted. The first school of thought includes seminal writings by Apple, Bourdieu and Passeron, Bowles and Gintis, Illich, Kumar, and Willis. In different ways, these authors argue that educational institutions play an important role in the reproduction of an unequal social order. They prepare children/students to become workers in a hierarchical and stratified capitalist production process (Bowles and Gintis, 1976; Willis, 1977). Schools discipline and control, and therefore make young people lose their capacity to think and act independently (Illich, 1970). They define what is valuable knowledge, and hence 'whose knowledge is of most worth' (Apple, 2000; Kumar, 1991). Because they impose the same standards and criteria to all students, they not only reproduce but also justify existing inequalities, exactly because it is much easier for elite children to meet these so-called objective, neutral standards than it is for children of less privileged background\s (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1977).

The second school of thought, drawing upon authors such as Nussbaum and Sen, regards education, in principle, as a positive force. Nussbaum (2005, 2008) and Sen (1999, 2009a) have conceptualized education in terms of human capabilities. Being knowledgeable and having academic skills is itself a capability that can enrich people's lives. Apart from that, education is important for the expansion of other capabilities. Being well-educated helps people to make better choices with regard to nutrition and health; it can also help them to participate more meaningfully in public debates and democratic processes. Good and just societies, according to these authors, should therefore contribute to the expansion of the capabilities of all people – irrespective of gender, caste, class or other divisions. For Sen, capabilities do not necessarily lead to certain outcomes. His point is, rather, that they open up possibilities, and therefore create more freedom, to decide what kind of life one values and wishes to live. Education, in this approach, is hence fundamentally linked to both social justice and freedom. This capability framework goes well together with the idea of education as a human right. Because education is so important for developing human capabilities, every child has a right to decent education – irrespective of whether this education pays off economically. Implicit in these positions about the social function and purpose of education are different conceptualizations of the role of the state. The idea of education for social and political control focuses squarely on the power dynamics operative within and around the state apparatuses. The education policies of the state are, therefore, not considered to be straightforwardly positive or even neutral.

Instead, it is argued that apparently egalitarian policy rhetoric and actions to spread education for all are usually fraught with contradictory intents and even if not, are bound to have outcomes that are basically reproducing the status quo. The idea of education as a progressive force, on the other hand, assumes a more benign state working more or less in the general interest, or in any case the possibility that societies, through a process of democratic deliberation, can decide what

kind of schooling they value, and how that should be provided. Both perspectives have limitations. The first view, focusing on control and hegemony, is often somewhat silent about whether and what kind of counter-forces may emerge – say, in the form of public action or policy activism. It assumes not only that education is a powerful tool for socialization into a given social milieu or position within that milieu, but also that state institutions have the capacity to shape and mould educational institutions to the extent necessary. In other words, the hegemonic potential of educational institutions is taken for granted, and the possibility of counter-hegemonic forces remains underemphasized and under-theorized. The capabilities framework, on the other hand, may lead to a somewhat unsuspecting and benign view of the role of the state or the democratic process. This framework comes with a risk to take insufficient notice of the power dynamics operative within the education apparatuses, in its policy framing and in the processes of implementation. So, while dominance may be taken as sheer predominance in the first school thereby foreclosing any possibility of a democratically informed school reform, the second may easily overemphasize the feasibility of such transformation.

The Role of Teacher

In the research studies such as those quoted above, the effective programs of formative assessment involve far more than the addition of a few observations and tests to an existing program. They require careful scrutiny of all of the main components of a teaching plan. As the argument develops it becomes clear that curriculum, instruction, and formative assessment are indivisible. To begin at the beginning, the choice of tasks for class and homework is important. In content it will be guided by the framework of the curriculum, and in particular by the models of progression in the learning of the subject area that are expressed, albeit implicitly, in that framework. But planning of a classroom task will also be guided by the need to adopt a style of work that supports the broader aims of the curriculum notably to promote effective learning and success for all. Thus, classroom tasks have to be justified in terms of the learning aims that they serve, and they support effective learning if opportunities for pupils to communicate their evolving understanding are built into the planning. Discussions, in which pupils are led to talk about their understanding, provide the opportunity for the teacher to respond to and reorient the pupil's thinking. However, teachers often respond, quite unconsciously, in ways that inhibit the learning of a pupil. Recordings commonly show that teachers often look for a particular response and, lacking the flexibility or the confidence to deal with the unexpected, try to direct the pupil toward giving the expected answer. Over time the pupils get the message they are not required to think out their own answers. The object of the exercise is to work out, or guess, what answer the teacher expects to see or hear, and then express it so that the teaching can proceed. The posing of questions by the teacher is a natural and direct way of checking on learning, but is often unproductive.

However, where, as often happens, a teacher answers her or his own question after only two or three seconds, there is no possibility that a pupil can think out what to say. In consequence, pupils don't even try if you know that the answer, or another question, will come along in a few seconds; there is no point in trying. It is also common that only a few pupils in a class give answers. Then the teacher, by lowering the level of questions, can keep the lesson going but is actually out of touch with the understanding of most of the class the question-answer dialogue becomes a ritual, one in which all connive and thoughtful involvement suffers. To break this particular cycle, pupils must have time to respond, perhaps to discuss their thinking in pairs or in small groups before responding. On the constructivist and social discourse views of learning, it is essential that any dialogue should evoke thoughtful reflection in which all pupils can be encouraged to take part, for only then can the formative process be effective. Class tests, and tests or other exercises set for homework, are also important means to promote feedback. However, the quality of the test items, that is, their relevance to the main learning aims and their clear communication to the pupil, needs scrutiny. Given questions of good quality, it is then essential to ensure the quality of the feedback here both relevance to the learning aims and sensitivity to the effects on the recipient are important. Several research studies focusing on feedback in classroom assessment have shown that if pupils are given only marks or grades, they do not benefit from the feedback on their work, whereas, in closely matched situations, those who are given only relevant comments do benefit.

One comparison, between four groups given comments only, grades only, praise only, and no feedback respectively, showed that only the comments group showed significant learning gains, while the two given grades or praise showed enhanced "ego-involvement" that is, an introverted focus on their performance to the detriment of attention to the learning tasks. Thus, feedback should only give specific guidance on strengths and weaknesses, with the means and opportunities to work with the evidence of difficulties the way in which test results are reported back to pupils so that they can identify their own strengths and weaknesses is a critical feature. The worst scenario is one in which some pupils get low marks this time, they got low marks last time, they expect to get low marks next time, and this is accepted as part of a shared belief between them and their teacher that they are just not clever enough. A fundamental determinant of teachers' approach to their work will be their beliefs about their pupil's capacity to learn. At one extreme there is the "fixed IQ" view: if it were true that each pupil has a fixed, inherited intelligence, then all a teacher can do is to accept that some can learn quickly while others can hardly learn at all. At the other pole is the "untapped potential" view, which starts from the view that so-called "abilities" are complexes of skills that can be learned. In this view, all pupils can learn more effectively if one can clear away any obstacles set up by previous difficulties. The evidence shows that formative assessment, which assumes "untapped potential," does help all pupils to learn and can give particular help to those who have previously fallen behind. Most of the initiatives that have been found helpful take more class time, particularly when a central purpose is to change the outlook on learning and the working methods of pupils. Thus, teachers have to take risks in the belief that such investment of time will yield rewards in the future.

The Perspective of Students

The ultimate user of formative assessment is the pupil. As has been emphasized, where the classroom culture focuses on rewards, "gold stars," grades or place-in-the-class ranking, then pupils look for ways to obtain the best marks rather than at the needs of their learning that these marks ought to reflect. One reported consequence is that pupils tend to avoid difficult

tasks. They also spend time and energy looking for clues to the "right answer." Many are reluctant to ask questions for fear of failure, particularly if they have been led to believe that they lack "ability." The positive aspect is that such outcomes are not inevitable. What is needed is a culture of success, backed by a belief that all can achieve. Feedback to any pupil should be about the particular qualities of his or her work, with advice on what he or she can do to improve, and should avoid comparisons with other pupils. Many of the successful innovations have developed self- and peer-assessment by pupils as ways of enhancing formative assessment, and such work has achieved some success with pupils from age five upward. Indeed, on a constructivist view of learning, self-assessment must be an essential feature. The main problem that developing self-assessment encounter is not the problem of reliability and trustworthiness: it is that pupils can only assess themselves when they have a sufficiently clear picture of the targets that their learning is meant to attain. This accord with analysis on the fact that emphasizes the action in learning has to be directed to close the gap between the present state of the learner and the goal of the learning, and that this has to be done by learners themselves. Surprisingly, and sadly, many pupils do not have any clear picture of the goals of their learning, and appear to have become accustomed to receiving classroom teaching as an arbitrary sequence of exercises with no overarching rationale. It requires hard and sustained work to overcome this pupils' culture of passive reception.

Thus, the involvement of pupils in their own assessment changes both the role of the pupil as learner and the nature of the relationship between teacher and pupil, making the latter shoulder more of the responsibility for learning and calling for a radical shift in pupils' own perspectives about learning. Generally speaking they don't reflect on their own learning process in an overall fashion. They think their assessment has more to do with the effort they made than with what they have actually learnt. This quotation shows that the expectations that pupils have built up from their experiences of assessment in school can constitute an obstacle to their taking a positive role in assessment. Here, it emerged that the pupils believed that the summative assessments of them were for the school's and their parents' benefit, not for themselves. The weak pupils believed the purpose was to make them work harder. Since the assessment was not used to tell them how to work differently, they saw it as a source of pressure, which made them anxious.

As a consequence of such evidence, that they decided to reduce its summative tests and to enhance the formative role of assessment. When innovations in learning practices, including formative assessment, are introduced, many pupils will resist attempts to change accustomed routines, for any such change is threatening, and emphasis on the challenge to think for yourself (and not just work harder) can be disturbing to many. Pupils will find it hard to believe in the value of changes for their learning before they have experienced the benefits of such changes. Where formative assessment has been emphasized, it has been found that pupils bring to the work a fear of assessment from their experience of summative tests, and it takes some time for them to become more positive about formative work. They share with teachers a difficulty in converting from norm-referenced to criterion-referenced ways of thinking. Thus, the values of formative assessment are not to be seen as extras to be added to any particular regime of curriculum and pedagogy. It is rather the case that, as with any consideration of curriculum and pedagogy, with the addition of formative assessment as a third element to these two, it is only through appraising the values embodied and so realized in the articulation of all three that any judgment can be made. Within some secondary schools, covert and overt forms of streaming were retained. The most common of these forms were "broad-banding," dividing pupils on much the same criteria as for streaming, but into classes with wider ranges of test scores, setting by subject attainment, resulting in the allocation of individuals to the same or very similar pupil groups across many subjects. However, in most schools the decision should be taken to have mixed ability classrooms. Many teachers in these schools saw the abandonment of streaming as a pragmatic response to an acknowledged problem that of managing pupils in the lower streams who had been demotivated by failure in the 11+ examination and were consequently disaffected. In some of these schools, differentiation took a variety of forms, for example, all pupils working through the same, or different, curricular material, but at their own pace (as in resource based learning or individualized learning schemes); ability grouping based on informal teacher assessment (as in many primary classrooms), or whole class teaching of a common curriculum, but with different kinds and degrees of individual pupil or group support being given and widely different levels of expected outcomes.

However, in most secondary schools, a "fresh start" policy was adopted in which, for the first two years, all pupils were taught the same curriculum at the same pace in mixed ability classes. This policy allowed pupils an extended period in which they were expected to settle into the new environment and to sort themselves out, before being selected by tests compiled by subject teachers to enter different levels of the certification courses. Teachers' responses to the different attainment levels and learning characteristics of pupils during this period of their schooling were absent, idiosyncratic, or unsystematic. Such schools had clearly not addressed the central problem of dealing with differences between pupils, but had merely deferred it. It is not surprising then, that there is currently little consensus within the profession as to the meaning of the term "differentiation" and, as recent studies suggest, even apparent agreements sometimes hide very different concepts. Indeed, we should not have expected that the teachers' "cautious experiments" were entirely free from theory or that the concepts that had informed the selection system should be readily abandoned.

Assessment and Learning

If teachers are going to engage in the demands and difficulties of developing innovative assessment systems, then certain conditions need to be met. Teachers need to have the new strategies explained in professional language that they understand and trust they abhor "technical jargon." They need to be clear about the aims of the new strategies and they have to perceive the changes as having the potential to solve current problems and deal with present professional concerns rather than as creating difficulties that are just as formidable as the existing ones. They need to have models of what the new strategies might actually comprise in practice, together with examples developed by other teachers and already in use in classrooms. And finally, they need to have enough of a grasp of the underlying principles involved to customize, with confidence, the strategies already available in order to make them manageable and effective within their own context. The

necessary context for these requirements includes a wide professional base of adequately developed understanding of the underpinning theoretical rationale, and the support and commitment of policymakers. Other teachers have responded differently. They recognize that if they are to be more effective in monitoring pupil progress, in identifying difficulties, in expecting particular qualities of pupil response and in matching pupils more accurately to work, which would promote progression, they have to abandon the concept of assessment as an episodic process concerned with the formation of a historic record of pupils' attainments. They have to move to the concept in which assessment is seen as continuous, concerned with the creation of a flow of contemporary information on pupil progress that will genuinely inform the teaching and learning processes. Many were already developing classroom systems that matched this new concept and saw in the assessment guidelines a validation of their beliefs and developing practices. But they also recognized that the burden of keeping track of pupils' achievements would be intolerable if they were to attempt to bear it alone. Assessment information had to be shared with the pupils. And for such teachers, the answer to the question: "Who would read it?" had to be "the pupils." "It's been very much trial and error trying to identify the needs of the pupils rather than the requirements of the curriculum guidelines. We've gone for something more pupil than guideline based." One teacher had sought the pupils' views on this system and described their reactions as enthusiastic, particularly with respect to the element of informed responsibility which it afforded them.

Constructing a Curriculum

To account for what curriculum a particular student experiences it is not enough to look solely to the organizational structure in which the course occurs. We have referred to the effects of compulsory and voluntary attendance, the difference between business and technical departments, the effects of the students' existing qualifications, and the tightness or looseness of examination requirements. But for a full account it is necessary to mention the actors within these structures, the students' career aspirations and consequent choices of course, the lecturers' sources of legitimation in university subjects or in business and industry, and the continued existence of the liberal studies tradition. To this must be added the need to co-opt students' commitment to courses, the so-called 'control' issue. Further education students take seriously those courses which lead to high status qualifications and those courses which appear to be closely related to present or future employment. The sharpest problem faces lecturers who teach courses that are both low in status and not closely related to work; in the 'social and life skills' courses this led to a high sensitivity to students' concerns in everyday life. Lecturers attempted to capture students' interest by responding quickly to their expressed needs. Bowles and Gintis (1976) have proposed a correspondence between modes of control in education and modes of control at work. The processes by which curriculum is created and maintained are not simple or homogeneous. The different versions of the curriculum, mediated by examination requirements, play a role in social control in both college and workplace by encouraging students to accept particular purposes and criteria as valid. The process is reciprocal: the values of the workplace are reflected in college curricula, which in turn reinforce those values in the students' perceptions of work. But this is not the whole story.

Lecturers, like students, pursue their own purposes, sometimes in order to advance their careers but sometimes because of commitment: to values. The students pursue qualifications, but also want to understand the world and to enjoy classes, and these aspirations to become part of the context within which the lecturers carry out their teaching. Thus there is no simple transmission of the values of business and industry, but a complex interplay of actions and motives within an institutional structure which is itself undergoing piecemeal change.

The school curriculum structures knowledge according to assumptions embedded in the wider society and passes that knowledge on to the young. However, as Bourdieu (1974) has argued, the young do not themselves arrive at school with the same experience and resources. 'Each family', he says, 'transmits to its children, indirectly rather than directly, a certain cultural capital and a certain ethos' (Bourdieu, 1974, p. 32). The possession of such cultural capital offers a child the possibility of an unproblematic and familiar relationship to the school curriculum: the assumptions underlying its selection are already the assumptions of the child. The school curriculum is not all of a piece, though. In the secondary sector it is normally organized into separate subjects which represent a division not only between contents but between sub-cultures: competing subject subcultures within the overall culture of the school. Where such subject identities are firm and strongly demarcated, secondary schools operate what Bernstein (1971) calls a 'collection code'. The strict segregation between individual subjects that characterizes the 'collection code' curriculum can strongly affect pupils' experience of schooling, particularly after subject options are chosen at the end of the third year. As the subject itself is, and has historically been, at the center of immense ideological controversy. At the heart of this controversy is one of the major value tensions in Western society: that between rationalism and romanticism. From the rationalist perspective, education is training for work, and schools are responsible for equipping children with skills to sell in the market place. Romanticism, on the other hand, sees education as personal development.

While it is true that many teachers' expectations are too low, teaching strategies do need to incorporate the recognition of cultural gaps, and teachers need to develop techniques for bridging them both through the careful selection of content and through sensitive teaching which allows pupils to appropriate that content. For, as Bourdieu (1974, p. 37) has pointed out: To penalize the underprivileged and favour the most privileged, the school has only to neglect, in its teaching methods and techniques and its criteria when making academic judgments, to take into account the cultural inequalities between children of different social classes. We might expect that one of the strongest effects of examinations on pupils would be to stimulate conformity to teachers' demands. Indeed, it is plausible to suggest that it is those pupils committed to examination success who are most likely to conform to school requirements since their goals can only be achieved through such cooperation, since it is teachers who communicate the requirements of examination boards to pupils and prepare them to fulfill these. Pupils taking exams are, then, to a large extent dependent on the school. Moreover, since it is in the school's interests for pupils to be successful in external exams, there would seem to be no conflict of interests between the school and exam-oriented pupils. In theory, both pupils and teachers are working together to achieve the same objective. Here, in

contrast to the case of the low stream or band two pupils given more attention in the literature, a consensus rather than a conflict model of classroom relations might be thought to be more appropriate. However, while this reciprocity of interests would lead one to expect there to be an absence of deviance on the part of exam-oriented pupils, my observations of such pupils in lessons revealed that they quite frequently engaged in deviant activities and that there was indeed conflict with teachers. This clearly requires some explanation. If pupils are committed to passing exams, deviance would appear to be contrary to their own interests as well as to those of the teacher. However, it is worth noting that passing examinations may not be the only concern these pupils have. Deviant acts might be motivated by alternative interests. Two plausible motives are:

- The attractions of deviance. Despite commitment to examination success, pupils may find certain deviant courses of action irresistible.
- Peer-group pressures towards deviance. Exam-oriented pupils who wish to attain status in certain peer groups might have to be deviant on occasions in order to do so.

In that deviance motivated in this way is contrary to the academic goals of these pupils, teachers can appeal to such goals in attempts to enforce conformity. One aspect of the hidden curriculum of exams, evident in these extracts, is that with certain pupils appeal to exams can facilitate teacher control. The dependence of exam-oriented pupils on teachers gives these teachers considerable power over them. An obvious implication is that teachers have less ability to control those pupils who are not exam-motivated. Not surprisingly, perhaps, teachers sometimes tried to make pupils exam-motivated. Attempts were made to persuade low ability pupils that they could be successful in exams if they tried to the academic goals of these pupils, teachers can appeal to such goals in attempts to enforce conformity. .If one aspect of the hidden curriculum of exams is the facilitation of teacher control; another is 'instrumentalism' on the part of pupils. That is, the examination itself is perceived as the sole purpose of school. Official goals which are unrelated to exams are dismissed. Moreover, the pupils set out to learn not the official syllabus, but only what is needed in order to pass the exam. One pupil who had adopted this instrumental attitude felt that if you were not taking exams at all school would be a complete waste of time.

Similarly, there is evidence that pupils tried to adopt 'short cuts' of the kind described in their work on university students. If a topic is not compulsory in the exam it can be treated as non-essential. Similarly, if a certain topic is unlikely to come up in the exams there are good grounds for dismissing it as unimportant. Of course, at university level, because the lecturers set the questions and mark the papers, students tend to be sensitive to cues about what is likely to be on the exam paper. Indeed, some students actively seek this information. Some students try to find out what the faculty thinks is important and revise only those topics. However, in schools, because exams are external, teachers can be no more than 'cue conscious' themselves. So, for school pupils, finding out what the teacher thinks is important may be of no help whatsoever since the examiners' favorite topics and those of individual teachers are unlikely to correspond. The teacher may engage in 'question spotting' and can base his or her guesses on considerable knowledge of previous exam papers.

Nevertheless, it is up to the pupils themselves to decide whether the teacher's guesswork is likely to be any better than their own. As well as 'question spotting', some teachers were prepared to provide pupils with 'tips' on how to pass exams and to go along with the instrumental attitude, accepting that it was not the subject that was being learned but how to pass the exam. Teachers were sometimes quite explicit about this. Despite conflict over preparation for exams and output, it is notable that pupils did not seem to challenge the mode of teaching prevalent in exam courses. Thus one aspect of the hidden curriculum of exams which seemed to be accepted by both pupils and teachers was the utilization of formal instruction and dictation as the best way to cover the material on the exam syllabus. Obviously, teaching style was to some extent dictated by the subject. In maths, for example, formal instruction tended to be predominant in exam classes. In geography nearly every lesson at sixth-form level consisted of dictation. Indeed, the teacher only had to begin speaking and pupils would begin writing down what he said! In non-exam classes, however, especially with the less able, this mode of teaching was almost entirely absent and the teaching was very activity-based; the reason for this was that such pupils were expected to find more formal methods too difficult and uninteresting. With those doing exams, material had to be taught in what was assumed to be the most efficient way interesting or not. Teachers did not see it as part of their role to have to motivate exam pupils. Such pupils were expected to be self-motivated.

I have considered some of the effects of external examinations on those pupils for whom passing exams is an important goal. The implication of much existing work on pupil orientations is that these pupils would be expected to adopt a 'conformist' orientation to school and that teacher and pupil relations would be characterized by consensus. However, this does not seem to be the case, suggesting the need for a deeper exploration of the reasons for deviance on the part of exam-oriented pupils. What emerges is a difference between such pupils and their teachers over the centrality of exams. Although all deviance cannot be accounted for in this way, some of it appears to result from disagreements among pupils and teachers over the priority of exam preparation. Whereas teachers give considerable emphasis to the social side of school, many of the most 'able' pupils adopt an instrumental attitude, rejecting what does not help to prepare them for exams. They are not willing simply to conform to all institutional requirements. Indeed, they exercise their own judgment even over what kinds of school work will and will not help them to pass their exams. As a result, pupils we might have expected to share the values of the school and to conform to its demands come into conflict with their teachers, and over an issue on which one might have expected there to be consensus - over helping them to pass examinations.

On the question of where power over assessment procedures is located, this too is associated with the form of evaluative control - process or product. In process evaluation, power over assessment procedures resides in that part of the education system which controls inspection usually central but to some extent also local government. In the case of product evaluation, power is located more within those institutions which control the design and administration of assessment procedures usually in central government together with local government authorities to whom some limited power has been devolved, and also, in decentralized systems, in a large number of other

non-statutory **bodies** such as examination boards and their clients (notably parents, pupils, employers and, of course, teachers themselves). Thus, a consideration of the nature and amount of control over their practice experienced by teachers in terms of assessment procedures demands a more complex conceptualization than the traditional centralized/decentralized dichotomy. In particular, it requires a theoretical model which is based on the way in which the education system actually works rather than on its formal administrative arrangements alone. Only such a model, which takes the form and location of assessment procedures as determining criteria, can explain the increasing convergence in the form of control between the two societies at the present time, a convergence which, as the following section sets out, cannot be explained simply in terms of movements along the continuum between centralization and decentralization.

Thus the orientation procedure neatly solves several problems at once. First, it provides a means of selection and of controlling pupil and parent frustration at a time when public opinion is still strongly egalitarian and democratic. Secondly, it provides for greater 'product evaluation' control of teachers by clearing away some of the traditional assessment bureaucracy and making teachers directly and visibly responsible for their actions. Thirdly, it allows for a more technocratic, depersonalized approach to educational administration and more efficient 'process evaluation'. Fourthly, it provides for the most effective sort of assessment control of teachers a combination of 'process' and 'product' evaluation in which the central prescription of curriculum norms is linked to the formal processes of pupil assessment. For teachers, the effect of these four closely interrelated processes which nominally increase their power is likely to be the removal of much of the traditional impotency of central government whilst giving them a quite new vulnerability to consumer pressure.

Where does all this leave the teacher? I have described some of the limitations on the autonomy of the teacher in two ostensibly very different education systems. It has been particularly concerned with the way in which that autonomy is regulated by assessment procedures. I have suggested that teachers in both systems are closely controlled by the prevailing assessment procedures although these have traditionally taken and continue to take different forms in the two countries. In England there has been something of an oscillation between a more 'free market', decentralized approach to assessment control mediated by the semi-autonomous exam boards and the links they in turn have with the universities at times of plenty, and more directive, centralized strategies based on the tighter control of public examining and institutional accountability when economic and social problems dictate a more utilitarian direction for educational activity. In France, by contrast, the development has been from what was, in fact, the relative freedom of a highly centralized system in which assessment control was vested in national, government-run selective examinations and personal teacher inspection. This has been replaced by a nominally more decentralized, positive control based on a reflexive relationship between teacher-conducted continuous assessment according to nationally prescribed norms, and an increasingly corporate management approach to educational administration, provision and control. The information thereby generated provides an increasingly powerful means of both directing the careers of individual pupils and the education system as a whole. By the same token, the institution of continuous assessment based on national norms now not only exhorts teachers - as the system has always done but makes that exhortation effective as these norms relate directly to the assessment of pupil progress and simultaneously provide for the national statistical monitoring of educational standards within the system.

The activities of the 'Assessment of Performance Unit' are similar to some aspects of the French initiative. The search for national norms as assessment criteria at the present time is also a comparable development. A currently less developed but potentially very significant trend in many countries is the increasing government as well as popular support for the idea of 'profiles' based on continuous assessment and culminating in a 'positive' statement or certificate for all pupils. Whilst this initiative, like that in France, has much to recommend it educationally, it has the potential to provide for the very effective imposition of centrally-determined curricular norms and pedagogic directives. If in some ways such a development can be seen as a step towards greater equality of educational provision, it is much more significantly a step towards much greater control of teachers' aims and practice. In the past teachers' autonomy was safeguarded by the lack of central curricular prescriptions which meant that, despite the very powerful control exerted by the emphasis on 'product evaluation', there was considerable room for individual teachers, pressure groups and semi-autonomous bodies such as the exam boards to influence the content of that control. In the same way, in the past, teachers' autonomy was safeguarded by the relatively minor role of 'product evaluation' despite their location within a highly centralized, bureaucratic education system in which every aspect of pedagogic activity, and especially curricular objectives, was tightly controlled. The increasing similarity of the two systems reflects the fact that each is tending to institute the aspect hitherto lacking to ensure effective control. Perhaps even more important than this increasingly effective control, however, is the growing association of educational administration in both countries with a corporate management approach. Such an approach is likely to disguise the essentially political nature of educational goals in an ideology of scientific rationality. In this event, value judgments appear as merely administrative decisions dictated by rationality and the goal of maximizing efficiency. It seems probable that effective educational control implies the existence of a social order ready to concur in educational goals - the way in which assessment procedures help to bring this about will perhaps prove ultimately more significant than their role in imposing such goals.

Conclusion

Nevertheless, the "marginal man" is caught between two societies that are "antagonistic." As he navigates his way between these two societies, he experiences a "conflict of cultures," and with it, "inner turmoil and intense self-consciousness." Notion of the "marginal man" had a strong influence on American social thought. While focus is on the inner conflicts of marginal people as they lived between two worlds, more recent scholars have tended to shift the emphasis away from the inner self and notions of individual ambivalence and uncertainty to the inequities and conflicts between those at the center and those on society's perimeter dissidents, women, ethnic groups, radicals, and other minorities. Unlike many works on education, which are concerned solely with schools, this paper uses a broader definition of education "the

deliberate, systematic, and sustained effort to transmit, evoke, or acquire knowledge, attitudes, values, skills, or sensibilities, as well as any outcomes of that effort." This definition includes schooling but also goes beyond it. Conversely, it is more limited than the larger processes of socialization and acculturation. The broader definition of education used here is important for those concerned with formal policies and actual practices as they affect minorities, because so much of education occurs outside the schools. The need of the hour is to delve into historical subjects and the different "angles of vision" on two major themes that form the conceptual core of school curriculum.

REFERENCES

Apple, M.W. 1982. Education and Power. Boston, Mass.: Routledge and Kegal Paul.

Apple, M.W. and WEIS, L. 1983. Ideology and Practice in Schooling. Philadelphia, Pa: Temple University Press.

Apple, Michael W. 2000. Official Knowledge, London: Routledge.

Apple, Michael W. and Christian-Smith, Linda K. 1991. 'The politics of the textbook', in Michael W. Apple and Linda K. Christian-Smith (eds) The Politics of the Textbook, New York: Routledge: 1-21.

Bain, L.L. 1985a. 'The Hidden Curriculum Re-examined.' Quest, 37, 145–53.

Bain, L.L. 1985b. 'A Naturalistic Study of Students' Responses to an Exercise Class.' Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 5, 2–12.

Bain, L.L. 1986. 'Issues of Gender, Race and Class in Health Promotion Programs.' Paper

Bain, L.L. 1988. 'Beginning the Journey: Agenda for 2001.' Quest, 40(2), 96–106.

Bourdieu, Pierre and Passeron, Jean-Claude (1977/1990) second edition. Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture, London: Sage Publications.

Bowles, S. and Gintis, H. 1976. Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life, New York: Basic Books.

Cherryholmes, C.H. 1988. Power and Criticism: Poststructural Investigations in Education. New York: Teachers College Press.

Coleman, J.S. 1965. Adolescents and the Schools. New York: Basic Books.

District Information System for Education (DISE): Major Findings 2005-06. New Delhi.

Dore, Ronald. 1976. The Diploma Disease: Education, Qualification and Development, London: George Allen and Unwin. Second edition published in 1997 by the Institute of Education University of London.

Everhart, R.B. 1983. Reading, Writing and Resistance: Adolescence and Labor in a Junior High School. Boston, Mass.: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Giroux, H. 1981. 'Pedagogy, Pessimism and the Politics of Conformity: A Reply to Linda McNeil.' Curriculum Inquiry, 11(3), 211–22.

Government of India (n.d.). Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan Framework.

Griffin, P.S. 1984. 'Girls' Participation Patterns in a Middle School Team Sports Unit.' *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education,* 4, 30–8.

Griffin, P.S. 1985a. 'Boys' Participation Styles in a Middle School Physical Education Sports Unit.' *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education,* 4, 100–10.

Griffin, P.S. 1985c. 'Teaching in an Urban Multiracial Physical Education Program: The Power of Context.' Quest, 37, 154–65.

Griffin, P.S. 1989. 'Gender as a Socializing Agent in Physical Education,' in TEMPLIN, T.J.

Hall, M.A. 1988. 'The Discourse of Gender and Sport: From Femininity to Feminism.' Sociology of Sport Journal, 5(4), 330 40.

Illich, Ivan, 1970. Deschooling Society, New York: Harper and Row.

Kumar, Krishna, 1991. Political Agenda of Education, New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Little, Angela W. 1997. 'The diploma disease twenty years on: An introduction', special issue of Assessment in Education, 4 (1): 5-21.

Majumdar, Manabi and Jos Mooij, 2011. Education and Inequality in India. A Classroom View, London: Routledge.

Mehta, Arun C. 2005. Elementary Education in Unrecognized Schools in India: A Study of Punjab based on DISE 2005 Data. New Delhi, India: NUEPA

Muralidharan, Kartik and Kremer, Michael. 2006. Private and Public Schools in Rural India. mimeo), Harvard University.

Narayan, Krishna and Mooij, Jos. 2010. 'Solutions to teacher absenteeism in government primary schools in India: A comparison of management approaches, *The Open Education Journal,* 3: 44-52.

National University of Educational Planning and Administration (NUEPA) (2007. November.

Nussbaum, Martha C. 2005. 'Freedom from dead habit', The Little Magazine, VI (1 & 2): 18-32.

Physical Education, pp. 71–85. Champaign, Ill.: Human Kinetics, Publishers. presented at the 12th Conference on Research on Women and Education, Washington, D.C.

Rich, A. 1980. 'Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence.' *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society,* 5(4), 631–60.

Robeyns, Ingrid. 2006. 'Three models of education: Rights, capabilities and human capital', Theory and Research in Education 4 (1): 69-84.

School Physical Education Program.' Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 56(2), 103– 10.

Sen, Amartya. 1999a. Development as Freedom, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Silberman, M. Ed. 1971. The Experience of Schooling. New York: Holt, Rine-hart and Winston.

Tagore, Rabindranath. 1907. 'Manipulations and distortions in education', (in Bengali. in Rabindra Rachanabali (Collection of Essays), Kolkata: Sri Swaraswati Press: 537-45.

Tooley, James and Dixon, Pauline. 2003. Private Schools for the Poor: A Case Study from India. Reading: CfBT Research & Development.

Unesco, 2005. Education for All. The Quality Imperative. EFA Global Monitoring Report. Paris: Unesco

Willis, Paul. 1977. Learning to Labour: How Working Class Kids Get Working Class Jobs. Farnborough : Saxon House.

****