Deconstructing student voice: new spaces for dialogue or new opportunities for surveillance?

Michael Fielding & Jane McGregor

Paper presented to the Symposium

Speaking up and speaking out: International perspectives on the democratic possibilities of student voice

AERA Montreal
April 2005

This paper is in **draft** form.
Please do not quote without prior permission of the authors.

Dr Michael Fielding
Centre for Educational Innovation
School of Education
The Sussex Institute
University of Sussex
Brighton BN1 9QQ
UK

m.fielding@sussex.ac.uk

Dr Jane McGregor
Networked Learning Group (NCSL)
Derwent House
University Way
Cranfield
Bedfordshire MK43 OAZ
UK

Jane.McGregor@ncsl.org.uk

Abstract

This paper sets out to explore recent developments in a re-emerging field, now often known as 'student voice', which in its apparent desire to encourage young people to articulate their concerns and aspirations about a whole range of matters has the potential to offer an important contribution to educational renewal. We begin by attempting to contextualise what is now a burgeoning range of practical and research activities before then attempting a two-fold differentiation of what we take 'student voice' to be about. We look, firstly, at professional understandings and locations of student voice in order to try to get a more fine-grained feel for the kinds of things that currently exemplify its daily work, using examples from the Networked Learning Communities programme in England. Secondly, and partly in response to disappointments and unfulfilled aspirations, we look at a number of political and ideological frameworks in the hope that they might assist in deepening our understanding of the prospects and possibilities of future work in this field. In our final, short section we argue strongly for the development of dialogic spaces, both private and public, within and between schools. We end with some ambivalent reflections on the two central aspirations of student voice work, namely, that it holds out the possibility of (i) fruitful educational development and (ii) deeper 'transformation'.

| 1 | **The Contemporary Context of 'New Wave' Student Voice in England** |

Urgency

The need to re-articulate our aspirations for education is at once urgent and exhilarating (1). It is urgent because, as writers like David Marquand remind us, the application of market models to the public realm not only fail to enhance the cause of democratic human flourishing, it also undermines the inter-personal foundation of our civic and communal practices and aspirations. In so doing it disrupts and distorts the very basis of our well being as citizens and as persons. 'The intrusion of market measuring rods and a market rhetoric may twist (the distinctive practices of the public domain) out of shape, and corrode the ethics they embody and pass on.' (Marquand 2003: 35)

In England education has suffered particularly badly in this respect. Not only, to quote Marquand again, have 'the cult of private-sector managerialism and the accompanying audit explosion … transformed the attitudes and behaviour of its managers' (Ibid: 125), we remain driven by the raucous 'rigour' of a dispiriting, increasingly punitive and discredited form of accountability – 'the suspicious and impatient hectoring and the relentless paper-chasing' (Ibid: 142) - and the bullying requirements of a subsequently pressured practice, full of ticked targets and prescribed pedagogy, signifying, if not nothing, then too little we feel genuinely worthwhile and too much we abhor. Good teachers achieve despite the current system rather than because of it, whilst significant and increasing numbers of young people find school unfulfilling or reject it altogether. The stentorian tones of middle class 'voice' dominate the monologue of the 'big conversation' and the dissembling privilege of 'choice' renders inaudible the increasingly alien discourse of social justice and basic humanity: 'money talks; and the louder it talks, the harder it becomes to hear un-monied voices' (Ibid: 132)

Despite the fact that 'transformation' is replacing 'school improvement' and 'networking', 'collaboration' and 'personalisation' look set to become the new orthodoxy, there is little acknowledgement that we are only tinkering with a moribund system. Still less is there any recognition that, unless we make the appropriate intellectual effort to think more profoundly and in a more historically informed way about our current dilemmas, we look set to unwittingly usher in a new era that is totalitarian both in its dispositions and its practical consequences. These are matters the populist panacea of 'personalisation' is unlikely to either address or redress. Insistent advocacy of 'voice' and 'choice' does little to demystify the metaphysics of the market or make visible the 'beneficent' hand that guides its daily work: alliterative resonance is no substitute for profound thought and intelligent action.

Exhilaration

The depth and extent of market rationality – 'the chief threat to democracy in present-day Britain' (Ibid: 4)' - make the task of educational renewal all the more urgent. Interestingly, the discourses of what we have, perhaps tongue-in-cheek, called the 'new wave' of 'student voice' which provide the central pre-occupation of this paper, pose something of a puzzle. Is student voice best understood as part of an essentially neo-liberal project, as part of a resurgent democratic engagement, as part of a Foucauldian furtherance of 'governmentality', a mixture of all or some of these, or something quite different that needs to named more eloquently and more convincingly than other discourses and frameworks currently allow?

We will come to those dilemmas shortly. For the moment it is enough to record at least an initial exhilaration since, perhaps to our surprise, two decades of profoundly damaging policies and practices have also seen the emergence of apparently positive developments in what has come to be known as pupil or 'student voice'. As much as any development in schools in the last ten years, this 'new wave' of student voice activity seems to hold out real hope both for renewal and for the development of pre-figurative democratic practice that give teachers and students the courage and the confidence to create new practices and proposals for a more just and vibrant society.

Student voice covers a range of activities that encourage reflection, discussion, dialogue and action on matters that primarily concern students, but also, by implication, school staff and the communities they serve. This includes such developments as peer support arrangements (e.g. buddying systems, peer tutoring, peer teaching, circle time), systems that encourage and enable students to articulate their views and see through appropriate changes (e.g. schools councils, students on school boards, students on appointment panels for new staff – including deputy principals and principals, 'child-to-child' initiatives, and students-as-researchers) and a small but growing cluster of activities that encourage various forms of overt student leadership (students as lead-learners and student-led learning walks) and what may be termed 'active citizenship' through initiating and participating in community projects.

In many cases, particular approaches are supported and / or inspired by external organisations dedicated to developing and promoting those areas of work. It is also increasingly true that there is significant external support from a number of different sources, many of which offer a range of approaches rather than a single focus and some of which seek to provide a coherent strategic orientation plugged in to local, regional and sometimes national networks.

Of the five approaches mentioned below, the most substantially funded and most extensive are those connected to central government. Whilst the recent Department for Education and Skills (DfES) 'Working Together: Giving children and young people a say' (DfES 2004) is a one-off intervention, it remains an important, if rather cautious, symbolic statement. The most significant and substantially funded government student voice work is the Networked Learning Communities (NLC) programme, launched in September 2002, brings together clusters of schools, Local Education Authorities (School Districts), Higher Education Institutions and the wider community, to work collaboratively to raise standards and improve opportunities for young people. The NLC programme is almost certainly the largest such initiative in

the world, and is the National College for School Leadership's (NCSL) most extensive development and research programme. The particular aims are to develop collaborative and enquiry-based networks, learn about networked learning and to inform the wider education system and a major aspiration is 'learning *on behalf* of others . There are now 137 networks collaborating across England, including approximately 1,500 schools, 25,000 staff and over 500,000 students, this represents around 5% of the schools in the country (Jackson,2004).

Secondly, there are externally based frameworks and programmes such as the relatively recent Hay McBer 'Transforming Learning' programme (Hay McBer 2004), the long-running, widely used Keele Survey (Keele University 2004), and the new Office for Standards in Education (OfSTED) framework (OfSTED 2003) that either require or encourage schools to systematically seek the views of young people, often on matters to do with the quality of teaching and learning. In addition, citizenship education became a statutory requirement for high schools in England from September 2002 and a recommended 'subject' for elementary schools following the 'Crick Report' for the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA1998) and has been demonstrated to be most successful where students are actively involved in whole school decision-making and dialogue with adults around their teaching and learning (Deakin Crick et al, 2004)

Thirdly, the student voice movement in England owes a huge debt to the sustained, creative and imaginative work of Jean Rudduck at the University of Cambridge who led the highly successful Economic & Social Research Council (ESRC) Teaching & Learning Research Programme (TLRP) Phase 1 Network Project 'Consulting Pupils About Teaching and Learning'. As the title suggests, the emphasis was on understanding how consulting young people in a range of ways, often though not solely within the routines of ordinary curriculum engagement, can help students, teachers and schools become more vibrantly engaged with a richer understanding and practice of teaching and learning. The findings and publications emerging from the six projects involved are making significant contributions both to the development of student voice work in schools and to an appropriately reflexive engagement with underpinning theoretical and ideological issues (see Arnot et al 2004, Fielding & Bragg 2003, Flutter & Rudduck 2004, MacBeath et al 2003, Rudduck & Flutter 2004)

Fourthly, there are local and regional centres of support. Most of these are based around universities and include Cambridge University; London University Institute of Education; Manchester Metropolitan University; Nottingham University; and Sussex University. Also important is the fact that a small, but growing number of school districts have committed themselves to supporting this kind of work in a variety of ways.

Finally, the Non-Governmental organisations such as the Carnegie Young People's Initiative (Carnegie Youth Foundation 2005), the Phoenix Education Trust (Phoenix Education Trust 2005) and School Councils ,UK (School Councils UK 2005) provide significant arenas for making links, raising issues of concern and developing student-led initiatives such as the English secondary School Students association

At first and even second glance then, all seems well. The range of work that is going on is very impressive indeed, there is a release of energy and hope, an eagerness to engage in news forms of development and enquiry, a vibrancy that has for too long been absent from much of teachers' daily work. However, there are a number of key questions it is important to ask at this point. The first set arise from the need for greater clarity, not about the range of student voice activities, but about their nature: what kinds of things are being described as student voice? Is there any way of interrogating practices so that we can form reasonable judgements about the degree to which they are, for example, benign but condescending, cynical and manipulative, supportive and groundbreaking, with regard to the involvement of young people? Is administering an externally devised questionnaire about the quality of teaching to a particular year group of students which provides useful information to senior leadership significantly different in kind to a multi-method student-led review of an area of the curriculum which is subsequently transformed by student involvement?

A number of writers have suggested frameworks that help us to think about these matters more clearly. In England, perhaps the best known and the most influential is Roger Hart's 'Ladder of Participation' (Hart 1997) [See also the useful adaption by Gerison Landsown (Lansdown 1995)]. Others include the work of Douglas Barnes and his Leeds' colleagues (Barnes et al 1987), Mary John (John 1996), Caroline Lodge and Jane Reed (Lodge & Reed 2003), Harry Shier (Shier 2001), Pat Thomson and Roger Holdsworth(2003) and Dennis Thiessen (Thiessen1997)

Fielding's two-part framework (see Fielding 2001b&c) is in sympathy with much of this work and arose out of his engagement in the students-as-researchers initiative which he started in 1996 with Louise Raymond, then deputy principal at Sharnbrook Upper School, Bedfordshire. The first part – *From Data to Dialogue: A Four-fold Typology of Student Engagement* (see Figs 1-4 pp 5-7 below) - explores the differential, inter-related involvement of young people and staff (usually, but not necessarily, their teachers) in taking forward their work together. It is this framework that provides the means of interrogating student voice developments within the Networked Learning Communities (NLC) initiatives over the past 3 years. The second part - *Evaluating the Conditions for Student Voice* (see Fig 5 p.8 below) suggests nine questions designed to interrogate the conditions within which student voice activities may take place. Together they offer a set of distinctions that help us to be clear (a) about the nature of the work being undertaken and (b) whether or not it is likely to become the kind of reality we wish to support.

2.1   From Data to Dialogue: A Four-fold Typology of Student Engagement

Student involvement can mean and is often intended to mean very different things. It includes practices that see young people in largely passive mode with student voice only audible through the products of past performance as well as practices where student voice is the initiating force in an enquiry process which invites teacher involvement as facilitating and enabling partners in learning. In order to understand and engage with this variety and range of student voice activity we draw on Fielding's

(Fielding 2001b) four-fold typology which posits 'Students as Data Source', 'Students as Active Respondents', 'Students as Co-Researchers' and 'Students as Researchers'.

Fig 1
Students as Data Source – Characteristic Examples

Teacher Role	Acknowledge + use information about student performance
Student Role	Receive a better informed pedagogy
Teacher Engagement with Students	Dissemination
Classroom e.g.	Data about student past performance
Team / Dept e.g.	Looking at samples of student work
School e.g.	Student attitude surveys, cohort exam + tests scores
Network e.g.	Survey used to provide network level data from all schools

With 'Students as Data Source' there is a real teacher commitment to pay attention to student voice speaking through the practical realities of work done and targets agreed. There is an acknowledgement that for teaching and learning to improve there is a need to take more explicit account of relevant data about individual students and group or class performance. Students are thus recipients of a better informed pedagogy. Teachers are helped to understand more about students through the effective dissemination of information about their performance or attitudes. In addition to these, by now much more common practices within English classrooms, work with Networked Learning Communities (NLCs) also points to the importance of utilising student data across a network of schools to open up and facilitate discussions around aims for and perceptions of learning.

Fig 2
Students as Active Respondents – Characteristic Examples

Teacher Role	Hear what students say
Student Role	Discuss their learning + approaches to teaching
Teacher Engagement with Students	Discussion
Classroom e.g.	Shared lesson objectives / explicit assessment criteria
Team / Dept e.g.	Students evaluate a unit of work
School e.g.	Traditional School Council
Network e.g.	Hay McBer 'Transforming Learning' approach to classroom climate

With 'Students as Active Respondents' there is a teacher willingness to move beyond the accumulation of passive data and a desire to hear what students have to say about their own experience in lessons and in school. Students are thus discussants rather than recipients of current approaches to teaching and learning. Dissemination of existing information is supplemented and transcended through the teacher's commitment to make meaning out of that data through active discussion with her students. Of the many instances within NLCs that exemplify this mode of student voice one of the most interesting is the Hay-McBer 'Transforming Learning' approach which involves the use of online diagnostic software to generate new forms of data on student perceptions of classroom climate. Originally designed to be anonymous, in NLCs the active involvement of students and adults in dialogue

through the process has been critical, not least as a significant test of the climate for taking supported risks. Another powerful, innovative example of 'students as active respondents' within NLCs is the 'partners in learning approach' which involves students working closely with trainee teachers and their mentors to provide feedback on lessons.

Fig 3
Students as Co-Researchers - Characteristic Examples

Teacher Role	Listen in order to learn
Student Role	Co-researcher with teacher on agreed issues
Teacher Engagement with Students	Dialogue (teacher-led)
Classroom e.g.	Focus groups conducted by student co-researchers
Team / Dept e.g.	Students assist in team / dept action research
School e.g.	Investigating use of space
Network e.g.	Transition between elementary and middle / high school

'Students as Co- Researchers' sees an increase in both student and teacher involvement. This is much more of a partnership than the two previous modes and, whilst student and teacher roles are not equal, they are moving more strongly in an egalitarian direction. Students move from being discussants to being co-researchers into matters of agreed significance and importance. Whilst the boundaries of action and exploration are fixed by the teacher, and whilst she identifies (again typically through negotiation) what it is that is to be investigated, explored and better understood, the commitment and agreement of students is essential. This change in relationship is matched by a change in the form and manner of teacher engagement with her students: hearing is supplemented by the more attentive listening. Since there is a much richer and more overt interdependence in the 'Student as Co-Researcher' mode, discussion is replaced by teacher-led dialogue. As befits dialogue, teacher and students are in a much more exploratory mode. There is now the potential to move out of the arena of 'delivery' and enter spaces that are potentially more open and more creative.

NLC examples include the development of student-led 'Learning Walks', observations and intervisitations where students visit each other's schools with an agreed focus in mind. The plans of the 'Think First' NLC in Sussex to redesign the curriculum have been significantly led by carefully supported student activity and agency. Eight children from each of the school councils in each of the eight elementary schools met to discuss what their school council was like, having made videos to share this with others. They went to the local council chamber and played the 'diamond nine' prioritising exercise alongside adults to decide what good learning looked like in a Think First school. At a second meeting at the Council, the young people decided that they wanted to focus on learning styles to explore how the school environment is supportive of learning. The school council students then became 'VAK (visual auditory kinaesthetic) detectives' and are going on 'learning walks' in each others' schools to observe and discuss according to previously agreed protocols, before the Networked School Council meetings. Student leadership is thus enacted, and mediated, through collaborative activities. Network activists believe that the iterative approach to involving young people and members of the wider

community through a collaborative enquiry approach has proved to be a vibrant and motivating process for all concerned (McGregor & Tyrer 2004).

Fig 4
Students as Researchers- Characteristic Examples

Teacher Role	Listen in order to contribute
Student Role	Initiator and director of research with teacher support
Teacher Engagement with Students	Dialogue (student-led)
Classroom e.g.	What Makes a Good Lesson?
Team / Dept e.g.	Gender issues in technology subjects
School e.g.	Evaluation of e.g. PSHE system, radical school council
Network e.g.	Network student councils

The fourth mode – 'Students as Researchers - deepens and extends the egalitarian thrust we noted with 'Students as Co-Researchers'. Partnership remains the dominant working motif, but here it is the voice of the student that comes to the fore and in a leadership or initiating, not just a responsive role. It is students who identify issues to be researched or investigated; students who undertake the research with the support of staff; students who have responsibility for making sense of the data, writing a report or presenting their findings; and it is students to whom the class teacher, team / department or school community are bound to respond in ways which are respectful, attentive and committed to positive change. Teachers are thus not just committed to appreciative listening in order to learn from students in joint enquiry, but active listening in order to contribute to and support student-led research. Dialogue is at the heart of this mode of working. Distinctively the dialogue is student-led rather than teacher led and, potentially at any rate, the exploratory impetus of 'Students as Co-Researchers' is further enhanced by the pivotal place of student perceptions and perspectives in the animation and conduct of the research. It is the very differences that tend to exist between the experiences and hopes of young people and those of adults that offers a source of creativity and vibrant engagement.

In addition to the many instances of 'Students as Researchers' projects some NLCs have set up parallel student structures and processes to take forward student-led networking across the schools. In Haverhill in Suffolk, students have set up a network council and an annual network-wide student conference. Training and support for such developments is fundamental and has been provided by paid student consultants who are employed during a 'gap year' after leaving school and before going to university (Bedfordshire School Improvement Partnership 2005).

Whether we use the typology offered here or one of those cited earlier it is clear that different kinds of student voice development open up very different sets of possibilities for students, for staff, for the school as a learning community and for the schools' capacity to engage with its communities in the process of reciprocal renewal. What is also clear is that student voice activities, however committed they may be, will not of themselves achieve their aspirations unless a series of conditions are met that provide the organisational structures and cultures to make their desired intentions a living reality.

2.2   Evaluating the Conditions for Student Voice

The following nine interrogative sites, together with their attendant questions, offer one way of trying to ensure that we ask ourselves serious questions about the institutional conditions likely to support the kinds of developments we wish to encourage. They are animated by Linda Alcoff's Foucauldian insistence that it is 'the structure of discursive practice' (Alcoff 1991/2) that has a key influence on whether or not the voices of young people are taken seriously (see Fielding 2004a for further reflections on this point). Too often we either avoid many of these questions or acknowledge them in ways which seldom lead to sustained action. On their own or in combination they tend to probe too deeply into the lived realities that enable or preclude the kind of engagement we desire.

Fig 5
Evaluating the Conditions for Student Voice

Speaking	• *Who* is allowed to speak? • *To whom* are they allowed to speak? • *What* are they allowed to speak about? • What *language* is encouraged / allowed?
Listening	• *Who* is listening? • *Why* are they listening? • *How* are they listening?
Skills	• Are the skills of dialogue *encouraged and supported* through training or other appropriate means? • Are those skills understood, developed and practised within the *context of democratic values and dispositions*? • Are those skills themselves *transformed* by those values and dispositions?
Attitudes & Dispositions	• How do those involved *regard each other*? • To what degree are the *principle of equal value* and the *dispositions of care* felt reciprocally and demonstrated through the reality of daily encounter?
Systems	• *How often* does dialogue and encounter in which student voice is centrally important occur? • Who *decides*? • How do the systems enshrining the value and necessity of student voice mesh with or *relate to other organisational arrangements* (particularly those involving adults)?
Organisational Culture	• Do the *cultural norms and values* of the school proclaim the centrality of student voice within the context of education as a shared responsibility and shared achievement? • Do the practices, traditions and routine daily encounters demonstrate values supportive of student voice?
Spaces & the Making of Meaning	• *Where* are the public spaces (physical and metaphorical) in which these encounters might take place? • Who *controls* them? • What *values* shape their being and their use?
Action	• What *action* is taken? • Who feels *responsible*? • *What happens* if aspirations and good intentions are not realised?
The Future	• Do we need *new structures*? • Do we need *new ways of relating to each other*?

In earlier work Fielding (Fielding 2001c) has used this framework to explore new developments and existing practices within the field of student voice. It has proved quite helpful in a number of respects, particularly as a means of grounding and interrogating much of the ambitious rhetoric inevitably associated with new developments in a practical field. What struck him at the time and more forcibly since was how hard it was to practice and sustain more ethically nuanced approaches to student voice informed by professional identities and aspirations that run counter to the entrepreneurial norms that define and exemplify the dominant context of performativity. The more radical, 'transversal' (Fielding 2001b) forms of students-as-researchers work that started in high spirits and great hope in the mid 1990s have proved harder than anticipated to develop elsewhere in a sustainable way. Thus, something with seemingly profound consequences for the cultural practices and structural arrangements of a highly successful school amounted in some other schools in other contexts amounts to little more than the dreary sameness of management-inspired questionnaires about matters of little real consequence to the relatively small proportion of students who chose to return them. The brave and adventurous rupturing of boundaries and roles that was students-as-researchers in one school became a rather dull and dutiful student-sanctioned conformism in another. Why?

3   Deconstructing Student Voice: The Political Dimension

In order to provide more satisfactory answers to questions about the enormous variation in advocacy and practice we need to locate professionally differentiated approaches within a politically differentiated analysis of contemporary student voice work in England.

There are many different frames and analytic resources that can be used to do this. In this inevitably perilous and constrained task we have chosen to identify three standpoints that are likely to attract significant support and offer substantial explanatory potential. We have termed these neo-liberal, emancipatory and post-structuralist. A fourth standpoint, namely 'person-centred', is only touched on lightly in our final section for reasons of space.

3.1   Neo-liberal Hegemony

Those approaching student voice from a neo-liberal standpoint tend to emphasise a range of different ways in which students can be consulted about their learning in order that teachers will respond, standards rise and attainment increase. Within the neo-liberal story there are three apparently contradictory, but ultimately synergistic narratives. Its still dominant script is one which invites us to move away from the traditional areas of pastoral and wider engagement with young people and focus more insistently on formal learning in classrooms in schools. It is proclamatory, even proud, in its confidence and its insistence that we return again and again to learning. Its is no accident, for example that the title of the recent, highly successful ESRC TLRP Phase 1 Network project on student voice, which foregrounded a very exciting range of

developments in the field mentioned in Section 1 above, was called 'Consulting Pupils About Teaching and Learning'.

The second script, which is now emerging more strongly than in the recent past, concerns ways in which we are invited to listen to and proactively develop the affective voices and behaviour of young people in what has come to be known as the 'well being' agenda. Here, what seemed at first to be contradictory developments, now turn out to be complementary practices. Circle time, one-to-one tutorials, coaching, mentoring, peer tutoring and buddying schemes are legitimated as the active sites of emotional intelligence and consequently more sustained engagement in what is seen as the core work of the school i.e. to raise standards of attainment in publicly measurable ways.

The third script concerns the neo-liberal interpretation of citizenship as primarily to do with the consumption of political commodities and artefacts, often through representative structures or processes. Here schools councils are particularly prominent, though again, it is interesting to note that one of the tests of their contemporary credentials concerns the degree to which their agendas extend to matters of teaching and learning, not just the more traditional, largely pastoral concerns.

3.2   Emancipatory Critique

Emancipatory critiques of the dominant neo-liberal position tend to argue that the current vogue for student voice is primarily an instrument of school effectiveness driven by adult purposes linked firmly to economic performance and the continued ascendancy of those in positions of power. The double advocacy of 'choice' and 'voice' at the heart of neo-liberal rhetoric is seen as at best disingenuous and at worst dishonest. Promotion of student engagement turns out to be important and prominent for much the same reasons as 'user' engagement is important in other professions; that is to say, they are both essentially disciplinary devices aimed at increased compliance and enhanced productivity. The entry of student voice into the secret garden of the curriculum is neither innocent nor innocuous. In re-articulating the largely predictable list of what makes a good teacher, a good lesson or a good school students become unwitting agents of government control, for example supporting the status quo of 'setting' (tracking) according to 'ability'. (Hart et al 2004, Thomson & Gunter 2005)

'Choice' possesses the double virtue of engaging and motivating those who make the choice and disciplining those whose job it is to provide the services in question whilst its pervasive, insistent and eloquent presence masks the central framework within which choice is expressed and action constrained. Its more radical variants, such as those advocated by Charles Leadbeater (Leadbeater 2004 a&b) under the aegis of the 'personalisation' agenda are highly unlikely to go much beyond 'customisation' of existing options. The now ubiquitous use of terms like 'personalisation' also alert critics to the co-option and incorporation of discourse typical of quite other perspectives and orientations. Thus, as we have noted earlier, 'well-being', is robbed of its teleological status and becomes a mere foot soldier in the standards crusade.

Equally unsatisfactory from an emancipatory standpoint is the atomistic individualism typical of neo-liberal thinking, its ironically undifferentiated account of 'voice', its pervasive silence about issues of power, and its highly instrumental view of learning. Thus, within the current valorisation of student voice there is no convincing account of the common good. Nor is there any recognition that not all voices are the same – that some students are more privileged and more able than others to articulate their needs in the dominant discourse (see especially Rubin & Silva 2003, Silva 2001). Nor is there any acknowledgement that the cultural and structural arrangements and spaces within which those voices are heard are themselves shaped and controlled by positional interests (see Fielding 2004a and McGregor 2004a&b). Still less is there any awareness that the beatific adornment of 'learning' in entirely instrumental robes makes advocacy of the primacy of 'well being' a contemporary professional heresy (see Grey 2001 and Biesta 2004 for excellent critiques of the current hegemony of 'learning').

3.3   Post-structuralist Response

Whilst post-structuralist critics of work on student voice are well known (e.g. Ellsworth 1989 and Orner 1992) they are only now beginning to engage with the new wave of student voice advocacy and activity. Among the most eloquent and insightful is Sara Bragg (Bragg 2003). She argues not only that the optimism animating early research in this latest phase of student voice development was naively oblivious to power relations (e.g. Soo Hoo 1993), but also that emancipatory critiques operate with too totalising a view of power (Holdsworth & Thomson 2002). Writing about arguably the most radical of contemporary student voice developments – Students-as-Researchers – Bragg suggests that, rather than dismissing it as a more sophisticated form of incorporation, we should appreciate its ambivalence and its positive, if inevitably constrained, potential. Certainly, along with other forms of student voice, Students-as-Researchers is 'not so much voice as device' (Bragg 2003: 6) guiding what can and cannot be said through students' hybrid self-construction of new identities that allow greater autonomy and independence. Whereas neo-liberal advocacy is silent about the costs that accompany increased agency emancipatory critiques are too strident in their dismissal of the possibility of any significant capacity to challenge that hegemony. Post-structuralist perspectives acknowledge both the gains made and the price paid: developments like Students-as-Researchers do offer real, not illusory, freedom, but 'at the cost of an intensification of relations of domination in the need to assent with heart not just body, to give an inner commitment not just outer conformity' (Ibid:12).

3.4   Contributions of Student Voice to Educational Renewal

What we hope is clear from this necessarily brief engagement with a number of key perspectives through which one can read the various narratives of contemporary student voice work is that the possibilities of educational renewal will seem very different depending both on which lens one looks through and what one chooses to look at.

The Neo-liberal Contribution

The strengths of the neo-liberal position lie primarily in its willingness to significantly extend the arenas within which the voices of young people are legitimately expressed and the companion injunction that those who listen take what they say seriously. There is ample evidence from NLCs and elsewhere in England that real strides are being made. A wide and creative range of practices are growing in ways which are beginning to make schools feel different places, places where students are taken seriously and their agency valued in ways that have in the past been unusual or the product of a particularly courageous teacher working against the odds. The NLC programme-wide review undertaken after year one of the programme showed that 31 of 76 networks had undertaken, or were planning to undertake a range of student involvement and 'voice' activities. It identified three main forms of student involvement - students taking an active role in the development of the network, being engaged in enquiry, and in feedback on teaching and learning e.g. students as teachers (Networked Learning Group, In press)

Student voice forces us to confront the present realities and future aspirations of those for whom the system of formal schooling exists. Insofar as it is able to do that it is more honest and more real in its engagement and more encouraging of those who will later become the custodians of society. Through championing the voice of young people as both consumers and customers society becomes more attentive to individual need and thereby richer and more vibrant in its negotiations and decisions. It becomes, in effect, a more responsive society and in so doing it not only enhances its capacity to be creative, but also its capacity to gain and retain the allegiance of young people to social and political processes as such. Extending the range and depth of student voice thus turns out to be an important response to the contemporary legitimation crisis, not just of one standpoint or another, but of politics as such.

However, whilst it can be plausibly argued that substantial benefits of student voice developments are real and significant it must also be recognised that the majority of those practices within NLCs, and more widely across schools in England, shows relatively little evidence of moving beyond benign ameliorations of the status quo, despite the important 'feelgood' factor. Indeed, there is some evidence that in a minority of cases students are cast as the unwitting agents of practices that are malign, dispiriting and little more than an opportunistic colonisation of a promising grassroots movement by agencies and interests (local, national and international) that have quite different ambitions and purposes - see, for example, Independent (2003), Times Educational Supplement (2004)(a) and (b). Co-opting young people into an extended form of teacher surveillance is a profound betrayal, not only of teacher professionalism, but of student trust. In this disciplinary manifestation 'new wave' student voice turns predatory, becoming, in effect, a tsunami of democratic practice and aspiration.

Even if we put on one side the more offensive and destructive examples a profoundly illiberal colonisation of student voice work, there remains a persistent and irresolvable difficulty for neo-liberals which lies in their atomistic, market-oriented reductionism that, however deft their contemporary sleights of hand, remains incapable of giving a satisfactory account of the public good or a convincing strategy for its realisation. The discourse of the market and the discourse of the public realm are incommensurable.

Arguably one of the most serious challenges faced by contemporary, largely neo-liberal, student voice work concerns the scant attention given to the specifically public nature of its practice and the role of collective or communal voice. There is invariably a lack of serious engagement both with the wider student body on whose behalf various schemes and initiatives take place and with school staff on whose goodwill and understanding so much depends.

The Emancipatory Contribution

Whereas the residual atomism of neo-liberal ontology presents inevitable and enduring problems for anything other than a self-interested, calculative form of civic engagement the solidary orientation of critical theory encourages an approach to student voice that seeks to develop the very areas neo-liberalism distorts or ignores. This is likely to involve particular use of quasi-collective forms and structures like students-as-researchers and student councils and the necessary, companion commitment to reaching the whole student body on whose behalf they do their work. What marks out a typically emancipatory approach is firstly its strong sense of solidary responsibility, e.g. undertaking research or articulating views and suggesting changes on behalf of others, and, secondly, a clear sense of located identity, e.g. the deliberate identification of and loyalty to groups and persons often marginalised within particular communities or wider society. The discourse and working practices of researchers who are, e.g. young refugees (Kirby et al 2001), or, disenfranchised young women (Cruddas 2001, Cruddas & Haddock 2003) are significantly different, both in process and purpose, to students-as-researchers in e.g. most English secondary schools.

Student voice explicitly committed to work with those who are most disadvantaged within schools or within wider society has yet to emerge with any significance, not just within NLCs, but elsewhere across the education system in England. There is, however, a desire to understand what 'working on behalf of others' means and how it might best be developed in practice. Thus, within a small number of NLCs, most notably the Bolton Pastoral Network, where there is a focus on multi-agency working, there is evidence that collective events such as student voice conferences organised and run by students are energising people in ways that not only transcend the particularities of individual schools, but also insistently engage the attention and require the responses of adults at district level. At a national level it will be interesting to see whether the recent emergence of ESSA (English School Students Association) is sustained and developed in ways which the NUSS (National Union of School Students) was unable to achieve in the 1970s.

In addition to an insistent concern for matters of social justice there are three other features of emancipatory approaches to student voice which could contribute particularly positively towards the next phase of educational renewal. These are firstly, the specifically public nature of its advocacy, to which we shall return in a moment; secondly, its inclination to involve and engage with communities outside the school, e.g. providing safe and creative spaces for young children to play in an often hostile urban environment; and, thirdly, its impetus towards an international, rather than a parochial, orientation e.g. engaging with globalisation or the support of young people in a country suffering war or persecution.

Given the resonance of Marquand's defiant rallying cries against the 'decline of the public', the renewal of the public realm must have substantial claims on our time and our attention. One response to Marquand would be to explore more imaginatively and more tenaciously ways in which we can develop a specifically public realm in schools, one which is used by adults and young people as co-enquirers and co-constructors, not just of the instrumental pre-occupations of school improvement, but the educational requirements of civic engagement (Fisher, 2004) .For example, current students-as-researchers work tends to underplay and under-explore the later stages of its work. These include making of meaning from the data, agreeing recommendations and suggestions for desirable changes, debating and discussing the validity, desirability, significance and meaning of the report, and taking appropriate action which binds the community together in realising the desired changes. Too often some of these stages are skimped and others ignored; too often, as one very supportive teacher remarked, there is no space, real or metaphorical for, in this case staff, to either register support for the work of students-as-researchers or register disagreement with the findings of their research. There was, in effect, no public space in which young people and adults could, as mutual partners in the development of their school as a learning community, discuss matters of common intention and shared significance. Invitations to students to present work or discuss issues at staff meetings are an important first step and a number of schools do do this. But this does not address the fundamental point that we need to create public spaces that are jointly and freely egalitarian and within which any member of the school, whatever their age, status, gender or cultural identity feels able to raise matters of significance to themselves and the community to which they belong and which they re(create) (Benhabib,1998).

The Post-structuralist Contribution

Post-structuralists would support much of the drift of the emancipatory argument, but remind us, firstly, of the multiple, shifting nature of identities; secondly, of the dangers of an undifferentiated, totalising notion of the public; and, thirdly, of spaces that are likely to open up within the neo-liberal project for different stories to be told and new opportunities to be explored.

In addressing the habitual singularity of student 'voice' typical of neo-liberalism and the dangers of undifferentiated collectivity endemic in critical theory the post-structuralist contribution to the renewal of civil society through student voice foregrounds the importance of the local, the transitory and the evanescent, even opportunistic forms of student voice. These will often be linked to the marginalised and under-represented groups in school or society (see Cruddas 2001, Cruddas & Haddock 2003 mentioned above).

A school inspired by a post-structuralist reading of student voice would encourage multiple groupings and sites for student engagement, both within lessons and formal arenas for learning and in non-formal and community based contexts. It would be keen to move beyond dominant groups of school activity like school councils and students-as-researchers and encourage locally negotiated, locally energised forms of engagement e.g. between groups of students and their teacher(s) about matters of

pedagogy or inter-personal welfare in the classroom; temporary alliances clustering round particular issues e.g. addressing personal / psychological safety in particular parts of the school, and groups animated by more enduring matters of identity and social justice, e.g. gay adolescent males struggling against the homophobic norms of their peers.

Finally, a post-structuralist approach to student voice would, like its emancipatory counterpart, also pay attention, not just to the sites and topics of student concerns, but to the manner in which members of the groups relate to each other, to the way the sensitivities, values and commitments that brought them together require them to work differently, sensitively and openly, not just efficiently and effectively.

4   Person-Centred Approaches to Student Voice: On the Practical Necessity of Philosophy

Elsewhere, Fielding (Fielding 2004c) has argued that whilst each of the three perspectives outlined above have important things to contribute to educational renewal none of the arguments or advocacy, even from the more promising perspectives and combinations, goes to the heart of either the crisis we are facing or the opportunities we must open up if we are to retain and extend our humanity together. In the UK and in North America we face a crisis of educational renewal, but that crisis is part of a much deeper malaise we need to name much more clearly. Our crisis is a crisis of the human person (Fielding 2004b), not just of our capacity to engage with each other in recreating and extending the essential structures, activities and dispositions of our modern democratic heritage.

Certainly, those writing from within the emancipatory and post-structuralist traditions have compelling things to say that illuminate aspects of the crisis, but none names its most pernicious dangers with sufficient clarity or, in line with David Halpin's advocacy (Halpin 2003), paints a vibrant picture of intriguing and energising alternatives.

Arguing against the dominance of 'high performance' approaches which hold such sway on both sides of the Atlantic Fielding's work on 'person–centred education' offers an initial response. Student voice operating within the 'high performance' mode is largely an instrumental undertaking orientated towards increased measurable organisational performance. In its most extreme form it is about the <u>use</u> of student voice for particular kinds of adult purposes. It is often technologically and emotionally sophisticated, seemingly interested in young peoples' points of view, and attentive to suggestions that may enhance the school's effectiveness and reputation. It is, however, ultimately totalitarian and often dissembling in its dispositions and its operation: student voice only has significance and is only legitimate insofar as it enhances organisational ends.

In contrast to high performance approaches, student voice operating in 'person centred' mode is explicitly and engagingly mutual in its orientation towards widely conceived educational ends that will often include measurable results, but are not

constituted or constrained by them. It is about students and teachers working and learning together in partnership, rather than one party using the other for often covert ends. Its processes and procedures are emergent, rather than fixed, and shaped by the dialogic values that underpin its aspirations and dispositions.

Despite its limitations (see Burbules 2000, Lefstein 2004) the dialogic motif provides the most promising inspiration and practical grounding for person centred approaches to student voice and civic renewal. As Morwenna Griffiths' (Griffiths 2003, 2004) and Perpetua Kirby's (Marchant & Kirby 2004, Kirby et al 2002) recent work suggests we have to develop spaces and practices within and between our organisations that nurture dialogue, not as exotic or special features of otherwise quite different institutions, but as integral practices of human learning and daily encounter. We need to create public and private spaces, both physical and metaphorical, where dialogue, not just discussion can take place in ways which are emergent and unanticipated, not just purposefully and properly planned. We need to create shared practices where we can be attentive and open with one another in ways which encourage our mutual responsibility for the quality of our lives together. It is not about displacing the supra-personal virtues of the public realm with the personal intimacy of the private realm. It is about the conjunction of both, but in a way which makes the former subservient to the latter. It is about ensuring justice is informed by and committed to our care for each other as persons, not just as citizens (Noddings 1999). It is about acknowledging the importance of roles and yet also understanding what roles are for. It is about ensuring student voices and teacher voices are also the voices of persons in relation to one another in the quest for a deeper and more fulfilling humanity.

Perhaps the greatest challenge to student voice work, 'new wave' or otherwise, lies in the often unstated double assumption of creative difference and transformative potential. The first of these assumptions - that if we create the right conditions in which young people and adults engage with each other attentively, respectfully and joyfully then the distinctive standpoints of each perspective will be the source of creative development rather than unproductive conflict - has some evidence to substantiate it (e.g. Fielding & Bragg 2003). The more radical claim that those creative differences can in turn lead to a quite different order of things, to a transformation in a real rather than the familiar rhetorical sense, is much harder to demonstrate. Thus, as Charles Leadbeater (Leadbeater 2004b) and others rightly point out, asking young people what kind of school they would like presumes the continued existence of schools as viable and desirable social and educational institutions. Young people are as much the product of social, personal and economic relations and presumptions as the rest of us. What evidence is there that teachers and students engaging with each other in particular ways stand even the remote possibility of a fundamental leap of both imagination and practice that will help us to see and make the world differently to how it currently is?

There is some evidence, but it is occasional, unusual and sometimes, perhaps inevitably, almost tautologically, idiosyncratic. That evidence comes from gifted, courageous teachers and students, who, to echo Stephen's Spender's words, 'are truly great. Who from the womb remember the soul's history … who in their lives fight for life, Who wear at their hearts the fire's centre'. Those teachers and students are more likely to flourish, more likely to create what Fielding has elsewhere called a 'radical

collegiality' (Fielding 1999) if they work in schools that offer quite different models and aspirations for joint learning than those we currently presume (2). If they and what they believe in are to survive their stories must, in my view, be woven into the largely forgotten counter-narratives of our radical heritage that current arrangements, both for compulsory schooling and the preparation of teachers, have virtually obliterated from our memories (3). As Milan Kundera reminds us 'the struggle of man (sic) against power is the struggle of memory against forgetting'. If the 'new wave' of student voice is to be more than a fashionable event or the servant of forces that seek quite other realities it must take seriously its own heritage and its responsibilities for those who will struggle for social justice and human fulfilment when the wave has crested and it is no longer new.

Notes

1   This paper draws heavily on Fielding 2004(c) from which it differs in two main respects. Firstly, this AERA paper pays particular attention to the work on student voice supported by the National College for School Leadership (NCSL). Secondly, it does not adequately develop the notion of person-centred education which, for Fielding, provides the deeper rationale for student voice, 'new wave' or otherwise. See Fielding 2000 (a)(b), 2001(a)(d), 2004(b)(c) for initial explorations of why a person-centred approach is important and what it might look like.

2   See, for example, the work of the Coalition of Essential Schools in the USA and the work of Human Scale Education in the UK. See also the work on Person Centred Education at the University of Sussex Centre for Educational Innovation.

3   In England, the legacy of schools like Stantonbury Campus, Milton Keynes and Countesthorpe Community College, Leicestershire has continued through the courageous work of many teachers who have remained true to person-centred values and commitments despite mockery, marginalisation and 'the discourse of derision' in the last twenty years. See in particular the work of people like Mike Davies (Headteacher at Bishop Park College, Clacton, Essex) and Gill Mullis (Assistant Headteacher at Hastingsbury Upper School, Bedford) who 'wear at their hearts the fire's centre'. See also the work of people like Alison Peacock (Headteacher at The Wroxham School, Potters Bar, Hertfordshire) for exemplification of similar commitments in elementary schools. Of course, this list could be much longer.

References

Alcoff, L. (1991/92) The problem of speaking for others, *Cultural Critique*, 20, 5-32

Arnot, M., Mcintyre, D., Pedder, D. & Reay, D. (2004) *Consultation in the Classroom: Developing Dialogue about Teaching & Learning*, Cambridge, Pearson

Barnes, D., Johnson, G., Jordan, S., Layton, D., Medway, P. & Yeomans, D. (1987) *The TVEI Curriculum 14-16: An Interim Report Based on a case Study of Twelve Schools*, Leeds, Leeds University

Bedfordshire School Improvement Partnership (2005) www.bsip.net

Biesta, G, (2004) Against Learning: Reclaiming a language for education in an age of learning, *Nordisk Pedagogik*, 24, 70-82

Benhabib, S. (1998) Models of Public Space: Hannah Arendt, the Liberal Tradition and Jurgen Habermas, in: J. Landes (Ed) *Feminism- the Public and the Public* Oxford, Oxford University Press

Bragg, S. (2003) 'Student Voice & Governmentality: The Production of Enterprising Subjects', Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the British Educational Research Association, Edinburgh

Burbules, N. (2000) The Limits of Dialogue in Critical Pedagogy in P. Trifonas (ed) *Revolutionary Pedagogies*, New York, Routledge Falmer, 251-273

Carnegie Youth Foundation (2005) www.carnegie-youth.org.uk

Cruddas, L. (2001) Rehearsing for Reality: Young Women's Voices & Agendas for Change *Forum* 43, 2, 62-66

Cruddas, L. & Haddock, L (2003) *Girls' Voices: Supporting girls' learning and emotional development*, Stoke on Trent, Trentham Books

Deakin Crick,R., Coates, M., Taylor, M., & Ritchie, S. (2004) A systematic review of the impact of citizenship education on the provision of schooling *Research Evidence in Education* London, EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education)

DfES (2004) *Working Together: Giving children and young people a say*, London, Department for Education & Skills (www.dfes.gov.uk/participationguidance)

Ellsworth, E. (1989) Why Doesn't This Feel Empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy, *Harvard Educational Review*, 59, 3, 297-324

Fielding, M.(1999) Radical Collegiality: Affirming Teaching as an Inclusive Professional Practice *Australian Educational Researcher,* 26, 2, August, 1-34

Fielding, M. (2000a) The Person Centred School, *Forum,* 42, 2, 51-54

Fielding, M. (2000b) Community, Philosophy & Education Policy: Against Effectiveness Ideology & the Immiseration of Contemporary Schooling *Journal of Education Policy* 15 (4) pp 397-415

Fielding, M. (2001a) Target Setting, Policy Pathology & Student Perspectives: Learning to Labour in New Times in M. FIELDING (ed) *Taking Education Really Seriously: Four Years Hard Labour,* London, Routledge Falmer, 143-154

Fielding, M. (2001b) Students as Radical Agents of Change *Journal of Educational Change* 2, 3, 123-141

Fielding, M. (2001c) Beyond the Rhetoric of Student Voice: New Departures or New Constraints in the Transformation of 21st Century Schooling? *Forum,* 43, 2,100-110

Fielding, M. (2001d) OFSTED, Inspection & the Betrayal of Democracy, *Journal of Philosophy of Education,* 35, 4, 695-709

Fielding, M. (2004)(a) Transformative Approaches to Student Voice: Theoretical Underpinnings, Recalcitrant Realities *British Educational Research Journal 30*, 2, 295-311

Fielding, M. (2004) (b) 'Philosophy and the End of Educational Organisation', Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain Annual Conference, New College Oxford, April

Fielding, M. (2004)(c) 'New Wave' Student Voice and the Renewal of Civic Society *London Review of Education* Special Issue on 'Education for Civic Society' Vol.2 No.3 November, 197-217

Fielding, M. & Bragg, S. (2003) *Students as Researchers: Making a Difference*, Cambridge, Pearsons

Fisher, K. (2004) Revoicing Classrooms: A spatial manifesto, *Forum*, 46(1), 36-38.

Flutter, J. & Rudduck, J. (2004) *Consulting Pupils: What's in it for schools?*, London, Routledge Falmer

Grey, C. (2001) *Against Learning*, Research Papers in Management Studies WP 4/2001, Cambridge, University of Cambridge Judge Institute of Management

Griffiths, M. (2003) *Action for Social Justice in Education: Fairly Different*, Buckingham, Open University Press

Griffiths, M. (2004) 'Social Justice and Spaces for Democracy', Paper presented to the ESRC Seminar Series 'Democracy, Education & Methodology', Centre for Research in Education & Democracy, University of West of England, Bristol, May

Halpin, D. (2003) *Hope and Education: The Role of the Utopian Imagination,* London, Routledge Falmer

Hart, R. (1997) *Children's Participation: The Theory & Practice of Involving Young Citizens in Community Development and Environmental Care*, London, Earthscan

Hart, S. Et Al . (2004) *Learning Without Limits* Maidenhead, Open University Press/McGraw Hill.

Hay Mcber (2004) *Transforming Learning* www.transforminglearning.co.uk

Holdsworth, R., & Thomson, P. (2002) 'Options with the regulation and containment of 'student voice' and / or students researching and acting for change: Australian experiences', Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April

Independent (2003) Pupil Power: the school where students assess their teachers' performance *The Independent - Education* 6th March

Jackson, D. (2004) 'Networked learning communities; Characteristics of 'networked learning' - what are we learning?' Paper presented at the International Congress for School Effectiveness and Improvement, Rotterdam, Netherlands, January.

John, M. (1996) Voicing: Research and practice with the silenced, in M.JOHN (ed) *Children in Charge: The Child's Right to a Fair Hearing*, London, Jessica Kingsley, 3-24

Keele University (2004) *Keele University Attitudinal Survey* www.keele.ac.uk/depts/ed/research/cfss-survey-types.html

Kirby, P., Hays Young Researchers, Wubner, K. & Lewis, M. (2001) The HAYS Project: Young people in control? in J. Clark, A. Dyson, N. Meagher, E. Robson, & M. Wootten (eds) *Young People as Researchers: possibilities, problems and politics*, Leicester, Youth Work Press

Kirby, P., Lanyon, C., Cronin, K. & Sinclair, R. (2002) *Building a Culture of Participation: Involving children and young people in policy, service planning, delivery and evaluation*, London, Department for Education & Skills

Lansdown, G. (1995) *Taking Part: Children's participation in decision making*, London, Institute for Public Policy Research

Leadbeater, C. (2004)(a) *Personalisation through participation: a new script for public services*, London, Demos

Leadbeater, C. (2004)(b) *Learning about personalisation: how can we pout the learner at the heart of the education system?*, London, Department for Education & Skills

Lefstein, A. (2004) 'Dialogue in schools - towards a pragmatic approach', Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain

Lodge, C. & Read, J. (2003) 'Improvement in Action: Sustainable improvements in learning through school-based, teacher-led enquiry', Paper presented at the International Congress for School Effectiveness and Improvement, Sydney, January

Macbeath, J., Demetriou, H., Rudduck, J. & Myers, K. (2003) *Consulting Pupils: A Toolkit for Teachers*, Cambridge, Pearson

Marchant, R. & Kirby, P. (2004) The Participation of Young Children: communication, consultation and involvement, in B.NEALE (ed) *Young Children's Citizenship: ideas into practice*, York, Joseph Rowntree Foundation

Marquand, D. (2004) *Decline of the Public: The Hollowing-out of Citizenship*, Cambridge, Polity Press

Mcgregor, J. (2004)(a) Editorial: Space and Schools, *Forum*, 46, 1, Spring, 2-5

Mcgregor, J. (2004)(b) Space, Power and the Classroom, *Forum*, 46,1, Spring, 13-18

Mcgregor,J & Tyrer G. (2004) 'Recognising student leadership in Networked Learning Communities'. paper presented at the British Educational Leadership and Management Research Conference, Oxford, July

Networked Learning Communities (2004) www.networkedlearningcommunities.org.uk/aboutus/ncsl.html

Networked Learning Group (In press) *Networked Learning Communities Year One Review*. Cranfield, Networked Learning Group, National College of School Leadership.

Noddings, N. (1999) Care, Justice and Equity, in M.S.Katz, N.Noddings & K.Strike (eds) *Justice and Caring: The Search for Common Ground in Education*, New York, Teachers College Press, 7-20

OfSTED (2003) *Inspecting Schools: framework for inspecting schools*, London, Office for Standards in Education

Orner, M. (1992) Interrupting the Calls for Student Voice in "Liberatory" Education: A Feminist Poststructuralist Perspective, in C. LUKE & J. GORE (eds) *Feminism & Critical Pedagogy*, London, Routledge, 74-89

Phoenix Education Trust (2005) www.phoenixeducation.co.uk

Qualifications & Curriculum Authority (1998) Education for Citizenship and the Teaching of Democracy in Schools: Final Report of the Advisory group on Citizenship. London,QCA

Rudduck, J. & Flutter, J. (2004) *How to Improve Your School: Giving Pupils a Voice*, London, Continuum

Rubin, B.C. & Silva, E.M. (eds) (2003) *Critical Voices in School Reform: Students living through change*, London, Routledge Falmer

School Councils UK (2005) www.schoolcouncils.org

Shier, H. (2001) Pathways to Participation: openings, opportunities and obligations *Children & Society* 15, 107-117

Silva, E. (2001) 'Squeaky wheels and flat tires': a case study of students as reform participants, *Forum*, 43, 2, 95-99

Soo-Hoo, S. (1993) Students as partners in research and restructuring schools, *Educational Forum*, 57, Summer, 386-393

Thiessen, D. (1997) Knowing about, acting on behalf of, and working with primary pupils' perspectives: Three levels of engagement with research, in A. Pollard, D.Thiessen, & A.Filer (eds) *Children & Their Curriculum*, London, Falmer Press, 184-196

Thomson, P. & Gunter, H. (2005) 'Researching students: voices and processes in a school evaluation', Paper presented to the American Educational Research Association Annual Conference, Montreal, Canada

Thomson, P. & Holdsworth, R. (2003) Democratising schools through 'student participation': an emerging analysis of the educational field informed by Bourdieu, *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 6, 4, 371-391

Times Educational Supplement (2004)(a) Where pupils give out the stars: Forget OfSTED, here are the toughest critics of all *Times Educational Supplement* 28th May p.11

Times Educational Supplement (2004)(b) Teenage inspectors form son of OfSTED: Students at a Southampton School will soon be assessing the performance of their teachers *Times Educational Supplement* 24th / 31st December p.7