

Educational Review.

Hall of Fame – Editorial.

Graham Butt and Symeon Dagkas

Although it is unusual for any edition of *Educational Review* to include an Editorial (see Thomas 2016), this Special Issue warrants a brief commentary to introduce the articles it contains.

For more than 5 years the website for this journal has featured a ‘Hall of Fame’ page which provides links to previously published articles that have proved very popular, are highly cited, or have generated considerable debate among readers. The link to this site can be found here: <http://explore.tandfonline.com/content/ed/cedr-hall-of-fame>

As a consequence of the sustained interest shown in such articles it has been the intention of the editor and editorial board of *Educational Review* to commission six of the original authors of ‘Hall of Fame’ publications to contribute new, shorter articles which both reflect upon, and update, their original work. These articles - alongside specially commissioned pieces from invited academics, which provide reflections and commentaries on the changes that have occurred since the original articles were published – are collected together in this Special Issue. The academics who were invited to comment on the ‘Hall of Fame’ submissions are all noted experts in their field. Readers will, of course, choose to engage with these articles in whichever ways they wish – however, it may be helpful to first visit the webpage listed above to read the original article on which the ‘responses’ have been based. Given that the connection between the articles featured on the ‘Hall of Fame’ webpage is based solely on their popularity, there is no explicit conceptual or thematic link between them; as such, this issue is comprised of an eclectic mix of articles. The structure and layout is as follows: ‘Hall of Fame’ authors provide an ‘update’ to their original articles, followed by a contemporary commentary on the original by another expert in the field. The new articles are presented in the same date order as the ‘Hall of Fame’ publications – that is, from Elliott in 2003 to Hornby and Lafaele in 2011.

Julian Elliott, in his 2003 paper ‘Dynamic Assessment in Educational Settings: Realising potential’, identified the attraction for many professional psychologists and teachers of ‘dynamic assessment’ – while also recognising its apparent failure, at the time of writing, to become more highly regarded and recognised in mainstream educational practice. Countering the assumption that dynamic assessment was comprised of little more than IQ testing, Elliott sought an approach to assessment that would bring together the fields of psychology and education in classroom settings - his intention

being to use the findings from such assessments to help devise interventions in teaching and learning. The updated article published here, submitted by Elliott, Resing and Beckmann, speaks to the 'unfulfilled potential' of dynamic assessment, drawing important distinctions between this and dynamic testing – with the latter being claimed to be of particular interest to researchers in psychology who wish to make connections between children's ability to both reason and solve problems. By contrast, those who choose to engage in dynamic assessment tend to be more practitioner-focused, searching for ways in which assessment data can guide intervention and inform practice. Unfortunately this form of assessment has, as yet, only had a modest impact on assisting classification or predicting future performance, according to the authors. The potential strength of dynamic assessment, it is argued, lies in identifying cognitive (and executive) functioning difficulties, such that programmes could be devised to address these. But the evidence for this is equivocal, indicating that gains achieved through 'brain-training' programmes undertaken in laboratory settings do not seem to transfer easily to classrooms.

Phil Stringer's response to Elliott's original paper acknowledges the broad application of 'researcher led' and 'practitioner led' assessment, but also highlights the work of a smaller group of 'researcher-practitioners' working in the field. He argues that a consensus now largely exists regarding constructs and assessment processes, while increasing clarity over the purposes of assessment has led to the development of greater mutual respect between actors. Largely reporting on a situation of little change, Stringer does however note the recent clearer focus on intervention studies and the use of dynamic assessment in other fields, such as speech and language therapy, second language development and bilingualism. He concludes by stating that the premise in Elliott's (2003) title of 'realising potential' was always contestable.

Audrey Osler and Hugh Starkey's (2003) 'Hall of Fame' article recognised - with particular attention to deficit models of young people used to validate the need for citizenship education - the limitations of education for national citizenship. They proposed the introduction of 'education for cosmopolitan citizenship', based in part on Held's ideas of cosmopolitan democracy, as a means of challenging nationalist notions of citizenship. Osler and Starkey also drew our attention to the effects of globalisation on young people's lives, identifying how citizenship education can help them to understand and possibly address local, national, regional and global issues. Aware that many young people live in diverse communities, and in an increasingly interdependent world, they encouraged the recognition of different sites for citizenship education in schools, homes and communities. Osler and Starkey's contribution to this issue extends their concept of cosmopolitan citizenship further still

- while noting that in times of economic stringency, of demographic change, and of general uncertainty we must resist those 'authoritarian and populist leaders whose rhetoric suggests easy solutions to complex problems'. The authors argue that populist ideas are a direct threat to human rights, believing that education for cosmopolitan citizenship should now become more central in the school curriculum. They conclude their new article with suggestions that might prove effective in strengthening democracy through education, empowering students to become 'effective agents for change and social justice in their own communities'.

Darren Sharpe's response to Osler and Starkey's (2003) article recognises that the concept of cosmopolitan citizenship remains contested, and uses research into young people's political lives in Leicester (following periods of local, regional and national political changes) to support his analysis. His case study exemplifies young people's disconnection from 'the political' in Western society. Interestingly, Sharpe observes how 'Young, South Asian participants .... have not distanced themselves from the South Asian community entirely, but the way participants have approached narrating their self-identities has not necessarily been forged in, or determined upon, how 'Indian' or 'Pakistani' identities are conceived by the common culture'. This leads him to question the positive impact of promoting cosmopolitan citizenship among young people, who he sees as forging new types of ethnic identities. Sharpe therefore questions what types of educational approaches are important in strengthening political engagement. His article acknowledges Osler and Starkey's recognition of the disconnection from political life of many young people, but criticizes their lack of attention to 'broader socio-cultural and socio-political forces that influence the construction of youth identities'. Acknowledging young people's reduced commitment to national political systems and mainstream parties across Europe, and therefore their susceptibility to the rhetoric of more radical organisations, Sharpe notes a skepticism and mistrust of the political mainstream. Indeed, he argues that the ideals of cosmopolitan citizenship appear to have been abandoned in the post-Brexit, counter terrorism, era. Multicultural education in the UK has only achieved modest gains, while young people's uneven transitions from education to employment have spawned a mistrust of political institutions and agents. According to Sharpe, Osler and Starkey's article also 'privileges the perceptions and ontologies of South Asian and African young people at the expense of their white counterparts', and as such demonstrates why the concept of cosmopolitan citizenship has limitations.

Richard Bailey's (2005) contribution to the collection of 'Hall of Fame' articles previously addressed the outcomes of participation of children and young people in physical education and sport from a

political perspective. This extended to a rationalisation of the role played by both in social inclusion, and the development of social capital – through analysing their potential contribution to the social policy agenda of Tony Blair’s New Labour Government. Bailey’s article highlighted how sport and inclusion were elements of his wider research programme, which also investigated the social and educational value of physical activities. The assumed positive outcomes of engaging in sport require greater empirical research, according to Bailey, who notes that the beneficial impacts of physical education may be marginalised by the school curriculum. In his contribution to this Special Issue Bailey takes the opportunity to reflect on his previous article, written more than a decade ago and during what he believes to have been a particularly interesting period in the history of education. Recognising that physical education has traditionally held a peripheral position within the school timetable, he underlines the indefensibility of a ‘conception of education in which the body barely figures’. Bailey therefore re-orientates the aims of education to focus on well-being and the maintenance of a ‘flourishing life’.

Symeon Dagkas’ response to Bailey’s 2005 article indicates his intention to critique what he refers to as a ‘milestone paper within the field(s) of Sport; Physical Education (PE ) and .... physical activity (PA)’, noting that it is currently among the most cited articles in *Educational Review’s* history. In his contribution to this Special Issue, Dagkas chooses to explore the notion of social inclusion through sport and PE, embracing their impact on young people’s health. He does this, in part, by outlining the findings of research that has been published since Bailey’s original article - concluding that a number of questionable claims have been made about the ways in which sport and physical education support the improved social inclusion of the young. Dagkas advances a conceptualisation of the ‘pedagogies of exclusion’ – considering potential barrier factors such as lack of provision of economic resources, gender, race, ethnicity, religion and sexuality. Evidence that the focus on health-based outcomes can lead to disengagement from sports, as these can exclude young people and damage their body image, is presented. Dagkas concludes that the case for social inclusion through sport is still under-researched and largely anecdotal, with large gaps in research evidence concerning the practices needed to engage ethnic minority young people in physical activities. He argues for the recognition of ‘intersectionality’ as a research paradigm to help explain the multiple positionalities of sport, physical activity and health pedagogies.

Michael Apple’s ‘Hall of Fame’ article (Apple 2005) noted that many educational institutions in the West, at the time of writing, were deemed to be failures. These were criticised not least for displaying ‘high drop-out rates, a decline in ‘functional literacy’, a loss of standards and discipline, the

failure to teach 'real knowledge' and economically useful skills, poor scores on standardised tests, and more' (Apple 2005, p.271). Apple outlined how the political Right has, over a number of years, sought to blame educationists for such failures - making causal connections between falling standards in education and the decline of national economies, rising poverty, unemployment, lack of international competitiveness and other social and economic ills. However, he was careful to note that such issues are not solely the product of reactionary neo liberal policies - the political Left, both in the US and UK, also holds some responsibility, having simply extended the policies introduced under more conservative administrations. In this issue, Apple takes the opportunity to reflect on almost five decades of his own thought, and published work, across a range of themes. Using a focus on differential power and dominance he explores aspects of education theory, policy and practice. He is critical of education policy makers on both sides of the political spectrum, but is particularly disapproving of the ascendant Right – specifically the increasing influence of neoliberal, neoconservative, authoritarian populist, and managerialist policies in education and society. He concludes by acknowledging the risks inherent in widening participation and notes that 'We need nuanced and substantive ways of judging the potential of the emerging alternatives' to the forces of the Right.

Glenda McGregor's response acknowledges the importance of Apple's (2005) original article, similarly recognising the influence of the Right on economic, political and cultural landscapes, as well as on education policies in the West (and increasingly in SE Asia, and elsewhere). She focuses on the extent to which education policy and practice have changed over the last decade, while at the same time celebrating Apple's influence on research that has helped to create more socially just education systems. McGregor underlines Apple's recognition of the dominant direction of change towards 'conservative modernisation' of educational institutions, and similarly notes the Right's pronouncements of declining standards and decaying education provision - which assume the need to adopt a 'back-to-basics' approach. She takes the opportunity here to make judgements about the wisdom of extending educational 'measurement', and therefore competition, as the dominant characteristic of national and international testing. The subsequent benchmarking of students, institutions and teachers through the use of published league tables of assessed performance is similarly questioned. Like Apple, she regrets the commodification of education as a 'product', of viewing parents and students as 'consumers', and of the implicit importance of being given 'choice' if this merely serves to 'turn citizens into economic purchasers rather than democratic participants'. Her arguments extend into a consideration of the introduction of 'Free Schools' and academies, which she sees as privatising state education by stealth. McGregor concludes by asserting that a

convincing counter-narrative to neo-liberal dogma has yet to materialise from the Left, creating a necessity for the implementation of socially just policies to counter the 'collateral damage' of dominant neo-liberal social and economic policies.

David Bakhurst's original article, 'Reflections on Activity Theory' (published in 2009), repeats the bold claim that activity theory might represent 'the most important legacy of Soviet philosophy and psychology'. Focusing on Engeström's account of activity theory, he tracks its development through the work of Vygotsky, Leontiev and a range of recent contributors who have shifted the focus of activity theory onto considerations of difference, discourse and dialogue. These developments have, for Bakhurst, created a tension between the original Russian conceptions of the theory and more recent Western interpretations – which often apply the theory as an empirical method for modeling activity systems. In his current article – 'Activity, Action and Self-Consciousness' – Bakhurst both reflects upon, and updates, his previous contribution to this journal, considering recent shifts both in the theory itself and in its modern application. He offers a philosophical consideration of the activity approach, while also investigating the concept of activity itself, to draw together the insights of its Russian originators with contemporary advances in the philosophy of action. He argues that intentional human action is self-conscious and is best understood through an appreciation of the character of human life activity. Drawing on the work of Marx and Ilyenkov, Bakhurst focuses on Leontiev's distinction between action and activity, presenting the contention that 'some activities have ends that are infinite (that is, ends that are not exhausted by their realization) and internal (that is, intelligible only to those immersed in the activity itself)'. Bakhurst concludes with the thought that the intentions that underlie much contemporary research into activity theory represents rather different enterprises from those envisaged by the theory's founders. He reasons that thinking is an activity that characterizes the form of human life-activity – and that because human agency is self conscious agency, thought enters into all of our actions.

Levant's response makes a plea for 'two, three, many strands of activity theory' - noting that Bakhurst's original article does not simply support the 'philosophical' strand of activity theory as a counterpoint to the 'organizational' strand; on the contrary, it makes a critical intervention into both strands, and 'invites us to see activity theory as an unfinished project rather than as a coherent methodology'. Here the respondent takes a closer look at the nature of Ilyenkov's anthropocentrism in light of recent scholarship. Following the publication of Bakhurst's reflections in 2009, Levant acknowledges that a number of significant developments occurred in both the application of activity theory and the discussion of its theoretical elements. He chooses to focus on three - the renewed interest in Ilyenkov's work and the ways in which the activity approach developed in postwar Soviet

philosophy; the contributions of scholarship that have reimagined and (re)applied activity theory in innovative ways - which have enabled its practical application in education; and finally (although not specifically within the close remit of activity theory) he offers a discussion of the problems Bakhurst identifies in relation to anthropocentrism. This, Levant claims, has pertinence given the recent configuration of the current geological epoch as the Anthropocene, or 'Age of the Human'.

Garry Hornby and Rayleen Lafaele's (2011) 'Hall of Fame' article tackled issues around parental involvement (PI) in education, seeking to provide a model to explore the gap between 'rhetoric and reality'. In so doing their initial contribution also exposed the barriers to the development of effective PI, which were characterized as relating to parent and family factors; child factors; parent-teacher factors; and societal factors. It was the intention of the authors to enable education professionals to achieve a greater understanding of these barriers as the precursor to developing better, more effective, PI in education. The benefits of PI, as identified by Hornby and Lafaele (2011), included improved parent-teacher relationships, enhanced teacher morale and school climate; increased school attendance; better attitudes, behaviour and mental health of children; and increased parental confidence, satisfaction and interest in education. In this edition, Garry Hornby (writing now with Ian Blackwell) updates his original article, having conducted a small scale study with 11 primary schools in the UK. Their findings shift the original focus somewhat: despite the continuing importance of the factors originally identified, they find that parents and schools are now facing additional pressures as a consequence of external services and agencies having withdrawn their support. The corollary is that schools must now find novel, broader approaches to supporting parents. Further barriers to PI are identified by schools, including some practical barriers not previously identified – although, pleasingly, such obstacles now appear to be slightly less of an impediment to effective parental involvement than they once were. The schools included in their study held clear expectations that the involvement of parents remains a necessary component in facilitating the most effective education for children. The authors surmise that this may be because schools are now better at engaging parents in supporting children's learning and well-being than they were a decade ago. As such, they believe that a more optimistic pattern of parental involvement in education may be emerging.

Fan, Li and Sandoval's response to Hornby and Lafaele's (2011) article, whilst supporting many of their original ideas, contests that the explanatory model they proposed did not fully reflect all the possible interactions between the different factors identified. Fan et al claim that Hornby and

Lafaele's (2011) article tended to downplay broader societal influences in the relationships between parents and schools, adapting and reformulating their explanatory model, and seeking to explicate how the barriers previously identified can have interactive and confounding effects on effective PI in education. Their reformulated model therefore attempts to offer a broader understanding of the barriers and factors, primarily by taking into account wider 'interactive and confounding effects' in the context of society. They contend that 'how the parent and family factors act as barriers to PI is often intertwined with the adverse effects of child factors, and vice versa'.

Finally, it is, as always, important to acknowledge the work of the anonymous reviewers that ensure that every issue of *Educational Review* is of a comparable standard to those of other highly rated, peer reviewed, international journals in the field of education. For this issue reviewers were asked not only to consider the original articles from the 'Hall of Fame' website, but also to review pairs of articles that updated or responded to these submissions. Their highly professional and supportive comments to authors, often produced to exacting timelines, do them much credit.

Professor Graham Butt

Oxford Brookes University

gbutt@brookes.ac.uk

Professor Symeon Dagkas

Canterbury Christ Church University.

symeon.dagkas@canterbury.ac.uk

## References

Apple, M 2005 "Doing things the 'right' way: legitimising educational inequalities in conservative times". Educational Review. Vol 57 (3) p.271-293.

Bakhurst, D 2009 "Reflections on activity theory". Educational Review. Vol 61 (2) p.197-210.

Bailey, R 2005 "Evaluating the relationship between physical education, sport and social inclusion". Educational Review. Vol 57 (1) p.71-90.

Elliott, J 2003 "Dynamic Assessment in Educational Settings: Realising potential". Educational Review. Vol 55 (1) p.15-32.

Hornby, G and Lafaele, R 2011 "Barriers to parental involvement in education: an explanatory model". Educational Review. Vol 63 (1) p.37-52.

Osler, A and Starkey, H 2003 "Learning for Cosmopolitan Citizenship: Theoretical debates and young people's experiences". Educational Review. Vol 55 (3) p.243-254.

Thomas, G 2016 "Editorial". Educational Review. Vol 68 (1) p.1-3.