

THE INTERNET IS NOT A PANACEA

TOM CONLON

SYNOPSIS

Technology enthusiasts and politicians have portrayed the Internet in unrealistic and misleading ways which give an inflated impression of its suitability for school education. This paper seeks to redress the balance. It argues that the Internet is not a library, nor a 'community', nor a panacea for difficult problems of teaching and learning. To determine the benefits and pitfalls for education will require extensive research and evaluation in which not only the Internet but also its alternatives should be explored. Until this is done, the option of saying no to the Internet is a legitimate one for schools.

INTRODUCTION

The growth of the Internet — and especially of its multimedia arm, the World Wide Web — has been truly phenomenal. In June 1993 the Internet connected approximately 1.3 million computers across the globe and Web sites numbered around 130. By July 1996 the corresponding figures were 12.9 million and 230,000; by January 1997 the Web had grown to 650,000 sites (Scientific American, 1997). In the space of a few years, the Internet which previously had been the province mainly of scientists and engineers has been massively transformed.

Undoubtedly the Internet brings opportunities to education, including (the focus of this paper) school education; but it also presents a new set of problems. Unfortunately, neither the opportunities nor the problems are yet well understood. For example, the National Council for Educational Technology (NCET) points out that: 'There is no quantitative evidence of the impact and benefits of the Internet on UK education to date.' (NCET, 1997)

Neither is there much evidence that is qualitative. According to the NCET, less than 1% of all teachers have personal Internet subscriptions and no more than 4% of primary schools have an Internet connection (NCET, 1996b). About 80% of secondary schools have connections but this may mean no more than a single computer (perhaps used for administration) with a modem link. Very few schools currently have the dedicated broadband network connections that are necessary for significant levels of classroom use.

Given this context, the best way forward surely lies through research and carefully planned trials. Unfortunately schools are under pressure to move quickly. Telephone and cable companies, Internet service providers, and hardware and software vendors all regard education as a potentially lucrative source of revenue. Technology enthusiasts and politicians add to the clamour. Schools are vulnerable to such pressure, especially since the creation of an educational 'marketplace' has set school against school in a competition to win the support of parents.

In his book 'Silicon Snake Oil', Clifford Stoll has provided a sharp critique of the exaggerated claims and distortions that have been made for the Internet in the USA (Stoll, 1995). Unfortunately in the UK critical debate seems hardly yet to have begun whilst the pressure groups have gained enormous momentum. Doubtless a critical and reflective literature will emerge eventually, as has happened in previous phases of technology development in education (e.g. Robins & Webster, 1989; Solomonides & Levidow, 1985; Conlon & Cope, 1989). However, the rate of change in this field is such that if critical analysis is to be able to influence policy, it must begin sooner rather than later.

The aim of this paper is to stimulate such timely critical analysis. I do so by offering a critique of claims that have been made by UK politicians and technology enthusiasts. Specifically, I argue that:

- Politicians and technology enthusiasts have often presented unrealistic images of the Internet.
- In particular, the Internet is not a library.
- Neither is the Internet a 'community'.
- Neither is the Internet a panacea for problems of teaching and learning.

It hardly needs to be said that although this paper takes a critical line, it does not therefore amount to an argument that the Internet is good for nothing. The scope of this paper is quite limited: it mostly relates to the World Wide Web, and to the published comments of a few individuals. The author's view in summary is that the Internet is actually quite promising as a resource for teachers but there are good reasons to question its suitability as a resource for children. More importantly, the paper represents a plea for balanced and rigorous evaluation, a process that is not helped by a commitment in advance to simplistic positions.

IMAGES OF THE INTERNET

How is the Internet portrayed at present? The NCET begins its account 'What is the Internet?' with the following quotation, which it offers without comment:

The Net is possibly the largest store of information on this planet. Everybody can be part of it; it is one of the few places where race, creed, colour, gender, sexual preference do not prejudice people against others. All this through the magic of modern technology. Communication is the key. People talking to people. The Net isn't computers. That's just the way we access it. The Net is people helping each other in a world-wide community. (NCET, 1995)

This is the *Internet-as-utopia*: a virtual paradise in which human imperfections vanish under the benign influence of technology. Sadly, the image of utopia is only too easily dispelled. Racist, violent, and pornographic material is commonplace on the Internet. An investigation by Harold Thimbelby, Professor of Computing Research at Middlesex University, indicated that 47% of the 11,000 most often repeated searches on the World Wide Web were pornographic. Thimbelby concluded: 'The Internet has been called a global electronic village. If so, most of it is a heavily-used red light district.' (Thimbleby, 1995)

Other images of the Internet come from politicians. In November 1996 Raymond Robertson, the Scottish Education Minister, announced the creation of a new Superhighways Task Force. Robertson said:

Make no mistake. New technology is coming fast and it is improving even faster. Its effects are inescapable... we need to monitor the beneficial changes it has so that we can spread good practice throughout our schools. In this way we can begin to shape the classroom of tomorrow. (Robertson, 1996)

Here the images are more mixed. The promise of a better future is combined with a threat: join the bandwagon or be crushed by it. The Internet is equated with educational progress. Acceptance of the technology is to be unconditional and uncritical.

Robertson was speaking at the Scottish Council for Educational Technology (SCET) conference 'Lifelong Learning in a Wired World'. At the same conference, SCET's Chief Executive Nigel Paine promised that his organisation would assist

Scotland to become '100% wired' to the Internet during 1997.¹ Paine said:

... the best service we can do our young people is to help them leave education at whatever age, not just skilled in a particular subject area, but confident and competent in a technological world. The best thing we can do for our adults is to help them on the first steps towards coping and competing in that world. The point is, we either wake up to what is happening around us, we equip our people to survive in that world or we die, not fast, but slowly the sad economic death of obsolescence. (Paine, 1996)

What images are we offered here? The language is tough, perhaps even Thatcherite. The Internet is presented as the nation's chance of gaining a competitive edge in the grim struggle that is the global economy. So dire would be the consequences of failure that the very purpose of education must be redefined (inevitably, in technological terms) to ensure our salvation. Paine's rhetoric is evangelistic, even messianic, as befits one who believes that he holds the key to a life and death struggle.

Of course, these few short extracts can only give a brief flavour of public pronouncements about the Internet. Yet, having read many such statements I believe that they accurately convey some of the recurring images advanced by the UK Internet pressure groups. The Internet is presented as:

- An idealised community;
- The path to educational progress and to 'the classroom of tomorrow';
- An unstoppable force: schools have no choice but to accommodate it;
- The key to our future economic prosperity.

I believe that such images are unbalanced and misleading. In the next few sections, I argue against three specific misrepresentations.

THE INTERNET IS NOT A LIBRARY

In their descriptions of the Internet, technology enthusiasts are fond of the metaphor of the *Internet-as-library*. For example, Nigel Paine tells the *Times Educational Supplement*: 'It is like a library with all its books scattered on the floor.' (TES, 1997)

The metaphor is appealing since libraries are universally respected. However, it is also deeply misleading. The Internet is not a library, not only because of its chaotic organisation but also because it lacks the most essential attribute of a library: books. With exceptions such as the Bible, the Internet has very few books on-line. One reason is financial: the Internet provides no satisfactory method of paying publishers for their work. Another is practical: reading a book from a computer screen is not very pleasant.

What then does the Internet contain? Since the information is given away free, the content leans heavily on advertisers and sales-people of various kinds. Recent figures suggest that around two-thirds of Web sites are commercial (Scientific American, 1997). Also, because anyone with a computer can publish on the Internet, the mad, the sad and the bad are all there. The Web is now the favoured recruitment medium for cults, such as the Heaven's Gate cult which recently committed mass suicide in the belief that a spaceship hidden behind the Hale-Bopp comet would transport their bodies to paradise (Scotland on Sunday, 1997). Internet users are never more than a dozen keystrokes away from illegal material and the case of three Berwick schoolboys shows that some of this material will find its way to curious youngsters. The boys downloaded details of how to make Molotov cocktails and hallucinogenic drugs, steal by credit card fraud, and use one-handed killing techniques. They tried out the credit card fraud and ended up in court (Scotsman, 1994).

Fortunately, such desperate material is uncommon: a high proportion of Web pages are merely trivial. Michael Fry nicely characterises these pages as:

... rather like teenagers' bedrooms, a whole mixture of daft things: collages stuck on the wall, naughty things under the bed, No Entry Signs nailed to the door, odd collections that express individuality and the desire to shock and break out. (quoted in *Net*, 1997)

On the Internet, absence of regulation means (among other things) lack of any form of quality control: a document need not be seen by anyone, other than its author, prior to publication. In contrast, publishers, editors, reviewers, the paying public, and library boards all exercise an influence in determining whether a book will appear on a library shelf. Although the system is not perfect, these mediating influences do ensure that libraries are largely free of illegal, trivial and commercial material.

The Internet does contain high-quality material. The problem is how to find it among the millions of on-line documents. Libraries index their collections according to standard classification schemes, such as the Dewey Decimal system: no such scheme is enforced on the Internet. On the World Wide Web, information can be pursued by 'surfing' (the hopeful practice of following links from page to page) or by entering keywords into a search program. Keyword searching is often confounded by the sheer size of the Internet, and by the unreliability of its content: a typical search may produce hundreds or thousands of 'hits', without any guarantees about the quality or authenticity of the documents uncovered.

So is the Internet 'like a library'? Yes, if a library can be imagined which has no librarians and hardly any books; which has an abundance of material that is blatantly deviant, commercial, untruthful, or trivial; where nobody accepts responsibility for what is on the shelves; and without any method of classifying the collection. That's some library.

THE INTERNET IS NOT A COMMUNITY

The notion (mentioned earlier) of the Internet as 'people helping each other in a world-wide community' is not only romantically simplistic, it also misleads in an important sense. The Internet is not a community. At any rate, it is not a community in the meaningful sense described, for example, by Sergiovanni:

...communities are collections of individuals who are bonded together by natural will and who are together binded to a shared set of ideas and ideals. This binding and bonding is tight enough to transform them from a collection of 'I's into a collective 'we'. As a 'we' members are part of a tightly knit web of meaningful relationships. (Sergiovanni, 1994)

What are the shared ideas of the Internet's 100 million users? A common set of electronic communication protocols hardly constitutes a meaningful relationship. One might equally well speak of a 'national grid community' or a 'radio wave community' as a community of the Internet.

Yet, although the Internet is patently not a community, communities do use it. This is where some interesting questions lie. When a community — say a fishing club, an environmental group, a school — adopts the Internet, do the bonds of that community become stronger or weaker as a result? Would a locally controlled computer network help with community relationships more than a global one, like the Internet? Who influences the community in choosing its technology, and with what motives?

Unfortunately, there seem to be no studies of school communities which can answer such questions in the context of education. However, studies of the

introduction of new technology into Scottish industry reveal that the management objectives behind change are the product of complex strategic choice, but issues related to *power* and *control* are often to the fore (McLoughlin & Clark, 1995). It would be naive not to expect such issues to arise also in education, and indeed they are already discernible in the speeches of ministers and policy makers, as the following quotations show:

But not just business can benefit from the Information Age. Far from it. Education is a very important area too. The Superhighways for Education Initiative has been launched, and my own department is running Schools on-line, a pilot project involving 60 schools and over 150 teachers with 18 sponsoring companies. This project is exploring how to use the resources of the Internet to deliver the National Curriculum. (Taylor, 1996)

In schools in the longer term we may see an overall decline in the numbers of teachers to pupils in favour of more adults with different skills, such as network technicians for instance or resource managers/librarians. The trend could be towards fewer, but more highly IT qualified teachers managing the work of other skilled adults involved in the learning process. (NCET, 1996a)

Thus, behind choices that may seem to be merely technological there lie visions — contestable, ideologically inspired visions — of how schools should change, and under whose power and control. The Internet is not inevitably an empowering force. It will hardly be perceived as such by teachers if, having already learned to be wary of a centrally controlled curriculum, they are now told to give up their jobs in order that ‘network technicians’ can deliver it more efficiently.

Relationships between males and females may also be affected by the Internet. Dale Spender, a feminist writer who has conducted a study of this subject, reports that females on-line are outnumbered twenty to one by males. Furthermore, the Internet provides an anonymity which seems to encourage abusive and coercive sexist behaviour. Spender writes:

The studies that have been done on communication on the net make it clear that it’s more a male monologue than a mixed-sex conversation. The discourse is male; the style is adversarial. The premises are winning or losing. Despite the enormous potential of the net to be a network — to promote egalitarian, cooperative communication exchanges — the virtual reality is one where aggression, intimidation and macho-mode prevail. As some perceptive researchers have noted, the behaviour is not so different from that of aggressive men behind the wheel of the car on the road. (Spender, 1995)

Spender quotes numerous examples of sexual harassment — and worse — on the Internet. She recommends that women adopt a gender neutral name, or a male pseudonym, ‘...simply to avoid some of the hassle... any blatant feminine names that are out there (such as ‘Marilyn’) probably belong to men in drag’. (*Ibid*, p. 245)

It is of course sad that such a tactic should be thought necessary; clearly it underlines the need for caution in proposals for children’s use of the Internet. Yet there is no echo of this in, for example, the recent recommendation of Tony Blair’s IT inquiry group that all children aged nine and above should be given personal electronic mail accounts on the Internet (Stevenson, 1997).

Can any characterisation of the Internet be wider from the mark than ‘world-wide community’? Unfortunately, yes. A new Scottish course on the Internet aimed at 16–18 year olds tells teachers: ‘It is important to emphasise the democratic, de-centralised nature of the Internet.’ (Higher Still Development Unit, 1997)

De-centralised, certainly; but the notion of the Internet as *democratic* is astounding. A more accurate label may be *anarchistic*, although that label sits uneasily alongside the powerful forces that drive IT in the world today – for example Gates and Murdoch, the telephone and cable companies, and the communications moguls.

THE INTERNET IS NOT A PANACEA

In his (previously mentioned) speech at the ‘Lifelong Learning in a Wired World’ conference, Nigel Paine related a tale of a Glasgow teacher who asked a pupil to name two types of fish:

...the pupil replied Single and Special. What do you do with a pupil like that? How do you balance the very narrow view of the world that can’t see further than the fish and chip shop? You could do it by lecturing at them, not very successful; you could do it by giving them a book which they probably will not be interested in reading; you can send them to the library to do research, or you can let them loose on the Internet. In half an hour that pupil could visit aquaria around the world. She could learn about hundreds of different species of fish, learn about their physical characteristics, the way they see, the way they hear and could come back entranced, perhaps excited and perhaps motivated to learn more. In that one single instant she could break out of the cycle of narrow focus and lack of interest in knowing more than she already does and seeing no further than the end of her street. (Paine, 1996)

This is the *Internet-as-panacea*: pictures of fish on a computer screen provide a miraculous cure for a woefully impoverished knowledge of the environment. Of course, one suspects that the pupil’s original remark was actually intended as ironic. But even accepting the situation at face value, why should we believe that the Internet scenario gives the best possible outcome? The tale could have ended quite differently. For example, each of these alternative endings seems at least plausible:

- The teacher takes the class on a day out to Marine World. They see, touch and feed real fish, talk with the keepers, and take home sea shells.
- The teacher provides a lesson (not a ‘lecture’) which is actually highly effective: it is skillfully pitched towards the pupil’s existing knowledge and interests, involves group discussion, and makes good use of audiovisual materials.
- The pupil tries the Internet but can’t find any pictures of fish. She looks at lots of pages of information from the Web: they take an age to load and mostly turn out to be articles from academic journals, none of which she understands.
- The pupil successfully uses the Internet but finds her way to extreme pornographic material. Her parents subsequently complain to the School Board.
- The pupil finds some very nice pictures of fish which the teacher later incorporates into a teaching package. The school is sued for breach of copyright.

The beauty of telling a tale is that the narrator gets to choose the ending.

Technology evangelists have been forecasting the demise of the teacher and the school for a long time. Nearly thirty years ago Ivan Illich recommended the use of ‘liberating technologies’ — he meant the postal service and the telephone — to create an *educational web* (Illich, 1971). More recently, the teacher’s role has been variously challenged by developments in Resource-Based Learning, Interactive Video, and Intelligent Tutoring Systems. Although these ideas all have merit, it is

fair to say that their impact has been generally less than their proponents predicted. Why? One explanation is that schooling is necessarily a social experience — one in which a child's live interaction with his or her peers and teachers plays an essential part. Another is that technologists exaggerate the effectiveness of new methods. They underestimate the skills of a good teacher and undervalue the teacher's role.

This isn't to deny that Paine's scenario is possible — the child 'let loose on the Internet' may indeed learn and be motivated. However, there are good reasons why we should regard this as optimistic, including the following:

- The child may not be able to find relevant, high-quality information that is pitched at an appropriate level.
- Even if she looks in exactly the right place, the network may not be able to deliver the required information. The Web is inherently unreliable: there is no guarantee that an address reached yesterday will be contactable today. Long waits which end with messages saying 'The site cannot be accessed' are common and not very motivating. They may however be expensive.²
- Even if the required information is obtained, it may not much help the child to learn. Research into the effectiveness of hypertext and hypermedia (i.e. electronically linked structures of information, like the Web) indicates that it is not particularly good for novices initially attempting to learn about a topic (Charney, 1994). McKendree, Reader and Hammond report that:

There is no reason to believe that hypertext is any more easily assimilated with what the reader already knows than a linear text. A linear text is an exquisitely connected structure... Assimilation requires actively comparing, contrasting, questioning, and applying what is being read and what has been previously learned. If a hypertext can encourage learners to actively engage in this manner, it will be effective. But there is no reason to think that simply because it is done in hypertext form it will be more likely to invoke such strategies than a good book. (McKendree, Reader & Hammond, 1995)

This does not mean that good on-line learning resources are impossible. But enough is known about the technology to make safe a prediction that their development will require a lot of work, and to expect that existing Web pages — even millions of them, with lots of pictures — will save us the trouble of asking too much. McKendree *et al* counsel software developers against superficial approaches. They recommend that:

...building in a combination of relevant work and a supportive environment is more effective for learners than giving them a whizzy, fact-filled 'multimedia experience'.

As with much of IT, on the Internet appearance threatens to triumph over substance. Teachers should not be misled. For instance, learners working with the Web may well produce colourful project reports. But cutting and pasting is not the same as learning: it may simply be plagiarism.

CONCLUSION

Contrary to the impressions which may have been given by some UK politicians and technology enthusiasts, the Internet is neither a library, nor a community, nor a panacea for difficult problems of teaching and learning. These are simplistic notions which, given the pressure upon schools to look good in the 'education marketplace', could be dangerously misleading.

At this early stage, any appraisal of the Internet's potential role in schools should

be tentative. Perhaps however we can usefully distinguish the Internet's prospects as a tool for *teachers* from its prospects as a tool for *children*. As a tool for teachers, the Internet's negative features — its chaotic organisation, its absence of quality control, its unreliability — might be outweighed by its benefits as a powerful medium for research and communication. In higher education, the Internet has been effective when strategically used by skilled and knowledgeable adults.³ Teachers who have Internet links in their homes and staff bases may likewise find them to be of value.

But as a tool for children, the negative features loom large and the benefits are much less clear. To determine the balance of advantage will require extensive research. As a minimum, schools will require assurances that children are safe from the violent, pornographic, racist, cult-oriented, and other unsuitable material that contaminates the Internet. Software screening systems such as *Cyber Patrol* (Microsystems Ltd.) may provide part of the answer, but computer security systems are never foolproof or without disadvantage and careful evaluation will be necessary. Until this research and evaluation is done, schools that would not dream of allowing strangers to walk unchallenged into their buildings will be justified in taking a similarly cautious line towards the 'virtual visitors' who may arrive through the Internet. The option of saying no to the Internet is legitimate.

There are alternatives to the Internet which might bring some of the same kinds of benefit with less risk: for example, internal school networks (Intranets), reference materials on CD-ROM, and subscription-based conferencing systems. More radically, a computer network could be created exclusively for education. Obviously this would require a major public service investment, but there are precedents. In the USA, the Clinton administration has announced that a new computer network, separate from the Internet, is to be developed so that scientists and engineers who now find the Internet hopelessly choked with data traffic can get back to work (*Scientific American*, 1997). In the UK finance houses and banks have decided similarly to develop their own private networks, recognising that to piggy-back for free on the unregulated Internet is not a good long-term strategy.

The history of IT in education suggests that technology evangelism is unhelpful. By misrepresenting complex issues as clear-cut, the evangelists short-circuit or polarise debate. The danger is that alternatives are overlooked and the role of research and evaluation is marginalised. Furthermore, evangelism inflates expectations to unrealistic levels and hence makes subsequent disillusionment almost inevitable. A slogan such as '100% wired by 1997' may have momentary appeal but schools concerned to plan for the future will want to look beyond mere soundbites: the technology choices and their implications for teachers, learners and communities could be far-reaching.

NOTES

¹ SCET itself had less than two years of Internet connection experience at the time of Paine's speech.

² Costs to schools of Internet connections depend partly on the connection type. A report by McKinsey and Company (*The Future of Information Technology in UK Schools*, 1997) recommends that schools obtain dedicated leased line connections. These avoid tariff arrangements but are expensive at commercial rates (between £7,200 and £33,000 per school per year according to the capacity of the connection). Recently UK cable companies have announced a variety of special arrangements which appear to offer schools much lower costs, but as always, *caveat emptor is* the rule.

³ It is unwise to place too much reliance on Internet research sources. For example, how likely is it that the World Wide Web references given at the end of this paper will still be accessible in five years' time?

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

For helpful comments on a draft form of this paper I offer thanks to Peter Cope and John Fairley. Thanks also to many Moray House colleagues who provided feedback and encouragement.

REFERENCES

- Charney, D. (1994), *The Impact of Hypertext on processes of reading and writing*. In Sef, C. & Hilligoss, S. (Eds), *Literacy and Computers: the complications of teaching and learning with technology*. New York: Modern Language Association.
- Conlon, T. & Cope, P. (Eds). (1989), *Computing in Scottish Education: the First Decade and Beyond*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Higher Still Development Unit (1997), Support Notes of 'The Internet', a module proposed for an Intermediate 2 level course in Information Systems, p.6.
- Illich, I. (1971), *Deschooling Society*. Harper and Row.
- McKendree, J., Reader, W., and Hammond, J. (1995) *The 'homeopathic fallacy' in learning from hypertext*. In: Interactions, ACM Press, 23, 7, 4–82.
- McLoughlin, I. & Clark, J. (1995) *Technological Change at Work*. In: Heap, N., Thomas, R., Einon, G, Mason, R. & Mackay, H. (Eds) *Information Technology and Society*. Open University: Sage Publications, 1995.
- Microsystems Software Ltd., *Cyber Patrol*, Silwood Park, Ascot, UK SL5 7PW. Tel: 01344 874111.
- NCET (1995), *Highways for Learning – The Internet for schools and colleges: What is the Internet?* <http://www.ncet.org.uk/publications/highways/full.html>
- NCET (1996a) *NCET Response to House of Lords Committee on Science and Technology Sub-Committee Information Superhighway: Applications in Society*, March. <http://www.ncet.org.uk/temps/ish.html>
- NCET (1996b), *Internet Bulletin. How many UK schools are on the Internet?* 12 November. <http://www.ncet.org.uk/gen-sheets/intbull.html>
- NCET (1997), *Highways for Learning – The Internet for schools and colleges: Towards an Evaluation*. <http://www.ncet.org.uk/publications/highways/full.html>
- Net Magazine* (1997) March, p. 118.
- Paine, N. (1996), speech to SCET conference 'Lifelong Learning In a Wired World', November. <http://www.scet.org.uk/liveconf/NPKey.htm>
- Robins, R. & Webster, F. (1989), *The Technical Fix: Education, Computers and Industry*. Macmillan.
- Robertson, R. MP (1996), speech to SCET conference 'Lifelong Learning In a Wired World', November 96. <http://www.scet.org.uk/liveconf/sment.htm>
- Scientific American*, (1997) March, pp.42–45.
- Scotland on Sunday*, (1997) 30 March, pp.20–21.
- Scotsman*, (1994) 8 October.
- Sergiovanni, T.J. (1994), *Building Community in Schools*. San Francisco, Jossey Bass. Quoted in Fielding, M. *Beyond Collaboration: On the Importance of Community*, appearing in: Bridges, D. & Husbands, C. (Eds) (1996) *Consorting and Collaborating in the Education Marketplace*. Falmer.
- Solomonides, T. & Levidow, L. (Eds). (1985). *Compulsive Technology: Computers as Culture*. Free Association Books.
- Spender, D. (1995), *Nattering on the Net: Women, Power and Cyberspace*. North Melbourne: Spinifex Press. p.198.
- Stoll, C. (1995), *Silicon Snake Oil*. Pan Books.
- Stevenson, D. (1997), *Information and Communications Technology in UK Schools: An Independent Inquiry*. 78–90 St. John Street, London EC1M 4HR.
- Taylor, I. MBE MP (Minister for Science & Technology) (1996) *Highway Codes on the Information Superhighway*, speech to the 'Seize the Moment' Conference, 21 March. <http://www.dti.gov.uk/minispeech/ishighco.htm>
- TES (1997), *Computers Update*, 3.1.97 p. 5.
- Thimbleby, H. (1995), *Problems In the Global Village*. Talk given 12 September 1995, Newcastle, UK, to the British Association. <http://www.cs.mdx.ac.uk/research/village.html>

PARENTS AS PARTNERS IN ASSURING THE QUALITY OF SCHOOLS

JANE MARTIN, STEWART RANSON AND GRAHAM TALL

SYNOPSIS

The need to improve the relationship between schools and parents has been an increasing focus of public policy since the 1970s with a raft of legislation both in Scotland and in England and Wales designed to encourage parental rights and responsibilities. One development has been the involvement of parents as part of the inspection process of schools. This paper looks at the pioneering work on the Quality Assurance Unit of the Education Department of Strathclyde Regional Council before its demise in April 1996 through an analysis of parental questionnaires. The data gives a unique insight into how parents judge their children's schools at the time of inspection and underlines the value of their contribution as quality assurers. The authors interpret the analysis in terms of a development model of parental involvement in schools resulting in an interactive partnership between parents and their children's schools and recommend ways forward for the new education authorities.

INTRODUCTION

There is growing understanding that involving parents in the life of the school is the key to improving the motivation and achievement of pupils. Parents play an indispensable role as complementary educators (for example, in home-school reading schemes) and, if there is to be a shared understanding of the purpose and organisation of the curriculum, then parents, as school inspectors have acknowledged, need to know what is intended, and how it is to be pursued and achieved. Some schools have tried to go beyond 'effective communication' to use the skills and experience of parents to enrich the learning experience and to involve them in assessing and evaluating the quality of achievement. Indeed, it is increasingly argued that a conception of parents as partners who have a shared sense of purpose with teachers provides the foundation for schools to improve learning quality (Macbeth, 1995; Tomlinson, 1991; Wolfendale, 1993; Bastiani and Doyle, 1994).

The need to improve the relationship between schools and parents has been an increasing focus of public policy since the 1970s. The rights and responsibilities of parents in the educational process are emphasised in recent legislative developments. Parents have a right to information about schools (e.g. Parents' Charter in Scotland 1995), typically so that they can make informed choices for their children (1981 Education (Scotland) Act, in operation since 1982). Parents have become elected members of School Boards and take part in ballots (if there are any) for Self-Governing schools (The Self-Governing Schools etc. (Scotland) Act 1989). The 1989 and 1993 Education Acts strengthening parental rights in relation to complaints they may have or appeals in relation to 'statements' ('records of need', in Scotland) for children with special educational needs followed legislation in Scotland at a much earlier date (Education (Scotland) Act 1981). The partnership between teachers and parents as complementary educators in the learning process continues to be emphasised in public documents including 'A Manifesto for Partnership' from the Educational Institute of Scotland as well as the recent Parents' Charter in Scotland. In England and Wales parents are invited to take part in an annual meeting to discuss an annual report from the governing body (Education Act 1986). Since 1992 (1990 Education Act) parents have been invited to take part in meetings as part of the inspection process by Ofsted.

This paper looks at this latter aspect of parental involvement in their child's education. It builds upon an analysis of data collated from parental questionnaires administered as part of the inspection process of schools throughout Strathclyde Regional Council and draws upon a model of development proposed in the final report of the research team to the Regional Council who sponsored the work.

Strathclyde's Policy Development

In the area of parental involvement in schools Strathclyde Regional Council provided a model for policy development. The largest education authority in Scotland until it was dissolved in 1996, it comprised six divisions covering the Glasgow conurbation and surrounding rural districts. In 1993, as part of Strathclyde's Social Strategy for the Nineties, the Regional Council committed itself 'to foster genuine partnership in education'. Proposals for action included:

In the context of decentralisation, further consideration will be given to means of empowering the users of the education service. The form in which this empowerment process will be developed is still the subject of a debate which is centred around the relative importance of consultative mechanisms, whether community based or in the form of school boards on the one hand and the facilitation of choice on the other. Within this steps will be taken to further develop partnerships between schools and parents, building on the experience of partnerships already developed in some schools.

Subsequent policy development regarding parents genuinely attempted to reflect this and a number of initiatives were taken in recent years to develop partnership both at the level of school and within the Regional Council. The role of the Regional Council was to inform and consult with parents on matters of policy and practice and also to enable closer liaison between schools and parents around teaching and learning. The basis of this partnership was information for parents and the facilitation of their involvement in the curriculum.

New initiatives included the establishment of a liaison officer for parents in 1991 – believed to be the first full-time officer appointed in the United Kingdom and, in 1995, new posts of liaison officers for parents in all six divisions of the region. A good deal of work was done to encourage closer liaison between schools and parents on homework and in October 1993 the Educational Development Service issued guidance for staff and parents on the management of pupils' homework. A Parents' Consultative Group on the Curriculum was also set up by the Director of Education in 1993 to foster dialogue and debate in an open forum through which two-way communication between the Council and parents could be established.

Subsequent developments of this process included a surgery system for parents to meet with school inspectors and, in 1994, local groups of the Consultative Group in all regional divisions. The commitment to customer satisfaction continued in the Region with the publication of *Strathclyde Charter of Parental Expectations* in 1994 which outlined the level of service parents could expect from schools in the region.

A vigorous commitment to home-school projects was established as part of the Region's urban programme with delegated funding from that budget for the Home-School Employment Partnership in a number of schools. As part of this partnership twelve project workers were recruited based in three local secondary schools and a comprehensive programme developed, from pre-5 to post-16, to facilitate continuing consultation with young people and their parents. This project included a project advisory group and a parents' representative group which met bi-monthly.

Strathclyde Education Quality Assurance Unit was instrumental in developing models for parental involvement and consultation alongside education department earmarked funding to support schools in working with parents. The involvement of

parents was encouraged in establishing school development priorities and in January 1995 it was estimated that around 50% of schools consulted or informed parents about development priorities often through the involvement of the school board.

As a result of these several developments in fostering a partnership between parents and schools, Strathclyde Region's Education Department became the leading local authority in the United Kingdom in this field. Its innovations continually broke new ground and had an impact on schools. One such innovation was the establishment of parental questionnaires as part of the inspection process within the Quality Assurance Programme. This was an initiative that arguably influenced developments in the Inspection process in England and Wales by the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) which routinely incorporates in the process a meeting for parents, a parental questionnaire and the requirement to distribute a summary of the inspection report to all parents.

Parental Questionnaires as part of the Inspection Process

In 1990 the Education Department created a Quality Assurance Unit to monitor and evaluate the quality of education provided in schools. Inspections were a central part of this process of quality assurance. Since 1990 the QA Unit carried out 207 establishment inspections. The value of involving parents in this inspection process was recognised from the outset. Listening to the views of parents would, it was argued, be of considerable benefit not only for schools but also for the education authority itself. A questionnaire instrument was chosen as the means for gathering the opinions of parents. The questionnaires — designed with moderate variations for nursery, primary, secondary and special schools — invited parents to answer fixed category questions, but also to comment about the quality of the service provided by the schools which their children attend.

The questionnaires sought parental reactions on the quality of:

- Accommodation
- Information on educational provision
- Homework
- School responses to parents
- Information on pupil progress
- Parental contacts with the school

Parents were invited to provide open-ended comments about what they liked best about the school and what suggestions they would make to improve the school.

The views of over 30,000 parents of pupils in Strathclyde schools and nurseries were gathered by questionnaire by the Quality Assurance Unit. The data set for the analysis referred to in this paper is drawn from schools which had been inspected following a revision of the format of the parental questionnaire as outlined above. The total number of establishments included in the analysis is therefore less than the 207 inspected overall, amounting to 158 schools and 34,030 parental responses.

Two discrete data sets have been drawn upon for the following analysis. The first data set is drawn from a report entitled *Analysis of Parental Questionnaires* produced by the Quality Assurance Unit in June 1995. This report presented quantitative data on parent responses to questionnaires by sector and division. Our analysis of this data is given in Section II as 'Parent Opinions on Relations between Home and School.' For the purposes of analysis these data will be grouped under the following headings in order to clarify the purposes and functions of home-school liaison:

Communication:

- (a) Satisfaction with information on education provision
- (b) Satisfaction with information on pupil progress

Interaction:

- (a) Satisfaction with the responsiveness of the school
- (b) Extent of parental contact

Participation:

- (a) Extent of involvement at transition stage e.g. secondary transfer
- (b) Extent of shared understanding of homework

The second data set draws upon qualitative data which the Authority received from open comments to their questionnaire. This data has been analysed from a summary presented by the Quality Assurance Unit in the Inspection Report for each individual school and is presented in Section III. Section IV offers a concluding analysis and recommendations.

PARENTS' OPINIONS ON RELATIONS BETWEEN HOME AND SCHOOL

The relationship between home and school will involve different tasks and will be informed by different purposes. The questionnaire invited parents to express their views about activities which imply different kinds and stages of relationship between home and school. We discuss the questions asked in relation to the purposes of: communication, interaction and participation. These are discussed in turn.

Communication

If the relations between home and school are to flourish and parents are to fulfil their contribution to the education of their child they need to be provided with relevant information. The questionnaire invited parents to comment on the quality of information provided about two important areas of school activity: firstly, about *information on the nature and variety of educational provision*. Parents were asked to agree or disagree with the following statements:

Full information is provided about the school on:

- subjects taught
- activities within the school
- the way your child is taught
- social events
- discipline
- absence and punctuality
- homework

Information on Educational Provision

The data in Table 1, as with many of the tables, suggests considerable support from parents for what schools were doing. Nevertheless there were differences of response which it is important to analyse. This table is arranged in a rank order so that what parents believed to be the fullest information provided by the school is placed at the top of the table and the least adequate information is at the bottom. This suggests

that while schools were better at providing information about ‘social events’ and ‘activities within the school’, they were less diligent in providing information about the core educational processes of teaching and learning, the curriculum offered, homework strategies, and the approach used by the school to maintain discipline. The least effective provision of information was believed to be around absence and punctuality which could be a serious concern for parents.

Table 1: Information on Educational Provision

Full information is provided about the school on:	Pre-Five	Primary	Secondary	Special	ALL
	Yes %	Yes %	Yes %	Yes %	Yes %
Social events	86	89	77	88	84
School activities	91	84	4	88	80
Subjects taught	-	76	82	88	78
Homework	-	76	74	66	75
The way your child is taught	83	74	70	91	73
Discipline	74	68	77	81	72
Absence and punctuality	-	63	76	60	68

Total responses = 34,030

There were variations between phases of education in the quality of information provided. Nurseries, primary and special schools, more than secondary schools, were perceived by parents to be better at providing information on social events, teaching strategies, and activities within school. Secondary schools, however, were believed to be more effective at communicating information about the curriculum, matters of discipline and information on absence and punctuality. This may reflect the priorities of different school sectors as much as their relative expertise. Special schools were perceived to be the least effective at providing full information on absence and punctuality but may again reflect the particular environment of the special school.

Information on Pupil Progress

Perhaps the most important information parents wanted to receive was that which described and developed understanding of the progress children were making in their learning at school. The second area of questioning focused upon *information provided about pupil progress*. Parents were asked to agree or disagree with the following statements:

- The school keep you well informed about your child’s progress
- Invitations, by appointment, to discuss progress keep you well informed
- Formal written reports keep you well informed
- Parents’ evenings keep you will informed

Table 2 presents the data in a rank order.

Table 2: Information on Pupil Progress

	Pre-Five	Primary	Secondary	Special	ALL
	Yes %	Yes %	Yes %	Yes %	Yes%
Parents' evenings keep you well informed.	56	88	81	82	84
The school keeps you well informed about your child's progress.	79	77	73	88	75
Invitations, by appointment, to discuss progress keep you well informed.	65	80	71	84	75
Formal written reports keep you well informed.	-	73	76	83	74

Parents were typically satisfied with the information they received about their child's progress at parents' evenings. However, they were rather less satisfied that schools should keep them 'well informed' about their child's progress, nor were they uniformly content that the written reports provided by the school kept them well informed. Not all parents, furthermore, were happy with the information they received when they visited the school by appointment to discuss their child's progress.

Parents of different phases and types of school perceived the quality of the information provided with varying levels of satisfaction. Special schools, followed by primary schools, were judged to keep their parents better informed than other types of school, though secondary schools were believed to prepare more informative formal school reports than primary schools. Primary schools were perceived to mount the best parents' evenings. The data, however, contained some areas of concern. 27 percent of parents in secondary schools were clear that their schools did *not* keep them well informed about their child's progress in learning. Systems of informing parents by invited appointment were least satisfactory in Pre-Five establishments and in secondary schools, while 44 percent of parents with children at nurseries were uncertain whether parents' evenings were satisfactory. (Were they uncertain whether there were such meetings? Do many nurseries not hold such meetings?).

The consistently high scores parents gave to special schools is interesting. Excellent information on learning progress is of course vital for the parents of children with special educational needs. Clearly many special schools in the Region were responding effectively to parents' high expectations for good quality information on their children's progress. Although the smaller size of special schools is an important factor which can influence the quality of interaction, the research literature also emphasises how special schools are consistently concerned with the involvement of parents in the learning process. However it begs the question that if some institutions and their professionals can establish a tradition of 'public service orientation' why others in the same education service cannot: especially given the Authority's policy of 'all children are special'.

Interaction

Parents need to get in touch with schools for many reasons. They may need to enquire about the curriculum or activities in school, or arrange to meet a teacher to discuss progress in learning, or gain permission for withdrawing their child because of some occasion in the family, or for medical reasons, and so on. Schools which

believe in a partnership with parents will wish to encourage them to get in touch with the school whenever they feel the need to do so: to phone, or visit the school and in particular to attend parents' evenings when they are held. The parent oriented school will wish to respond promptly to parents enquiries and in so doing to satisfy the reasons or concerns which prompted the enquiry. The extent of parental contact with schools is considered first and then parents' perceptions of the responsiveness of schools in dealing with their enquiries.

Parental Contact with Schools

Parents were asked about their contacts with the school in response to the following questions.

- Have you made an enquiry to the school?
- Have you visited the school for any reason?
- Have you attended any parents evenings?

This data is presented in rank order in Table 3 with the most frequent contact at the top of the list.

Table 3 shows that most parents made contact with their child's school, either through a visit or by making an enquiry, or attending a parents' meeting. Yet there were important variations: in secondary schools, 38 percent of parents never made an enquiry and 17 percent never visited the school; in primary schools, 31 percent of parents never made an enquiry at the school; and in special schools, 34 percent of parents never attended a parents' evening. (This could, of course, be accounted for by the greater interaction in nurseries between parents and teachers each day which can make the mounting of parents evenings, as well as attending them, perhaps appear less necessary).

Table 3: Parents Contact with the School

	Pre-Five	Primary	Secondary	Special	ALL
	Yes %	Yes %	Yes %	Yes %	Yes%
Have you visited the school for any reasons?	67	90	83	91	87
Have you attended any parents' evenings?	44	91	83	66	86
Have you made an enquiry to the school?	54	69	62	76	65

The extent of parental contact in Nurseries and other Pre-Five establishments ought to be highlighted. Over forty per cent of parents had not made any enquiry of the nursery, 56 percent had never attended any parents' meetings, and over 30 percent had never visited the nursery for any reason. These figures seem particularly high. This may be explained by the high level of informal contact parents had with nurseries which negates the need for more formal arrangements. Perhaps many nurseries do not hold parents' evenings — but if not should they? Perhaps the lack of contact suggests parental satisfaction — but why are the figures so different between Pre-Five and Primary schools? The figures suggest that parents who ostensibly 'do not bother' to get in touch with a nursery, do make the effort to make contact with the primary school. The trends which appear to be evident may more easily be explained

by the perceived level of dependence of the child on the parent — which are seen to necessitate more frequent contact. It may be that the perception of primary education as in some way more important than nursery education in the minds of the parent or may indicate a parental need to seek out information on curriculum issues which is not so acute in the nursery sector.

Responsiveness to Parental Enquiries

One of the most significant characteristics of what has come to be called the new management of public services is precisely its ‘public service orientation’. How committed are public services to listening to and responding to the needs and wishes of their publics? Parents were asked:

- Does the school deal with enquiries promptly?
- Does the school deal with enquiries satisfactorily?

This data is set out in Table 4.

Table 4 : Responsiveness to parental enquiries

	Pre-Five	Primary	Secondary	Special	ALL
	Yes %	Yes %	Yes %	Yes %	Yes%
Does the school deal with enquiries promptly?	85	81	73	93	78
Does the school deal with enquiries satisfactorily?	72	77	71	74	75

The levels of responsiveness which parents perceived in relation to their enquiries was quite high. Ninety-three percent of parents with children at special schools (85 percent in primary schools) believed the schools responded promptly to their enquiries. Secondary schools were perceived to be rather less prompt in dealing with parental enquiries and although 93 percent of special school parents were happy with the expeditiousness of their schools response, only 73 were satisfied with the response they received, implying they had not been given sufficient information or a satisfactory enough explanation of why the school took a particular action. The discrepancy was also high in nursery and Pre-Five establishments.

Participation

Our developmental framework for the school-parent relationship is based upon the assumption that the involvement of parents forms a very significant stage of development. The importance of participation, above communication or interaction, lies in the status which is accorded to parents in the education process. Intending to involve parents implies that a school is willing to regard them with a degree of equality which reflects their status as partners, seeking to draw upon their experience and knowledge as complementary educators.

We pick out two questions from the questionnaire instrument which allude to the importance of participation. These questions give us data which gives us some insight into the extent to which parents have been involved at transition stages and the extent of shared understanding.

Extent of Involvement

The first question asks parents whether they are involved when their child first started or transferred to the school. These are important stages in a child's educational career when parental involvement is crucial in ensuring an easy transition into a new learning environment.

Table 5: Involving parents when their children start school

	Pre-Five	Primary	Secondary	Special	ALL
	Yes %	Yes %	Yes %	Yes %	Yes%
When your child starts / transfers to school parents are involved.	89	73	77	88	75

Table 5 suggests that the involvement of parents in the transition to a new school was supported rather better in nurseries and special schools but is quite high generally. The lowest score (73 percent), rather surprisingly, was in primary schools.

Extent of Shared Understanding

Schools and parents can say they act as partners in the education of the children when they work together to establish shared understanding about the educational experience. The partners know how each needs to make a contribution which complements that of the other. The questionnaire asks one question in the section on homework, that reflects such an understanding of partnership, and requires parents to consider whether they know how they can help with homework. Parents are asked to respond to the statement:

- I know what help I am expected to give with homework.

This data is presented in Table 6:

Table 6: Extent of Shared Understanding (Homework)

	Primary	Secondary	Special	ALL
	Yes %	Yes %	Yes %	Yes %
I know what help I am expected to give with homework.	75	56	69	67

Table 6 indicates that between the sectors there was significant variation in parents' grasp of what was expected of them by schools in relation to homework. Parents with children at primary school felt most involved in developing shared understanding of homework, while secondary school parents perceived themselves the least knowledgeable about how they could help their children with learning at home.

Our data suggests that whilst schools across Strathclyde had taken steps to improve the quality of the home-school relationship, the extent of real partnership — reflecting mutual understanding and purpose — was possibly more limited. One item of school life, of course, is too fragile a basis for generalisation. The question

on homework is a very pertinent example, however, of how schools might consider the extent and quality of their ‘partnership’ with parents.

III PARENTAL SATISFACTION

Although the questionnaire as a whole formed a survey of parents’ opinions and experience of schools, it also provided data which could be interpreted in terms of ‘customer’ satisfaction. The final section of the questionnaire, in particular, invited parents to express their own comments in response to:

1. What things do you like best about the school?
2. What things do you suggest to improve the school?

Each school’s Inspection Report included a summary of these open comments which we draw upon in this section.

Parental Evaluations and Criteria of Judgement

The discussion of the questionnaire data on parental satisfaction provides important and complementary evidence for our unfolding analysis. While the data, both quantitative and qualitative, provide substantive evidence on how the parents were actually *evaluating* Strathclyde’s schools, the open comments, we argue, also presented the *criteria* which they used to judge the quality of schools. Together they provided the most valuable insight into the orientation of parents and thus the conditions for partnership with schools.

While parents were satisfied with a number of aspects of school life, it is clear they were rather less content with significant aspects of the education of their children in schools, to an extent which questions the degree of partnership yet established in a number of Strathclyde’s schools.

Parents were happy with important aspects of schools: with the cleanliness, safety and (with greater anxiety about secondary schools) the accessibility of school buildings; they were happy with communication about parents’ evenings, about social events and activities in schools; parents, moreover, were satisfied with the promptness of schools’ response to their enquiries. Yet it seems clear that schools often remained much less effective in satisfying parents on those issues which concerned them most. Parents indicated concern that school buildings were unattractive and in a state of disrepair. They appeared to be dissatisfied with the quality of information they received about the core processes of teaching, learning and the curriculum. Schools appeared reluctant to communicate information in those areas which might be open to interpretation of failure on the part of the school — discipline, lateness and absence. Parents were not satisfied with the general orientation and commitment of schools to communicate information about pupil progress in learning, nor were they happy with the capacity of schools to develop shared understanding about something as important as how parents could help their children with homework. Finally, although parents were content with the promptness of replies they were often not satisfied that they provided the information or explanations they had been seeking. All this suggests that too many schools remained reluctant to share information about the most significant aspects of learning which parents clearly regarded as fundamental to their understanding and well-being.

The education of their children is of the greatest significance for parents and the repetitiveness of the issues and concerns, to which the evaluation reports routinely refer, suggests parents had a clear frame of criteria which they brought to judge the quality of schools. We summarise these as:

- A positive ethos which fosters good relations

- High standards of professionalism
- An ordered, safe, caring environment
- Strong leadership from the head and others who manage the school
- Parental involvement, communication, liaison
- Broad curriculum provision which develops the confidence and capacity of pupils
- Adequate resourcing to enable small classes and meet equipment needs
- Accommodation which is attractive and well maintained

Parents value an education which provides high professional standards of teaching in a caring atmosphere that focuses, as far as possible, upon the particular learning needs of individual children in an ordered, safe environment. The learning experience and teaching strategies of the school will strive to develop the capacities of young people enabling them to grow in self-confidence but also in sensitivity to others. The school will provide a broad curriculum and offer diverse opportunities for extra-curricular activities which encourage young people to develop understanding of their distinctive cultures and learn to express themselves, for example, through the arts as well as sport. The school will be well led and managed with priority given to positive relations, especially with parents who will be perceived as partners. The conditions for learning will be supported by satisfactory resourcing and attractive accommodation.

IV TOWARDS PARTNERSHIP: CONCLUDING DISCUSSION

Strathclyde Regional Council was, we believe, the leading Authority in the country in promoting the involvement of parents. The Authority grasped early the significance of parental involvement for the quality of education. The Authority's idea of involving parents in school inspections to support the process of assuring the quality of schools was a leading innovation which has been influential nationally. In this concluding discussion we review the value of the Strathclyde initiative and introduce a developmental model of involvement before proceeding to analyse what can be learned substantively about the state of the partnership in practice.

Strathclyde and The Value of Parents as Partners in Assuring the Quality of Education

The typically high levels of parental response to the questionnaires demonstrates the striking success of involving parents in the Inspection process. It dramatically dissolves those traditional arguments that too many parents are not interested in education. Rather, when given a constructive opportunity to contribute their opinions parents have offered their reasoned experience in a form that can be of great value to educational policy makers as well as to the schools taking part.

We have argued that the responses of parents revealed valid criteria for a framework of evaluation. If parents do bring such a frame to bear upon their evaluations it suggests the most important understanding for an unfolding partnership between schools and the public. It implies that parents do not assess schools in a random manner but possess a clear and distinctive model of a 'good school'. It reinforces the assumption underlying policy developments in the Authority that parents must be involved as partners in delivering and assuring the quality of education in schools. The challenge for professional educators is to engage with parents to reach shared understanding about the most appropriate model of education in schools.

Improving Parental Partnership in Quality Assurance in Strathclyde

The commitment of parents to take part in the inspection process, as reflected in the return rates of questionnaires, vindicated the Authority's decision to involve parents. Following our analysis we would make the following recommendations for the newly created education authorities following the dissolution of Strathclyde Regional Council.

1. That the new education authorities should be encouraged to continue and build upon the excellent practice of involving parents in the process of quality assurance for schools.
2. That the new authorities can learn from the Ofsted experience in England and Wales and invite parents to meet school inspectors at the beginning of the process.
3. Also following the experience in England and Wales a summary of the Inspection report should be distributed to parents and a further meeting convened so that the findings of the inspection can be shared and discussed.
4. If the new authorities and their schools are to continue to promote the value of a partnership with parents then they need to encourage their schools to involve parents routinely — over and above the formal school inspections. The natural focus for this is the school development plan. Parents can be involved at significant stages during each year to help formulate strategic priorities and to help evaluate the extent to which they have been realised.

Understanding Stages of Development

Partnership with parents has been regarded as the key to improving pupil motivation and achievement, while service to and involvement of the public reflects the broader responsibility of school and college to promote education within the community. Characteristics of partnership for improving learning quality are perceived to include.

- (i) *Welcoming parents into the life of the school as partners:* establishing a new style in which schools will listen to and respond to parents.
- (ii) *Encouraging parents as complementary educators — in the home:* parental contribution to schemes of reading is encouraged because of its acknowledged influence upon motivation, confidence and attainment scores; and — *in school:* increasing recognition of the wide range of skills and experience amongst parents which can support the learning process.
- (iii) *Developing shared understanding of the curriculum:* establishing a closer match of understanding within the partnership and acknowledging that this takes time, given the differing perceptions of teachers, pupils and parents.
- (iv) *Enabling a dialogue in curriculum design:* listening to parents and members of the community about how the curriculum, enriched by local knowledge and experience can enhance a school's multi-cultural and anti-racist understanding.
- (v) *Facilitating partnership in the assessment of the learning progress:* establishing regular communication with parents about the progress their child is making; involving the parent in assessment and in agreeing a strategy about future development.
- (vi) *Enabling partnership in evaluation and accountability:* schools having the confidence to report to parents about performance, to listen to the 'accounts' of parents and to involve them in evaluating achievement.

While a number of studies have described different kinds of practice for involving parents (cf. Wolfendale, 1993; Bastiani, 1993; Macleod, 1989) an analysis created by Alastair Macbeth (1989) provides a useful model which proposes that the relationship between parents and schools passes through different stages of development. He proposes four stages of evolution. The first stage describes *the self-contained school*: here the emphasis is upon the enclosed school of professional expertise which holds parents at a distance. The self-contained school stage tends to be characterised by: emphasis upon teacher autonomy in decision-making; infrequent, formalised contacts with parents; staff development which neglects home-school liaison.

The second stage is one of *professional uncertainty*: with the spread of evidence about the value of participation teachers differ in their response, while parents often retain assumptions that the school should be self-contained. Characteristics of this stage include a growing recognition by teachers of the significance of home-school liaison for pupil performance; variation in teacher practice in regard to liaison; localised experiments in liaison techniques; and voluntary parent organisations more readily tolerated in schools.

As the practice of liaison develops so both parents and teachers discover that mutual confidence gradually replaces mutual caution. Features of this third stage of *growing confidence* may include:

- A style of school management which encourages the involvement of parents
- Parents entering schools and classrooms informally
- Voluntary parent organisations being accepted as part of the school community
- The appointment of home-school liaison teachers
- Two-way reports in which parents express views about the school

While stage three depends upon voluntary dedication which often results in uneven practice, stage four seeks to establish more formally the principles and practice of parental participation in the life of the school. The relationship between parents and the school is regarded as '*a concordat*' of *mutual commitment* whereby teachers work in partnership with parents and forums are established to encourage the views of parents on matters of policy. Some schools strive to reach beyond the family to involve members of the community in the life of the school. Learning does not begin and end at the school gate, and the effective school seeks actively to involve the community it serves.

Towards a Model of Development

While Macbeth's analysis emphasises how the professional world of schools and teachers need to change if relations between home and school are to improve, it nevertheless tends to neglect the parental point of view. Both perspectives need to be understood if the relationship is to develop over time. We believe it is helpful to suggest a developmental model which illustrates the positions of parent and professional, as well as the purposes and nature of the relationship at each stage. This model is shown in Figure 1.

1. *Dependence*: this stage describes the traditional relationship between home and school. Parents are passive and deferential in the face of teachers professional knowledge and training. The typical purpose for meeting parents is one of instruction, whether in the context of meeting particular parents to discuss learning or behavioural issues of a particular child, or in collective meetings, for example, to inform parents about changes in the curriculum. The underlying message of this stage suggests a model of the didactic learning relationship.

2. *Membership*: the value of parents contribution to learning, as co-educators, begins to be recognised and legitimates their role in the home-school relationship. Parents begin to be consulted about changes and their views are listened to. The model of the relationship at this stage is provided by home-school reading schemes which acknowledge the reciprocity of contributions to enhancing progress in learning. The role of the professional becomes that of facilitator supporting the contribution which parents have to make.
3. *Interaction*: this model forms a third stage of development. The school expects and encourages the active participation of parents in the life of the school: valuing them as 'complementary educators', recognising the contribution they can make to the learning process and the well-being of the school, willing to listen and to learn from them. The model is one of a learning workshop in which the participants are valued as equal partners in discussion and work together to develop a shared understanding of a particular policy or dimension of school practice.
4. *Partnership*: the fourth stage of partnership develops further the emphasis within the previous model of shared understanding and collaborative working. Here School Board members, parents and teachers enter into a public partnership which holds them jointly responsible for the governance and development of the school. Adversarial relationships are eschewed, but it is acknowledged that understanding needs to be reinforced by shared ownership and commitment. This requires a degree of formal organisation in which rights and responsibilities are defined, roles, procedures and joint accountabilities clarified and policies negotiated.

Fig. 1: Forms of Developing Partnership

	Purpose	Organisation	Parent role	Teacher role model	Pedagogic
Dependence	instruction	parents' evenings	passive, listening	the only expert	didactic
Membership	consultation	reading schemes	receiving, commenting	facilitator	listening
Interaction	dialogue	learning compact	active discussion influencing	engaging	inquiring learning
Partnership	joint responsibility	governance forums	parent body	professional mediation	negotiated curriculum

The key issue is the notion of equality. Partnership implies a relationship freely entered into. Thus partnership can only really work when all partners recognise the freedom of the other to enter into the relationship and respect the contribution which they bring. So it is with parents and teachers. Wolfendale's phrase 'equal shares' (1994) is helpful in solving the problem of equality by showing how different but equally important contributions are made by teachers and parents to the learning progress of young people. This ideal standard brings with it, moreover, an implied sense of shared responsibility.

This can remain problematic (see Tomlinson, 1991; Macbeth, 1989; Sallis, 1988). Lack of self-esteem on the part of some parents, often located in cultural factors, is very often perceived as apathy by schools who then blame parents for lack of

success. All the evidence points to parental interest in and desire to assist in their child's education (Martin *et al.*, 1995; Hughes *et al.* 1994). The problem is how to meet their needs in order that they may play a full and active part as partners.

If parents are to develop a constructive policy-making partnership with professionals in schools, then the onus may be on the professionals initially to create the appropriate climate of welcome. Many parent members of governing bodies or school boards have found their commitment and enthusiasm diminished by 'initial feelings of being out of their depth and blighted by jargon' (Golby and Brigley, 1989). Indeed Golby and Brigley's study highlights the difference in effectiveness between parents operating in an 'enabling environment' with enlightened professionals and those struggling with 'tokenist attitudes' which impose crucial limitations on the conception and practice of 'governorship'. (See also Deem, Brehony & Heath 1995.)

Parents themselves will also need to change how they perceive their role, if they are to play a greater part in formulating policy in schools. Parent groups in Britain appear to have failed to achieve the degree of influence on policy that some continental organisations have gained and remain, as Shipman (1984) describes, 'outsider groups'. Interestingly, recent research (Hughes *et al.*, 1990) suggests that such notions as 'consumerism' or 'parental choice' have only limited relevance, yet parents are intensely interested and concerned about their child's education. Parents will need to understand the need to become involved collectively at the level of policy formulation if they are to influence the quality of education as experienced by their individual children. The challenge for parents is to grasp the educational value for the learning process of working together with the school to manage change.

The State of the Partnership

Partnership has been defined by Pugh (1989) as 'a shared sense of purpose, mutual respect and the willingness to negotiate' and 'a sharing of information, responsibility, skills, decision-making and accountability'. The parental questionnaires reveal a distinctive substantive evaluation of the 'partnership' between schools and parents. The discussion of parental perceptions of the quality of the relationships between home and school suggests, however, that schools may tend to be located at earlier stages in a line of progression towards partnership. Parents typically perceive the quality of information they receive from schools about social events, for example, is much more satisfactory than the quality of shared understanding and expectation about how they are to help with their children's homework which we have picked out as a practice which illustrates partnership at work.

Referring to our typology of forms of partnership between parents and schools in Figure 1 the discussion here suggests that more schools are at earlier rather than later stages of partnership. The data does not allow us to quantify the number of schools at different stages, but we would hypothesise from the data presented that 'most' schools will have reached the stage of according parents *membership* (communicating information to them and consulting parents on changes), and many schools will have moved to a stage of *interaction* (of entering a dialogue with parents about how to improve the quality of learning and achievement in the school), only some schools will have progressed to a stage of *partnership* (which involves the parent body in reaching shared understanding about school policies and practice).

We conclude by recommending the new local authorities to continue to promote and develop Strathclyde Regional Council's excellent policy initiatives to involve parents in the life of the school. An initial step for the new authorities would be to consolidate good practice, in terms of our framework, at the stage of interaction. This stage expects and encourages the active participation of parents in the life of the school: valuing them as 'complementary educators', recognising the contribution

they can make to the learning process and the well-being of the school, willing to listen and to learn from them.

The model is one of a learning workshop in which the participants are valued as equal partners in discussion striving to develop a shared understanding of a particular policy or dimension of school practice.

The advantages of moving to this third stage of interaction ties the pedagogy of parental participation to the best practices of learning within a school: engaging rather than instructing, enabling rather than directing. More importantly it is a model which connects the needs of the institution and those of the pupil: the individual interest in the child requires a parent to develop understanding and agreement about the whole. The quality of the whole is understood as a condition for the development of each individual. Unless parents and teachers agree about homework, or uniform, or behaviour and language, or many key areas of the curriculum then the divergences in experience are likely to impede the learning of pupils severally. (Unless homework, for example, is an agreed practice, then the commitment of young people can slip easily through the crevices of adult disagreement or the inequity of 'rules' applied differently). Only a shared understanding between teachers, parents and governors as well as pupils can provide the necessary climate required for all to learn effectively.

All correspondence to Jane Martin, Research Fellow, School of Education, The University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham B15 2TT.

REFERENCES

- Adler, M., Petch, A. and Tweedie, J. (1989), *Parental Choice and Educational Policy*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Atkin, J., Bastiani, J. with Goode, J. (1988), *Listening to Parents* Beckenham: Croom Helm.
- Bastiani, J. (1988), *Perspectives on Home-School Relations: Vol. 2 From Policy to Practice*, NFER-Nelson.
- Bastiani, J. (1996), *Taking a Few Risks*, London: Royal Society of Arts.
- Bastiani, J. and Doyle, N. (1994), *Home and School: Building a Better Partnership*, London: National Consumer Council.
- Bell, R. and Macbeth, A. (1989), Unit 6 *Parent-School Relationships* in the Open University E208 *Exploring Educational Issues*, Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Caldwell, B. and Spinks, J. M. (1988), *The Self-Managing School*, London: Falmer.
- Deem, R., Brehony, K. and Heath, S. (1995), *Active Citizenship and the Governing of Schools*, Milton Keynes: The Open University Press.
- Echols, F., McPherson, A. and Willms, J. D. (1990), 'Parental choice in Scotland', *Journal of Education Policy* 5: 3.
- Golby, M. and Brigley, S. (1989), *Parents as School Governors*, Tiverton: Fair Way Publications.
- Hannon, P. and Jackson, A. (1987), *The Belfield Reading Project*, London: The National Children's Bureau.
- Hughes, M., Wikeley, F. and Nash, T. (1990), *Parents and the National Curriculum*, School of Education: University of Exeter.
- Hughes, M., Wikeley, F. and Nash, T. (1994), *Parents and their Children's Schools*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Macbeth, A., Corner, T., Nisbet, S., Nisbet, A., Ryan, D. and Strachan, D. (1984), *The Child Between: A Report on School Family Relations in Countries of the European Community*, European Commission: Brussels.
- Macbeth, A. (1989), *Involving Parents: Effective Parent-Teacher Relations*. Oxford: Heinemann.
- Macbeth, A. (1995), Partnership between parents and teachers in education, in A. Macbeth, D. McCreath and J. Aitchison (Eds) *Collaborate or Compete: Educational Partnerships in a Market Economy*, London: Falmer.
- Macleod, F. (Ed.) (1989), *Parents and Schools: The Contemporary Challenge*, London: Falmer.
- Martin, J. and Ranson, S. (1994), 'An opportunity for partnership: annual parents' meetings', in A. Thody (Ed.) *School Governors: Leaders or Followers?* Harlow: Longman.
- Martin, J., Ranson, S. and Rutherford, D. (1995), 'The Annual Parents' Meeting: potential for partnership', *Research Papers in Education* 10: 1, 19-49.

- Martin, J., Ranson, S., Mckeown, P. and Nixon, J. (1996), 'New Forms of school governance: Reaching shared agreements with parents — from deference to dialogue?' Paper presented to *British Educational Management and Administration Society Research Conference*, Cambridge, 25–27 March.
- Meighan, R. (1989), 'The parents and the schools — alternative role definitions, in *Educational Review* 41: 2).
- Munn, P. (Ed) (1993), *Parents and Schools: Customers, Managers or Partners*, London: Routledge.
- Nixon, J., Martin, J., Mckeown, P. and Ranson, S. (1996), *Encouraging Learning: Towards a Theory of the Learning School*, Milton, Keynes: Open University.
- Ouston, J. and Klenowski, V. (1996), 'Parents' responses to school inspections', in J. Ouston, P. Earley, and B. Fidler (Eds) *Ofsted Inspections: The Early Experience*, London: David Fulton.
- Pugh, G. (1989), 'Parents and professionals in pre-school services: is partnership possible?' in S. Wolfendale (Ed) *Parental Involvement: Developing Networks Between School, Home and Community*, London: Cassell.
- Raab, C. (1993), 'Parents and school: what role for local education authorities?' in P. Munn (Ed) *Parents and Schools: Customers, Managers or Partners?* London: Routledge.
- Ranson, S. (1994), *Towards the Learning Society*, London: Cassell.
- Ranson, S. and Stewart, J. (1994), *Management for the Public Domain: Enabling the Learning Society*, London: Macmillan.
- Sallis, J. (1988), *Schools, Parents and Governors*, London: Routledge.
- Shipman, M. (1984), *Education as a Public Service*, London: Harper and Row.
- Tizard, B., Schofield, W. and Hewison, J. (1982), Collaboration between teachers and parents in assisting children's reading, *British Journal of Educational Psychology* 52.
- Tomlinson, S. (1991), *Teachers and Parents: Home-School Partnership*, London: Institute for Public Policy Research.
- Wolfendale, S. (Ed) (1989), *Parent Involvement: Developing Networks Between Home, School and Community*, London: Cassell.
- Wolfendale, S. (Ed) (1993), *Empowering Parents and Teachers*, London: Cassell.
- Wolfendale, S. (1994), Proceedings from the inaugural meeting of Parents' Education Research Network, London.
- Vincent, C. (1996), *Parents and Teachers: Power and Participation*, London: Falmer.