

A Feminist and Critical Perspective on Family-Education Partnerships for Gender Equality and Quality Basic Education

By

Miriam E. David
Professor of Policy Studies in Education
Associate Director for HE, ESRC TLRP
Keele University
Keele, Staffordshire ST5 5BG
Email: m.david@keele.ac.uk

**Final draft paper for BEYOND ACCESS SEMINAR Dhaka, BANGLADESH
January 31st 2005** On the Theme of PARTNERSHIPS FOR GENDER EQUALITY
& QUALITY BASIC EDUCATION: AN EXAMINATION OF PLANNING,
TRAINING & EDUCATION

Introduction:

In this paper I shall review critically and reflect upon the wealth of studies on 'partnerships' for gender equality in education in Anglophone and European countries. I shall focus upon studies that have developed around policies and practices for 'family and education' partnerships and consider two sets of studies about the relationships between families and education, namely those such as home-school relations, parental or family involvement or participation in education, either at home or at school, to parental choice, business and community partnerships with schools (Kenway and Bullen, 2003; Buckingham and Scanlon 2003) and secondly some aspects of how teaching and learning or pedagogies have been developed into curricula for parent, personal, social and sex education and family values around notions of lifelong learning especially for women as mothers,. Some of the arguments about families and education have been moral and about the empowerment of women in families, communities and society; others have been economic and about how education is important to the economic development of particular societies and communities, which require the support of families for their achievement. These arguments may pose dilemmas about family and educational responsibilities, especially for women.

Given the wealth of work on these ideas I shall necessarily be selective and illustrative of the diverse and complex ways in which these studies of educational partnerships have developed in relation to changing socio-economic and global contexts and policy or political regimes, what have been called changing forms of governance (Franklin et al, 2003) and especially with respect to neo-liberalism and partnerships for new forms of so-called democratic participation. Drawing on the work that I together with others and colleagues have undertaken (David, 2003a) I take a critical and feminist perspective on the various approaches and how they have developed in relation to the wider context and the development of feminist theories and concepts in relation to gender, family and education. I will also take as a starting point the British literature and where possible, develop connections with wider work from Anglophone and European societies. What can we learn from the voluminous work, largely Anglophone, on aspects of partnerships between families and education;

home and school; and especially the way this work has developed from a feminist and/or critical perspective for developing gender equity in education today and in developing countries?

I argue that feminist work has focussed on understandings of 'the family', and the growing complexities in relation to reconstituted, divorced or co-habiting families, lesbianism and homosexuality, changing conceptions of male and female responsibilities at home, doing the emotional caring work for family and children and in work or public life, notions of masculinities and femininities and how important that is to achieving social and sexual changes in relation to education opportunities and schooling and employment. However, there have been contradictory developments around both definitions of sexual equality or gender equity and education, and implementation strategies around diversity and difference and community involvement or participation. Thus under recent policy regimes for example young women have been both applauded for their outstanding educational achievements, and targeted for special programmes of personal and sex education. Class-based strategies for social change around poverty remain endemic in policy developments although family differences by social class have not been eroded, and little attention has been paid to family change and the growth of female-headed households or lone parent families and changes in relation to migration, ethnicity and/or race and religion. I will conclude with considering the kinds of feminist practices and pedagogies around family/parental educational involvement, home-school relations and gender relations in early childhood and primary education and how these might contribute to the Millennium Development Goals of gender equality in education.

Starting Points: The British Policy Context under New Labour:

In Britain, as an example of a key industrial society, it is now argued that gender equity in education has been achieved: girls, and young women, achieve as well as boys and young men in public examinations such as examinations at the end of secondary education (GCSE and GCE A levels) and at university or in higher education they are equal participants and earn similar degree results (DfES 2004; AUT, 2004; EOC, 2004). Thus it is often argued that there is no longer an issue about women's access to and participation in all levels of education whatever their family backgrounds in terms of social class and ethnicity. Indeed this is particularly the case for girls and women from middle class family backgrounds who have been privileged to benefit from educational opportunities and the problem is seen as one about working class boys' underachievement associated with issues about changing forms of masculinities in relation to wider social and family changes (Arnot et al 1999; Weiner et al 1997).

Indeed, many of the current policy arguments and strategies are about widening participation to higher education in England and Wales on the basis of social class family backgrounds rather than gender and developing new partnerships between families and education, including private and business rather than public, to enhance these. Studies of widening access to higher education on the basis of social class have become central to current government strategies to expand higher education and achieve the goal of fifty percent participation of the age cohort of 18 to 30 year olds by 2010 (White Paper 2003). Diversity and difference in terms of gender, ethnicity or

race and sexual orientation are not considered to be an issue in this particular key policy development to which the New Labour government is committed. Economic growth is predicated upon educational expansion and access to educational and economic resources.

Nevertheless, whilst a notion of gender is now entrenched within legal and political discourse, access to and participation in employment, particularly professional forms of employment, such as politics, the law and medicine, and academic work, may not be equally available to such highly educationally achieving women and little consideration has been given to their personal, social and family identities. Access to forms of professional employment may remain constrained by on the one hand discrimination in the labour market and, on the other, traditional family responsibilities and values, including especially the difficulties of childcare and emotional and social care of home and family (EOC, 2004). In an article entitled “‘Mummy track’ keeps women from top jobs’ (*The Guardian* 30 December 2004 p. 7) it is argued that the latest report from the EOC (2004) shows that ‘the glass ceiling’ continues with a major barrier to women reaching top jobs being that ‘work is organised in a way which assumes people don’t have caring responsibilities’. There is also the question of the quality of care and education that highly achieving women are able to give to their children when they become mothers and the kinds of support, despite their privileged middle class family backgrounds.

However, there are examples of how some women have broken through the ‘glass ceiling’ and managed to achieve senior posts, despite traditional cultures. Typically, however, these are when women do not continue to hold major family and childcare responsibilities and have relatively adult children. The question is whether gender equality in education is for the purposes of individual educational achievement and forms of remunerative employment or even widening access and participation to higher levels of education for access to more highly paid jobs, traditionally known as social mobility. Or is it about wider questions of social and sexual justice and not just social mobility through educational merit but also about forms of social inclusion and social cohesion or community and employment opportunities? What identities do such highly achieving young women develop (Walkerdine, Lucey and Melody 2001) and furthermore what identities do such highly achieving women give to their children – the next generation – and what is the quality of both family and educational relationships?

To what extent has the achievement of gender equity in education in Britain merely served to reinforce social class inequalities in terms of family backgrounds and to create even more of a double burden for women as mothers in terms of care of children, support for the children’s education and family and involvement in stressful forms of employment? Has it indeed altered the family life-work balance such that the now conventional work-life balance is tipped against quality family life and towards more individualised forms of work in the new and global economy? To what extent is it also dependent upon the invisible labour of migrant, ethnic minority and poor women from other countries, including asylum seekers?

The recent appointment of a new Secretary of State for Education in Britain who is a relatively young married mother of four young children leads to interesting questions about the future of family and education partnerships and responsibilities for women,

or at least some middle class and highly educated mothers. It also raises questions about the kinds of education policies to pursue for all families in relation to both gender equality in education and maternal versus paternal responsibilities for children's emotional care and education. To what extent have changes in education and family and their related policies in fact now achieved gender equality in Britain and are these models for the achievement of MDG? What kinds of quality of education and family life are now on the public agenda as ways to develop? To what extent has the pursuit of economic and educational policies under neo-liberalism allowed for the achievement of individual and classed rather than collective goals for employment and economic growth? How have these social transformations eroded issues around the quality of family life and family support for children within education? This example of Ruth Kelly as Secretary of State for Education sets the context for considering the wider research evidence about equality and quality in family and education relationships or partnerships in Britain and other developed societies such as Australia, Canada, the USA, and parts of Europe, drawing here on the work of the European Research Network on Parents and Education (ERNAPE).

There were numerous media commentaries about Ruth Kelly's exceptionalism as both a highly educated and successful woman and as a mother with a young family. They all argued that there still were not equal educational opportunities for either all children or schoolgirls. In addition, they make the point that there are not equal opportunities for all families and mothers in families to support their children through school and through their own involvement give them a quality education. These commentaries encapsulate the range of issues about educational partnerships that give cause for public attention under current neo-liberal regimes and in Britain in particular at present. They also illustrate the ways in which socio-economic changes have to some extent opened up to public scrutiny the question of women's emotional caring and educational work within families in relation to children and schools. They make the point that schools are not only about educational achievement and chances for social mobility through employment but also about supporting children from difficult home circumstances or family backgrounds of poverty rather than privilege (David, 1997).

The various commentaries addressed the question of how the government might orchestrate and even activate the partnerships between home and school or family and education, between public and private, individuals and communities. They did not however raise specifically the question of in whose interests. To what extent is the pursuit of education now to be deemed a private rather than public interest and yet what role should families, and mothers especially, play in supporting schools and children's education to ensure their educational success? The role of religion in relation to educational values and policy is also raised in this respect, whilst other questions of diversity are not directly addressed. Here it seems clear that Ms Kelly holds rather traditional and 'conservative' views on family life, family planning and abortion, drawn from her Catholic beliefs, and yet not about women's economic and social roles.

It is however interesting to note that several commentators are themselves professional women, beneficiaries of an expanding and changing education system and mothers of school-age children, who address these questions perhaps in part from their own personal lives, as much as from a public commitment to these questions of

social change and social cohesion or community life and collaboration. In other words, to what extent do the debates about equal opportunities in education also raise questions about quality of educational provision, educational achievements and the quality of family lives? These are some of the myriad of issues raised about educational partnerships and I shall now attempt to illustrate how they have been addressed from the feminist and critical research literature.

Changing contexts and emerging concepts:

How we study and understand 'family-education partnerships' depends crucially on both the context and the ways in which concepts have developed in relation to these various social and political changes. Indeed I shall argue that the various social and feminist concepts that we use have developed in relation to our changed understandings and analyses of the changing political and social contexts. I very briefly elaborate on these in this section before summarising some of the literature in respect of these debates.

I have argued (David 2003a) that there were three periods of political change in the post-second world war era of what might be called forms of liberalism that could be linked to broader social changes and forms of feminist study and analysis. In the first period of social liberalism or social democracy the rise of 'second wave feminism', to distinguish it from earlier political forms of feminist campaigning, was particularly important as a critique of the workings of liberal social democracy not only with respect to education but also with respect to women and the family. This was the period from the 1960s and into the 1970s. The second period can be considered one of a backlash to a more liberal and social democratic era and is often called the period of economic liberalism. Here notions of gender entered the lexicon of social and policy analysis. The third period of neo-liberalism is that of transformation of political and social relationships and the ways in which feminists and others have come to understand these changes, and provide a critique of 'educational partnerships'. Under neo-liberalism there have been major shifts towards feminist and critical reflexive methodologies and more personal reflections (David 2003a).

The current notion of 'educational partnerships' is of relatively recent origin and is a term coined about changing social and political relationships within contemporary educational reforms (Franklin et al, 2003). The term has been used both by contemporary politicians in Britain and the USA and by critical and feminist commentators about the expanding role that collaboration between the public and private sectors, between families and communities has come to play in the governing of schools, children and families in response to an array of worldwide economic and social changes. It is a useful way of both thinking about the changing social and political contexts for education over the last decade or so and analysing the particular discourses of change in relation to gender, family and education. Gender has now entered the lexicon of public policy and legal discourses. Thus the notion of educational partnerships is also useful for demonstrating the limits of how particular political and social changes have entered public discourses. It also raises questions about the kinds of commitment to deeper changes and transformations of women's lives in relation to family and public policies and work.

As I have argued elsewhere (David, 2003a and b) one notion of partnerships as part of global official policy discourses emerged at the same time that policy-makers and social science researchers were beginning to question transformations in family life away from traditional forms of marital relations the so-called nuclear family and sexual or gender identities. The idea of partnerships could be associated with these personal life transformations as much as with wider business arrangements, for example (Kenway and Bullen 2003). The coupling of the public adoption of the notion of partnerships with personal, private and family changes entails wide and deep cultural transformations. I have also argued changes in policy and political regimes can be linked to changing family lives as well as the more conventionally conceived global social and economic transformations and ways of studying these changes, especially from a feminist perspective.

The specific context for the emergence of the notion of 'educational partnerships' relates to how New Labour adopted and adapted the social and sexual agendas of neo-liberalism – from the Conservatives in Britain and the new Democrats in the USA – and developed more complex policies around equal opportunities. They have both redefined how to develop policies by changing the discourses from social disadvantage and social class to ones about social inclusion and social exclusion (Levitas, 1997). In other words, whilst there has been official recognition of both social and family changes, such as the changing approaches to marriage and parenting practices (Duncan and Edwards, ed 1998) and their implications for education, there has been little recognition of the gender aspect of these changes, except with respect to individual women. Yet the implications are important for how we study and question the social transformations and develop new forms of policy and practice that may be more female and mother-friendly.

Changing Feminist Concepts and Methodologies:

In the early period of social and feminist critique under social democracy of the 1960s and early 1970s there were limited concepts and concerns were largely limited to political concepts. Indeed much of the early feminist work focussed upon the problems of women's private family lives, what Friedan (1963) in her most important study that launched liberal feminism in the USA, called the 'problem that has no name'. This was essentially an exploratory study about women's lives as wives and mothers of school-age children in suburban American communities. Although this study was rich in detail about the social and emotional problems of white middle class highly educated women in families in the USA and was the pretext for the launch of the women's movement, it was not a sophisticated theoretical or conceptual study about the workings of sexual or gender relations (Stambach and David 2005). However, Friedan herself reneged upon these perspectives in her later work, arguing for a more traditional approach to family lives for women (Friedan, 1982).

In this early formative period of feminist political and analytical work, the emphasis was on the extent to which women's private and personal lives were essentially political, in the sense that women were subject to deep power relations in the family. 'The personal is political' was coined as a phrase to illustrate this form of women's oppression in both family and public life. It also became associated not only with women's family and work lives but also abuses of power in relation to sexual abuse and family or marital violence. However, some of the key public policy issues raised

were about equal educational opportunities for women, relating to other issues such as social class and ethnicity/race using relatively traditional social democratic or liberal notions of equal opportunities.

Indeed, the notion of equality of educational opportunity was initially coined under social democracy or liberalism and the period in which there was a political commitment and consensus towards a welfare society (David 2003a). The state was used largely to provide social and educational services although the notion of the partnership with the family was not fully discussed but was implicit in the emergent notions of the welfare state. Social scientists came to use these concepts to develop studies or critiques of the achievement of social change and the reduction of social class differences largely on an individual basis. Family background in terms of access to income or economic status became proxy measures of social class, invariably based upon fathers' occupational status. Women's occupational or educational status did not enter the equation.

Furthermore, the concept of gender did not emerge as analytical or political notion until the late 1980s replacing the notion of sexual divisions as analytical tool for feminist theorists. This emerged during the period that I dubbed economic liberalism, with the moves towards marketisation of public and social services. Indeed, perhaps the most important study during this period of time, which has presaged the moves towards a more theoretical approach to studies of gender is that by Judith Butler (1990). As a political philosopher she raised the question about the troubling notion of gender for understandings of social and political relations. She questioned both the ontological and epistemological basis of these issues. Drawing also on other philosophical traditions, such as French post-structuralism, the analysis of gender became linked to wider social issues. The complexity of personal changes and sexual and social identities became entwined with more political analysis.

More recently, as neo-liberalism has emerged out of economic liberalism, as I have termed this contemporary period, in common with other writers, (David 2003a) there have been many complex shifts in policies and practices of power relations and how we understand and study them. Many critical and feminist thinkers, drawing on Butler amongst others, have referred to 'the cultural turn' and its influence on our ways of studying political regimes and their practices. Gender, interestingly, has become one of those notions that is now embedded within public policy discourses although its conceptualisation remains limited.

As I argued in another paper (David 2003b) looking at educational partnerships I try to follow Nancy Fraser (1997; 2000) who has attempted to fashion a critical social and feminist theory of what she has called 'the post-socialist condition'. She attempts to combine a revised socialist perspective with feminist and post-structural theories as a way to critique politics and policies within regimes of neo-liberalism. This paper is indeed an attempt to analyse critically educational discourses about partnerships in Britain, by comparison with the USA and other countries and their complexity in relation to gender and sex in this specific 'post-socialist condition' and context.

Under neo-liberalism feminist research methodologies and agendas have grown and developed in particular with respect not only to critiques of public policies but also the discourses that underpin them but also for exploring the dilemmas of family lives

and our understandings of them in relation to education and school practices (Ribbens and Edwards 1997). In particular, feminists along with other critical analysts have adopted a range of methodologies and approaches to study and critique public policy discourses and the ways in which they may impinge upon women's family lives and in relation to children, education and their care. These methodologies entwine with other approaches to the study of changing family lives and policy contexts. Most importantly the cultural or 'social turn' has led to more qualitative and ethnographic methodologies and approaches, highlighting the complexities of changing political and social contexts for the study of family-education partnerships. A particularly important strand here has been the development of studies of notions of 'family practices' and how these may have implications for sexual and gender relations. These have also led to deeper cultural studies about diversity and difference in relation to families. The emphasis on the 'personal' in relation to subjective and narrative accounts has also become critical to these studies.

From the Family-Education Couple to Family-Education Partnerships?

Notions of a particular kind of partnership between families and education, particularly as mediated by the state, had entered the lexicon of public service and educational provision in the post-war era of social democracy and social liberalism. The particular notion of 'the family-education couple' was one coined by the French Marxist philosopher Louis Althusser (1971), who argued that not only was it important as part of the social structure but that its significance lay in its ideological effects. He thus conceptualised 'the family-education couple' as an ideological state apparatus. Whilst this notion is no longer used in this form it seems to me to illustrate the ways in which there have been massive changes in the conceptualisation and approach to 'educational partnerships over the last 3 decades or so. However, throughout this period despite the shifts and changes there has been very little attention to either sexual or gender equality in education embedded within these changing notions.

For example, I used Althusser's kind of approach together with a feminist perspective in an attempt to elucidate the relations between the state, the family and education in the late 1970s (David, 1980). The notion was predicated upon a very traditional nuclear family suffused with implicitly religious values around marriage and parenthood, including patterns of care and responsibility for children. Althusser had not deconstructed the notion of the traditional family in terms of sex or gender, but had seen it as related to religion and social class. I argued, however, that it was possible to conceive of traditional forms of state educational provision as forms of patriarchal control whilst the roles of families and communities could be characterised as female dependency position.

During the period of social democracy in Britain, and what might be called social liberalism in the USA, there was a great political commitment to the expansion of educational opportunities and an attempt to reduce social class inequalities, particularly in terms of family backgrounds – often defined crudely in terms of privilege or poverty. Thus the notion of partnership embedded in these complex policies was one of a relationship between families and education mediated by the state. Nevertheless, there was relatively little concern with the question of equal opportunities on the grounds of sex or gender.

Some of the major social science studies, and official reports emerged during this period of time, pointing to the development of what is now broadly the sociology of education, as well as educational policy studies, and part of a concern with what was known as the welfare state (David 2003a). On the one hand, there were major studies of what the class-based relationships between families and education were, and on the other, studies of the particular and specific influence of policies and practices, leading to what later became known as policy relevant research, including a major theme of psychological research on children's development and work around both parental involvement and participation.

More importantly, the notion of parental support for children's education as a way of improving children's life chances began to emerge especially through official reports in both Britain and the USA (Plowden report 1967; Coleman in the USA, 1966). Again, no attention was paid to the implications for women, as mothers, in this respect and yet this 'ideology' has remained pervasive within both policies and practices, despite the massive cultural and social transformations over the last 30 to 40 years, although the ways in which this is now analysed is rather more complex and nuanced around family practices and various kinds of identities, social, sexual and familial (Weeks, 2005).

The policies were augmented, particularly initially in the USA, by policies known as community control or political participation, on the grounds of empowerment and collective rather than individual mechanisms. Whilst these patterns took a variety of complex forms under social democracy in Britain and social liberalism in the USA families and parents tended to be provided with a very limited role. Although most of the commentaries and academic studies tended to ignore the gender and sexual dimensions, there were some emergent studies by feminist academics and sociologists who pointed to gendered and sexist patterns (Stambach and David 2005).

In addition there were glimmerings of the recognition that children's development was important before the start of schooling. Indeed, this raised the issue of the kinds of private and family-based care and education for children before the age of compulsory schooling and the role of mothers. One aspect of this was to question, especially from a feminist perspective, the kinds of care and education for children within home and family settings rather than in pre-school education or nurseries. Much of the evidence and arguments began to be developed by feminists for more than childcare at home. Arguments were made both for children and for their mothers. It is now 20 years since *For the Children's Sake: Making Childcare more than women's business* was published (1985) in which Caroline New and I developed an argument and evidence for nurseries and education for children out-of-home.

Over the last 20 to 30 years, then notions of educational partnerships have shifted and changed. There have been a range of policies and practices developed around parental involvement and participation, and more recently under economic and neo-liberalism parental and family choice and the ways in which different kinds of public or private provision might support or sustain emergent new policy values and practices. These have led to an array of research studies on parents, mothers, fathers and children which I will elaborate below. The significant policy developments have been to develop public policies for young children and to some extent their mothers, policies

such as childcare and early childhood education, and links between families, schools and education more generally.

In particular, under recent policy regimes, the notion has shifted towards younger children and their families too. There has been an array of policies for early childhood education, childcare and workplace nurseries and thus arguments also about the relationships between women, work and family and how these might be modified by the workings of more complex policies. However, the question of what shifts in family-state responsibilities with respect to education should be has been very contradictory and complex. Although there has been recognition that children's education is a public responsibility and benefit, and thus state provision of education has long been recognised, providing for very young children and babies has been a much more difficult issue, given pressures to maintain parental and maternal responsibilities.

The question of mothers' responsibility, often couched in terms of family or parental responsibilities, has remained deeply entrenched in most policy discourses across most developed and industrial societies. Indeed, in both Britain and the USA, under Thatcherism and Reaganism, the increase in family break-down or break-up became a major cause for concern, and re-invigorated policies for ensuring women's place with childcare and education became a cause celebre (David 1998). Moreover, 'family values' became a major issue for public policy debate, where families were implicitly if not explicitly traditional, patriarchal nuclear families. Indeed, the moves towards lone parent families led to a moral backlash and policy initiatives to reinforce traditional family patterns across many Anglophone countries.

However, under new policy regimes, especially New Labour in Britain over the last five to seven years, revised policy discourses about partnerships between state, family and education have emerged

Indeed, there has also emerged a whole range of policies and practices with respect to family, and mothers' involvement in childcare, education and employment whatever ethnicity, race, religion or even sexuality and family structures. Notions of choice, participation and involvement of family and community in partnerships to engage and activate have become part of the mantra of neo-liberal policies and practices including especially for education, replacing the more traditional notions of equal opportunities as specified by government agencies and bodies.

Most recently these are evident in British education policies where the New Labour Secretary of State for Education argued that she was 'the parent champion' and would develop more parental choice and involvement in schools, including possibly allowing parents to establish their own schools (*The Guardian* 7th January 2005). It has also become fashionable to discuss notions of governance as forms of 'new managerialism' rather than more traditional concepts (Franklin et al 2003).

A key issue in all of these discursive and policy changes has been the conception of social class, diversity and gender. In particular, there has been a redefinition of notions of social disadvantage towards conceptions of social inclusion and exclusion. This has been a move away from traditional notions of social class towards a notion of the individual in which gender may play a part. Thus, embedded within these

revised notions have been arguments about ensuring greater economic and even personal responsibilities of people, especially young people for themselves, and the identification of bringing up children as a key issue.

Teenage pregnancy and parenthood (not identified as motherhood) became the first of several issues to be identified by the Social Exclusion Unit, created by New Labour in 1997, as a major social problem and a key form of social exclusion from participation in economic life. Ways to prevent teenage pregnancy were identified including especially educational strategies, such as sex and relationship education linked to previous policies of personal and parent education. (David et al 2002). Definitions of appropriate parenting and motherhood were clear embedded within these new discourses. Young women becoming pregnant whilst still at school were not identified as parents in terms of the discourses of educational partnerships about families and education.

Also embedded within these new approaches were revised forms of support for forms of parenting, linked to young children's early development, drawing on US models. At the same time in Britain, therefore was the emergence of the Sure Start strategy for children's health, welfare and education particularly for children of socially excluded families, often young mothers, and bringing up children on their own. Within these discourses there have developed major arguments for 'personal responsibilities', that is both families and individuals becoming more responsible for their own welfare and support for their children rather than state support and responsibility (David 2003b). However, the kinds of support offered to such families by the state provided new kinds of partnerships in which there are strong notions of appropriate parenting. Whilst this specific policy development emerged from arguments for a 'national childcare strategy' the target were not all families. Yet the arguments for this being a public service remain illusory; with arguments about 'affordable childcare' and that children's pre-school education is more of a private rather than a public benefit. On the other hand, the Children Act of 2003 has been committed to the notion that 'every child matters' and a commitment to more public concern if not financial responsibility as part of the practice of so-called 'joined up thinking'. Again there is a parallel here with the US policy development of 'no child left behind'.

All of these policy developments have been subject also to a range of studies about the effects and impacts on families and family members since they have particularly influenced the roles and responsibilities of mothers in terms of the care and education of their children. Much of this work has contributed to what has become known as evidence based policies and practices.

Emergent Research Themes Around Family Education Partnerships

Changing notions of family-education partnerships and emergent feminist and critical research methodologies have led to a very rich seam of work around diverse aspects of these developments, theoretically, conceptually and methodologically. I shall now focus on they ways in which these policy developments and social, family and economic changes have been studied by feminists and others. Here I want to address some of these studies for demonstrating different implications of the social changes for the partnerships between families and education and especially for the implications for gender equality. I draw on a number of reviews and essays around

these themes (David, in Crozier and Reay eds 2005; David 2003a; David 2003b). Many of the studies that have developed have been linked with policy developments and providing critiques of how they may work, including Sure Start and early-childhood education. In addition and linked specifically with policy developments around home-school links there are several studies to demonstrate the complexities of how these are working within new regimes and with new business and quasi-private organisations (Buckingham and Scanlon 2003; Kenway and Bullen 2003). There are myriads of new ways of understanding and analysing all of these shifts and changes, both in policy and practice around new ways of working between families and education (David 2003b).

During the last decade a number of important research themes have emerged first about women in families as mothers and especially about mothers rather than girls at school and their relationships with education, looking especially at what have become known as family and parenting practices and the ways in which parenting is negotiated within and across reconstituted and fragmenting families. For example, an early feminist study to pick up on the broader themes of family and education from the point of view of women, was a study with colleagues entitled *Mothers and Education: Inside Out? Exploring Family Education Policy and Practice* (1993) in which we looked at the range of issues in relation to mothers' relations to children, schools, higher education and as part of what is now known as lifelong learning. This emerged out of other studies of mothers' work and practice that also drew on a range of American studies, especially by Griffith and Smith (2005). Griffith and Smith concentrated however more on the theme of mothering work for schooling than the studies of mothers and schooling that emerged in Britain. Indeed, different theoretical perspectives were taken in this respect.

Secondly, it also led to studies of the workings of particular emergent neo-liberal policies such as parental choice of education (David, West and Ribbens, 1994). This policy shift, to choice and diversity, in any event, became a major theme of 'policy sociology' during the 1990s (Ball, 1990), although most of the studies did not adopt a feminist perspective. Yet it has led to wider studies of marketisation, family choice and school diversity (Stambach and David 2005) and the themes of involvement and choice (Gewirtz, Ball and Bowe (1995)).

Thirdly, there have emerged more detailed studies of particular aspects of mothers' lives within communities, defined in terms of class and/or ethnicity, from the point of view of children and their upbringing. For example work on lone mothers (Standing 1999 and Gillies 2001), black parents (Reynolds 2001 a and b), parents from different communities, including Pakistani parents in London and by comparison with parents in Lahore (Inayat, 2004), and studies of Pakistani families (Basit, 1997a and b). There are also studies of mothers and children in primary schools in particular communities such as Indian and Asian families (Bhatti 1999 and Rassool 1999).

Fourthly, some of these studies focus on how the young people or children negotiate their own identities looking at specific communities. Other specific studies of families and minority ethnic communities in relation to schooling focus more on the constructions and negotiations around educational progress and success across gender, race and class. They include the critical study by Mirza (1992), and more recent studies by Archer (2003), Shain (2002) and Osler (2002) of different minority ethnic

communities. The ways in which families and schools negotiate understandings about education and family values has been a thread in this kind of research. For instance Francis and Archer (2005) have studied how children from British-Chinese families negotiate and construct their identities through education, gender and race or ethnicity work together.

Fifthly, there have been a number of key studies of various forms of parental participation in schools and education, with work by Vincent (1996; 2000), being amongst the more sophisticated, whilst not adopting a feminist perspective. The critical feminist and socialist work of Crozier (2000; 2002) on parents in relation to ethnicity, race and schooling is singularly important in demonstrating how families of ethnic minority children fare in relation to particular types of education. Crozier's (2004) more recent work relates specifically to negotiations and constructions of identities amongst young British-Pakistani families in relation to changing forms of schooling. Most recently, there has been a growth of research around linkages between families and education as well as policy developments requiring this kind of support. For example, work around early childhood education has related more to the importance of emergence of ideas about public provision rather than private but mediated increasingly by new business practices, and thus quasi-private notions. These may lock mothers into traditional family roles or an increasingly difficult work-life balance since the revised requirement through IT, and especially quasi-official websites is of family responsibilities for young children. Vincent and Ball's study (2002) illustrates the point about how families and mothers especially are now expected to make choices and be involved in their children's continuing class-based education. For example, in their study of markets in relation to childcare Vincent and Ball, they have shown how dramatic these shifts are for mothers especially of very young and pre-school children and in early childhood. Thus parents, and mothers especially become active partners and participants in the educational process.

Sixthly, however, all of these studies have adopted a range of different theoretical and empirical approaches that tend to be more critical of the more policy-relevant and policy-related emerging work on parental involvement and children's educational skills and development in reading (Wolfendale and Topping 1996). This kind of research on parents and education has tended to be more didactic and prescriptive, and has linked clearly with a range of studies from across Europe and North America. ERNAPE has brought together scholars and researchers around international projects on the involvement of parents in education together with an American network hosted by Epstein. It hosted several conferences at which studies of European policy developments and practices around the role of parents in relation to types of school and levels of education have been presented. Here themes of community development have been singularly important as the flyleaves of edited conference proceedings illustrated the discursive rhetoric of this. For instance 'The different forms of involvement run from orientation to *partnerships* in specific subjects to systems, models and strategies for *school-family-community partnerships...cooperation between the various partners in the collaboration between parents, schools and communities*' (my emphasis) (Smit et al., 2001; cited in David 2003b).

Seventhly, a major recent longitudinal study on the relationships between children in early childhood education and families and the role of particular forms of education, teaching and learning strategies has just been published. The study by Sylva,

Blatchford et al (2004) demonstrates the values and importance of education for continuing education for early childhood development and subsequent educational achievement. This demonstrates the value and importance of extending educational provision for younger children rather than continuing to rely on family care and support. It also contributes to a new mantra of the New Labour government: that of importance of early childhood education rather than home for levels of educational success and achievement, especially in the context of more complex family lives now.

Finally, however, more significantly have been the more theoretically informed studies, developing new approaches to studying family-education relationships. A major study was that by Lareau (1989) for the USA on elementary schools and families developing an analysis using Bourdieu's notion's of cultural capital. Reay (1998) developed a similar study in London on roles of middle class versus working class families in relation to elementary education. However, Reay's study also focussed on the differences of mothers' work in these schools, pinpointing differences between working class and middle class in terms of mothers' work and involvement and using Bourdieu's notions of habitus and cultural capital. Reay and others have also extended notions of cultural capital to social capital and rather more contentious ideas about emotional capital. Notions of social capital are strongly developed by Edwards and colleagues in a major research group and work (Edwards, 2004). Here the importance of social networks of mothers on a class basis has been found to influence the ways in which children's education develops.

Educational Partnerships: Parents and Schools and Beyond

Emerging from this welter of policies and practices around families and education has been an enormous number of studies that demonstrate the effects of social and political transformations on family lives and educational opportunities. The key finding, however, is that whilst there have been an enormous array of changes both for men and women, from various diverse social and minority ethnic backgrounds and family lives, and economic change has wrought new forms of social class, an expansion of the middle classes at the expense of the working classes, relative differences remain. More importantly perhaps is that although women's lives have been transformed in terms of work and family, there remain massive inequalities both in terms of class and gender. Thus the constraints of being a mother whether in a working class or middle class family persist. This kind of finding builds upon the detailed theoretical and empirical work of Lareau and Reay, referred to above as well as the more traditional studies and the more traditional class-based but theoretically informed studies of Savage (2000), Skeggs (1997) Power et al (2003) and Ball's very important study (2003) of the middle classes and education.

A key study that brings together a lot of sociological work on families and education and changing forms of relationships is that by Fiona Devine (2004). Her study is entitled *Class Practices: How Parents Help Their Children Get Good Jobs*. She uses new theoretical, methodological and ethnographic approaches to study traditional questions about whether policies and practices around equal educational opportunities have in fact brought about transformations in traditional forms of social mobility. Whilst her work is not specifically about gender, she is clearly informed by this literature and indeed, writes in a personal vein and from her own personal life as a working class woman who benefited from the major social and educational changes of

the period of social democracy. Gender is clearly relevant since she has become a middle class woman and she considers how both mothers and fathers work to support their sons and daughters in different ways (Devine, 2004, p. 1-17).

The study is of a sample of middle class families in Britain and USA in the 1990s: both about their ways into the middle class in the 1970s and 1980s through their parents' support and help for them, mobilising economic, cultural and social resources to help them into professional employment or careers; and how they as middle class parents now try to increase their children's chances of educational success and occupational advancement. She took a sample of doctors and teachers and their partners with children drawing similar numbers of families in Boston and Manchester. She chose teaching as an example of a semi-profession that is open to women and it remains female-dominated whilst medicine remains more traditional. She looked at both how these families got to where they got and how they are trying to support their own children in a more insecure labour market and form of higher education and argues about how the more insecure period now so that not as easy to secure the advantage that their parents secured for them to rise into the middle classes. She wrote:

This monograph has drawn on the stories of a small sample of middle class parents – medics and teachers – in Britain and America. It is a diverse sample in terms of gender, race and ethnicity. It is also a diverse group in terms of the interviewees' class backgrounds...people from long-established upper middle-class backgrounds, those whose parents had been mobile from working-class or blue-collar into the middle class...and those who were upwardly mobile themselves from modest social backgrounds...the interviewees were children so to speak. I also spoke to them about being parents, now all middle class parents, and how they hoped they were helping their children through the education system and, they hoped, into good jobs...This research has allowed me to explore how the middle class are seeking to remake themselves from generation to generation in both old and familiar and new and novel ways...(2004, p. 174)

Her study led her to conclude that forms of parental help for their children were changing and there were clear glimmerings of the importance of gender as part of that process of social change. Thus she concluded that (2004 p. 179)

'...the interviewees from upper-middle-class and middle-class backgrounds, whose parents were highly educated people, mobilised their cultural resources on their children's behalf. To be sure, they expected, they expected their children to be academically able like themselves, and that they would be as successful at school as they had been and secure entry into the more prestigious universities and colleges, again, on a par with if not better than their parents...They confidently assumed things would go well unless their children demonstrated otherwise. These interviewees also spoke of how their parents had had high occupational horizons for they expected them to go into high-level professional jobs like themselves. A very important caveat needs to be introduced here, however. Such high occupational aspirations applied more to the men than the women interviewees in both countries (although the start of changes in gendered views could be detected among some of the younger women members of the sample who became medics).

This study clearly follows on previous work in demonstrating how the middle classes still seek to maintain advantage in the labour markets and how gender equalities have not yet been achieved. In particular, there remain clear differences in how men and women in middle class families respond to these changes and the cultural and social constraints upon their lives. However, many studies have shown that in particular contexts mothers can be important as regards supporting their children in education (David, et al 2003) and in becoming involved in education themselves to support their children (Edwards 1993). Furthermore some Australian studies have shown that gender has been very important in social change at school, even if it does not necessarily lead to more lasting changes for the family lives in adulthood. A key study was that by Kenway et al (1998) on the importance of education for gender and social change. Similarly Arnot et al found that social and family changes were particularly important for educational change (Arnot et al 1999).

Young Parents and Education: a problem? Pedagogies and practices

A key issue to emerge from some of the more critical work on sex, sexualities and education has been developing forms of new pedagogies and practices with respect to family and education. In particular, there has been a concern in the feminist literature about how all of these social changes and practices lead to new conceptions of sex and sexuality and how these emerge from negotiations around family and school practices. Thus, as we have already noted above, there have been many studies of how boys and girls develop their identities of masculinity and/or femininity in relation to emergent new practices of schools and communities (Francis, 1997; Skelton, 2001; Shain 2002) and especially around gender and ethnicity and/or ethnic minority communities (Mirza, 1992; Shain, 2002; Osler 2002) as well as gender and class. In particular, studies of girls' educational and social development in relation to family and wider social practices have been closely explored (Reay and Lucey 2003; Walkerdine, Lucey and Melody 2001) and in the USA (Mikel Brown 1997), Australia (Kenway, Willis, Blackmore and Rennie, 1997). A fascinating study of boys in relation to school and community can be found in Frosh, Phoenix and Pattman (2002) illustrating the importance of context and community. Jackson (2003) has also presented very interesting work on how boys negotiate conceptions of masculinity in the light of changes in their family and school lives and Archer (2003) has looked at Asian boys' negotiations around their identities in family and school.

As we have noted the various global, social, family and economic changes have also led to concern about the rise of young and school-age parents across Anglophone and European countries, even with a deeply Eurocentric focus about family life patterns and structures (Pillow 2004; Kelly 2000; Luttrell 2003; David et al 2002). However, the ways in which these policy concerns have manifest themselves within policy discourses has not mapped on to the emergent discourses about family-education partnerships. Even more significantly for this purpose however are how emergent pedagogies and curricula for personal, social and health education, including sex and relationship education as a result of these policy concerns about rates of teenage pregnancy, as well as changing family patterns (Williams, 2004).

A key concern amongst policy makers in Anglophone countries has been how to address changing family practices and especially the growing bifurcation of patterns of childbirth and childrearing (Kehily and Thompson 2005). Birth rates amongst all

women have been rising, so that the average age is almost 30 now, but especially for middle class mothers, whereas there has also been a rise in very young mothers, with an average age of around 16. Thus these young mothers are no longer seen as 'normal' but as an exceptional; 'children rather than adults having babies'. Thus they are not identified as parents in common with 'normal parenthood' for family and education partnerships. Given the normalisation of middle class parenting, these mothers are to be subject to new strategies around sex and marriage. In the USA this is a strongly religious flavour with 'abstinence-only before marriage' as the basis for the education (David, 2003b).

Indeed, and somewhat curiously, the 'moral panic' about teenage pregnancy in Britain and in the USA has identified the one as a problem of social exclusion rather than about how to support such so-called new parenting practices. The response of governments in neo-liberal regimes has led to development of policies of prevention rather than support and the invocation of notions of personal responsibilities for family matters.

Some of the questions raised within the New Labour government have been about comparative evidence of the extent and scale of the rise of young and teenage parenthood, Thus in particular comparisons were drawn with how the Netherlands had not experienced such a 'problem'. However, critical and feminist policy researchers have demonstrated the complexities of how the practices of parent and sex education in different communities have led to different approaches (Lewis and Knijn 2002; van Loon 2003).

The New Labour government in Britain has addressed this 'problem' by suggesting a wide-ranging strategy to deal with teenage pregnancy through education and health strategies, developing a new curriculum for sex and relationship education, linked to parent education, and developing a notion of a 'healthy schools standard'. These strategies have also implied new pedagogical approaches to how to teach such issues, identifying the problems as 'learner identities'. As we have noted elsewhere, these new curricula and suggested pedagogies for personalised education, grew out of a mix of concerns about family practices and policy issues (David, Smith and Alldred 2002) in the context of family life changes. There has also been the development of new parenting classes for women involved as mothers in projects for early childhood, such as the Sure Start schemes for socially excluded and disadvantaged families.

We were asked to conduct an evaluation of one LEA's implementation of a strategy for sex and relationship education (SRE) to prevent teenage pregnancies (David et al 2002). We found that teachers and professional educators were highly challenged to develop such a programme, around traditional parent education, and providing sex education in the context of religious values around marriage and family. However, they aimed to develop a new personal pedagogy linked to the emergent work on Personal, Social and Health Education, which related to emotional issues about learning rather than the more traditional didactic measures. Others (Scott et al 2001; Buston et al 2001) have also addressed these questions and especially about how new constructions and negotiations around gender and sexual identities are emerging from these debates and studies. These remain vital public policy questions (Toynbee, 2005)

Many feminists have addressed these intriguing questions about the policies and practices across societies with concerns about both the policies and practices (Bullen, Kenway and Hey 2000). Others have studied the complexity of the emergent debates in Canada (Kelly 2000) New Zealand (Middleton 1999) and the USA (Pillow 2003) whilst others have engaged with interesting studies of the lives of young women becoming mothers. Luttrell's (2003) moving and detailed ethnographic study of young women is particularly important here. She studied young women in different special educational programmes in the USA and invited them to talk about their constructions of their own identities and how they negotiated across family and education. She also questioned their teachers and professional educators and revealed how, over time, these women learned to be more confident and clear about their personal and family lives and how they could forge more complex identities within the constraints of their communities and education became a means of empowerment rather than constraint.

Conclusions:

This brief review of the emerging debates, linked critical and feminist research about educational partnerships around families and education demonstrates the complexities of the issues about gender equality in education. The review, especially in the Anglophone and largely European countries with a tendency also to being Eurocentric has revealed the rich and complex debates about gender equality. The feminist research evidence, through different theoretical and methodological frames, especially emergent ethnographic and qualitative approaches to women's lives in constructing and negotiating identities in families and education, from schools, and pre-school or early childhood education, through to lifelong learning demonstrates the importance of maintaining a commitment to gender issues. It has also illustrated the contradictions and dilemmas for women as mothers, professional educators and teachers, and in communities participating to promote or challenge parenting identities, as developing through revised forms of discourse about educational partnerships.

In particular, whilst gender equality is not a major theme of either the policy debates or discourses and nor is it a central focus of much of the research it remains vital for developing equalities between and within families. However, as far as educational achievement is an issue it is assumed that gender equality has largely been addressed, in so far as the research evidence seems to point towards girls' examination performances in access to higher levels of education being as good as boys, if not better. Also I noted key policy concerns are now about how to widen social class access and participation in higher education, without attention to gender. However, as I have also noted there are studies of how women (such as Devine 2004) who have participated in higher education do not go on to secure graduate and professional employment on a par with men, and their partners. More importantly, they are constrained by cultural expectations about family and how it matters as well as economic constraints on patterns of employment and discrimination in labour markets. They are even more constrained by emergent policy discourses around personal and parenting responsibilities for themselves and their children, especially amongst working class, and ethnic minority families and households.

Indeed, what I have tried to illustrate is that it is clear that at the level of policy in the advanced and Anglophone countries within neo-liberal regimes there has emerged a clear recognition that families need partnerships involving 'public' support for the care and education of children and that parents should be helped with the upbringing of their children. However, these arguments are not always on the grounds of gender equality alone and nor are they only about supporting girls' educational achievements. They tend to be partly for children's development and for social change i.e. social mobility but also economic reasons, to enable mothers to participate in work and to take personal responsibility for family, children and work. They are also for such women to avoid the 'risks' of social exclusion and economic dependence. Thus they are classed, and often also racialised arguments.

The critical and feminist research has shown how families, and mothers especially negotiate around constructions of identities, through gender, social class, ethnicity and/or race and schooling, and how complex these processes are. Most of the research reviewed has revealed that women in families remain constrained by responsibilities for family and children in bringing up their children. Thus the implications are for gender equality to remain central to discourses about family-education partnerships to ensure women's equal employment and work possibilities. Indeed, under neo-liberal policy regimes discourses around parenting and mothering and expectations about what women in families should do seems to have increased personal responsibilities. This is through normative expectations and the normalisation of middle class notions of parenting. In this respect, the research that demonstrates how middle class families continue to secure advantage for their children through detailed negotiations around family and education means that extensions and expansions of educational opportunities maintain and exacerbate traditional class distinctions.

However, there are also examples of how these negotiations around family and education partnerships lead to creative and imaginative strategies such as involvement in education whilst mothers. These may be both for children and for themselves, empowering them to be able to move out of constricting family constructions and identities. Indeed, women's aspirations for their children and their own education are major issues for the future. Women's involvement in lifelong learning, higher education or adult education, as mothers, demonstrates that there are key possibilities for extending and deepening family-education partnerships.

Moreover, some of the emergent work on young mothers and women in educational settings for socially excluded groups reveals exciting possibilities and challenges. The studies by Luttrell (2003) and Pillow (2004) provide support for the evidence of David et al (2003) of young women becoming mothers to demonstrate that although their identities and possibilities are severely constrained by their disadvantages their negotiations around care and education of their own children are challenging. In addition, the work on developing forms of sex and relationship education, linked to forms of parent and citizenship education and through new personal and reflective pedagogies, holds the possibility of important developments.

Lessons from Family-Education Partnerships for Beyond Access?

The question now is what can be learnt from this brief and illustrative review about the possibilities for gender equality in education in developing countries? How might

we go ‘beyond access’ through family and education partnerships? I would argue that the critical and feminist research has alerted us to paying attention and developing implementation strategies in 5 inter-linked arenas.

First, historically gender equality in education in Anglophone and European countries with a tendency to Eurocentrism with little concern for social and familial diversity and difference was seen as about rights or entitlement for girls but with little recognition of the specific family context and the ways in which family and cultural or religious values influenced constructions of social and economic identities. These specific cultural and community identities around family need to be made explicit and negotiations around how family, parenting and childcare are played out also must be addressed. In order to achieve gender equality in education parents – both mothers and fathers – need to be aware of how family and personal responsibilities impinge upon this and the constructions of social and sexual identities. To what extent is the revised approach to personal and family responsibilities normalising very conservative and classed notions of mothers’ ‘work’ and around religious and traditional family values without regard to sexuality and difference?

Secondly, it is also important for attention to these issues to be given by governing agencies, religious bodies and schools, including teachers. Constructions of parenting responsibilities through governance, and through schools, imply differences and to achieve gender equality some questioning of how these are differential responsibilities needs to be considered. Consideration must also be given to the ways in which these gender and sexual identities are played out within families and schools and communities.

Thirdly, as we have seen, developing new ways of linking family and education from pregnancy and birth to early childhood education, within communities and with new forms of personal pedagogies is an important consideration. How might new collective, collaborative forms of community participation and care develop to ensure that these personal parenting responsibilities for babies within a community are shared and supported? What kinds of family and parenting through ethnic and/or religious communities might relieve the burdens on individuals and develop collective forms of childcare?

Fourthly, there are possibilities for developing curricula, and specific personal and/or feminist pedagogies, around family-education partnerships and matters. Learning about how diverse parenting strategies and partnerships influence gender equality can become part of the curriculum of schools, much as in the kinds of curricula developed for Personal, Social and Health Education (PSHE) in Britain, and including citizenship and sex and relationship education.

Fifthly, these kinds of curricula, and pedagogies, need also to be developed for teacher education and for forms of community education and lifelong learning. They serve, as I have already argued, to help to develop women’s aspirations and activate their participation in community and parenting work. They also empower women to be able to extend and challenge traditional family and personal responsibilities.

However, it is clear from the evidence about how such strategies for teacher education are developing in Anglophone countries just what the complexities and constraints

are. Given the fact that many teachers, and professional educators are uncomfortable with these personal and sexual issues, attention needs to be paid to developing particular pedagogies around emotional questions, rather than traditional forms of learning and teaching. Nevertheless, the possibilities for transforming learner identities and thus family-education partnerships to achieve gender equality in education and community remain immensely exciting. This is a challenge that could and should be taken up.

Addressing the challenges of developing educational partnerships for family and community could lead to exciting new agendas for gender equality within and beyond education, into community and citizenship through new forms of entitlement and reflexive relationships.

References

- Althusser, L. (1971) 'Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses' in *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays* London: New Left Books
- Archer, L (2003) *Race, Masculinity and Schooling: Muslim boys and education* Buckingham, Open University Press.
- Arnot, M., David M.E. and G. Weiner (1999) *Closing the Gender Gap: Postwar Education and Social Change* Cambridge: Polity Press
- AUT (2004) *The Unequal Academy*
- Ball, S (2003) *Class Strategies and the Education Market* London Routledge Falmer Education
- Ball S (1990) *Policy and Policy Sociology*
- Basit, T. (1997a) *Eastern Values, Western Milieu: Identities and Aspirations of Adolescent British Muslim Girls* Aldershot Ashgate
- Basit, T. (1997b) 'I want more freedom but not too much' *Gender and Education* 9 (4) 425-439
- Bhatti, G (1999) *Asian Girls at home and at school: an ethnographic study* London Routledge
- Brown, L. M. (1997) *Raising their Voices: the politics of girls' anger* Cambridge Mass and London Harvard University Press
- Buckingham D and M Scanlon (2003) *Education, Entertainment and Learning in the Home* Buckingham Open University Press
- Bullen, E. Kenway J and Hey V (2000) New Labour social Exclusion and Education Risk Management: The Case of Gymslip Mums *British Educational Research Journal* 26, 441-451

Buston, K, D. Wight and S. Scott Difficulty and Diversity: the context and practice of sex education *British Journal of sociology of Education* 22 (3) 353-368

Butler, J. (1990) *Gender Trouble: feminism and the subversion of identity* New York and London: Routledge

Coleman Report (1966) *On Equality of Educational Opportunity* US Department of HEW

Crozier, G (2000) *Parents and Schools: Partners or Protagonists?* Stoke on Trent Trentham Books

Crozier G (2002) Beyond the Call of duty: The impact of Racism on black Parents' Involvement in Their children's Education paper presented to Market Forces seminar at Kings College London June

Crozier, G. (2003) in Castelli, S, M. Mendel and B. Ravn (eds) *School, Family and Community Partnership in a World of Differences and Changes* (Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Gdanskiego, Gdansk, Poland) proceedings of the European Research Network for Parents and Education (ERNAPE) conference held in Gdansk, Poland, September 4th-6th.

Crozier G (2004) paper presented to AERA/Joyce Epstein's group

Crozier, G. (2004) Beyond the Call of Duty: the impact of racism on black parents' involvement in their children's education, in G. Crozier and D Reay (Eds) *Activating Participation: parents and teachers working towards partnership* Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books Limited

Crozier, G. and D Reay (Eds) (2004) *Activating Participation: parents and teachers working towards partnership* Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books Limited

David, M. E. (2005) Activating Participation: a personal reflection on research on mothers and education, in G. Crozier and D Reay (Eds) *Activating Participation: parents and teachers working towards partnership* Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books Limited

David, M. E. (2003a) *Personal and Political: feminisms, sociology and family lives* Stoke on Trent Trentham Books

David, M. E. (2003b) Partnerships and Parents: Issues of Sex and Gender in Policy and Practice in Franklin et al

David M. E., P Alldred, and P Smith (2003) Teachers' Views of Teaching Sex Education: pedagogy and models of delivery *Journal of Educational Enquiry* 4 (1) pp 80-96 online Australian Journal

David, M. E., P Alldred, and P Smith, (2002) *Get Real about Sex: Linking Sex and Relationship Education to the Achievement Agenda* A report on SREPAR to DfES and Stoke-on-Trent LEA, Keele, Keele University

- David, M.E. (ed) (1998) *The Fragmenting Family Does it Matter?* London IEA Health and Welfare Unit Choice in Welfare
- David, M.E., A. West and J. Ribbens (1994) *Mother's Intuition? Choosing Secondary Schools* London: Falmer Press
- David, M.E., R. Edwards, M. Hughes and J. Ribbens (1993) *Mothers and Education: Inside Out? Exploring Family-Education Policy and Experience* London: Macmillan
- David, M.E. (1980) *The State, the Family and Education* London Routledge and Kegan Paul
- Devine, F. (2004) *Class Practices: How Parents Help their Children Get Good Jobs* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- DfES (2004)
- Duncan, S and Edwards, R (1999) *Lone Mothers, Paid Work and Gendered Moral Rationalities* London: Macmillan
- Duncan, S R. Edwards, T. Reynolds and P. Alldred (2003) Motherhood, Paid Work and Parenting: Values and Theories *Work, Employment and Society* 17 (2) 309-30
- Duncan, S R. Edwards, T. Reynolds and P. Alldred (2004) Mothers and childcare: Policies, Values and Theories *Children and Society* 18 (4)
- Edwards R. (1993) *Mature Women Students: separating or connecting family and education* London Taylor and Francis
- Edwards R, J. Franklin and J. Holland (2003) *Families and Social Capital: Exploring the Issues* London Families and Social Capital ESRC Research Group Working Papers No.1
- EOC (2004) *Annual Report* Manchester EOC
- Francis B (2000) *Boys, Girls and Educational Achievement* London Routledge/Taylor and Francis
- Francis, B and Skelton, C (eds) (2001) *Investigating Gender: Contemporary Perspectives on Education* Buckingham: Open University Press
- Francis, B. (1999) Lads, Lasses and (New) Labour: 14-16 year old students' responses to the laddish behaviour of boys and boys' underachievement debate, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 20: 355-71.
- Francis B and L. Archer (2005) The discursive and Material Practice of British-Chinese Achievement: Negotiations of Race, class and Gender between families and the school paper presented at the International Sociology of Education conference on Teaching and Learning in Changing Times Montague Hotel London January 3-5th

- Franklin, B; M.N. Bloch and T.S. Popkewitz (2003) *Educational Partnerships and the State* NY and London Palgrave Macmillan
- Fraser, N. (2000) 'Radical Academia, Critical Theory and Transformative Politics: an interview with Nancy Fraser' *Imprints*, 4, 197-212
- Fraser, N. (1997) *Justice Interruptus: critical reflections on the 'post-socialist' condition* London and New York Routledge
- Friedan B. (1982) *The Second Stage* London Michael Joseph
- Friedan B (1963) *The Feminine Mystique* Harmondsworth Penguin
- Frosh, S. A. Phoenix and R. Pattman (2001) *Young Masculinities: Understanding boys in contemporary society* London: Palgrave
- Gillies, V J. Ribbens-McCarthy and J. Holland (2001) *Pulling Together: Pulling Apart: The Family Lives of Young People* London: Family Policy Studies Centre in association with the Joseph Rowntree Foundation
- Gewirtz, S., S. Ball and R. Bowe (1995) *Markets, Choice and Equity in Education* Buckingham: Open University Press
- Hill, Paul (2004) 'Supermum takes on Education brief' *The Times Higher* December 24/31 2004, p.3
- Inayat, N (2004) Parental Involvement, Attitudes and Responsibilities in Education: A Case Study of Parents in Britain and Pakistan. PhD Dissertation.
- Jackson, C (2003)
- Kehily, M.J. and Thompson, R (2005) *The Making of Modern Motherhood* presentation to BSA Family Studies group Keele Keele University January 14th (based upon ESRC project in Identities series)
- Kelly, D (2000) *Pregnant with Meaning: teen mothers and the politics of inclusive schooling* New York Lang
- Kenway, J Willis, S Blackmore J and Rennie L (1998) *Answering Back: girls, boys and feminism in schools* London: Allen and Unwin
- Kenway and Bullen (2003) *Consuming children* Buckingham Open University Press
- Lareau, A (1989) *Home Advantage: social class and parental interventions in Elementary Education* London: Falmer Press
- Levitas R. (1997) *The Inclusive Society? Social Exclusion and New Labour* London: Macmillan

- Lewis, J and T. Knijn (2002) The politics of sex education policy in England and Wales and the Netherlands since the 1980s *Journal of Social Policy* 31 (4) 669-95
- Luttrell, W (2003) *Pregnant Bodies: Fertile Minds* New York and London: Routledge
- Middleton S. (1998) *Disciplining Sexuality: Foucault, life histories and education* New York: Teachers' College Press
- Millar, Fiona (2004) Dear Ruth Kelly *The Guardian* G2 December 21 2004 p. 20
- Mirza, H.S (1992) *Young, Female and Black* London: Routledge
- New, C. and David, M.E. (1985) *For the Children's Sake: Making Childcare more than women's business* Harmondsworth; Penguin
- Osler, A (1997) *Education and Careers of Black Teachers, changing identities, changing lives* Buckingham: Open University Press
- Osler, A (2000) (ed) *Citizenship and Democracy in Schools: Diversity, Identity, Equality* London: Oxfam Educational
- Osler, A and K. Vincent (2003) *Girls and Exclusion: Rethinking the Agenda* London: Routledge Falmer
- Pillow, W. S. (2004) *Unfit subjects: Educational Policy and the Teen Mother* New York and London Routledge Falmer
- Powell, H (2004) *The Guardian* G2 December 22 2004 p. 9
- Plowden Report (1967) *Children and their primary schools* London HMSO
- Pollard, A and Filer A (1999) *The Social World of Pupil Career: Strategic Biographies Through the Primary School* London Continuum
- Power, S, T. Edwards, G. Whitty and V. Wigfall (2003) *Education and the Middle Class* London Open University Press
- Rassool, N (1999) *Literacy for Sustainable Development in the Age of Information* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters
- Reay D. (1998) *Class Work: Mothers' involvement in their children's primary schooling* London UCL Press
- Reay D. and H. Lucey (2003)
- Reynolds, T (2001a) Black fathers and family lives in Britain, in Goulbourne H. and M. Chamberlain (eds) *Families and the Transatlantic World* London Macmillan
- Reynolds, T (2001b) Black mothers, paid work and identity *Journal of Ethnic and Racial Studies* 24 November

- Ribbens, J and Edwards R (1998) (eds) *Feminist Dilemmas in Qualitative Research: public knowledge and private lives* London Sage
- Savage, M (2000) *Class Analysis and Social Transformation* Buckingham: Open University Press
- Scott, S. S. Jackson and K. Blackett-Milburn (2001) Swings and Roundabouts: risk anxiety and the everyday world of children *Sociology* 32(4) 686-750
- Shain, F. (2002) *The Schooling and Identity of Asian Girls* Stoke on Trent Trentham Books
- Skeggs, B (1997) *Formations of Class and Gender* London: Sage
- Skelton C. (2001) *Schooling the Boys: Masculinities and Primary Education* Buckingham: Open University Press
- Skelton, C and Francis, B (2003) (eds) *Boys and Girls in the Primary Classroom* Buckingham: Open University Press
- Smit, F van der Wolf, K and Slegers, P (eds)(2001) *A Bridge to the Future: Collaboration Between Parents, Schools and Communities* Nijmegen Holland Institute for Applied Social Research
- Smith, D. E. and A. Griffith (1990) Coordinating the uncoordinated: mothering, schooling and the family wage in Miller, G and Holstein, J. (eds) *Perspectives on Social Problems vol2* Greenwich CT: JAI Press
- Stambach, A and David, M. E. (2005) Feminist theory and Educational choice: how Gender has been involved in Home-School Choice Debates *Signs, Journal of Women and Culture* vol 30, no 2
- Standing, K (1999) Lone Mothers and Parental Involvement: A contradiction in policy? *Journal of Social Policy* 28, (3) 479-517
- Sylva, K and S. J. Blatchford (2004) The Effective Provision of Pre-Schools Education (EPPE) project, linked to the ESRC's TLRP, paper presented in Cardiff conference, November
- Taylor, M and R. Smithers (2005) Kelly woos middle-class parents with talk of school choice *The Guardian* January 7th p.9
- Topping, K and S. Wolfendale (1985) *Parental Involvement in Children's Reading* London: Taylor and Francis
- Toynbee, Polly (2005) Vera's Timely Reminder: Mike Leigh's film about a backstreet abortion provides a much-needed antidote to 'pro-life' propaganda *The Guardian Comment and Analysis* January 7th p.23

- Van Loon, J (2003) *Deconstructing the Dutch Utopia: Sex Education and teenage pregnancy in the Netherlands* London: Family Education Trust
- Vincent, C (1996) *Parents and Teachers: Power and Participation* London routledge Falmer
- Vincent, C (2001) *Including Parents? Education, Citizenship and Parental Agency* Buckingham: Open University Press
- Vincent, C and S. J. Ball (2002)
- Walkerdine, V. H. Lucey and J. Melody (2001) *Growing Up Girl* Basingstoke: Palgrave
- Walkerdine, V. (2003) Reclassifying upward mobility: femininity and the neo-liberal subject, *Gender & Education* 15(3) 237-248.
- Weiner, G., Arnot, M. and David, M. E. (1997) Is the future female? Female success, male disadvantage and changing gender patterns in education in A.H. Halsey et al (eds) *Education, Culture, Economy and Society* Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Weeks, J (2005) *Rewriting Sexuality and Intimacy* paper presented at the ESRC seminar series on *Family, community and Social Change: Looking Back and Moving Forward* London South Bank University January 6th
- White Paper (2003) *The Future of Higher Education* London: HMSO
- Williams, F (2004) *Rethinking Families* London: Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation
- Wolfendale S and Topping K (1995) (eds) *Family Involvement in Children's Literacy: Effective Partnerships in Education* London: Cassell