EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND SCOTTISH DEMOCRACY (THE 1998 SERA LECTURE)

LINDSAY PATERSON

SYNOPSIS

Scottish educational research has a great deal to contribute to the evolution of Scottish democracy after the Scottish parliament is elected in May 1999. Educational research has relevant strengths in its empirical base, in its work on policy implementation, in its study of policy pluralism and networks, in its understanding of the social conservatism of influential aspects of Scottish culture, and in its impact on popular views about education. On the other hand, there has been remarkably little research on the popular politics of Scottish education. We know little of why education was one of the two or three most significant reasons why the 1997 referendum so clearly endorsed a Scottish parliament. And we have little research-based analysis of the nature of education's past or prospective contribution to Scottish democracy. To take full advantage of the opportunities, Scottish educational researchers will have to develop a much fuller engagement than hitherto with politics and political culture.

INTRODUCTION

Educational research, like all Scottish social research, faces new opportunities and challenges over the next few years which we have spent almost no time debating hitherto. In all the numerous discussions of the 1980s and 1990s about methods and theories, about researchers and practitioners, and about internal and external approaches to policy research, the remarkable absence has been of any sustained preparation for the constitutional reconstruction upon which Scotland is about to embark. A reading of the products of Scottish educational research, or indeed of any other educational research in the UK, would find scant evidence of why the nature of UK democracy is about to change profoundly, far less of what researchers can do in the new context. If researchers, as researchers, have thought about the changes at all, the assumption is probably that new democratic institutions mean just more of the same—more policies to evaluate, more policy processes to analyse, more politicians about whom to be cynical.

This paper is therefore mainly about asking questions. It starts with two broad contexts: a brief sketch of the constitutional changes that will happen in Scotland over the next few years, and then a summary of what has been said about the relationship between research and policy in general. It then asks what we might be good at in the new era—what kinds of policy research Scottish educational researchers have engaged in, and how that corresponds to the new political processes which the Scottish parliament might inaugurate. The paper finishes by analysing what has been missing from Scottish educational research, and implicitly therefore points to new directions we have to take if we are to make a full contribution to the new Scottish democracy.

SCOTTISH DEMOCRACY

The changes which are being made to the structure of Scottish government are well-known, and so need only be summarised here (Brown, McCrone and Paterson, 1998). Following the general election in May 1997, the new government moved quickly to hold a referendum on a Scottish parliament. Their proposals were published in July 1997 (Scottish Office, 1997), and followed closely the scheme that had been

developed by the Scottish Constitutional Convention between 1989 and 1995 (SCC, 1995). The referendum which followed on 11 September 1997 endorsed this by a margin that took most people by surprise: in a turnout of 60%, 74% voted in favour of a parliament, and 63% voted that it should have limited taxation powers. The government then maintained its timetable by publishing the Bill that set up the parliament in December 1997. It reached the statute book in November 1998. Elections for the new parliament will take place on 6 May 1999, and it will take power on 1 July 1999.

So by this time next year there will be an elected Scottish parliament with full legislative responsibility for almost all those areas of policy that are currently administered by the Scottish Office. That includes, in particular, almost all education: the only exceptions are some curricular aspects of higher education that relate to UK-wide professions (such as medicine and architecture), the funding and governance of the Open University although that is now under review, about 40% of the research budgets of the universities (but only 40%), and some limited aspects of training policy. Even in these areas, however, the parliament will have an influence: it is inconceivable, for example, that the UK Research Councils will ignore the parliament's need for informed advice about its policy making. More generally, even those domestic policy topics that are reserved to Westminster—such as social security and equal opportunities—will be affected over time by policies of the Scottish parliament. For example, housing benefit rules cannot be immune to Scottish housing policy, and the parliament would be free to legislate to supplement UK programmes on poverty, or to reform local taxation in order to make the entire structure of personal taxation more redistributive (Maxwell, 1997; Parry, 1997). There is survey evidence that people in Scotland are more in favour of redistribution than people elsewhere in Britain (Brown, McCrone, Paterson and Surridge, 1998, Ch. 5).

That change in legislature would, in itself, be significant enough. But three further features of what has been happening could have profound implications for policy and therefore for research. The first is the electoral system and the parties' approach to the first elections. The composition of the parliament will be broadly proportional to the votes gained by the parties. So probably no party will have an overall majority. In particular, almost certainly neither the Labour party nor the Conservative party—which have controlled Scottish educational policy for three quarters of a century—will be able to form a government on its own (and indeed the probability of the Conservatives' getting anywhere near government is as small as any chances ever are in politics). The selection mechanisms which the parties are using will also, further, probably catapult Scotland from having one of the lowest rates in Europe of female representation in the national legislature to having one of the highest: if Labour's scheme of pairing similar constituencies survives intact, and if the current proportion of women in the lists of the SNP and the Liberal Democrats is reflected in these parties' eventual candidatures, then at least 30% of the elected members will be female, a level close to Scandinavian. These changes in both party and gender balance are likely to stimulate a style of debate and decision making with which we are completely unfamiliar in Britain.

The second new feature that might affect policy making is associated with these electoral changes, but goes beyond it. The Convention hoped that the style of the new parliament would be radically different from that of Westminster (Crick and Millar, 1995). There would be much more open consultation, Bills would be published in draft form so that they could be scrutinised thoroughly, a much broader range of witnesses would be summoned to select committees (not just the already powerful), committees would have a capacity to initiate legislation as well as comment on it, and the role for the executive would be reduced. It was also hoped that the civil

service would gradually be opened up to public view, that the committees would have sources of advice independent of the civil service, and that there would be guaranteed ways in which groups external to the parliament and executive could contribute to debates in committee and on the floor of the parliament. And it was proposed that local government should have its powers entrenched by the parliament so that the parliament would generally not interfere with councils' activities in their own geographical areas. All these ideas found ready audiences during the referendum debate in 1997, and have been taken up by the Consultative Steering Group which is preparing the standing orders and operating conventions of the parliament. The Group is chaired by Henry McLeish, the Scottish Office Minister who has oversight of the setting up of the parliament, and it contains representatives of the four main parties, and of various other organisations such as the Convention of Scottish Local Authorities and the Constitutional Convention. The question about local government's status is the subject of the separate Commission chaired by Neil McIntosh, former chief executive of Strathclyde Region.

Part of the intention of these changes has been to stimulate a more active and engaged citizenry—the third point. There has been much debate about new forms of citizenship, about starting to bridge the gap between society and government, and about the role which education might play in achieving these aims (Paterson, 1998a).

In short, the programme of constitutional reform on which the government has embarked in Scotland aspires to be fundamental. The holding of a referendum, and the result of it, entrenches the changes in a way that no other feature of our domestic government can claim. Whatever may happen to the grander visions of a participatory democracy, the very creation of a proportionately elected Scottish parliament cannot help but change the nature of Scottish democracy. The making of Scottish educational policy, like the making of all other areas of Scottish social policy, will never be the same again.

RESEARCH AND POLICY

Before I assess the scope for educational research to contribute to the new debates which are starting, I would like to step back a bit and summarise what academics have said more generally about the relationship between research and policy.

If there is a consensus in this literature it is that the official model—which is probably also the popular model—is inadequate. Policy is not made rationally, and so research cannot contribute rationally to its development or evaluation.

What is usually meant by rational policy making in this debate is summarised by Bulmer (1986, pp. 5-6) as consisting of five steps:

1. A problem requiring action is identified, and the relevant values, goals and objectives are enumerated.

2. All important strategies for solving it are set out.

3. The important consequences which would follow from these are predicted.

4. The consequences of each strategy are then compared to the values, goals and objectives set out in (1).

5. A policy is chosen in which the consequences most closely match the values, goals and objectives.

According to this model, social science knowledge can contribute to steps (2), (3) and (4), although not really to the essentially political or moral issues which arise in (1) and (5). Rein and Schön (1977, p. 235) describe this as the 'problem solving'

approach to the use of research to inform policy making. Weiss (1977, p. 13) suggests that a refinement of the model could allow some research contribution to the setting of the problem, if knowledge created through research can stimulate policy-makers into taking action. But the main role for research is still in working out the most feasible means towards desired ends.

Bulmer and others have pointed to six ways in which policy making is rarely as rational as that (Booth, 1988, pp. 3–24; Bulmer, 1986, pp. 6–9; Weiss, 1977, pp. 11–17). These ways overlap and interact with each other, because the real world of policy making does not fit neatly into any categories of theoretical analysis.

The most obvious is that policy is made by the pluralist bargaining of interest groups (Jordan and Richardson, 1987; McLennan, 1989). Weiss (1977, p. 13) describes the resulting knowledge as 'iterative'—not the rational analysis supposed in step (3) in the model above, but a much more diffuse process. A current example from Scottish education would be the knowledge which the Higher Still process is generating about unified systems of curriculum and assessment (Raffe and Howieson, 1998). The outcome of Higher Still is not going to be the result of one rational enquiry into the problems of the Highers: that, in essence, was what the Howie committee was (although it, too, involved a lot of bargaining internally). The committee's report itself stimulated a great deal of further discussion and research, as has the subsequent decision by the Scottish Office to go ahead with a reform that is not the same as Howie recommended (McPherson, 1992a).

Partly as a result of this, policy-making proceeds incrementally (Lindblom, 1980), the second point. Policy-makers do not identify problems in the deliberate way envisaged in step (1) of the rational model. Problems arise because they are, as it were, the next thing on the list, often in fact because they have been thrown up by the solution to a previous one. Another way of putting this is that policy development continues throughout implementation (Hogwood and Gunn, 1984; Sabatier, 1986). For example, the need to reform the curriculum and assessment for ages 16–18 was a consequence partly of the earlier replacement of Ordinary Grade by Standard Grade, partly of the rising rate of staying on beyond age 16, and partly because of changes in the structure of higher education (more people taking Honours degrees, and fewer entering directly from school fifth year). All these problems had been identified by research (McPherson, 1992b), but had also been noticed by teachers, the inspectorate, and education authorities: research was only one source of influential knowledge among many.

Third, the bargaining which leads to incremental change is affected as much by power and interests as by dispassionate science. Weiss (1986, pp. 36–7) argues that research then becomes ammunition for fighting political battles. No piece of social research is conclusive, and so research findings are used selectively by whatever side of the debate finds them most congenial. An example would be the debate about academic selection in primary and secondary schools, where the research has such complex results that both proponents and opponents of greater selection can find support in it for their positions (Gamoran, 1992; Hallam and Toutounji, 1996; Harlen and Malcolm, 1997; Oakes, Gamoran and Page, 1992; Scottish Office, 1996).

The fourth point is that policy relies as much on what Lindblom and Cohen (1979) call ordinary knowledge as on research. Policy makers derive their ideas from common sense, from unsystematic observation, and from thoughtful speculation. As Lindblom puts it: 'for some complex decisions, rules of thumb and other arbitrariness are, at least on a priori grounds, no less desirable than attempts at rational analysis that cannot be conclusive or even approach conclusiveness' (Lindblom, 1988, p. 224). A similar point has been argued by Wainwright (1987). There are influences from the ideas of politicians, civil servants, journalists, pressure-group leaders, business people, and so on. Bulmer (1986, p. 25) points out that the social policy of

the post-war and 1960s Labour governments in the UK was influenced as much by the close social contacts between Labour politicians and academic researchers as by rational planning. For the movement towards comprehensive secondary schooling, it mattered as much, therefore, that A. H. Halsey knew Tony Crosland informally than that Halsey was publishing research on the invidious effects of selection. McPherson and Raab (1988) would call this part of the 'assumptive world' of the policy makers: the taken-for-granted knowledge about how education works rather than the outcome of research conducted and debated rationally. Of course, some of this ordinary knowledge is based on thoroughly rational analysis, and some is even influenced by research. But it is not all like that.

As a result, fifth, the greatest impact which research can make on the policy process is through stimulating what Weiss (1977, 1982, 1986) calls 'enlightenment'. If policy makers rely on common sense, then researchers have to aim to shape that. As she puts it, 'the ideas derived from research provide organising perspectives that help people make sense of experience' (1982, p. 303). Concepts probably matter more here than specific empirical findings (Wagenaar, Kallen and Kosse, 1982, p. 8; Booth, 1988). An example from educational policy would be the ways in which research on intelligence in the 1920s and 1930s by Godfrey Thomson and others became the common sense of policy makers, and indeed of most people, including most educationalists and most politicians on the left (Simon, 1974, pp. 240–50).

Of course, sixth, it is not only the policy elites' common sense that can be illuminated by research. Social enquiry is part of the whole intellectual enterprise of society (Weiss, 1986). The rational model in fact has to come back in here, because it still commands great normative power, being 'a "dignified" myth' (Gordon, Lewis and Young, 1977, p. 29). But it is then only one of several ways of talking about research. Others include the demystifying role of social science (Bulmer, 1986, p. 178), and the capacity of research to set problems, whatever it may do to help solve them (Rein and Schon, 1977, p. 235). One important consequence is that research on educational policy (or on any other area of policy) should be set in a wider study of politics and culture as a whole (Dale, 1994; Raab, 1994). Thus understanding why the old common sense about intelligence and selection was replaced by new ways of understanding children's learning has to pay attention to general changes in society and culture as well as to specific research on the workings of the selective system. For example, we could cite researchers who showed that the system was unfair (Glass, 1954; Floud, Halsey and Martin, 1956; Douglas, 1964), but that research on its own would not be enough to explain why a perception of unfairness became so politically potent. To understand that, we would have to look to more general accounts of social and cultural change, by which equal rights to social citizenship came, in principle, to be widely accepted (for example, Giddens, 1991; Inglehart, 1990).

EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND THE SCOTTISH PARLIAMENT

The new forms of policy-making proposed by the Constitutional Convention match this analysis of policy research quite well. Both question the notion that the executive has or ought to have a prerogative over setting goals and evaluating progress towards them. Both emphasise the importance of incremental change as a result of pluralist bargaining: both acknowledge the importance of social partners, negotiating through officially sponsored committees, and gathering evidence from a variety of sources. The evidence, moreover, will include scientific research but not be confined to it: a point that was frequently made during the discussions in the Convention was the importance of ordinary knowledge—the knowledge which people acquire through actually experiencing social problems. And so both imply that the most influential type of research will be that which contributes to general social enlightenment. The

main question for us here, then, is how well-placed Scottish educational research is to take part in this process.

WHAT EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH HAS BEEN GOOD AT

An introductory general point is that educational research in Scotland is quite good at empirical work. This may seem to be quite a mundane point, but—whatever the faults of the educational research enterprise in Scotland (and I come to these later)—I think that it would be difficult to sustain for Scotland the kind of allegation which Hargreaves has made for England (although ostensibly talking about the UK), that there is a 'fatal flaw' arising from a 'gap between researchers and practitioners' (Hargreaves, 1996, p. 1, quoted by Tooley and Darby, 1998, p. 7; see also Hargreaves, 1997, and McIntyre, 1997). If that impression is correct, an immediate reason could be the domination of the research agenda by the Scottish Office: Nisbet (1995, p. 13) estimates that nearly one half of income for Scottish educational research between 1984 and 1993 came from the Scottish Education Department and its successors. This did create problems for the research agenda (such as tying it too closely to the demands of a government whose grip on legitimacy was tenuous), but it has probably helped to keep it close to the needs of the education system. The connection with practice has probably been helped further by the continuing independence of the colleges of education from universities until recently, and by the separate existence of the Scottish Council for Research in Education. Other major sites of academic research have also depended heavily on funding from policy makers, especially the Scottish Office. Examples include the Education Department at Stirling University and the Centre for Educational Sociology at Edinburgh University; the CES's series of surveys of school leavers provides a national data base that is unrivalled in educational research anywhere in Europe. Seeing research as being primarily about practice has a long record in Scotland: it was the original reason, after all, why the EIS helped to set up the Scottish Council for Research in Education, and was the original motive of most of the leading academics who established Scottish educational research earlier this century, such as William Boyd, Douglas McIntosh, William McLelland and Godfrey Thomson (Bell, 1975, 1983).

But the relevance of educational research to policy is deeper than that. There are three particular features of recent work which have a great deal to offer the new styles of policy making—on implementation, on pluralism and networks, and on the conservatism of Scottish educational culture.

The work on policy implementation is most strongly associated with the investigations by Sally Brown and colleagues into the conditions under which curricular innovations can work in practice. For example, Swann and Brown (1997) examined the extent to which the 5–14 programme had had any impact on teachers' classroom practice, and concluded that, despite the claims by government that the policy process was consultative, the innovation was too hierarchically controlled to make the difference to practice which its proponents had hoped. The problem was that the policy makers had not taken account of teachers' 'existing ideas about their day-to-day teaching and the extent to which they regard the new policy as desirable and practical' (p. 91). Swann and Brown conclude that an innovation will work only if it takes account of deeply embedded classroom cultures (see also Brown, 1990, 1992 and Brown and McIntyre, 1993). The general lesson is that 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). It is debate about policy which matters, not the search for an ideal system (Brown, 1992, p. 23).

A similar point has been made repeatedly by John Macbeath and colleagues in their research on how to improve the effectiveness of schools. For example, Macbeath

and Jardine (1997) paraphrase Anders (1996) on the 'dangers of not matching strategies to the developmental stage of the organisation'. Schools do not improve unless the strategies for improvement are developed in partnership with their staff. Further examples of the difficulties of implementing innovations can be found in many other areas of policy research. For example, research on school boards and devolved school management has shown repeatedly that they have not fulfilled the intentions of their instigators, either to create an educational market or to challenge the alleged domination of education by professional educators (Adler, Arnott, Bailey, McAvoy, Munn and Raab, 1997; Munn, 1992, 1998; Munn and Brown, 1989; Munn and Holroyd, 1989). Research on the original proposals for national testing in primary school has shown that they were disrupted because they were imposed without consultation (Brown, 1990; Swann and Brown, 1997). Research on the Technical and Vocational Education Initiative has shown how it was 'domesticated' by teachers (Bell, Howieson, King and Raffe, 1989), being used, in particular, for the promotion of programmes of equal gender opportunities (Turner, Riddell and Brown, 1995). And the Centre for Educational Sociology used its survey series to show repeatedly the only partial success of numerous youth training schemes in the 1970s and the 1980s (Raffe, 1984, 1988).

So that is the first type of understanding which educational research can offer the new parliament—a thoroughly researched sense of caution about change. One of the reasons for the caution is then the knowledge produced by the second relevant strand of Scottish educational research—its work on pluralism and networks in policy making.

The most famous example is the account by McPherson and Raab (1988), and also Raab's own further development of the ideas of networks (Raab, 1992). These studies do seem to demonstrate the wisdom of the Constitutional Convention's acknowledgement that policy making is plural, and that good policy has to involve partners. McPherson and Raab found that the Scottish Education Department has never been able to get its own way: it has had to negotiate with teachers, local authorities, colleges of education, and other influential groups. That has involved compromise by the SED, but it has also kept it at the heart of the system.

Similar conclusions have emerged from other work on the policy process, most of it influenced by the model of McPherson and Raab. Marker (1994) used the metaphor of a spider's web to describe the same phenomenon in policy for the colleges of education. Finlay (1995) analysed the networks which maintained the links between further education colleges and schools even after the colleges had been removed from the control of local authorities. Kirk (1998) noted the SED's role in guiding the negotiations which surrounded the Scottish Tertiary Education Advisory Committee up to 1986. And Raffe and Howieson (1998) have recently found the same kind of process in the development of Higher Still.

The research also shows that the system has verged on corporatism, precisely because the Scottish Office has kept tight control of the networks, imposing its own 'assumptive world' even on its partners. The most well-known account of that process is by Humes (1986, 1995). He has proposed that there are three reasons why the leadership class can lead: it commands the Scottish consensus about broad goals, there is widespread Scottish faith in the stewardship of the great and the good, and, in any case, not enough people know how the policy process works.

One of the recurrent arguments for a Scottish parliament has been to reduce that Scottish Office control, or at least to subject it to democratic oversight (Paterson, 1998b). So the Scottish parliament is likely to want to try to extend the networks. Educational research can contribute to that at the most basic level simply by having mapped the character of the networks and of the Scottish Office control of them, thus reducing the effect of Humes's third reason (lack of knowledge of the policy

process). It could also contribute to breaking down the Scottish Office influence by disseminating knowledge more widely, exactly as envisaged by the Constitutional Convention. At the very least, the select committees of MSPs have to have access to independent knowledge that has not been commissioned, managed, and summarised by the civil servants. If the effect is to diminish automatic respect for the leadership class, that too would be consistent with the Constitutional Convention's goals.

Nevertheless, matters will not be a straightforward process of democratisation. The very consensus which Humes identified as supporting Scottish Office control of policy making was also a reason why the Constitutional Convention favoured new styles of policy making in the new parliament. So there is a potential contradiction here, understanding which is the third opportunity for educational research to contribute to the new process. Consensus yields change only to the extent that it is not conservative, and yet, over and over again, Scottish educational researchers have pointed to the reluctance of Scottish education to embrace change enthusiastically. Sometimes that has been because it was resisting changes which came from the Conservative government (school boards, national testing). But sometimes it has been simply because of ingrained suspicion of anything new. Probably the most influential essays on Scottish education in the last couple of decades have been those collected in 1983 in *Scottish Culture and Scottish Education* (edited by Walter Humes and Hamish Paterson). Its unrelenting picture of dull conformity resonated in Smout's characterisations of the system throughout the last two centuries (Smout, 1986, pp. 209–30), and with the first book entirely on women's experience of the system (edited by Fiona Paterson and Judith Fewell, 1990). In such a culture, policy innovation cannot be thoroughly consultative if it is to get anywhere at all: that is the conclusion of Raffe and Howieson (1998) even of the highly consultative process that is producing Higher Still. But, because teachers are crucial to any change in educational policy, we are then back with Brown's analysis of the problems of innovation. As Swann and Brown (1997, p. 110) point out, if an innovation seeks to recruit teachers by emphasising that it is simply building on their already good practice, then it is not challenging enough, and risks stagnating.

So this strand of educational research can tell us that a consultative Scottish parliament might be a frustrating place for people who also want radical reform. If research has anything more than a cautionary role to play here, it might be in taking advantage of the model which (from Weiss) we labelled 'enlightenment' earlier. There is some reason to believe that educational research has helped to change aspects of Scottish culture, although to prove this would be difficult. For example, it seems likely that one of the reasons why there is so little controversy about the principle of comprehensive secondary education is that researchers have, broadly, found the Scottish system to be working quite well (McPherson and Willms, 1987; Benn and Chitty, 1996). Another example is that the research which the Howie committee commissioned was widely accepted as showing that the existing mix of Highers and National Certificate modules was not working (McPherson 1992a; Raffe and Howieson, 1998). And, even more diffusely, research on social class and education has not vanished in Scotland, unlike elsewhere in the UK, and so has continued to condition the debate about effective schools (Brown and Riddell, 1992; Fraser, 1997; Nisbet and Watt, 1994; Riddell, 1994; Watt, 1996). By 1998, the Scottish Office's target-setting document took the association between social circumstances and attainment as unchallenged (Scottish Office, 1998) conclusively demonstrating that research has influenced the general attitude to these topics would, nevertheless, require a research project in itself.

WHAT ARE THE GAPS?

Despite all these achievements, and all the resulting understanding which educational

research can offer the new parliament, there are also serious gaps, of which I discuss two here. The most remarkable is how little analysis we have of the politics of Scottish education. Roger Dale (1994) has drawn a distinction between education politics (the internal workings of the system) and the politics of education (the location of that system in the wider political system). Raab himself has endorsed this (Raab, 1994), and of course in one sense works such as those by McPherson and Raab and by Humes do situate the education system in a wider political context. But what that research lacks is any sense of overt politics, as opposed to the intricate nuances of networks and implementation. It is all very well putting liberal democratic theory in its place: it has indeed been crucially important that political science has pointed to the many ways in which the myth of parliamentary democracy obscures how decisions are made. But that does not mean that electoral and party politics are irrelevant, especially at a time when Scotland is about to acquire a whole new forum for their exercise.

In particular, the research on educational policy has given us almost no sense of how the various piecemeal discontents have been aggregated into general dissatisfaction with the Scottish governing system; and yet we know from the Scottish Election Survey and the Scottish Referendum Survey that one of the main reasons why people voted in favour of a Scottish parliament in 1997 was an expectation that it would make better educational policy (Surridge, Paterson, Brown and McCrone, 1998).

Consider, for example, the work by McPherson and Raab. Despite being the most thorough and the most theoretically well-informed empirical study of any field of Scottish policy making in the unreformed union, and a work of intellectual significance far beyond the small world of Scottish educational policy making, this book has almost no discussion of democracy or of nationalism in the overtly political sense. The reader would get little sense of the popular political ferment that was the background at least to the last fifteen of the forty years which it surveys. Indeed, in one of their few references to 'devolution', the authors note that the devolution legislation of the 1970s displaced educational reform from the agenda (p. 157); they do not acknowledge the argument which was even then being put that the problem with Westminster was inadequate time for any Scottish topics at all (Paterson, 1998b).

Humes—writing in the early 1980s—was so sceptical about Scottish home rule that he feared it could be a 'romantic retreat' (p. 205). That was written when optimism about Scottish politics was difficult to sustain, but the resulting gaps in his influential book cannot be ignored. It does not investigate whether there might be some interaction between waves of home rule agitation and particular types of response from the leadership class (Paterson, 1994). As a result, it does not analyse whether dissatisfaction with the governing system might be shared by people campaigning for home rule, whether they might see a Scottish assembly or parliament as a means to a social revolution, including an educational revolution.

From neither of these two influential studies of the policy-making system as a whole do we have any understanding of the role which education has played in the general dissatisfaction with Scottish government, or of the likely role which a new electoral politics could play in educational policy making.

The same is true of the many otherwise excellent studies of particular policy areas. Munn, for example, concludes her overview of research on parents in Scottish educational policy with the comment: 'the kind of issue in which parents have been involved as policy participants, whether at individual, local or national level, have not been the "grand issues" of schooling' (Munn, 1998, p. 393). That is a summary of research into parents as directly involved in committees, boards, and so on. But we now know that, in the 1997 referendum, parents (and others) were indeed paying

attention to the grand issues, insofar as they apparently took account of them when deciding how to vote on the future of the country's constitution (Surridge, Paterson, Brown and McCrone, 1998). It could be that parents have left the grand issues to the grand occasions—the general elections and the constitutional referenda—and it could be that they were wise to do so. From educational research, we simply do not know.

Similarly, we do not know from the research on implementing curricular innovations whether the decaying political legitimacy of the Conservative government in Scotland played any role in exacerbating teachers' distrust. The point is not to deny that Scottish teachers' resistance to change shares many features with experience elsewhere, as Sally Brown and her colleagues have argued convincingly. The unanswered question is, rather, how this common experience interacted with the particular political context here. That is unanswered because it has been unasked. Even the rare research which has provided us with empirical analysis of teachers' political values has not then related that to wider questions of the legitimacy of the policy process (Arnott, 1993), even though political-science accounts of legitimacy emphasise its basis in a congruence between the values of a governing system and the values of the society which it aims to rule (Beetham, 1991, p.11), values towards which we would expect teachers to contribute quite a lot. Similarly, writing which has asked some general questions about the relationship between research and its political context has not asked specific questions about the Scottish political context (Stronach, Allan and Morris, 1996).

The school effectiveness research, likewise, has analysed accountability mainly at the level of the school, and occasionally at the level of the education authority (Willms, 1987). There has been no contribution from it to the debate about national accountability. Neither, it could be added, has there been much systematic study of the role of elected local councillors in making education accountable, despite some limited attention to directors of education (Flett, 1989). Fairley (1998), however, has related some general research on the nature of local democracy and local government to the needs of education (a point to which we return shortly).

The work on examination systems, too, has eschewed politics. Raffe, for example, in a lecture to the 1989 meeting of the Scottish Educational Research Association, argued compellingly that Scottish Enterprise should have an educational agenda. But he stopped at that essentially technical solution to the gulf between education and training: he did not pick up on the Constitutional Convention debates which were going on even as he spoke about how the whole system of Scottish education and training could be made more coherent by being placed within the remit of an elected parliament. In similar vein, Howieson, Raffe, Spours and Young (1997) point to the consensus in Scotland around a unified system of education and training (in contrast to England), but ask no questions about how that consensus was constructed, whether it reflected popular preferences as opposed to those of an elite, and whether it would survive scrutiny by an indigenous legislature no longer so worried about resisting encroachments from England.

A further example has to do with economics. Pamela Munn (commenting on an earlier draft of this article) has pointed out how little research on the economics of education there has been anywhere in the UK. In Scotland, there have been valuable contributions on particular topics, such as during the reform of local government in the mid-1990s (Midwinter and McGarvey, 1994), and on the impact of higher education (McNicoll, 1995; Newlands and Parker, 1997). But with the exception of some research by Midwinter (1997), there is nothing which addresses the economic aspects of education's place in the wider system of government. This absence has been despite the importance of financial and economic questions in the debate about a Scottish parliament (Heald, Geaughan and Robb, 1998; Paterson, 1998b). That is,

after all, why we had the second question in the 1997 referendum.

The lack of attention to the overarching national question in educational research is all the more puzzling when we consider how careful all these educational researchers have been at documenting Scottish differences from England (although not really from Wales or Northern Ireland), at identifying how the current system of policy making does not adequately defend or develop Scottish difference, and—especially—at explaining in detail the role of civil society in dealing with policy locally.

Nevertheless, one extended exception to these strictures does show what can be done. It is in relation to analysis of the policy process in vocational education and training. John Fairley has repeatedly sought to relate the developments in that field to the political pressures on the Scottish Office, and in the volume he edited with Alice Brown in 1989 on the Manpower Services Commission in Scotland, he and Brown traced the interaction between political questions and the specific technical issues which the MSC was addressing (Brown and Fairley, 1989; see also Fairley and Lloyd, 1995). Fairley later argued that the eventual transfer of training policy to the Scottish Office in the years up to 1995 was due to the strengthening focus of Scottish politics 'on the country's constitutional relationship with the UK' (Fairley, 1996, p. 52). Fairley has also examined the potential for local democratic involvement in the Local Enterprise Companies (Fairley, 1992). In a comment on a draft of the present paper, he has suggested that one reason why the research in this area has paid attention to the full political context is that vocational education and training were themselves politicised by the Thatcher government from 1982 onwards, and so researchers could not avoid the wider issues.

The example of vocational education and training illustrates something of the potential. It shows that understanding at least that development in policy did require a sustained analysis of the wider debate about the Scottish constitution. For the rest, however, we do not know from research how the Scottish political debates of the last two decades modified the educational ones, and for none of these areas—even vocational training—do we know how the educational debates influenced the wider politics. As May has argued, 'the political world for many issues is defined in terms of the varied interest groups, government agencies, and attentive citizens that have a stake in the system' (May, 1991, p.203). Scottish educational research has paid a lot of attention to the groups and the agencies, and has also studied the activities of citizens in communities. But it has largely ignored the relevance for education policy of citizens' relationship with the state.

Partly as a result, we do not know much from Scottish educational research what a new democratic culture could look like, the second major gap. Until very recently, there has been almost no Scottish contribution to educational debates about citizenship or education for citizenship—nothing to rival numerous English contributions (Avis, Bloomer, Esland, Gleeson and Hodkinson, 1996; Carr, 1991; Heater, 1990; Ranson, 1994; Ranson and Stewart, 1994). These writers were responding partly to the English political context of Thatcherism and the apparent decay of social democracy, and partly to world-wide interest in the topic (Kennedy, 1997; Nie, Junn and Stehlik-Barry, 1996; Putnam, 1993). In Scotland, there has been much analysis of the deficiencies of market models of education (Adler, Petch and Tweedie, 1989; Brown, Stephen and Low, 1998; Hartley, 1994; Jonathan, 1990, 1993; Munn, 1998; Tett, 1993), but there has been little empirical evaluation of other forms of social organisation. If we want to find anything Scottish that can match that recent English writing, we have to look to the general historians and the general philosophers. The historians have, for example, told us something about the interaction of the educational and home rule debates in the second half of the nineteenth century (Hutchison, 1986), about the relationship of Scottish nationalism and imperialism in the school curriculum during the early years of the twentieth

century (Anderson, 1995), and about the role of Presbyterianism in sustaining the myth of educational democracy in the middle of the twentieth century (Maxwell, 1982; Scott, 1971). The general philosophers have given us the recent revival of interest in Macmurray (Fielding, 1996; Macmurray, 1996), the analysis of the Enlightenment contribution to social philosophy (Berry, 1997; Sher, 1985), and—pre-eminently—the scholarship of George Davie (1961, 1986, 1991, 1994). But none of this has come from specifically educational philosophers.

Only very recently has the work on the nature of democracy been taken up in the literature on Scottish educational policy, for example in Fairley's writing on the role of local government in education (Fairley, 1998). In a paper given at this year's SERA conference, Tom Conlon considers (among many other topics) whether Information Technology really does offer scope for a strengthening of democracy (Conlon, 1998). Schuller (1997) has been investigating the nature and applications of the concept of social capital, and Riddell, Baron, Stalker and Wilkinson (1997) have considered whether it is useful when analysing the social rights of people who have learning difficulties. If experience elsewhere is a guide (Putnam, 1987), the new Scottish parliament will have to depend on reservoirs of social capital if it is to renew democracy. More generally, the relationship between popular education and radical democracy has been discussed at several meetings of the Biennial Adult Education Conference in Edinburgh (see, for example, the special edition of *Edinburgh Review* (1993), Alexander (1994), Crowther, Martin and Shaw (1998), Martin (1996) and Steele (1997)). In a different general sense, the work on values education has begun to sponsor debates on Scottish citizenship (Hartley, 1997). These very welcome developments are, however, just a start.

Needless to say, there is absolutely no reason at all why any particular researcher ought to have engaged in these studies that are missing: the people with whom I have been taking issue were busy producing many excellent studies of other things, some of which I cited earlier. My point is about the educational research community as a whole. Nor are there any simple reasons for the gaps. Some of the explanation may be in funding: if the Scottish Office has dominated educational research, then it has been difficult for researchers to question its very existence and democratic accountability. Some may lie in the separation between educational research and political research which Dale and Raab noted for the UK as a whole. And some may be based on a suspicion of political nationalism. These possible explanations are merely speculative; establishing the truth would require yet another research project.

CONCLUSION

The new style of democracy envisaged by the Constitutional Convention offers many new opportunities for new policy research, both by analysing the more diverse pluralism that might emerge, and by contributing to the knowledge of the different parties to that process. Research would, in a sense, then be doing little that was different from what it already does (according to writers such as Bulmer and Weiss). The difference would be in the greater and more democratic openness of the processes to which it was contributing. Research might also serve to enlighten society as a whole, in the model favoured by Weiss, becoming part of a learning culture that might, because of that firm basis of knowledge, be more strongly democratic (Ranson, 1994).

In this new context, Scottish educational research will be able to draw on many creative strands in its recent practice. It will be able to analyse the difficulties of innovating in a conservative social environment, but it will also be able to contribute to understanding the ways in which that conservative consensus can change slowly. Scottish educational research has an excellent record of analysing policy making that is not straightforwardly liberal democratic.

But the problem is that Scotland is about to embark on an experiment in liberal democracy and that educational research has contributed very little to understanding why. It has not explored how education became one site for a generalised dissatisfaction with Scottish government, and so cannot contribute to an understanding of why, when voting overwhelmingly in favour of a parliament in September 1997, people gave education as one of the reasons for doing so. So we have no more than a rudimentary understanding of the part which educational policy might play in the new polity. More profoundly, we have no more than the beginnings of an understanding of how education as a cultural institution could shape Scottish society in the new context, and so we have little sense of the specific role which educational research—or any other type of research—could play in building this new educated democracy. Developing such an understanding will matter not only for explaining the workings of the parliament, but also for analysing its failings, whether these lead to scepticism about the whole project of national self-government or to demand for a much stronger version of it than we will get next May.

I do not have any answers; no one researcher does. The problem is for all of us. And, with the parliament now inevitable and imminent, there is no longer any way of opting out of the debate.

REFERENCES

Adler, M., Arnott, M., Bailey, L., McAvoy, L., Munn, P. and Raab, C. (1997), *Devolved School Management*, Edinburgh: Department of Politics, Edinburgh University.

Adler, M., Petch, A. and Tweedie, J. (1989), *Parental Choice and Education Policy*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Alexander, D. (1994), 'The education of adults in Scotland: democracy and curriculum', *Studies in the Education of Adults*, 26(1), pp. 31-49.

Anders, T. (1996), *Customer Driven Leadership*, Atlanta: The Anders Company.

Anderson, R. D. (1995), *Education and the Scottish People, 1750-1918,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Arnott, M. (1993), *Thatcherism in Scotland: an Exploration of Educational Policy in the Secondary Sector*. PhD Thesis, Strathclyde University.

Avis, J., Bloomer, M., Esland, G., Gleeson, D. and Hodkinson, P. (1996), *Knowledge and Nationhood*, London: Cassell.

Beetham. D. (1991), *The Legitimation of Power*, London: Macmillan.

Bell, C., Howieson, C., King, K. and Raffe, D. (1990), 'The Scottish dimension of TVEI', in A. Brown and D. McCrone (eds), *Scottish Government Yearbook*, Edinburgh: Unit for the Study of Government in Scotland, pp. 92-103.

Bell, R. E. (1975), 'Godfrey Thomson and Scottish education', unpublished manuscript.

Bell, R. E. (1983), 'The education departments in the Scottish universities', in W. Humes and H. M. Paterson (eds) *Scottish Culture and Scottish Education*, Edinburgh: John Donald, pp. 151-74.

Benn, C. and Chitty, C. (1996), *Thirty Years On*, London: David Fulton.

Berry, C. (1997), *Social Theory of the Scottish Enlightenment*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Booth, T. (1988), *Developing Policy Research*, Aldershot: Avebury.

Brown, A. and Fairley, J. (1989) (eds), *The Manpower Services Commission in Scotland*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Brown, A., McCrone, D. and Paterson, L. (1998), *Politics and Society in Scotland*, second edition, London: Macmillan.

Brown, A., McCrone, D., Paterson, L. and Surridge, P. (1998), *The Scottish Electorate: the 1997 General Election and Beyond*, London: Macmillan.

Brown, S. (1990), 'The national curriculum and testing: enlightened or imported?', *Scottish Educational Review*, 22(2), pp. 68-77.

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, pp. 7-27.

Brown, S. (1996), 'The conditions for effective learning and teaching', in *Effective Learning and Teaching Conference: Report*, Edinburgh: General Teaching Council, pp. 1-10.

Brown, S. and McIntyre, D. (1993), *Making Sense of Teaching*, Buckingham: Open University Press.

Brown, S. and Riddell, S. (eds) (1992), *Class, Race and Gender in Schools*, Edinburgh: Scottish Council for Research in Education.

Brown, S., Stephen, C. and Low, L. (1998), 'A research analysis of pre-school provision in the market place', *Scottish Educational Review*, 30(1), pp. 4-14.

Bulmer, M. (1986), 'The policy process and the place in it of social research', in M. Bulmer (ed.), *Social Science and Social Policy*, London: Allen and Unwin, pp. 3-30.

Carr, W. (1991), 'Education for citizenship', *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 39 (4), pp. 373-85.

Conlon, T. (1998), 'Critical thinking required or Seven Deadly Sins of Information Technology', paper presented to the annual meeting of the Scottish Educational Research Association, Dundee, 24-26 September.

Crick, B. and Millar, D. (1995), *To Make the Parliament of Scotland a Model for Democracy*, Edinburgh: John Wheatley Centre.

Crowther, J., Martin, I. and Shaw, M. (1998), *Popular Education and Social Movements in Scotland Today*, London: National Institute of Adult and Continuing Education.

Dale, R. (1994), 'Applied education politics or political sociology of education? Contrasting approaches to the study of recent education reform in England and Wales', in D. Halpin and B. Troyna (eds), *Researching Educational Policy*, London: Falmer, pp. 31-41.

Davie, G. E. (1961), *The Democratic Intellect: Scotland and Her Universities in the Nineteenth Century*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Davie, G. E. (1986), *The Crisis of the Democratic Intellect: the Problem of Generalism and Specialism in Twentieth-Century Scotland*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Davie, G. E. (1991), *The Scottish Enlightenment and Other Essays*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Davie, G. E. (1994), *A Passion for Ideas: Essays on the Scottish Enlightenment 2*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Douglas, J. W. B. (1964), *The Home and the School*, London: MacGibbon and Kee.

Edinburgh Review (1993), 'Democracy and the curriculum', special issue, no. 90.

Fairley, J. (1992), 'Scottish local authorities and local enterprise companies: a developing relationship?', *Regional Studies*, 26(2), pp. 193-207.

Fairley, J. (1996), 'Vocational education and training in Scotland—towards a strategic approach?', *Scottish Educational Review*, 28(1), pp. 50-60.

Fairley, J. (1998), 'Local authority education in a democratic Scotland', *Scottish Educational Review*, 30(1), pp. 61-72.

Fairley, J. and Lloyd, M. G. (1995), 'Economic development and training: the roles of Scottish Enterprise, Highlands and Islands Enterprise and the Local Enterprise Companies', *Scottish Affairs*, no. 12, pp. 52-72.

Fielding, M. (1996), 'Beyond collaboration: on the importance of community', in D. Bridges and C. Husbands (eds), *Consorting and Collaborating in the Education Market Place*, London: Falmer, pp. 149-167.

Finlay, I. (1995), *Bridges or Battlements? Current Relationships Between Colleges, Schools and Education Authorities*, Glasgow: Scottish School of Further Education and Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Flett, I. (1989), *Association of Directors of Education in Scotland: the Years of Growth, 1945-1975*, ADES.

Floud, J. E., Halsey, A. H., and Martin, F. M. (1956), *Social Class and Educational Opportunity*, London: Heinemann.

Fraser, H. (1997), *Early Intervention Literature Review: A Research Report to the SOEID*, Edinburgh: Moray House Institute of Education.

Gamoran, A. (1992), 'Is ability grouping equitable?', *Educational Leadership*, 50, October, pp. 11-17.

Giddens, A. (1991), *Modernity and Self-Identity*, Cambridge: Polity.

Glass, D. V. (1954) (ed.), *Social Mobility in Britain*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Gordon, I., Lewis, J. and Young, K. (1977), 'Perspectives on policy analysis', *Public Administration Bulletin*, no. 25, pp. 26-35.

Hallam, S. and Toutounji, I. (1996), *What do we Know about the Grouping of Pupils by Ability?*, London: Institute of Education.

Hargreaves, D. (1996), 'Teaching as a research-based profession: possibilities and prospects', Teacher Training Agency Annual Lecture.

Hargreaves, D. (1997), 'In defence of research for evidence-based teaching: a rejoinder to Martyn Hammersley', *British Educational Research Journal*, 23(4), pp. 405-19.

Harlen, W. and Malcolm, H. (1997), *Setting and Streaming: a Research Review*, Edinburgh: SCRE.

Hartley, D. (1994), 'Devolved school management: the "new deal" in Scottish education', *Journal of Education Policy*, 9(2), pp. 129-40.

Hartley, D. (1997), 'Values added: some sociological interpretations of values in education', *Scottish Educational Review*, 29(2), pp. 163-74.

Heald, D., Geaughan, N. and Robb, C. (1998), 'Financial arrangements for UK devolution', in H. Elcock and M. Keating (eds), *Remaking the Union*, special issue of *Regional and Federal Studies*, London: Frank Cass, pp. 23-52.

Heater, D. (1990), *Citizenship: the Civic Ideal in World History, Politics and Education*, London: Longman.

Hogwood, B. W. and Gunn, L. A. (1984), *Policy Analysis for the Real World*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Howieson, C., Raffe, D., Spours, K. and Young, M. (1997), *Unifying Academic and Vocational Learning: the State of the Debate in England and Scotland*, London: Institute of Education.

Humes, W. (1986), *The Leadership Class in Scottish Education*, Edinburgh: John Donald.

Humes, W. (1995), 'The significance of Michael Forsyth in Scottish education', *Scottish Affairs*, no. 11, pp. 112-30.

Humes, W. and Paterson, H. M. (1983) (eds), *Scottish Culture and Scottish Education*, Edinburgh: John Donald.

Hutchison, I. (1986), *A Political History of Scotland 1832-1924: Parties, Elections and Issues*, Edinburgh: John Donald.

Inglehart, R. (1990), *Culture Shift in Advanced Industrial Society*, Princeton University Press.

Jonathan, R. (1990), 'State education service or prisoner's dilemma: the "hidden hand" as source of education policy', *British Journal of Education Studies*, 38(2), pp. 116-32.

Jonathan, R. (1993), 'Parental rights in schooling', in P. Munn (ed.), *Parents and Schools*, London: Routledge, pp. 11-26.

Jordan, A. G. and Richardson, J. J. (1987), *British Politics and the Policy Process*, London: Allen and Unwin.

Kennedy, K. (ed.) (1997), *Citizenship and the Modern State*, Lewes: Falmer.

Kirk, G. (1998), *The Scottish Tertiary Education Advisory Council*, PhD thesis, Open University.

Lindblom, C. (1980), *The Policy-Making Process*, second edition, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Lindblom, C. (1988), *Democracy and Market System*, Oslo: Norwegian University Press.

Lindblom, C. and Cohen, D. (1979), *Usable Knowledge*, New Haven: Yale University Press.

Macbeath, J. and Jardine, S. (1997), 'Evidence for improvement', paper presented to the Tenth International Congress for School Effectiveness and School Improvement, Memphis, January.

Macmurray, J. (1996), *The Personal World: John Macmurray on Self and Identity*, P. Conford (ed.), Edinburgh: Floris Books.

Marker, W. (1994), *The Spiders' Web? Policy Making in Teacher Education in Scotland, 1959-1981*, Glasgow: Sales and Publication Department, University of Strathclyde.

Martin, I. (1996), 'Creating space for the "democratic intellect": the Edinburgh biennial adult education conference', *Scottish Journal of Adult and Continuing Education*, 3(2), pp. 99-113.

Maxwell, S. (1982). 'The secular pulpit: Presbyterian democracy in the twentieth century', in H. M. Drucker and N. Drucker (eds), *Scottish Government Yearbook*, Edinburgh: Unit for the Study of Government in Scotland, pp. 181-198.

Maxwell, S. (1997), 'Social policy and the Scottish parliament: a response to Richard Parry', *Scottish Affairs*, no. 21, pp. 54-8.

McIntyre, D. (1997), 'The profession of educational research', *British Educational Research Journal*, 23(2), pp. 127-40.

McLennan, G. (1995), *Pluralism*, Buckingham: Open University Press.

McNicoll, I. (1995), *The Impact of the Scottish Higher Education Sector on the Economy of Scotland*, Glasgow: Committee of Scottish Higher Education Principals.

McPherson, A. (1992a), 'Critical reflections on the Howie report', in R. Wake (ed.), *Critical Reflections on Curriculum Policy: the SCRE Fellowship Lectures*, Edinburgh: Scottish Council for Research in Education, pp. 29-52.

McPherson, A. (1992b), 'The Howie committee on post-compulsory schooling', in L. Paterson and D. McCrone (eds), *Scottish Government Yearbook*, Edinburgh: Unit for the Study of Government in Scotland, pp. 114-30.

McPherson, A. and Raab, G. (1988), *Governing Education*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

McPherson, A. and Willms, J. D. (1987). 'Equalisation and improvement: some effects of comprehensive reorganisation in Scotland', *Sociology*, 21(4), pp. 509-39.

Midwinter, A. (1997), 'Local education spending in Scotland and England: problems of comparison in the LACE study', *Scottish Educational Review*, 29(2), pp. 146-53.

Midwinter, A. and McGarvey, N. (1994), 'The restructuring of Scotland's education authorities: does size matter?', *Scottish Educational Review*, 26(2), pp. 110-7.

Munn, P. (1992), 'Devolved management of schools and FE colleges: a victory for the producer over the consumer?', in L. Paterson and D. McCrone (eds), *Scottish Government Yearbook 1992*, Unit for the Study of Government in Scotland, Edinburgh University, pp. 142-56.

Munn, P. (1998), 'Parental influence on school policy: some evidence from research', *Journal of Education Policy*, 13(3), pp. 379-94.

Munn, P. and Brown, S. (1989), *Pilot School Boards: First Impressions*, Edinburgh: Scottish Council for Research in Education.

Munn, P. and Holroyd, C. (1989), *Pilot School Boards: Experiences and Achievements*, Edinburgh: Scottish Council for Research in Education.

Newlands, D. and Parker, M. (1997), 'The prospects and potential of a new university in the Highlands and Islands', *Scottish Affairs*, no. 21, pp. 78-94.

Nie, N., Junn, J. and Stehlik-Barry, K. (1996), *Education and Democratic Citizenship in America*, University of Chicago Press.

Nisbet, J. (1995), *Pipers and Tunes: A Decade of Education Research in Scotland*, Edinburgh: Scottish Council for Research in Education.

Nisbet, J. and Watt, J. (1994), *Educational Disadvantage in Scotland: a 1990s Perspective*, Edinburgh: Scottish Community Education Council.

Oakes, J., Gamoran, A. and Page, R. N. (1992), 'Curriculum differentiation: opportunities, outcomes and meanings', in P. W. Jackson (ed.), *Handbook of Research on Curriculum*, New York: Macmillan, pp. 570-608.

Parry, R. (1997), 'The Scottish parliament and social policy', *Scottish Affairs*, no. 20, pp. 34-46.

Paterson, F. and Fewell, J. (1990), *Girls in their Prime*, Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press.

Paterson, L. (1994), *The Autonomy of Modern Scotland*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Paterson, L. (1998a), 'Education, local government and the Scottish parliament', *Scottish Educational Review*, 29(1), pp. 52-60.

Paterson, L. (1998b), *A Diverse Assembly: the Debate on a Scottish Parliament*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Putnam, R. D. (1993), *Making Democracy Work*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Raab, C. D. (1992), 'Taking networks seriously: education policy in Britain', *European Journal of Political Research*, 21(1-2), pp. 69-90.

Raab, C. D. (1994), 'Where are we now: reflections on the sociology of education policy', in D. Halpin and B. Troyna (eds), *Researching Educational Policy*, London: Falmer, pp. 17-30.

Raffe, D. (ed.) (1984), *Fourteen to Eighteen*, Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press.

Raffe, D. (ed.) (1988), *Education and the Youth Labour Market*, Lewes: Falmer.

Raffe, D. (1989), 'An educational agenda for Scottish Enterprise?', paper presented to the annual conference of the Scottish Educational Research Association, St Andrews, 28-30 September.

Raffe, D. and Howieson, C. (1998), 'The Higher Still policy process', *Scottish Affairs*, no. 24, pp. 90-108.

Ranson, S. (1994), *Towards the Learning Society*, London: Cassell.

Ranson, S. and Stewart, J. (1994), *Management for the Public Domain*, London: Macmillan.

Rein, M. and Schon, D. A. (1977), 'Problem setting in policy research', in C. Weiss (ed.), *Using Social Research in Public Policy Making*, Lexington: Lexington Books, pp. 235-51.

Riddell, S. (1994), 'Education', in G. Fyfe (ed.), *Poor and Paying for It*, Glasgow: Scottish Consumer Council, pp. 87-105.

Riddell, S., Baron, S., Stalker, K. and Wilkinson, H. (1997), 'The concept of the learning society for adults with learning difficulties: human and social capital perspectives', *Journal of Educational Policy*, 12(6), pp. 473-83.

Sabatier, P. (1986), 'Top-down and bottom-up approaches to implementation research: a critical analysis and suggested synthesis', *Journal of Public Policy*, 6(1), pp. 21-48.

Schuller, T. (1997), 'Building social capital: steps towards a learning society', *Scottish Affairs*, no. 19, pp. 77-91.

Scott, D. (1971), *A. D. Lindsay: a Biography*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Scottish Constitutional Convention (1995), *Scotland's Parliament, Scotland's Right*, Edinburgh: Convention of Scottish Local Authoriteies.

Scottish Office (1996), *Achievement for All*, Edinburgh: The Stationery Office.

Scottish Office (1997), *Scotland's Parliament*, Edinburgh: The Stationery Office.

Scottish Office (1998), *Setting Targets: Raising Standards in Schools*, Edinburgh: The Stationery Office.

Sher, R. (1985), *Church and University in the Scottish Enlightenment*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Simon, B. (1974), *The Politics of Educational Reform, 1920-1940*, London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Smout, T. C. (1986), *A Century of the Scottish People, 1830-1950*, London: Collins.

Steele, T. (1997), 'Marginal occupations: adult education, cultural studies and social renewal', *Scottish Journal of Adult and Continuing Education*, 4(1), pp. 21-36.

Stronach, I., Allan, J. and Morris, B. (1996), 'Can the mothers of invention make a virtue of necessity? An optimistic deconstruction of research compromises in contract research and evaluation', *British Educational Research Journal*, 22(4), pp. 493-509.

Surridge, P., Paterson, L., Brown, A. and McCrone, D. (1998), 'The Scottish electorate and the Scottish parliament', in *Understanding Constitutional Change*, special issue of *Scottish Affairs*, pp. 38-60.

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.

Tett, L. (1993), 'Education and the market place', *Scottish Educational Review*, 25(2), pp. 123-31.

Tooley, J. and Darby, D. (1998), *Educational Research: a Critique*, London: Ofsted.

Turner, E., Riddell, S. and Brown, S. (1995), *Gender Equality in Scottish Schools*, Glasgow: Equal Opportunities Commission.

Wagenaar, H. C., Kallen, D. B. P. and Kosse, G. B. (1982), 'Social science and public policy making in the 1980s', in D. B. P. Kallen, G. B. Kosse, H. C. Wagenaar, J. J. J. Kloprogge and M. Vorbeck (eds), *Social Science Research and Public Policy Making*, Windsor: NFER-Nelson, pp. 7-20.

Wainwright, H. (1994), *Arguments for a New Left*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Watt, J. (1996), 'Educational disadvantage in a culture of achievement: research priorities for the early years', *Scottish Educational Review*, 28(2), pp. 139-48.

Weiss, C. (1977), 'Introduction', in C. Weiss (ed.), *Using Social Research in Public Policy Making*, Lexington: Lexington Books, pp. 1-22.

Weiss, C. (1982), 'Policy research in the context of diffuse decision making', in D. B. P. Kallen, G. B. Kosse, H. C. Wagenaar, J. J. J. Kloprogge and M. Vorbeck (eds), *Social Science Research and Public Policy Making*, Windsor: NFER-Nelson, pp. 288-305.

Weiss, C. (1986), 'The many meanings of research utilisation', in M. Bulmer (ed.), *Social Science and Social Policy*, London: Allen and Unwin, pp. 31-40.

Willms, J. D. (1987), 'Differences between Scottish Education Authorities in their examination attainment', *Oxford Review of Education, 13(2), pp. 211-32.*

109

The scottish educational system and globalisation scottish education revisited a big transfer of power the general election in the united kingdom aspirational scotland international scotland every scot getting the right chances 26 september 2005 the scottish myth and nationalistic language scottish values, ideas and ambitions from witherspoon to today 6 april 2006 scotland's past greatness scotland's dependency on the united kingdom. The Scotland Act 1998 (The Scotland Act 19981) confirms the (re-) establishment of a Scottish Parliament and a Scottish Executive. The Chair of Scottish History and Literature at the University of Glasgow was founded in 1913, endowed by a grant from the receipts of the 1911 Scottish Exhibition held in Glasgow's Kelvingrove Park, as well as donations from the Merchants House of Glasgow and other donors. The chair has been held by a number of prominent historians of Scotland, including two Historiographers Royal. Although the chair is now based within the Department of History, it retains its original title. The CSHE Research and Occasional Paper Series (ROPS) includes working papers, original research studies, reflective essays by authors affiliated with CSHE, and major reports generated by CSHE related research projects. Authors are responsible for the content, and the views and interpretations expressed are not necessarily those of CSHE's research staff and other affiliated researchers. Questions regarding the content of individual ROPS contributions and CSHE research reports should be directed to the authors. If you would like to be notified when new CSHE ROPS papers are posted, please em