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ABSTRACT

Teachers and others who are not representative participants in the authorized governance structure often find they must make decisions concerning the legitimacy of attempts to influence public education. These 'evaluators-at-the-fringe' of the formal policy-formation structure find themselves being 'gate-keepers' for what will be considered legitimate attempts to influence public education.

Having defensible criteria for determining the legitimacy of attempts to influence public education policy is important. Without such criteria, resources will be wasted on the implementation of inappropriate attempts to influence public education. Or, just as important, influences which could be beneficial for the students, or for the society as a whole, may never be seriously considered.

In this paper it is argued that criteria for evaluating attempts to influence public education can be derived from the obligation to participate in the promotion of the public good, the right of individuals to self-preservation, the obligations associated with justice as fairness, and the duty to acknowledge the insights of the 'marketplace of ideas.' It is argued that there is an underlying tension between the rights of citizens to influence public policy and the rights of children being
raised. It is established that the right of citizens to participate in the debate concerning the nature of public education policy follows necessarily from the conditions for a satisfactory democratic social arrangement.

The legitimacy of individual attempts to influence public education policy is evaluated using a two part process. The first step in the process is to categorize the attempt to influence according to the kind of interests that appear to be motivating the attempt. The second step is to evaluate critical aspects of the attempt in terms of the criteria. Only attempts which are judged legitimate in terms of these criteria are eligible for any consideration as a possible influence on public education policy.

The paper concludes with an application of the framework to several examples of attempts to influence public education policy.
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INTRODUCTION

A. THE IMPORTANCE OF THE TOPIC

Attempts to influence what happens in public education are persistent phenomena in our society. Consider the following:

- A fastfood franchise outlet offers to provide materials for a reading program. The materials feature familiar characters from the company’s advertising. Teachers who agree to use the program in their classroom also get gift certificates to give to students as rewards for good work.¹

- A Canadian children’s book writer sends a letter to a school requesting that the principal request funding from the Canada Council to pay her expenses and fee to give a series of readings in the school.²

- An instructor in a Teacher Pre-Service Education Program advises teachers to design alternative, ‘locally-developed’ report card forms in order to make the task of reporting to parents more effective.³

- A group of single mothers makes a presentation to a school board demanding a district-wide nutrition education program.⁴

- A committee from a faculty in a major university submits a brief to a provincial curriculum design

¹ McDonald’s Restaurants reading program - reported in The Nanaimo Times (89-11-30)

² Several school districts on central Vancouver Island sponsor an Annual Writers’ Festival. Writers often approach schools directly in order to get invited to this festival.

³ I am involved in the development of an education ministry funded, in-service program dealing with the writing of anecdotal reports.

⁴ Harewood Committee Enhancement Study Group (Nanaimo, B.C.) proposals to School District #68, October, 1990.
committee arguing for the maintenance of the status quo in school graduation requirements.⁵

These examples illustrate some of the ways groups and individuals try to influence what goes on in our public education institutions. Like most attempts to change public education policy, the examples cited reflect the interests of those who advocate them. It is generally agreed that it is unacceptable to allow special interest groups to indiscriminately influence public education. However, all the examples appear to have some merit. Although they are reflective of the interests of those promoting them, they are not purely self-serving. Obviously attempts to influence public education policy must be evaluated. How can this be accomplished?

At first glance, the need to improve the handling of conflicting or counter-productive influences on public education might be mistaken for a straightforward organizational issue. If an organizational approach were taken, the solution to the problem of dealing with inappropriate influences on public education would consist of re-organizing the formal policy-making process for the purpose of closing the proverbial ‘back-door’ to aspiring influencers. Such an organizational strategy is unsatisfactory for two reasons. First, aspiring influencers

⁵ University of British Columbia Faculty of Arts submission to the B.C. Ministry of Education Graduation Program Advisory Committee, April, 1991.
would inevitably find other informal means of circumventing the formal policy-making structure.\textsuperscript{6} Second, focusing only on the formal structure of public education policy-making would divert attention from the fundamental questions regarding the appropriate criteria for determining the legitimacy of attempts to influence.

The purpose of this paper is to identify defensible grounds for evaluating the legitimacy of attempts to influence public education policy. Past investigations into influences on education policy have tended to focus on who the advocates are and how those who have power exercise it over aspiring influencers. In fact, the question of who sets the public education agenda by deciding education policy has been called "the basic policy issue."\textsuperscript{6}(Clark 1988, 175) This paper represents a fundamental shift from that perspective.

The question being addressed in this paper is: What are defensible grounds for evaluating the legitimacy of an

\textsuperscript{6} The fact that special interest groups systematically work to avoid detection by education authorities in order to ensure that their views are, in fact, adopted by the school system is evidence of the importance of the informal policy-making process. For example, the president of a professional association for Social Studies teachers reported to a meeting of Social Studies methods instructors (University of Victoria, May 2, 1991) that the creation and dissemination of learning materials related to the 1991 Gulf crisis was only possible because it was done completely outside of the authorized system. The upshot is that materials are in use in the schools without any kind of 'formal evaluation.'
attempt to influence public education policy in a modern pluralist democratic social arrangement such as ours?

The primary focus of this question is on what ought to be. The question is not about what is or what most likely will be the case when individuals actually engage in decision-making about the legitimacy of attempts to influence public education. Rather, it is about the criteria that ought to be used to ensure that attempts to influence public education are consistent with the moral and political obligations implicit in our notion of pluralist democratic social arrangements.

B. WHO NEEDS TO BE ABLE TO EVALUATE?

Various groups are involved in evaluating attempts to shape education policy. It is not unusual for ordinary citizens to be drawn into debates concerning the legitimacy of particular attempts to influence public education. Some of these citizens would, no doubt, appreciate guidance in the form of criteria that are consistent with their sense of moral and political obligation. Likewise, aspiring influencers may be concerned with the extent to which their attempt satisfies general criteria of legitimacy. Furthermore, classroom teachers must evaluate attempts to influence what will go on in their classroom in areas that are not covered by formal policy.
Teachers must conform to the policy direction set by those with the authority to exercise the teaching power. But the policy for a complex enterprise such as public education tend to be set at a general level. There are even times when policy decisions emerging from the formal process contain significant contradictions that must be resolved by the teacher at the classroom level. Teachers must also handle the pressures exerted by those who, despite the fact that they are clearly outside the formal education system, persist in attempting to shape education policy.

Teachers function at the boundary of the formal and informal processes for shaping public education. In a sense they are the ultimate protectors and implementers of the directions set through the formal process. However, the

To ensure the promotion of public benefits and avoidance of public harms it is necessary to put certain powers under the control of the state. In this paper the allocation of power to the state is taken to be the simple transfer of individual rights to the state for the purpose of more effectively accomplishing the upshot of those rights for individuals. For example, the individual’s right of physical self-defence against harm from non-citizens is transferred to the state. The state’s power of national self-defense is justified on the basis that citizens acting independently could not effectively exercise their right of self-preservation in the face of hostile attack from non-citizens. Other examples of the transfer of power are the military, legislative, executive, and judicial powers.

The power to teach is at least as important as the other powers of the state. The teaching power is: "... the inherent constitutional authority of the state to establish and direct the teaching authority and institutions needed to ensure its continuity and further its legitimate general and special purposes." (Tussman 1977, 54)
Responsibility of teachers extends beyond the simple implementation of formal policy. The potential exists for education authorities to create harmful policies that are not in the best interests of the society. Teachers play a key role in the process of correcting the mistakes of the governing representatives. Teachers must also act on behalf of corrective forces operating outside the formal education system. While those operating beyond the formal policy-making sector may identify the correctives, often only classroom teachers can implement those correctives. Before directions emerging from the informal policy-formation sector can be implemented, teachers must evaluate the proposed directions. Those evaluations must be conducted in terms of a defensible set of criteria.

The criteria developed in this paper should assist teachers, aspiring influencers and citizens in general in making effective evaluations of attempts to influence public education policy.

C. What Needs to Be Evaluated?

Prior to attempting to establish a defensible set of criteria, we need to be clear about what it is that needs to be evaluated. We are concerned here with attempts by aspiring influencers to have their particular views integrated into decisions concerning the functioning of public education. This general description of what aspiring
influencers are attempting to do suggests three general dimensions that must be addressed when evaluating attempts to influence public education.

First, the idea being proposed must be evaluated in terms of the moral and political obligations inherent in the social arrangement. In particular, is there a justification for the inclusion of the understandings, abilities and dispositions inherent in the proposal as a part of the process of initiation into the role of citizen.

Second, the anticipated impact of the proposal must be evaluated in terms of priority and feasibility. The potential for disruption of the society as a result of adoption of the proposal must be evaluated in terms of the fundamental values of the society. The desired impact of the proposal must at least appear achievable.

Third, there is the possibility that adoption of a proposal may result in a preferential, personal advantage for the advocates. Obviously, the degree to which the proposed public policy favours the advocates must influence the evaluation of the legitimacy of the attempted influence. For example, where the gain resulting from the adoption of a proposal results in an unjust treatment of others, the defensibility of the proposal is questionable.
To provide the guidance necessary for a fair and effective evaluation of attempts to influence, judgments must be made about these three dimensions.

D. OUTLINE OF THE PAPER

The purpose of this paper is to identify a set of criteria which can act as a basis for determining the legitimacy of attempts to influence public education. To be satisfactory these criteria must have a reasonable chance of being publicly acceptable and accessible to the majority of citizens in a modern pluralist democratic society such as ours.

If publicly accepted and accessible criteria are required, where should they come from? I will argue that a satisfactory set of criteria can be derived from:

1. the obligation to participate in the promotion of the public good,
2. the right of self-preservation,
3. the obligations associated with the principles of justice as fairness, and
4. the duty to acknowledge the insights of the 'marketplace of ideas.'

These obligations and duties, I argue, are implicit in our notion of pluralist democracy.

The chapters of Part 1 set out the conceptual groundwork, and clarify the underlying tension between the rights of citizens to influence public policy and the rights of the child in the process of 'growing up.' I argue that
the right to engage in attempts to influence public education follows necessarily from the conditions for a satisfactory democratic social arrangement. Three sets of categories that can be applied to attempts to influence public education are described. These categories are based on the purposes of public education, the general strategies for re-shaping societies, and the degree of egoism motivating attempted influences. The categories highlight the various aspects of attempted influences that must be evaluated. Based on the analysis in Part 1 an initial framework for the evaluation of attempts to influence public education policy is established.

The chapters of Part 2 establish categories for classifying attempts to influence public education policy based on the apparent interests motivating the attempt. The initial evaluation framework from Part 1 is extended and revised as the result of applying it to the categories. Part 2 concludes with a summary of those revisions.

In Part 3 an abbreviated version of the evaluation framework is applied to five examples of attempts to influence public education policy.
PART 1

CHILD-RAISING, SOCIETY-SHAPING AND PUBLIC EDUCATION

PREAMBLE

The purpose of Part 1 is to establish a basis for a valid evaluation of attempts to influence public education. This is accomplished by presenting an evaluation framework which is consistent with our notions of public education and modern pluralist democracy. Most of Part 1 consists of an analysis of those notions.

A prerequisite to this undertaking is to clarify what I am taking to be the overall purposes of public education. Public education can be seen as serving two basic purposes in our society. The most easily recognized purpose is to raise children to the point where they can function within the existing society. The second purpose is to shape the society in ways that are likely to improve the potential for citizens to achieve certain kinds of benefits. This second purpose is not universally acknowledged as a purpose of public education. When it is, it tends to be the purpose that raises the most concern. These two purposes are not necessarily in harmony with each other. However, taken together, the two purposes of public education - child-raising and society-shaping - seem to capture the
fundamental tensions that must be confronted by those who evaluate attempts to influence public education policy.

It is my contention that there are clear limits governing the pursuit of each of these purposes. In particular, it is my contention that child-raising as a purpose of public education is limited to that which can be justified as a legitimate interference with the freedom that citizens to engage in self-governance. In other words, any interference with the freedom of children experience while educating them must be justifiable in terms of the same principles that justify interference with the freedom of citizens in general. Obviously, this has implications for determining what ought to be considered defensible attempts to influence public education.

It is also my contention that citizens in a pluralist democratic society have a right to shape society by influencing public education policy. Any interference with that right can only be justified in terms of the principles which govern the rights of citizens in general.

Implicit in the pursuit of child-raising and society-shaping as purposes for public education is an assumption about the rational nature of those dealing with the complex

8 This claim is implied by Rawls' First Principle of Justice which stipulates that: each person is to have an equal right to the most extensive system of equal basic liberties compatible with a similar system of justice for all. (Rawls 1971, 302)
task of creating, sustaining, re-creating or replacing the social arrangement. It is my contention that citizens of modern pluralist democracies can be seen as at least striving to function as rational beings in their public social relations. To the extent that citizens are rational, they will insist that the criteria used to evaluate attempted influences on education are consistent with the principles underlying the justification of their social arrangement. They will also insist that where someone appears to have a right to influence public policy, others have a concomitant right to evaluate that attempted influence. Functioning rationally in this context implies the need for a publicly accessible set of defensible criteria for evaluating the legitimacy of attempts to influence public education.

It must be recognized that the problems being confronted through efforts to shape the society are complicated by the fact that the nature of the social arrangement of the future is not fully determined by the past and present characteristics of the society. In other words, the problems being confronted are not straightforward deterministic ones where all the information required for calculating the degree of benefit of a particular policy are available. Rather they are stochastic problems where the best an evaluator of attempts to influence can do is judge the degree to which an attempted influence will maximize the
anticipated value of the benefits that are likely to be achieved.

Because this is a stochastic problem, the evaluator must ask: is it better to protect the extant arrangement or to allow an attempt to influence a public institution in anticipation of other benefits that might or might not be achieved? To address this question, it must first be established that society shaping is a legitimate purpose for public education. It is not necessary to do the same for child-raising. The relationship between the strategies that might be used to re-shape the society by influencing public policy and public education institutions must be clarified. With child-raising, on the other hand, it is reasonably straightforward to stipulate what will and will not be accepted as legitimate child-raising in the context of public education. Most important, is the burning issue of the degree of egoism which can be justified as the motive behind attempts to re-shape the society by influencing education. This involves sorting out some of the fundamental moral and political obligations associated with participation in our society in order to establish a condition to govern what level of pursuit of self-serving interests is acceptable in the context of influencing public education. The child-raising purpose of public education has no parallel to this issue.
Part 1 has three chapters. In Chapter 1, the context is set. The focus of public education that is of particular concern is established. In particular, a way of talking about the shared views that underlie both the child-raising and society-shaping purpose of public education is established. The critical aspects of the social arrangements under consideration are identified. It has been confirmed that attempts to influence public education for the purpose of re-shaping the society must also be allowed.

In Chapter 2 of Part 1, the two fundamental purposes of public education, child-raising and society-shaping, are analyzed in order to clarify the kinds of criteria that rational citizens would employ when evaluating attempts to influence public education policy. The relationship between the process of initiating children into the set of shared views that seem to underlie the society and the process of re-shaping that society in ways that will generally benefit all citizens is explored. The analysis of this relationship provides a basis for the initial framework for the evaluation of attempts to influence public education which is proposed in Chapter 3 of Part 1.
PART 1

CHAPTER 1

SETTING THE CONTEXT - PRELIMINARY DEFINITIONS

A. INTRODUCTION

The first step in any analysis is to establish the general context for the analysis and to clarify the relevant basic terminology and principles that are being used. In Section B of this chapter the notions of civic consciousness and civic virtue are defined. In Section C the characteristics of the type of society under consideration, a modern pluralist democratic social arrangement, are stipulated. In Section D the implications of what I call the Void Reduction Requirement are considered.

B. SHARED VIEWS, CIVIC CONSCIOUSNESS AND CIVIC VIRTUE

Participation in a democratic society necessarily requires a significant number of shared views about what constitutes the good life. If participants do not share, to some extent, views on individual rights and moral and political obligations, the social arrangement will be in peril. First, there must be prosaic but important shared views on the appropriateness of the various language games that can be played on different occasions. For example, citizens in a democracy must have a shared understanding of
the language and the actions into which that language is woven in games of 'taking turns' and 'following the leader', whether the games are 'Simon Says' in the playground, the speaker ruling in the legislature, or the elder passing the talking stick at a village meeting. Second, there must be some shared views on what is considered to be of value. This is of great importance in modern pluralist societies where there are also significant differences in views on what is worthwhile. In other words, the differences only make sense where there is some shared view on a common standard for judging worthiness. This complex cluster of more or less generally shared views has been labelled civic consciousness by Dahl (Dahl 1982, 138).

Dahl uses civic consciousness to describe those shared views that appear to be fundamental for the continuation of the extant society (Dahl 1982, 138ff). In this paper the civic consciousness signifies whatever generally held orientations toward the good life exist within a particular social arrangement. This notion of civic consciousness is useful in that it draws our attention to the aggregate of decisions made by individuals who are acting reasonably consistently with what appears to be the intention of achieving a particular pattern of benefits within a social arrangement. As indicated above, there is a general striving among members of a society to have the civic consciousness be rational.
a rational orientation toward the good life. Dahl calls the ideal that is being sought, civic virtue. He defines it as follows:

Civic virtue may be said to exist among some aggregate of persons if each person involved in making collective decisions (hence in a democratic system, all citizens) acts steadily on the conscious intention of achieving the good of all the persons in the aggregate. Either conflicts of interest do not arise; or, if they do, citizens give priority to the public good. (Dahl 1982, 142)

If the pattern of benefits being pursued in a particular society is for the good of all persons in that society, we have a case of civic virtue.

Public education has a fundamental role to play in both the identification and the pursuit of such a pattern of benefits. This paper argues that an important justification for the defensibility of an attempt to influence public education is that adoption of the influence will advance the pursuit of civic virtue within the society.

C. SCOPE OF SOCIAL ARRANGEMENTS BEING CONSIDERED

Public policy necessarily implies the presence of an identifiable social arrangement. Only those social arrangements that can be classified as modern, pluralist and democratic are being considered in this paper. To the extent that the participants in a social arrangement are rational, their notion of legitimate public policy will be imbedded in
their notion of a satisfactory social arrangement. Therefore, to understand what is considered legitimate public policy for the purpose of determining the legitimacy of attempts to influence public institutions, it is necessary to unpack our notion of a modern pluralist democracy.

The term modern limits my analysis to social arrangements which can reasonably be expected to accommodate the aspirations of those who must cope with local, national, regional and global conditions that characterize our period in history.

The term pluralist indicates the existence of a significant number (a plurality) of relatively autonomous\(^9\) individuals. These individuals hold identifiable positions concerning aspects of public policy as it is articulated or implemented by the state. They belong to groups which are relatively autonomous from the state. These groups are engaged in advocating particular views which the individuals consider worthwhile for general adoption within their social arrangement.

---

\(^9\) The aspiring influencers of public policy under consideration are autonomous agents or members of relatively autonomous subsystems within the overall social arrangement. In other words, they are not acting as governing representatives nor are they acting as agents of governing representatives.
The structure of these groups can range from very loose, unstructured, temporary associations formed around a single issue to well-defined, tightly-knit, alliances with long-term strategies covering a range of issues. I call these groups autonomous groups to avoid that negative connotation conveyed by the label special interest groups. This negative connotation occurs when special interest is taken to be synonymous with self-interest. While the autonomous groups in pluralist societies may advocate purely selfish interests, they may also strive to improve the general good. The identifying characteristic of autonomous groups is that they are not advocating influences from within the authorized institutional structures of the society.10

The term democratic as it is being used in this paper is best understood in terms of the relationship between the notion of ideal democracy and the notion of an actual democracy (Dahl 1982, 10-1).

An ideal democracy is defined here in terms of Dahl’s criteria (Dahl 1982, 6). An ideal democracy involves full participatory citizenship where all binding decisions are decided on the basis of one-person, one fully informed,

10 Autonomous groups do not have the constitutional authority of the state to implement change to public institutions without the explicit approval of others.
openly debated vote. Dahl's criteria for an ideal democracy are:

1. Citizenship in the sense of participation in the democratic process must be open to all those present who may be subject to collective binding decisions and who ought to be capable on the basis of some general characteristic such as age of having considered opinions about what will benefit them personally.

2. In the process of making binding collective decisions, prior to the final expression of individual positions, each citizen has adequate and equal opportunity to arrive at a considered opinion about the most desirable binding collective decision.

3. Prior to the final expression of individual positions, each citizen has an equal opportunity to express an opinion about their preferred final decision.

4. The final expressed opinion of each citizen carries equal weight in the making of any binding collective decision. In other words, binding collective decisions are made on the basis of one person-one freely decided, informed vote.

5. All decisions about which matters will or will not be posed for collective binding decisions will be made by the body of citizens (Dahl 1982, 6).

This ideal sense of democracy is very stringent; so stringent in fact, that it is not possible to have an ideal democratic social arrangement of the type implied by the term modern. The local, national, regional and global conditions of today are simply too complex to allow an ideal democracy to exist.

However, the term democratic can also be used to describe a set of characteristics that can be observed in actual social arrangements. We call these arrangements
actual democracies. The characteristics of actual democracies parallel those of the ideal democracy, but they are not identical. In this actual democracy sense, the term democratic distinguishes social arrangements that have a degree of democracy from social arrangements which are clearly not democratic. Those actual democracies have the following eight characteristics. The first seven characteristics are based on Dahl’s analysis of what are generally considered to be modern democratic nations (Dahl 1982, 10-1). The eighth characteristic is implied by Dahl’s analysis. It is critical that the eighth characteristic be made explicit for the analysis that follows in this paper.

The characteristics of actual democracies are:

1. The definition of citizenship, for the purpose of participating in the selection of governing representatives, is broad enough to include all those present who may be subject to collective binding decisions and who ought to be capable, on the basis of some general characteristic such as age, of having considered opinions about what will benefit them personally.

2. There is constitutional delegation of control over binding decisions of the state to governing representatives. In other words, the state has the power to decide.

3. There is frequent selection of governing representatives by citizens through some form of free, fair election.

4. The qualifications for running as a governing representative are roughly equivalent to the qualifications for citizenship.

5. There is constitutional protection for citizens against punishment for articulating a position on political issues.
6. There is ensured access for citizens to alternative sources of information on matters relevant to past, present and future binding decisions of the state.

7. There is constitutional authorization for the formation of relatively independent associations of individuals promoting particular interests that may or may not be consistent with the decisions of past or present governing representatives of the citizens.

8. Constitutional arrangements for decision-making processes that achieve a reasonable approximation of the characteristics of democracy in the ideal sense are sought and implemented.

In this paper the notion of democracy indicates those social arrangements that have achieved some measure of the characteristics of actual democracies for the purpose of achieving the outcomes that are embedded in the notion of the ideal democracy.

D. THE VOID REDUCTION REQUIREMENT

While the notions of ideal democracy and actual democracy are obviously related, we should not simply look for ways to convert the extant social arrangement into an ideal democracy. In fact it is not even reasonable to expect that actual democracies will ever be successfully modified to conform to the criteria for an ideal democracy. As suggested above, there is an apparently insurmountable void between the two.

In the context of public policy-making, whether or not it is related to public education, acknowledging that there is an insurmountable void between the ideal democracy and what can be implemented in practice puts us on the horns of
a dilemma. Consider, for example, the provisions for
dialogue and public debate about public policy issues. If we
were to act on the knowledge that the dialogue and debate
provisions of the ideal democracy are completely impractical
in complex modern societies, we would risk limiting the
autonomy of citizens to influence public institutions that
have an impact on their lives. That contradicts the basic
condition for democratic social arrangements which requires
that citizens be allowed to participate in the debate over
the shape of public policy at least in areas that will
effect their welfare. However, if public institutions were
limited to actions that have been subjected to dialogue and
debate among all citizens who may be effected, the elected
representatives would be seriously impeded in making the
decisions required to ensure that public institutions
function for the benefit of the citizens. On the one side of
the dilemma, the autonomy of individuals to protect
themselves is at risk. On the other side of the dilemma, the
authority of the state acting in the interests of the public
as a whole is at risk.

To minimize the potential impact of this dilemma, what
I call the Void Reduction Requirement must be followed. The
Void Reduction Requirement requires that changes to the
arrangements of actual democracies must be directed at
reducing the void between the actual arrangement and our
notion of an ideal democracy. The Void Reduction Requirement
requires that for changes in social arrangements of an actual democracy to be defensible they must improve the chances for a closer approximation of the effect, if not the form, of democracy in the ideal sense. Applied to the situation being considered in this paper, the Void Reduction Requirement requires that proposals for change to public education policy must at least appear to have a chance of successfully re-shaping the social arrangement so that it more closely approximates the conditions for an ideal democracy.

There is an important corollary which follows from the Void Reduction Requirement. The corollary stipulates that, when there is evidence of a viable alternative to a less than ideal democratic aspect of the social arrangement, it is legitimate for individuals who recognize the alternative to attempt corrective action.

Satisfaction of the Void Reduction Requirement is not straightforward. It typically involves the balancing of the rights of individuals to engage in self-government with the rights of citizens to be protected by the state against unjustified interference from other individuals.

The difficulty in determining the degree of satisfaction of the Void Reduction Requirement can be seen in the process of planning for teaching. It is not uncommon for classroom teachers to have to decide if activities being
proposed by some autonomous group ought to be used in the classroom. These teachers must decide whether use of the activities is consistent with the rights of the child being raised, the rights of other citizens to protection from unjustified interference by these aspiring influencers, and the rights of the influencers to engage in attempts to reshape their society. Teachers must make judgments concerning the appropriate balancing of those rights. They must make judgments concerning the accuracy of the claims of the advocates. They must make judgments concerning what is probably in the best interests of the children as they will be when they have grown up. They must protect what is worthwhile\(^\text{11}\) in the extant social arrangement while, at the same time, conveying the sense that change for the purpose of more closely approximating an ideal democratic arrangement is always a possibility and is certainly desirable. While the judgments made by teachers in regard to each of these areas are not always straightforward, they are important. This is because the upshot of the teachers'
decisions can significantly affect what our civic consciousness will become.

For the Void Reduction Requirement and its corollary to make any sense it must be assumed that change is actually possible. Without the potential for change in a social arrangement, the Void Reduction Requirement becomes vacuous. If change is to occur in either the civic consciousness or in the regulative structures of a society, an awareness of the potential for change must be a part of the civic consciousness. In other words, it must be considered legitimate within the society to ask about the appropriateness of institutional arrangements that make up the society or to ask about the defensibility of an aspect of the prevailing civic consciousness. Such a condition is obviously a prerequisite for the Void Reduction Requirement.

Public education has a role to play in establishing this prerequisite. Children must be initiated into an understanding that changes to the civic consciousness may be worthwhile. By ensuring that an understanding of the necessity of the potential for change in the structures or shared beliefs of a society is a part of the civic consciousness of emerging generations, public education ensures that children are raised in such a way that the efforts of aspiring society-shapers now and in the future have the potential for success. To the extent that public education can also step outside the constraints of the
social arrangement that supports it and provide emerging citizens with an understanding of the criteria for determining the extent to which their social arrangement approaches civic virtue, the needs of students as potential evaluators of their own attempts and those of others to re-shape their society will also be served. Of course all this must be done while simultaneously initiating children into the extant social arrangement in such a way that they can adapt and live within it.

When viewed from the perspective of the Void Reduction Requirement, the systematic initiation of children into a defensible civic consciousness that includes the understanding that there can be legitimate reasons for changes in the civic consciousness appears to be pivotal. To the extent that pursuit of the child-raising purpose of public education serves this function, child-raising would appear to take precedence over attempts to re-shape the society by influencing public education. To verify this ordering of the purposes of public education it is necessary to analyze those purposes in more detail. This is done in Chapter 2.
PART 1

CHAPTER 2

PUBLIC EDUCATION: SOCIETY-SHAPING & CHILD-RAISING

A. INTRODUCTION

In Chapter 1 it was argued that participation in a democracy requires a significant number of shared views among the citizens concerning what constitutes the social arrangement. It was also established that, where there is evidence of a viable alternative to a less than ideal form of the social arrangement and where that alternative satisfies the relevant epistemological criteria, citizens have a right to attempt corrective action. This right implies that a part of the shared view held by the citizens of a pluralist democracy must be an awareness of the potential for change within the society. The difficulty lies in the determination of which attempts to change the society should be permitted, especially in the context of public education where those attempts could easily interfere with the rights of emerging citizens. In other words, to what extent should attempts to shape the society be allowed to interfere with the child-raising dimension of public education? Society-shaping needs to be considered in more detail in order to clarify the dimensions of attempts to re-
shape society through public education which need to be evaluated.

Chapter 2 establishes the basis for an examination of the efforts of aspiring society-shapers in pluralist democratic societies in the context of public education. Society-shaping is not universally acknowledged as a purpose for public education. Therefore, in Section B of this chapter the legitimacy of society-shaping as a purpose of public education is established. In Section C, the role of teachers in evaluating attempts to influence public education is considered. In order to get a better understanding of what society-shaping can involve, the general strategies that society-shaping tends to follow are considered in Section D. Those strategies are analyzed in terms of their relation to public education as an institution within our society. The underlying concern with attempts to re-shape the society is the degree of egoism motivating the attempt. In Section E the purposes of society-shaping are analyzed in terms of the balancing of egoistic and altruistic motives. A condition is established to govern what is an acceptable level of egoism in attempted influences on education. In Section F the claim that child-raising is a fundamental purpose of public education is elaborated. Finally, in Section G the principle which places child-raising at a higher priority than society-shaping as a purpose of public education is confirmed.
B. SOCIETY-SHAPING: LEGITIMATE PURSUIT IN A DEMOCRACY

Before proceeding it is important to confirm that society-shaping is a legitimate purpose for public education in a pluralist democracy. In fact, it can be argued that having citizens attempt to re-shape the society by influencing public education is implicit in our notion of a pluralist democracy.

Societies are not static social arrangements. They are shaped and re-shaped throughout their history. In particular, they are shaped by relatively autonomous citizens and groups acting with the specific intention of better achieving some end. Is this as it should be?

There is no question that actions carried out with the specific intention of re-shaping society have occurred and, more importantly, have had a significant impact on modern pluralist democracies. But is this the way it ought to be? Can society-shaping in a pluralist democracy by anyone other than the authorized governing representatives be justified? In particular, can re-shaping of the society through the institutions of public education by anyone other than the authorized governing representatives be justified? These basic questions can be addressed at either a fundamental level or at a context specific level.

At the fundamental level, these questions can be seen as challenges to the justification for society-shaping in
terms of the principles that underlie the society itself. Interpreting these questions at this level implies the need for a justification of actions of society-shaping in terms of broader principles. The question becomes: Is the importance that is attached to the right of citizens to shape their society justified? Because these rights are implicit in the justification of pluralist democracies, asking if the rights are justifiable is equivalent to asking if rational individuals would be compelled to accept democracy as a defensible social arrangement. Such an interpretation of these questions takes us too far from the issue being addressed in this paper. For the purposes of this paper, I assume that a pluralist democracy is a justifiable form of social arrangement.

At a context specific level, however, these questions about citizens' right to shape their society are relevant to the issue at hand. Based on the conception of a pluralist democracy, these questions can be taken to be about the logical necessity of permitting actions that are likely to result in society-shaping. Given the nature of modern pluralist democracies, the question becomes one of justifying the claim that it is necessary to allow autonomous groups to engage in society-shaping. In other words, are there characteristics of pluralist democracies which imply the necessity of this particular form of society-shaping?
Dealing with the questions about citizens’ right to engage in society-shaping at the logical necessity level implies the need to identify characteristics of modern pluralist democracies that could be logically connected to such a right. The seventh characteristic of an actual democracy listed in Chapter 1 stipulates that if there are autonomous groups advocating particular interests that appear to be inconsistent with decisions made by governing representatives, the concerns of those groups must be accommodated in some way. In other words, where members of an autonomous group see ways to re-shape the society so that it will better serve their needs, their right to self-government entails the right to at least attempt to re-shape their society.

But first we need to ask, is it reasonable to assume that such autonomous groups will emerge in a pluralist democracy? One might argue that, by definition, the extant social arrangement is the ultimate expression of self-government by citizens. In other words, one might say that the representative governance structure achieves the effect of an ideal democracy, and thus completely satisfies the Void Reduction Requirement. If this were the case there would be no justification for autonomous groups’ attempts to influence public policy. Any claim to the right to re-shape the society would be, by definition, mistaken. However, if we accept that at least in the modern context, an ideal
democracy is not possible and the best we can hope for is an imperfect actual democracy, such agitating groups will necessarily appear.

Moreover, the sixth characteristic of actual democracies listed in Chapter 1 requires that citizens must have access to alternative sources of information related to any binding decisions on the social arrangement. The issues that are of interest to the citizens of democracies are complex. It is inevitable that the positions taken on issues of public governance will differ according to the perspective taken, even though those different perspectives are all reasonable. The problem is that it is not always clear which, if any, perspective is most reasonable. It seems inevitable that the different perspectives arising from the available sources of information will result in conflicting directions for public institutions. As a result, it seems likely that autonomous groups advocating competing perspectives on public policy issues will emerge.

The case can be stated even more strongly. Autonomous groups engaged in attempts to re-shape their society are an important part of the institutional structures for the governance of modern democracies. It is true that actual democracies are shaped to a large extent by the decisions of the governing representatives. Citizens are most often expected to exercise their right to self-government by influencing the shape of the society through their selection
of governing representatives. Whether one holds that representatives ought to try to be representative of their constituents' views or that they ought to use their own best judgment, citizens ought to have the opportunity to criticize or support the views and policy-decisions of their representatives.

Allowing autonomous groups to advocate changes to the society introduces the risk of public policy being determined by non-representative groups. The risk is especially high when those groups can bring nearly unlimited resources to bear on the formal decision-making process. If there is not an effective process for the evaluation of attempts by autonomous groups to influence public policy, the conditions for democratic control through some form of elected representation are in jeopardy. In the case of public education there is an enormous potential for vulnerability to autonomous groups willing to commit large amounts of resources to have their influence adopted within the school system.

C. TEACHERS AND ATTEMPTS TO INFLUENCE

From time to time individuals at the fringes of the representative governance structure are forced by circumstances to evaluate these attempts to influence public institutions. For example, it is not unusual for teachers to find themselves under pressure from autonomous groups who
are advocating particular perspectives for adoption within the classroom. These attempts to influence teachers very often are exerted beyond the scope of the formal governance structure. In a very real sense, teachers can be the only protection children and society have from some indefensible influences on public education. It is important to note that where teachers do decide to implement an attempted influence, the perspective imbedded in the influence will become a part of the civic consciousness acquired by their students. Where teachers reject an attempted influence, the likelihood of the influence being incorporated into the civic consciousness is significantly reduced.

It is essential that teachers evaluate these influences effectively. Teachers must be wary of false promises of desired outcomes. They must avoid simply jumping on an 'educational bandwagon' where, if the advocates succeed in recruiting the support of a large number of teachers, the effect will be at least as potent a force in shaping the society as having official adoption of the influence by the formal policy-makers. There is a significant risk to opening the door to all influences with no meaningful evaluation of those influences before they are adopted. A society is built on the shared understandings of the citizens, no matter how fragile that sharing may be. Just because those understandings have evolved as a result of the decisions and supportive reactions of those at the
fringes of the formal policy-making process does not make them any less potent. As long as there is a workable, acceptable, defensible process in place for the evaluation of the attempted influences of autonomous groups, there is the potential for a society to adapt and adjust according to the best available knowledge. In other words, society-shaping is an important dimension of modern pluralist democracies. Society-shaping is one of the fundamental purposes of public education in a democracy. However, the society-shaping purpose is also a source of legitimate concern for those who must judge the legitimacy of attempts to influence public education. When advocates claim that they are attempting to re-shape the society, questions arise about, among other things, the appropriateness of the strategy they are employing and the degree to which the attempt could be self-serving.

D. STRATEGIES FOR RE-SHAPING SOCIETY

Having established the importance of society-shaping as a purpose for public education, it is necessary to clarify the nature of attempts to influence public education policy which are primarily concerned with society shaping. First, I consider the strategies used by those attempting to influence education for the purpose of re-shaping their society.
Influences on public education policy for the purpose of society-shaping follow one of two distinct strategies. I call these two strategies the dictated-consciousness strategy and the structural-adjustment strategy.

The dictated-consciousness strategy is where a particular form of civic consciousness is prescribed on theoretical grounds as necessary for the achievement of civic virtue. Society-shaping through the dictated-consciousness strategy is characterized by efforts to impose a predetermined civic consciousness society-wide through rational persuasion. A critical feature of the dictated-consciousness approach to social change is the focus on re-shaping the civic consciousness of citizens rather than on overhauling the social arrangement. The assumption underlying this strategy of social change is that any required structural adjustments will necessarily come about as a result of the adjustments to the civic consciousness. In other words, the structural adjustments will only occur once the civic consciousness has been adjusted.

Obviously there is a close connection between society-shaping using a dictated-consciousness strategy and public education. Public education is the fundamental means for initiating future citizens into a predetermined civic consciousness. Where the hold of a prevailing civic consciousness needs to be broken, public education can be used to add respectability to the emerging views of what is
right. In fact it might be argued that public education of some form is required if attempts to re-shape the society using a dictated consciousness strategy are to have a chance of succeeding at anything near a society-wide level.

The second society-shaping strategy, the structural-adjustment strategy, is based on the assumption that changes to the fundamental structures of the social arrangement necessarily precede changes in the civic consciousness. In other words, change the institutional arrangements first and the shared views necessary to achieve civic virtue will follow as a result. Influencers using the structural-adjustment strategy promote changes to the regulative structures of the society as a means for changing the civic consciousness to an orientation that approaches civic virtue.

The connection between public education and the structural change strategy can take different forms. The most obvious connection is where public education is the institutional structure which must be changed in order to clear the way for other changes. Claims that public education is the part of the structure that most urgently needs radical restructuring are not uncommon. For example, the argument is sometimes made that if competition for grades were eliminated from public education, our society would be less competitive and therefore more co-operative. Those making the argument claim that such a society would be
a more rewarding arrangement for citizens in general. To achieve the objective, public schooling would have to be restructured.

In cases where education institutions are targeted as needing structural adjustment, the relationship between public education and structural change is obvious. The claim is essentially that the pursuit of civic virtue is being impeded by the extant public education institution. What is being advocated is that education institutions be altered in order to reduce the inherent impediments. Attempts to influence public education policy which follow structural adjustment strategy can be very difficult for those directly involved in public education to evaluate. This is because such attempted influences may challenge the basic assumptions used to guide the day-to-day activities of the educational enterprise. This suggests a limit on the kinds of attempted influences that can reasonably be expected to be fairly evaluated by those directly involved in public education.

It is also possible for the relationship between a proposed structural change and public education to be less direct. Advocates of structural adjustments to public institutions may simply see public education as a supportive adjunct to other public institutions. While the other institutions require radical overhaul, public education must keep up with the changes. Calling for structural changes in
other public institutions only requires that public education be purged of views that sustain the other institution. In such cases the extant education system only needs to be adjusted to the point that it does not continue to initiate future citizens into the old structures.

The relationship between public education and structural change can also be one where public education contributes in a positive way to the required structural change. For example, some structural changes can only be accomplished over time-frames measured in decades. In such cases, we are dealing with changes which bridge the generations. Public education is required to prepare future generations for a changed society. If the emerging citizens are not prepared to take over the future adjusted society, there is a risk of back-sliding in the structural adjustments. A significant feature of these cases is that public education is expected to initiate students into a society before that society is in place.

Identification of the dictated-consciousness strategy and the structural-adjustment strategy is useful in that it draws our attention to critical aspects of attempted influences that need to be evaluated. For example, where an attempted influence uses the dictated-consciousness strategy, the evaluation of the attempt must focus on the claim that the civic consciousness to be dictated is not only legitimate, but also satisfies the Void Reduction
Requirement. In other words, the change in the civic consciousness must be in the direction of an improved fit with the effect of the ideal democracy.

Where public education is targeted as a social institution requiring structural adjustment that is prerequisite to the development of a more defensible civic consciousness, the feasibility of the change must be examined. The balance of harms and benefits that are likely to arise because of the change must also be considered. The potential effect of the disruption experienced by children being raised during the transition period must be evaluated. Where the expectation is that public education will initiate students into a future society that does not yet exist, there must be some reasonable assurance that the desired social arrangement will come to fruition.

Analysis of the strategies used in attempts to re-shape society highlights other aspects of attempted influences that must be evaluated. The balance of benefits and harms that are likely to arise from the attempt must be considered. The feasibility of achieving the desired outcome must also be factored into the evaluation process.

The relationship between public education and the specific strategy for society-shaping also has implications for what would be defensible criteria for evaluating those attempts. For example, disruption to the extant child-
raising process is, in itself, potentially harmful. As indicated above, evaluators of attempts to influence must consider more than just the desirability of the intended outcome as it is characterized by the advocates. Evaluation of attempted influences also involves judgments about the cost of correcting the arrangement as compared to the cost of using an imperfect arrangement. While the corollary of the Void Reduction Requirement stipulates that attempts to achieve civic virtue are justified, teachers may also be justified in blocking those attempts. In particular, the potential for harm to students, even where those students are being initiated into the civic consciousness through imperfect means or where the civic consciousness they are being initiated into is not the closest possible approximation of civic virtue, may be sufficient justification for dismissing an attempted influence. For example, raising children for some highly desirable future social arrangement can not be justified if those children are not able to survive within the extant social arrangement. Sacrificing the welfare of these emerging citizens in the pursuit of civic virtue may not be justified. An evaluation of attempts to influence public education policy must deal with these issues.

E. MOTIVES FOR ATTEMPTING SOCIETY-SHAPING

In the preceding sections I have established that society-shaping is a legitimate purpose for public education
and is potentially a legitimate pursuit for those advocating influences on public education. I have also established that the strategies for re-shaping the society necessarily have a relationship with public education, even when the attempted influence does not appear to be directed specifically at public education institutions.

While the preceding analysis of society-shaping has given an idea of the potential scope of attempts to influence public policy, there is a more fundamental issue which is yet to be resolved. It is generally accepted that advocates must not be allowed to use public education to gain an unfair advantage at the expense of other citizens, especially at the expense of the children being raised through public education. Therefore, evaluation of the legitimacy of an attempted influence necessarily involves evaluation of the anticipated impact of adoption of the influence. An obvious source of information about the anticipated impact of the influence is the claims of the advocates. However, it is reasonable to assume that the advocates will tend to emphasize those effects which are most likely to meet with the approval of the evaluators and downplay other intended effects.

A judicious evaluator of attempts to influence public education will also consider the undeclared motives of the advocates as an indicator of the intended impact of the influences. Thus, for example, where an attempt is clearly
motivated by pure egoism, this will be taken as an indicator that eventual effect of adoption of the influence could produce an unfair advantage for the advocates at the expense of others. Therefore, the prudent position for an evaluator to take is to disallow attempts which appear to be motivated by pure egoism unless it can be clearly demonstrated that the effect of adopting the influence will not be purely self-serving for the advocates.

The question addressed in this section is: Is it possible to establish some kind of criterion to govern the balance of self-serving and other-serving motives where it is likely that those motives will be fulfilled? If this question cannot be answered in the affirmative, there is no point in continuing the development of an evaluation framework. A framework which did not provide guidance in making judgments concerning the legitimacy of the probable impact of advocates' apparent motives would be fundamentally flawed.

A criterion is required which uses the motives that appear to be behind attempts to influence as a basis for making judgments about the defensibility of the intended impact of attempts. It is my contention that the motive of most concern is pure egoism. Attempts which are motivated by pure egoism are likely to produce effects which provide unjust advantages to the advocates because, if the underlying motive of the advocates is to gain some advantage
over others, they will probably adjust and adapt their proposal during its implementation in order to achieve their undeclared intention.

The criterion established in this section limits the kind of self-serving ends that can be legitimately pursued. I call the criterion the Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion. The Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion stipulates that the acquisition of benefits by the advocates of a particular influence must not be dependent on the fact that others will not gain the same or related benefits.

Based on evidence of the degree of egoism that can be said to characterize the attempt, the exclusiveness of particular benefits that the advocates might gain as a result of adoption of their influence can be more or less predicted. Attempted influences can be said to be motivated by pure egoism or by something less than pure egoism. This distinction between purely egoistic motives and less egoistic or even partially altruistic motives serves as an indicator of the potential for gaining an unfair advantage as a result of adoption of the influence which, in turn, is the basis for making judgments concerning the legitimacy of the anticipated impact of attempted influences.

Making judgments concerning the legitimacy of an attempted influence based on inferences drawn from the apparent motive for the attempt is not a novel suggestion.
In fact, it is a part of the typical process of evaluation of attempted influences on education. It is not uncommon for influences to be dismissed on the basis that they appear to be solely for the purpose of personal gain for the advocates. The motive for such influences is characterized as pure egoism. To the extent that influences motivated by pure egoism are likely to succeed in achieving the advocates' intended impact, they are not defensible. On the other hand, it is also recognized that there are attempted influences which appear to be solely for the purpose of improving the society for the benefit all citizens. The latter influences can be characterized as being motivated by pure altruism. To the extent that influences motivated by pure altruism will achieve their intended impact, they are defensible.

I take the concern about the motivation behind attempts to influence policy to be a manifestation of the application of a general principle which guides public education policy-making. The principle is:

Given the potential for harm to children resulting from an influence on public education which is motivated by self-serving interests which are likely to be achieved as a result of adoption of the influence, such an influence should not be allowed.

While I agree that this ought to be a fundamental principle of education policy-making, there is a risk of over-zealous application. Some might interpret the principle
to mean that any attempt to influence public education that might result in personal gain for the advocates ought to be dismissed. I call such an extreme prohibition the General Egoism Prohibition. The General Egoism Prohibition could be used to justify the dismissal of all attempts by autonomous groups to re-shape their society by influencing public education. Since the purpose of this paper is to provide a rational basis for vetting autonomous groups' influences on public education and since it is possible that the General Egoism Prohibition could be used to dismiss them all, the principle must be refuted.

The argument upon which the General Egoism Prohibition is based is flawed from the start. It starts as follows:

1. Authorized governing representatives strive to shape the society in ways that are in the best interests of all citizens.

2. Autonomous groups are attempting to shape the society in ways that are different from that stipulated by the authorized governing representatives.

3. Therefore, autonomous groups attempting to re-shape their society are necessarily attempting to achieve personal gain.

This argument relies on a suppressed and faulty assumption. That assumption is that autonomous groups which pursue ends that vary from those defined by the governing representatives in matters of public education or any other public policy area, are necessarily seeking some kind of personal gain that conflicts with the broader public interest. The historical record provides evidence which
contradicts this assumption. There are numerous examples where autonomous groups fortunately prevailed against the authorized governors and saved the society from what, in hindsight, are obviously mistaken public policies. Presumably an analysis of the history of public education would provide equivalent examples in the area of public education policy-making.

While the General Egoism Prohibition is far too restrictive a criterion for evaluating attempts to influence public education policy, it does highlight the tendency to evaluate attempted influences in terms of the advocates' apparent motives where those motives serve as an indicator of the intended impact of the influence. There is no question that some attempted influences ought to be rejected on the basis that they have no redeeming qualities to compensate for the unfair advantage they would give the advocates. A defensible process for evaluating attempts to influence education must block such attempts to use a public institution for purely selfish gains. However, contrary to the General Egoism Prohibition, evidence of egoistic tendencies does not, on its own, mean that the influence could not also be in the interest of others.

The General Egoism Prohibition completely blocks attempted influences that are likely to result in satisfaction of self-interested egoistic motives as well as other-interested altruistic motives. It is my contention
that it is not reasonable to claim that a significant number of people in our society do not seek to take care of the welfare of at least a few others as well as their own welfare. In other words, a significant number of citizens in modern pluralist democracies are not seeking purely egoistic ends in their participation in public affairs.

The General Egoism Prohibition also eliminates the possibility of allowing attempts to influence where, despite evidence that those attempts may be motivated by egoism, the eventual impact of adoption could be beneficial to the society as well as to the children being raised into that re-shaped society. On these grounds it seems clear that a less restrictive criterion than the General Egoism Prohibition is required.

There are several conditions that must be met by a criterion if it is to be a satisfactory replacement for the General Egoism Prohibition. First, a replacement for the General Egoism Prohibition must continue to focus on the distribution of benefits anticipated to result from adoption of an attempted influence. In particular it must provide guidance to potential evaluators in terms of the advantages that advocates could gain if their influence were adopted. The indicator being used as a basis for the evaluation must be reasonably easy for teachers and others at the fringes of the formal policy-making structure to detect. Finally, the
evaluation must lead to a defensible judgment of the overall legitimacy of the attempted influence.

The primary characteristic which I have selected as the basis for a criterion to replace the General Egoism Prohibition is the range of potential beneficiaries. Influences which can be seen as self-serving for the advocates must be evaluated in terms of the fairness of the distribution of benefits. In other words, the question must be asked: Are the benefits available to others, or are they limited exclusively to the advocates? A benefit is an 'exclusionary benefit' when it is a benefit to the advocates primarily because it is not available to others. This new criterion, which I call the Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion, stipulates that to be defensible an attempted influence must not result in what appear to be exclusionary benefits, especially for the advocates.

The Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion provides a clear standard for making judgments concerning the legitimacy of attempted influences in terms of the balance of egoistic and altruistic motives for the attempt where those motives are taken to be an indicator of the likely impact of the influence. When properly applied it will screen out attempts which will satisfy only purely egoistic ends. If an attempted influence does not satisfy the Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion, the attempt must be
dismissed on the basis that it is not a defensible attempt to re-shape the society by influencing public education.

Successful application of the Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion requires accurate identification of the potential for benefits which are benefits because others have not gained equivalent or related benefits. Application of the Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion starts with the question: Are there likely to be benefits which will be necessarily limited to the advocates? The next question is: Are those benefits which will accrue to the advocates benefits because no one else will have access to the benefit? If the answer is 'yes', the attempt to influence does not satisfy the Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion. Therefore, it is not a defensible attempt. It must be dismissed.

Unfortunately the evaluation of attempts to influence education with the Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion is not always decisive. In preparation for fitting the Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion into an evaluation framework it is useful to clarify the scope of its effectiveness and to get a sense of its limits. The limits of the Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion are best illustrated by considering its application.
The first example illustrates application of the Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion to an influence that could clearly result in advantages for the advocates:

**Example #1 - TV News Network**

An international, twenty-four hour television news organization is promoting a direct satellite feed service to schools. To access the service a school needs a satellite dish as well as other equipment to process and re-broadcast the company’s television signal into classrooms. The equipment is expensive.

The company has a capital equipment start-up subsidy for schools in lower socio-economic neighborhoods. The subsidy consists of a grant to cover the cost of the equipment required to access the service. There are three conditions attached to the subsidy:

1. All teachers in the school must participate in a training program provided by the news service company. Teachers who participate in the training program are asked for a commitment to use the live-feed news activities on a regular basis.
2. The school administrator must provide testimonials for use in the company’s advertising.
3. Parent and community groups and/or local businesses must indicate that they will help the school pay the ongoing service fees.

Should a school staff consider applying for the subsidy?

---

12 This example is hypothetical. However, it combines elements from several different actual cases. For example, CNN does provide a special news service for schools. This service is actively promoted on the FidoNet BBS's (Electronic Bulletin Board Systems) used by teachers and students. The Knowledge Network has had subsidy programs to assist schools and community groups with the cost of equipment. Other programs such as Project Tree and the Co-operative Resource Materials Project (OISE) limit access to materials to those who undertake ‘training programs’ and commit themselves to use the materials in the ways suggests by the sponsors.
There is obvious evidence of self-serving motives on the part of the news service company. The company is trying to sell a service to schools in order to make a profit. However, there is also evidence of other-serving motives behind the company's attempt to change the way students keep up-to-date on world affairs. The start-up subsidy program for schools which would not otherwise be able to use the service can be taken as evidence of concern for the society as a whole as well as for students. After all, having well-informed high school graduates is generally accepted as being to everyone's advantage. Providing students with a wide range of up-to-date information from around the world along with the opinions of people on-site should also be to the students' advantage.

The task for teachers as evaluators of this attempt to influence education is to judge the news service company's attempt to become an information supplier in school classrooms in terms of the fairness of the anticipated impact of the attempt. What kind of evidence and positions are available for such an evaluation? The company would, no doubt, argue that while they may profit from the sale of their service to schools, their attempt to radically change the flow of information into the public education system should be judged on their commitment to make the service available to all students. The company probably sees the subsidy program as their commitment as good corporate
citizens to support equal access for all students to a worthwhile source of information.

However, it could also be argued that the subsidy program is a strategy for improving the chances of the company becoming the sole commercial provider of information in schools. In other words, the subsidy program could be described as simply a marketing strategy that is designed to purchase long-term market-share in the news broadcast industry. If the company succeeds in making the service universally available in schools, students will be 'forced' to use the service as a part of their school experience. If students are exposed to this company's news channel on a regular basis during their school career they may conclude that, despite the teachers' attempts to engage them in critical analysis of the program, that it is a source of reliable information because it is associated with schools. From this perspective the subsidy program is self-serving and lacks any merit in terms of benefits for others.

The controversy concerning the legitimacy of the news service's attempt to influence education could easily extend to the defensibility of the training program and attempts to solicit commitment from teachers, school administrators, parents and the community as a whole. From the company's perspective these are reasonable conditions to attach to their donation to public education. The company simply wants some assurance that their donation is going to be used to
support the provision of this service to all students. Of course others might argue that these features of the subsidy program are additional evidence of the company's attempt to use schools to gain an unfair advantage in the marketplace.

A judgment is required. After all, it is generally acknowledged that developing an awareness of current world events among all students is worthwhile, both for the students and for the society as a whole. Are teachers justified in dismissing this attempted influence because of the indicators that it is self-serving? Is the criticism based on concern with the future profits for the company out of place?

In the case of the news service's attempt to have their school program universally adopted by schools, application of the Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion is decisive. To apply the Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion, a characteristic that can be judged is the degree to which the advantages that the news service company might gain depend on the exclusion of other TV broadcast companies from receiving the same benefits. In other words, is it the case that the company will only benefit if others do not benefit in the same or related ways. By definition increased market-share is an exclusionary benefit. If this company gets a larger share of the business, it is at the expense of other companies. According to the Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion, this attempt should be dismissed as indefensible.
The company's attempt to increase market-share has been taken as an indicator of the probable impact of adoption of their influence. The accuracy of this indicator can be tested. For example, if the receiving equipment only picks up the sponsoring company's service, all the benefits that might arise for the company would be exclusionary. Suppose a teacher suggested adjustments to the receiving equipment that would provide access to other signals. Does the company insist that the equipment being subsidized can only be used to pick up their signal? If so, it can be assumed that the company's primary objective is to increase marketshare, not to provide students with open access to up-to-date information. In other words, the apparent motivation behind this attempt is purely egoistic. Given the resources of the company, it is likely that they will succeed in achieving their intended impact. There is compelling evidence that adoption of the attempt will produce an effect that will not satisfy the Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion.

There are attempts to influence public education policy which are generally considered defensible despite the potential for benefits for the advocates. What judgment does the Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion produce in these
cases? Consider the application of the Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion to the following example:

**Example #2 - School Lunch Program**

A community-based volunteer group runs a free drop-in breakfast program in a church basement in a low socio-economic neighborhood. The volunteers notice that a large number of school-age children regularly ask for food to take for lunch.

The program volunteers conclude that in other parts of the school attendance area where there is no breakfast program there must be children going through the school day without a proper meal. The 'Breakfast Program' group starts to advocate lunch programs in the neighborhood schools. They solicit the support of their own children's teachers.

Despite what appears to be sincere concern for other people's children, there is evidence that this attempt to influence education policy could also turn out to be self-serving for the advocates. A school lunch program would make life easier for the advocates by supplying lunches for their own children. Application of the Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion in this case is straightforward. The benefits that the advocates of the school lunch program receive are non-exclusionary. The fact that one parent benefits by not having to make school lunches does not depend on other parents not having the same benefit. According to the Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion, the intended impact of this attempt is defensible.

---

This example is based on the experiences of the 7-11 Club at St. Peter's Church in Nanaimo.
Application of the Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion does not always provide a decisive conclusion. Consider the following example:

**Example #3 - Change-Making Kit**

A community-based financial co-operative purchases change-making games from its provincial coordinating organization. The local financial co-operative or as such associations are called in Canada, credit union, distributes the games free-of-charge to all primary teachers in the local schools.

The game consists of sets of play coins that are nearly indistinguishable from real money. The only obvious differences is that the 'head' and 'tail' on the coin have been replaced with internationally recognized symbols for credit unions - the cupped hands and the rainy day umbrella. The print materials with suggestions for teachers on activities and learning centres to help students practice making change also display these symbols.

Before considering how the Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion would apply to this attempt to influence public education, let us consider the broader picture of how a classroom teacher would typically proceed in her evaluation of these materials. The teacher's first concern would be to reassure herself that there is nothing about the materials that conflicts with what she takes to be important for her students. In other words, the teacher would focus her

---

14 This example is based on a B.C Central Credit Union’s project in the late seventies. BCCCU distributed change-making kits to all B.C. schools. Complaints were made to the Department of Education and school superintendents were directed to have the kits returned to BCCCU because of the presence of credit union symbols on the kits.
evaluation on dimensions of the civic consciousness that she considers important. For example, if the teacher is promoting co-operative learning strategies, she would check to see if the activities provide opportunities to practice that way of working with other people. The teacher would have already decided that the promotion of co-operative strategies is consistent with what she considers to be worthwhile. Since these materials are sponsored by a co-operative and supposedly have co-operative games in the activity guide we can assume that the change-making kit could pass this first test. Typically, this kind of test would be applied several times, in terms of the different aspects of the civic consciousness that the teacher is promoting with her students. Some of these different aspects may not be related to the influence being promoted by the advocates. For example, the teacher is likely concerned with correcting gender bias wherever possible. She would evaluate the activities in terms of the degree to which the activities reinforce traditional gender roles. If the kit included activities that challenged gender stereotypes related to job functions in financial institutions, the kit would pass another test of the legitimacy of its anticipated impact.

The teacher would also be concerned with the implementability of the proposed teaching strategies. In other words, she would ask if it is possible to implement
the credit union's change-making kit, and if it is likely that the anticipated impact of using the kit will be realized. Have the designers of the kit provided a logical sequence in the development of the skills that are to be learned using the materials in the kit? Judgments concerning the feasibility of achieving anticipated impact of the influence being promoted by the credit union also relate to the teacher's capacity to teach in the ways being suggested by the creators of the materials as much as the satisfactoriness of the design of the materials. The credit union change-making kit would have to be checked to see if the support in terms of materials and ideas for the activities being proposed matches the teacher's need for guidance in teaching change-making. In the case of teaching change-making the required level of support would be minimal. It seems safe to assume that the credit union change-making kit would also satisfy criteria governing the feasibility of successful implementation of the attempted influence.

Despite the positive aspects of the credit union's change-making kit, the international credit union logo on the coins could be taken as evidence of an attempt to satisfy purely self-serving interests. As in Example #1, the teacher might ask if this is simply an attempt to increase market share. In the actual situation where the B.C. Credit Union Central attempted to distribute change-making kits to
B.C schools, the materials were returned as unacceptable propaganda. The credit union's attempt clearly failed the General Egoism Prohibition. Would it fail the Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion?

From the teacher's perspective, the General Egoism Prohibition did not produce a reasonable result. Change-making activities in schools in the past were limited to worksheets. Practising making change by doing worksheets was demonstrably unsatisfactory. Significant numbers of students did not become competent change-makers. As teachers came to realize this, they turned to hands-on activities. The problem with hands-on activities is in finding life-like objects which the students can manipulate. Real coins are not feasible. Some teachers simply converted the worksheets to manipulatives by cutting out the drawings on the worksheets. Others collected bread bag tags and pop bottle caps as substitutes for coins. There is no question that coins in the credit union kit were more effective than paper coins or bottle caps. But the General Egoism Prohibition overrode the teacher's desire to use the credit union coins. The Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion would not.

A teacher who is primarily concerned with how to help her students develop the skills involved in making change and who is aware of the possibility that the credit union might gain the exclusionary benefit described above, might
use the Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion to argue against the ban on the change-making kits as follows:

1. In the co-operative business sector, the logos on the coins are considered generic. The logos do not represent any particular credit union. They represent a form of financial institution just as a picture of a building with classic columns and a sign with the word 'bank' represents another form of financial institution.15

2. There is no reason to believe that the local credit union would not have selected a kit with other logos that were so generic that they could be taken to symbolize any financial institution in the local community.

3. The other local financial institutions have not made any effort to help resolve the problem of teaching change-making.

Based on these observations the teacher could pose several hypothetical questions. For example, the teacher might ask what a more generic logo would be. The teacher might ask whether or not it is reasonable to assume that the credit union would distribute the materials with the more generic logo. This could be seen as a test of the local credit union's commitment to promotion of the logo. On the other hand the teacher might ask whether or not it is reasonable to assume that other local financial institutions would join

15Credit unions are locally owned and operated financial co-operative enterprises. Local credit unions band together to form umbrella organizations at a regional, provincial, national or international level. Thus, for example, the World Council of Credit Unions (WOCCU), presently based in Washington, D.C., coordinates the efforts of credit unions internationally. But WOCCU is governed by representatives from local credit unions. Local credit unions are not like local branches of privately owned banks which are single corporate bodies.
with the credit union to produce a kit that did not promote any particular form of financial institution. This question could be seen as a test of the seriousness of the potential threat of an exclusionary benefit for the credit union. Presumably, if the other local financial institutions do not see the threat as significant, the benefits are not likely to be exclusionary. Based on the responses to these kinds of hypothetical questions, the teacher could decide to give more weight to the relatively certain benefit for her students than to the remote benefit for the advocates. In terms of the Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion, the teacher could make a reasonable claim concerning the lack of exclusionary benefits for the local credit union, based on her assumptions concerning the probable responses to her somewhat hypothetical questions. While the Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion is not as decisive as the General Egoism Prohibition in this case, it does provide the flexibility that appears to be required.

In each of the three examples considered above, there is evidence, based on assumptions related to the apparent and possible motives of the advocates, indicating that the intended impact of the influence will benefit the advocates. The news channel company will not only generate revenue from the sale of the news service, but it will be able to reinforce its image as a source of reliable information. The Breakfast Program volunteers will be saved the bother of
making their children's lunches every day. The credit unions will benefit by having raised their profile among present and future members.

The tendency of evaluators of these attempts to make judgments based on the balance of the potential personal gain for the advocates and the benefits for others is appropriate. The goal is to have these judgments be consistent with the rights of individuals to shape their society and to be protected from self-serving attempts by others striving to re-shape the society only for their own benefit. To accomplish this goal, the judgments must be made in terms of criteria which support valid and reliable evaluations.

The Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion provides a basis for the evaluation of attempted influences based on the balance of self-serving and other-serving effects of adoption of the attempts. But, because it is less restrictive than the General Egoism Prohibition, the Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion also facilitates the endorsement of a broader range of attempted influences by evaluators at the fringes of the formal governance structure. The Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion does not distinguish as decisively and simplistically as the General Egoism Prohibition. Instead it produces some borderline cases where it is not clear whether or not the impact of adoption of an attempt will turn out to be unfair.
Additional criteria are required if teachers are to be guided in their attempts to balance their concern for their students with their responsibility to protect not only those students but, in a sense, to protect the society from attempts to re-shape public education for purely self-serving reasons. From the perspective of parents and many teachers, the most obvious group needing protection from the results of self-serving attempts to re-shape the society are the children who are being initiated into the society.

F. IMPORTANCE OF CHILD-RAISING

It is generally accepted that there is an obligation to provide physical care for children until they are reasonably able to take care of themselves. There is a similar obligation to initiate children into their society to the point where they have a reasonable chance of being able to participate as citizens.

A fundamental part of child-raising is the protection of children from victimization in the sense of allowing children to be used for someone else’s personal advantage. Self-serving attempts to influence public education can result in the victimization of children. From a child-raiser’s perspective such attempts, once recognized, are clearly unacceptable. It is inevitable that rational child-raisers will end up evaluating attempts to re-shape society
through public education in order to reduce the risk of victimization of the children.

Nowhere is this more obvious than where teachers, as child-raisers, make decisions concerning which influences on their classroom practices they will adopt. But teachers have a dual role. They are also society-shapers. By the very nature of their work in schools over the years, teachers can shape the society in significant ways. Evidence of the sensitivity of the society as a whole to this dual role of teachers is manifest in the measures that are taken to limit the scope of teachers' decisions.16

Child-raising is a necessary enterprise in rational societies.17 I have already indicated that it is my position that any interference with their freedom that children experience while participating in the activities that make up public education must be justifiable in terms of the same principles as those which justify interference with the freedom of citizens in general. It is important to note that

16 The kind of thing I have in mind are the formal and informal constraints that control the work and, to a certain extent, the lives of teachers. Teachers are controlled formally through the definition of curriculum and the imposition of externally designed examinations for their students. Teachers are also controlled through community, professional and personal relations which dictate what are and what are not acceptable behaviours and attitudes for teachers.

17 I have explored the importance of child-raising within social arrangements in detail in THE POLITICAL BASIS FOR CHILD-RAISING (Grant 1984).
the limits imposed by my position protect the rights of the children, not of others in the society. This position has important implications for our understanding of child-raising.

Before it is possible to confirm the importance of child-raising as a fundamental purpose of public education, it is necessary to clarify just what is meant by child-raising. Child-raising occurs through a series of interactions between the child and the child-raisers. An interaction can be brief or extended, well-planned or incidental. A set of more or less planned interactions involving a particular child-raiser might be said to make up a child-raising process. For a child-raising process to be defensible, the intended upshot of the process must be the capacity of the children to function within a social group that has a system of principles related to those that guided their child-raising. Under the normal circumstances of an orderly evolution of a society, the preparation of citizens to live in their social arrangement, that is the child-raising process that the citizens have experienced, should not be irreversible. In other words, citizens must not have to engage in heroic efforts to undo what was done to them during their child-raising.

Overall, the child-raising processes must be as fair as the procedures that any citizen of any age can reasonably
be expected to endure. It is my contention that the minimum requirements for a defensible child-raising process are:

1. A child-raising process must provide children with a reasonable chance of participating in the social arrangement of their choice, where those choices are consistent with the principles that prevailed during their period of initiation.

2. A child-raising process must facilitate the transmission of the worthwhile aspects of the extant social arrangement to the emerging generation.

3. A child-raising process must not initiate future generations into anything that is known to be harmful.

4. A child-raising process must not require extra-ordinary levels of altruism from the child-raisers.

Child-raising as a fundamental purpose of public education implies the occurrence of child-raising processes which satisfy these requirements.

These requirements obviously impose limits on the actions of child-raisers. Are the limits reasonable when considered from the perspective of the child-raiser? Presumably rational individuals who find themselves involved in the task of raising children are aware of two things. First, they are aware that they themselves exist within the context of some identifiable social arrangement. Second, they are aware that the children they are raising must eventually function in some social arrangement. While the nature of that future social arrangement cannot be completely understood by anyone, child-raisers must at least believe that they can shape the child to the extent
necessary for the child to exist within the anticipated social arrangement.

A critical feature of child-raising is the relationship of the child-raising process to the value attached to the social arrangement into which the child is being initiated. The value of child-raising is directly related to the value the child-raiser attaches to the anticipated social arrangement. For a child-raiser to raise a child for anything other than what she considers to be a worthwhile future social arrangement would be perverse. In fact, it is just this eventuality that we are trying to protect children from when we engage in the evaluation of attempted influences on public education. Protecting children from initiation into less than worthwhile future social arrangements is consistent with the principle of protecting individuals from unnecessary harms. The limits this imposes on the actions of child-raisers are consistent with the limits that govern the relationship among citizens in general. Therefore, the limits are justified. The fact that it is children who are being protected simply strengthens the need for protection because children are generally not able to protect themselves from the harms that can be inflicted under the guise of child-raising.

The difficulty is in predicting the worth of future social arrangements. Where the child-raiser is advocating a future social arrangement that is not generally accepted as
worthwhile, the onus is on the child-raiser to attempt to convince others that the society needs to be re-shaped in certain ways. In other words, before the child-raiser can justify initiating a child into a social arrangement that only she considers worthwhile, she must convince other citizens that her view of the worthiness of that future social arrangement is defensible. Child-raisers cannot justify imposing their view of what is worthwhile on children when they cannot convince other citizens that their view is defensible. The requirements for a defensible child-raising process override the rights of the citizen to attempt to re-shape their society.

There are child-raisers who do not seriously reflect on the worthiness of the anticipated social arrangement as it relates to their child-raising undertakings. Presumably most of these non-reflective child-raisers simply conform to the child-raising expectations and traditions of their social group. Where this occurs, it shifts the level of analysis from the individual child-raiser to the social group.

At the social group level of family, friends, and ethnic or religious communities there is typically a concern for the regeneration of the group beyond the life-span of the group's living members. Raising children to fit into the social arrangements of the group is a basic part of this regeneration process. Thus, while an individual child-raiser
may simply be following the expectations of the social group, the group expectations are driven by the general desire to regenerate the social group into what is accepted in the group as a worthwhile future social arrangement. In this context, where the future of the social group is threatened, the child-raising process is also threatened since, being guided primarily by the group’s expectations, its purpose is to raise children so the social group will extend into the future. A child-raiser who is guided by the social group’s expectations will strive to re-shape the society in order to remove the threat to the social group, and thus to the child’s future as a member of that group. Child-raising and society-shaping become integrated purposes pursued by members of the group, individually or as part of autonomous groups, through attempts to influence public policy by any means possible.

There are two possible types of non-reflective child-raisers, the pessimist and the optimist. The pessimistic child-raisers cannot imagine a worthwhile future arrangement for the social group. These pessimistic child-raisers effectively deny the potential for worthwhile regeneration of their social group. The pessimistic child-raiser’s denial of the potential worthiness of regeneration of their social group is equivalent to a denial of the worthiness of the extant social group. The fact that such a person is involved in child-raising and is being guided by the social group’s
vision of the future indicates cynicism, irrationality or some kind of unfortunate mistake. In other words, pessimistic child-raisers should not be involved in raising children. An optimistic child-raiser, on the other hand, sees the future as either a continuation of the existing social arrangement or a worthwhile, improved version of the existing structure. An optimistic child-raiser who is also concerned with society-shaping sees the future social arrangement as ranging anywhere from a systematic improvement to a radical adaptation of the existing structure. Whatever the future holds, the optimistic child-raiser sees child-raising as important for both the child being raised, for the social group, and for the society as a whole.

To summarize, it is just as important to initiate children into their society as it is to ensure that their physical needs are met during the first years of their life. In the process of this initiation, it is critical that children be protected from victimization. To this end, it is necessary to impose requirements that stipulate the conditions for defensible child-raising processes. However, it is possible to impose those requirements on child-raising without imposing any unreasonable limits on the rights of citizens. In the process of considering the limits on child-raisers in this section, a relative order of importance of child-raising and society-shaping has started to emerge.
G. SOCIETY-SHAPING AS A PART OF CHILD-RAISING

It is clear that society-shaping and child-raising are both important purposes for public education in pluralist democracies. It is also clear that there will be times when these purposes conflict and that, therefore, some kind of balancing will be required. However, society-shaping and child-raising are not always at odds. As suggested above, being an effective child-raiser sometimes involves attempting to re-shape the society in order to succeed at child-raising. Teachers in particular are likely to find themselves in this position. This link between child-raising and society-shaping needs to be clarified.

It has already been established that, for a social arrangement to be successfully maintained over a period of time, the participants need some measure of shared understandings and beliefs about that arrangement. In other words, there needs to be a significant level of agreement concerning what is worthwhile and what is unacceptable behaviour within the proximate social groups that are part of the society. Any individual who does not have these basic understandings will have a very difficult time fitting into the social arrangement in any kind of intentional way. If there are not sufficient shared understandings and beliefs within a group, the social arrangement will start to
These are the kinds of critical understandings which, when more or less shared by the participants in a social arrangement, form the civic consciousness.

One of the primary functions of child-raising is to initiate children into the civic consciousness of the society of the child-raisers. As the motto, 'parents are a child's first teacher' suggests, initiation into the civic consciousness tends to start on a one-to-one basis in the home. Public education complements the child-raising that occurs at home by compensating for the unpredictable effects of child-raising as it is conducted by parents acting in

---

18 An example of this kind of collapse was observed while working with South African community organizers (August, 1991). While they had been raised under circumstances that conveyed a clear form of civic consciousness, during their late teens and early twenties they had, for obvious reasons, made conscious decisions to reject the prevailing views concerning the legitimacy of the state. One form this took was the conscious decision to disobey any form of state rule or law. Any exception to this general action-guiding decision involves a decision at the individual instance level to obey a particular rule for specific reasons that were compelling enough to cancel out the rejection of the state. In other words, they had decided to reverse the principle of: obey unless civil disobedience can be specifically justified on a case-by-case basis. By the time I met these folks they were child-raisers. Now they face the dilemma of raising the next generation into a civic consciousness that is defined primarily in terms of denial of the rule of law. Even in day-to-day activities such as moving in traffic, it was a conscious decision to obey the rules of the road. While the original intent of this denial of the legitimate authority of the state to govern their lives was intended to cause the collapse of the social arrangement they had been raised into, it is a puzzle how their children should be initiated into a social arrangement that has not yet formed.
relative isolation, with no direct accountability to the larger social group. In this sense, public education is an institution formed for the purpose of initiating children into a civic consciousness in a public environment.

It has already been established that a social arrangement is not only reflected in the civic consciousness, it is also shaped by it. The means for complementing the idiosyncratic home-based child-raising processes with a public education obviously has an impact on the broader social arrangement. Child-raising in the context of public education is, therefore, necessarily a form of society-shaping. Where a group of child-raisers decide that a certain civic consciousness is worthwhile and that the children they are raising should be initiated into the form of social arrangement that such a consciousness will create or perpetuate, those child-raisers are engaged in society-shaping. From the perspective of child-raisers it is clear that society-shaping through public education must be compatible with their child-raising processes.

From the broader perspective of control over the civic consciousness for the general good of the society, child-raising is at least as important to society-shaping as the direct control exerted through the representative governance structure. There is no question that the range of decisions available to the governing representatives can be significantly limited by the prevailing civic consciousness
as it has been passed on by child-raisers. Those who are primarily concerned with society-shaping often recognize and, thus, attempt to capitalize on this power of child-raising in order to achieve their objective of re-shaping the society.

How should an evaluator of an attempt to influence education balance the requirements of child-raising and expectations of society-shapers. Child-raising and society-shaping can be very closely related. It has been established that child-raising in the sense of initiating children into an anticipated, worthwhile social arrangement is inherently worthwhile. The process of raising children so they can participate in the society clearly requires that child-raisers can, when necessary, act to re-shape the society from outside the representative governance structure. On the other hand, successful society-shaping by those not specifically concerned with child-raising is dependent on the ability to influence public education for the purpose of adjusting the civic consciousness. In other words, child-raising as a purpose of public education has precedence over society-shaping.

The purpose of this chapter was to establish a basis for an examination of the efforts of aspiring society-shapers in the context of public education. I have argued that society-shaping is a legitimate purpose of public education in a modern democracy. I established the need for
and usefulness of the Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion. This criterion replaces the General Egoism Prohibition and provides a basis for screening out attempts to influence public education for purely self-serving reasons. Finally, I outlined the inter-relationship between child-raising and society-shaping. In particular, I established that child-raisers must be prepared to engage in re-shaping their society in order to have a reasonable chance of successfully raising the children they have responsibility for. Likewise, aspiring society-shapers must pay attention to the need to have children raised in particular ways if they are to succeed in re-shaping the society in the ways they deem necessary.
A. INTRODUCTION

There are parameters governing what should and what should not be considered defensible attempts to influence public education. These were established in Chapters 1 and 2. The purpose of Chapter 3 is to create an initial framework to guide the evaluation of attempts to influence public education based on those parameters.

In Section B of this chapter I outline a generic evaluation scheme which serves as a model for the evaluation framework. In Section C I summarize the general parameters established in Chapters 1 and 2 as a set of requirements that must be satisfied if an attempted influence on public education in a pluralist democracy is to be considered defensible. In Section D I take those general requirements and convert them into a framework for evaluating attempts to influence public education in our society.

This evaluation framework can be used by anyone. However, the primary users I have in mind are classroom teachers and others who are not in positions of authorized governing representatives but are still directly involved in
making the educational decisions required for the day-to-day operation of a classroom. It is my contention that evaluation of many attempts to influence public education occur outside the authorized representative governance structure. Observation of classroom teachers engaged in day-to-day planning for teaching inevitably reveals evidence of attempts to influence education which are not vetted by the formal policy-makers. Teachers, parents, students and citizens in general must make judgments concerning the legitimacy of these attempted influences. It is, therefore, both socially and educationally important to define criteria which can be used by such people.

The observation that many attempts to influence public education are evaluated outside the formal education policy-making structure is not intended to be an excuse for anything less than justifiable judgments being made. Obviously, there is no justification for these judgments being made according to personal whim. It is clear from the analyses of the preceding chapters that in evaluating attempts to influence public education there are specific requirements which must be satisfied. Those requirements are an integral part of our notions of child-raising, society-shaping and pluralist democracy. However, it is also clear that the application of the principles underlying those requirements is not always straightforward. The framework
set out in this chapter is intended to provide guidance\textsuperscript{19} to those outside the formal education policy-making structure who find they must make judgments concerning what ought to happen in public education.

**B. A GENERIC EVALUATION PROCESS**

The generic evaluation process\textsuperscript{20} described in this section will be used as a model for the framework for evaluating attempted influences on public education.

An evaluative judgment about a set of proposed actions can be characterized as going through three distinct stages. In the first stage, a specific aspect of the proposed actions is identified as being significant. In the second stage, what are taken to be relevant manifestations of that aspect of the proposed actions are measured against an appropriate set of criteria. In the third stage a judgment is made concerning the legitimacy of the actions in terms of that aspect.

\textsuperscript{19} The term 'guidance' is being used in a persuasive rather than a directive sense. This framework for evaluation is not intended to be a mechanistic, self-contained process. Teachers and others who may need to evaluate attempts to influence will have context-specific knowledge that they must also factor into their judgments.

\textsuperscript{20} This process is generic in the sense that it could be used as a model for the design of an evaluation system for any phenomenon.
The criteria must stipulate the aspect to be evaluated, the standards that are to be applied and the weight to be given to the judgment. When a particular criterion is not satisfied, there are two possibilities. The first possibility is the most straightforward. The judgment concerning that aspect is taken to be decisive with the result that the proposed actions are dismissed as indefensible. The result is either 'A' or 'B', where A is 'clearly defensible' and B is 'clearly not defensible'. The second possibility covers situations where the application of the initial criterion is merely indicative. In other words, the judgment that arises from application of the criterion is 'not A' but only 'maybe B'. Where this occurs, supplementary decisions must be identified until there is a decisive judgment concerning a particular aspect.

The weighting given to each aspect that needs to be evaluated is important. The evaluation of some aspects of the proposed action serves as a threshold which must be satisfied if the phenomenon being evaluated is to receive any further attention. The evaluation of other aspects is important because it determines what kind of additional evidence is required. In the end, if all the aspects that are taken to be significant end up being evaluated as satisfactory, the proposed actions must be judged as defensible.
Based on this generic model of the evaluation process, an evaluation framework must have three elements. First, the relevant aspects of the attempts to influence that need to be evaluated must be identified. Second, the criteria against which each aspect is to be judged must be stipulated. Finally, the relative weight to be given to the judgment of each aspect must be indicated. In particular, any threshold conditions which override all other considerations must be defined.

C. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS FOR LEGITIMACY OF INFLUENCES

There is no question that it is not acceptable for evaluations of attempted influences by those on the fringes or those in the formal governance structure simply to be opinions based on personal whim. Our notion of citizenship in a modern pluralist democracy and our sense of what are acceptable processes for initiating children into our society dictate what is and what is not acceptable in public education. The requirements which must be satisfied by attempts to influence public education, if those attempts are to be considered defensible in terms of being worth serious consideration and possible adoption, can be extracted from the analyses of the notions of child-raising and society-shaping in the context of public education in a pluralist democracy.

Six principles emerged from this analysis:
Principle #1:
The desire to change the society through public education must be balanced with the more fundamental child-raising function of public education.

Principle #2:
Citizens must be allowed to attempt to shape their society by influencing public education.

Principle #3:
Citizens have a right to evaluate the legitimacy of an attempt to influence public education for the purpose of shaping the society.21

Principle #4:
The anticipated impact of adoption of attempts to re-shape the society by influencing public education must not be an unfair advantage for the advocates at the expense of others.

Principle #5:
To be defensible, an attempt to make a society more just by re-distributing the primary social goods of liberty, opportunity, income, wealth or the basis of self-respect to benefit those least favoured must not cause anyone to be less well-off than they would be if the primary social goods were distributed equally.22

Principle #6:
To be defensible, an attempt must not have any obvious insurmountable obstacles to successful implementation where adoption of the attempt is justified on the basis of its anticipated impact.

---

21 Citizens' right to evaluate is handed over to formally authorized policy-makers who undertake the evaluation of an attempted influences on behalf of the citizens. Where the attempted influence is being evaluated outside the formally authorized policy-making structure, citizens have a right to participate directly.

22 As Rawls argues, the general conception of the principles of justice for the institutions that constitute a society is that the primary social goods are distributed equally. The only exceptions to equal distribution allowed are those in which an unequal distribution is to the advantage of the least favoured. (Rawls 1971, 302)
These six principles form a basis for the evaluation of the legitimacy of attempts to influence public education.

D. AN EVALUATION FRAMEWORK - INITIAL VERSION

In this final section of Part 2 Chapter 3, the generic evaluation process in Section B is used as a model for converting the six principles listed above in Section C into an evaluation framework. Based on the general requirements of Section C, three aspects of attempts to influence education have been identified for evaluation. The first aspect to be evaluated is the apparent willingness of the advocates to subject their attempt to influence public education to public scrutiny. The second aspect to be evaluated is the anticipated impact of the proposed influence. The third aspect to be evaluated is the potential for successful implementation of the influence. Each aspect is evaluated in what I call a Decision Frame.

The first Decision Frame consists of an evaluation of the first aspect, the level of willingness on the part of the advocates to have their proposed influence subjected to public scrutiny. Advocates of influences on public education must not interfere with the concomitant right of citizens to evaluate the legitimacy of attempted influences. For an attempted influence to be defensible, there must not be any evidence of intentional interference with the evaluation of that attempt. I call this the Public Scrutiny Criterion.
The Public Scrutiny Criterion is justified on the basis of the right of citizens to participate in decisions that could affect their well-being. The relevant obligation imposed by this right is that advocates must be willing to submit their attempts to influence public education to the scrutiny of either the formal governance structure or to the informal forum of public scrutiny.

The Public Scrutiny Criterion is a threshold criterion. As such it is concerned with the question: Should the attempt to influence be considered at all? The resulting judgment is based on whether or not there is evidence of any interference by the advocates with efforts to subject the attempted influence to public scrutiny. Where there is evidence of intentional interference, the attempt must be dismissed because it can not be evaluated. The only recourse at this point would be for the advocates to attempt to influence the authorized representatives through the formal policy-making process.

Where the advocates actually facilitate well-informed public debate on their attempted influence, evaluators must move onto the second Decision Frame. The second Decision Frame focuses on the second aspect, the anticipated impact of the attempted influence in terms of the purposes of public education. There are three possible routes through this Decision Frame.
The first criterion of the second Decision Frame checks for evidence of interference with the child-raising dimension of public education. Since child-raising is the primary purpose for public education, attempts to influence public education must be checked to see whether or not the anticipated impact of the influence will involve interference with the extant child-raising processes.

The anticipated impact of an influence should not interfere in any substantive way with the extant child-raising process as it is being conducted by rational, caring child-raisers. I call this the Primary Purpose Criterion. The justification for the Primary Purpose Criterion is based on the position that child-raising generally takes precedence over society-shaping as a purpose of public education.

Evaluation of an attempted influence in terms of the Primary Purpose Criterion will produce one of two results. First, where there is evidence that the attempted influence is solely for the purpose of child-raising and there is no evidence of interference with the extant child-raising process, the attempt must be judged as defensible in terms of priority of purpose for the proposed influence.

The second alternative is that the attempted influence is unsatisfactory in terms of the Primary Purpose Criterion. In other words, there is evidence that the influence could
result in substantive interference with the extant child-raising process. While this eventuality does not justify a decisive judgment that the anticipated impact of the attempted influence is unsatisfactory, the judgment is indicative of the need for further evaluation of the anticipated impacts of the influence.

The meaning of substantive interference in this context needs to be clarified. Substantive interference with the extant child-raising process is being used in a strong sense. If someone involved in child-raising can establish even a hypothetical interference with a legitimate child-raising process, this is seen as substantive interference with the extant child-raising process. The result is that the attempt does not satisfy the Primary Purpose Criterion.

There could be attempts to influence where the disruption caused by the anticipated impact is simply a matter of preference, unrelated to the quality of the child-raising process. If it can be generally accepted that the issue is simply a matter of preference with no substantive impact on the child-raising process, then the interference is not significant. The attempt could be said to satisfy the Primary Purpose Criterion. An example of this might be the advocacy of union organizers to replace volunteer lunch-hour
supervisors with paid aides. Of course the difficulty is in distinguishing matters of personal preference from substantive matters. If there is doubt as to the significance of the anticipated interference, the attempt must be judged as unsatisfactory in terms of the Primary Purpose Criterion.

The justification for the use of a strict form of the Primary Purpose Criterion is that it is possible to override the Primary Purpose Criterion in special circumstances. In other words, there will be times when interference with a child-raising process can be justified. This is accomplished by extending the second Decision Frame to re-evaluate the anticipated impact of an attempted influence in terms of supplementary, potentially overriding, criteria.

It is possible that the anticipated impact of an attempt that does not satisfy the Primary Purpose Criterion is defensible even though it interferes with the extant child-raising processes. The other aspects of the anticipated impact which need to be considered are highlighted by the following three questions:

1. Are the advocates of the influence challenging the extant civic consciousness because the social arrangement into which the children are being initiated is not as good as we know it could be?

23 This is seen as an attempt to influence public education policy because it involves change of personnel who will be with the students, re-allocation of resources, and dismantling of a community-based network of volunteers in the school.
2. Are the advocates challenging the civic consciousness in order to improve the society by making it more just?

3. Does achieving the intended impact of the attempted influence depend on the exclusion of others from achieving those benefits, or is it at least possible for any citizen including the children who are emerging into citizenship to benefit?

The first question implies the need to look at the differences between the extant social arrangement and the social arrangement that is projected to occur if the influence is adopted. The issue is one of balancing projected long-term benefits for the students with the potential for harm inherent in the disruption in the extant child-raising process. In particular, the balance of potential harms and probable benefits for the children presently being raised need to be evaluated.

The second question highlights the need to consider the relationship between the interference in the child-raising process and the benefits which are intended for others in the society. The second question raises the possibility that greater weight should be given to the potential for broad social benefits for citizens in general rather than to the relatively limited range of educational benefits for the students. For example, the disruption of public education in the townships of South Africa starting on June 16, 1976 was clearly harmful to the children whose formal education was terminated. However, that harm is justified by the organizers of those actions in terms of the
sweeping social changes that were being pursued. In other words, they argue that the greater good for the society ought to be given more weight than the short-term smoothness of children’s educational experiences.

The focus of the second question shifts our attention from the relatively narrow focus on students to a broader concern for the welfare of the non-students. This shift raises the possibility that there are times when giving more weight to concern for citizens can justify disruption of the extant child-raising processes. However, before such a shift in the weighting of the purposes of public education can be justified, the issue raised by the third question must be considered.

The third question focuses the evaluator’s attention on the appropriateness of the balance of self-serving and other-serving motives behind attempts to influence the public institutions of a society. This issue has already been considered in Chapter 2 Section E - Motives for Attempting Society-Shaping.

The supplementary parts of the second Decision Frame take the form of three follow-up criteria, each dealing with one of the issues raised by these questions. These follow-up criteria are only applied if the Primary Purpose Criterion is not satisfied.
The first follow-up criterion which I call the Long-Term Benefit Criterion stipulates that interferences with child-raising can be compensated for by benefits the effected children will eventually gain as a result of adoption of the influence. The Long-Term Benefit Criterion is intended to be a supplementary, overriding criterion. It is supplementary because it is only invoked when the evaluation in terms of the Primary Purpose Criterion is not clearly positive and where, despite the potential interference with the child-raising process, it is at least possible that the attempted influence may serve the long-term interests of children better than the extant arrangement. The Long-Term Benefit Criterion is overriding in the sense that a positive evaluation in terms of the Long-Term Benefit Criterion overrides the negative judgment in terms of the Primary Purpose Criterion.

The Long-Term Benefit Criterion is justified on the basis that it is necessary if the pursuit of civic virtue using structural-adjustment strategies that target educational institutions for re-structuring is to be considered defensible. Presumably it is always the case that re-structuring of educational institutions results in disruption to the child-raising process for those actually being educated at the time. The Long-Term Benefit Criterion allows for the possibility of some short-term harm to students in the form of a disrupted educational experience.
where the overall impact is likely to result in benefits for the children as they become participating citizens in the re-shaped society. Where an attempted influence is satisfactory in terms of the Long-Term Benefit Criterion, the anticipated impact of the influence is defensible, even though it does interfere with the extant child-raising processes in some substantive way.

The second and third follow-up criteria function together to deal with the more problematic situation where it is the benefit for the society as a whole which must compensate for the disruption to the extant child-raising processes. I call the second follow-up criterion the Justice Criterion. The third follow-up criterion is the Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion which is set out in Chapter 2 Section E. These two criteria work together to ensure that any re-adjustment to the priority assigned to child-raising over society-shaping is defensible. Where an attempt to influence public education satisfies both the Justice Criterion and the Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion the anticipated impact of the influence is defensible.

The Justice Criterion requires that an attempt to adjust an unequal distribution of social goods by re-shaping the society through public education must be to everyone's
advantage. The justification for the Justice Criterion is based on the following principle which has been assumed in the analyses of the preceding chapters:

All social values - liberty and opportunity, incomes and wealth, and the bases of self-respect - are to be distributed equally unless an unequal distribution of any, or all, of these values is to everyone's advantage (Rawls 1971, 62).

The Primary Purpose Criterion starts from the assumption that any inequality in the distribution of social values that is implicit in giving the child-raising purpose of public education precedence is to everyone's advantage. In other words, the subsidiary 'unless' clause in Rawls' statement of the principle is made the initial concern in this evaluation framework. The Justice Criterion is required to allow those attempted influences that are primarily concerned with correcting unjust imbalances by adjusting the extant child-raising practices. Where an attempt to influence education is seen as possibly resulting in some kind of interference with the extant child-raising process, the Justice Criterion permits the use of public education as a means for re-shaping the society in order to create a more defensible distribution of social values.

24 'Being to everyone's advantage' is to be understood as being to the direct advantage of the least favoured without harming others to the point that they are less well-off than they would be if there was an equal distribution of the social goods.
The Justice Criterion is only applicable where the following condition pertains. It must at least appear that the advocate's intention is to remedy what appears to be an unjust distribution of social goods. Where this condition is met, the Justice Criterion is required to ensure that child-raising practices that are likely to result in a more just society prevail.

Satisfaction of the Justice Criterion is a necessary but not sufficient condition for evaluating as defensible those attempted influences which could cause substantive disruption in the extant child-raising processes of public education. The attempt must also be evaluated in terms of the Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion.

The Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion limits the pursuit of social goods where anticipated impact of adoption of the influence could result in an unfair advantage for the advocates or others. The Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion sets the minimum standard for examining the defensibility of a re-distribution of benefits that might arise from an attempted influence. The Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion stipulates that the acquisition of benefits by the advocates of a particular influence must not depend on others being
blocked from gaining the same or related benefits.\textsuperscript{25} As has already been argued, where it is likely that the purely egoistic motives of the advocates will be satisfied at the expense of others, the attempted influence does not need to be considered further by the evaluators at the fringe of the formal policy-making process. Attempts which satisfy the Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion and appear to be defensible attempts to make the society more just in terms of the Justice Criterion are defensible. In other words, anticipated impacts which satisfy both the Justice Criterion and Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion are defensible, even where the influence is likely to involve some interference with the extant child-raising processes. The Justice Criterion and Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion can override the Primary Purpose Criterion.

This brings us to the final Decision Frame in the evaluation framework. The third fundamental aspect of attempted influences that must be evaluated is the potential for successful achievement of the anticipated impacts of an attempted influence. I call the criterion that is applied to this aspect the Feasibility Criterion. The Feasibility Criterion stipulates that it must be reasonable to assume

\textsuperscript{25} The Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion is based on the assumption that being blocked from benefits because others have used the institutions of the society to get exclusive possession of those benefits is a harm to those who have been shut out.
that the anticipated impact could follow from implementation of the influence being proposed.

All attempts to influence education must be evaluated in terms of the Feasibility Criterion. The Feasibility Criterion only applies to attempted influences which are available for public scrutiny and where the anticipated impact is defensible. Therefore, application of the Feasibility Criterion is the last step in any evaluation process.

The Feasibility Criterion is required to reduce the risk of avoidable waste of time, effort and other resources because such wastage is likely to reduce the quality of public education. Minimizing wastage of resources is considered important because to do otherwise increases the risk of harm to children and to the society as a whole. The limited resources available for public education must be used wisely. It is clearly not possible to implement simultaneously every well-intentioned, non-harmful, non-egoistic attempt to influence public education. Choices have

---

26 The notion of limited resources is intended to cover a wide range of 'resources' that are required in the process of achieving the outcome intended by the advocates of the influences. For example, classroom teachers have a finite amount of time to search for, evaluate, research, refine and implement any particular educational activity. When a teacher is considering one attempt to influence their practice they are not considering others. Teachers' practice appears to recognize that fact. A framework to guide their practice must also recognize it.
to be made. Presumably the only justifiable objective is to optimize the use of available resources for the benefit of the children being raised and the society as a whole. Where it is possible to ascertain that there is no plausible connection between an attempted influence and the impact the advocates claim will ensue, continued pursuit of the attempt is not defensible. Such unfeasible attempts must be dismissed.

The Feasibility Criterion directs the evaluator’s attention to the reasonableness of the claim that the advocates’ influence will achieve what it is supposed to achieve. However, the Feasibility Criterion does not require that achievement of the anticipated impact of an attempted influences must be certain, or even without difficulty. There is always the possibility of failure in the attempt to influence public education, no matter how defensible the attempt may be. Requiring absolute certainty of successful implementation would probably eliminate most worthwhile influences on public education.

The justification for the Feasibility Criterion is that, if unfeasible attempts are not dismissed, resources are likely to be wasted in the futile effort to implement the influences. The upshot of such waste would be a reduction in the fair distribution of social goods which, in a just society, must be avoided where possible.
As indicated in the introduction to this section, the evaluation framework has three components: (1) the aspects that need to be evaluated; (2) the criteria to be applied to each of those aspects; and (3) an indication of the priority, threshold, and supplementary considerations that dictate the sequence of application of the criteria. This initial version of the evaluation framework has three Decision Frames, each dealing with a fundamental aspect of attempts to influence public education. The first Decision Frame contains a threshold criterion. The second Decision Frame has several options, two of which lead to an application of follow-up criteria. The third Decision Frame has a single criterion which must be applied to all attempts that have been judged as satisfactory in the other two Decision Frames.

The initial version of the framework for evaluating attempts to influence public education can be summarized as follows:

**Decision Frame #1**

The level of willingness of the advocates to subject their attempt to influence public education must be evaluated in terms of the Public Scrutiny Criterion.
1.0 - Public Scrutiny Criterion

The Public Scrutiny Criterion stipulates that there must be no intentional interference with evaluation of attempts to influence public education. This is a threshold criterion. Failure to satisfy this criterion justifies dismissal of the attempt without any further consideration.

Decision Frame #2

The second aspect that must be evaluated is the anticipated impact of the proposed influence. The anticipated impacts of an attempted influence are first evaluated in terms of the Primary Purpose Criterion.

2.0 - Primary Purpose Criterion

The Primary Purpose Criterion stipulates that attempts to influence that are not related solely to the purpose of child-raising must not be perceived by rational, caring child-raisers as interfering in any substantive way with their efforts to raise their children. Where an attempt satisfies the Primary Purpose Criterion, the anticipated impacts are defensible.

Where an attempt does not satisfy the Primary Purpose Criterion, the anticipated impacts of the attempt must be re-evaluated in terms of the following supplementary criteria. Anticipated impacts of attempted influences that do not satisfy the Primary Purpose Criterion must be re-evaluated in terms of the Long-Term Benefit Criterion.
2.1 - Long-Term Benefit Criterion

The Long-Term Benefit Criterion stipulates that interferences with the extant child-raising processes that could effect the children being raised must have a reasonable chance of being compensated for by benefits the children will eventually gain as a result of the influence being adopted. Where the impacts on the extant child-raising process are likely to be balanced by future benefits to the emerging citizens who are in a sense harmed in the short-term by the disruption, the anticipated impacts of the influence are defensible.

The Long-Term Benefit Criterion can override the failure to meet the Primary Purpose Criterion. Where the anticipated impacts do not satisfy the Long-Term Benefit Criterion, they must be re-evaluated again in terms of the Justice Criterion and the Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion. Application of the Justice Criterion requires that the attempted influence focuses on remedying what is claimed to be an unjust distribution of social goods. Where this pre-requisite condition is satisfied the attempt must be evaluated in terms of the Justice Criterion.

2.2a - Justice Criterion

The Justice Criterion stipulates that an attempt to adjust an unequal distribution of social values by re-shaping the society through public education must be balanced by evidence that the anticipated impacts will result in a more just society. In particular, the anticipated impact is to everyone’s advantage.

In this second set of supplementary criteria for evaluating the anticipated impacts of the attempted influence, the
attempt must also be evaluated in terms of the Non-
Exclusionary Benefits Criterion.

2.2b - Non-Exclusionary Benefits Criterion

The Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion stipulates that the acquisition of benefits by the advocates of a particular influence must not depend on others not gaining the same or related benefits.

Taken together, the Justice Criterion and Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion can override the Primary Purpose Criterion. Where the anticipated impacts of an attempted influence satisfy both the Justice Criterion and the Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion, they are defensible.

Decision Frame #3

The anticipated impacts of the attempted influence must also be evaluated in terms of the Feasibility Criterion:

3.0 - Feasibility Criterion

The Feasibility Criterion stipulates that achievement of the anticipated impacts of the proposal must at least appear possible as a result of implementation of the proposed influence. In particular, there must appear to be a causal relationship between the actions inherent in the proposal and the anticipated impact of the attempt.

An attempt to influence public education where all three Decision Frames result in judgments that the relevant aspect of the attempted influence is defensible, is a defensible attempt.
A defensible attempt to influence public education in a modern pluralist democracy must be given serious consideration for implementation. However, it must be noted that the implementation of defensible attempts is not automatic. Classifying an attempted influence as defensible means that it must be given serious consideration, not that it must necessarily be implemented. There are other considerations that will come into play. As described in the example of the teacher examining the credit union materials, evaluators of attempted influences will also consider the relationship between the attempted influence and other objectives they may have in mind for the students. There are also pragmatic considerations such as the immediate availability of the resources required to implement the attempted influence. Establishing the legitimacy of an attempted influence simply means that dismissing the attempted influence out of hand cannot be justified. Advocates of defensible influences are justified in their attempt to influence. They have a right to persist with their attempts to influence until they happen on circumstances which support the active implementation of their proposal.
SUMMARY OF PART 1

In Part 1 an initial version of a framework for evaluating the legitimacy of attempts to influence public education policy was established. This framework is based on the notion of public education in a modern pluralist democracy. My overriding concern in proposing a framework is that it be valid in the sense that it tests the aspects of attempted influences that would be viewed as critical by thoughtful, well-informed, rational evaluators of those attempts.

Chapters 1 and 2 of Part 1 contain analyses of the notions of public education and modern pluralist democracy. A fundamental insight has been that public education, as an institution within a pluralist democracy, has two potentially conflicting purposes. The first of these purposes is to raise children into a civic consciousness that will benefit the child as an individual within the extant social arrangement. The second purpose of public education is to influence the shape of future social arrangements so they more closely approximate civic virtue.

My analysis of public education in a pluralist democracy has been guided by some fundamental assumptions. For example, I have assumed that any interference with the freedom of the citizens must be justifiable. In particular,
the freedom of citizens to participate in shaping their society and the limits on freedom that children experience while being raised must be justifiable in the same terms and according to the same principles as those which apply to all persons in the society. I also assume that a necessary connection exists between the criteria for evaluating the defensibility of influences intended to result in shaping the society, the justification for the interferences required by child-raising, and the principles used to justify the democratic social arrangement within which such society-shaping and child-raising occur.

Chapter 3 of Part 1 contains an initial version of a framework for evaluating attempts to influence public education policy. It is my contention that evaluations of attempted influences which follow this framework will be valid in the sense that they will be based on judgments concerning the important aspects of the phenomenon.

The next question that must be asked concerns the reliability of the framework in providing the guidance required to make those evaluations. In other words, will evaluations made by different individuals at different times concerning equivalent attempts to influence education consistently produce the same judgment? This is the question which is addressed in Part 2 where I conduct an initial exploration of the effectiveness and limits of the
evaluation framework when it is applied to various categories of attempts to influence public education policy.
PART 2
EVALUATING CATEGORIES OF ATTEMPTS TO INFLUENCE

INTRODUCTION

A. PREAMBLE

In Chapter 3 I outlined an initial version of a framework for the evaluation of attempts to influence public education policy. This framework is based on my analysis in Chapters 1 and 2 of public education as an important institution of modern pluralist democracies. It is directed at people at the fringes of the formal education policy formation process.

Before it is reasonable for me to recommend this evaluation framework as the basis for making judgments about the legitimacy of attempts to influence public education, the evaluation framework must be checked to see if it guides evaluators to distinguish consistently between defensible and indefensible attempts to influence education.

The purpose of Part 2 is to consider the degree of consistency of judgments made using the initial version of the evaluation framework. In Part 2 I categorize attempted influences and apply the initial version of the evaluation framework to those categories. In the process, some gaps in the initial version of the framework become evident.
Treatment of those gaps provides a basis for producing a revised framework at the end of Part 2.

B. CATEGORIES OF ATTEMPTED INFLUENCES

An effective categorization scheme would have two important characteristics. First, placement of attempts would be reasonably straightforward. Second, placement of an attempt in a particular category would more or less establish the legitimacy of the attempt.27

In Part 2, I describe a categorization scheme with these characteristics in mind. I identify six categories of attempts to influence public education policy. I define these categories in terms of the interests that are likely to be served if the influences are successfully implemented. My notion of interests being served parallels the Rawlsian notion of what is valued in our society, namely liberty, opportunity, incomes, wealth, and the bases of self-

27 Ideally, an evaluator would only have to place an attempt into a category to determine the legitimacy of the attempt. This would be ideal on two fronts. First, it would make the task of evaluation easier for the evaluator who would only need to focus on the categorization of attempted influences. Second, it would reduce the potential for inconsistency among judgments made by different evaluators throughout the school system. Those judgments would differ only to the extent that placement of particular attempts was ambiguous.
Where possible I have grounded the category in analyses in the education research literature. To illustrate the kinds of attempted influences that fit in the categories I consider some examples of attempts to influence public education policy.

I realize that empirical characteristics of attempts to influence public education might be used to categorize attempts. For example, variables such as the frequency of attempts of a particular type, the occupations of the advocates, the socio-political environment, or the rates of successful implementation of influences might be used to lump attempted influences into meaningful categories. However, there are not sufficient data available to hypothesize about cause-effect relationships which might allow such empirical characteristics to serve as the basis for meaningful categories of attempted influences. Therefore, instead of using characteristics that might emerge from an empirical analysis of attempts to influence

---

28 Social goods are those things which have the property that it is rational for persons generally who have a rational plan of life to want. A person's plan of life is considered rational if, and only if it is one of the plans that is consistent with the standard principles of rational choice when those principles are applied to all the relevant features of the situation, and it is that plan which would be chosen by the person if she had full awareness of the relevant facts and consequences. (Rawls 1971, 62, 399, 408)
public education, the organizing characteristic I use is the differences in interests that would be served if an influence is successfully implemented.

In Part 1, I established that pluralist democracies are justified to the extent that they facilitate the fair distribution of social goods. For this to occur the public institutions which constitute pluralist democracies must at least not impede the fair distribution of those social goods. In addition, there must be some public institutions which facilitate the fair distribution of those goods. Public education is generally considered to be one of these 'facilitating institutions' in our society.

This means that an overriding objective of those shaping public education policy must be to achieve some kind of reasonable balance in terms of the interests of those who are served by the broader public policies. In other words, the interests of children, advocates, and citizens in general must be balanced in some defensible way. I contend that one way for a society to achieve this fundamental objective of democratic societies is for people to evaluate

\[29\] Several of the categories which I define in this chapter are adaptations of schema proposed by researchers investigating patterns of change in the curriculum and organizational structures of school systems. Other categories reflect concerns which, as a result of my experiences in the administration of school systems, appear to me to embody significant factors in the evaluation of attempted influences as they occur at the fringes of the formal education policy-making structure.
attempts to influence public education in terms of the interests of those who are likely to be served by the anticipated impact.

It is my contention that proposed changes in public education can be lumped into the following six categories of interests:

1. Student interests
2. Pedagogy interests
3. Merchandising interests
4. Image interests
5. Single-Issue interests
6. School-Subject interests

I start each of the next six chapters with a description of the category in terms of the characteristics of attempts which fit into it. Next, I describe a test which can be used to determine whether or not a particular attempt fits the category. Then I provide an example of an attempted influence which clearly fits the category. I conclude each chapter with a category-level evaluation in which I apply the initial version of the evaluation framework to a generic attempted influence identified only in terms of the characteristics which were used to define the category.

The categories of student interests, merchandising interests, and single-issue interests have been adapted from the socio-historical analyses of educational change. The Pedagogy Interest Category has its roots in the arguments for radical expansion of teacher control of public education policy. School-Subject interests have been documented in the historical analysis of curriculum development. I have added the image interests category to deal with some straightforward, indefensible but persistent cases that would be missed otherwise.
I consider the six categories in what seems to be an intuitively logical order based on what the outcome of the evaluation will probably be. First, it seems likely that attempts to influence motivated by concern about students and pedagogy should more often than not turn out to be defensible. This is born out with application of the evaluation framework to the first pair of categories - Student Interest Category and the Pedagogy Interest Category - with a generally positive judgment. Second, it seems likely that attempts motivated by a striving for profits should more often than not turn out to be indefensible in terms of the goals of public education. Again, this is supported in the application of the evaluation framework to the second pair of categories - Merchandising Interest Category and the Image Interest Category - with a generally negative judgment. Third, it seems likely that attempts which are intended to reflect positions taken in areas under debate within the society should fall into a grey area. Application of the evaluation framework to the last pair of categories - Single-Issue Interest Category and the School-Subject Interest Category - supports this with somewhat ambiguous results which can only be resolved by re-evaluation of the attempts at the case-level.
PART 2

CHAPTER 4

THE STUDENT INTEREST CATEGORY

The first category of attempted influences is the Student Interest Category. This category is characterized by the fact that the attempts which fit into it are directed at better meeting the interests of the students.

Assertions of a student's rights in a particular situation clearly fit in the Student Interest Category. Demands for additional benefits for students who exhibit unique characteristics such as deafness or unusual musical talent also fit in the Student Interest Category. Attempts which are seeking benefits for students in general also fit in this category.

It is not uncommon for attempts in the Student Interest Category to be hidden from public view. For example, students' attempts to influence policy for their own personal benefit are not generally noticed beyond the school walls. A parent's attempt to make the school system more responsive to her child usually occurs without any fanfare or systematic documentation. While these student and parent initiated attempts may not be noticed beyond the school walls, teachers cannot ignore them. Teachers must evaluate such attempts in order to determine the
defensibility of allowing them to influence the operation of their classroom and/or school.

A. Student Interest Category Placement Test

For a categorization system to be effective each category must be defined in such a way that placement of items in the appropriate category is reasonably straightforward. In other words, the characteristics which are attached to each category must clearly distinguish non-examples from correct examples. In the case of the Student Interest Category, I take the critical distinction between an attempt which fits the category and one which does not to be the difference between the preferred notion of childhood within the extant civic consciousness and a notion of childhood advanced for the purpose of promoting changes to the civic consciousness. To reflect this distinction, the placement test for the Student Interest Category must differentiate between attempts which pursue interests that relate to students as individuals and attempts which pursue the interests of the society as a whole.

While some notion of childhood is necessarily a part of the civic consciousness, the rationale for the preferred notion of childhood that reflects what is in students' interests is based on what it ought to be like to be a child per se rather than on what a child ought to be like for a particular social arrangement to prevail.
For example, it might be argued that for a society to be secure, children must be raised in such a way that they are reluctant to express views which differ substantially from the views of the majority of citizens. The argument for such a position might be that the only way to ensure that the social arrangement will prevail is to ensure that once the majority view is expressed, it is not challenged. Attempts to influence motivated by this kind of argument do not fit in the Student Interest Category. Such attempts which focus on what a child ought to be like in order to facilitate the preservation or development of a particular social arrangement fit in the Single-Issue Interest Category.

On the other hand, consider an attempted influence where the anticipated impact is that children would not be held responsible for any criticisms they might make of public policy decisions. Assume that the rationale for this attempted influence is that children ought to be given an opportunity for exploration without the risk of being held accountable. The focus of such an attempt is on the children, not the society as a whole. Because the attempt focuses on what it ought to be like to be a child for the

---

31 This kind of argument was heard in Uganda (Summer, 1991) where, after a decade of 'troubles', there appeared to be consensus that it was more important to develop a common view among the citizens than to take the risk of highlighting differences in the pursuit of an 'improved' common view.
sake of the children it fits in the Student Interest Category.

Attempts which fit in the Student Interest Category are attempts to reduce the void between the notion of childhood which is being advocated and the notion of childhood which dominates the extant civic consciousness. A particular view of what childhood ought to be like is being advocated on the assumption that, if that view is adopted, the public institutions of the social arrangement will tend to evolve in the ways required to ensure that childhood becomes more like what it ought to be.

The test for determining the presence of promotion of student interests starts with an examination of the probable effect of changing the prevailing notion of childhood in the extant civic consciousness. If the intention of the advocates and the probable effect of accepting their influence is to make childhood per se more like what it ought to be, the attempt fits into the Student Interest Category. If the attempt is to change the notion of childhood for some other reason or if it is possible that adoption of the influence will have an effect on students that is inconsistent with the notion of childhood imbedded in the attempted influence, then the attempt does not fit in the Student Interest Category.
B. Examples of Promotion of Student Interests

Social reformers sometimes focus their attention on changing the society in order to make childhood more like what it ought to be. Therefore, it is not surprising that the socio-historical record of childhood has evidence of attempts to influence which fit in the Student Interest Category.

An example of social reform which focussed on childhood is the child-centered movement in English Canada at the turn of the century. According to Sutherland (1976), those involved in the child-centered movement of the early twentieth century were primarily concerned with re-shaping the generally held notion of childhood. This concern for the quality of childhood per se and by implication the quality of life for children as students appears to be a relatively new phenomenon which has just emerged in the last century. Based on the stories of the ‘child-saving’ programs where pauper’s children and street children were collected in Britain and shipped to foster homes in colonial Canada and other evidence, it has been concluded that "English Canadians showed little awareness of children as individual persons...(and)... saw nothing of the inner, emotional life of youngsters...."(Sutherland 1976, 6) During the twentieth century the prevailing view of children in the developed
western world\textsuperscript{32} has evolved. The view of children as an important, but cheap source of labour which might benefit the family unit, has yielded to a child-centered view where parents must provide a better life for their offspring with no expectation of a return.

Influencing public education policy for the purpose of changing the notion of 'what childhood ought to be like' is a fundamental part of the child-centered movement. For example, compulsory school attendance policies were advocated as a means of forcing people to accept the notion of children as learners rather than children as earners\textsuperscript{33} (Sutherland 1976, 93). The argument used by advocates of the child-centered view of childhood was that child labour is inconsistent with their view of what childhood ought to be like. The attempts of these proponents of the child-centered view of childhood to influence public education clearly fit in the Student Interest Category.

\textsuperscript{32} Children are still seen as sources of revenue and security in families facing extreme poverty, in the impoverished pockets of the so-called developed western world.

\textsuperscript{33} Obviously there can be other reasons for using public education policy as a means for curtailing child labour. For example, some may have had the objective of removing children from the labour pool in order to force changes to the society as a whole. Where the latter reasons prevailed, the resulting attempt to influence public policy would fit in the single-issue category.
There are more recent examples of attempts arising from the child-centered movement. One such example is the 'mainstreaming movement'. Since the late sixties, parents of children with various handicapping conditions have been very active advocates for the integration of their children into the mainstream of public education. Parent support groups have turned into special interest groups advocating more appropriate services for children with particular kinds of handicaps within the mainstream of neighbourhood schools. Anyone engaged in the day-to-day operation of schools eventually is confronted with attempts arising from this movement. These attempts typically focus on what childhood ought to be like for the purpose of improving the lot of children with handicaps.

While there is some documentation of parents struggling to have their child placed in the regular classroom setting (e.g. Nolan, 1987), usually the story is lived and forgotten by all except the parents who struggled to change the system for the sake of their child.\textsuperscript{34} However, there is a public record of 'mainstreaming movement'

\textsuperscript{34} As a school and district administrator (1974-82) I had to explain to parents that even though what they were requesting was obviously the best thing for their child, 'policy' did not permit it. As a school administrator I was also required to develop and recommend policy changes that would facilitate parents' proposals for what was the best for their child. In the cases I dealt with, it was the parents acting independently, in the interests of their child, that prompted radical policy changes which unfortunately were limited to the local jurisdiction.
attempts where parents of children with special educational needs have used the courts to force change in public education policy. The case law record of these actions describes desperate but apparently defensible attempts to influence public education policy.

There is evidence in the case law record of the court’s use of the fundamental distinction imbedded in my definition of the Student Interest Category. The courts distinguish between attempts to change our notion of what childhood ought to be like and attempts to change the society by changing our notion of childhood. Leary highlights this distinction in his analysis of parents resorting to the courts to deal with what they consider to be ‘classroom malpractice’:

At one end of the family spectrum there are ‘issue-oriented’ parents who are always seeking new avenues to further their cause.... At the other end of the spectrum, we have parents who are sufficiently motivated to embark on this traumatic first-time experience to seek perceived justice for their own and, perhaps, other children (Leary 1981, 92-3).

O’Shea alludes to this distinction in her analysis of U.S. judicial decisions dealing with the rights of parents to influence the public school curriculum during the period 1874-1979:
Objections [by parents] may be based on constitutionally protected values such as freedom of religion or privacy; or they may be based on a variety of personal beliefs such as parental opinion that their child is wasting time studying one subject when another is more important (O'Shea 1979, 58).

The fact that the courts distinguish between those attempts to influence public education that are clearly on behalf of the student and those that are intended to advance some other interests such as preservation of a constitutional agreement reflects the different values attached to the different sets of interests. Presumably, more detailed analysis of the case law record and the experiences of those involved in the day-to-day operation of schools would substantiate the significance of this difference.

**C. Evaluation of the Student Interest Category**

The next step is a category-level evaluation of the legitimacy of attempts in the Student Interest Category. A category-level evaluation is one which is based solely on the characteristics used to place attempts in the particular category. For the Student Interest Category a category-level evaluation seeks an answer to the question: Is an attempt to influence public education which is primarily concerned with making childhood more like what advocates claim it ought to be necessarily defensible in terms of the criteria of the initial version of the evaluation framework set out in Chapter 3?
(i) Public Scrutiny Criterion

The first criterion from the evaluation framework, the Public Scrutiny Criterion, stipulates there must be no evidence of intentional interference with the public evaluation of attempts to influence public education. Therefore, the first aspect that must be considered is the degree to which advocates would be willing to have their proposed influence subjected to public scrutiny.

Attempts which fit in the Student Interest Category are directed at the promotion of a particular view of childhood for general adoption within the society. The view of childhood being promoted requires a particular interpretation of the relevant aspects of the extant civic consciousness. While the advocates of the influence are not trying to change the civic consciousness, they are trying to change the interpretation of what being a child and/or student ought to be in terms of the prevailing views.

The underlying justification for any attempt in the Student Interest Category is that, interpreted properly, the extant civic consciousness dictates a particular view of what childhood ought to be like. Attempts which fit in the Student Interest Category necessarily invoke the dictated
consciousness strategy. As in all instances of the dictated consciousness strategy, attempts in this category depend upon rational persuasion of a significant portion of the citizenry in order to change their view of what childhood ought to be. To successfully influence education policy, advocates of attempts in this category must convince other citizens that a proper understanding of the extant civic consciousness implies the changes they are advocating. They expect that successful persuasion of the citizenry will eventually lead to change in the structural arrangements of the society where those arrangements will impact on what childhood ought to be like. Reliance on rational persuasion necessarily involves critical analysis by others. To the extent that attempts which fit in the Student Interest Category involve the dictated consciousness strategy of change through rational persuasion, they satisfy the Public Scrutiny Criterion.

---

35 See Chapter 2, Section D: The dictated-consciousness strategy is where a particular form of civic consciousness is prescribed on theoretical grounds as necessary for the achievement of civic virtue. Society-shaping through the dictated-consciousness strategy is characterized by efforts to impose a predetermined civic consciousness society-wide through rational persuasion. A critical feature of the dictated-consciousness approach to social change is the focus on re-shaping the civic consciousness of citizens rather than on overhauling the social arrangement. The assumption underlying this strategy of social change is that any required structural adjustments will necessarily come about as a result of the adjustments to the civic consciousness. In other words, the structural adjustments will only occur once the civic consciousness has been adjusted.
Empirical investigation of attempts in this category would presumably corroborate the preceding argument. Apart from the fact that all efforts to change should be open to discussion, it also seems likely that the success of attempts that fall into the Student Interest Category is directly related to the level of public dialogue about what childhood ought to be like. Therefore, I assume that openness to public scrutiny is recognized by insightful advocates as an empirically necessary condition for the success of such attempts.

(ii) Primary Purpose Criterion

The second criterion from the evaluation framework, the Primary Purpose Criterion, requires that child-raising must be given precedence over society-shaping. It would seem at first glance that attempts to influence public education which fall into the Student Interest Category satisfy the Primary Purpose Criterion by definition. However, there is at least one possible exception.

There are situations where public knowledge of an individual student's needs could be harmful to the student. For example, advocates of a change in attitude toward HIV positive students might publicize the identity of particular students in order to promote their cause. Some would argue that even though identification of HIV positive students in a community clearly interferes with certain aspects of the
extant child-raising process for those students, the overall effect for those students is still positive. I would disagree. Attempts which fit in the Student Interest Category but which involve public knowledge of particular characteristics of individual students could violate the Primary Purpose Criterion.

Given the possibility of harm to some students, the Primary Purpose Criterion does not produce a decisive judgment regarding the legitimacy of the anticipated impacts of attempts motivated by student interests when applied at the category-level. As a result, the second Decision Frame must be extended to include application of the Long-Term Benefits Criterion.

(iii) Long-Term Benefits Criterion

The Long-Term Benefits Criterion stipulates that there must be a reasonable chance that interference with the extant child-raising process will be balanced by benefits the children will eventually gain as a result of the influence being adopted. Where the impacts on the extant child-raising process are likely to be balanced by future benefits to the emerging citizens, it is reasonable to judge the overall anticipated impact of the influence as defensible.

An attempt to influence which fits in the Student Interest Category is characterized by its pursuit of a more
defensible notion of 'what childhood ought to be'. To be defensible such a notion must satisfy my contention from Chapter 1 that there must not be any interference with a child which is not justifiable in terms of what is legitimate interference with the freedom of citizens to engage in self-governance. In other words, any interference with their freedom that children experience while participating in the activities that make up public education must be justifiable in terms of the same principles as those which justify interference with the freedom of citizens in general. A notion of 'what childhood ought to be' which does not conform at least to this standard is neither defensible nor in the long-term interest of the child.

It is possible that changes to the extant child-raising processes may result in clear improvements to the prevailing notion of what childhood ought to be. It is also possible that those changes will not be accompanied by compensatory benefits for those being raised during the 'period of adjustment'. Consider, for example, the effect of the transition from the extensive use of child labour to its complete abolition and the introduction of public education. Children thrown out of work because of the enactment of child-labour laws would not benefit from new public education opportunities even if universal public education were implemented immediately. In fact they might not even
have the wherewithal to obtain enough to eat. For the 'liberated' child labourers of the late nineteenth century, the disruption to what had been the normal child-raising processes must have caused harm. Furthermore, the gradual enactment of universal public education meant that, as adults, former child labourers were competing with a younger, better educated work-force. The former child labourers lost the advantage of their work-related experiences. In other words, a case can be made that the introduction of laws prohibiting child-labour which was clearly a change in view of what childhood ought to be was defensible in the long-term for some children and not for others.

For the purposes of the category-level evaluation of the 'anticipated impacts' aspect of attempts in the Student Interest Category the result is clear. The legitimacy of attempts in this category has not yet been established. The 'anticipated impacts' aspect must be evaluated again, this time in terms of the Justice Criterion and the Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion.

(iv) Justice & Non-Exclusionary Benefits Criteria

Application of the Justice Criterion at the category-level is not straightforward. The Justice Criterion stipulates that, to be defensible, an attempt to influence public education must be directed at adjusting an unequal
distribution of social goods. By definition successful influences that fit the Student Interest Category will benefit particular students. But is it reasonable to conclude that, based solely on the characteristics of the category, the impact of attempts in the Student Interest Category will always be just?

If an advocate's claim is based on the assumption that the extant system unnecessarily restricts the pursuit of certain social values by some students and that implementation of the influence being advocated will eliminate that disadvantage, then the Justice Criterion is satisfied. This is the kind of egalitarian argument the Court refers to in Peter Mills v Board of Education of District of Columbia[^36] where special educational services required by Peter Mills and other handicapped students were being refused on the grounds of inadequate funding of public education. The court ruled that the school district's

... interest in educating the excluded children clearly must outweigh its interest in preserving its financial resources. If financial resources are not available to finance all of the services and programs that are needed and desirable in the system then the available funds must be expended equitably in such a manner that no child is excluded from a publicly supported education consistent with his needs and ability to benefit therefrom (Peter Mills v Board, 1972).

While in this case it appears that the Justice Criterion was eventually satisfied as a result of the court's ruling, it is possible for attempts in the Student Interest Category to violate the Justice Criterion. For example, if the upshot of an attempt was simply to shift social values to one student at the expense of all others, the Justice Criterion may not be satisfied. To take it to the extreme, if a child's handicapping condition was so severe that providing the minimum educational opportunities for that one child required so much funding that every other student's opportunities to learn were reduced far below what is generally accepted as minimal, the Justice Criterion would not be satisfied.

It is not possible to conclude the categorical evaluation of the Student Interest Category using the Justice Criterion. As a result it is not possible to make a conclusive judgment concerning the defensibility of attempts that fit in the Student Interest Category based solely on the characteristics used to place them in the category.

There are two options at this point. The first option is to abandon the category-level evaluation and resort to case-by-case evaluation of each attempt which fits in the Student Interest Category. The second option is to complete the evaluation in terms of the Non-Exclusionary Benefits Criterion and the Feasibility Criterion in order to reduce the number of criteria that need to be applied at the case-
level. In other words, attempts which fit in the Student Interest Category would then only need to be evaluated in terms of the Justice Criterion at the case level. The second option is taken.

The Non-Exclusionary Benefits Criterion stipulates that the anticipated impact of an attempt must not be directed at purely egoistic ends. Judgments in terms of this criterion are made on the basis of evidence that the extent to which the advocates of the attempted influence benefit depends on others not having access to the same or related benefits. The obvious beneficiaries of attempts in the Student Interest Category are the students.

The condition for violation of the Non-Exclusionary Benefits Criterion is that the beneficiaries gain an exclusive advantage at the expense of others. This can only occur where it is a student who advocates a change in the notion of 'what childhood ought to be' and where adoption of that change would result in some advantage for that student at the expense of everyone else. Not surprisingly there is a general suspicion of students' attempts to influence education, even where students claim to have purely altruistic motives. If there was a subsidiary categorization of attempts to influence in terms of the role of the advocate in the public education enterprise the eventuality of violation of the Non-Exclusionary Benefits Criterion by
attempts in the Student Interest Category could be contained. In other words, students as advocates of attempts which fit in the Student Interest Category need to be considered as a separate sub-category. In the meantime, the category-level evaluation in terms of the Non-Exclusionary Benefits Criterion of attempts in the Student Interest Category does not produce a decisive judgment when it is applied to this category as it is presently configured with no distinction related to the role of the advocates.

The second Decision Frame of the evaluation framework does not produce a definitive judgment concerning the legitimacy of the anticipated impacts of attempts motivated by student interests.

(v) The Feasibility Criterion

The final Decision Frame in the initial version of the evaluation framework proposed in Chapter 3 consists of the Feasibility Criterion. The Feasibility Criterion stipulates that, given the strategy for implementation of the influence being advocated, the anticipated outcomes from that influence must at least appear to be attainable. In the case of attempts in the Student Interest Category, the feasibility of those attempts can be established at the

---

37 The matter of creating sub-categories of attempts is considered in Chapter 10 Section A.
category-level, based solely on the characteristics which result in their placement in the category.

Advocates of attempts which fit in the Student Interest Category are primarily concerned with achieving some result for students. By definition, their commitment is not to a particular program of action per se. Rather the focus is on achieving some end. Thus, if other experienced, child-centered child-raisers point out that the influence being advocated is not likely to succeed in making child-raising more closely fit a particular notion of 'what childhood ought to be like', the advocates of attempts in this category will seek other means for having their notion of childhood incorporated into the extant civic consciousness. The fact that attempts in this category are open to public scrutiny makes it reasonably certain that the anticipated impact is feasible. In other words, attempts to influence which fit in the Student Interest Category satisfy the Feasibility Criterion because they are open to scrutiny.

(vi) Results of the Category-Level Evaluation

The category-level application of the evaluation framework to attempts which fit in the Student Interest Category has produced mixed results. An argument based on the characteristics used to place attempts in the category demonstrated that the Public Scrutiny Criterion was likely to be satisfied. Based on the assumption that public
scrutiny necessarily involves scrutiny by others who are experienced, child-centered child-raisers, the Feasibility Criterion is also satisfied. However, the second Decision Frame which evaluates the legitimacy of the anticipated outcome of attempts does not produce a definitive, category-level judgment. At this point it is not possible to make a decisive judgment concerning the legitimacy of all attempts in the category on the basis of the characteristics which identify attempts in this category. However, the introduction of sub-categories of attempts which identify whether or not an attempt is advocated by students or non-students reduces the number of attempts that need to be evaluated at the case-level.\textsuperscript{38}

\textsuperscript{38} This refinement is discussed in Chapter 10 Section A below.
Teaching is a complex process. By definition, it involves creating the best fit between teaching strategies and the educational needs of the students in the classroom (Stenhouse 1975, 4). But each group of students is unique. A classroom has its own ethos. The ethos of a classroom is not only unique, it is also dynamic. It evolves as the students develop. Furthermore, the environment of the school and surrounding community, even to the level of the global community, can have implications for what can reasonably be expected to happen in the classroom.

To cope with this complex situation, teachers and others who happen to have pedagogical expertise must
locate or develop models of the educational process. They seek models which provide a framework for the content and educational experiences required by their students. These models are directed primarily at questions of teachability.

It can happen that the policies prescribed by the authorized policy-makers impede effective implementation of the model of pedagogy teachers have adopted. In reaction, teachers often attempt to influence public education policy so that it facilitates rather than impedes the implementation of their apparently superior models of pedagogy. Such attempts to influence may be directed at

---

40 Model building by practising teachers is a form of epistemics. Epistemics is the piecing together of the processes by which knowledge and understanding are achieved and communicated. The educational processes which teachers attempt to capture in these models include elements of how students seem to perceive things, how those perceptions change and how they influence other areas of knowledge and understanding, and how students talk or write about what they know and understand. I say this is only a form of epistemics because it is much less structured than that implied by the term epistemics as it was coined at Edinburgh University School of Epistemics where it is used to refer to the scientific study of knowledge and the construction of formal models of the perceptual, intellectual and linguistic processes.

41 Questions of teachability are: When it has been decided that all students ought to be initiated into X through their public education experiences, is it possible to do that? When we spend time initiating all students into X, what happens in the other areas A, B, C, etc. that are also accepted as worthwhile, necessary parts of the civic consciousness which must be conveyed through public education? Is the whole package still teachable?
gaining support from the authorized policy-makers. What are more relevant to the analysis in this paper are attempts by teachers which circumvent the formal policy-making process by gaining wide-spread, unauthorized adoption of their model and eventually forcing an after-the-fact endorsement by the authorized policy-makers. These attempts fit in a distinct category which I call the Pedagogy Interest Category.

The identifying feature of an attempt which fits in the Pedagogy Interest Category is that it is an attempt directed at improved achievement of the extant goals of public education. These attempts focus primarily on questions of teachability. They are motivated by a desire to improve the child-raising processes of public education as a means for better achieving the extant goals of public education within the society.

A. Pedagogy Interest Category Placement Test

It is my contention that attempted influences which fit in the Pedagogy Interest Category can be distinguished from related attempts that do not fit on the basis of the reasons for concern with teachability. In particular, an attempt to influence only fits in the Pedagogy Interest Category if the advocates’ concern for teachability has arisen because they are seeking to achieve the current goals of public education. On the other hand, attempts motivated
by the desire to re-shape the society by adjusting teaching practices do not fit in the Pedagogy Interest Category.

To understand how this distinction can be made in practice, it is necessary to understand how pedagogical theory-building occurs in the context of teaching. Teachers are constantly dealing with questions of teachability in terms of the individual students. However, for a teacher to ascertain the teachability of a program or activity beyond the narrow range of the individual student in a particular situation she requires some kind of model or theory of what happens in schools. Because there are so many variables affecting what actually happens in schools, the determination of what is sound pedagogy requires ongoing critical reflection on the practices of teaching. Teachers sometimes notice patterns in their experience and share these insights with each other. Because the patterns that emerge from these deliberations have been noted as significant by teachers based on their insights into teaching and learning they are worth considering from a public education policy perspective.

Attempts which fit in the Pedagogy Interest Category are directed at changing the models or theories of what needs to occur in the classroom for the purpose of better achieving the extant goals of public education. Attempted influences motivated by pedagogical interests must be grounded in the unique insights on teachability arising from
reflection on the experiences of teachers. The basis for the claim that attempted influences which fit in the Pedagogy Interest Category are defensible is that the collective wisdom of teachers and others concerned with teachability can help achieve the extant goals of public education. As a result, it is necessary to ensure that those with expertise in pedagogy can have a significant\textsuperscript{42} impact on public education policy.

Unfortunately it is not straightforward to identify attempts by teachers which are motivated by pedagogical interests. The primary characteristic used to identify attempts motivated by pedagogy interests is that it is reasonable to assume that the advocates have access to the unique experiences gained while teaching. The difficulty in categorizing attempted influences arises when teachers and others who claim to have unique insights on pedagogical matters portray what is actually an attempt to change the society as simply a matter of pedagogy.

One of these 'difficult to categorize' attempts was exemplified by James H. Block's analysis of the potential impact of large-scale implementation of mastery learning

\textsuperscript{42} Individual teachers or groups of teachers in a school can have a short-term, localized impact on public education. The term 'significant' is being used to indicate an impact beyond the immediate sphere of the advocates. In other words, will the innovations survive the retirement or transfer of the innovative champions and committed advocates of the changes?
strategies (B.C. Primary Teachers Association - Spring Conference, 1980). Block is seen as an expert on Bloom's mastery learning approach (Block 1971). Bloom's mastery learning approach is a pedagogical model where every student gets the dose of instructional time required to master the things being taught. Bloom's mastery learning strategies are directed at resolving a major issue of teachability - how do we get all of our students to learn? At first glance promotion of this model appears to be motivated by pedagogical interests.

However, in the process of promoting this model to a group of primary teachers Block explained that he saw the mastery learning strategy as having the potential to radically change North American society by completely separating the effects of socio-economic background from success in school. Block argued that if the resources for public education were re-allocated, all students could end up being competent participants in their society. Late bloomers would bloom. The disadvantages of birth and poor early child-raising would be compensated for rather than perpetuated by public education. In other words, children from dysfunctional families and harassed ethnic groups would receive compensatory support in their schooling. As a result, in time students from impoverished backgrounds would not be distinguishable in terms of their success at school. Is this a fundamental shift in the goals of public
education? If citizens cannot be differentiated on the basis of success in school, has the society been re-shaped in fundamental ways? Block appears to believe that it will be. To substantiate his claim Block referred to the impact the mastery learning strategies were having on Korean society where they were being implemented on a large scale (Kim 1969).

If Block's attempt to promote the mastery learning strategy is likely to advance the extant goals of public education, namely that all students be given the opportunity to acquire the understandings, capacities and dispositions inherent in our civic consciousness, then it fits in the Pedagogy Interest Category. However, if Block's attempt is likely to have the effect of creating a new society where the impact of early childhood experiences is eliminated, then his attempt to influence public education policy does not fit in the Pedagogy Interest Category. It is not clear how a decision concerning the placement of attempts related to mastery learning should be made. Presumably this kind of uncertainty could arise with the categorization of other attempted influences.

To circumvent the uncertainty exemplified by the mastery learning example, I use the extant goals of public education within a society as an indicator of the general nature of the civic consciousness. In other words, I am taking the extant goals of public education to be a
reasonably reliable indicator of the generally accepted beliefs about public education within a society.

The test for the identification of pedagogy interests can be summarized as follows. It has two conditions. The first condition requires that the attempted influence is grounded in extended reflection on the actual practices of teaching. The second condition requires that the anticipated impact of the influence is the more effective achievement of the extant goals of public education. Where an anticipated impact of the influence is the re-shaping of the society, the attempt does not fit in the Pedagogy Interest Category.

B. An Example of Promotion of Pedagogy Interests

A clear example of theory building emerging from reflective practice is the Whole Language Approach. Whole Language is an approach to teaching young children to read and write. It involves a variety of strategies for teaching reading, writing and other language-related communication skills, understandings and dispositions. It embodies a model of language learning that is fundamentally different from the model inherent in basal reader programs.

Over the years many teachers have noticed that some children who succeeded in doing the exercises provided in basal reading programs still could not make sense of print material. Nor could these students put their own ideas in writing. In other words, these children had the 'skills' of
reading and writing but they could not read or write. Staff room banter played on the idea that if children had to wait until they got to school to learn to talk, we would end up with citizens who could neither talk nor read. Some teachers saw the initial oral language learning processes of early childhood as a potential model for teaching reading and writing. These ideas were obviously shared. Eventually champions of these more holistic alternatives to basal reading programs emerged. As the notion of a 'Whole Language Approach' took hold during the eighties, teachers looked for ways to replace the authorized textbook-based basal reading programs.

Attempts to have the Whole Language Approach to teaching reading and writing officially endorsed have resulted in debate concerning the shift in approach. Parents query the de-emphasis on phonic skills. The use of 'creative spelling' in the initial stages of writing raises eyebrows. In the meantime teachers and others who are convinced of the need for the kind of change embodied in the Whole Language Approach attempt to influence a range of public education policies in order to support the implementation of this pedagogical model. For example, teachers attempt to have resources for the purchase of books and other teaching materials re-allocated to support the Whole Language Approach. They attempt to have instruments used to collect information about student achievement in reading and writing.
changed. Instructors involved in pre-service teacher preparation programs attempt to promote the 'Whole Language Approach' as a viable teaching strategy.

The Whole Language Approach to teaching reading and writing does not entail changes to the goals of public education. The focus of the Whole Language movement is on teachability. Advocates of Whole Language appear to be concerned with the effectiveness of teaching strategies. There is no evidence of a desire to change the over-arching goals of the curriculum. Attempts to promote the pedagogy of Whole Language clearly fit into the Pedagogy Interest Category.

C. Evaluation of the Pedagogy Interest Category

How do attempts to influence which fit in the Pedagogy Interest Category fare when they are evaluated on the basis of the characteristics that justify their placement in this category?

(i) Public Scrutiny Criterion

Attempts in this category falter on the first Decision Frame because of the likelihood of resistance to public, non-expert evaluation. Attempted influences which fit in the Pedagogy Interest Category are, by definition, promoted by those who consider themselves to be experts in the area of pedagogy. Those who consider themselves experts generally
resist subjecting their views to the critical review of 'just anybody' since it is often impossible for non-experts to fully comprehend what they are being asked to criticize. One of the manifestations of this resistance is the use of professional jargon. For example, what would a person-on-the-street take the labels 'Whole Language', 'basal readers' and 'creative spelling' to mean?

Attempted influences in the Pedagogy Interest Category typically utilize educational jargon. Because educational jargon obscures rather than clarifies what is at stake for those who do not understand it, it is likely to interfere with meaningful public scrutiny. Jargon can be used by experts to exclude those who do not understand the subtleties of the issues at stake. From the definition of the category, advocates of influences in the Pedagogy Interest Category are likely to claim to be an authority in the aspects of pedagogy embodied in their attempt to influence.43 Because members of the general public cannot

43 The distinction from Peters (1959, 17) between being 'an authority' in pedagogy and being 'in authority' to make decisions concerning public education is fundamental to the notion of pedagogy interests. Teachers and others who reflect on what happens in classrooms in the processes of teaching and learning claim to be 'an authority' based on the insights they have gained and the models of teaching and learning they have come to understand. Administrators and others functioning in the roles defined by the representative governance structure are 'in authority' as a result of the state's inherent constitutional authority to establish and direct the institutions of public education which are necessary for the continuity of the society. (Tussman 1977, 54)
competently use the jargon to engage in the language game of pedagogical experts, it is easier for their 'inexpert' evaluations to be dismissed.

While it is possible to understand why pedagogical experts seek to exclude non-experts, this poses a problem for the category-level evaluation of attempts in the Pedagogy Interest Category. The Public Scrutiny Criterion is a threshold criterion. Attempted influences must either appear to be readily available for public scrutiny or be subjected to the scrutiny of the formal governance structure of the state before they deserve serious consideration. Attempted influences in the Pedagogy Interest Category do not appear to satisfy the Public Scrutiny Criterion at the category-level.

There may be times when the fears of the 'expert' advocates are reasonable. Where understanding the attempted influence is dependent on some kind of complex technical knowledge, some kind of safeguards on the scope of public scrutiny may be justified. These safeguards can be accomplished by adding a rider to the evaluation framework which stipulates that only criteria which are acceptable to the community of pedagogical experts can be applied in the

44 It is possible for educational policy-makers to establish policies and procedures which would achieve this purpose. For example, adjudicating committees representing the broad community but with access to their own experts can be formed to evaluate attempted influences on behalf of the community.
process of public scrutiny. In this way the risk of dismissal of an attempted influence on the basis of judgments by uninformed non-experts is eliminated. In order to proceed with the category-level evaluation of attempts which fit in the Pedagogy Interest Category I am assuming that the problems inherent in subjecting expert proposals to scrutiny by non-experts can be resolved.\textsuperscript{45} Based on this assumption, I contend that attempts in this category satisfy the Public Scrutiny Criterion. This adjustment is reflected in the revisions in Chapter 10.

(ii) Primary Purpose Criterion

The next step in the evaluation process is to evaluate the anticipated impact of influences in the Pedagogy Interest Category based solely on the characteristics related to their placement in this category.

The Primary Purpose Criterion stipulates that an attempted influence must not interfere in any substantive way with the extant child-raising processes. By definition, attempted influences in the Pedagogy Interest Category are directed at changing the extant child-raising processes for the purpose of better achieving the goals of public education. This usually involves the re-shaping of public

\textsuperscript{45} This is only intended to be a tentative solution. The issue of subjecting the recommendations of experts for the approval of elected but non-expert officials is just as problematic as the public forum. This issue is re-visited in Chapter 10.
education. The rationale for this re-shaping is grounded in a concern for effective initiation of children into their society. After all, the effective initiation of emerging citizens into their society is a primary goal of public education. However, the re-shaping of some aspect of schooling probably involves changes to the extant child-raising process. In other words, attempts which fit in the Pedagogy Interest Category appear not to satisfy the Primary Purpose Criterion.

The apparent failure of attempts in the Pedagogy Interest Category to satisfy the Primary Purpose Criterion seems to contradict the intent of this criterion. The intent of the Primary Purpose Criterion is to restrict interference with the extant child-raising processes in order to protect the children, not the preferences and habits of the child-raisers. The justification for restricting interference with child-raising is based on the assumption that any interference with the extant processes interferes with the effective initiation of children into their society. Attempted influences in the Pedagogy Interest Category directly challenge that assumption. While advocates motivated by pedagogy interests accept the goals of public education as a reasonable means for initiating children into the extant civic consciousness, they do not accept the claim that the extant pedagogical practices constitute defensible child-raising. In other words, attempts to influence which
fit in the Pedagogy Interest Category are attempts to change child-raising processes in order to better achieve the goals of public education. Therefore, it is inevitable that attempted influences in this category will interfere with the child-raising processes. However, because attempts in the Pedagogy Interest Category are directed at the educational needs of the students and thus at child-raising, not at society-shaping, the intent of the Primary Purpose Criterion is satisfied. Given that attempts in the Pedagogy Interest Category appear to satisfy the intent, if not the initial form of the Primary Purpose Criterion, the anticipated impact of attempts in this category is taken to be defensible in terms of the second Decision Frame. The Primary Purpose Criterion is modified in Chapter 10 Section B making it less restrictive than it is in the initial version of the framework proposed in Chapter 3.

(iii) The Feasibility Criterion

The final aspect of attempts in the Pedagogy Interest Category which needs to be judged is how reasonable it is to assume that the anticipated impacts are likely to be achieved if the influence is adopted. A necessary condition for an attempted influence to be feasible is that it is pedagogically sound. Because only those influences which are grounded in insights related to teachability fit in the Pedagogy Interest Category, the attempts in this category appear to meet this condition.
However, while teachability is a necessary condition for an innovation to be feasible, it is not sufficient. There must also be resources available to implement the innovation. In the case of attempts to influence which fit in the Pedagogy Interest Category, the critical resource is teachers willing to adopt pedagogical models which are likely to be more effective in achieving the extant goals of public education. To judge attempts in the Pedagogy Interest Category in terms of the Feasibility Criterion, the relationship between teachability and teacher's willingness to change needs to be clarified.

For the sake of argument, I assume that the pedagogical soundness of the innovation has been demonstrated sufficiently to answer questions raised by reasonable sceptics in the profession. Presumably if it has been demonstrated that an innovation is sound and if there is reason to believe that its implementation would improve the potential for achieving the goals of public education, teachers who understand those goals and are striving to initiate their students into the society would be willing to adopt the innovation.

The assumption that implementation of educational change depends on teachers is consistent with empirical studies of educational change. Based on his analysis of attempts to implement innovations in pedagogy Fullan concludes that:
Educational change depends on what teachers do and think—-it’s as simple and as complex as that (Fullan 1982, 108).

It does not necessarily follow that all teachers will change, even when the innovation is being proposed on the basis that the advocates have the requisite pedagogical expertise. It is argued by some that a condition for successful implementation of pedagogical innovations is that all teachers be "active implementers" (Connelly 1980, 107). In other words, according to this claim, the feasibility of an attempted influence depends on all teachers understanding the nature of and rationale for the innovation. However, even having all teachers sufficiently informed to enable them to be active implementers is not a sufficient condition for successful implementation of change in teaching. Knowledgeable teachers can still be unreasonable and resist change. As anyone who has been involved in the implementation of educational innovation will recognize, additional levels of teacher involvement in the design and advocacy of educational innovations does not eliminate the possibility of unreasonable resisters.

The only way the quandary raised by the possibility of unreasonable resisters to change can be resolved is by invoking the duty of the state to protect citizens from unjustified interferences and predictable harms.

As I indicated in the preamble to Part 1, it is my contention that any interference with the freedom of
citizens, whether they are 'emerging' citizens or full citizens, must be justified. By definition of attempts in this category, the 'unimproved' teaching practices which recalcitrant teachers compel their students to endure under the pretense that those experiences are a necessary part of the initiation into the society cannot be justified on pedagogical grounds. Nor can the continued use of such teaching practices be justified in terms of the state's authority to exercise the teaching power. The upshot is that teachers who refuse to implement practices which are accepted by others with pedagogical expertise as being more effective means for achieving the extant goals of public education are violating the rights of the children in their classrooms on the basis of an indefensible use of the state's teaching power.

The state has a prima facie duty to protect its citizens. Where the rights of a group are being systematically violated under the guise of the authority of the state, the state is obviously required to intervene. The risk of harm to students imposed by recalcitrant teachers who refuse to implement teaching strategies which are advocated by pedagogical experts as more effective means for achieving the goals of public education must be compensated for by the state. Protection of students from recalcitrant teachers employing ineffective teaching strategies is straightforward. The state has the authority to compel those
teachers to change or, failing that, to replace the recalcitrant teacher with someone who is willing to implement effective teaching strategies.

The state has a special obligation to protect students who are subjected to special limitations due to the exercise of the state’s teaching power. There are some obvious means by which the state can meet this obligation where there are recalcitrant teachers. The upshot is that the risk of recalcitrant teachers is not sufficient reason for declaring that an attempt to influence education is not feasible. In other words, attempts to influence which are directed at the effective achievement of the goals of public education are feasible.

(iv) Results of the Category-Level Evaluation

Evaluation of attempted influences solely on the basis of the characteristics justifying their placement in the Pedagogy Interest Category has led to a qualified judgment concerning the defensibility of those attempts. The judgment is qualified because the initial version of the evaluation framework proposed in Chapter 3 is inadequate.

For attempts in this category to be judged as defensible, there are some additional factors that must be considered. First, special consideration had to be given to reducing the reluctance of those who see themselves as having expertise. Second, because these attempts are
directed at changing pedagogical practices, they necessarily have an impact on the extant child-raising processes with the result that the interpretation of the Primary Purpose Criterion had to be less than literal. Finally, the potential for recalcitrant teachers highlights the need to give consideration to the state's capacity to protect its emerging citizens from unjustified interference by those claiming to exercise the state's teaching power. These additional factors are re-visited in Chapter 10 where they serve as a basis for refining the Feasibility Criterion of the third Decision Frame in the evaluation framework.
CHAPTER 6
THE MERCHANDISING INTEREST CATEGORY

The public education system routinely requires goods and services purchased from outside the system. Attempted influences motivated by the desire to influence public policy so that it favours the purchase of particular goods or services over others fit into the Merchandising Interest Category. Attempts motivated by merchandising interests occur when people involved in the business of providing goods and services strive to gain an advantage by influencing public policies or educational practices in order to promote the purchase of their goods or services. The advantage necessarily involves monetary gain for the advocates.

The impact of attempts in the Merchandising Interest Category on a society can be significant. For example, the textbook publishing and distribution industry described later in this section has fundamentally shaped certain aspects of public schooling. Textbooks used as readers have been purchased for use in the public education system for over a century. The result is that the experience of learning to read has been shaped for millions of children by the textbook publishing industry. Likewise, the test
publishing industry has shaped our notion of successful achievement in school.

**A. Merchandising Interest Category Placement Test**

The test for the presence of merchandising interests is based on the potential for profit for the aspiring influencers through sales of their goods and services to education institutions.

Suppliers are aware of the fact that policy decisions determine which goods and services are purchased. Not surprisingly, producers and suppliers of the resources used by education institutions engage in attempts to influence policy. The advocates of attempts motivated by merchandising interests see the education system as a potential purchaser of their goods or services.

The identification of attempted influences which fit in the Merchandising Interest Category is relatively straightforward. Attempts directed at changing public education so the purchase of the advocates' goods or services are favoured over others, or possibly even directed by policy, fit into the Merchandising Interest Category.

**B. Example of Promotion of Merchandising Interests**

Examples of the promotion of merchandising interests in the context of public education are not hard to find. Industrial Education/Technology teachers receive a wide
variety of free samples from suppliers of industrial equipment and supplies. School librarians are offered free trips to book broker’s warehouses in exciting foreign locations. Business Education teachers are provided with free samples of business software. Unfortunately many attempts to influence the purchasing patterns of public education institutions have not been documented in a systematic way. The exception is the textbook industry which has been scrutinized in detail.

Textbook publishers have clearly benefited from public education policy decisions which support the purchase of textbooks. In fact, textbooks account for a significant portion of the overall publishing industry. In the U.S. textbooks accounted for $1.5 billion of the $6 billion total book publishing sales in 1980 (Coser 1982). Tomkins concludes from his analysis of the industry in Canada that school system textbook purchases are "the greatest source of revenue for the (publishing) industry and without them Canadian publishing would not be able to survive."(Tomkins 1986, 410)

What is significant for this paper is that textbook publishers are selling much more than just reams of paper.

46 The study of the efforts of major corporations such as Apple and IBM to influence the view of what is taken to be important for public education would probably reveal an interesting case of the promotion of merchandising interests.
Textbooks control the flow of ideas to emerging citizens. The social relations expressed and maintained by written texts have an impact which is much more authoritative than the impact of other books (Olson, D.R. 1980, 192). As a result, textbooks have a significant impact on the shaping of the civic consciousness throughout a society and over time. Textbooks create a shared understanding of a certain set of words and images from school to school, from town to town, and even from one generational cohort to another. The impact of this sharing of words, images and ideas through the use of textbooks is obviously profound.

Publishers tend to play down the extent of their influence on public education policy. They would rather characterize their business as simply responding to the directives of the authorized public education policy-makers and the needs of teachers and students. Publishers contend that the authority of school textbooks is created by the ways they are used in classrooms. In other words, it is the teacher who controls the meaning of the text. Luke et al. elaborate as follows:

Conventional classroom discourse is about the text, based on the text, or directed to it. Teachers introduce the text: explaining, discussing, and assessing comprehension of both form and content. Although more commonly, instructional methods and objectives are externally directed by teacher's guides and curriculum guidelines, teachers individually interpret both mode of instruction and textual knowledge (Luke, De Castell & Luke 1983, 117).
This claim lends credence to the publishers’ claims of non-directive response to the marketplace. However, I contend that it over-simplifies the situation. Teachers can only use texts that are authorized and provided for use. Publishers exercise a large degree of control over the availability of textbooks.\(^{47}\) The control of the textbook industry has become concentrated in a few hands. Seventy-five percent of textbook sales in the U.S. in 1980 were made by just twenty companies (Coser 1982). It is likely that the leveraged takeover era of the eighties has further reduced the number of independent companies involved in textbook publication. In other words, teachers are at the mercy of decisions made by a relatively small group of publishers that function relatively independently of the formal policy formation process of public education.

What is even more significant is that there is evidence that publishing houses appear to adopt a

\(^{47}\) Obviously there are other ways that the availability of texts can be controlled. For example, in the Philippines under martial law or in South Africa’s bantu education era teachers could not access texts that were not authorized by the government, even though they were available from some publishers. However, these cases clearly fall outside of the scope of actual democracies.
paternalistic view of the public education enterprise. Lorimer concludes from his analysis of the impact of the changing corporate structures on textbook production and merchandising strategies:

... multi-national (publishing houses) have come to generate so much for the classroom that they have come to control much of the teaching process and many of the activities of the classroom. As a result, they have come to believe that it is they who control whether and how much learning takes place in the classroom (Lorimer 1984, 289-290).

There is no question that the financial success of textbook publishers is at the mercy of public policy and the prevailing educational practices. The degree to which a publisher's product conforms to the policy determines the potential for business success or failure. The dependence of the industry on public education policy was highlighted in the disastrous collapse in textbook publishing in the early eighties when soaring production costs coincided with policy decisions directed at restraint in public spending as a strategy for compensating for inflationary pressures in the world economy (Heron 1980, 20). Unfortunately, the degree to which the damage to the industry was reduced by influences

48 Examples of pressure from publishers to purchase off-the-shelf materials that may not match the policies of an educational jurisdiction abound. The Ministry of Education in B.C. has attempted to have publishers create materials designed specifically to support the prescribed B.C. curriculum. These attempts failed to a large extent because it was not profitable for the companies to create materials for an educational jurisdiction such as B.C which has a relatively small market.
exerted by the industry to ensure that public education policy maintained a minimal level of expenditure on textbooks has not been documented. However, I suspect that systematic investigation would demonstrate that the publishing industry did influence policy, even during that economic downturn. Any such efforts by those engaged in textbook publishing to influence public education policy would be attempts motivated by merchandising interests.

C. Evaluation of the Merchandising Interest Category

To merchandise is to promote the sale of goods or services which can be provided by the merchandiser. Merchandising involves convincing potential purchasers of the value of those goods or services in terms of their needs or wants. Merchandising is more than simple persuasion. It is an attempt to have potential purchasers adopt a view of the relative value of certain goods or services that favours their purchase over others.

(i) Public Scrutiny Criterion

To persuade potential purchasers of the value of the goods and services merchandisers must control the information about and the images associated with the goods or services they are promoting. In other words, merchandisers generally resist public scrutiny of their attempts to promote their goods and services for sale. To the extent that the attempts to influence public education
policy for the purpose of merchandising follow typical sales practices, the threshold of the Public Scrutiny Criterion will not be satisfied.

There is no reason to believe that the sales practices of those involved in the sale of products or services to education institutions are different from other merchandisers. I have no doubt that systematic documentation of attempts to influence which are motivated by merchandising interests would provide evidence of deliberate attempts to highlight the value of some goods or services while blocking attempts to assess the comparative value of other goods and services. Based on the typical practices of merchandisers, it is clear that most attempts to influence public education policy which fit in the Merchandising Interest Category do not satisfy the Public Scrutiny Criterion.

It is possible that some advocates may not see openness to public scrutiny as problematic. Such openness would only make sense where the advocates believe that

---

49 This observation is based on personal experience in the highly competitive retail grocery, hardware and petroleum trade. The experience being referred to is my participation as director and president of the board of a consumer retail organization (Mid-Island Consumer Services Co-operative) that sells $32M worth of groceries, hardware, clothing and petroleum products annually. While it is a user-owned operation, it is in a highly competitive marketplace that some would claim is the paradigm of competitive sales and merchandising enterprises and the associated business practices.
public scrutiny of their motives or of any aspect of the goods or services which they are promoting for use in public education will not significantly diminish the potential for adoption of their influence and which will in turn lead to the purchase of a particular product or service. In fact these 'open' advocates may see public scrutiny as a sort of free advertising. To be supportive of the attempted influence and still acceptable to those who were scrutinizing the attempt, public scrutiny would have to reveal a particular pattern of benefits. In particular, it would have to be reasonable to anticipate that the benefits would provide significant long-term advantages for children and/or support some kind of re-distribution of social goods within the society. The positive aspects of the anticipated outcomes would also have to be significant enough to counter-balance the special advantages the advocates are expecting to gain from the sale of their goods or services.

Attempts which fit in the Merchandising Interest Category and at the same time are open to public scrutiny form an interesting sub-category of attempted influences which I call the 'Open Merchandising Interest Sub-category.' Of the influences motivated by merchandising interests, only those which fit in this sub-category satisfy the Public Scrutiny Criterion.
(ii) Long-Term Benefits Criterion

The next step in making judgments concerning the defensibility of these 'open' merchandising attempts is to apply the second Decision Frame which evaluates the legitimacy of the anticipated impact of the attempted influence. It is clear that these attempts are motivated by self-serving interests. Merchandising is an activity which, by definition, is intended to produce a situation which violates the Non-Exclusionary Benefits Criterion. The possibility that these 'open' attempts to merchandise may not interfere with the extant child-raising processes does not seem to be relevant. There must be some clear advantage for students resulting from the purchase of the goods or services. In particular, attempts in this subcategory can only be defensible if the anticipated impact of using the goods or services being merchandised includes a significantly improved future for the students. In other words, if an attempted influence is to be judged as defensible it must unequivocally satisfy the Long-Term Benefits Criterion. The upshot is that for attempts motivated by 'open' merchandising interests the second Decision Frame collapses to a single judgment in terms of the Long-Term Benefit Criterion. That judgment is whether or not adoption of the influence will clearly produce some kind of long-term benefit for students. Such a judgment cannot be made at the category-level. It must be made case by case.
(iii) Results of the Category-Level Evaluation

To summarize, given the difficulty in subjecting private sales organizations to public scrutiny, it seems reasonable to adopt the position that attempted influences on public education policy by private organizations connected with the merchandising of goods or services to public education institutions are not generally open to public scrutiny. Therefore, attempts which fit in the Merchandising Interest Category are not defensible. In effect this means that decisions concerning which goods and services to purchase to support the public education enterprise should follow from rather than influence the relevant policies.\(^{50}\)

There is one possible exception. Some attempted influences in the Merchandising Interest Category are open to public scrutiny. For these ‘open’ attempts application of the Long-Term Benefits Criterion is pivotal. Application of the Long-Term Benefits Criterion may corroborate the advocate’s claim that adoption of the influence is necessary for certain long-term benefits for the students. In such

\(^{50}\) How then should decisions about which textbooks, computers or school buses be made? First, the decision must be made after the school system’s requirements have been established independently, without any influence from the suppliers. Second, the purchases must be made on the open market where any supplier has access to information about the system’s requirements and opportunity to merchandise their goods in terms of those requirements.
cases, it can be assumed that because the advocates will gain from successful implementation of the influence, they will take whatever measures are required to ensure that their attempted influence is feasible.

In summary, attempts that fit into the Merchandising Interest Category are usually not defensible attempts to influence public education policy. However, under very special conditions of openness and clear benefit to students, there may be exceptions. Those exceptions would need to be verified through case-level evaluation.
There are attempts to influence public education policy which are directed at establishing a link between the sense of worth associated with an aspect of the processes or outcomes of public education and an image which identifies the advocates. The advocates of these attempts want access to public education so they can display their image in such a way that the value generally assigned to some aspect of education will add to the perception of value generally associated with their image. The influence the advocates want to have on education policy is straightforward. They are striving to ensure that public education policy does not block their efforts to display their image in ways that connect it with the public education enterprise. These attempted influences fit in what I call the Image Interest Category.

Despite the fact that it seems obvious that such attempts are not defensible as a basis for shaping public education policy, they occur frequently. The examples range from the banking institution textbook covers and the image can be a symbol (the 'double arches' of McDonald's) or a slogan ("Just Do It" of Nike).
chocolate bar company national maps of the forties and fifties to the athletic shoe manufacturer’s school team uniforms and the soft drink company’s ‘nutrition break’ stands at school sport-days of the nineties.

Attempts to influence in the Image Interest Category necessarily involve the promotion of an image that is readily connected with some consumer product or service. The underlying objective of advocates of these attempts is to improve ‘product’ loyalty through its identification with some positive aspect of education. The strategy adopted by advocates of attempts in the Image Interest Category typically involves an approach to some level of the school system seeking permission for involvement with public education as ‘good corporate citizens.’ An important characteristic of attempts motivated by image interests is the expectation that involvement as a good corporate citizen will result in a payoff in terms of an artificial link with the worthiness associated with some aspect of public education with the corporate image.

A. Image Interest Category Placement Test

Attempts that fit in the Image Interest Category must be distinguished from attempts in the Merchandising Interest Category. The basic distinction is that the goods or services associated with attempts in the Image Interest
Category are not required for the normal conduct of public education.

Attempts motivated by image interests must be made to look as if something worthwhile is being done for students, for public education, or for society in general. Without this veneer of concern for the goals of public education, these attempts would have no chance of being adopted.

The fact that attempts in the Image Interest Category are not attempts to merchandise may be used by the advocates as part of an argument for permitting the attempt. For example, claims such as "... we’re not making money from this ..." may be made. Advocates of attempts that fit in the Merchandising Interest Category could not make this claim. Of course such claims do not justify attempts in the Image Interest Category, nor are they really true. Sometimes corporations do donate resources to support the public education enterprise with no fanfare and no strings attached. However, donations that are motivated by image interests are made to increase the corporation’s market share by improving the potential consumers’ perception of the value that should be attributed to its image and, by implication, to its product or service. Because of this, those who are motivated by image interests must disguise their attempt to influence public education in some way if the attempt is to be considered seriously by those making
the decisions about what will or will not be allowed to happen in classrooms and schools.

Probably one of the easiest ways to identify attempts in this category is to check for some kind of condition regarding identification of sponsorship of the influence. Typically there is a condition attached to acceptance of the apparent benefits of the offer inherent in the attempted influence. The condition may be clearly stated, or just understood. It always involves giving some kind of public credit to the sponsor of the attempt. Of course that credit is only related to the positive aspects of the influence. It is also understood that any negative aspects of the influence are not to be mentioned. The most blatant form of crediting sponsors is display of a 'corporate logo' in such a way that the sponsor's connection with the 'goodness' of education is reinforced.

In summary, an attempt fits in the Image Interest Category if the primary concern of the advocate is creation of an image by association with the positive aspects of public education. Attempts in the Image Interest Category are also identified by the fact that while some kind of merchandising is usually involved, the product or service which is sold is not required for the operation of the public education system.
B. Evaluation of the Image Interest Category

The case for rejecting influences that fit in the Image Interest Category is even more compelling than it was for those in the Merchandising Interest Category.

(i) Public Scrutiny Criterion

Attempted influences in the Image Interest Category necessarily fail to satisfy the threshold of the Public Scrutiny Criterion which requires reasonable access for evaluation of the attempt in the public forum. The effect of influences motivated by concern for creating an image is to establish false associations between unrelated or marginally related activities. If an audience is aware of the false linkage that is being created in the interests of improving an image, it is not possible to create the desired effect. Therefore, facilitating public scrutiny of attempts motivated by image interests would be self-defeating.52

Influences in the Image Interests category rely on deception at worst and ignorance at best. When this deception is laid bare by public scrutiny, an attempt to influence motivated by image interests is futile. For

52 Teachers who recognize this may use the materials as a vehicle for engaging their students in critical scrutiny of attempts to influence personal and social views. In other words the teachers would not see the attempt to promote these materials as fitting in the Image Interest Category because they were using it for something other than the promotion of the advocates' interests.
example, the cigarette ads of the sixties and seventies that associated healthy, outdoor life with smoking lost their impact in direct relation to the increased awareness of the harm caused by smoking.

The upshot is that attempts which fit in the Image Interest Category depend on a lack of public scrutiny for their success. The adjustments proposed for attempts in the Pedagogy Interest Category in Chapter 5 and the School-Subject Interest Category below in Chapter 9 where limits are imposed on the scope of public scrutiny do not help in the case of the Image Interest Category. As a result, when evaluated at the category-level, attempts in the Image Interest Category cannot pass the threshold of the Public Scrutiny Criterion of the evaluation framework of Chapter 3.

(ii) Results of the Category-Level Evaluation

Given the connection between ignorance about the actual intention of the advocate and the potential for success, it is clear that attempted influences that fit in the Image Interest category necessarily fail the threshold of the Public Scrutiny Criterion and must, therefore, be dismissed as indefensible.
There are attempts to influence public education policy which can only be described as somebody's attempt to impose on others their perspective of 'the way things ought to be' in our society. The perspective being promoted by any of the advocates of these attempts relates to a single-issue which is more or less unresolved within the society. Lack of resolution of the issue may be evidence of inability to sort out the competing perspectives. On the other hand, lack of a consensus on the 'way things ought to be' in relation to the issue may just be evidence that the issue has not even been raised in the public forum. I place these attempted influences into what I call the *Single-Issue Interest* Category.

I use the label *single-issue* to describe the motivation for these attempts in order to highlight the fact that they can be described in terms of the special interest the group has in advocating the influence. An indicator that an attempt is motivated by a single-issue interest is that a clear link can be established between the perspective being promoted, the benefits that are likely to arise as a result of adoption of the influence, and the overall goals of the
group advocating the influence. The issue being addressed by an attempt in the Single-Issue Interest Category must be identifiable as a concern of the advocates. The attempted influence must entail a claim that 'this is the way things ought to be' in our society. The desiderata that the advocates are proposing must be a manifestation of some social value\textsuperscript{53}. In other words, it is not just awareness of a social issue that is being advanced. The attempted influence must also promote what the advocates take to be a viable solution to that issue. Finally, it must be reasonable for the advocates to assume that the particular set of social values they are promoting can be achieved within a pluralist democracy. In other words, attempted influences which fit in the Single-Issue Interest Category are proposals to adjust a particular aspect of the social arrangement. They are not attempts to replace the extant pluralist democratic social arrangement.

A. Single-Issue Interest Category Placement Test

The preceding description of attempts to influence education policy which fit in the Single-Issue Interests category can be summarized in the form of three identifying characteristics.

\textsuperscript{53}As explained in Chapter 4 in the context of the Justice Criterion, social values include liberty and opportunity, income and wealth, and the bases of self-respect.
The first identifying characteristic is that the advocates are content to function within the context of a pluralist democracy. The fact that the advocates have focussed their attempt to re-shape the society on public education is taken to imply that they support the generally accepted view of the purposes for public education in a pluralist democracy. In other words, they believe that a significant number of citizens ought to have a shared set of understandings, capacities, and/or dispositions in relation to important areas of human activity. They also believe it is possible to convey such knowledge through public education.

The second identifying characteristic of attempts motivated by single-issue interests is that the details of the advocates' view of what a pluralist democratic society ought to be like differs in some way from the society as it is. Attempted influences in the Single-Issue Interest Category necessarily involve a prescription of what the civic consciousness ought to be within the confines of a modern pluralist democracy. However, within those confines, a definite change in perspective is being proposed. That change can be characterized as tinkering with the extant social arrangement in order to come closer to achieving what the advocate believes is civic virtue. The change in perspective does not extend to replacing the social arrangement with a non-democratic or non-pluralist system.
The third identifying characteristic of attempts in this category is that the special interest group which is advocating the influence is relatively autonomous. In addition, dealing with the particular issue is a recognizable part of the group's autonomous effort to influence policy in ways that will favour achievement of the group's overall vision of civic virtue.

Influences which fit in the Single-Issue Interest Category are wide-ranging. Examples of groups whose attempts to influence fit in the Single-Issue Interest Category include organizations such as the United Nations Association, the Canadian Cancer Society, the Canadian Studies Foundation (CSF), the Canadian Red Cross, the Canadian Foundation for Economic Education (CFEE), the

54 A relatively autonomous special interest group is a group with an identifiable purpose. The purpose may not have been formally identified by the group, but it must be possible to interpret the actions and plans of the group in such a way that a 'group purpose' can be identified. The term special interest is used to signify the fact that a significant amount of the group's actions are intentionally directed toward the promotion of particular interests through a variety of means. The group is autonomous in the sense that it can, if it is decided by the group, take positions that are significantly different from those of the authorized policy-makers. The modifier relatively reminds us that there is always a degree of pressure to conform to some general social consciousness. However, because the civic consciousness is limited to that which is generally agreed on within a society, it is possible for a group to be autonomous with respect to most aspects of the consciousness.

55 See Appendix A for a sample listing of materials available from the following groups.
Canadian Co-operative Association (CCA), Inter Pares, and UNICEF. Each of these groups has programs designed to promote and support the shaping of public education policy in particular ways that are connected to their broader organizational goals.

Non-profit cultural organizations such as the Vancouver Opera Society and the Nanaimo Art Gallery Society have seen influencing educational policy through school programs as fundamental to the achievement of their overall goal of raising the cultural awareness of citizens. There are similar programs designed and promoted by profit-oriented and/or service-oriented public and private corporations. For example, the Insurance Corporation of B.C. (ICBC) and the Workers Compensation Board (WCB) have programs intended to promote a particular perspective on health and safety issues.

The programs being advocated by these various groups for use in the schools embody a perspective which, if generally held, would assist in the achievement of the organizations’ declared goals. For example, the programs being promoted by the Cancer Society, ICBC and WCB address issues associated with healthy life-styles. Improving life-styles is a primary goals of these organizations. Likewise, the programs sponsored by the U.N. agencies, CFEE and CCA are attempts to promote particular socio-economic views which are implicit in the goals of those organizations. The
educational programs of the opera, art gallery and CSF focus on promoting cultural views. The Western Canada Wilderness Committee is concerned with the promotion of particular environmental views in schools in order to achieve their broader organizational goals of environmental awareness.

The advocates of these various attempts to influence public education policy are striving to integrate a perspective that is implicit in their undertaking into our civic consciousness. In other words, as a part of their broader organizational goals they are trying to re-shape our society through public education within the context of the extant society.

B. Understanding Interest Groups

Analyses of how special interest groups function can provide useful insights into the process followed by those promoting single-issue interests.

Karier's interest group theory (Karier ud.) suggests a framework for the analysis of the relationship between project sponsorship and curriculum product. Karier derives his interest group theory from an analysis of the historical record of the influence of foundations on education in the United States. Karier documents how U.S. foundations have "... been clearly at the cutting edge of every educational reform from the 'Carnegie Unit' to the 'open classroom'". (Karier, 32) However, it is not clear from
Karier's analysis whether or not the success of these influential groups was primarily a result of their ability to combine abundant resources and prestige with their efforts to influence American public education policy.

Roald (1980) investigated the attempts of two much more modest foundations. He analyzed attempts by the Canadian Foundation for Economics Education (CFEE) and the Canadian Studies Foundation (CSF) to influence public education in Canada. Based on his analysis of the activities of CFEE and CSF, Roald concludes that "... the fact that groups exist which have definable 'interests' does not in itself suggest that the processes of curriculum-making conform to interest group theory."(Roald, 123) Roald also claims that there is evidence that "... the activities of the foundations (CFEE and CSF) seem to suggest that they view direct political lobbying as dysfunctional in achieving
their goals.\(^{56}\) Ricker also argues that "... the mainstay explanation of educational politics in Canada...."\(^{(Ricker, 123)}\) is bureaucratic hegemony, that is, control of the concept of what education ought to be by the educational bureaucratic structure. As a result, the attempts by CFEE and CSF to exert influence on public education are interpreted in terms of the notion of bureaucratic hegemony theory. Based on this analysis, Roald concludes that interest groups can only succeed where they work toward the eventual co-option of the ideas of the interest group by the bureaucratic structure.

Roald theorizes that the co-option strategy works because the educational bureaucratic system is less prone to characterize the advocacy attempts of single-issue interest groups that operate this way as political action. In other

---

\(^{56}\) Roald goes on to conclude that "On the balance the CFEE and the CSF are likely better described as groups with interests in curriculum policies than as interest groups when the latter is taken to mean the advocacy of overt political influence over curriculum policy making."\((\text{Roald, 123 in Bernier & Tomkins 1980})\) My experience with CFEE does not support Roald's conclusion. In 1988 I was under contract with the Canadian Co-operative Association to direct the development and introduction of materials about co-operative strategies as a form of entrepreneurship. The topic had been selected to fit into the Ontario provincial education system theme of entrepreneurship. CFEE had been contracted by the Ontario Ministry of Education to oversee the production of the Entrepreneurship Unit (teacher and student materials). In my discussions with the Ministry Education Officer responsible for this project, Tom Tidy, I was informed that all decisions on topics and materials to be included were being made at CFEE.
words, being perceived by the educational bureaucracy as engaging in political action tends to result in a negative evaluation of an attempted influence. Of course interest groups work at influencing other groups who must also support the attempted influence if it is going to eventually be implemented. As Roald points out, CFEE and the CSF devoted "... time and resources in an effort to influence other interest groups--such as teachers and school boards."(Roald, 124) What is important, however, is that interest groups appear to succeed in their attempts to influence public education only to the extent that they can avoid being perceived by the educational bureaucracy as being involved in 'political activism'.

Based on Roald's analysis, it might be concluded that for attempts motivated by single-issue interests to be defensible, a delicate balance between raising awareness and not raising protest must be maintained. Such a condition is not defensible. An attempt can be defensible and not be successfully implemented because of lack of 'political correctness.' In other words, it could be legitimate to advocate an influence on public education even though making the proposal will undoubtedly raise protest. Some attempts to influence public education may be defensible simply because they bring attention to an issue which needs to be debated in the public forum. The fact that the original
influence is highly unlikely to ever be implemented may not be important.

Any group promoting a single-issue interest runs the risk of setting off protests and counter positions, resulting in the generation of a controversial issue. To protect itself, a group may work to create "... a community of interest, (with) 'networks' of people and institutions" (Roald, 125). From Roald's analysis it appears that these communities of interest serve as a buffer against the educational bureaucracy's sensitivity to the stigma of controversy.57

Investigators of special interest groups have documented the functioning of groups promoting attempts motivated by single-issue interests. While there are still unanswered questions concerning the most effective strategies for special interest groups to use, there is evidence of the successes and failures of groups to influence the civic consciousness through the public

57 There are times when the networking systems are inadequate to overcome the bureaucratic hegemony. The failure of the family life programs of the 1970's is a case in point. In the Lower Vancouver Island school districts there were excellent and apparently powerful networks of community and school people. Once those programs became controversial, the full weight of the administrative component of the education system was required to terminate those programs. Once the decision had been made to close those programs there was, however, no question that they would be closed despite persistent community resistance to that decision.
education system. Presumably this reflects the fact that some of those attempts were legitimate and others were not.

C. Examples of Promotion of Single-Issue Interests

Two examples have been selected from the many examples of groups involved in the promotion of interests that fit into the Single-Issue Interests Category. The first example involves the promotion of an Energy Curriculum by a major utility company in Canada. The second is about the promotion of novels by Filipino nationalists.

(i) The Energy Curricula

Ontario Hydro provides energy curriculum materials for use in schools. These materials are designed to support the development of an understanding of the changes in the technology involved in the production of energy in our modern industrialized world. These materials can have an influence on the public's conception of what is a desirable technology for energy production.

The prevailing notions of what is worthwhile in terms of the production and consumption of energy is important to utility companies. Without the right set of shared views concerning certain aspects of the energy production industry, utility companies will have difficulty achieving their corporate goals. To achieve their goals, Ontario Hydro and other electric utility companies must emphasize the
positive and downplay the negative effects of their industry. If it becomes public knowledge that the supposedly clean and safe electric company mascot, Reddy Kilowatt, comes from a controversial, polluting, potentially dangerous energy source, the utility companies obviously become concerned (Harty 1983).

Ontario Hydro claims that the purpose of their materials, *NUCLEAR SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY*, is "to provide balanced, responsibly prepared materials for the classroom teacher." Ontario Hydro's declared intention is to have students develop what Hydro takes to be an appropriate understanding of the electric power industry. Ontario Hydro sees these materials as a means for communicating

... more effectively with the public regarding both its technology and the environmental and socio-economic impacts of that technology (Spratt 1983).

Others who have examined *NUCLEAR SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY* argue that the use of these materials in schools will, in the long-term, benefit the corporate sponsors at the expense of sound educational experiences for the students who have used the materials. These critics argue that the materials have been designed in such a way that future generations will not see the relevance of the 'hard questions' of costs in terms of long-term financial commitments, the environment and the safety of employees and neighbors (Gaskell 1983).
Is Ontario Hydro engaged in an attempt motivated by single-issue interests? There is no doubt that Ontario Hydro is attempting to influence public education by producing and distributing these materials. In promoting these materials, Ontario Hydro is advocating a program that it claims will benefit both students and the society as a whole. However, the views imbedded in the materials are fundamental to the success of the overall goals of the company. Ontario Hydro is functioning as a relatively autonomous group. Its attempt to influence public education by providing NUCLEAR SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY materials to schools is an example of an attempted influence that is motivated by single-issue interests.

To achieve its objective of influencing public education, Ontario Hydro absorbed the cost of development of the NUCLEAR SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY materials and distributed them free-of-charge to any teacher who requested them. Ontario Hydro's strategy was to encourage as many teachers as possible to use the materials in their classrooms without waiting for any kind of official mandate from the formal education policy-making structure. In other words, Ontario Hydro was using the 'back door' to approval. Obviously this strategy works best where there is a shortage of resources for use in classrooms.

The objective of this kind of 'back door' strategy is to produce a critical mass of informal adoption which can
then be used to support a request for formal adoption by the authorized policy-makers. Once a critical mass of informal adoption has been reached, the need for formal approval may be a moot point. The effect of widespread adoption by teachers acting independently is nearly as good as having formal policy support for the Ontario Hydro perspective on electrical energy production. Ontario Hydro's strategy clearly was to shift evaluation to those at the fringe of the formal policy-making structure.

To justify the suggestion that the materials should be a part of the existing curriculum, Ontario Hydro offered an interpretation of the general goal statements of public education. Because the general goals statements come from the formal education policy-making process, they create the appearance that the materials have some kind of formal authorization. However, because Ontario Hydro's interpretation of the goals of public education has no official endorsement, its interpretation must also be evaluated as a part of their attempt to influence public education.

An important part of the argument for adoption of materials such as those developed by Ontario Hydro is a principle concerning the need to ensure a balanced view of controversial issues. However, the notion of a balanced view in curriculum is problematic.
As indicated above, one of the characteristics of attempts motivated by single-issue interests is that the attempted influence promotes a particular perspective on an issue. That perspective must be consistent with the overall goals of the advocates. The advocates of attempts in the Single-Issue Interest Category typically claim that their perspective must be conveyed through public education if there is to be a balanced understanding of viable alternatives. In particular, they claim that their perspective must at least be seen as a viable position to take.

Demonstrating that a perspective is viable involves the production of a reasonable argument for the perspective being advocated. In the case of attempts in the Single-Issue Interest Category, that argument must be consistent with the assumptions inherent in the overall goals of the group advocating the influence. An argument for the viability of the perspective being promoted through the energy curriculum based on the assumptions held by Ontario Hydro could be made as follows:

1. The provision of a reliable electric energy system is critical to our society.
2. It is important that all citizens have some basic understanding of what it means to have a reliable electric energy system.
3. In order to understand what it means to have a reliable electric energy system, it is necessary to have a basic understanding of how it works.
4. Understanding how the system works does not necessarily mean understanding the extremely complex problems that are faced by those responsible for planning for and providing the system over the long term.

Starting from different assumptions obviously leads to a different perspective that could also be claimed as viable. For example, evaluators of the energy curriculum materials in Beattie (1983) make the following counter arguments to justify rejection of Ontario Hydro's attempted influence:

1. The benefits of a reliable electric energy system must be balanced in terms of short and long term economic, social and environmental costs.
2. There is a possibility that some of those costs are not acceptable.
3. The provision of reliable electric energy within the acceptable constraints of cost is complicated more by questions of value than by questions of technology.
4. The public must understand what the costs of a reliable electric system might be and what the options are, even if some of those options might mean a less reliable or smaller supply of electric energy.

The claim that an alternate view must be provided implies that where there is not consensus there must be some kind of balanced treatment of all perspectives that have a reasonable claim to being viable. If, as its critics suggest, the use of Ontario Hydro's energy curriculum materials limits consideration of the controversial points, then the materials do not support the development of multiple views. Ontario Hydro's attempt to influence has been judged as indefensible by Beattie et al. where its adoption would lead to a one-sided view of nuclear energy sources by avoiding any discussion of critical issues.
related to long-term environmental harms. In other words, to the extent that the legitimacy of Ontario Hydro's attempt to influence public education depends on its contribution to alternate viable views, the attempt is not defensible. It is not clear to what extent public education can be used to ensure a balanced view on all controversial issues that occur in a modern pluralist democracy. However, the legitimacy of some attempts to influence such as that of Ontario Hydro clearly depends on the extent to which it is likely to facilitate the development of a balanced understanding of viable alternative views. In other words, a criterion is required to evaluate the degree of balance that a particular attempt to influence facilitates. Such a criterion is considered in Chapter 10, Section B.

---

58 I recognize that there probably are teachers using the materials and conveying restricted views concerning energy production to their students. In fact it is just this eventuality which motivates this paper. If there was more effective guidance in the evaluation of attempts to influence education policy beyond the scope of the formal decision-making structures, it may be possible to reduce the number of occasions where materials such as these are implemented uncritically.

59 Teachers may use the Energy Curriculum materials for purposes other than those intended by Ontario Hydro. A teacher may use the materials as a basis for demonstrating that nuclear power is not a safe source of energy. In other words, the teacher may subvert Ontario Hydro's attempt to influence public education. In effect the teacher has taken the position that the attempt is indefensible.
(ii) Tagalog Literary Classics

The second example of an attempt to influence public education policy motivated by a single-issue interest has been taken from the record of a controversy over the inclusion of Filipino classical literature in the Philippines public school curriculum.60

Jose Rizal’s *NOLI ME TANGERE* and *EL FILIBUSTERISMO* are seminal novels in Filipino literature.61 Rizal is generally recognized as a national hero, a perceptive analyst of the Filipino experience and an inspiring author in the Filipino context.62 Despite the importance of Rizal’s writings, Filipino students can still complete their formal education without any exposure to this author. Those who advocate the inclusion of Rizal’s novels in the Filipino school curriculum will be able to see how the goals of the advocates are being served.

60 This example is used because it comes from a society that is a pluralist democratic social arrangement, but far enough removed to allow North Americans to adopt a disinterested perspective and, therefore, to be able to see how the goals of the advocates are being served.

61 Stephen Henry S. Totanes in "The Historical Impact of *NOLI ME TANGERE* and the *EL FILIBUSTERISMO*" in Soledad S. Reyes, *THE NOLI ME TANGERE: A Century After—An Interdisciplinary Perspective* 1987 argues that these novels are significant for three reasons. First, Rizal is a national hero because of the stand he took for Filipino nationalism against Spanish domination. Second, the novels express in a very dramatic way the struggle that still seems to capture the struggle for a national identity. Finally, the novels are the first and possibly still the best exemplars of a unique Filipino literary style.

62 Because Rizal wrote in the vernacular, the first person to do so, his work is not well-known outside the Tagalog speaking world.
curriculum argue that to be a true Filipino, one must understand Rizal. Rizal can only be understood through his novels.

What is at stake is a particular view of what it means to be a Filipino. Rizal’s works contain a critical treatment of particular Spanish and Filipino religious organizations (Totanes 1987). The nationalists promoting the novels argue that the Filipino civic consciousness ought to include some sense of the historic roots of the nation. The religious officials opposing the novels argue that anything that implies criticism of their organization is against the general interest and, therefore, should not be a part of the civic consciousness.

While the issues at stake are clearly related to the broad goals being pursued by the Filipino Catholic Church and Filipino nationalists, both groups have successfully diverted attention away from the connection between its position on this controversy and its broader organizational goals. Each side claims to be seeking the improvement of the civic consciousness for the sake of the students. In other words, each side characterizes its attempts as motivated by student interests. Each side also argues that the attempts of the other side are motivated by self-interest and, therefore, are not defensible. Based on these claims each side in the Rizal literature controversy has succeeded in creating and sustaining a network of support over the last
century. Each side has a reasonably well articulated view of
what the relevant aspects of the civic consciousness ought
to be. Each side takes public education policy as critical
to the shaping of the civic consciousness.

A balanced curriculum covering these competing
perspectives does not seem possible. Given the overwhelming
nature of the unresolved struggle for control of the society
in the Philippines, the possibility of compromise appears
minimal. It seems that the Rizal literature controversy will
only be resolved when one of the groups changes its position
or loses its power to influence.

At the moment, despite the fact that public education
is governed at the national level in the Philippines, the
decision on whether or not to use Rizal's novels is dictated
by whoever controls the local political structure. In other
words, the formal public education policy-making structure
has been completely subverted, as has the less formal
policy-making power of teachers and others attempting to
work in the interests of their students. Judgments
concerning which influence will prevail are being made
outside the public education system. In a sense, the
handling of the Rizal novel controversy in the Philippines
is a case of anarchy in the realm of public education
policy. It provides a good example of what an effective
evaluation of attempts to influence public education policy,
even at the fringes of the formal policy-making process, is designed to avoid.

D. Evaluation of the Single-Issue Interest Category

Application of the initial version of the evaluation framework to attempts in the Single-Issue Interest Category at the category-level does not produce a conclusive evaluation of their defensibility. This is not a surprise, given that attempts in this category fall into the grey area of unresolved controversies related to the preferred shape of the society. However, the category-level evaluation of attempts in the Single-Issue Interest Category still does serve a purpose by focussing our attention on the points that need to be evaluated at the case-level.

(i) Public Scrutiny Criterion

There is no basis for evaluating the level of willingness of the advocates to subject their attempt to public scrutiny based on the characteristics used to identify attempts in this category. The Public Scrutiny Criterion has to be applied on a case-by-case basis.

Presumably some attempts motivated by single-issue interests will be sufficiently open to public scrutiny to pass this threshold test and justify evaluation in terms of the other two Decision Frames. With the understanding that attempts in this category must satisfy the Public Scrutiny
Criterion on a case-by-case basis, the question becomes one of the extent to which additional evaluation at the category-level can be completed in order to reduce the number of judgments that must be made at the case-level.

(ii) Primary Purpose & Long-Term Benefits Criteria

The Primary Purpose Criterion requires that child-raising be given precedence over the society-shaping purpose of public education. There is nothing about the characteristics which identify attempts in the Single-Issue Interest Category which can be used to inform an evaluation at the category-level in terms of the recognition of the importance of child-raising.

Likewise, there is nothing about the characteristics of this category which can be used as a basis for evaluating attempts in terms of the Long-Term Benefit Criterion. In other words, if there are interferences with the extant child-raising processes which are to the short-term disadvantage of the students, the characteristics used to place attempted influences in this category do not serve as a basis for evaluating the legitimacy of that interference in terms of the long-term benefits that can be anticipated for those students.
(iii) Justice & Non-Exclusionary Benefits Criteria

For the anticipated impact of these attempts to be judged defensible at the category-level, it must satisfy both the Justice Criterion and the Non-Exclusionary Benefits Criterion.

Before the Justice Criterion can be applied, it is necessary to check that the pre-condition prevails. The pre-condition for application of the Justice Criterion is that the attempted influence focuses on remedying what is claimed to be an unjust distribution of social values. By definition, attempts to influence motivated by single-issue interests involve efforts to adjust the civic consciousness in order to achieve civic virtue. Achieving civic virtue requires the presence of a just society. However, it does not necessarily follow that the advocate's pursuit of civic virtue involves the re-distribution of social values. That can only be determined at the case-level.

Where this pre-condition is satisfied the Justice Criterion requires that the proposed re-distribution of social values through public education must benefit the least favoured without causing harm to others. As indicated above, the notion of civic virtue entails the notion of a just society. In other words, if it has been determined at the case-level that it is necessary and appropriate to apply the Justice Criterion, then, because the Justice Criterion
has been satisfied at the category-level, the evaluation process can move directly to the next part of the second Decision Frame - the Non-Exclusionary Benefits Criterion.

The Non-Exclusionary Benefits Criterion stipulates that the re-distribution of benefits to the advocates of an attempt must not depend on others not gaining the same or related benefits. It is not clear from the characteristics used to categorize attempts that fit in the Single-Issue Interest Category whether or not they satisfy the Non-Exclusionary Benefits Criterion. However, if there was an assurance that promotion of the perspective being advocated is consistent with the provision of a balanced view which presents all available viable perspectives on the issue, then it would be possible to declare attempts in this category satisfactory regardless of the Non-Exclusionary Benefits Criterion. Without that assurance, case-level information is required to make that judgment.

It is clearly possible to have attempts motivated by single-issue interests which do not have defensible outcomes in terms of the criteria of the second Decision Frame. However, it is important to note that it is also possible for attempts motivated by single-issue interests to have an
anticipated impact that is defensible in terms of those criteria.\textsuperscript{63}

\textsuperscript{63} A case can be made for the defensibility of the Filipino nationalists attempt to have Rizal’s novels read in schools. The case for the defensibility of the attempts by the Rizal novel study advocates in terms of the second Decision Frame might go as follows: Advocates of the universal study of Rizal’s literature in Filipino schools recognize that such a change would disrupt the extant child-raising process for many children. In particular, those children who are being raised according to the guidelines established by the Filipino Catholic Church hierarchy would be exposed to criticism of the church where they were not in the past. The extent to which the disruption to the extant child-raising processes would be compensated for by benefits the children would eventually gain is not clear. Exposing children to the historical excesses of the church hierarchy would likely weaken the persuasive power of the church hierarchy in the Philippines. It is not clear that such a de-stabilization in Filipino politics, based on a history which may not reflect present practices, would be in the long-term interests of the emerging citizens of the Philippines. Given this uncertainty, the attempts of the promoters of Rizal’s novels must be subjected to the Justice and Non-Exclusionary Benefits criteria. The pre-condition of the Justice Criterion is met. Rizal promoters claim that the extant child-raising practices which limit study of historically significant Filipino literature to advanced education results in an unjust distribution of the social values as a result of down playing the value of what is unique to the Filipino culture. Furthermore, the Rizal promoters can reasonably claim that developing an awareness of Filipino culture will benefit those who need it but lack it without harming others. Furthermore, the benefits are non-exclusionary. Every Filipino benefits, not just the advocates. In particular, a richer awareness of the historical roots of Filipino culture among all emerging citizens is likely to strengthen the society and therefore benefit all citizens. Of course the feasibility of achieving the desired impact in the present context is another question.
(iv) Feasibility Criterion

The final criterion in the evaluation framework, the Feasibility Criterion, requires that it at least appears reasonable to expect that the anticipated impacts of the influence being advocated can be achieved. While it is stipulated in the definition that the advocates of attempts in the Single-Issue Interest Category must be able to make a case that their influence can be implemented within the extant social arrangement, there is still the possibility that another group may be advocating a competing influence such as is the case in the example of Rizal's novels. As a result it is not possible to establish the feasibility of an attempt at the category level. Each attempt must be evaluated in terms of the Feasibility Criterion at the case-level.

(vi) Results of the Category-Level Evaluation

Evaluation of attempts which fit in the Single-Issue Interest Category is inconclusive at the category-level. The Single-Issue Interests category is a borderline category where each attempt must be re-evaluated at the case-level in terms of each Decision Frame. In addition, it is clear that an additional criterion is required to evaluate the claim that an attempt is defensible because it is required to ensure that a balanced view is presented. This new
criterion, the Multiple Views Criterion, is defined in Chapter 10, Section B.
PART 2

CHAPTER 9
THE SCHOOL-SUBJECT INTEREST CATEGORY

The last category of attempted influences are those motivated by what I have labelled school-subject interests. Attempts motivated by school subject interests are concerned with the worthiness of school subjects as they relate to some aspect of shared human experiences. The aspect may simply be an understanding of what others have seen as being significant. The aspect may be the development of the capacities required to engage in an experience that others deem worthwhile. Or, the aspect may be the development of a disposition to follow the conventions of the group in order to extend the range of experiences that are likely to be shared as a recognizable member of that group.64

Attempts motivated by school-subject interests are based on a claim concerning the worthiness of some aspect of 'school subject' knowledge. These attempts can be directed at creating, modifying, preserving or eliminating school subjects. Regardless of the intended impact on school subjects, advocates of these attempts must ground their attempt in some kind of special personal insight into what

64 All of these aspects of shared human experience will be referred to as knowledge.
dimensions of the civic consciousness ought to be conveyed through public education. Such attempts fit in what I call the School-Subject Interest Category.

It is important to note that while the development of school subjects is a complex process, it is guided by a simple claim. The claim is that certain knowledge is so worthwhile that everyone should be given the opportunity to acquire it. In the process of trying to deal with some aspect of the human condition, individuals produce knowledge which they take to be very worthwhile. As a result of the conviction that the knowledge they have produced is very worthwhile, they may decide that it should be shared with everyone. In other words, these knowledge-producing individuals believe that the knowledge should be a part of our civic consciousness. They see public education as an effective means for infusing this knowledge into the civic consciousness. As a result they attempt to influence public education.

The most obvious knowledge producers engaged in attempts to influence school subjects are the professional academics who work in the traditional disciplines as traditional intellectuals. The disciplines are created, shaped and controlled by these traditional intellectuals. Because they have access to important insights as a result of their discipline-based investigations, traditional intellectuals are experts in their disciplines. But it is
not only traditional intellectuals who have insights which are so worthwhile that they ought to become a part of the civic consciousness. Reflective individuals, what Gramsci calls the organic intellectuals, attempting to cope with different aspects of the human condition can also have important insights.\textsuperscript{65} The insights of the organic intellectuals may not fit into any of the traditional disciplines. However, that does not mean that the knowledge they produce is necessarily any less worthwhile. In fact, no matter what its genesis, the understandings, capacities and/or dispositions entailed in the knowledge may form the basis for a defensible attempt to influence what ought to be conveyed through school subjects.

It is important to note that influences which fit in the School-Subject Interest Category have the potential to advance the interests of the advocates. Being identified with a recognized school subject can result in preferred access to resources. For example, the increased attention to school science in the post-Sputnik era of the sixties, clearly had spin-off benefits for science educators in terms of resources available to develop new programs. Just as publishers gain from the successful merchandising of their

\textsuperscript{65} Gramsci (1971, 6) clarifies the significance of these 'organic intellectual'. Organic intellectuals are ordinary citizens who have reflected on the knowledge that has supported their attempts to deal with the human condition, and are willing and capable of sharing their insights with other citizens who are also struggling with the same conditions.
products and services to education systems, advocates motivated by school-subject interests can profit from the adoption of their views on school subjects. One of the challenges for evaluators is to distinguish attempts which happen to have coincidental benefits for the advocates from attempts which are motivated by pure egoism and where acquisition of those benefits is the sole concern.

Examples of attempts to influence public education motivated by school-subject interests have been documented by curriculum historians. The socio-historical analysis of these examples highlights an important distinction. That distinction is between what might be called the actual intentions and the declared intentions of advocates. Awareness of this distinction alerts us to the fact that it is possible to unintentionally promote knowledge that is not worthwhile. In particular, it is possible for experts to be blinded by their own biases. Given the possibility that experts may be advocating mistaken views because of an unconscious bias, those who must evaluate the legitimacy of the attempt cannot simply take declarations of intention at face value. There must be other indicators of the actual intentions implicit in the attempt if it is to be judged as defensible. Where it is possible that experts’ intentions

66 Goodson, (1986, viii) has indicated that this kind of investigation appears to fascinate curriculum historians, with the result that there has been a reasonably thorough investigation of the area.
are not as they appear, it would also be prudent for the evaluators to have independent verification of the experts' claims about the worthiness of the knowledge being promoted. These requirements place a heavy load on the evaluators of attempts which fit into the School-Subject Interest Category.

A. School-Subject Interest Category Placement Test

To determine if an attempted influence is motivated by school-subject interests a two-part test must be applied. First, there must be evidence that the intended effect of the attempted influence is to direct in some sense what ought to be the content of a school subject. The intended effect may be to create a new school subject or to modify, preserve or eliminate an existing school subject.

The second part of the test consists of checking to see if the attempt to influence the school subject is grounded in some kind of verifiable insights into the worth of the knowledge implicit in the attempt. As indicated above, there are at least two sources for the insights that the second part of the test is checking. The insights may be the result of a conscious attempt to engage in a sustained exploration of an area of human experience. Or, the insights may be the result of reflection on experiences gained while dealing with an aspect of the human condition which can be related to a school subject. These conditions for placement
of an attempted influence in the School-Subject Interest Category can be summarized as follows:

1. The advocate’s declared intention must be to have a direct effect on a school subject for the purpose of conveying worthwhile knowledge.
2. The influence must be grounded in verifiable insights into the worthiness of the knowledge being promoted.

B. Example of Promotion of School-Subject Interests

An excellent example of an attempt motivated by school-subject interests has been documented by Bob Moon (1986) as the New Math curriculum controversy. From 1960 to 1980 school mathematics curriculum was dominated by the New Math controversy. The controversy arose as a result of the movement to infuse the existing school subject with the 'New Math.' The premise behind the advocacy of New Math was that there was worthwhile knowledge that should be conveyed through the school mathematics curriculum. The New Math movement clearly fits into the School-Subject Interest Category.

Moon identifies some important shifts in the motivation for the attempts to influence school mathematics. Those shifts followed the progression of the movement from an initial conceptualization of the need to improve school mathematics to institutionalization of the changes in the education system. During the early stages of the New Math controversy in the 1960's, the advocates of change to school mathematics saw themselves as reformers concerned with the
introduction of mathematical knowledge they considered to be of much greater worth than what was being taught. The altruistic, student-centered motivation of the sixties evolved into a somewhat self-serving concern for professional recognition and advancement in the eighties. Moon describes this transformation, which was caused to a large extent by strategic considerations, as follows:

... the activists of the sixties opted for, using Kirp’s (1982) phrase, ‘professionalization as a policy choice’... thereafter, for mathematics educators as a group a more detached, academic approach to the politics of curriculum reform became essential (Moon 1986, 214).

The transformation from a transitory reform movement to a permanent school-subject innovation obviously requires institutionalization of the innovations as a part of the generally accepted view of what the curriculum ought to be. One obvious indicator of institutionalization is the level and permanence of funding for the innovation. Once an innovation starts to be funded on a permanent basis the nature of the curriculum reform movement appears to shift.

Moon provides evidence that eventually the funding for a curriculum innovation rewards those who promote and/or adopt the innovation. By implication, those who resist the change have difficulty accessing funding. In the case of the New Math movement, the payoff for those involved in the initial mathematics curriculum reform was significant (Moon 1986, 21). The introduction of New Math created a new
professionalized group of mathematics education specialists. Academic departments of mathematics education were created throughout Europe and Britain. Within twelve years of the initial meetings that gave rise to the New Math reform movement at Royaumont in 1959, mathematics education institutions were established in Britain\(^{67}\), the Netherlands,\(^{68}\) West Germany,\(^{69}\) France\(^{70}\). In Denmark the Royal Danish College mathematics education centre was expanded. Each of these centres had to be staffed with mathematics education specialists, thus assuring a supply of positions for those who started off as active promoters of 'New Math.'

Moon has documented another interesting shift that follows the transition from the initial reform stage to the institutionalization stage. As implementation progresses, classroom teachers are more willing to implement the innovations without the formal sanction of the authorized education policy-makers. In other words, the power of the bureaucratic hegemony is significantly reduced. Moon reports:

---

\(^{67}\) University of Nottingham and Chelsea College.

\(^{68}\) The Dutch Instutuut Ontwikkeling Wistunde Onderwijse (IOWO) and Stichting voor de Leerplanontwikkeking (SLO).

\(^{69}\) For example, the Bielfeld Centre run by Bauersfeld and Steiner.

\(^{70}\) The French Instituts de Recherche sur l'Enseignement des Mathematiques (IREMs).
In subject-based curriculum development, administrators and inspectors, even where they retain significant formal powers, are circumscribed in their activities by other groups that impinge on the development process. Nowhere is this more clearly illustrated than in France (where) by 1968 inspectorial activity operated at a minimal level (Moon 1986, 218).

Given this description of what can happen in situations where specialists in the traditional disciplines become advocates of attempts in the School-Subject Interest Category, Ricker's theory of bureaucratic hegemony referred to above appears to be an over-simplification.

Moon's description of the New Math movement also provides evidence of the importance of alliances among groups advocating influences on public education policy. In the case of the New Math movement, the shifting alliances among groups with different, but apparently non-conflicting interests in particular school-subject areas were critical to the success of the movement. Moon summarizes his observations as follows:

New Maths is representative of Ball's thesis, that curriculum change is a long-term, interpersonal process, based upon the establishment of subject paradigms via networks of communication and apprenticeship (Moon 1986, 223).

71 In another example of school-subject interests S.J. Ball concluded from his study of the teaching of English that the nature of English as a school subject changed "as the outcome of the strategies, pressures and influences of particular groups of individuals with investments in the teaching of English." (Ball, S.J. 1982, 13)
I have also observed these shifting alliances in other, undocumented attempts to influence directed at school-subjects.\footnote{While working as director of the Co-operative College of Canada Curriculum Resource Materials Project (1986-8), developing materials related to co-operative business enterprises I saw evidence of this kind of shifting alliance. Members of GLACIE (the Great Lakes Association for Co-operation in Education) expressed concern that materials about co-operatives were not following the patterns that had been established for co-operative learning. The initial relationship between the Co-operative College Curriculum Resource Materials Project and GLACIE was antagonistic. The College staff initiated a proposal to collaborate with GLACIE in the introduction of materials about co-operation and co-operatives into the Ontario school system. The College presented workshops at the May, 1988 GLACIE Annual Conference. The Co-operative College Workshops became a part of the GLACIE workshop program. By September, 1988, two College (Ontario Region) staff members were on the GLACIE Executive Committee. Similar alliances were formed in the Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Maritime regions between regional offices of the College and teachers’ professional associations, rural education associations, and teacher training programmes.}

Based on the record of the New Math movement as described by Moon, it is apparent that attempts motivated by school-subject interests are complex. In the example of the New Math movement there is evidence of a shift in motives as the attempt moved through the different phases from initial conception to general implementation. There is also evidence of the importance of alliances. Finally, the importance of formal institutionalization of the innovation is made clear. However, one of the difficulties in evaluating these attempts is to make certain that the long-term impact of the
change on students is not over-shadowed by the transient benefits that may accrue to the advocates.

C. Evaluation of the School-Subject Interest Category

(i) Public Scrutiny Criterion

Application of the Public Scrutiny Criterion to attempts in the School-Subject Interest Category raises the same problem that occurred in the evaluation of attempts in the Pedagogy Interest category. By definition most advocates of attempts motivated by school-subject interests are expert in the area of knowledge which is the subject of their attempted influence. If these experts are reluctant to submit their attempts to public scrutiny by non-experts, they must be willing to submit them to the formally authorized policy-development process. In fact, as indicated above, a part of the formal process will be scrutiny of the attempted influence by recognized experts in the area. Scrutiny by experts is exactly what the advocates would want.

However, there are certain risks inherent in reliance on the authorized formal evaluation process for attempts motivated by school-subject interests. These risks apply to both the advocates and the society as a whole. A critical judgment that must be made about attempts motivated by school-subject interests is the worth of the knowledge which is the subject of the attempted influence. It is likely that
the advocates would argue that the knowledge that is being promoted can only be properly evaluated by someone with the relevant expertise. However, it is a mistake to assume that use of the authorized formal process ensures that the naive judgments of non-experts are replaced with the independent, informed judgments of the relevant experts.

Another problem is to make certain that the independent experts are, in fact, independent. An example would be an attempt to influence motivated by a school-subject interest that is embedded in an academic discipline. Discipline-based academics would promote the influence. Discipline-based academics would also have to be involved in evaluating the attempted influence. The expert-advocates and the expert-evaluators in the academic world are typically part of a relatively small, interdependent community. As a result the expert-evaluator asked to provide an unbiased judgment as a consultant for the authorized public education policy-makers is probably much more dependent over the long-term on the good will of the expert-advocates than on the authorized policy-makers. If identification of independent experts-evaluators is problematic in the traditional disciplines, it is next to impossible in areas outside the traditional disciplines. Advocates who claim to have insights gained from experiences which do not fit in the traditional disciplines are unlikely to accept the judgments of those who have not had the same experiences. Therefore,
the claim that resorting to the formal policy-making process in order to ensure that there are independent, expert-evaluators may not be as straightforward as one would expect.

From the perspective of citizens in general, the expectation is that the state will provide protection from influences which are primarily self-serving for the advocates. It is also clearly in the interests of the society as a whole that the understandings, competencies and dispositions conveyed through the school subjects are grounded in what appears to be the best available knowledge. This captures the tension involved in the definition of curriculum.

The validity of judgments about the worth of knowledge depends on the level of expertise available to the evaluators. As indicated above, locating experts who can act independently from their 'college of experts' may be a problem. In other words, policy-makers operating within the formal policy formation process may only have access to the advice of experts who are associated in some way with the advocates. Given the risk of biased judgments by the experts, prudent policy-makers must exercise caution in accepting those judgments. Caution in this situation consists of the authorized policy-makers independently scrutinizing the attempted influence. In other words, even in the formal policy formation process, attempted influences
motivated by school-subject interests must be scrutinized by non-experts. The difference is, these non-experts have the ultimate authority to make judgments concerning the legitimacy of the attempted influence. By virtue of their position of authority in the formal policy-making process, once a judgment has been made, policy-makers tend to resist reversal of a judgment. Recognizing this, insightful advocates will be more inclined to accept judgments by non-experts at the fringes of the policy formation process.

As with the Merchandising Interest Category, there is also the possibility of a subset of attempts in the School-Subject Interest Category. This subset consists of attempts which are deliberately made open to public scrutiny. If the scope of scrutiny by non-experts is limited as it was above in the category-level evaluation of the Pedagogy Interest Category, it seems reasonable to expect that a significant number of attempts in the School-Subject Interest Category will satisfy the Public Scrutiny Criterion. Therefore, the remainder of this category-level evaluation of attempts in the School-Subject Interest Category is only applicable to those attempts where there is evidence that the advocates recognize the inevitability of non-expert review and facilitate public scrutiny.
(ii) Primary Purpose Criterion

For this subset of attempted influences in the School-Subject Interest Category where the advocates have the foresight to recognize that their attempt will eventually be subjected to the scrutiny of a non-expert, the next step is to apply the Primary Purpose Criterion. The Primary Purpose Criterion requires that there is no evidence of substantial interference with the extant child-raising processes.

As indicated above, attempts to influence motivated by school-subject interests take one of four different directions in terms of the extant curriculum. Attempts in the School-Subject Interest category can be to preserve, to modify, to create, or to eliminate some aspect of a school subject. Therefore, evaluation of attempts in this category in terms of the Primary Purpose Criterion requires two sets of data. First, the degree of linkage between the extant curriculum and the extant child-raising practices needs to be established. Second, the 'direction of change' embodied in the attempted influence needs to be compared to the direction of the prevailing trends in the evolution of child-raising practices.

Based on information about the degree of linkage and the relative direction of changes it is possible to make judgments in terms of the Primary Purpose Criterion. For example, where the extant child-raising practices are
evolving to a different form, attempts to preserve an aspect of a school subject which is closely linked to the present child-raising practices would not satisfy the Primary Purpose Criterion. Thus, in native communities where there is a rapidly growing awareness of the value of the Native heritage and the harm caused by imposition of Euro-centric views, child-raising practices would probably be changing to reflect the change in adult perspective. An effort would be made to convey the value of the Native heritage through public education. The traditional Euro-centric school curriculum would be seen by parents and eventually by students as being inappropriate. In such a situation an attempt to strengthen the curriculum by, for example, introducing a Great Books approach would be disruptive.

On the other hand, if there is no reason to believe that the extant child-raising practices are in the process of changing, an attempted influence directed at upgrading a school subject so that it more accurately reflects the underlying discipline would also not satisfy the Primary Purpose Criterion. For example, in the New Math movement of the sixties, even though the changes being promoted reflected a more sophisticated view of mathematics, they were disruptive to child-raising practices. Because parents did not understand the method and terminology of the New Math movement, their position as homework-helper was being eliminated. Parents felt they were no longer able to use
their own school experiences as a frame of reference for raising their children. The result appears to have been that parents could no longer encourage and support their child's learning in mathematics. While it has not been documented, this appears to have been a significant disruption in the extant child-raising processes. An evaluator who recognized that this disruption would occur would judge that these attempts to introduce New Math did not satisfy the Primary Purpose Criterion.

It is not possible to make a category-level evaluation of attempts motivated by school-subject interests in terms of the Primary Purpose Criterion. It must be re-applied at the case-level in terms of the degree of linkage and relative direction of change between the attempted influence and the extant child-raising processes.

(iii) Long-Term Benefit Criterion

For attempts in the School-Subject Interest category which are open to public scrutiny but do not satisfy the Primary Purpose Criterion, the next step is to apply the Long-Term Benefit Criterion. Evaluation in terms of the Long-Term Benefit Criterion requires a judgment in terms of the balance between the disruption to the extant child-raising practices and the potential gain for the children if the influence is adopted. Because the extent of the disruption to child-raising is not known, the standard for
long-term benefits must be high enough that it would compensate for any reasonable level of disruption to the experience of childhood.

By definition, attempts to influence which are motivated by school-subject interests are directed at having school subjects reflect what the advocates claim is the best available worthwhile knowledge. It would seem that it is clearly in the long-term interests of students to be initiated into the best available worthwhile knowledge rather than to waste time acquiring knowledge that is not worthwhile or is out-of-date. The possibility that child-raising practices may be disrupted because the child-raisers cannot assimilate the best available worthwhile knowledge along with their children does not seem to be a sufficient reason for limiting students' access to knowledge. Therefore, given the intent of attempts in this category and given the assurance that the value of the knowledge being advocated will be evaluated prior to adoption of the influence, attempts in this category satisfy the Long-Term Benefits Criterion.

(iv) Justice & Non-Exclusionary Benefits Criteria

It is interesting to note that application of the Justice Criterion and the Non-Exclusionary Benefits Criterion also produces a positive evaluation in the second Decision Frame. What is being advocated with influences
motivated by school-subject interests is what the aspiring influencers believe to be knowledge of such worth that it should be available as a part of everyone's initiation into the civic consciousness. Sharing worthwhile knowledge is to everyone's advantage in terms of the fair distribution of social values. Therefore, attempts in this category satisfy the Justice Criterion.

As was seen in Moon's analysis of the New Math controversy, inclusion of particular knowledge as school knowledge may directly benefit the experts who advocate the influence on the curriculum. The value of their expertise and special insights can be significantly enhanced by adoption of the influence. It is possible that they will benefit in some very concrete ways as well. But the possibility that the advocates will benefit does not depend on others being blocked from acquiring the same benefits. As any teacher knows, some students will take the knowledge conveyed and become more expert than the teacher, curriculum writer or discipline expert ever could be. Proponents of the 'Old Math' have access to knowledge underlying the New Math movement. They can acquire that knowledge and join their colleagues' attempts to form the evolving 'New Math Education' hierarchy. Acquisition of benefits by the advocates does not depend on others being blocked from gaining the same or related benefits. Attempts in this category satisfy the Non-Exclusionary Benefits Criterion.
(v) Feasibility Criterion

It is clear from the legacy of failed attempts to implement sound educational change, that changing what is conveyed through school subjects requires more than just a conviction that certain knowledge is very worthwhile. There is nothing about the characteristics used to place attempts in the School-Subject Interest Category that allows a judgment in terms of the Feasibility Criterion. The potential for achieving the anticipated impact of these attempts as a result of adoption of the proposed influence can only be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

(vi) Results of the Category-Level Evaluation

The category-level evaluation of attempted influences which fit into the School-Subject Interest Category has produced mixed results.

Application of the first Decision Frame produced inconclusive results in terms of the initial version of the evaluation framework. In the process of applying the first Decision Frame, the need for modifications to both the evaluation framework and the categorization of these attempts came to light. Those modifications are made in Chapter 10.

Evaluation of attempts in the School-Subject Interest Category in terms of the criteria of the second Decision
Frame established that, even at the category level, the anticipated impacts of these influences are defensible.

Finally, it was not possible to evaluate these attempts at the category-level in terms of the Feasibility Criterion in the third Decision Frame.
PART 2

CHAPTER 10

SUMMARY OF CATEGORY-LEVEL EVALUATIONS

In the introduction to Part 2, I argued that an ideal evaluation framework would produce a complete and satisfactory evaluation of attempts to influence public policy in terms of clearly defined categories of attempted influences. If such an evaluation framework could be designed, evaluation of attempted influences would be relatively straightforward. In the ideal situation, the legitimacy of attempts would simply be determined on the basis of the categorization. Evaluation of an attempt would consist of placing the attempt in the appropriate category on the basis of the tests for categorization. There would be no need to engage in case-by-case evaluations.

However, given the analysis of the preceding chapters, complete evaluation of attempts to influence public education at the category-level in terms of the initial evaluation framework is not possible. The potential for great diversity among attempts to influence public education policy makes it impossible to reduce the number of judgments to a few decisions about categorization of attempts. As a result, public policy-makers responsible for the disposition of attempts to influence public education should guard
against judgments based completely on the categorization of an attempt.

In the process of applying the initial version of the evaluation framework from Chapter 3 to the categories defined in Chapter 4 the need for several changes in the categorization scheme and to the criteria of the evaluation framework also emerged. While these changes do not result in an ideal framework which allows complete evaluation of all attempted influences at the category-level, they do increase the utility of the framework at the category-level. Presumably, these changes will also improve the utility of the framework at the case-level.

In Section A of Chapter 10 I add several sets of sub-categories to the category scheme introduced at the beginning of Part 2. In Section B of Chapter 10 I examine the revisions required in the evaluation framework.

A. Adjustments to the Category Scheme

The sub-categories of attempted influences defined in this section are designed to reduce the number of incomplete category-level evaluations encountered in the preceding chapters.

(i) Student Interest Sub-Categories

The need to add the first set of sub-categories became apparent during the application of the Non-Exclusionary
Benefits Criterion to attempts in the Student Interest Category in Chapter 4.

The Non-Exclusionary Benefits Criterion evaluates the acceptability of the relationship between the advocates and the intended beneficiaries of an attempted influence. To satisfy the Non-Exclusionary Benefits Criterion it must be reasonable to assume that the attempts being evaluated are not motivated by pure egoism. Where there is a risk of pure egoism at the category level, the attempt to influence must be re-evaluated at the case-level. If the advocate is also the intended beneficiary, the risk of pure egoism is obvious.

Since students are the intended beneficiaries of attempts in the Student Interest Category, the Non-Exclusionary Benefits Criterion can only be violated where the advocates for a change in the notion of 'what childhood ought to be' are students. Dividing attempts motivated by student interests into sub-categories which distinguish between student and non-student advocates sharpens the focus of the application of the Non-Exclusionary Benefits Criterion. Attempts in the new Student Advocated Student Interest Sub-category must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis if there is a chance that they are not motivated by pure egoism. However, by definition attempts in the new Non-Student Advocated Student Interest Sub-Category satisfy the Non-Exclusionary Benefits Criterion at the category-level.
since the beneficiaries of attempts in this category can only be students.

(ii) Merchandising Interest Sub-Categories

The strategy of creating sub-categories of attempted influences can also be used to eliminate an obstacle encountered in Chapter 6 when the Public Scrutiny Criterion was applied to the Merchandising Interest Category.

Some attempts in the Merchandising Interest Category follow the common practice of retail trade secrecy. As a result, it had to be assumed during the category-level evaluation that attempts motivated by merchandising interests are not open to public scrutiny. However, as I noted in Chapter 6, it is possible that some advocates who are motivated by merchandising interests see openness to public scrutiny as supportive to their efforts to sell goods and services to the education system. The attempts of advocates who are open to public scrutiny fit into what I call the Open Merchandising Interest Sub-category. By definition, influences in the Open Merchandising Interest Sub-category satisfy the Public Scrutiny Criterion. The remainder of the attempts motivated by merchandising interests are still taken to be closed to public scrutiny, at least for the purpose of category-level evaluations.
(iii) School-Subject Interest Sub-Categories

The final set of sub-categories required to improve category-level evaluation divides attempts motivated by school-subject interests according to the direction of the proposed change in relation to the extant curriculum. The category for attempts motivated by school-subject interests is defined in terms of the extant curriculum. However, the relative direction of the influence in relation to the extant curriculum appears to be a more important characteristic. Attempts motivated by school-subject interests can be directed at preserving, modifying, creating, or eliminating some aspect of the extant curriculum. Because attempts motivated by school subject interests are always attempts to influence the extant curriculum in a particular direction they can be placed in sub-categories which describe these directions. The effect is to replace the School-Subject Interest Category with the following sub-categories: Preserving a School-Subject; Modifying a School-Subject; Creating a School-Subject; Eliminating a School-Subject.

Category-level evaluation of attempts motivated by school-subject interests in terms of the Feasibility Criterion was not possible where all the attempts were lumped together in the School-Subject Interest Category. It is my contention that where an attempt to influence the shape of school-subjects is consistent with the anticipated
form of generally accepted child-raising procedures, it is reasonable to conclude that the Feasibility Criterion is satisfied. Conversely, where there is an attempt to shape a school-subject in such a way that it contradicts the anticipated child-raising procedures, the attempt does not satisfy the Feasibility Criterion. I indicated in Chapter 9 that the fit between the attempt to shape a school subject and the anticipated child-raising procedures must be evaluated. In particular, the 'direction of change' embodied in the attempted influence must be compared to the prevailing trends in the evolution of child-raising practices. The re-categorization of attempts in the School-Subject Interest Category into the four sub-categories conveys information that is necessary for the application of the Feasibility Criterion in its revised form below.

Based on these refinements to the categorization scheme attempts to influence public education can be categorized as follows:

1. Student Interest Sub-Categories
   (a) Student Advocated Student Interest Sub-category
   (b) Non-student Advocated Student Interest Sub-category
2. Pedagogy Interest Category
3. Merchandising Interest Sub-Categories
   (a) Closed Merchandising Interest Sub-category
   (b) Open Merchandising Interest Sub-category
4. Image Interest Category
5. Single-Issue Interest Category
6. School-Subject Interest Sub-Categories
   (a) Preserving a School-Subject Interest Sub-category
   (b) Modifying a School-Subject Interest Sub-category
   (c) Creating a School-Subject Interest Sub-category
   (d) Eliminating a School-Subject Interest Sub-category
B. Adjustments to the Evaluation Framework

In the process of applying the initial version of the evaluation framework to every category some gaps in the evaluation framework itself also became apparent. In this section I summarize the adjustments I made to the evaluation criteria in the preceding chapters.

(i) Revisions to Public Scrutiny Criterion

For an attempt to influence public education policy to be considered defensible in a pluralist democracy it must be open to public scrutiny. In the analysis leading up to the initial version of the evaluation framework, public scrutiny was described as either scrutiny by authorized policy-makers or scrutiny by any citizen who wanted to participate. The function of the initial version of the Public Scrutiny Criterion was to serve as a threshold for attempts to influence which are evaluated outside that formal policy-making process. Where an attempted influence was scrutinized by the authorized policy-makers in the context of the formal policy-making process, the Public Scrutiny Criterion did not apply. In other words, the Public Scrutiny Criterion ensures that when advocates circumvent the systematic scrutiny of the formal policy-making process, their influence is at least open to scrutiny by anyone participating in the public forum.
A problem with the definition of the Public Scrutiny Criterion arose in its application to attempted influences resulting from unique insights that implied some kind of expertise. For example, attempts motivated by pedagogy interests or by school-subject interests assume a level of expertise among the advocates that is not necessarily shared by the public in general. This expertise is the basis of the advocate's claim to be an authority in the area covered by the attempt. Dismissal of these 'authoritative attempts' to influence public education policy simply on the basis of lack of scrutiny by non-experts cannot be justified. To deal with this problem, the principle from Chapter 3 Section C - General Requirements for Legitimacy of Influences which underlies the Public Scrutiny Criterion must be amended to read:

Principle #3 (revised):

Any citizen who can understand the basis for advocate's justification of the attempt has a right to evaluate the legitimacy of an attempt to influence public education for the purpose of shaping the society.

This limit on the right of all citizens to evaluate the legitimacy of attempted influences is consistent with another of the principles which were used in Part 1 as a basis for the initial version of the evaluation framework:

Principle #2: Citizens must be allowed to at least attempt to shape their society by influencing public education where there is no justification for interfering with the attempt.

The first Decision Frame is changed to read:
**Decision Frame #1 - Public Scrutiny Criterion (revised)**

The level of willingness of the advocates to subject their attempt to influence public education must be evaluated in terms of the Public Scrutiny Criterion.

The Public Scrutiny Criterion stipulates that there must be no intentional interference with evaluation of attempts to influence public education by any citizen who can understand the basis for advocate's justification of the attempt. Where the attempted influence and/or its justification are beyond the understanding of most ordinary citizens, the collegial review of the attempt must be public. This is a threshold criterion. Failure to satisfy this criterion justifies dismissal of the attempt without any further consideration.

(ii) Revisions to Primary Purpose Criterion

The second Decision Frame also required adjustment. The second Decision Frame deals with the defensibility of the anticipated outcome of an attempt in terms of the two primary goals of public education - child-raising and society-shaping.

A problem arose in the evaluation of the anticipated impact of attempts in the Pedagogy Interest Category. The original intent of the Primary Purpose Criterion was not achieved. The principle which this criterion is designed to cover is:

**Principle #1:**
The desire to change the society through public education must be balanced with the more fundamental child-raising function of public education. More specifically, any attempt to influence public education should enhance but must not significantly
diminish the child-raising function of public education.

The effect of Principle #1 is to give the child-raising purpose of public education first priority. To this end the Primary Purpose Criterion stipulates that the anticipated impact of an influence should not interfere in any substantive way with the extant child-raising process as it is being conducted by rational, caring child-raisers.

In my explanation of the initial version of the evaluation framework in Chapter 3, I speculated that application of the Primary Purpose Criterion would produce one of two results. Either there would be evidence that the attempted influence is solely for the purpose of child-raising because there is no evidence of interference with the extant child-raising process, or there would be evidence that the influence could result in substantive interference with the extant child-raising process. I surmised that these two results, together with the results of application of the Long-Term Benefits Criterion, would provide the basis for distinguishing attempts on the basis of whether or not they were directed at the child-raising or society-shaping purpose of public education.

In the process of applying the Primary Purpose Criterion to attempts in the Pedagogy Interest Category in Chapter 5, a third possibility emerged. It is possible to have an attempted influence seeking to improve the extant
child-raising solely for the purpose of improving the childhood of those who are presently children. Clearly such attempts interfere with the extant child-raising process. However, it does not seem reasonable that they be approved on the basis of some kind of long-term benefit or benefit to other citizens.

In retrospect, this third possibility is not surprising. Obviously it is possible for the extant child-raising process to be inconsistent with the broader social purpose of raising children into the society. However, for the evaluation framework to be valid, it must recognize these attempts for what they are - attempts which, while they interfere substantially with the extant child-raising processes, are defensible because they are for the specific purpose of improving the way children are presently raised. Otherwise, the application of the Primary Purpose Criterion to such attempts will produce false negative judgments.

This problem can be traced back to the way I defined the Primary Purpose Criterion in Chapter 3. At that point I acknowledged that I was using the notion of substantive interference with the extant child-raising process in a very narrow sense. I defined interference with the extant child-raising process in such a way that the mere possibility of an apparently adverse connection between the attempted influence and the extant child-raising processes was evidence of substantive interference. My justification for
imposing such a narrowly defined condition was that the Primary Purpose Criterion could be overridden by other criteria in the second Decision Frame. In other words, I acknowledged that there would be times when interference with the extant child-raising processes could be justified. The problem that emerged in Chapter 5 is that the other criteria in the second Decision Frame are not designed to re-assess the interference with the extant child-raising processes in terms of the merits of those processes. The other criteria of the second Decision Frame focus on the merits of the claim that the interference with the extant child-raising processes are justifiable in terms of some kind of future benefits to the children or to the society as a whole.

To allow for the possibility of an attempted influence which interferes with the extant child-raising process for the purpose of improving those child-raising processes, an amendment to the Primary Purpose Criterion is required. To that end, the first criterion of second Decision Frame becomes:
2.0 - Primary Purpose Criterion (revised)

The Primary Purpose Criterion stipulates that attempts to influence that are not related solely to the purpose of child-raising must not interfere in any substantive way with the extant child-raising process as it is being conducted by rational, caring child-raisers. For an attempted influence to interfere in a substantive way there must be evidence that the anticipated impacts of the attempted influence are inconsistent with the generally accepted purposes of child-raising. For the purposes of the application of this criterion the generally accepted purposes of child-raising are to help children develop in such a way that they are able to conform to the expectations within the society while also being able to take advantage of the opportunities that living within that society are claimed to provide.

(iii) Multiple Views Criterion

The need to recognize that there are multiple reasonable views on controversial issues was not factored into the initial version of the evaluation framework in Chapter 3. However, in the process of evaluating attempted influences in the Single-Issue Interest Category, it became clear that there are attempts which focus on advocating alternate reasonable views on controversial issues. Judgments about the legitimacy of the anticipated impacts of such attempts must be based, in part, on the extent to which those impacts are likely to facilitate a more complete understanding of the various perspectives that can reasonably be taken on controversial issues.

For attempted influences which are primarily concerned with promoting a particular perspective on a controversial
issue, such as in the Ontario Hydro nuclear energy curriculum proposal mentioned in Chapter 8, the relevance of encouraging consideration of different perspectives through public education is significant. Developing a reasonable view on a controversial issue which is unresolved within the society requires that the various competing perspectives on the issue be examined. But attempts to re-dress an imbalance in the deliberations of the public forum, at least through public education, may be dismissed as a case of pure egoism. However, it is conceivable that an attempt to influence public education policy may be defensible for the simple reason that it promotes examination of an important issue that has not yet been resolved within the society.

While public education may not be the most effective means to ensure a deeper or more balanced view on controversial issues related to life in a modern pluralist democracy, there is no question that public education can impede the development of an understanding of the multiple views related to the issue by restricting the variety of perspectives to which children are exposed. Therefore, it is necessary to consider the degree to which an attempt is likely to facilitate an understanding of the range of reasonable perspectives which can be taken on an issue.

Promotion of multiple views on unresolved issues within a society is obviously connected with the society-shaping goals of public education. Provision of
opportunities to understand various perspectives on important controversial issues is peripherally related to dimensions evaluated by both the Justice Criterion and the Non-Exclusionary Benefits Criterion. However, in their present configuration, these criteria do not provide sufficient focus on the presentation of competing perspectives as part of public education.

An additional criterion is required. This criterion is required to determine whether or not advocates whose influence is directed at a controversial issue within the society are redressing some kind of imbalance in the presentation of competing perspectives on the issue. I call this new criterion the Multiple Views Criterion. It provides another route through the second Decision Frame.

2.2b - Multiple Views Criterion

Application of the Multiple Views Criterion requires that:

(i) the proposed influence entails an attempt to re-dress an imbalance in the public deliberations around a controversial issue that has implications for the just distribution of social values, and

(ii) the apparently unjust distribution underlying the deliberations may be perpetuated by the extant child-raising practices.

Where these conditions are satisfied the attempt must be evaluated in terms of the Multiple Views Criterion. The Multiple Views Criterion stipulates that an attempt is defensible where:

(a) the perspective being introduced into the public consideration relates to what appears to be a more just distribution of social values, and
(b) an understanding of the various perspectives is likely to contribute to a deeper understanding of the issue.

The Multiple Views Criterion is invoked where it is reasonable to claim that the attempted influence will likely serve to advance the ongoing deliberations of the public forum on an issue related to the functioning of the social arrangement. The Multiple Views Criterion is only applied to attempted influences which seek to promote a particular perspective on controversial issues where there are other, competing perspectives already being promoted through public education. The Multiple Views Criterion can serve as an alternative for judging the legitimacy of the anticipated impact of attempted influences which appear to interfere with the extant child-raising processes and to produce benefits for the advocates. In other words, the anticipated impact can be judged as defensible in terms of either the Justice Criterion and the Non-Exclusionary Benefits Criterion, or in terms of the Justice Criterion and the Multiple Views Criterion.

(iv) Revisions to the Feasibility Criterion

The last aspect of the evaluation framework which needs adjustment prior to evaluating attempted influences at the case-level is the scope of the Feasibility Criterion. As noted in Chapter 5, the feasibility of achieving the anticipated impacts of an attempt is directly related to the willingness of teachers to implement the practices implicit
in the attempted influence. Dependence on the willingness of teachers, taken to the extreme, means that the mere possibility of unreasonable resistance to change within the teaching profession is sufficient to raise doubts about the feasibility of every attempted influence. I took the position in Chapter 5 that, at some point, the duty of the state to protect citizens from unjustified interferences and predictable harms must override the possibility of unreasonable resistance to implementation of change. This serves as a reference point for what can realistically be considered within the scope of the feasibility of attempts to influence public education policy achieving their anticipated impacts.

The argument for defining the scope of the Feasibility Criterion is based on the state's duty to exercise its teaching power for the sake of its citizens. The state has a prima facie duty to protect its citizens. One way the state protects its citizens is by ensuring that children are prepared for citizenship. Thus, pursuit of the child-raising goal of public education is a manifestation of the state's efforts to carry out that duty. 73 Where the exercise of the state's legitimate power to direct the raising of children

73 Tussman has labelled this the teaching power of the state. "The teaching power is the inherent constitutional authority of the state to establish and direct the teaching activity and institutions needed to ensure its continuity and further its legitimate general and special purposes." (Tussman, J. 1977. 54)
is systematically blocked under the guise of the authority of the state, the state has an unequivocal obligation to intervene. In other words, persistent use of teaching practices that work against achievement of the child-raising goal of public education is a blatant abuse of the state's power. The state has the authority and the duty to intervene in order to protect the students of recalcitrant teachers.

The upshot is that the state must act to remedy the effects of inaction by recalcitrant teachers. However, those engaged in the determination of the legitimacy of attempts to influence public education policy at the fringes of the formal policy-making process may not have the authority to exercise the teaching power of the state, especially when it comes to remedying the effects of inaction by recalcitrant teachers. What has not been made clear to this point is who has the responsibility for establishing the linkage between the determination of the legitimacy of an attempted influence, the failure of teachers to implement, and the initiation of the state's remedial actions.

For the purposes of this paper I am stipulating that this responsibility is shared between the advocates and the evaluators of the attempt. In other words, exercising the right to promote a change in policy or the right to participate in the evaluation of attempts to influence
public education policy invokes the concomitant duty\textsuperscript{74} to inform the authorized public education policy-makers of any influence deemed defensible because it improves the potential for achieving the child-raising purpose of public education. It is important to note that this duty only applies in relation to attempts directed at the primary purpose of public education - child-raising.\textsuperscript{75}

Once informed, the duty to deal with recalcitrant teachers must be exercised by those authorized to exert the state's power to teach. To reflect this adjustment Decision Frame \#3 becomes:

\textbf{Decision Frame \#3 - Feasibility Criterion (revised)}

The anticipated impacts of the attempted influence must also be evaluated in terms of the Feasibility Criterion:

\textsuperscript{74} Most promoters see informing the authorized policy-makers as an integral part of their attempt to influence. However, some promoters believe that the authorized policy-makers will override the judgments of the evaluators at the fringe and block implementation of their influence. While promoters may choose which 'door' to use to establish the legitimacy of their attempt, once it has been deemed defensible they must let the authorized policy-makers know what they are doing.

\textsuperscript{75} The implication of this limit is that the state's teaching power can only be invoked by those at the fringes of the policy-making process to enforce attempted influences judged as satisfactory in terms of the Primary Purpose Criterion or the Long-Term Benefits Criterion.
The Feasibility Criterion stipulates that achievement of the anticipated impacts of the proposal must at least appear possible as a result of implementation of the proposed influence. In particular, there must appear to be a causal relationship between the actions inherent in the proposal and the anticipated impact of the attempt. In addition, successful implementation of the influence can not depend on the authorized policy-makers being unaware of the value of the attempted influence in terms of its effectiveness in achieving the child-raising purpose of public education.
PART 2

SUMMARY OF PART 2

Before proceeding to case-level evaluations, the revised categorization scheme and the revised framework need to be summarized.

CATEGORIZATION SCHEME

The first step in the evaluation of attempts to influence public education policy is to place the attempt in the appropriate category. There are six general categories, three with sub-categories, and each with a placement test as follows:

**Student Interest Sub-Categories Placement Test**

1. Is the intention of the advocates to make childhood per se more like what it ought to be?
2. Is the probable effect of adopting the influence to make childhood per se more like what it ought to be?

If the answer is yes to both questions, and
3. If the advocate is a student, the attempt fits into the Student Advocated Student Interest Sub-category.
4. If the advocate is not a student, the attempt fits into the Non-Student Advocate Student Interest Sub-category.

**Pedagogy Interest Category Placement Test**

1. Is the attempt grounded in unique insights which can only be acquired by reflection on the actual practices of teaching?
2. Is the anticipated impact of the influence more effective achievement of the extant goals of public education?

If the answer is yes to both questions, the attempted influence fits into the Pedagogy Interest Category.
Merchandising Interest Sub-Categories Placement Test

1. Is the attempt directed at influencing public education policy in any way that will promote the purchase of the advocate’s goods or services rather than someone else’s?

If the answer is yes, and
2. The advocates are not open to having the public scrutinize any aspect of their attempt, the attempted influence fits into the Closed Merchandising Interest Category.
3. The advocates are open to having the public scrutinize any aspect of their attempt, the attempted influence fits into the Open Merchandising Interest Sub-category

Image Interest Category Placement Test

1. Is the attempt directed at promotion of the advocate’s image by association with the positive aspects of public education?
2. Is adoption of the influence completely independent of the purchase of any goods or services required for public education?

If the answer is yes to both questions, the attempted influence fits into the Image Interest Category.

Single-Issue Interest Category Placement Test

1. Are the advocates content to function within the context of a pluralist democracy?
2. Do the details of the advocates’ view of what a pluralist democratic society ought to be differ in some way from the society as it is?
3. Are the advocates relatively autonomous in their pursuit of the goals implicit in their attempted influence?
4. Is the issue inherent in the attempted influence a recognizable part of the group’s autonomous effort to influence policy in ways that will favour achievement of the group’s overall vision of civic virtue?

If the answer is yes to all four questions, the attempted influence fits into the Single-Issue Interest Category.

School-Subject Interest Sub-Categories Placement Test
1. Is there evidence that the intended effect of the attempted influence is to have a direct effect on a school subject for the purpose of conveying worthwhile knowledge?

2. Is the attempt to influence the school subject grounded in some kind of verifiable insights into the worthiness of the knowledge being promoted?

If the answer to both questions is yes, and
(a) The attempt is directed at preserving some aspect of the extant curriculum, the attempt fits into the Preserving a School-Subject Interest Sub-category.
(b) The attempt is directed at changing some aspect of the extant curriculum, the attempt fits into the Modifying a School-Subject Interest Sub-category.
(c) The attempt is directed at adding something to the extant curriculum, the attempt fits into the Creating Interest Sub-category.
(d) The attempt is directed at eliminating some aspect of the extant curriculum, the attempt fits into the Eliminating a School-Subject Interest Sub-category.

Once an attempt has been placed in a category the evaluation framework must be applied.

REVISED EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

Based on the refinements made to the initial evaluation framework the revised version of the evaluation framework\textsuperscript{76} is as follows:

Decision Frame #1 - Public Scrutiny Criterion (revised)

The level of willingness of the advocates to subject their attempt to influence public education must be evaluated in terms of the Public Scrutiny Criterion.

\textsuperscript{76} See Appendix B for a graphic outline of the framework.
1.0 - Public Scrutiny Criterion

The Public Scrutiny Criterion stipulates that there must be no intentional interference with evaluation of attempts to influence public education by any citizen who can understand the basis for advocate's justification of the attempt. Where the attempted influence and/or its justification are beyond the understanding of most ordinary citizens, the collegial review of the attempt must be public. This is a threshold criterion. Failure to satisfy this criterion justifies dismissal of the attempt without any further consideration.

Decision Frame #2

The second aspect that must be evaluated is the anticipated impact of the proposed influence:

2.0 - Primary Purpose Criterion (revised)

The Primary Purpose Criterion stipulates that attempts to influence that are not related solely to the purpose of child-raising must not interfere in any substantive way with the extant child-raising process as it is being conducted by rational, caring child-raisers. For an attempted influence to interfere in a substantive way there must be evidence that the anticipated impacts of the attempted influence are inconsistent with the generally accepted purposes of child-raising. For the purposes of the application of this criterion the generally accepted purposes of child-raising are to help children develop in such a way that they are able to conform to the expectations within the society while also being able to take advantage of the opportunities that living within that society are claimed to provide.

Where an attempt does not satisfy the Primary Purpose Criterion, the anticipated impacts of the attempt must be re-evaluated in terms of the following supplementary criteria. Anticipated impacts of attempted influences that
do not satisfy the Primary Purpose Criterion must be re-evaluated in terms of the Long-Term Benefit Criterion.

2.1 - Long-Term Benefit Criterion

The Long-Term Benefit Criterion stipulates that interferences with the extant child-raising processes that could effect the children being raised must have a reasonable chance of being compensated for by benefits the children will eventually gain as a result of the influence being adopted. Where the impacts on the extant child-raising process are likely to be balanced by future benefits to the emerging citizens who are in a sense harmed in the short-term by the disruption, the anticipated impacts of the influence are defensible.

The Long-Term Benefit Criterion can override the failure to meet the Primary Purpose Criterion. Where the anticipated impacts do not satisfy the Long-Term Benefit Criterion, they must be re-evaluated again in terms of the Justice Criterion and the Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion. Application of the Justice Criterion requires that the attempted influence focuses on remedying what is claimed to be an unjust distribution of social goods. Where this pre-requisite condition is satisfied the attempt must be evaluated in terms of the Justice Criterion.
2.2a - Justice Criterion

The Justice Criterion stipulates that an attempt to adjust an unequal distribution of social values by re-shaping the society through public education must be balanced by evidence that the anticipated impacts will result in a more just society. In particular, the anticipated impact is to everyone's advantage.\textsuperscript{77}

In the second set of supplementary criteria in the second Decision Frame, the anticipated impacts of the attempted influence must be evaluated in terms of the Non-Exclusionary Benefits Criterion or the Multiple Views Criterion.

2.2b(i) - Non-Exclusionary Benefits Criterion

The Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion stipulates that the acquisition of benefits by the advocates of a particular influence must not depend on others not gaining the same or related benefits.

2.2b(ii) - Multiple Views Criterion

Application of the Multiple Views Criterion requires that:

(i) the proposed influence entails an attempt to re-dress an imbalance in the public deliberations around a controversial issue that has implications for the just distribution of social values, and

(ii) the apparently unjust distribution underlying the deliberations may be perpetuated by the extant child-raising practices.

Where these conditions are satisfied the attempt must be evaluated in terms of the Multiple Views Criterion. The

\textsuperscript{77} 'Being to everyone's advantage' is to be understood as being to the direct advantage of the least favoured without harming others to the point that they are less well-off than they would be if there was an equal distribution of the social goods.
Multiple Views Criterion stipulates that an attempt is defensible where:

(a) the perspective being introduced into the public consideration relates to what appears to be a more just distribution of social values, and

(b) an understanding of the various perspectives is likely to contribute to a deeper understanding of the issue.

Taken together, either the Justice Criterion and Non-Exclusionary Benefit Criterion or the Justice Criterion and the Multiple Views Criterion can override the Primary Purpose Criterion. Passing one of these pairs of criteria signifies that the anticipated impacts of an attempted influence are defensible because they appear to be directed at the society-shaping goals of public education in a reasonable way.

**Decision Frame #3 - Feasibility Criterion (revised)**

The anticipated impacts of the attempted influence must also be evaluated in terms of the Feasibility Criterion:

The Feasibility Criterion stipulates that achievement of the anticipated impacts of the proposal must at least appear possible as a result of implementation of the proposed influence. In particular, there must appear to be a causal relationship between the actions inherent in the proposal and the anticipated impact of the attempt. Recalcitrant teachers are only considered an insurmountable obstacle where there is evidence that the advocates and evaluators of the influence are unwilling or unable to communicate to the authorized policy-makers the value of the attempted influence in terms of its effectiveness in achieving the child-raising purpose of public education.
This concludes the category-level evaluation of attempts to influence public education policy. As was found in Chapters 4 to 9 above, not all of the criteria in the framework need to be applied in every case. Simply placing an attempt in a category determines whether or not it passes some of the criteria. Part 3 consists of the evaluation of five attempts to influence public education policy using a combination of the revised categorization scheme and the revised evaluation framework.
PART 3

CASE-LEVEL APPLICATION OF THE FRAMEWORK

PREAMBLE

The evaluation of attempts to influence public education at the individual case-level is done in two steps. First, using the process for categorizing set out in Chapter 10 Section A, the attempt is placed into the appropriate category. Once categorized, the attempt is evaluated in terms of the relevant criteria in the evaluation framework.

A. THE ABBREVIATED CASE-LEVEL FRAMEWORK

While the category-level evaluations in Chapter 4 to 9 did not provide the wherewithal to make conclusive judgments concerning the legitimacy of every attempt to influence public education policy, they can be used, based on the categories, as the basis for some assumptions about attempts. Those assumptions can be integrated into the case-level evaluation of attempts to influence in a systematic way, by creating an abbreviated version of the evaluation framework. This abbreviated framework is described in this section. It is the framework I use in the case-level evaluations in Chapter 11.
(i) Evaluating Cases Motivated by Image Interests

The most straightforward assumption from category-level evaluations relates to attempts which fit into the Image Interest Category. Any attempt which fits into the Image Interest Category can be dismissed as not defensible, simply on the basis that the attempt fits into that category.

(ii) Evaluating Cases Motivated by Merchandising Interests

A similar assumption can be made about attempts which fit into the Closed Merchandising Interests Sub-category. In other words, attempts to influence public education in order to support the merchandising of products or services required for use in the public education which are not completely open to public scrutiny can be dismissed as not defensible.

However, if an attempt fits into the Open Merchandising Interest Sub-category, the same assumption does not apply. The evaluation of attempts which are open to public scrutiny requires the application of only two criteria - the Long-Term Benefits and Feasibility criteria. First, there must be evidence that the anticipated long-term impact of adoption of the influence is a significant benefit in terms of the child-raising goals of public education for the students. Second, open attempts to merchandise must satisfy the Feasibility Criterion. Attempts which fit into
the Open Merchandising Interests Sub-Category and satisfy the Long-Term Benefits and Feasibility criteria are defensible attempts to influence public education policy.

(iii) Evaluating Cases Motivated by Pedagogy Interests

The evaluation of attempts which fit into the Pedagogy Interests Category also requires evaluation in terms of specific aspects of only two criteria - the Public Scrutiny and Feasibility criteria. First, to satisfy the Public Scrutiny Criterion, there must not be evidence of resistance on the part of the advocates to scrutiny by anyone who can at least understand the standards the advocates use to justify their attempt. The Public Scrutiny Criterion still serves as a threshold that must be crossed before the legitimacy of an attempted influence is considered further. Second, to satisfy the Feasibility Criterion it must be reasonable to assume that the teaching power of the state will be exercised where necessary to remove the risk of recalcitrant teachers failing to implement the change. For the teaching power to be invoked, the advocates, evaluators and implementers of an influence must convey, to those involved in the formal adoption and enforcement of public education policy, the significance and indicators of non-adoption of the influence. Therefore, for an attempt which has been placed into the Pedagogy Interest Category to satisfy the Feasibility Criterion, it must be reasonable to assume that there will be sufficient flow of information
from the informal fringes to the authorized core of the policy-making process to ensure that the teaching power will be exercised when required.

Where an attempt to influence public education which fits into the Pedagogy Interest Category satisfies the Public Scrutiny and Feasibility criteria in these specific areas, it is a defensible attempt.

(iv) Evaluating Cases Motivated by Student Interests

Based on the category-level evaluation of attempts which fit into the Student Interest Sub-categories, the assumptions that can be made about individual attempts in these sub-categories can be translated into some short-cuts and adjustments in the application of the three Decision Frames. First, the order of application of the criteria in the second Decision Frame is re-arranged for the evaluation of attempts in the Student Advocate Student Interest Sub-category. In particular, the Non-Exclusionary Benefits Criterion becomes a threshold criterion and must, therefore, be applied first. Then the threshold of the Public Scrutiny Criterion is applied. If an attempt passes this two-part threshold, the next step is to evaluate the anticipated impact of the influence in terms of either the Justice Criterion or the Long-Term Benefits Criterion.

If an attempt fits into the Non-Student Advocate Student Interest Sub-category, the evaluation starts with
the Public Scrutiny Criterion and then moves to the second Decision Frame. Any attempt by a non-student motivated by student interests satisfies the Non-Exclusionary Benefits Criterion by definition of the sub-category. However, complete evaluation of the anticipated impact of an influence in this sub-category can only be established at the case-level.

The evaluation in terms of the Feasibility Criterion of attempts motivated by student interests is the same for both sub-categories. At the category-level, it was established that satisfaction of the Feasibility Criterion was related to the probable scope of the public scrutiny. However, the probable scope of public scrutiny can only be established at the case-level. Application of the Feasibility Criterion to individual attempts motivated by student interests involves determining if it is reasonable to assume that the attempt will be scrutinized by individuals who understand child-raising from a child-centered perspective. As with attempts in the Pedagogy Interest Category, the issue of the recalcitrant teachers must also be dealt with. Attempts which satisfy this abbreviated version of the evaluation framework are defensible attempts.
(v) Evaluating Cases Motivated by School-Subject Interests

The number of assumptions arising from the category-level evaluation of attempts which fit into the School-Subject Interest Sub-categories is limited. Any attempt which is motivated by school-subject interests must be evaluated at the individual case-level in terms of openness to scrutiny. In particular, there must be evidence that the attempt is open to scrutiny by those who can at least understand the standards used by the expert-advocates to justify the claim.

A set of sub-categories for attempts motivated by school-subject interests was described in Chapter 10. These subcategories follow from the need to highlight certain features of the attempts in order to focus application of the second Decision Frame on the critical aspects of the attempt. In particular, to apply the Primary Purpose Criterion we must know the relationship between the direction of change, if any, imbedded in the proposed 'school-subject' and the direction of change, if any, that can reasonably be anticipated for the extant child-raising processes. For example, if it is reasonable to assume that the extant child-raising processes are likely to remain static in the areas relevant to the attempted influence, an attempt to modify the curriculum would probably not satisfy the Primary Purpose Criterion. On the other hand, an attempt to preserve the curriculum would. The same kind of thing
happens with the application of the Long-term Benefits Criterion.

The sub-categorization of attempts motivated by school-subject interests is not sufficient to establish the legitimacy or the feasibility of the anticipated impacts of attempts in any of the School-Subject Interest Sub-cATEGORIES. The relationship between the direction of change implicit in the proposal for the 'school-subject' and the extant child-raising practices can only be identified at the individual case-level. In other words, attempts motivated by school-subject interests must be evaluated in terms of all three Decision Frames of the revised evaluation framework, including the Multiple Views Criterion where necessary.

(vi) Evaluating Cases Motivated by Single-Issue Interests

Likewise, there are no short-cuts for the individual case-level evaluation of attempts which fit into the Single-Issue Interest Category. All three Decision Frames of the revised evaluation framework must be applied in order to determine whether or not a particular attempt is defensible.
CHAPTER 11
EXAMPLES OF CASE-LEVEL EVALUATIONS

A. INTRODUCTION

Using the relevant parts of the abbreviated evaluation framework outlined in the preceding section, the legitimacy of individual attempts to influence public education policy can be established at the case-level. To get a sense of how teachers and others at the fringes of the formal policy-making process might use this framework, five examples of attempted influence are considered.

There is no shortage of examples of attempts to influence public education policy.\(^78\) The diversity among attempts by autonomous groups to influence public education illustrates the complexity of public education policy-making in a modern pluralist democracy. The examples that have been selected provide evidence of the pressure placed on teachers and others at the fringes of the formal policy-making structure. The five examples are intended to provide an

\(^{78}\) These examples have been taken from a variety of sources. It is not unusual to find this kind of item in mass media publications. Moon documents the public media coverage in the Netherlands as a part of his analysis of the Math curriculum controversy (Moon 1986) with citations from seventeen newspapers. Hibler examines the extent of corporate involvement in Canadian classrooms in "Classroom Commercials" CANADIAN CONSUMER (September/October, 1991 v.21 no. 9&10) - and so on.
opportunity to explore the question: Does the evaluation process set out in this paper improve the potential for those judgments made by teachers and others at the fringes of the formal education policy-making process to be reasonably consistent with the overall goals of public education in a modern pluralist democracy? The examples are considered in the order of the first five categories in the abbreviated evaluation framework set out in the preamble to Part 3.

B. EXAMPLE #1 (RONALD MCDONALD’S READING PROGRAM)

... consider what’s starting to happen in Nanaimo elementary schools. Ronald McDonald is showing up in regular classes to instruct youngsters to read.... A few totally misguided parents have raised some questions about this, asking school officials whether it is entirely appropriate to have such blatant advertising by one of society’s great polluters.... The school spokesmen take refuge in vague comments about how good the McDonald’s reading program (a small comic book) really is (The Nanaimo Times 89-11-30).

The first step in the evaluation of this attempt by McDonald’s fast food chain to have their ‘reading program’ adopted in Nanaimo schools is to place the attempt into a

79 Because there are no short-cuts for the evaluation of attempts which fit into the Single-Issue Interest Category, the application of the framework is a duplication of the category-level evaluations. Attempts in this category are extremely varied, reflecting the full range of issues that are advanced by citizens in a modern democracy. Consideration of a single example of an attempt motivated by single-issue interests would not give an accurate sense of how the framework works for attempts in this category. Therefore, the exploration of the use of the framework in this category is left for future investigation.
category. Categorization involves an analysis of the claims made by the advocates in terms of the placement tests outlined in Chapter 10.

The McDonald's executives characterize their attempt as motivated by both student interests and pedagogy interests. They see their proposal as evidence of good corporate citizenship. Their proposal starts from the assumption that schools fail to teach reading. The McDonald's Reading Program is intended to save children from the incompetence of teachers who are unable to teach them to read. In other words, according to the advocates the attempt is motivated, at least in part, by student interests.

The promoters of the McDonald's reading program also claim that their program is a model of effective pedagogy. In other words, when teachers see the McDonald's reading program work, they will see teaching strategies that they should adopt. Again, based on the assumption of failure of the schools and incompetence of the teachers, the advocates claim that this attempt is also motivated by pedagogy interests.
Finally, the advocates of this version of the adopt-a-school program are seeking a fundamental change in the way schools are perceived in our society. In particular, they are seeking to have schools adopt the strategies that make private sector corporations such as McDonald's successful enterprises. In other words, the notion of success through competition and encouragement of the independent entrepreneurial spirit is being promoted as a model for public education policy. This indicates the possibility that this attempt is motivated by a single-issue interest.

Before it is possible to categorize this attempt, we need to consider what the McDonald's reading program actually looks like. Gift certificates for two-for-one purchases at McDonald's are provided to reward students who do the activities in the program. The content of the program relies on the characters used in the promotion of the business. Ronald McDonald, the Golden Arches and other characters from McDonald's advertising campaigns are featured. The promoters of the McDonald's reading program claim that these symbols are, in a sense, already a part of our civic consciousness. In other words, according to the promoters of the program, the extensive use of these symbols

80 "Most companies involved in Adopt-a-School and other partnerships with America's schools mean well. Along with the Business Roundtable, they believe that 'How well we educate all of our children will determine our competitiveness globally, our economic health domestically and our communities' character and vitality.'" (The Economist 90-01-13)
in the reading program is not advertising because the students already know what the symbols represent. This is just an attempt to use these common symbols to engage students in the reading process. But would McDonald’s support the same reading program if it was re-designed without those images? It seems clear that McDonald’s corporate involvement in this program is contingent on the display of those symbols. In other words, there is evidence that McDonald’s attempt to have their reading program accepted for use in certain classrooms is directed, at least in part, at the promotion of the McDonald’s image by association with the positive aspects of public education. Furthermore, McDonald’s is not in the business of merchandising products or services that are required for public education.

The question is: Given the mix in interests that appear to be motivating this attempt, which category should it be placed into? The advocates’ underlying assumption that children are not learning to read provides the clue as to the real motivation for this program. There is no question that there are children who do not learn to read. There is no question that there are teachers who do not know how to teach reading. A case can even be made that there are schools which fail miserably in this task. If McDonald’s focussed their attempt to introduce their reading program in those schools and classrooms, then the argument that their
attempt was motivated by student, pedagogy and even single-
issue interests would seem reasonable. However, as reported
in the Nanaimo papers, McDonald's has introduced the program
into schools with a good record of teaching children to
read. These are schools in middle class neighbourhoods where
there is ample evidence of parent support for children's
learning. It so happens that there is good reason to believe
that the views of the children in these schools can
influence the level of patronage of the three McDonald's
outlets in the area. This is compelling evidence that the
introduction of the McDonald's reading program in the
Nanaimo schools is motivated by image interests. Finally,
given the tone of the Nanaimo Times report, there is
evidence of significant resistance to any kind of public
scrutiny of McDonald's attempts to gain access to Nanaimo
classrooms. What is of real concern is that this resistance
to public scrutiny is being perpetuated by the authorized
policy-makers.

How should a teacher evaluate the legitimacy of
McDonald's attempt to gain her consent to fill her classroom
with the McDonald's reading program? After all, the
authorized policy-makers in the school district have
endorsed its use. Based on the placement of the attempt in
the Image Interest Category, she should dismiss McDonald's
attempt as not defensible. Dismissing it as not a defensible
attempt means that it is not worth any further
consideration. It also implies that, if the authorized policy-makers have accepted the McDonald’s reading program for implementation in classrooms, the teacher-evaluator or the objecting parent has grounds for challenging that endorsement.

C. EXAMPLE #2 (WRITERS-IN-SCHOOLS PROGRAM)

A Nanaimo school principal displays a letter from a Prince George writer of children’s books in the staff room. The writer is seeking an invitation to visit the school and give a reading of her latest book. She states:

I have been contracted by the Greater Victoria Public Library to give a series of readings as a part of their Writers-in-the-Library Program. This program is funded by the B.C Provincial Secretary to help B.C. authors promote their books. In order to make my trip worthwhile and also to provide me with the chance to do a little travelling on Vancouver Island, I am looking for schools who will invite me to give readings. All costs of my visit can be covered by the Canada Council. The school just needs to apply. I believe that it is very beneficial for young children to meet professional writers. It makes the importance of writing come alive. It also helps children realize their potential as writers....

The first step in evaluating this writer’s attempt to get access to the school is to place it into a category. The writer is selling a service, namely a performance where she reads her works. She suggests that this service will help the school achieve some of the important goals of the Language Arts curriculum. She expects to profit from the

81 This example has been fabricated from information collected from the District Resource Centre Coordinator (SD#68), Assistant Director of Public Services (Vancouver Island Regional Library) and teachers involved in a visiting-writers program.
transaction. Therefore, it seems reasonable to check if the writer's attempt to get the school to invite her to read fits into the Merchandising Interest Category.

For an attempt to fit into this category there must be evidence that the attempt is directed at promoting the purchase of the advocate's service rather than someone else's. Canada Council funding regulations limit the number of readings a school can get in a year. In other words, the writer's attempt is directed at getting access to benefits that will be exclusive to her in the case of this school. Therefore, the attempt fits the Merchandising Category. However, given the tone of the letter, the writer is open to public scrutiny of her attempt. Therefore, her attempt to have the school invite her for a reading fits into the Open Merchandising Interest Sub-category.

Attempts which fit into the Open Merchandising Interest Sub-category must be evaluated in terms of the Long-Term Benefits Criterion and the Feasibility Criterion. To satisfy the Long-Term Benefits Criterion, there must be evidence that the anticipated impact of the proposal will probably produce a significant benefit in the long-term for students. Those benefits must be in terms of the child-raising goals of public education. The children's author claims that her readings will help students gain the confidence necessary to become effective written communicators. That is clearly a future benefit for the
students and it is directly connected to the child-raising
goals of public education. While it is not certain that
every child will gain confidence as a result of this
experience, it is reasonable to claim that some children are
likely to gain more confidence as writers as a result of
meeting a professional writer. Therefore, achievement of the
anticipated impact as a result of adoption of this writer’s
proposal is feasible.

Teachers who received a copy of this letter could
justify taking the position that this writer’s attempt to
influence what they do is defensible. In other words, they
cannot simply dismiss her attempt out-of-hand. They must
have good reasons for not adopting her proposal. For
example, they may decide that the writer’s request does not
fit into the school’s schedule. They may decide that there
are other, more effective ways to give students confidence
as writers. They may feel that although the Canada Council
will pay travel and stipend expenses, the hidden costs in
terms of staff time and lost teaching time cannot be
justified. What they cannot do is to simply dismiss the
writer’s attempt to influence what they do as not defensible
and, therefore, not worth considering.
D. EXAMPLE #3 (REPORT CARD FORM)

An instructor of a course on Classroom Assessment in an Elementary Teacher Pre-Service Education Program is passing a copy of a 'locally developed' report card from Halfmoon Bay School around to colleagues, students in his course and teachers in the Nanaimo schools. The instructor is trying to encourage teachers to look critically at the forms they are using to report to parents.

Every year this instructor spends time in his course highlighting the problems teachers have using the provincially authorized primary report card form. The points he raises are based on what teachers have told him and on his research into parent reactions to the form. The instructor always concludes this section of his course by suggesting to his students that teachers should work to have the form changed. After several years this attempt to get teachers to take action has paid off:

A former student contacted the instructor on behalf of the primary teachers at Halfmoon Bay School. She recalled the instructor's exhortations to act rather than suffer in silence with the authorized form. The primary teachers at her school wanted suggestions on how to reduce the time needed to write anecdotal reports. The instructor suggested that the teachers re-design the provincially authorized primary report card form. The instructor reminded the former student that she must have the school board pass a motion approving their locally-developed report card form. The former student led the team of teachers in the re-design of the primary report card and got board authorization to use it. The teachers tried the form out on some parents who re-acted very favourably to the new form.

The first step in evaluating this attempt is to fit it into a category. The instructor's attempt is grounded in his analysis of teachers' experiences with various forms of reporting to parents. In other words, his attempt is grounded in special insights into the operation of schools. However, the instructor is not trying to change the goals of
public education. He is advocating changes directed at improving the quality of written communication between teachers and parents. Therefore, the instructor's attempt to influence how teachers report to parents through his course can be placed into the Pedagogy Interest Category.

From the abbreviated case-level evaluation framework, attempts which fit into the Pedagogy Interest Category only need to be evaluated in terms of the Public Scrutiny Criterion and Feasibility Criterion. To satisfy the first, the attempt must be open to public scrutiny with a rider included to overcome the concerns of expert advocates who are reluctant to have their attempt subjected to the scrutiny of non-experts. The rider is not needed in this example. There is ample evidence of openness. The instructor makes certain that those adopting his suggestions realize that they must get the approval for the new forms from the school board and, perhaps the most crucial audience, the parents. The instructor also encourages teachers who take up his suggestion to report their experiences by publishing articles in their professional newsletters. Based on these observations, his attempt clearly satisfies the Public Scrutiny Criterion.

Using the abbreviated evaluation framework, attempts which fit into the Pedagogy Interests Category must also satisfy a special version of the Feasibility Criterion. According to this version of the Feasibility Criterion, it
must be reasonable to assume that the state has access to the information required to exercise its teaching power in order to deal with recalcitrant teachers who resist adoption of an influence that is clearly in the best interests of good pedagogy. In particular, there must be evidence that those who are aware of the value of the influence, if it is adopted, will be in a position to convey the significance of the influence to those authorized to enforce public education policy. The teachers who asked for suggestions from this instructor were reminded of the need to get board approval before the revised report card is even piloted. In other words, the teachers served notice to the authorized policy-makers that they see this change as worth exploring. An initial link between the teachers and the authorized policy-makers is in place. In short, there is evidence that, if this instructor's views on report forms prove to be a significant improvement on the present forms, those responsible for the enforcement of public education policy will have been informed of the significance of the innovation. The attempt by this instructor satisfies the adapted version of the Feasibility Criterion.

Based on the application of the abbreviated evaluation framework to this attempt to influence the form of written reports to parents, the attempt is defensible. In other words, it is legitimate for the instructor to persist with his attempts to convince teachers that they should explore
ways to change the report form and to seek permission to have their locally designed forms approved for use. While there may be times when boards refuse to give approval, that does not reduce the legitimacy of the attempt.

E. EXAMPLE #4 (SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM)

A group of single mothers in a low socioeconomic neighbourhood in Nanaimo banded together to convince the staff in their children’s school that there should be a lunch program in the school. Most of the mothers saw this simply as an attempt to improve the chances for their children to succeed in school. However, one mother argued in an essay for a political philosophy course at the local college that the action being taken by this group was part of a much larger struggle related to making the society more just.82

To categorize this attempt it is necessary to sort out what appear to be some basic differences in the apparent motivation within this group for promoting the school lunch program. Clearly, some of the group saw improvement in the way children are raised as the motivation for working with this group. In other words, they were motivated by student interests. However, at least one mother saw this action as a part of a much broader movement. She saw the group’s purpose to be to fundamentally change the notion of society’s responsibility to support those who do not have a fair share of the social values of liberty and opportunity, income and wealth, and the other bases of self-respect.

The first step in the categorization of this attempt is to check the lone mother’s theory that this is an attempt which fits in the Single-Issue Interest Category. The first part of the placement test for attempts in the Single-Issue Interest Category concerns the willingness of the advocates, the lone mother in this example, to function within the context of a pluralist democracy. Since there is no evidence to the contrary, it seems reasonable to assume that she saw the struggle for a more just society taking place within the society as it exists. In terms of the second part of the placement test, there is also evidence that the details of her view of what society ought to be differed in some fundamental ways with our society as it is. The third part of the placement test focuses on the independence of the group. The Harewood Community-Enhancement Study Group appears to be a relatively autonomous group. However, it is the fourth part of the placement test that turns out to be decisive. The last question addressed in the Single-Issue Interest Category placement test is:

Is the issue inherent in the attempted influence a recognizable part of the group’s autonomous effort to influence policy in ways that will favour achievement of the group’s overall vision of civic virtue?

The fact that most of the group saw their actions as limited to the issue of a school lunch program means that this attempt as it is being pursued by the group was not
motivated by the single-issue interest of making the society more just as the lone mother indicated in her essay.

The efforts of the Harewood mothers were directed at getting a lunch program in their children's school. The mothers argued that regardless of the home situation, no child should have her ability to learn impaired by lack of proper nutrition. The critical part of the mothers' argument was that their proposal would make childhood per se more like what it ought to be. Based on these points from the placement test for the Non-Student Advocated Student Interest Sub-category, the attempt by the Harewood group to get a school lunch program fits into that sub-category.

Evaluation of an attempt which fits into the Non-Student Advocated Student Interest Sub-category starts with the Public Scrutiny Criterion and then moves to the second and third Decision Frames. The only assumption that can be made on the basis of the category-level evaluation is that the attempt satisfies the Non-Exclusionary Benefits Criterion.

The attempt by the Harewood Community-Enhancement Study Group was open to scrutiny. In fact, the mothers realized that the only way they could have any influence was to establish alliances with other groups such as the school staff, local merchants who would give a deal to the school, public health workers, and local Parent Advisory Committees.
In the process of establishing those connections, the mothers had to justify their attempt. In other words, the attempt was open to scrutiny by others, especially to others who had an interest in the welfare of the children and the neighbourhood.

The intended impact of the lunch program was to make children less reliant on their home situation. Clearly, this implies a change in the extant child-raising practices for at least some children. After all, that is the intent of the proposal. However, the claim is that the disruption is necessary to ensure that children are sufficiently nourished to have a chance of succeeding in school. In other words, the anticipated impact of the proposal is a significant benefit for those children in the future. While the anticipated impact of the attempt does not satisfy the Primary Purpose Criterion, it does satisfy the Long-Term Benefits Criterion.

At the category-level, it was established that satisfaction of the Feasibility Criterion by an attempt in either of the Student Interest Sub-categories was related to the probable scope of the public scrutiny. In particular, there must be evidence that the attempt by the Harewood mothers is likely to be scrutinized by individuals who understand child-raising from a child-centered perspective. As indicated above, there is evidence that the mothers recognized the need for the support of others who are
concerned about the welfare of the children. Based on that evidence, the anticipated impact of the attempt satisfies the Feasibility Criterion.

From the application of the abbreviated evaluation framework, it can be concluded that the Harewood mothers' attempts to get a lunch program were legitimate. Teachers and others involved with the children who were asked to lend support to the mothers' proposal should have treated this as a defensible attempt to influence public education policy. While there may have been reasons for not adopting the influence, the attempt could not simply be dismissed without some kind of justification.

F. EXAMPLE #5 (UBC SCIENCE FACULTY)

The heads of the University of B.C.'s 12 science departments have unanimously censured the education ministry's plan for a revised school system, suggesting it could 'drastically undermine the province's economic growth in scientific and technological fields.'... The 12 department heads passed a resolution saying the new program will have 'severe, immediate and long-range negative effects on education in science and technology,' and individual departments are preparing responses detailing their criticisms. (Vancouver Sun 90-01-10)

Again, the first step is to categorize the attempt. The science department heads were attempting to preserve certain aspects of the extant curriculum. In particular, they were concerned about the education ministry's plan to replace the traditional school science courses of Physics, Chemistry and Biology with a general Science and Technology
course. They were also concerned with the ministry's plan to replace school-based course-work with some kind of work experience program. While their arguments against the proposed changes, at least as they were reported in the popular press, allude to the broader social issue of damage to the economy, the thrust of the department heads' attempt is to preserve school subjects. In other words, there is evidence that the intent is to have a direct effect on school subjects for the purpose of ensuring that worthwhile knowledge continues to be conveyed to students. Furthermore, the fact that the advocates are department heads at a recognized post-secondary education institution makes it reasonable to assume that they have insights gained through study and experience into the worthiness of the knowledge conveyed through the school science curriculum. Finally, their attempt is directed at preserving the school science curriculum and graduation course requirements. Based on these points, the department heads' attempt to stop the education ministry's plans fits into the Preserving a School-Subject Interest Sub-category.

The next step in evaluating the heads' attempt is to look for evidence of resistance to public scrutiny. The fact that the heads' efforts were reported in the press certainly indicates openness to scrutiny. In fact, it would appear that the heads decided to 'go public' with their objections
to the proposed change because they saw public awareness as a necessary part of their strategy to influence policy.

Was it legitimate for the department heads to attempt to exert this influence on public education policy? There are two parts to this question. First, was the anticipated impact of the department heads' proposal defensible? If so, was it reasonable to assume that what they proposed, which was no change to the school science curriculum, could result in those anticipated impacts?

The second Decision Frame is applied in order to determine the legitimacy of the anticipated impacts of adopting the influence. Its application involves an appraisal of the anticipated direction of change in the extant child-raising processes. The question is: Is it reasonable to assume that the extant child-raising processes are going to remain static as they relate to any aspect of the school science curriculum and the replacement of school-based studies with work experience? The education ministry's position is that child-raising processes are changing. Their prediction is self-fulfilling in that the ministry has the power to implement changes in the primary and intermediate levels of the public school system. In fact the reasons for the ministry's proposals for the changes which the department heads were opposing were that the experiences of children at the early school levels were being changed so radically that the senior level program had to follow. The
upshot is that the department heads' attempts do not satisfy the Primary Purpose Criterion.

The department heads' public statement is in terms that indicate a connection with the Long-Term Benefits Criterion. The heads indicated there are two areas where students will likely suffer if the ministry's proposals are implemented, and therefore, will benefit if the heads' influence is followed. The department heads' position was that the present school science curriculum is required to ensure "the province's economic growth in scientific and technological fields." Furthermore, the press release implied that the department heads believe that discipline-based academic study, not a mix of general science study and practical experience is the best way to provide students with the requisite understandings of science and technology in a modern world. In other words, according to the department heads, the anticipated impact of their position would result in significant benefit to the students in the long-term.

At this point an evaluator of the department heads' attempted influence has a decision to make. Is it reasonable to accept the advocates' assumption that the changes in elementary education will be reversed at some point in the future? A prudent evaluator would accept the education ministry's position rather than the university department heads' speculation since the ministry has the authority and
resources to cause the change. By taking this position the evaluator is rejecting the claim that the purpose for this attempt is primarily to advance the child-raising goal of public education.

The attempt must now be evaluated in terms of the society-shaping goal of public education. In other words, are the anticipated impacts of this attempt just in terms of the Justice and Non-Exclusionary or Multiple Views criteria?

Application of the Justice Criterion is complicated by the question of what should be taken as a more just distribution of social values. Given that the present senior secondary school science curriculum clearly discriminates against particular groups of students, a change in the curriculum that made science more available to all students would be a re-distribution that would favour those students who are presently blocked from participating. The ministry contends that students who presently specialize in science at the high school level would simply delay that specialization until post-secondary. More important from the ministry’s perspective, those science specialists would also benefit from a broader education at the high school level.

The university department heads argued that delaying the specialization would not only disadvantage the science specialist student but would eventually harm everyone in the society by impeding economic growth in the technological
sector. In other words the department heads' took the position that providing special advantages for some is to everyone's advantage in the long run. Given the historical precedent for this position, it would be reasonable for an evaluator to decide that this attempt satisfied the Justice Criterion.

The legitimacy of this attempt falters on the next two criteria. Clearly, one of the anticipated impacts that can be associated with this attempt is maintenance of the status quo in the university science faculty. Radical changes to the high school curriculum could eventually have an impact on the structure of the disciplines. A shift in the balance from study in school and work after graduation could also raise some questions about the emphasis placed on academic studies as a preparation for work in the technological fields. For example, if the preparation of engineers was moved from the universities to institutes of technology, the science faculty would have to down-size. The heads' attempt does not satisfy the Non-Exclusionary Benefits Criterion. The advantages that the advocates would acquire as a result of maintaining the status quo in the science curriculum are advantages because no-one else receives them. For example, the department heads at the institutes of technology have smaller departments because of the prevailing view that the discipline-based science background for major groups of professional positions can only be received at universities.
The alternative to satisfying the Non-Exclusionary Benefits Criterion is that the attempt promotes a balanced view. In other words, even if there are special benefits for the department heads, if their influence will result in a more balanced view of science and technology within the society, then it is still a defensible attempt. The department heads' attempt was, in fact, directed at restricting the view of what can be called a study of science. They wanted to see the notion of 'school-science' restricted in two ways. First, they were advocating that only the discipline-based subjects of biology, physics and chemistry be required as a basis for specialization. Second, they were advocating the study of these school subjects without exposure to practical situations where the disciplines are applied. Practical experience, innovation, creative adaptation and reflective practice were not seen by the heads as important. The effect of adoption of the department heads' influence would be to preserve the view that what is important is to learn what has been discovered by others as defined within a very restricted view of what makes up legitimate science. This could not be construed as the promotion of multiple views of our human experience of the physical world. The anticipated impact of adoption of the department heads' attempt does not satisfy the Multiple Views Criterion. As a result, the anticipated impacts of the department heads' attempt to influence public education is not defensible, at least to the extent that it should be
considered for adoption by those at the fringes of the formal public education policy-making process. This is the last attempt to influence public education which will be considered in this paper.
CONCLUSION

In conclusion, in this paper I have established a framework for the evaluation of the legitimacy of attempts to influence public education in a modern pluralist democratic society. I derived the criteria in the framework from the obligation to participate in the promotion of the public good, the right of individuals to self-preservation, the obligations associated with the principles of justice as fairness, and the duty to acknowledge the insights of the 'marketplace of ideas.' The framework is primarily for use at the fringes of the formal educational policy making process.

I contend that only attempts which are judged defensible according to this framework should be considered as the basis for change in public education policy. Once an attempt has been judged defensible, the next step is to decide whether or not it should actually be implemented. This step will take into account considerations such as time and resources available, local community conditions and priorities, and events in the broader society. It is inevitable that there will be attempts which are judged defensible and yet are not implemented. Taken together, the evaluation framework and the decision about whether or not to implement constitute Phase I of the educational change process as described by Fullan (1991, 47).
It is my contention that, if public education is to fulfill its role in a pluralist democracy such as ours, teachers and others at the fringes of the formal policy-making process must base their preliminary evaluations of attempted influences on the points highlighted by the framework explicated in this paper. Focussing on these points will make it more likely that appropriate perspectives from the 'marketplace of ideas' will be incorporated into decisions about how public education will be used to shape our society.
APPENDIX A

SAMPLES OF SINGLE-ISSUE INTERESTS

National and regional United Nations Associations produce and develop materials for use in schools:
- Ghana Kit. Winnipeg: The UN Association, [ud].
- Sri Lanka Kit. Winnipeg: The UN Association, [ud].

The Canadian Cancer Society distributes a variety of materials related to health issues:
- Smoking & Health Kit - Grades 4-6 (1981) Toronto: Canadian Cancer Society.
- Celly - Kid's Best Friend (Health Education Kit) (1979) Toronto: Canadian Cancer Society.

The Canadian Studies Foundation produced a wide variety of materials related to Canadian issues, some of which were intended for use in schools:

The Canadian Red Cross Society has produced a wide range of materials for use in schools:
- First Aid Illustrated, Toronto: Canadian Red Cross Society.

The Canadian Foundation for Economics Education (CFEE) is a privately funded project based in Toronto. The governing board is consists of senior executives from major Toronto-based national and multi-national corporations. The objective of CFEE is to provide materials about the capital-based economic model. The Entrepreneurship Program (1986)
was developed for use in Ontario business education and social studies programs.

The Canadian Co-operative Association (CCA) is a national body supported by co-operative businesses in anglophone Canada. The CCA develops materials about co-operation and co-operatives for use in schools.

Inter Pares developed materials as a part of the Common Heritage Programme:

UNICEF produces and distributes materials such as:

The Vancouver Opera Society Schools Program provides an opportunity for school groups to attend special performances at reduced rates.

The Nanaimo Art Gallery Society mounts special displays such as the National Museum of Canada Killer Whale Show for school groups.

The Insurance Corporation of BC (ICBC) has produced a widely distributed kit to support safety education in BC schools:
The Western Canada Wilderness Committee (WCWC) develops and distributes materials intended to provide a balance to the materials made available by the major forest industry companies:

- **The Magical Earth Secrets.** (1990) Burford, D., Vancouver: WCWC.

Similar materials have been developed by other organizations:

APPENDIX B

Public Scrutiny Criterion:
Is the attempt to influence open to public scrutiny?

[Diagram]

Primary Purpose Criterion:
Is the influence likely to interfere with the extant child-raising?

[Diagram]

Long-term Benefits Criterion:
Is there likely to be compensating future benefits for the child?

[Diagram]

Justice Criterion:
Will the result be a more just society?

[Diagram]

Non-exclusionary Benefits Criterion:
Will there also be benefits which are exclusive for the advocates?

[Diagram]

OR

Multiple Views Criterion:
Will perspectives on important social issues be expanded in ways that are likely to lead to a more just society?

[Diagram]

Feasibility Criterion: Is it reasonable to assume that adoption of the influence will lead to the anticipated impacts?

[Diagram]

DISMISS THE ATTEMPT AS NOT LEGITIMATE

ACCEPT THE ATTEMPT AS LEGITIMATE AND CONSIDER IT FOR ADOPTION
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