

1991

Taking "Affective Education" seriously : some thoughts on the training of primary school teachers for thir role in providing conscious pastoral care and personal and social education

Peter Lang
University of Warwick

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte>



Part of the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Lang, P. (1991). Taking "Affective Education" seriously : some thoughts on the training of primary school teachers for thir role in providing conscious pastoral care and personal and social education. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 16(1). <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.1991v16n1.4>

This Journal Article is posted at Research Online.
<https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/vol16/iss1/4>

TAKING "AFFECTIVE EDUCATION" SERIOUSLY:

SOME THOUGHTS ON THE TRAINING OF PRIMARY SCHOOL TEACHERS FOR THEIR ROLE IN PROVIDING CONSCIOUS PASTORAL CARE AND PERSONAL AND SOCIAL EDUCATION

Peter Lang
University of Warwick

ABSTRACT

In this paper it is argued that many countries see education as partly concerned with the "Affective" dimension. It is then suggested that the way this is interpreted and responded to varies considerably and usually involves some ambivalence. Having identified different kinds of responses what can be described as the generalist approach is focused on, where all teachers are seen as sharing the responsibility for the pupils' pastoral care and personal and social education. This is then considered in relation to the situation in primary schools and the training of primary teachers. Having suggested why specific training needs have tended to remain unidentified and unmet, a case is presented for the recognition of a specific set of training needs and a particular approach to planning. It is not suggested that no effective pastoral care or personal and social education in primary schools takes place nor that there is no appropriate training. What is argued is that this tends to incidental rather than systematic. This paper is therefore intended to provide an example of a way in which a more systematic approach could be developed.

INTRODUCTION

How seriously do we take "Affective Education"? Indeed what do we mean by "Affective Education"? The term is less familiar in some countries than others, but as the first part of this paper takes an international perspective, the term "affective" is used as its meaning encompasses all current educational approaches to this aspect of student development in whatever country they are found. The "Affective Domain" includes all work that is concerned with the student's feelings, emotions and personal and social development, the positive encouragement offered by schools and the support when difficulties are encountered in these areas. In what follows I shall argue that "Affective Education" is not taken seriously enough, then endeavour to draw out the

implications of this for the training of primary teachers and, on the basis of this, identify some specific training needs.

In his comment on the attitude of researchers Dockrell provides support for my argument.

Of the 32 countries represented at the 8th World Congress of the World Association of Educational Research, ranging alphabetically from Argentina to Zimbabwe, at least 30 assumed that education had a role in the development of personality. Yet there is a marked Anglo-Saxon reluctance to be concerned with research in this area.
(Dockrell, 1987, page 5).

When the writer's own inquiries broadened Dockrell's focus to include teacher training, discussions with teachers and teacher trainers in a number of different countries indicated that this "reluctance" might extend to this area as well. These inquiries showed that a similar reluctance was found in an unwillingness to acknowledge the need for systematic as opposed to incidental consideration of education's contribution to the "affective development" of students.

Further, what was also revealed was what might be characterised as a widespread ambivalence in relation to the significance and implications of this area.

A WORLD WIDE CONCERN ?

Part of this ambivalence was found in the responses to questions addressed to teachers in several different countries and an examination of books and resources currently available. This data suggested that a responsibility for the personal and social development and welfare of pupils (their "Affective Education") is something that is accepted by schools and teachers in a number of different education systems and countries. Though the data also indicated that what this actually means in practice may vary greatly. Thus the ambivalence involved rhetorical

support for the area's significance contrasted with a reluctance to think through the resource and training consequences of this. Many of the teachers and teacher trainers I talked to while affirming the area's importance had not considered the significance of this in terms of resources or training.

It is also the case that, where it is recognised, responses to this responsibility are characterised by a range of differing policies and practices; these can be seen as forming a continuum from the situation where the main response is in terms of the work of a limited number of specialists, within (and sometimes without) the school, to the opposite extreme where the response is seen as something to which every teacher within a school contributes to a more or less equal degree. There is evidence that the implications of the specialised approach are not fully thought through in the countries where it is favoured. This is something highlighted in the case of the United States by a report on the school counsellor which suggested that in many cases they spent most of their time on administration and testing rather than counselling (Commission of pre-college Guidance and Counselling 1986). The discussion that follows will argue that this is the case in countries where the generalist approach is preferred. When the issue of training is considered it is in countries where the responsibility is seen as that of all teachers that this apparent lack of thought is very significant. Where "Affective Education" is accepted as part of the educational entitlement of every pupil, if teachers are not trained to provide it there is little chance the students will receive it. In England, a country where at both primary and secondary phases the assumption is that these areas are the responsibility of all teachers, the general lack of training and the resulting opting out by teachers and their unease and incompetence have been regularly drawn attention to. (See for example, Maher and Best (1982) and H.M.I. (1982).) Though as has been indicated there are problems with the specialised approach, at least those involved have normally received some form of systematic training for what they do. Though not in every case, in at least one province of Canada, Manitoba, teachers can be appointed to a post as full time counsellor without any further training. The diversity of response described above is heightened by the range of different terms used in relation to the work involved, such as pastoral care, personal and social education, moral education, health education, guidance and counselling. The use of

the term counselling tends to correspond to the most specialised approach and pastoral care to the most general but in fact there are no hard and fast rules, most terms being used in a number of different ways, both between countries and within them. It was for this reason that the broad term "affective education" has been used initially in this paper.

The writer's major concern is with the approaches which involve 'generalist delivery' and the need for teachers involved in these to be supported by specific training. As these approaches are most often found in countries where the terms pastoral care and personal and social education are used, it is these that will now be used. In England where both terms are current there can be considerable confusion about their usage as in some schools what is described as pastoral care is called personal and social education in others. Currently personal and social education is used at both primary and secondary phases; pastoral care mainly at secondary. Though there is a considerable amount of overlap, personal and social education has been more developed in terms of its place in the curriculum and its philosophical underpinnings. As long ago as 1983 the writer drew attention to tensions within the literature of pastoral care -

The final stage which takes us to the present has been the emergence of two as yet mainly unrelated strands, one strand being that of techniques, the other of critique. Technique is represented by the emergence of a literature relating to how you do pastoral care, this literature tends to take a mainly unproblematic stance 'pastoral care is pretty good, let's make it a little better'. The second strand that of critique, is represented by a small number of papers and articles which have called into question many of the basic assumptions made about pastoral care and suggested that the whole area is more problematic than is normally recognised.
(Lang, 1983).

This quotation illustrates the long standing nature of some of the concerns expressed in this paper.

In some ways the development of personal and social education has been more systematic than pastoral care. In 1984 Richard Pring produced the first book to seek to provide a philosophical analysis of the area. He saw it as concerned with the development of the 'person' and thus a consideration of the way decisions about what constituted a worthwhile person might be made.

Pring's (1984, page 31) analysis does lead to practical recommendations and he recommends -

We might therefore ask of the curriculum and of the other experiences pupils are receiving in schools ; does the curriculum, for example,

- (i) *respect pupils as people who can think. that is, have their own ideas and points of view, capable of contributing to the various explorations, inquiries, or activities that children and adults engage in ?*
- (ii) *assist pupils to see others as persons whatever their colour, creed or appearance?*
- (iii) *enable pupils to see themselves as persons, able not only to think and to reflect and to develop a point of view, but also to accept responsibility for their own behaviour and future ?*
- (iv) *foster that attitude of respect for oneself and others as persons, that is, as people that have legitimate points of view and that can and should be held responsible for what is done?*

Pring goes on to argue that schools keen to develop personal and social education should start by asking questions about the impact of the curriculum as a whole on the pupil. What little philosophical work on the aims of personal and social education that has followed Pring is also heavily weighted toward morality. One notable exception has been John White (1989) who presents a counter argument that PSE should be directed to the promotion of each pupil's personal well-being.

In England these philosophical perspectives appear to have had a limited effect on the perceptions and practices of those involved in work in these areas in schools.

For example, a recent HMI (1988) report on PSE in a number of secondary schools was critical of the somewhat 'ad hoc' and piecemeal approaches to planning and aims that were found.

In England the relationship of personal and social education with the curriculum has been reinforced by its inclusion in the directives of the National Curriculum Council.

The education system is charged with preparing young people to take their place in a wide range of roles in adult life. It also has a duty to educate the individuals to be able to think and act for themselves, with an acceptable set of personal qualities and values which also meet the wider social demands of adult life. In short the personal and social development of pupils is a major aim of education; personal and social education being the means by which the aim is achieved.

(National Curriculum Council 1990, page 7)

So far however, the Council's pronouncements have been at a very general level and make little contribution to raising the level or clarity of the debate.

Though there are significant differences between the specialised and generalist approaches and though the terms used vary, much that underlies them is in fact very similar.

My own direct inquiries and research have confirmed this is the case in the United Kingdom, Australia, Canada, the United States and Singapore. Indeed similarities can be quite specific e.g., almost every approach that I have examined has included something on the need to encourage decision making skills in pupils. To further illustrate this in relation to this paper's specific focus, consider the following from a Canadian paper on guidance at the elementary level:

The elementary school Guidance Programme should :

- *teach children to accept responsibility for their own behaviour;*
 - *develop in children an understanding and acceptance of one's self and others;*
 - *identify children with special needs related to learning, behaviour and interpersonal relations, which affect their social and educational growth;*
 - *teach children how to make decisions, solve problems, communicate and relate to others;*
 - *teach children how to acquire and use information which is essential to their career awareness and development;*
- (Morrison 1987, page 65)

These aims would be quite familiar to those concerned with pastoral care in England and

Australia, but when it comes to delivery there are clear differences. Morrison continues:

An elementary school guidance program is necessary to complement the services of principals and teaching staff. The program must be under the direction of a suitably trained Counsellor to whom teachers, parents, students and others concerned with a student's welfare have ready access.

Here we see a clear articulation of the specialised approach and it is significant to note the stress on training.

SOME PROBLEMS OF THE GENERALIST APPROACH

Returning to the primary phase and the 'generalist' approach, I would suggest that examples of this approach can be found in Australia, England and Singapore and it is these countries which I will have particularly in mind in the following discussion, though what I say will be applicable elsewhere and indeed my evidence will be drawn from a wider range of countries.

A significant illustration of the problems related to the 'generalist' delivery of pastoral care and personal and social education is provided by data from a project, sponsored by the Council of Europe, the "Contact School Plan". This project involved a network of twelve contact schools providing liaison between primary schools engaged in innovation. This was part of Project No. 8 "Innovation in Primary Education" of the Council for Cultural Co-operation (CDCC) of the Council of Europe (1982-1987). The following is a quotation from one of the reports written about the project.

CHILD-TEACHER RELATION

Quite a lot of contact schools ascertain that there is an increasing lack of satisfying social relations between children and adults. that is why they think it is an explicit task for the school to provide the children, for the sake of the development of their personality, with certain models, by way of adults working there, with whom they can identify themselves; somebody whom you care for, who is interested in you (not only your new jumper), who is open about him/herself, who has an identity of his/her own. This places teachers in the situation of having to enter into individual relationships with individual children (instead of a collective

relation with a group). And that requires an organisation of a group in which there is time for "one-to-one contacts.

At some schools this principle has led to explicit educational activities in the field of "learning to work together" and "self-control/learning for myself" for the older children. It also asks for open contacts with parents about the child as a person. A task that teachers also bring in is; associating with adults. At many schools both the necessity and the difficulty have been ascertained.

(Kopmels 1988, page 13)

The schools involved were a primary school in each of Australia, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, U.K. and (the then) West Germany, and it is this that makes this evidence so compelling. What is being said can't be dismissed as the product of particular national foibles but has something of a more general quality.

It seems to me that what Dr. Kopmels is describing and the schools felt a need to develop are some of the essentials of effective pastoral care and possibly also personal and social education?

The needs which the schools perceived have quite specific implications for the initial and inservice training of primary teachers. Currently in many countries primary teachers are not equipped to respond to them, either in terms of outlook or training. For example, in some of the countries in which the primary schools are situated teacher training involves no work that would assist teachers in addressing these perceived needs. In others it is only provided incidentally in support of some specific academic objective. Even in Britain famous for its innovatory primary education and where pastoral care and personal and social education have long been seen as the responsibility of all there have been few, if any, instances of specific training designed to prepare either new or experienced teachers. In virtually all the countries mentioned in this paper the training of primary teachers involves concern for academic subjects, specific teaching skills and aspects of classroom organisation, child development is also usually covered. However, there is little that can be seen as specifically providing the skills needed to deliver personal and social education.

THE IDENTIFICATION OF TRAINING NEEDS

It is now proposed to consider the preparation and development of teachers for the provision of pastoral care (pupil welfare and support) and personal and social education (the school's conscious contribution to the pupil's personal development) at the primary stage. In relation to the primary phase this is a particularly important topic not because this is the only phase where training is an issue but because, at this stage, the problem has some unique characteristics and equally the responses required are in some ways specific to this phase.

There are a number of reasons why this stage warrants concern, in particular the lack of systematic training already highlighted. For example, in England the report by Her Majesty's Inspectors "The New Teachers in school" (HMI 1982), already referred to, a study of new teachers in school found that "Whereas only some 21% felt less than well prepared for classroom management, the highest figure, 54% felt themselves not well prepared for pastoral duties".

How then might this situation be improved? Given that supporting literature is limited, theory undeveloped and policy often confusing, how might training needs be identified? Perhaps part of the solution can be found through an examination of the perceived needs of the primary schools themselves. I would suggest that a consideration of the concerns articulated in the European primary schools referred to in the quotation above gives some clear indications. I have already argued that the range of different countries involved gives this evidence a particularly powerful relevance, a relevance which my own experience suggests could well extend to the Australian context. The perceptions reported in relation to these schools suggest three training needs for teachers in the primary field, if they are to provide pupils with the effective pastoral care and personal and social education, they appear to be seeking. The schools have recognised the need for teachers who care in depth not just superficially, teachers who are capable and willing to be open and who have identities of their own.

- 1) A clear implication is that teachers need a considerable degree of self-awareness and capacity for personal growth.
- 2) If, as the quotation suggests, teachers need to work with pupils on a one-to-one basis,

they will need the skills to do this. Perhaps most importantly they will need the basic counselling skills of effective listening and of empathy.

The schools have also identified the importance of organising groups in a way that allows time for one-to-one contacts.

- 3) Here they touch on maybe the most crucial skill of all, the ability to organise and run the class in a way that provides opportunities for the one-to-one contacts to take place relatively undisturbed. As the schools themselves suggest, this requires a considerable degree of skill and sophistication on the part of the teacher, who will have to use a range of strategies and techniques. The essential skill here is that of using effective group work approaches. These, apart from providing the opportunity for the teacher to engage with individual pupils, can make a very positive contribution to the personal and social development of pupils. This is so, especially where the teacher acts as a facilitator and the pupils take much of the responsibility for the way things run and their actual learning. Where primary schools have developed systematic approaches to personal and social education, group work is often one of the key modes of delivery. Again, however there has been little specific training, and even where there has been, its effect seems to have been limited. In relation to this there is considerable evidence that many primary teachers do not have the skills needed to organise their classes in such a way as to provide opportunities for work with individuals, and as a means of encouraging their positive personal and social development, through the use of co-operative group work. Often teachers who believe they are using group work actually have pupils working in groupings, i.e., they have not planned or organised the situation so that the pupils will need to work in a collaborative manner. (See for example Yoemans (1983), Harwood (1988).)

NEGLECT OF PASTORAL CARE AND PERSONAL AND SOCIAL EDUCATION AT PRIMARY LEVEL

An added difficulty when considering training for primary teachers is that where attention has or

is being given to pastoral care and personal and social education it has tended to be at the secondary stage. In England and Australia the history of pastoral care over the last twenty years is a story almost entirely told in terms of secondary schools and even here the story has often been sketchy. Lack of a developed literature and clear rationale, confusion and lack of analysis as well as inappropriate practice have been features of both countries. (See for example Hyde, N. and Lang, P. (1987) and Hellwig, E. (1989).) So far as the development of personal and social education in England has been concerned the situation has been very much the same. Here a further problem from the primary teacher's perspective is that the main feature of the development of personal and social education in British secondary schools has been timetabled taught courses. Because of the difficulty of timetabling in a similar way and because of its association with the secondary phase, British primary teachers at least, have tended to see such an approach to PSE is not only impractical but inappropriate.

The relevance of pastoral care and personal and social education for primary schools is highlighted by some recent developments in Britain. In spite of the difficulties I have suggested, a number of individual schools and in some cases groups of schools have developed politics and related areas of practice. In some school this goes no further than the teachers of a particular age group meeting at the start of the year to decide what personal qualities they will seek to encourage in their students; in others pupils are encouraged to build up a personal record of their achievements; in a few schools, detailed whole school programmes have been developed and integrated into the school's curriculum and organisation. Eleanor Watson's description of her work developing pastoral care in a government primary school in Western Australia (Watson 1990), provides an example of one parallel example from Australia. It seems likely that there are others. Nevertheless it is still the case that at least in the British case these developments are very much the exception rather than the rule.

Given that pastoral care and personal and social education are concerned with the personal and social development of pupils, and in the light of the stress placed at the primary phase on the importance of early childhood experience in theories of child development, it might have been expected that work would start in the primary school and feed through to the secondary stage.

The fact that the reverse has tended to be the case perhaps throws some interesting light on the underlying factors that have had a causal relationship with their development. It is worth noting that both Best, Jarvis and Ribbins (1977) and Williamson (1980) have suggested that a key factor promoting these developments has been the need to control pupils. If their suggestion is correct it is hardly surprising that it was at the secondary stage that things started.

However, there is arguably another key reason why pastoral care and personal and social education have been neglected at the primary level and this stems from the perspectives and related attitudes of the schools themselves. In my introduction to an edited book on personal and social education I spend some time highlighting the issue, first by quoting one of the other contributors to the book.

Professor Richard Pring is one of Britain's most distinguished educational philosophers; he has written extensively on moral education and personal and social education. In his paper he argues -

It is seen as self-evident that Personal and Social Education (PSE) be at the centre of what we should be planning and should be doing in primary schools. And most teachers would claim that, in fact, they are indeed engaged in pursuing what is seen to be so obviously important.

But therein lies the problem, for what is seen to be self-evidently true, or what is seen to be obviously worth pursuing, rarely receives the critical examination and scrutiny that perhaps it requires. Rarely is that which is regarded as self-evident spelt out in detail. Certainly it is understood to be beyond the need for justification. And thus unfortunately anything might be acceptable under such bland and unhelpful titles as 'helping children to realise their potential' or 'facilitating growth' or 'encouraging personal autonomy'. (Pring 1988, page 2)

If, as Pring suggests, many primary schools while accepting the importance of personal and social education feel no need to consciously examine it, it is perhaps to be expected that specific training needs will not be identified.

In relation to the British situation I felt the argument could be taken further, and wrote -

Though it is seen as 'self-evident' among primary teachers that personal and social education should be at the centre of what is done in the primary school, this does not mean that PSE is regularly discussed in primary schools or much reflected in the documents produced relating to school policy. What it is more likely to mean, in most instances, is that when primary teachers are actually questioned about the importance of personal and social education, they will respond that it is central to all they do, both in their classrooms and the school as a whole. They will probably add that in their view the personal and social education of their pupils is already well catered for through their current practice. Thus even the 'taken for grantedness' of PSE is usually at an implicit rather than explicit level.

(Lang 1988b, page 2)

I have found that even where schools do make reference to personal and social education in their policy documents this can often remain a paper exercise and conscious thought and practice do not result.

Primary schools are often small, caring institutions with warm ethos and close relationships between pupils and teachers. However for primary school staff to make these assumptions about their own schools on an unexamined and 'taken for granted basis' is unhelpful and unlikely to lead to the identification of the skills needed to purposefully and positively promote the personal and social education of their pupils.

IN APPROPRIATE EMPHASIS

A related issue is that where primary schools do start to plan consciously their pastoral care and personal and social education this is sometimes as a response to problems relating to pupil behaviour, disaffection and social background. There are some inherent dangers if such an approach predominates. Pastoral care and personal and social education in isolation will not always provide solutions. If the provision of answers to these negative problems become seen as their major rationale, they may be discredited. However there is a more significant educational critique of this problem orientated development. Much that can be seen as pastoral care and personal and social education is part of the educational entitlement of all pupils, not just those with problems and difficulties. This is

something that has been stressed in the recent development of the new National Curriculum in England and was highlighted in a quotation from the National Curriculum Council given earlier in this paper.

RESPONDING TO THE PUPIL'S ENTITLEMENT

If then all primary pupils have an entitlement to pastoral care and personal and social education (individual support and planned situations which will enhance their personal and social development in a positive manner) what are the implications for the training of primary teachers?

Earlier, starting from concerns expressed in a sample of primary schools from Europe, I suggested three specific training needs. It should be noted that the European primary schools' experience acted as a catalyst for these ideas and that the writer had already started to formulate them. They were being developed on the basis of wide experience of initial and inservice training work with primary teachers in England, Singapore and to a lesser extent Western Australia. Indeed an examination of current practice can illustrate why each is important.

1) the need for self-awareness;

The 'taken for grantedness' already discussed is one reason why a greater level of awareness is needed but apart from this, as McGuinness (1989) has convincingly argued, a degree of critical self-awareness is a pre-requisite for effective work in this area. Pastoral care and personal and social education are not things you simply do to other people, they entail personal growth on the teachers part as well as the pupil. Thus for many student and practising teachers the ability to be open with pupils is not something that is automatically acquired, it is a something that has to be learned and developed and sometimes reviewed. In fact there is much skilled behaviour involved, when openness is appropriate and when not, what is appropriate to share and what not? the skills involved have similarities to those of 'self-disclosure' in the counselling process. The point about being open and self-disclosure is that they are not static but dynamic skills they develop through experience. Clearly an essential part of this process is learning about yourself, for example, what you are comfortable about

sharing, what not and why? Again personal and social education involves encouraging pupils to develop tolerance and understanding of difference in terms of culture and attitudes. To be taught effectively this behaviour requires modelling by the teacher. Teachers who do not consider their own preconceptions and prejudices thus coming to understand themselves better are unlikely to be able to do this. None of these ideas are new as they have been central to humanistic education for nearly two decades (see for example Rogers (1983)).

2) The need for the skills to work with pupils on a one-to-one basis;

In the case of the skills needed for working with individuals my own observations suggest that current primary practice allows teachers little opportunity to develop these; typically very small periods of time are spent with individual children. Although there is often talk of counselling children, the mechanisms through which this is achieved are rarely well established. Thus if these are skills which are unlikely to develop 'on the job' they clearly need incorporating into the training of teachers.

3) Pedagogic and classroom management skills which provide the space for work with individual children, and equally importantly, in themselves either contribute to or provide a vehicle for contributing to the pupils' personal and social development.

A key element of this will be the ability to promote effective co-operative group work. As has already been said, primary schools developing systematic approaches to personal and social education generally see group work as central to their work in this area. However, it has also been pointed out that there is evidence that the ability to organise and run this effectively is not something that a number of primary teachers have.

OTHER ISSUES

I am not arguing that these three training needs are the only areas that need consideration if effective pastoral care and personal and social education are to flourish in primary schools but they are the minimal necessary conditions. If they

are not met all else that is done is unlikely to succeed.

Equally though, training teachers in a way that responds to these needs will not be enough on its own. I have already written elsewhere of the need for effective management -

... all education particularly that concerned with pupils' affective development, requires a balance between top-down and bottom-up management. If staff are not involved in decisions and feel no ownership of what goes on, things are unlikely to be very effective. Pastoral care in particular requires real commitment from staff of a kind that cannot be achieved when even the most concerned heads take it upon themselves to make all the plans and give all the instructions.

(Lang, 1990b, page 101)

Finally, I believe that some kind of organising principles are needed to guide developments. Without such an underpinning, practice can easily become aimless and static.

In my work with schools and student teachers I have developed the following model which has been found useful both in mapping and considering the provision of pastoral care and personal and social education. In this model their objectives/response can be seen as falling into three categories, each of equal importance.

Reactive

- a) Support and individual guidance for students who have already encountered difficulties and problems of an educational, personal or social nature (cure)

Pro-active)

- b) Individual guidance and programmes/activities designed to equip students to deal effectively with common personal, social and educational difficulties they may encounter (prevention)
- c) Individual guidance, programmes and curricular based inputs designed to enhance the student's social development and personal effectiveness (enhancement).

This model provides an organising framework within which schools can develop a broad and balanced approach. Further b) and c) involve decisions about appropriate skills and the next stage of the planning may be to look at these. In relation to this I wrote in a recent short paper (Lang 1990C, page 9).

What emerges from this discussion is that for skills to be fully understood and developed within a school's approach to PSE they must be seen in terms of use in different contexts and situations. To be of real value to pupils they must be translatable into appropriate skilled behaviour, which in itself requires considerable skill.

Thus along with a balanced approach which includes both reaction and proaction the consideration of key skills and their contexts should form an integral part of a school's ongoing planning and reviewing of PSE. This would avoid the inefficiency of skills introduced fortuitously and randomly and the duplication that this can lead to. It will also avoid the ineffective 'bolt on' approach, when individual skills are emphasised on isolated occasions as a response to particular crises. The aim will be to encourage pupils' development of sensitive situation-responsive skilled behaviour rather than isolated and untransferable skills. The former could be characterised as education the latter as training.

I have suggested that the process involved can be conceived as follows.

.... in terms of a loop which involves both skill-specific work and opportunities to apply and develop what has been learned in a wider sense. This is an ongoing process and ultimately forms part of a spiral PSE curriculum which not only takes account of the pupil's total school experience - curriculum, ethos, climate - but also seeks to ensure continuity and development over time.

Use of the threefold model of the objectives/responses involved in pastoral care and personal and social education coupled with this skill development loop can be seen as a possible way of moving forward, once the basic conditions of training have been met. Thus when teachers have been trained in ways that equip them both in terms of perspective and performance, such a model and ideas may enable them to work together in a manner that will develop an effective whole school approach.

CONCLUSION

I have spent some time in this paper considering the situation of pastoral care and personal and social education in relation to Primary education. In doing this I have also touched on some of the broader issues that such developments in the

primary school will raise. On the basis of this I have suggested what are fundamental training needs of all those who will or do teach in primary schools in so far as pastoral care and personal and social education are concerned.

The three needs are critical as they all relate to the ways teachers perceive, understand and act at the interface - the point where the actual action takes place, be it in the classroom, the corridor or the playground. In the end it does not matter how elaborate the structures and policies are; if the interface remains the same, all the effort will have been wasted. This is something that has already been recognised by HMI in England when they concluded a report on pastoral care in a number of secondary schools:

Schools must consider how teaching and learning procedures can most appropriately benefit from and promote the care and overall development of pupils. Approaches will doubtless need to vary from school to school. Nevertheless the more schools are able to promote pastoral care through the curriculum, the more efficient and effective they are likely to be. Of course, if this is so, there will be no place for teachers who claim they are only interested in subjects, not young people, or vice-versa. (H M Inspectors 1989, page 47)

Thus HMI have recognised the fact that the elaborate structures of pastoral care in secondary schools make little difference if this does not affect what actually happens at the interface, the point where pupils and teachers interact in actual classroom situations. What HMI are arguing is that the correct location for pastoral care is within the classroom, not as in the current situation, outside it. Though the situation is not the same in primary schools, the message is, training must be concerned with what happens in the classroom.

I have sought to raise an important issue for those involved in teacher training. It has been my intention to draw attention to the questions not to provide the answers. There are of course further problems with which I do not deal. Such as the difficult task of convincing teachers and policy makers of the importance of the area in the first place. What is the appropriate stage for training to take place, how much as part of initial training, how much as part of inservice provision? Here we face the dilemma of stickability and applicability. If initial training does not include some response to the three needs identified little may be possible at a later stage. Equally if too much is done students will see it as irrelevant to

their immediate needs i.e. not applicable and thus little of it will remain with them. It won't stick. Logically some balance between initial and inservice seems appropriate.

The pastoral care and personal and social education of pupils (affective education) is of great importance at all phases of education; for primary pupils, who are at a key formative stage in the lives and are vulnerable, impressionable but also usually keen to learn it may be critical. It is often at this stage that attitudes are formed and social behaviours learned that can last for the rest of life. Primary schools need to confront these realities in a conscious and systematic way for this is an area too important to be left to chance or handled by those who are ill prepared to respond to the challenge presented by endeavouring to develop effective policies and practice.

REFERENCES:

- Best, R., Jarvis, C. and Ribbins, P.M. (1977). Pastoral care concept and process. *British Journal of Education Studies*, Vol 25(2).
- Commission on Pre-College Guidance and Counselling (1986). *Keeping the options open*. New York.
- Dockrell, B. (1987). "The Assessment of Children's' Affective Characteristics". *British Educational Research Journal*, Vol.13(1).
- Harwood, D. (1988). Personal and social education through co-operative and developmental group work in the primary school: Questions for research and development. In Lang, P. (Ed.). *Thinking about Personal and Social Education in the Primary School*. Blackwell, London.
- Hellwig, E. (1989). Pastoral care for the 1990's and beyond: A visitors viewpoint. *Pastoral Care in Education* Vol.7(1).
- HMI (1982). *The New Teacher in School*. HMSO.
- HMI (1988). *A survey of personal and social education courses in some secondary schools*. DES.
- HMI (1989). *Pastoral care in secondary schools: An inspection of some aspects of Pastoral Care*. 1987-1988, DES.
- Kopmels, D. (1988). School improvement from within: The contact school plan project number 8, *Innovation in primary education*. council of europe, strasbourg.
- Lang, P. (1983). Review of "Perspectives on Pastoral Care", Best, R. et al in *Pastoral Care in Education* Vol.1, No.1.
- Lang, P. (1988b). Introduction, in Lang, P. (Ed.). *Thinking About.... Personal and Social Education in the Primary School*. Blackwell: London.
- Lang, P. and Hyde, N. (1987). "Pastoral Care: Not making the same mistake twice". *Curriculum Perspectives*. Australian curriculum studies association. Vol.7.
- Lang, P. (1990a). "Trying, but could do better! A review of Pastoral Care in England and elsewhere paper presented at International Conference". *Pastoral care: A whole school responsibility*. International Institute for Policy and Administrative Studies, Perth: Western Australian College of Advanced Education.
- Lang, P. (1990b). "Responding to disaffection: Talking about pastoral care in the primary school": in Docking, J. (Ed.). *Education and alienation in the junior school*. Sussex: The Falmer Press.
- Lang, P. (1990c). "The place of skills in a planned approach to personal and social education in the primary school". *The Tacade Primary Journal* No.1, May.
- Maher, P. and Best, R. (1985). Preparation and support for pastoral care: A survey of current provision, in Lang, P. and Marland, M. (Eds.). *New Directions in Pastoral Care*. London: Blackwell.
- McGuinness, J. (1989). *A whole school approach to pastoral care*. Kogan Page Morrison, C., (1987). "Marketing guidance in elementary schools" *Guidance and Counselling* Vol.2, No. 5. University of Toronto.
- National Curriculum Council (199). *The Whole Curriculum*. NCC.
- Pring, R. (1984). *Personal and social education in the curriculum*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

- Pring, R. (1988). "Personal and social education in the primary school", in Lang, P. (Ed.). *Thinking about..... Personal and Social Education in the Primary School*. London: Blackwell.
- Rogers, C. (1983). *Freedom to learn for the 1980's*. New York: Charles E. Merrill.
- Watson, E. (1990). "A pastoral care programme in a Government primary school" paper presented at conference, *Pastoral Care : A whole school responsibility*. Perth.
- White, J. (1989). "The Aims of Personal and Social Education" in White, P. (Ed.). *Personal and Social Education a Philosophical Perspective*. London: Routledge, Kogan, Paul.
- Williamson, D. (1980). "Pastoral Care : Or Pastoralization". in Best, R., Jarvis, C., Ribbins, P. (Eds.). *Perspectives on pastoral care*. London: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Yeomans, A. (1983). "Collaborative group work in primary and secondary schools : Britain and the U.S.A." *Durham and Newcastle Research Review*.

BOOK REVIEWS

Hughes, Philip (ed.). (1991). *Teachers' professional development*. Melbourne: ACER

This collection of eight papers contributes to ACER's *Teachers in Society* series. The editors of the series specify that they seek to make links between the context, the education and the work of teachers. Through making such links they hope that the role of the Australian teacher will be better understood.

In the opening chapter, Philip Hughes provides a snapshot summary of the historical context of teaching and then focuses the attention of the reader on the primary concern of the book; teaching and factors which impinge upon the process. Teacher development is identified as one of the crucial issues for good teaching due to the stability of the teaching force and the changing context of the role. These two conditions have important implications for teachers and for teacher educators.

Hughes highlights issues which will be taken up by other contributors and provides a sketch of what is to follow in each chapter.

Against a backdrop summary of major educational reports and studies conducted in Australia during the last decade, Cherry Collins stresses the discrepancy between teacher development policy and practice. She suggests that in this time of change it is appropriate to examine what we have learned from past practice and what should be incorporated into new State and systemic structures. Collins also discusses "tasks facing teacher development", suggests that the "problem is political" and poses the question of "what next?".

Michael Scriven makes a strong statement on the relationship between teacher evaluation and teacher development. The position he advocates is that "teacher development is a sham unless based on evaluation". In a powerfully stated assertion, Scriven outlines some basic principles of teacher evaluation and development, expands his argument that "much current writing about the relation between teacher evaluation and teacher development is fundamentally wrong" and provides evidence from the literature for his claim. He proceeds to analyze the relationship of evaluation to development and summative to formative, and provides suggestions for casting evaluation within teacher development.

Bob Connors presents the results of a state-wide research project which sought to determine the development needs of teachers. Then he outlines a philosophy which supports four paradigms of professional development and argues for the importance of balance amongst the four. In concluding, Connors asserts that professional development is "a complex, continuous growth process, as teachers have different professional needs in differing educational contexts and at different stages of their careers". The paper ends with a recommendation that the needs of the teacher and of the system should be acknowledged and addressed.

Bevis Yaxley explores progress in the research area of teacher thinking and draws implications from this work for teacher development. In this chapter, teacher development programmes are seen as a means of assisting teachers cope and deal with changes in their professional, personal and economic lives. Both a theoretical stance and a practical application are offered.

The sixth paper, by John Baird, turns the reader's attention to the act of reflection and describes research which indicate its potential for individual and group development. He discusses the many uses of the term reflection and its subsequent hazy meaning. Observation, reflection and action are identified as key elements of teaching and learning and the process of reflection is discussed in relation to the outcome of metacognition. Three studies which focussed on the importance of reflection for intellectual development are presented and recommendations for implementing teacher development through reflection are offered.

Terry Evans and Daryl Nation present results of a research study which studied "primary teachers who commenced their fourth year of Bachelor of Education degrees as external students in Victoria in 1986". Three elements of social life - gender, accessibility and social class - are used as organizers for the discussion of research outcomes. The authors relate their research to the broad context and issues of distance education and its importance and relevance in the professional development of Australian teachers. They point out that against the background of factors such as remote schools and part-time study, which often necessitate reliance on distance education, "teachers' professional development courses can be seen as a process and resource with