

PAPER CODE: PEN01537

Contesting control; playing a political game. Educational research and curriculum development in contexts of constraint.

Paper presented at *The Australian Association for Research in Education conference, Fremantle, Australia, December, 2001.*

DR.DAWN PENNEY

Department of Physical Education, Sports Science and Recreation Management,
Loughborough University, UK.

Address for correspondence:

Dr.Dawn Penney

Department of Physical Education, Sports Science and Recreation Management,

Loughborough University,

Loughborough, LE11 3TU.

UNITED KINGDOM

Tel : + 44 (0)1509 223494 (direct)/ (0)1509 223282 (department)

Fax : +44 (0)1509 223971

e-mail : D.Penney@lboro.ac.uk

ABSTRACT:

Since the Education Reform Act of 1988, in England and Wales we have witnessed the development of a comprehensive array of policy initiatives designed to collectively (re-)establish central government control of the curriculum. Teachers, teacher educators and researchers can all claim to have been marginalised in and by these developments. All are increasingly positioned and portrayed as technicians. Drawing upon experience of undertaking qualitative and ethnographic research that has spanned a decade of policy and curriculum development in physical education, this paper will consider how educational researchers may be proactive in seeking to re-position themselves more centrally in curriculum development work. It will argue that if we are to be more active players in a political game, we need to review and extend established conceptualisations of educational research, and specifically, explore the ways in which power-relations clearly constrain but also enable researchers to actively engage in developments. The politics and ethics of researchers attempting to take a strategic stance in a highly contested curriculum field are discussed.

Acknowledgement :

This paper has been developed from a chapter entitled 'A Player in the Policy Game', forthcoming in "La otra cara de la investigación y la enseñanza" ("The other side on research and teaching"), edited by Alvaro Sicilia Camacho, Universidad de Almería, Spain.

Introduction.

This paper is directed towards the interests of those researchers whose starting point is a desire for their work to make some impact on policy developments and/or responses to policy made by teachers. It is written with a view of research being an active element of, and mechanism for, contesting policy and curriculum developments, in the form of 'official' curriculum documents and curricula and teaching in schools. At the heart of my discussion are matters of politics and power-relations, and in these terms, the context from which the paper arises and in which it is set, is important to note. In 1986 Finch reflected that "... any researcher who aspires to undertake the kind of research which is aimed at policy-makers is likely to meet the expectation that the research ought to be providing objective facts, and consequently will be assigned the role of technician in policy-making, providing 'facts' but no more" (p.196). Ozga's (2000) more recent work highlights that the current context, at least in England, can be regarded as equally inhospitable for critical researchers; "...there is less opportunity to pursue a social science project in research on education policy, and the version of policy analysis is highly instrumental" (p.71), with researchers now "re-cast as entrepreneur" to bid for predefined projects, that typically have a short timespan and in which attention becomes focused upon meeting deadlines and producing the required outputs. The context is one that Ozga views as leaving the "social science / critical theory project in education policy research" notably vulnerable. How we address this vulnerability and specifically, what positions we occupy and what spaces we can explore in policy arenas are issues that I pursue here. They are issues that the government has also signalled an interest in engaging with. In his speech to a meeting convened by the Economic and Social Research Council in February 2000, the then Secretary of State for Education and Employment, David Blunkett expressed the view that "We need to build a genuine partnership and interchange between the worlds of policy and research and this must be based on greater trust" (Blunkett, 2000). More specifically he identified a need for "a mutual recognition that very little research in the social and educational field is or can be entirely value free" and said that "...if we are to reach a better level of communication between researchers and policy makers it is right to expect both researchers and the users of research to be more explicit and self-critical about their underlying assumptions and values" (ibid, 2000).

My focus upon the assumptions and values of researchers and the ways in which these may come to the fore in the course of doing research and '*being a researcher*' (de Laine, 2000) is therefore timely. It is also personal. I write as someone who despite a sustained research focus on the National Curriculum for Physical Education and considerable efforts to ensure widespread dissemination of this work, has always remained at the margins of the policy developments. Several years and two revisions of the National Curriculum after Hammersley (1994) expressed the view that the Education Reform Act of 1988 "certainly throws substantial doubt on the well-foundedness of any optimism researchers may have had about the influence of their work on national policy making in education" (p.139), I find it somewhat disappointing to be regarding Hammersley's comments as still highly pertinent. Doing research and being a researcher has been my means of maintaining access to and engagement with the developments. It has been access and engagement achieved by request rather than by invitation and that as I discuss below, has been clearly limited.

However, it is access that I have also come to view as creating important openings and possibilities for research and a researcher to play an active role in a highly political, complex and openly contested process of policy and curriculum development (see Graham with Tytler, 1993; Penney & Evans, 1999). Exploring the nature of that process in more depth is, in my view, an important starting point for researchers who have particular visions and hopes in relation to policy and curriculum development, in arenas of central or local government and/or in schools. But before discussing the policy process, it is perhaps important to consider our personal standpoints in embarking upon educational research.

Being open about interests.

The question 'why do you want to do this?' is one that may well be overshadowed and inadequately explored in the initial stages of developing research, with attention instead focusing on the 'how, where and when' to proceed with a project. There seems a continuing reluctance to accept that as researchers we can and indeed should acknowledge and actively reflect upon our personal agendas. I suggest that rarely is educational research, and particularly policy research in education, undertaken without strong (even if not explicit) commitments and accompanying interests in instigating or encouraging change. Griffiths (1998) has identified that education is an area of research in which changes are sought at two levels; the individual (personal and ethical) and the collective (public and political), such that "educational research is research which participates in both personal and political changes. In short, educational research not only is action-oriented, but also cannot escape ethical and political issues. Nor should it try to..." (p.67). Yet, as Ozga and Gerwitz (1994) have identified "... on the whole researchers of education policy have tended to be neither explicit nor reflective about the values which inform or inhere their work" (p.122). Reflecting upon the motivations for undertaking research and specifically hopes of 'impact' in arenas of policy and practice seems crucial if we are to acknowledge, and address from the outset, that the act of research is by no means a neutral one. As Jackson (2000) identifies,

Conventionally, of course, the adherence to a committed political position is inconsistent with the neutrality and objectivity that is required of academic inquiry. For others, the suggestion that academics can ever be 'neutral' is in itself untenable, once the relationship between knowledge and power is accepted. While many would accept that there is no contradiction between political commitment and scientific rigour, few would now be prepared to defend the 'neutrality' of social science. (p.55)

Essentially, this is about admitting that we *do* have an agenda - that is personal and inevitably political. It may be an agenda that is embedded within and/or positioned alongside 'other agendas' associated with the research, such as the interests of funding agencies and/or individuals or organisations identified as participants in the research, but it will always be there - and in many instances will be the driving force that retains our commitment to a project. Furthermore, it will shape our perceptions and understandings of what we are investigating (Sparkes, 1992) and how we 'do research' (Travers, 2001).

For me this is and has been about being open in identifying myself as being not merely an educational researcher, but a researcher fundamentally concerned with issues of social justice and equity in education. I am concerned with not only developing understandings of *how* policies and practices have been constructed, but also "why they have been constructed in certain ways, and *who* and *what* categories of individuals benefit from these decisions" (Dewar, 1990, p.74 cited in Sparkes, 1992, p.40); with pursuing the processes by which certain meaning structures become accepted as natural, taken-for-granted, and legitimate and then considering whose interests these represent. But the concern also goes beyond critique. There is a transformative agenda; to engage with actors in the research

settings in ways that will prompt developments that will challenge existing inequities inherent in the established meaning structures, and in the policies and practices arising from them. In this paper I provide illustrations of the ways in which in the context of research conducted in a climate of 'curriculum control', I have pursued this agenda. I discuss my experiences and actions in relation to current conceptualisations of policy, research, the relationship between policy and research, and the strategic possibilities for critical researchers that new conceptualisations of this relationship may offer.

Reconceptualising Policy; Reconfiguring Research.

Throughout the 1990s work in the field of 'Education Policy Sociology' has extended our understandings and advanced our critiques of education policy. It has transformed understandings of policy 'making' and 'implementation'; of the relationships between 'policy' and 'practice' and between those individuals that we have traditionally deemed 'policy-makers' and 'practitioners'. Work such as that undertaken by Stephen Ball and his colleagues (see for example Ball, 1990; Bowe et al, 1992) has not merely deconstructed these relationships, but has presented reconstructions of them. From the viewpoint of policy as a complex, contested and relational process, 'policy and curriculum development' are inextricably linked; the boundaries between 'making' and 'implementation' are blurred and complex, and the process involves many sites and many individuals, both within and beyond education systems (Ball, 1990; Ozga, 2000; Penney and Evans, 1999). Policy, from this standpoint "is more about 'process' than 'product'" (Ozga, 2000, p.2); "...that it is struggled over, not delivered, in tablets of stone, to a grateful or quiescent population" (ibid, p.1).

Educational researchers have recognized that new conceptualisations of policy demand a methodological response. The challenge has been to adopt approaches and to generate designs capable of 'capturing the complexity' and engaging with the many sites, individuals and issues that interact and ultimately shape any particular 'piece of the action'. Thus it has been argued that we need linked investigation of multiple sites and multiple levels of education systems (macro, meso, micro; see Hargreaves, 1986). In addition, it has been emphasised that at all sites and levels, policy and curriculum development has *both* structural and personal dimensions, such that that "...'human agency' must be taken seriously in explanations of policy. But so too, must the context of action within structures and processes located in other sites, or enveloping all of them, and providing the constraints and opportunities for action" (Raab, 1994; p.25). Power-relations, shaped and legitimated by structures inherent to the policy process, have been acknowledged as central in determining the *relative* freedom of any individual operating within that process. Hence, the need for research to engage with both people and the structures that they operate within. As Raab (1994) identified, devising designs, procedures and analysis that embrace these conceptual understandings is no easy task. But even if we succeed in doing so, will it enhance the degree to which our research engages the individuals that we may aspire to influence? In the following section I pursue these issues and suggest that if we are concerned for research to 'have an impact' upon policy and curriculum development in education, we need to reflect further upon whether we have adequately and/or appropriately refined our research designs and procedures. I direct attention to the way in which research and researchers are positioned, but also position and may *re-position themselves* within the policy process and in the context of utilising particular methods.

Power and positions in policy development and policy research. Reviewing the game and adjusting the game plan.

In the course of researching the development and two revisions of the National Curriculum for Physical Education (NCPE) in England, we have documented the politics of policy development in physical education and shown that there has been a legitimate place for

some discourses, but not others (see Evans & Penney, 1995; Penney and Evans, 1999). It has been very apparent that some ideas, some research projects and some researchers, will be welcome in policy arenas relating to physical education, while others will not. This is true throughout the policy process, not only at central government level. Professional associations and physical education departments in schools are no less political and will be similarly selective in the values, interests and research agendas that they feel inclined to support. Not everyone will share a critical researchers' interest in transformative agendas. Whatever sites we choose to focus upon, 'policy influence' will be "a struggle to be heard in an arena where only certain voices have legitimacy at any point in time" (Ball, 1994, p.112). To be heard, ours has to be regarded as a legitimate voice. As indicated, this is in part a matter of values and interests. But it is also about perceptions of research, and of what constitutes a legitimate place and role for researchers in policy and curriculum development. It is these issues that I now turn attention to and in so doing, return to the inherently political nature of both policy development and research in education.

Finch (1986) appears to have been ahead of her time in not only recognising some of the key complexities of policy but also then confronting their implications for the relationship between research and policy. Finch (1986) outlined the inherent shortcomings of a 'rationalist model' in which the anticipation is for research to have a direct input at a specific time and place. She described the alternative conceptualisation of policy and the associated expectations of and for research, as a 'diffuse' model, that "emphasises that the potential for research input comes at many different points in the policy process" (p.151). Her advice to researchers was that they should therefore "... recognize and work within a diffuse and incrementalist policy-making process" (p.156), and specifically look for opportunities "to feed in social science knowledge at different times and with different people aiming at small changes, rather than expecting that a single input of research at a rational moment in the policy process will be effective" (p.156). While we may have developed more sophisticated research designs in response to new conceptualisations of policy and specifically, addressed the need for policy research to encompass multiple sites, and perhaps produce and present 'findings' in different forms for multiple audiences, I question whether policy research has adequately responded to the diffuse and incrementalist nature of the process. In the discussion that follows I argue that we can no longer afford to regard formal output from research, even if in many different forms, as either the only or necessarily the most effective means of seeking to 'feed into' or influence the process. Instead, I suggest that there is a need to see the very act and whole process of 'doing research' as presenting researchers with invaluable opportunities to be active players in the policy process. I argue that the potential for research to 'have an impact' upon thinking and actions will always be limited if we restrict our vision in terms of the *ways* in which, and the *times* at which we legitimately (and ethically, see also de Laine, 2000) look to make that impact.

The Power of Position(s): Participant Observation in Policy Research

As Crow (2000) has observed, "...research has a lot to do with power" (p.69). In arenas of central government, the relative disempowerment of researchers may be particularly acute, such that the opportunities for what Ozga (2000) terms "self-controlled research", that "permits researchers to define their own agendas and their own relationship to policy" (p.76) can be very limited. Access to particular sites and individuals within them is in many instances, something of a luxury to researchers, who are then often also at the mercy of others in terms of the extent and duration of the access. In seeking to gain access to some of the 'policy elite' in physical education in England, I have experienced the constraints imposed upon access in terms of who I have been able to access, where, when, and the role that I have been able to play. In several instances I have been 'allowed' the 'privileged' position of 'an observer' at key meetings held to discuss draft proposals for policy developments. Positioning researchers at the extreme observation end of the participant-

observer continuum (Burgess, 1994) raises interesting issues in relation to our concern with 'impact'. It reflects a rationalist conceptualisation of research, with the expectation that input (or feedback) from research and from the researcher comes *after* research is '*completed*'. In relation to this matter, it is notable that while many qualitative and ethnographic writers have sought to emphasise that we can not, nor should we, draw distinct boundaries between data collection and data analysis (see for example, Burgess, 1984; Hammersley and Atkinson, 1983), there has not been parallel recognition of the need to deconstruct the divisions between the *output from* research that may be capable of influencing thinking and actions, and the *act of* research, during which there may be many instances and many ways in which researchers consciously and deliberately, or inadvertently, can influence thinking and action. From the latter perspective, notions of 'output' and of potential 'impact' are seen as integral to and dispersed throughout the research process. Promoting this perspective amongst critical researchers in educational research seems critical if we have interests in re-positioning research and researchers.

However, as indicated above, limits to our positions may well be set for us in contexts of policy and curriculum development. The 'observer' status granted to me not only reflected a particular conceptualisation of research, but also the political nature of policy development in physical education. My position illustrated that "only certain voices have legitimacy" (Ball, 1994, p.112), or indeed are welcome. The prospect of researchers posing questions about developments, or commenting upon the likely responses to and effects of the proposed developments, is unacceptable in some policy forums. Research and the very presence of a researcher are not regarded as an asset to the policy development process, but rather a (political) threat to its smooth passage. Yet on several occasions I have seen that moves to define (and constrain) a researcher's position do not always leave the researcher incapable to re-defining their position and role. For example, at 'consultation' forums convened to bring together various individuals set to be involved in implementing proposed new requirements for physical education curricula, I have found myself with the opportunity (and the inherent ethical dilemmas) of being able and indeed, invited by other participants, to shift my position on the participant observation continuum. On occasions when teachers and other individuals have been asked to divide into groups to discuss specific issues prior to providing feedback to policy making authorities, I have been acutely aware that the role of silent observer is not conducive to building positive field relations. To remain silent in these instances is to stand apart from those whose views and experiences I have sought to explore, understand, and have also wanted to engage with. In setting ourselves apart we are not challenging rationalist conceptualisations of research and nor, more importantly, are we aiding the development of closer relationships between researchers and those involved in and responsible for policy and curriculum development in education. In several 'consultation' contexts I have been asked for my views upon issues, my understanding of particular proposals and insights that I may be able to provide from my research that can inform debates and discussions. The experiences have demonstrated the demand for researchers to think on their feet and in so doing, make both ethical and inherently political decisions (see also de Laine,2000).

I have not turned by back on these opportunities to 'be more active' within a policy setting and to integrate notions of 'input' and 'impact' in the participant observation role. I have, however, sought to respect the opportunities accorded to me and to therefore always clarify the status of the input that I provide and to balance my own views (or readings of texts) with alternative ones. In many instances the input that I have desired and felt able to pursue, has been to prompt participants to consider other questions to those that have been presented to focus discussion (and thinking). As reflected in my writing, I have been concerned to broaden debates and extend arguably narrow boundaries to discussions about the future development of the subject (see for example, Penney, 1999; Penney and Chandler, 2000). Through questioning (in participant-observation and interview settings, see below) I have

sought to clarify the boundaries to thinking and action that have been set for those involved in the policy and curriculum development process and explore the factors and interests underpinning the boundaries. With teachers particularly, I have been able to encourage critical reflection upon interpretations of policy and exploration of the possibilities that may arise from alternative interpretations. I have pursued with them the various curriculum opportunities that may be created (and legitimated) or alternatively denied by particular readings of policy texts. We have discussed the potential merits and pitfalls of the various responses to the task of implementing new National Curriculum requirements; and the ways in which in their particular schools, with their particular pupils, staff and resources for physical education, they should interpret and best respond to new directives.

Has this been an abuse of (privileged) access?; of my role and responsibilities as a critical educational researcher? Progressively I have grown more comfortable and confident with my position(s) and actions in instances in which there has been the opportunity, sometimes pressure and sometimes invitation, to pose questions and engage in debate. I view the opportunities and my exploration of them as consistent with the shift that we need to make in research if we are to fully engage with the notion of policy development as incremental and diffuse (Finch, 1986). If we accept the complexity, unpredictable and also political nature of policy and curriculum development in education, then I believe that we need to reconsider what constitutes and should constitute 'research input'. Responding to the incremental and diffuse conceptualisation of policy by diversifying the targets for formalised 'input' and seeking to present research findings in a form (and language) to suit different 'audiences' and in ways that seek to represent multiple voices (see Travers, 2001), is a response that may still leave research and researchers in a position of marginality. If we extend our visions of what may legitimately constitute 'research input' and of the times at which this may legitimately occur during the course of research, we then see that there are indeed "a range of possible 'relatively active' roles for the researcher" (Finch, 1986, p.232) in policy and curriculum development settings. Furthermore, they are ones that if we are committed to critical research, we should be committed to pursue. Increasingly I have become aware that the times that many researchers may define as moments of data collection (such as participant observation or interviews) will be the very few instances in which researchers have an opportunity to engage directly with participants, and in so doing, influence thinking and actions. I have seen that opportunities for change are, as Ozga (2000) identifies, "embedded in research", such that they "contribute to its power as an *educational process*, and help to explain why policy makers are so anxious to ensure that research is encountered by teachers only in predictable and limited ways" (ibid., p.70). Researchers who wait for opportunities to formally feed back research findings to participants may be contributing to the limits of the encounters. First, the level of interest in the research and the many other demands upon people's time may preclude feedback being made in person. As soon as we rely upon feedback in a written form, we reduce the chances of dialogue and the chances that those we are seeking to influence *will* engage with our work. Thus, I have come to value the instances in which dialogue has been possible *during* fieldwork. I am aware that not all will agree with my stance and may see my engagement with participants as misplaced and premature. But is it? In pursuing this matter further, I turn attention to the use of interviews in policy research.

The Power of Position(s) : Interviews in Policy Research

Anyone researching policy and/or curriculum development in education will appreciate that participant's time for interviews is scarce, and to be cherished. This is not only a characteristic of arenas of the policy elite but rather, something that is true of all policy settings and particularly schools. In this context, researchers may well feel under pressure to maximise their use of scarce time and to get as much relevant data as possible within that time. While I can sympathise with such feelings I can not support a stance that focuses so

overtly on obtaining from, rather than engaging with and giving to the participants in research. I have seen that policy research is and needs to be about personal relations. If we are concerned for research to have an impact upon those that we are researching, then we need to build and nurture relations. A 'snatch and grab' approach to data collection and research will not achieve this. If research is to be valued and engaged with by participants, it needs to be conducted with them, not merely on them (Griffiths, 1998). For me this demands that we pursue collaborative relationships and therefore, negotiate both our agendas and roles, and respond in ways that embrace participants' interests and needs. This prompts us to also consider the other matters that Griffiths raises; who and what is the research *for*? I began by stressing the need for researchers to be open and reflective about their own interests. Those interests will mean that the research is being conducted for particular purposes, with particular interests and the interests of particular individuals in mind. While never denying nor looking to exclude the researcher's agenda, we always need to foreground participants when we are addressing notions of who and what research is *for*. We can not hope to be welcomed, nor expect our work to be valued if we do not seek to ensure that it responds to the needs and interests of participants. As indicated, this may well demand modifications to our planned design of the research, or particular elements of it, and to the roles that we play in research settings. In a similar vein Barr (2000) has stressed that it is imperative that we enable the articulation of 'views from below', explaining that "This is not because by virtue of being from below they offer truer, more accurate accounts of the world...but because, in identifying and making available spaces where alternative ways of thinking and being can be worked up, such practices increase the possibilities of knowledge - that is, knowledge that is useful to those who generate it" (p.315).

Interviews are the setting in which these interests may well be pursued. The notion of 'interviews as conversations' (Burgess, 1994) and the merits of adopting a relatively unstructured approach to interviewing in qualitative research are widely recognised. Nevertheless, many researchers may still have feelings of doubt and/or discomfort about their own (legitimate) input in these settings. In my own research overcoming these doubts and extending the boundaries to what I see as legitimate input in interview settings has been fundamental to establishing research relations with policy-makers, education advisors and teachers in schools. The continued willingness of these individuals to engage in research is reliant upon establishing and retaining mutual respect. This has been enhanced by a greater willingness on my part (as the researcher) to engage openly in debate about policy and curriculum development issues, to talk through possible courses of action available to those making or implementing policy, and particularly, to work with teachers trying hard to understand and come to terms with the implications of new requirements in their particular circumstances. Taking this approach and taking up the roles of professional colleague and/or critical friend has demanded additional time and energies on my part. On several occasions I have left a school having made a promise and feeling an obligation to search out and return with additional resources or information that would help teachers in their task of implementation. I have done this willingly and with gratitude that I have found a form in which input from research is not only welcome but desired, particularly in contexts in which support and advice for curriculum development in physical education has become a luxury that few teachers have access to (see Evans and Penney, 1994). Furthermore, this has been a way of reciprocating for the time and interest that teachers have given to my research. In what has often seemed an inhospitable context for teachers, and one in which many have felt very remote from policy-makers and excluded from policy decisions, my interest in teachers' views and the insights that I have been able to offer into new developments, have been welcome. Developing these relations and new roles has been a development that in my view has been necessary, desirable and entirely consistent with the commitment and intentions of critical educational research.

Conclusion : To stay in the game we need to change our game.

The experiences that I have described have challenged and extended both my own and many participants' conceptualisations of research. They have demonstrated that "opportunities to connect regularly with relevant research are rare or absent in the working lives of most teachers" (Mitchell, 1999, p.44) but also that the research setting can be one in which teachers and researchers can work together to locate new insights and ideas in the real life contexts of teachers' practice. It is worth pursuing further the opportunities to develop positive relationships and to thereby retain an 'active role' in policy and curriculum development settings, because there are clearly both personal and structural issues at play here. Continued access to research settings is often problematic for many reasons, not least of which is the typically short-term funding available for research (see also Ozga and Gerwitz, 1994). I have been fortunate in managing to retain involvement with particular sites (specifically one Local Education Authority and five schools within it) for ten years, via a combination of various small grants and personal investment in the research in order to retain the continuity. Some of the individuals within the Local Education Authority and some of the teachers have been involved throughout the ten years, enabling us to get to know each other well, as professionals and as people with particular interests in and for physical education, and to develop relations that are collaborative and mutually beneficial. For several reasons it has not been possible for me to develop comparable relationships in other (and particularly 'elite') arenas. In these arenas I continue to feel positioned very much at the margins, struggling for access rather than being invited to participate in policy development. A key issue here is that the policy field in physical education has been (and remains) a changing field, with new sites and individuals becoming influential and others being repositioned in or removed from the action. Thus, while on each occasion that the National Curriculum has been revised I have always been able to return to the same schools, each time I have also faced new government agencies and new 'key figures' within them. My research has extended beyond the period that key figures have held a particular post, and beyond the life of the agency that they have been appointed within.

A changing field and changing players is not an easy context in which to establish sustained and mutually valued relationships that lend themselves to research and researchers having an impact. But neither is a field in which there seems continued scepticism about the need and/or potential value of insights from research and researchers. This again leads me to suggest that there is every reason to utilise the rare opportunities for dialogue that research access and fieldwork provides. If we view policy research as inevitably political, then 'interviews as conversations' need to be recognised as 'political conversations', with inherent potential pitfalls, dilemmas and opportunities for critical researchers. Neal's (2000) reflections on her own silence in interview settings highlight that if we do not explore spaces for dialogue that fieldwork may offer, we may well have lost the only chance that we realistically have to 'be a player in the policy game'. Following Finch (1986) I therefore stress the need to look for a dispersed input to policy and curriculum development, but in particular to recognise that there are opportunities for that dispersal throughout the policy process, not only at a point at which we feel it is 'completed'. In researching 'sites of struggle' we need to develop both the confidence and new research skills to engage in the struggle. In my view this demands greater openness about personal and political commitments, but also enhanced awareness of the opportunities to pursue those commitments in critical research. The difficulties that may be faced when doing so are not denied, nor the pressures to conform to more conformist and politically 'neutral' approaches (see Tooley with Darby, 1998), but they should not deflect us from exploring the potential to engage with policy makers and practitioners in new and perhaps very productive ways. In failing to do so we will be actively reproducing our marginality and the 'isolation' of research and researchers from the audiences we probably most value (see Bassey, 1997, cited in Tooley with Darby, 1998).

REFERENCES

- BALL,S.J. (1990) *Politics and Policy Making in Education. Explorations in policy sociology*. London : Routledge
- BALL,S.J. (1994) Researching Inside the State : Issues in the Interpretation of Elite Interviews. In D.HALPIN & B.TROYNA (Eds.) *Researching Education Policy. Ethical and Methodological Issues*. London : The Falmer Press.
- BARR,J. (2000) Engaging Educational Research. *Discourse : Studies in the cultural politics of education*, 21,3,pp.311-321.
- BLUNKETT,D. (2000) Influence or Irrelevance ? Can Social Science Improve Government ? Research Intelligence, 71,<http://www.bera.ac.uk/ri/no71/ri71blunkett.html>, 26/04/01.
- BOWE,R. & BALL,S.J. with GOLD,A. (1992) *Reforming Education and Changing Schools. Case Studies in Policy Sociology*. London : Routledge
- BURGESS,R.G. (1984) *In the Field : An Introduction to Field Research*. London : Unwin Hyman
- CROW,I. (2000) The power of Research. In D.BURTON (Ed.) *Research Training for Social Scientists*. London : Sage.
- DE LAINE,M. (2000) *Fieldwork, Participation and Practice. Ethics and Dilemmas in Qualitative Research*. London: Sage Publications.
- EVANS,J. & PENNEY,D. (1994) Whatever Happened to Good Advice ? Service and Inspection after the Education Reform Act. *British Educational Research Journal*, 20, 5, pp.519-533.
- FINCH,J. (1986) *Research and Policy. The uses of Qualitative Methods in Social and Educational Research*. London : The Falmer Press
- GRAHAM,D. with TYTLER,D. (1993) *A LESSON FOR US ALL. The Making of the National Curriculum*. London : Routledge
- GRIFFITHS,M. (1998) *Educational Research for Social Justice. Getting off the fence*. Buckingham : Open University Press
- HAMMERSLEY,M. (1994) Ethnography, Policy Making and Practice in Education. In D.HALPIN & B.TROYNA (Eds.) *Researching Education Policy. Ethical and Methodological Issues*. London : The Falmer Press
- HAMMERSLEY,M.& ATKINSON,P.(1983) *Ethnography. Principles in Practice*. London : Routledge
- HALPIN,D.& TROYNA,B. (1994) (Eds.) *Researching Education Policy. Ethical and Methodological Issues*. London : The Falmer Press.
- HARGREAVES,A. (1986) The Macro-Micro Problem in the Sociology of Education. In M.HAMMERSLEY (Ed.) *Controversies in Classroom Research*Milton Keynes : Open University Press.

JACKSON,P. (2000) Race and Racism. In D.BURTON (Ed.) *Research Training for Social Scientists*. London : Sage.

MITCHELL,I. (1999) Bridging the Gulf between Research and Practice. In J.LOUGHAN (Ed.) *Researching Teaching. Methodologies and Practices for Understanding Pedagogy*. London : Falmer Press.

NEAL,S. (1995) Researching Powerful People from a Feminist and Anti-racist Perspective : a note on gender, collusion and marginality. *British Educational Research Journal*, 21,4,pp.517-531.

OZGA,J. (2000) *Policy Research in Educational Settings. Contested terrain*. Buckingham : Open University Press.

OZGA,J.& GEWITZ,S. (1994) Sex, Lies and Audiotape : Interviewing the Education Policy Elite. In D.HALPIN & B.TROYNA (Eds.) *Researching Education Policy. Ethical and Methodological Issues*. London : The Falmer Press.

PENNEY,D. (1999) Physical Education : In Changing Times is it Time for a Change ? *British Journal of Physical Education*, 30,4,pp.4-6.

PENNEY,D. & CHANDLER,T. (2000) Physical Education : What Future(s) ? *Sport, Education and Society*, 5,1,pp.71-87.

PENNEY,D. & EVANS,J. (1999) *Politics, Policy and Practice in Physical Education*. London : E&FN Spon, an imprint of Routledge.

RAAB,C.D. (1994) Where we are now : Reflections on the Sociology of Education Policy. In D.HALPIN & B.TROYNA (Eds.) *Researching Education Policy. Ethical and Methodological Issues*. London : The Falmer Press.

SPARKES,A. (1992) The .Paradigms Debate : An Extended Review and a Celebration of Difference. In A.C.SPARKES (Ed) *Research in Physical Education and Sport : Exploring Alternative Visions*. London : The Falmer Press

TRAVERS,M. (2001) *Qualitative research through case studies*. London: Sage.

TOOLEY,J. with DARBY,D. (1998) *Educational Research. A Critique*. London: OFSTED Publications.

ENDNOTES