

## THE EARLY INTERVENTION PROGRAMME: STARTRITE FOR A NEW SCOTLAND?

ANNE PIRRIE AND HELEN FRASER

---

### SYNOPSIS

This article arises from the early stages of the National Evaluation of the Early Intervention Programme (NEEIP). The aim of the Early Intervention Programme (EIP) is to raise the standards of literacy and numeracy skills in Primary 1 and 2. It is also acknowledged—tacitly at least—that standards are likely to be poorer in areas of multiple social deprivation. By its very nature, the EIP is located at the boundary between education and social policy, although it seems possible that this particular boundary may be renegotiated by the Scottish Executive. As the article progresses, we follow the trail of *The Wee Kircudbright Centipede* and explore some of the pitfalls and ‘terrible fankles’ that can arise at the nexus between education and social policy.

The article draws on some preliminary findings from the first round of a survey of stakeholders’ perceptions of the EIP. Stakeholders’ perceptions of the main purpose of the EIP are explored, as are Primary 1 and 2 teachers’ views of its impact upon their practice. It concludes with an exploration of how the term ‘early intervention’ is interpreted in the broad area of education and social policy.

### INTRODUCING THE EARLY INTERVENTION PROGRAMME: STARTRITE

The Wee Kircudbright centipede  
She was very sweet  
She was ever so proud  
Of every one of her hundred feet  
Early ev’ry morning her neighbours came to glance  
She always entertained them with a beautiful little dance...

Scots have always taken pride in their education system. Education has a high priority in Scotland, and as Paterson (1998) points out, it ‘was one of the two or three most significant reasons why the 1997 referendum so clearly endorsed a Scottish parliament’ (p. 93). Certainly only the most ardent critics of ‘back to basics’ would dispute the fact that the ability to read, write and count effectively is the key to educational success. Indeed according to Richardson (1998), ‘measurements of “literacy standards” and “basic literacy skills” have become the barometer of the success and well-being of schools, teachers, students, citizenship, democracy and the political system’ (p. 116).

It is against this background that the Early Intervention Programme (EIP) was first launched in Scotland in June 1997. The three-year programme initially received funding of £20 million from central government. The local authorities provided an additional £4 million. In 1998, the government provided an additional £36 million over the three-year period 1999-2000 in order that, where appropriate, education authorities might involve more schools in the initiative. Total funding from central government to the EIP now stands at £60 million over five years, 1997/98 to 2001/02. This represents a significant investment in improving all pupils’ level of attainment in literacy and numeracy in the early stages.

The EIP was ‘aimed directly at raising the standards of literacy (reading and

writing) and numeracy skills in primary years 1 and 2' (SOEID, 1998a, p. 2). Its primary purpose was to ensure that 'all children... have the right start in primary school ...if they are to access all later stages of the curriculum' (p. 2) (our emphasis). (It remains to be seen, of course, whether there really is no distinction between ensuring that all children have 'the right start in primary school' and 'raising standards of literacy and numeracy' in Primary 1 and 2. But that does not concern us here.)

By its very nature, the EIP is located at the boundary between education and social policy. Nevertheless, in most people's minds the EIP tends to be associated with a series of closely-articulated education policy initiatives designed to raise levels of attainment in schools. In the Scottish context, perhaps the most significant of these are *Improving Achievements in Scottish Schools* (SOEID, 1996); *Setting Targets: Raising Standards in Schools* (SOEID, 1998b); attempts to develop a national baseline assessment strategy for Scotland (Wilkinson *et al*, 1998); the development of *A Curriculum Framework for Children in their Pre-School Year* (SOEID, 1997); and the HMI report *Improving Reading at the Early Stages 5-14* (SOEID, 1998c).

Many of these developments, including the EIP itself, have now been subsumed under the Excellence Fund, which was announced by the Scottish Education Minister Helen Liddell in November 1998. Several of the other 'key areas' in the Core Programme relate directly to enhancing the quality of teaching and learning in the 'early years'. Although the steps in the dance may be narrowly circumscribed, they admit of regional interpretation in their execution. It has thus far been left to the discretion of the local education authorities to determine local responses to local situations.

The main policy planks of the Excellence Fund as regards early years education are as follows: an investment of £52 million to reduce Primary 1-3 class sizes to 30 or below by 2001; an investment of £66 million in classroom assistants to establish a ratio of at least one adult for every fifteen pupils in primary schools; and the establishment of the Early Years National Training Organisation (SOEID, 1999, pp. 8-11). Although much of the above related to 'inputs into the system' (Scottish Council Foundation, 1999, p. 51), it was also acknowledged that family literacy schemes and home-link teachers play an important role in fostering literacy and numeracy development in the early years (p. 7). Specific reference was made to 'targeting excellence in the early years'. This was to be achieved by developing 'a coherent set of policies and initiatives to support early years... linking early education with childcare and support for teachers' (p. 2).

#### THE NATIONAL EVALUATION: FOLLOWING PIPERS AND TUNES

...Her leg at number ninety-four gave ninety-five a shunt  
Legs numbers one and two were twisting out in front  
As legs numbers nine and ten went wriggling up the side  
Legs seventy-three and seventy-four were doing the Palais glide.

The steps detailed above are the Kircudbright variant of the dance. They may do it differently in Banff, Buchan and Bearsden. For

... one of the strengths of the (...) Programme is its flexibility. There is no single model of Early Intervention which is being applied across Scotland: education authorities are being expected to consider the needs of their area and devise programmes to suit. (SOEID, 1999, p. 6)

One of the challenges for us as evaluators will be to describe these regional variations, and to determine which represent best value - both in terms of measurable gains in attainment and the best use of the resources available.

These are the focus of two discrete but interrelated strands of the National Evaluation currently being conducted by a team based in the Faculty of Education at the University of Edinburgh, in collaboration with KPMG Chartered Accountants. The first two strands relate to the impact of the EIP on pupils' attainment and assessing value for money. The findings reported here relate to the third strand of the evaluation – an investigation of stakeholders' perceptions of the impact of the EIP as it evolves.

The first round of a survey of stakeholders' perceptions of the EIP in its early stages the survey was conducted in March 1999. The survey will be repeated in the Spring of 2000, in order to ascertain any changes in priorities, attitudes and beliefs as the EIP evolves.

The survey focused mainly on stakeholders' perceptions of the purposes of the EIP; its perceived impact on attainment for different groups of pupils; and the effect it was thought to be having on classroom practice, workload and interprofessional relations. In this article, we focus on the first of these issues.

Questionnaires were sent to the headteachers of eighty schools throughout Scotland which had been involved in the EIP since its inception. The headteachers were asked to distribute questionnaires to all Primary 1 and 2 class teachers in their schools (214); to learning support teachers working in Primary 1 and 2 in relation to the EIP (72); and, where applicable, to nursery nurses and classroom assistants working with Primary 1 and 2 as part of the EIP (57). In order to ensure the confidentiality of responses, respondents were asked to return the questionnaires directly to us.

We also sought the views of local authority staff (32) involved in the implementation of the Programme in the thirty-two local authorities, and, where applicable, from educational psychologists with a specific remit for early intervention (27).

The overall response rate of sixty-seven per cent is very encouraging, and reflects the interest and enthusiasm engendered by the EIP in Scotland.

#### DIFFERING PERCEPTIONS OF PURPOSES OF THE EIP

Let us suspend disbelief for a moment and look upon the Wee Kircudbright Centipede as the Mother of the Nation. Are we really in step? Is there a consensus amongst those closely involved with the design and implementation of Early Intervention schemes across the country as to the primary purpose of the initiative? It is to this issue that we now turn.

What did the key stakeholders consider the most important purpose of the EIP? Local authority staff, primary headteachers, Primary 1 and 2 teachers, learning support staff, nursery nurses, classroom assistants and educational psychologists were asked to identify from a series of nine options what they considered to be the three most important purposes. They were asked to rate these on a scale of one to three.

Some of the prompts related to specific aspects of social and education policy, for example, 'to target resources for learning in areas of multiple social deprivation' (social inclusion); 'to increase the opportunity to set targets for groups and classes' and 'to enhance all pupils' levels of attainment in literacy and numeracy' (target setting and raising standards). (It should be borne in mind, however, that in this context 'all pupils' refers to all pupils - irrespective of age, aptitude or ability - in schools targeted for early intervention.) Other statements were deliberately more nebulous: for example, is one of the purposes of Early Intervention 'to foster a stimulating learning environment in the classroom'? Is the promotion of children's enjoyment of books and reading, number and counting considered one of the primary aims of the EIP? Respondents were then asked to identify the *least* important purpose from the same series of statements.

Table 1 below shows the percentage of respondents who considered 'enhancing

all pupils' levels of attainment in levels of literacy and numeracy' to be one of the main purposes of the EIP. It also indicates the percentage of respondents who did not rate this among the primary purposes of the initiative. (For a detailed breakdown of how the different stakeholder groups rated each of the given purposes, see Appendix). Table 2 shows the percentage of respondents who considered 'fostering a stimulating environment in the classroom' to be one of the main purposes of the EIP. The table also indicates the percentage of respondents who did not rate this among the initiative's primary purposes.

*Table 1: percentage of stakeholders rating 'attainment for all' between 1 and 3.*

<b>Stakeholder group</b>	<b>rated 1</b>	<b>rated 2 or 3</b>	<b>not rated</b>	<b>n</b>
Headteachers	64%	22%	15%	61
Local authority staff	59%	35%	3%	28
Educational psychologists	67%	30%	4%	24
Primary 1 and 2 teachers	75%	17%	7%	129
NNs*/classroom assistants	54%	26%	21%	39
Learning support teachers	62%	21%	15%	38

\* NN = nursery nurses

*Table 2: percentage of stakeholders rating 'foster stimulating environment' between 1 and 3.*

<b>Stakeholder group</b>	<b>rated 1</b>	<b>rated 2 or 3</b>	<b>not rated</b>	<b>n</b>
Headteachers	8%	22%	70%	61
Local authority staff	7%	20%	73%	28
Educational psychologists	Nil	16%	84%	24
Primary 1 and 2 teachers	2%	22%	76%	130
NNs/classroom assistants	8%	18%	74%	39
Learning support teachers	5%	10%	82%	38

These data are striking. For it would appear from Table 1 that the government policy of raising standards (with which the EIP is so closely associated) has met with broad acceptance amongst those most closely associated with its implementation. It is perhaps not surprising that those closest to the policy-making centre - such as local authority staff and to a lesser extent headteachers - rate raising attainment highly. However, it appears that three-quarters of Primary 1 and 2 teachers do too. So perhaps the much-heralded end to 'teacher-bashing' signalled by the Scottish Executive's first Education Bill is not so ground-breaking after all. For on this issue at least, teachers seem to be on-side.

But has there really been a widespread acceptance of a 'set of goals relating to "raising standards" with all that implies for the culture of learning', as a report recently published by the Scottish Council Foundation suggests (Scottish Council

Foundation, 1999)? We would suggest that there is a world of difference between acceptance and endorsement. Are we to interpret the responses to this question as a non-committal acknowledgement of the current policy agenda? Or do they represent the respondents' personal convictions? This will remain an open question until we have completed our analysis of the open questions in the questionnaire. Nevertheless, respondents were asked to identify what they considered the *three* most important purposes of the EIP. Might we not glimpse the well-spring of professional conviction here? What else did the respondents consider important?

We have noted elsewhere that one of the features of the EIP is its focus on the early years curriculum, and on the promotion of a range of complementary approaches to the teaching of reading and writing (Pirrie, 1999). If 'fostering a stimulating learning environment in the classroom' and 'promoting children's enjoyment of books and reading' are the preferred means to an end, it is perhaps not surprising that they were not generally identified as the main purposes of the scheme. But are these not valid ends in themselves? It will be one of our tasks to determine to what extent they are associated with perceptions of the long-term impact of the EIP.

The following quotation from an interview with someone with specific responsibility for Early Intervention in a local authority clearly illustrates the nature of the association between 'fostering a stimulating learning environment in the classroom' and enhancing all children's attainment in literacy and numeracy:

there's a tendency for EIP to have become a programme that looks at the teaching of reading or number globally in a classroom, and quite rightly in terms of making sure that the learning environment is stimulating etc, etc. But in terms of the project being about those more able youngsters who could be doing better, or those kids in the middle of the class who just muddle along, and those at the other end. So it's actually tracking each youngster and seeing where you need to put in the additional input [...] for me that's what Early Intervention is about.

Target-setting, one of the central planks of the 'coherent set of policies' which has attracted a fair amount of criticism to date (for example, Croxford, 1998) is considered by far the least important purpose by all the groups in our sample (see Appendix). It is interesting to note that of the group nearest the policy-making centre, namely local authority staff, only one of the twenty-nine respondents rated target-setting as important at all. When it comes to attitudes to target-setting, there may be auguries of the 'terrible fankle' to come. But let us take a closer look at the pride before the fall...

#### SCOTTISH PRIDE: THE POLICY CONTEXT

Neighbour Jenny Longlegs with jealousy was mad  
She went out and bought herself a pencil and a pad.  
She came a month of mornings and made a careful note  
Of ev'ry step the centipede made and this is what she wrote  
'Her leg at number ninty-four gave ninety-five a shunt, etc'  
Armed with exact notation young Jenny Longlegs tried  
To dance just like the centipede - she failed and nearly cried  
She grabbed hold of the centipede and said 'Now have a look  
And tell me how you do these steps I've written in my book.'

The Standards in Scottish Schools, etc. Bill, in the name of the new Children and Education Minister, Sam Galbraith, was presented to the Scottish parliament in the autumn of 1999 following a period of consultation. It is to be hoped that this Bill will signal an end to the bombastic rhetoric of "targeting excellence". For the unquestioning assumption that our education system is the best thing since sliced

bread will get us nowhere. Hubris is certainly not a term one generally associates with the Wee Kircudbright Centipede.

It is entirely appropriate for a country which has embarked upon a process of constitutional reconstruction on the scale that Scotland has that it be left to the education authorities to decide how to deploy the central funding made available for early intervention. Indeed this flexibility is perceived to be one of the major strengths of the Programme (SOEID, 1999, p 6). This apparent pluralism is in marked contrast to the approach adopted south of the border, where the National Literacy Hour has been widely criticised for being unduly prescriptive. As Angel Scott of Durham University explains

too rigid an implementation of the literacy hour is like painting by numbers; people will just concentrate on keeping within the lines and nothing truly creative was ever produced like this. Teachers will have to make it their own or it won't work. (Education *The Guardian*, July 27 1999, p 2)

Words that might have been spoken by an avenging angel from Scotland...

As evaluators we might assume that part of the rationale for the commissioning a national evaluation of the EIP was to determine which schemes were most effective and represented the best use of the resources available. The research was undertaken on the understanding that there is — as yet at least — no 'National' Literacy Strategy in Scotland. We would hope that the merits or demerits of alternative approaches and emphases will be debated openly. This would certainly be more in keeping with the style the new parliament looks set to adopt (Crick and Millar, 1995; Paterson, 1998). However, it remains to be seen to what extent the powers of local government will be entrenched by the parliament so that the councils will be able adequately to 'consider the needs of their area and devise programmes to suit' (SOEID, 1999, p. 6).

#### THE NATIONAL EVALUATION: THE WAY FORWARD

Part of our remit in the National Evaluation is to work with the education authorities and raise questions about the nature of the evaluation and evidence which will inform data collection at education authority level. We intend to draw extensively upon such data in the course of our evaluation. We stress that there are unlikely to be 'quick fixes' — there is no panacea for enhanced attainment in literacy and numeracy. The long-term effectiveness of schemes appears to reside in the use of mixed strategies, and is likely to be influenced by the rapid expansion of the pre-school sector, and by initiatives to reduce class sizes, and to increase the number of 'understanding adults' in the classroom (Fraser, 1998). However, as Dombey (1998) has pointed out, 'it is considerably more straightforward to look at what children do rather than carry out the kind of research that can lead to unequivocal conclusions about the consequences of particular approaches to literacy teaching' (p. 38).

Nevertheless, we shall be able to analyse the data gathered as part of the first and second rounds of the survey of stakeholders' perceptions described above in order to explore the respective contributions of nursery nurses and classroom assistants. We also intend to explore the nature and extent of interprofessional working between both these groups and Primary 1 and 2 teachers. We hope to be able to draw some conclusions about the perceived effectiveness of such innovative approaches to literacy and indeed numeracy teaching.

In the first round of the survey, Primary 1 and 2 teachers were asked what impact the EIP was having on their professional practice. Sixty-nine percent of those who responded reported that they were more aware of the evidence base in literacy research; and fifty-one per cent of the evidence base in numeracy research. Seventy-three per cent reported that they were spending more time in direct teaching

of literacy. Sixty-five per cent said that they were more confident in their professional practice; seventy-three per cent that they now expected more of their pupils.

These changes in perception and behaviour are not associated with any particular 'approach'. Yet they may well be associated with perceived changes in levels of attainment amongst pupils of all abilities; boys; girls; younger children; children who are amongst the oldest in their year group; pupils with specific difficulties in literacy or numeracy; pupils in Gaelic medium education; travellers' children; or children acquiring English as an additional language. The next step for us will be to determine - as far as it is possible for us to do so - the nature of such associations. At a later stage still, we shall be able to compare with attainment data collected from sixty-four schools throughout Scotland.

It is important to bear in mind that despite promising results associated with particular approaches (cf., for example, Johnston and Watson, 1997; Watson and Johnston, 1998), it is still the case that 'there is no single model of Early Intervention which is being applied across Scotland' (SOEID, 1999, p 6). And this is precisely as it should be. After all, we saw what happened to Jenny Longlegs when she tried to dance just like the centipede – she failed and nearly cried. Let her plight be a lesson to us all.

#### THE WEE KIRCUDBRIGHT CENTIPEDE: GETTING TIED UP IN A FANKLE

Said the centipede 'Do I do that?'  
And tried to demonstrate  
She'd never thought on the thing before  
She got into a terrible state.  
Her hundred legs were twisted, she got tied up in a fankle  
She fractured seven shinbones, fourteen kneecaps and an ankle.  
As legs numbers one and two were tied to three and four  
Legs numbers five and six were trampled on the floor  
Leg number fifteen was attacked by number ten  
Ninety-seven and ninety-eight will never dance again

As our cautionary tale suggests, there is many a slip between coherence and a fankle. (There are doubtless those who would argue that a fankle is a devolved form of coherence. But we shall leave them to it for the moment.)

As one would expect, there are several elements to this particular fankle. The first derives from our last point above. There is a danger that the early success associated with particular approaches will result in the promotion of a single model of early intervention. And as evaluators, we are acutely conscious of our potential role in this process. For there is intense pressure on us to come up with 'findings' to fit in with what is for us an arcane policy-making cycle. Yet we can appreciate that policy-makers might be frustrated to learn that one of our main findings to date is that centipedes have a hundred legs.

The promotion of a single model could have several deleterious consequences: the spirit of co-operation and partnership between local authorities would be vitiated by rivalry and competition; raising standards in literacy and numeracy would become a matter of approaches rather than practice in the broadest sense; and the teaching profession would be deskilled as it was translated rapidly from reflective practice to the implementation of a blueprint. It would be regrettable if this were to happen at this point, just as our evidence suggests that teachers are increasingly aware of the evidence-base in literacy and numeracy research and are more 'confident' in their professional practice. For it might signal an abrupt return to the confrontational style that characterised the previous Scottish Office in relation to policy presentation.

There are lessons to be drawn here from the research into curricular innovation

conducted by Sally Brown and her colleagues at the University of Stirling. In relation to the 5-14 programme, Swann and Brown (1997) argued that the top-down model of implementation meant that the impact of the initiative on practice was limited. For such a curricular innovation to be successful, they argue, policy-makers have to take account of teachers' 'existing ideas about their day-to-day teaching and the extent to which they regard the new policy as desirable or practical' (p.91). However exact Jenny Longlegs's notation, she will never emulate that glorious dance. For its success resides in its very particularity.

The second element of the fankle relates to the tangled web between education and social policy alluded to at the beginning of this article, and to the differential understandings of the very term 'early intervention'.

#### THE NEXUS BETWEEN SOCIAL AND EDUCATION POLICY

We conclude by taking a closer look at the nexus between social and education policy. It is generally believed that 'the largest vulnerable group' (in terms of children most likely to make poor progress in reading) is those 'who come from a disadvantaged family, live in a disadvantaged neighbourhood, or attend a school with many disadvantaged children' (McMillan and Leslie, 1998; cf. also Watt, 1996; Croxford and Cowie, 1996; Bynner and Parsons, 1998). Croxford and Cowie point out that although such measures of pupils' background are not 'an adequate substitute for measures of prior attainment, they are important additional factors for the analysis of school differences' (cf. also Paterson, 1991)

Several education authorities in Scotland have taken cognisance of these observations and targeted resources from the Early Intervention Programme at schools in areas of multiple deprivation. Other authorities where levels of socio-economic deprivation are particularly high have chosen to involve all schools, albeit on a phased basis. As such, early intervention would appear to be one of a number of strategies to foster social inclusion, although this was not a term that had wide currency when the EIP was introduced. Certainly the majority of the eighty primary headteachers in the survey sample considered that the EIP — in part at least — was about promoting greater equity in educational opportunities and attainment. In the first round of the survey, we asked them what they thought made their school an 'early intervention' school; forty-eight per cent responded by indicating that their school was 'located in an area of multiple social deprivation'; that there was a significant number of educationally disadvantaged pupils'; and that their school had a 'significant number of pupils with specific learning difficulties'. And yet sixty-nine percent of these same people did not rate 'targeting resources for learning in areas of multiple social deprivation' amongst the three most important *purposes* of early intervention. This is the paradox which lies at the very heart of the tangled web between education and social policy.

We saw above how headteachers - and indeed all the other stakeholder groups - considered 'enhancing all pupils' levels of attainment in literacy and numeracy' as the salient purpose of the EIP. This puts the EIP firmly back in the domain of education policy. And yet, on the face of things, it differs in one key respect from previous initiatives designed to raise levels of attainment. In the RAISE project (Robertson *et al*, 1994), for example, the researchers also acknowledged that the rationale for the initiative resided in the fact that 'special attempts have been made by government to support and increase attainment in areas severely affected by economic decline' (p. 1). They were also prompt to acknowledge that 'low attainment is no longer seen as solely rooted in individual intellectual characteristics' (p 1). However, the focus of the RAISE research was on a significant minority of pupils, namely those requiring learning support. In the EIP, ostensibly at least, the focus is on all children. In RAISE, the emphasis was on teaching strategies and the curriculum, as indeed it is in the EIP.



In practice, the term ‘early intervention’ appears to conjure up notions of educational deficit associated with multiple disadvantage. These are perhaps implicit in the SOEID’s pronouncement that ‘all children must have the right start in primary school’ (SOEID, 1998a, p. 2), but are elided by the imperative to ‘raise attainment’ which remains firmly in the domain of education policy. In much of the research literature, however, the focus is on the ‘slow reader’ (for example, Brooks *et al.*, 1998), and on the forms of educational intervention most likely to maximise the performance of individual children identified as having reading difficulties (Sylva and Hurry, 1995). In much of the research literature, individual children’s difficulties are consistently presented as being entirely divorced from *social* context in which they are more likely to emerge. We might hypothesise that part of the explanation for this lies in the pre-eminence of the disciplines of cognitive and developmental psychology in the field of early education (Pirrie, 1999).

But let us return to the dance for a moment. For we can rely on that champion of own-brand analytic phonics for an ‘explanashiun’. For we have yet more to learn from the wee Kircudbright centipede, that triumph of organic farming over genetic modification. She is a survivor, and lived to dance another day. Her final comment on her bruising ordeal contains a daunting message for educational researchers. For as Brown and McIntyre (1993) point out, getting teachers to make explicit their ‘craft knowledge’ (or to try an ‘explanashiun’ of what comes naturally) is a particularly difficult research enterprise. And, by implication, there is a lesson for policy-makers too. As usual, Brown puts it most succinctly ‘[policy-making] has to beware of assuming that progress will be guaranteed if we all plan better, and that our efforts have to be devoted to producing master plans and monitoring both their implementation and the “product” of education’ (Brown, 1996, p. 4). To paraphrase Paterson (1998): it is the dance that matters, not the search for an ideal system (cf. also Brown, 1992, p. 23).

The Wee Kircudbright Centipede she suffered a terrible pain  
And some of us were very surprised she ever danced again.  
But now she tells her neighbours, every one who comes to see  
Never try an explanashiun of what comes naturally.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We should like to thank the Survey Team at the University of Edinburgh for their invaluable help with the design of the survey. We are also indebted to our colleagues Joan Fairgrieve and Linda Croxford at the Centre for Educational Sociology for their help with data analysis. And, last but not least, thanks to Mrs Janette McGinn for permission to quote the full text of the popular children’s song ‘The Wee Kircudbright Centipede’ by the late Matt McGinn.

As the form and presentation of the argument might suggest, the views expressed are those of the authors alone, and are not necessarily those of the Scottish Executive or the University of Edinburgh.

#### REFERENCES

- Brooks, G., Flanagan, N., Henkhuzens, Z. and Hutchison, D. (1998) *What Works for Slow Readers? The Effectiveness of Early Intervention Schemes*. Slough: NFER.
- Brown, S. (1992) Raising standards: factors influencing the effectiveness of innovations, in R. Wake (ed.), *Critical Reflections on Curriculum Policy: the SCRE Fellowship Lectures*. Edinburgh: Scottish Council for Research in Education.
- Brown, S. (1996) The conditions of effective learning and teaching, in *Effective Learning and Teaching Conference Report*. Edinburgh: General Teaching Council, pp 1-10.

- Bynner, J. and Parsons, S. (1998) *Influences on Basic Skills: factors affecting the development of literacy and numeracy from birth to 37*, London: Basic Skills Agency.
- Crick, B. and Millar, D. (1995) *To Make the Parliament of Scotland a Model for Democracy*. Edinburgh: John Wheatley Centre.
- Croxford, L. (1998) *The Statistical Background to Government Target-Setting Policy*. Edinburgh: Centre for Educational Sociology (CES), University of Edinburgh.
- Croxford, L. and Cowie, M. (1996) *The Effectiveness of Grampian Secondary Schools, a report to Grampian Regional Council*. Edinburgh: Centre for Educational Sociology (CES), University of Edinburgh.
- Fraser, H. (1998) *Early Intervention: the key issues for research*. Edinburgh: SOEID (Interchange 50).
- Fraser, H., Croxford, L. and Pirrie, A. (1999) *NEEIP Briefing Paper 1*. (Unpublished report).
- Johnston, R. and Watson, J. (1997) Developing reading, spelling and phonemic awareness skills in primary school children. *Reading*, 31(2), pp. 37-40.
- McMillan, G. and Leslie, M. (1998) *The Early Intervention Handbook*. Edinburgh: The City of Edinburgh Council.
- Nisbet, J. (1995) *Pipers and Tunes. A Decade of Educational Research in Scotland*. Edinburgh: SCORE.
- Paterson, L. (1991) 'Socio-economic status and educational attainment: a multidimensional and multilevel study, *Evaluation and Research in Education*, 5 (3), pp. 97-121.
- Paterson, L. (1998) Educational research and Scottish democracy, *Scottish Educational Review*, 30 (2), pp. 93-109.
- Pirrie, A. (1999) Supposing: reading between the lines. An allegorical account of contemporary debates on literacy acquisition, *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 47, 7, pp. 348-363.
- Richardson, P. (1998) Literacy, learning and teaching, *Educational Review*, 50 (2), pp. 115-134.
- Robertson, P., Hamill, P. and Hewitt, C. (1994) *Effective Support for Learning: themes from the RAISE Project*. Edinburgh: SOEID (Interchange 27).
- Scottish Council Foundation (1999) *Children, Families and Learning. A New Agenda for Education*. Edinburgh: Scottish Council Foundation.
- Scottish Office Education And Industry Department (1996) *Improving Achievements in Scottish Schools*. Edinburgh: The Stationery Office.
- Scottish Office Education and Industry Department (1997) *A Curriculum Framework for Children in their Pre-school Year*. Edinburgh: The Stationery Office.
- Scottish Office Education and Industry Department (1998a) *The Early Intervention Programme: Raising Standards in Literacy and Numeracy*. Edinburgh: The Stationery Office.
- Scottish Office Education and Industry Department (1998b) *Setting Targets. Raising Standards in Schools*. Edinburgh: The Stationery Office.
- Scottish Office Education and Industry Department (1998c) *Improving Reading at the Early Stages 5-14*. Edinburgh: The Stationery Office.
- Scottish Office Education and Industry Department (1999) *Targeting Excellence: Modernising Scotland's Schools*. Edinburgh: The Stationery Office.
- Swann, J. and Brown, S. (1997) The implementation of a national curriculum and teachers' classroom thinking, *Research Papers in Education*, 12 (1), pp. 91-114.
- Sylva, K and Hurry, J. (1995) *Early Intervention in Children with Reading Difficulties: an evaluation of reading recovery and a phonological training*. London: School Curriculum and Assessment Authority (Short report).
- Watson, J. and Johnston, R. (1998) *Accelerating Reading Attainment: the effectiveness of synthetic phonics*. Edinburgh: SOEID (Interchange 57).
- Watt, J. (1996) Educational disadvantage in a culture of early achievement: research priorities for the early years. *Scottish Educational Review*, 28 (2), pp. 139-148.
- Wilkinson, E., Watt, J., Napuk, A. and Normand, B. (1998) *Baseline Assessment Literature Review and Pre-School Record Keeping in Scotland*. Edinburgh: SOEID (Interchange 55).

Appendix

Table 1: percentage of respondents in different groups who included each purpose as one of the three main purposes of Early Intervention

cell %	Headteachers	P1/P2 Teachers	Nursery nurses/ Classroom Ass	LS Teachers	Ed. Psych.	LA Staff
enhance attainment for all	85	92	80	82	96	93
provide a foundation for learning	64	64	69	69	38	48
identify & support pupils making poor progress	49	55	56	72	67	66
foster stimulating environment for learning	30	24	26	15	17	24
make staff aware of range of approaches	25	14	0	13	33	41
target resources in areas of multiple deprivation	20	15	10	18	25	10
promote enjoyment of books & reading	20	20	31	7	4	0
promote enjoyment number & counting	6	6	21	3	4	0
set targets for groups and classes	5	3	7	6	0	3
other	0	2	6	0	4	7
n=	61	130	39	39	24	29

Notes

- 1 The columns do not sum to 100% as respondents could choose more than one purpose.
- 2 It appears that for all groups the three main purposes are 'enhance attainment for all', 'provide a foundation for learning' and 'identify and support pupils making poor progress'. These were the only purposes rated by more than 50% of each group. 'Enhancing attainment for all' is the most frequent choice for all groups. There is an interesting difference between the groups as far as the order of the second two purposes. It is also worthy of note that a significantly higher percentage of nursery nurses and classroom assistants set greater store by 'promoting enjoyment of books and reading, number and counting'. However, these came well down the list of priorities even for this group.