

《 自著を語る 1 》

上田学 『日本の近代教育とインド』（多賀出版、2001年1月刊、5000円）

本書は、明治後半から大正期にかけて、当時の日本の教育制度に関する情報がインドにどのようにして届けられ、その地における教育改革のための基礎資料として活用されていたかを明らかにしたものである。

日本では明治の初期から近代国家を形成するために積極的な近代化政策が導入されていった。教育もその一角を構成し、全国的な教育制度を整備した結果、明治後半には義務教育の普及率が90%を超えるまでになったことはよく知られている。このような日本における教育の急速な発展は、西洋列強の支配下にあったアジア諸国に強烈なインパクトを与え、東アジアや東南アジアの一部の国々では積極的に日本の教育制度を理解し、これを導入する試みがみられた。これまで日本の教育制度の発達史を外国との関係で論じたものなかで、西洋が日本に与えた影響について研究したものは数多くある。また日本の教育制度が主として東アジア地域に紹介された過程を分析したのも少数ながら存在するが、日本と文化的な背景を全く異にし、地域的にも日本から遠く隔たった英領植民地インドにおいて、日本の教育に着目していたという事実は全く知られてこなかった。本書はこの研究上の空白を埋めるべく、20世紀初頭からおおよそ20年余の間に日本の教育がインドにどのように紹介され、現地における教育改革論議にいかなる影響を与えたかを、英国、インドおよび日本に残されている資料をもとに論証したものである。なお本書は「海外における日本の教育制度理解に関する研究—今世紀初頭のインドを中心に—」という題目で京都大学に提出した学位請求論文をもとに、若干の加筆を行って刊行されたものである。

本書は9章構成になっている。第1章では、19世紀後半から20世紀初頭までの英領インドの政治、行政制度を概観し、当時までの教育政策の特徴を述べている。英国人たちは在来の教育制度を全面的に再編成するのではなく、有能な人材を植民地官僚として登用するために英語教育の普及を図っていったが、本国政府が植民地をより効率的に経営するという政策に転換していった結果、現地の教育を近代化していく必要性が生じてきた。そのためインドに赴任していた英国人教育関係者を欧米に派遣し、当時の各国の教育制度を視察・研究させる方策を採用した経緯が明らかにされている。

第2章では、上記の欧米を中心とした海外の教育事情視察の一環として、日本を対象として取り上げられたその経過と、実際に訪日して視察を行ったシャープという人物のプロフィールを明らかにしている。

第3章では、シャープの日本における視察状況を、当時の日本のジャーナリズムをもとにして再

現している。それによって彼の約半年に及ぶ滞在中に、首都圏はいうにおよばず、北海道から九州まで移動し、各段階における学校や関係機関を訪問したことが判明するのである。

第4章では、訪日の成果をインド総督府に報告するという事前の約束を果たすため、帰国後に作成した報告書（拙訳『ある英国人が見た明治後期の日本の教育』行路社、1993参照）の内容を吟味し、彼の問題意識とインドにもたらされた情報の中身を検討している。

第5章は、シャープが日本で得た知見を報告書以外の方法で提示した事例を紹介するとともに、帰国後の活動状況を紹介することにあてられている。

第6章は、当時のインドで高揚していた義務無償教育実施のための運動がインド立法参事会にまでおよび、そこで法案の審議が行われた事実に着目し、その審議過程を総督府文書によって再現している。そのなかで義務無償教育の好例として日本の実績が紹介されていることが明らかにされている。

第7章はインドで紹介された当時の日本の教育事情が、その地を経由して英国およびベルギーにまで伝達されている事実が紹介されている。

第8章では、以上の動きとは別に、一藩王国が日本の教育事情を知るためにインド人高官を日本に派遣したことに注目し、彼の訪日計画が立案されている経過と日本での視察内容、帰国後に刊行された報告書の内容が吟味されている。

終章は、明治後半から大正期にかけてインドから日本に派遣された二つの視察の試みの相互関係と、現地にどのような影響を与えたかを総括して論述することにあてられている。このような内容から知られるように、本書はインドの教育の発展を機軸にして、英国式の教育と日本の教育情報との相克関係を論述したものであるとともに、日本の近代教育史の知られざる側面を新たに開拓したものであるということができるであろう。

《 自著を語る 2 》

齋藤新治 『中世イングランドの基金立文法学校史』（亜紀書房、1997年）

「なぜ私立学校がパブリック・スクールなのか」

これは竹内洋氏（京都大学、教育社会学）が、講談社現代新書『パブリック・スクール』（1993年）において、英国のエリート再生産装置を分析されたとき、付随的にたてられた問題である。これを解くために以下の事実があげられている。

- ①パブリック・スクールの起源は中世の文法学校（グラマースクール）にある。
- ② 教授内容はラテン語やギリシア語の文法であった。
- ③ 時の経過とともに王侯貴族や金持ちが基金を投じた文法学校も設立されるようになった。それは、かれらの子弟のための私立学校であったことになる。
- ④ とはいうものの基金立学校は、一定数の貧しい少年を授業料無料で入学させることを学校規則で規定されていた。
- ⑤ 王侯貴族上流階級の子弟専用の私立ではなく、貧しい少年にも出身地を問うことなく開かれていった。このところがパブリックの意味である。このパブリック・スクールの原型は1382年設立のウィンチェスター校である。

この説明で疑問は解かれると思う。しかし'93年以降の教育史、制度史の研究に目を通すと、いくつかの疑問が生じる。①については、ウィンチェスター校は定款上は現在も聖母のカレジエト・チャーチである。略してウィンチェスター・カレッジである。②ギリシア語文法は教授されていなかった。ウィンチェスターの定款はラテン語文法教授を指定、テキストはラテン語。マスターの資格はラテン語学力のみを要求している。トマス・アクィナスですらラテン語の翻訳に頼りながらギリシア語文献を読んでいた事実。③パブリック・スクールの原型において王侯貴族上流階級は基金を投じなかった。王の犬の飼育係からとりたてられた俗人出の司教が基金を投じた。くだって16世紀における教育関係の基金の提供者の階層分析と金額の分析が、宮腰英一氏（東北大学、教育制度史）によってなされている（『19世紀英国の基金立文法学校』、創文社、2000年）。同書の34頁以下の明らかにするところによれば、国王・貴族階層の教育関係資金の投入は全体の一割余にすぎない。久保田圭二氏（名古屋大学、教育史）の『宗教改革期イングランドの学校教育に関する考察』（福村出版、2000年）は、「国王エドワード六世は文法学校の破壊者」という有名なリーチ説の

意味を考察している。ロイヤルの形容詞が文法学校を限定していても、王侯貴族が基金を投じたことを意味しない。認可しただけである。④については定款文言上も貧困スカラ70名と基金投下者の肉親縁者の子弟に限られている。有名なウィンチェスター・カレッジの構成員全体を描いた14世紀の図版には剃髪したスカラに関しては70名のみである。王侯貴族金持ちの少年の姿は描かれていない。したがって⑤は矢印の方向がまったく逆。本来、基金の受益者は肉親縁者の子どもと貧困な少年達に限定されていたものが、次第に富裕な少年達をも受け入れていくようになっていった。

600年間を、短い時期に輪切りにしてみればそこに矛盾する実態が浮かび上がるのは当然である。B・サイモン流の教育史のように、国民の教養の分裂の源をさぐりそこにエリート再生産装置を見出す視点も必要であろう。しかし、一国民の形成は過去の遺産を背負いつつ未来に向っての歩みである。山も谷もあろうが、600年をつらぬいて遵守されている定款の精神から本質をみとる視点が必要であろう。第一次世界大戦後、卒業生らが奉獻したラグビー・チャペルの壁は、卒業生の戦没者の多くの碑銘で埋め尽くされている。これほどノブレス・オブリージの意義を生々しく伝えるものはない。原型ウィンチェスターの卒業生は剃髪したスカラであり、黒死病伝染の危機にさらされる僧職についた。本来、ウィンチェスターもイートンもそれぞれに、まず肉親縁者と近隣の者、そして島国英国全体の死者の鎮魂のための祈りのカレッジであった。長期の学習に耐える貧しいスカラの姿こそ、祈りよりも、いっそう死者の魂を鎮めるにふさわしいものであった。基金の投下は「祈りの大義」から「慈善の大義」へと転換した時点でなされた。パブリック・スクールを扱う議会の委員が「チャリティ」委員会であるのはそのためである。

時とともにすべてが浮き草のように流れゆきて痕跡すら残さない。ある意味では優れた特色を持つわれわれ日本の教育文化からは、相当無理な飛躍をしない限り、理解できないのが英国のそれである。この飛躍があるからこそ日英教育研究フォーラムは価値があると思っている。『中世イングランドの基金立文法学校史』（亜紀書房、1997年）で私はこうした次第の一端を明らかにしたかったのである。

《 自著を語る 3 》

滝内大三 『イングランド女子教育史研究』

私がこの著書を世に出した時、いつからこんなテーマを研究していたのか、という質問を複数の人から受けました。男性が女子教育史を研究するのをいぶかしく思う人もいたようです。こんなことではいけない、もっとしっかりしなければと思ったのですが、社交下手と出不精が災いし、進歩のないまま今日に至ったことを恥ずかしく思っています。

私の研究の出発点は日本の親子心中の研究でした。親が子どもを殺して自分も死ぬ、そして社会に迷惑をかけないという責任の取り方がいかにも日本的という感じで、なぜ何もかも親の責任にされるのだろうかと考えました。統計を取ってみると、圧倒的に母子心中が多かったのです。子どもが障害児だからとか、夫や男性に捨てられて生活に困ったからという理由が多かったのですが、家庭という世界の密室性とその中に置かれた女性の選択肢の狭さに、男性である私は強い衝撃を受けました。なぜ家庭生活がプライバシーなのか。どうして女性はプライベートな世界に生きねばならないのか。「子どもは私のものだ。誰にも渡さない」という遺書を残して死んでいった女性の言葉を反芻しながら、ジェンダーとは、セクシュアリティとはと考えめぐっていた頃、自殺に関する国際学会に出席したオランダの女性心理学者に出会って尋ねたことがありました。親子心中は文化的背景の違いによってしか説明できないだろうという返事が返ってきただけでした。

ともかくヨーロッパに親子心中はないということなので、その「文化の違い」を確かめるためにも（私には英語しか理解できる言葉がなかったので）イギリスに行って女性の生き方を調べてみたいと思いました。文化を学ぶためには歴史を知る必要があると気づき、ロンドン大学キングズ・カレッジに席を置いて勉強しました。キリスト教と女性の関係を中心に学ぶつもりでしたが、偶然の機会からトントン・レポートの分析をテーマとすることになりました。というのも、ロンドンに着いた時イースターの休暇が始まっており、しかたがないのでLSEの図書館に行って夏目漱石のロンドン日記を見ていたら、彼の下宿の大家が自宅で女学校を経営していたと書かれていたのが目にとまり、女子を対象にしたプライベート・スクールの存在に興味を覚えたからです。じつにいい加減な動機です。

ですから私の著書にはオリジナリティと言えるものはほとんどありませんが、文化や階級の違いを越えてジェンダーが人間の生き方に大きな影響を及ぼしてきたことを自分なりに理解できたという点が収穫だったと思っています。また日本では今もガヴァネスといえば没落した中産階級の住み込み女性家庭教師を意味するとされていますが、visiting governess やとりわけ school governess

と呼ばれた private school の女性教師たちの存在に注目したところに自分なりの工夫があったと思います。

もう一つ、学校教育の段階を「初級」「中級」「高級」に分け、あえて「初等」「中等」「高等」と呼ばないことにしました。男女に平等に教育機会が保障されて初めてその名称を使うべきだと考えたからです、これは私一人の独善であったようです。

それから「おまけ」のような形で、七王国時代のヒルダという女性の物語、チョーサーの「バーズの女房」、それにウォルストクラフトの紹介等を書きました。たとえそれが研究とはほど遠いものであっても、私にはそれを書く必然性があったと思っています。というのも、私の最初の関心の方向であったキリスト教の女性観について、自分なりに整理しておきたかったからです。そしてある程度長い時間の流れの中で、イングランドの女性の姿を俯瞰的に見ておきたいと思いました。現在は時間とテーマを限定し、緻密に研究することが主流ですが、私のような問題意識を持つ者にとっては、こういうスタイルも許されるだろうと考えました。

最初はまったく考えなかったのですが、出版してから学位論文として認めていただくことができました。日本教育学会の書評にも取り上げていただきました。自分でも十分自覚してはいましたが、19世紀末からの女子教育の流れがどうなっていくかという展望がなく、この本の弱点になっています。中産階級の女性にとって、ほんとうにガヴァネス以外に職業は開かれていなかったのか、また20世紀に入ってどういう動きが出るかについては、その後、資料を発掘したりスケッチ風のエッセーを書いたりしましたが、まだまとまったものは出せていません。この分野は研究者が少なく、切磋琢磨する機会に乏しいのですが、ぜひ新しい視点から優れた研究書が出ることを期待しています。

《 自著を語る 4 》

橋本伸也・渡辺和行・進藤修一・安原義仁・藤井泰『エリート教育』ミネルヴァ書房、2001年。3800円。

最近、日本社会の変質に伴って、急激な教育改革が進行中である。とりわけ、平等主義的な教育システムへの反省もあり、「エリート教育」への関心も高まっているようだ（たとえば、竹内洋『大衆モダニズムの夢の跡』新曜社、2001年や「中央公論」編集部編『論争・中流崩壊』中公新書ラクレ、2001年など）。こうした議論においては欧米のエリート教育の現状や歴史に論究される場合が少なくない。だが、意外とヨーロッパのエリート教育（とくに中等教育から高等教育に至る）の比較史について真正面から取り上げた日本人研究者による本格的な著作はこれまで、存在しなかった。

本書は、19世紀におけるイギリス、フランス、ドイツ、ロシアという4カ国のエリート教育を比較社会史的に論述したものである。したがって、上に述べたようなわが国の研究状況において、本書の刊行は大きな意義があるのではないと思われる。この本の実質的な編者（プロモーター）は、ロシア教育史を専攻する橋本伸也（京都府立大学）である。イギリスは藤井と広島大学の安原義仁、フランスは政治史専攻の渡辺和行（奈良女子大学）、ドイツはドイツ史を進藤修一（大阪外国語大学）が担当している。1996年春に最初の研究会が開かれ、ほぼ5年間の期間を経て、ようやく刊行されたものである。

序章は橋本の筆になるもので、そこでは、内外の先行研究を踏まえ「エリート教育」の比較社会史的意義を強調した上で、本書の対象と課題が論述されている。

本論は、二部構成になっている。エリート学校の「制度と機能」と「文化と紐帯」とである。第1部は、「近代ヨーロッパの中等教育から高等教育をへてエリートへいたる制度構造を解明すること」である。第2部は、「エリートたちに人格化されたその文化の内実を問う」ことである。

第1部は「近代イギリスのエリート教育システムーパブリック・スクールからオックスブリッジへの学歴経路」（藤井担当）から始まる。ここでは、二つのエリート教育機関の仕組みと実際について、教育実態、教育内容、生徒の社会的出自および進路（大学進学率を含めて）などの観点から、その基本的な事実が明らかにされている。とくに、従来あまり知られることがなかった、19世紀末のパブリック・スクールのリストが載せられているのは注目されよう。さらに第2章のフランス編では、エリート中等教育機関「リセ」が取り上げられ、第3章のドイツ編では、ギムナジウムと総合大学の100年間の改革史が述べられる。第4章のロシア編では、ロシアのエリート的で特権的な中等・高等教育機関等が体系的に論じられている。

第2部のイギリス編（安原担当）では、オックスフォード大学を事例として、エリートのエート

スを涵養したカレッジ制度、チュートリアル・システム、優等学位試験制度、学生課外文化などといった独自の教育装置について説明が加えられている。また卒業生の進路に関しても興味深い史実が数多く紹介されている。フランスは「ファキュルテ」と高等師範学校が、ドイツは大学生活の「決闘」が、ロシアは「古典語教育」が取り上げられ、それぞれの国のエリート学校のエートスに迫っている。

本書には多くの図版が挿入されており、視覚的にも楽しい本となるように工夫されている。またコラムとしてイギリスに関しては、「チャーチルの小学校時代」「弁論ユニオン」「大学選出下院議員」の3点が用意されている。

以上、本書の意義と構成について述べたが、現代のエリート・高等教育問題への示唆という観点からは、本書の読者には若干の不満も残るかもしれない。大衆化社会を経て、最近のエリート教育問題は新たな段階に入っていると言えよう。21世紀を迎えた今、本研究の成果を踏まえて上で、われわれは20世紀的エリート教育システムの歴史（解体、変容、再構築など）を、比較教育社会史の新たな議論の俎上に乗せる必要があるかもしれない。今後の課題も少なくないことは、執筆者の一人として十分に認識している。

なお、本書のいわば姉妹図書として、コンラート・ヤーラオシュ編、望田幸男、安原義仁、橋本伸也監訳『高等教育の変貌』昭和堂、2000年が刊行されている（イギリス高等教育史関係では4本の論文が収録されている）。

最後に、この共同研究が一つの契機となり「比較教育社会史研究会」が発足したことを申し添えておきたい。新たな企画も検討されている。今年の秋の教育史学会（上越教育大学）でコロキウムを開催しますので、興味がある方のご参加をお待ちしています。

藤井 泰（松山大学）

My Recommendation

Richard Aldrich, David Crook and David Watson, *Education and Employment: the DfEE and its Place in History*, Institute of Education, 2000, ISBN 0 85473 605 0, pp. 238, price £15.99

The Department for Education and Employment (DfEE) was created in 1995. Five years later this book provides the first major analysis of the creation, role and future prospects for the Department. Its publication also marks the centenary of the Board of Education, founded in 1900. The study which was supported by a generous grant from the Nuffield Foundation, draws upon a rich variety of primary and secondary sources, including interviews with the Secretary of State, David Blunkett, and the Permanent Secretary, Sir Michael Bichard. Indeed, the book was launched in June 2000 at the DfEE by David Blunkett himself and a week later most favourably reviewed by the previous Secretary of State, Gillian Shephard, as book of the week in the Times Educational Supplement.

The design and purpose of the book reflect an historical perspectives approach. Thus introductory chapters provide basic historical and comparative contexts and an in-depth account of the creation of the Department. Four historical chapters examine the separate trajectories of the Education and Employment departments throughout the century and the relationships between them. Political and administrative developments are located within broader social, cultural and intellectual frameworks. The penultimate chapter examines the concept and implementation of lifelong learning.

In their conclusions the authors contrast the unexpected nature of the creation of the new Department in the short term, with the longer historical perspective of vocational education which pre-dated the rise of the schooled society. They show that the DfEE was unique in international terms, and that the conjunction of Education and Employment raised the status of the Department above that of either of its predecessors. They also show the contrasting historical cultures of the two previous departments. Education was small in size, a policy department which

neither owned any schools nor employed any teachers. Employment, on the other hand was much larger, with commonly ten times as many employees, and offices throughout the country. The Employment department was often at its most prominent in times of national crisis - war or slumps. Conversely, the Education department might then be at its weakest.

Perhaps the most significant fact to emerge from this study, however, is the transient nature of political and administrative arrangements. In a single century the Education Department had four separate incarnations - Board of Education, Ministry of Education, Department of Education and Science, Department for Education. The Employment Department had five - Ministry of Department of Employment and Productivity, Department of Employment. Ministers in charge of the departments remained in office on average for some two years. Not surprisingly, therefore, the authors conclude that the department would soon change again and so indeed it proved.

In June 2001, following victory in the General Election, Prime Minister, Tony Blair, moved David Blunkett from his post at the DfEE to become Home Secretary. At the same time the Department for Education and Employment, which had lasted a mere six years, was recast once more. The DfEE lost responsibility for the New Deal programme, designed to get the jobless into work, and the Employment Service, with its JobCentre Plus, a combination of jobcentres and benefit agencies. These were moved to a new Department of Work and Pensions. Shorn of these responsibilities the DfEE became the Department for Education and Skills.

Richard Aldrich
Institute of Education
University of London

STEPHEN GORARD, *Education and Social Justice: The changing composition of schools and its implications*, 2000, Cardiff, University of Wales Press. £35.00 hardback ISBN No: 0-7083-1619-0

Stephen Gorard maintains that the 'crisis' in British education, a theme associated with the authors of the 'Black Papers' and, more recently with such commentators as Melanie Phillips, has been overplayed. This book dares to be different, by casting doubt upon the orthodox sociological view that educational participation, performance and attainment became more polarized in the 1990s. It finds no convincing evidence of UK underperformance at an international level and concludes that the quest for social justice will more successfully be addressed by the development of social and economic policies outside of the educational arena. 'Disadvantage remains disadvantage', Gorard reminds us, 'wherever students are taught how to read and write' (p.137).

Gorard's evidence is based on six datasets that have provided a basis for his own research over the past four years, supported by grants from the ESRC and Spencer Foundation. These data are extensive and sometimes complex, but the statistical information presented in the book is mostly accessible to the non-expert reader. Following a preliminary evaluation of the 'crisis' subsequent chapters draw on the datasets to examine the social composition of schools, segregation between institutions, national and international comparisons, differences between various school sectors and student achievement levels.

Gorard dismisses all suggestions of crisis and has a range of alternative explanations to hand. Faulty research design, misrepresentation of data and political scare mongering are central to his critique, and the published findings of Ofsted, the National Foundation for Educational Research and the Third International Mathematics and Science Survey are all questioned in his analysis. Chapter by chapter, the themes of social class, gender, ethnicity, selection and private schooling are subjected to Gorard's revisionism. From all this comes some good news and other news that isn't as bad as might be expected.

Some chapters work better than others, and occasionally the writing becomes

over-deterministic, but overt 'Whiggism' is avoided. Gorard draws inspiration from David Hamilton's rejection of the 'pathological view of public education' (p.5), but the challenge of developing and sustaining an argument around the theme of social justice poses inevitable difficulties. The final chapter sees the author proclaim that 'Social justice in British education is growing, as divisions between the home nations, between school sectors, between schools and between students are declining'. This raises important questions for the reader, however. Does Gorard believe that social justice – or injustice – is always measurable? Does it follow that qualitative approaches are less valid than the quantitative methodologies pursued in this volume? Can social justice be defined or understood in other ways?

This book is both interesting and provocative. Even if its central thesis is correct, however, it is unlikely to have much impact upon the discourse of school improvement or current policy trends. It is a curiosity that the existence of a 'crisis' in British education suits just about every individual, pressure groups or political party with an education viewpoint. Educational standards may not actually be falling, but the sense of crisis is perpetuated by the view from all sides that they are not high enough.

Education and Social Justice is an important book in two respects. First, it challenges a number of misapprehensions and damaging misrepresentations of Welsh education. Gorard's defence of Welsh comprehensive schools is especially robust. Second, this book should certainly be included on reading lists for education research methods courses. All too often news stories compound what Gorard terms 'the politician's error' by confusing percentages with percentage points. Unfortunately, however, it is not unknown even for educational researchers to misrepresent their data. The book calls for educational research to be numerate, rational, empirical and balanced. If it is not, the author warns, 'then the reputedly poor quality of much educational research may continue to be used to justify the curtailing of academic freedoms in this area, making research subservient to the needs of the government or one of its client groups such as teacher trainers' (pp.184-85). This is indeed a timely warning for us all.

David Crook, Institute of Education, University of London

LOWE, R. (ed) (2000) *The History Of Education: Major Themes* (RoutledgeFalmer, London: 4 volumes)

Confronted with the welcome but daunting task of selecting for review any one work of educational history produced over the past thirty years, the richness of the alternatives on offer seems almost overwhelming. Should it be Brian Simon? — but this seems too obvious. Should it be a book that has influenced my own work?— but which? Then the answer came: I should cheat, and have it all. And this choice is now possible through the appearance of a massive new collection of work in the history of education, edited with scrupulous care by Professor Roy Lowe.

This is a celebration of educational history as it has developed over the past thirty years: a collection of 111 major papers published between 1957 (Lawrence Cremin's paper on the progressive movement in American education) and 2000 (Gareth Elwyn Jones on educational policy making in Wales). It consists of four volumes, totalling 2,146 pages of text in addition to editorial introductions and an extensive index. The first volume focuses on debates in the history of education, an indispensable collection of historiographical essays that charts developments in perspectives on the field in America, England, Canada and Europe, and including several pieces on the study of women's education. The second explores education in its social context, with work ranging from Brian Simon and Richard Johnson on the origins and functions of mass schooling, to more recent work on education and the state, the politics of education, urban education, the education of women and girls, and education and masculinity. The third deals with studies in teaching and learning, more specifically the history of the curriculum, progressivism, the teaching profession, childhood, literacy, and the inculcation of attitudes. The final volume roves widely around a range of education systems, examining in particular depth issues of ethnicity, imperialism, school attendance, elite formation, and social reproduction, before concluding with a set of papers on different national systems. Included are two key papers that relate in particular to the history of education in Japan: the work of Takashi and Mangan on Japanese colonial education in Taiwan (number 95 in the collection), and that of Beauchamp on the development of Japanese educational policy, 1945-1985 (111). Nearly one-quarter of the pieces

were originally published in the journal of the History of Education Society in the United Kingdom, *History of Education*, reflecting in part the preferences of Lowe himself as editor of the collection and former editor of that journal, but also denoting the strong position of the journal in international debates.

Roy Lowe in his general introduction to the collection suggests that it embodies what has been in his view 'little short of a revolution' (vol. I, p. xlii) in the writing of the history of education since the 1960s. It does indeed reflect the major shifts in interest and emphasis that have taken place over that time. Yet it also evokes the underlying continuities, the common aspirations that link the work of the 1950s and 1960s to that of emerging authors in the early 21st century. In another way, too, the collection reveals the reinvention of the field of history of education, its restless search for new themes and issues that has often been necessitated by challenges to the relevance and even the very existence of the field.

Inevitably in a collection such as this there are some points of contention. Only twenty percent of the authors are women, for example. The overwhelming majority of items address issues on the 19th and 20th century history of education rather than of earlier periods. About two-thirds of the pieces were originally published in the fifteen years since 1986, which may also help to explain the exclusion of some leading figures from the 1960s such as Lawrence Stone, Harry Armytage, and Kenneth Charlton. The collection as a whole is also much less strong on neo-conservative and neo-liberal commentaries of educational history than it is of radical-left interpretations. Correlli Barnett, E.G. West and Martin Wiener, for instance, are represented in these volumes only by their critics. Nevertheless, Lowe's collection is a remarkable achievement, and surely constitutes a unique documentary record of the field as a whole. It is surely a lasting monument to the vigour and the aspirations of this fascinating field of study. If I were invited to take just one work on the history of education with me to a desert island I think I would be sorely tempted to cheat again, and to take this one.

Gary McCulloch
University of Sheffield

Dr John COLEMAN and Professor Leo HENDRY
The Nature of Adolescence (First published in 1980, 3rd edition 1999)
Routledge

This book is very well known amongst those studying adolescence. It is considered to be one of the main textbooks on this topic, and is widely used by students, academics, as well as those working with young people. It is written by two of the best known youth researchers in Europe: Dr John Coleman is Director of the Trust for the Study of Adolescence (England), and Professor Leo Hendry is at the University of Aberdeen (Scotland) and the University of Trondheim (Norway).

The book aims to document and explain the changes of the adolescent years, drawing on research from around the world. It is divided into chapters which address the following topics:

- physical development
- thinking and reasoning
- self and identity
- families
- sexuality
- health
- friendships and the peer group
- work, unemployment and leisure
- anti-social behaviour
- politics, altruism and social action
- stress, coping and adjustment

These chapters therefore investigate the major issues that are occupying adolescent researchers at present. Each chapter highlights key research findings, discusses their implications, and identifies areas for future research. Usefully, each chapter has a final section which provides key reading, and describes implications for practice. One of the main features of this book is the breadth of research that it draws upon. The majority of the chapters describe research from across Europe, the United States, and Australia, as well as some references from Asia and Africa. This wide range of references means that the book is truly global in its perspective.

When this book was first published in 1980, it became a key text on adolescence. However, the third edition, published in 1999, brought a new focus for the study of adolescence. The third edition has a number of features which distinguishes it from earlier editions. First, it focusses equally on the process of normal adolescent development, and abnormal development or problems in this period. Second, the most recent edition focusses on how social issues and societal problems impact on adolescent development. Third, new chapters were added in the third edition, focussing on anti-social behaviour, health, and politics and altruism. Finally, all the chapters now have a special focus on how gender and race/ethnicity influence patterns of adolescent development. These developments in the third edition are very valuable, and make this a truly up-to-date text book.

I would thoroughly recommend this book to anyone interested in adolescence. In particular the book demonstrates the importance of developing good theory and undertaking good research for understanding the lives of young people today, and the social issues that affect them. This book helps us to understand this key developmental phase.

Debi Roker (Dr)
Assistant Director
Trust for the Study of Adolescence
UK

droker@tsa.uk.com

Reclaiming Knowledge; Social Theory, curriculum and educational policy

By Johan Muller, London, RoutledgeFalmer (price £50.00)

The themes that the book addresses arise both from the author's engagement in a range of international debates in the sociology of education and from the leading role that he has played in the development of education and training policy in South Africa since Nelson Mandela's release from prison in 1990. He explores a number of specific educational issues such as literacy, the links between schooling and everyday life, the role of qualifications and the future of universities in economic regeneration. He also addresses the pressures on educational researchers themselves and whether they have an alternative to being either 'critics' in endless opposition or 'reconstructors' working for government and therefore constrained in what they can say about policies. These issues are not unique to South Africa. However, they are given a distinctness and urgency by the uniqueness of the South African context. So much was expected when the first democratic government led by the African National Congress was elected in 1994 and many of the committed intellectuals who had been involved in the struggle against apartheid found themselves playing a role in that government. For the first time they found themselves having to actually design and implement policies and not just critique them.

The book identifies a common thread in a number of areas of educational policy debate in South Africa which resonate with debates in other countries. These range from the argument proposed by Michael Gibbons and his colleagues that new forms of multi-disciplinary knowledge should replace the disciplines as the basis for the university curriculum, to what are known as the 'new literacy studies' which challenge the traditional emphasis that literacy necessarily involves the ability to read and write. Another area of educational policy explored in the book is the implications of the idea that competence should underpin all qualifications within a single national framework. Muller's argument is that the common thread in these apparently disparate policies is that they mirror, sometimes explicitly and sometimes not, two claims in recent social theory. These are that all forms of knowledge are, at some fundamental level, equal and that all boundaries are socially constructed in the interests of those in power and must be overcome. He

defines this theory as 'constructivism' which he suggests

"has taken a perfectly reasonable set of theses about the social constitution of knowledge and radicalised it into a claim that... reality is merely an artefact of our knowledge about it..."

Muller sees this radicalisation as having "pernicious effects on the formulation of policy and the practice of education (in South Africa)" and seriously at odds with a broader and more inclusive sense of the purpose and content of sociological theory. It is unlikely that these so called 'theories' would have such a direct effect on policy in industrialised countries in Europe or Japan where the capacity of schooling is far more extensive and deeply embedded than in South Africa. However the basic argument is in no way restricted to South Africa or developing countries. The distinctive feature of Muller's analysis and the examples he takes and why it is so important is that unlike other cases of the role of ideologies influencing educational policies (such as NVQs in the UK) they arise from progressive and even radical theories associated often associated with feminist and anti-racist movements.

Muller draws on a remarkable range of ideas which range from Latour's sociology of science to Bernstein's sociology of education and the work of Castells and others in development studies to challenge these trends. His specific focus, however, is on the lessons to be learnt from the sociology of knowledge, especially the ideas first developed by Emile Durkheim nearly a century ago and given a new life until his untimely death last year in the writings of Basil Bernstein.

His book re-establishes the question of knowledge at the centre of debates about education and in particular the curriculum. At the same time he asserts that a recognition of the 'intrinsic sociality' of knowledge does not lead, as some have argued, to an anti-epistemological relativist argument that all knowledge and all forms of thought are in some fundamental way equal. The strength of the book is the way in which his argument is developed. Muller does not just dismiss the 'constructivist' arguments that he disagrees with. He points out what he calls their relationship with their opposites. For example, at the same time as arguing that boundaries, whether between disciplines or between school and work, are

essential to learning and the production of new knowledge, Muller shows that it is precisely the boundedness of real learning that enables the learner to cross the boundaries and develop new knowledge. Furthermore, while his argument about the 'intrinsic sociality' of knowledge is mapped out very clearly in general terms in the introduction, it is not left there. He shows how it needs to enter any serious debates about the future of education if they are to move policy forward and not as so often do little more than repeat the past in a new language.

It is my view that Professor Muller has written a remarkable book that will be a storehouse of ideas for educationists both in South Africa and also in many other countries for years to come. It is a highly scholarly book, the product deep and extensive reading, and therefore not easy to read, even for those trained in sociology; however, it more than repays the effort. My only regret is that the publishers have so far lacked either the foresight or the market intelligence to publish it in paperback; to do so would, I am sure, more than repay their investment.

Michael Young

Counting Costs and Benefits: Human Capital and the Economics of Education

Interest in the economics of education developed in a series of bursts in the period since the Second World War, following the equally spasmodic, yet increasingly rapid expansion of post school education during that period. The expansion occurred because of the pressure of demand for educational qualifications from a seemingly ever growing sector of semi skilled, skilled and professional workers, which was to be found throughout the capitalist world. It is interesting that the demand came from the bottom up rather than the top down, with governments persuaded of the necessity through pressure from their citizens and by observing the policy and practice of their national competitors. Private employers, whether individual or in associations, were, at least at the outset, less persuaded of the necessity to meet the apparently insatiable demand for formal, post school educational qualifications. The need for basic education, literacy and numeracy, was accepted, but to go beyond that was seen by employers, always suspicious of growths in public spending, as probably unnecessary for more than a relatively few key workers. If advanced training was required, better for employers to provide it themselves, tailored to their company needs, for their own workers, who could be contractually bound, thus preventing the investment in training proving to be a gift to a competitor. Nevertheless, as the capitalist economy became more sophisticated, so the assumption grew that better educated workers would prove to be more productive and thus of greater value to an employer. It was assumed also that such workers would also be more competitive in an equally sophisticated, frequently changing and wider ranging labour market, to the benefit of themselves. Finally, it was assumed that the knowledge and skills needed by such workers would be most efficiently provided by a formal educational system responsive to the needs of the national economy and organized and financed by the State, which made it, theoretically at least, open to all citizens.

This was followed, in all developed countries, by a massive public investment in education at all levels. Education is, of course, assumed to be a 'good thing' for all sorts of reasons. The question in this context however, is whether educational

spending treated as an investment makes sense. A systematic attempt to measure the costs and benefits of such spending according to economic criteria followed, with comparison with the performance of competitors providing an additional tool. This attempt, begun initially by economists in the United States such as Jacob Mincer and Gary Becker, had as its intellectual foundation the long established theories of classical and neo-classical economic theory. It was observed that the average earnings of workers rose on a sliding scale linked apparently to the length of formal schooling. It was argued that the years of schooling represented an investment on the part of individuals and their families, either directly or in terms of earnings deferred, as well as on the part of the State as chief provider. Such schooling represented 'human capital', embodied in individual workers and was the economic product of the educational system. From this basis there developed an intellectual subset of the discipline of economics, sometimes known as 'human capital theory' or otherwise simply as 'the economics of education'. An early and subsequently well used text from the United Kingdom is Mark Blaug's *An Introduction to the Economics of Education*, first published in 1970¹⁾.

Whether one accepts the arguments put forward by the human capital theorists depends, of course, on whether the neo-classical theory of economics is also accepted as valid. The argument of the neo-classicists is that the price of a factor of production (in this case education) is set by its marginal contribution to total output or marginal revenue theory. The task of calculating this for the contribution of education to the marginal revenue of millions of individuals, let alone collectively, is obviously quite staggering, especially given the added complication of social costs and yields. It is worth noting that yet another theoretical sub set, has emerged in recent year and that is the concept of 'social capital' elaborated, among other by the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu²⁾. The contribution to marginal revenue lies at the core however, and as the debate over the merits of this fundamental principle ebbed and flowed over the past thirty years, so has the enthusiasm for 'the economics of education'.

It should be obvious, from what has been said above, that human capital theory and the accompanying tasks of human and social capital formation are also important elements in development theory . Their influence is perhaps greatest

when economies seem to have achieved, in the phrase of W. W. Rostow, 'economic take off.'³⁾

For instance, some very recent examples seek to explain (along with references to so called 'Asian values') the success of the newly industrializing countries of South East Asia and of the Pacific Rim. Particularly worth of notice are the volume of essays edited by Ogawa, Jones and Williamson in 1993⁴⁾ and by Joseph Tan in 1999. Most recently there is J.G.B. Tilak's quite excellent World Bank Institute paper which, while focussing on East Asia, also offers some suggestions on what others can learn.

In this sense of what may be of general applicability, what has not been available is an up to date book which sets out the theoretical basis of the debate and its relevance for education policy makers, practitioners and consumers. Certainly, the debate has once again become fierce, especially given the context of globalization of the economy, the growing demand for educational qualifications and, increasingly, that education be delivered privately or at least according to market principles. Clive Belfield's recent book, *Economic Principles for Education: Theory and Evidence* (2000)⁵⁾ goes a long way to meet the need. In ten succinctly written and accessible chapters, Belfield summarizes and analyzes the theories underpinning the application of economics to education, the development of human capital theory, the theory of enrolment choice, of the enterprise and specifically the evidence on treating educational institutions as economic enterprises. This leads on, in the second half of the book, to an examination of factor inputs and to the theory of the market. It concludes, as logically it should, with a fresh consideration of the role of government and the State in education, of key importance in an era of transition from state socialism⁶⁾.

Belfield concludes with an attempt to show how the aggregate effects of education can be measured and how economic theory may be used in the development of education policy. He argues that three micro-economic policy aims stand out. First, policies can influence the stream of costs and benefits within any investment appraisal; and which investor whether, State, private company, family or individual will not require such an appraisal? Secondly, the internal efficiency of education providers can be enhanced through the use of incentives. The complexity and

contradictions involved in such an exercise are also noted. Thirdly, analysis of provision and performance within the sector is encouraged for use by government, by other providers, by students and their families and by citizens as tax payers and voters. The task, he says, is not simply to provide more descriptive information, but to cultivate instead a better understanding of the expected costs and benefits of education. This will both stimulate efficiency and may allow a consensus for investment decisions to emerge. This would be a considerable gain given the heat of the political debate about educational provision and investment that is to be found everywhere. As a further contribution to this, economic concepts can be used set an agenda for educational research and, though he does not say this explicitly, comparative policy research especially. He rests his case fundamentally on the common sense appeal of economics, that resources, be they time, money, energy or will, are scarce and have alternative uses. This being so obviously the case, it is sensible to establish appropriate evaluative criteria which can identify the relative cost-effectiveness and outcome of the use of resources for educational purposes. This is not the same as a narrow, bureaucratic 'quality assurance' approach.

It is a simple, but effective argument and makes one wonder why the 'economics of education' isn't regarded as a fundamental part of the curriculum for those aspiring to be professionally engaged in education, whether as teachers, administrators or policy makers. We hear a great deal about the need for 'leadership' skills and the like, but this would be less rhetorical, if such skills were developed together with a sound grasp of the economic principles which lead us to invest in education at all. Belfield's book, which has the added attraction of an excellent bibliography, is an excellent tool by which to establish such an understanding. There are, of course, other fundamentals such as the history and philosophy of education, which have also been neglected in favour of fashionable solutions to education policy problems; but that lies outside the scope of this brief commentary.

Professor W. J. Morgan,
Director, The Centre for Comparative Education Research,
The University of Nottingham,
Nottingham, NG8 1BB, United Kingdom, <mailto:John.Morgan@nottingham.ac.uk>

- 1) Blaug, M. (1970), *An Introduction to the Economics of Education*,
- 2) Bourdieu, P. (1986) 'The forms of capital', Richardson, J. E. (ed.) *Handbook of the Theory of Research for the Sociology of Education*, Greenwood Press, Westport, CT., pp. 241-258.
- 3) Rostow, W.W. (1990), *The Stages of Economic Growth: A non communist manifesto*, 3rd Edition, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- 4) Ogawa, N, Jones, G.W. and Williamson, J.G. (1993), *Human Resources in Development Along the Asia-Pacific Rim*, Oxford University Press, Singapore, Oxford and New York.
- 5) Belfield, C. R. (2000), *Economic Principles for Education: Theory and Evidence*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, U.K. and Northampton, Mass.
- 6) See Muckle, J. and Morgan, W.J. (2001), *Post-School Education and the Transition from State Socialism*, The Continuing Education Press, Nottingham, U.K.

Information

NEW PUBLICATION FROM THE CONTINUING EDUCATION PRESS

Post School Education and the Transition from State Socialism (Eds.) James Muckle and W. John Morgan. The Continuing Education Press, Nottingham, 2001, £34. 95 hardback, ISBN 1 85041 093 3

This book, one of a series to be produced by the Centre for Comparative Education Research, examines the effect of the transition from State Socialism on post compulsory education in a number of countries world wide, There are analyses of the situation in Russia, China, Tibet, Uzbekistan, Mongolia, Bulgaria, Vietnam and Cuba. Some chapters are by nationals of the country concerned, others by outside observers, all with practical experience of the system under consideration. It is believed that these perspectives together provide a useful contribution both to the historical debate on the State Socialist experience and and to the discussion of the complex and uneven process of transition.

The book should be of interest to many SCUTREA members who may consider either individual purchase or a recommendation for library purchase. For other CEP publications see the web site at: <http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/cont-ed>

イギリスの教育の動き

－2000年8月から2001年7月まで－

佐々木 毅 （国立教育政策研究所）

2000年

<8月>

1日、ジャッキー・スミス学校水準担当政務次官は教員組合の一つであるPATに対し、校長の児童生徒を排除する権限を強化すると語る。2日、ブラックストーン教育雇用閣外相はデヴィッド・シャーロックを成人学習視学団ALIの首席視学官に任命することを発表した。9日、スミスは中等学校での学習に備えるリテラシーおよびニューメラシー夏季学校が1,800校、英才夏季学校が500校と記録的に増加したと発表した。23日、エステル・モリス学校水準担当閣外相はGCSEおよびGNVQの第1部試験の結果について受験生たちに祝意を述べた。31日、マルコム・ウィック生涯学習担当政務次官はニュー・ディールが失業中の若者たちの就職援助に成功しつつあると発表した。モリスは教育費のもっと多くの部分が学校に直接交付されることが望ましいと発言した。

<9月>

1日、モリスはグラマー・スクールをめぐる投票に関する法律（学校水準・大綱法）への改正要求を拒否した。また下院の教育・雇用委員会が教育事業における私的部門の役割の重要性を認めたことを歓迎した。7日、モリスは14か所の新しい小規模な教育改善行動地域E A Zの指定を発表した。12日、ブレア首相、ブランケット教育雇用大臣は親たちが教育における水準の引き上げに重要な役割を有していると言明した。15日、ブランケットは最初の3つのシティ・アカデミーの設置場所を発表した。19日、スミスは学校における親理事の全国的なネットワークが教育における親の全国的な発言の場となるであろうと述べた。20日、ブランケットはキー・ステージ・テストの結果インナー・シティーの学校における基礎学力が相当に改善されてきたことがわかったと述べた。またニュー・ディールの成功の上に、完全雇用への政策を追求すると語った。26日、ブレアはスペシャリスト・スクールのために2800万ポンドの新たな支出を行い、2004年9月までにその数を1,000校にするという目標を発表した。また中等教育におけるICT推進のための10億ポンドの支出を明らかにした。27日、ブランケットは2004年9月までにあらゆる3歳児が親が望む場合は無償の幼児教育を受けられるようにすると発言した。また基礎的なリテラシー／ニューメラシーをもたない成人の教育のために1億5千万ポンドを支出することを発表した。

<10月>

4日、マイクル・ウィルズ学習・技術担当政務次官は新しいテクノロジーが7－11歳の児童の成績の改善に役立つことが明らかになったと述べた。教育水準局OFSTEDは薬物教育についての