Educational Review
Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:
http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~content=t713415680

The past, the papers and the project

Jean Rudduck [a]
[a] University of Cambridge, UK

Online Publication Date: 01 May 2006

To cite this Article Rudduck, Jean(2006)'The past, the papers and the project',Educational Review,58:2,131 — 143
To link to this Article: DOI: 10.1080/00131910600583993
URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00131910600583993

Educational Review
Vol. 58, No. 2, May 2006, pp. 131–143

EDITORIAL

The past, the papers and the project

Jean Rudduck*
University of Cambridge, UK

The past

For *Educational Review* pupil voice is nothing new. Almost 30 years ago a Special Issue on the topic was produced under the editorship of Roland Meighan who had a strong and enduring commitment to democratic frameworks in school. In the editorial to that issue (Meighan, 1978a), called 'The learners' viewpoint: Exploration of the pupil perspectives on schooling', Meighan said this:

> There are only a few studies of schooling from the point of view of the learners. … This special edition attempts to focus on this neglected aspect of educational writing, to stop and listen and try to understand … by bringing together contributions from a number of current researchers interested in the various aspects of the pupils' viewpoint.

For his own article, Meighan (1978b) sought permission from schools to ask pupils questions about effective teaching and he singles out a couple of responses: 'Children are not competent to judge these matters', and 'Children are not mature (enough) for this kind of exercise'. We still, occasionally, hear similar comments and our data, as do Meighan's, challenge such easy dismissals. He found, as we have found, that pupils are generally thoughtful, insightful and cooperative in talking about teaching and learning.

In the 1978 Special Issue, Penelope Weston and colleagues interviewed pupils about their expectations at secondary school, making the distinction that has recently surfaced again between pupils as consumers and pupils as clients. Peter Woods' article highlighted the importance of teacher–pupil relationships to pupils' commitment to school. Barry Wade's data underlined the importance for pupils of teachers' personalities as well as their pedagogic skills. Lynn Davies presented the girls' view of teaching and learning but acknowledged that she had reservations about the focus: 'It is rather like highlighting the lions' view of captivity: it implies that this is demonstrably different from the tigers' view, and thus draws attention

*Faculty of Education, Cambridge University, 184 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB2 2PQ, UK. Email: jr10026@cam.ac.uk

ISSN 0013-1911 (print)/ISSN 1465-3397 (online)/06/020131-13

DOI: 10.1080/00131910600583993

away from the significant fact of captivity'. Her data suggested that boys and girls have similar perspectives on many aspects of teaching and learning.

This tradition of an external researcher going into schools and gathering information from pupils is still strong but in the intervening 30 years a lot has happened to change the context and status of what we tend now to call 'student voice research'.

In the 1970s researchers' commitment to exploring pupil perspectives was sustained in part by the desire to build a fuller understanding of life in schools and classrooms, and rounding out the picture meant eliciting and valuing pupils' accounts of experience. And there was also a concern, nourished most obviously by Roland Meighan, with democratic principles, principles which tend today to be most strongly articulated within the citizenship agenda. And then, as now, there was a concern for young people's rights. It was in the 1970s, at a time when student unrest in higher education was hitting the headlines internationally, that the secondary school student wing (NUSS) of the National Union of Students drew up a list of 27 'articles'. Their policy statement has been described by Wagg (1996, pp. 14–15) as 'one of the most uncompromising and idealistic statements of liberation philosophy ever seen in British educational politics' although now, in the midst of the present wave of interest in student voice, the things they called for seem less radical (see Rudduck & Flutter, 2004, pp. 107–110). In the late 1980s the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, with its explicit support for hearing what young people have to say both within and beyond schools, made its mark and only recently (in 2004) a new organization was set up—a possible re-incarnation of the NUSS—the English Secondary Schools' Association, or ESSA for short.

The most striking changes are to do with the status of pupil voice; with the status of pupils, individually and in groups, in schools; and with what they as members of the school as a learning community have to contribute to school improvement, self-review and inspection as well as to the appointment of new staff. There is also a growing commitment now to looking at issues of children and young people's voices and rights across different agencies and contexts, including but going well beyond the school sector. In part this trend reflects the interests of central policy makers. For example, the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) has appointed a Children's Commissioner whose task it is to try to ensure that the voices of children and young people are heard. All relevant government departments are also expected to take account of their views, as set out in the policy document, *Learning to Listen*. Guidelines have been sent to schools and to Local Education Authorities (LEAs) urging them to consult pupils about things that affect them and pupils can now become associate governors of schools. The Government's (2004) publication, *Every Child Matters*, is evidence of a continuing concern with young people's perspectives.

The climate has clearly changed since the last Special Issue on pupil voice. To summarize, the main influences, with all their colourful contradictions about empowerment and control, have been these:

- A zeitgeist commitment to voice alongside a concern for client and stakeholder interests.
- The high profiling of issues of rights and entitlements.
- Expectations about students contributing as members of the learning community and 'having their say'—as in frameworks for school inspection and self-review.
- Curricular and organizational developments such as PSHE and citizenship education and also the development of school or student councils (and, out of school, youth parliaments and civic youth groups).
- Technical advances that have made it possible for students to have online cross-institutional or national/international discussions.

All these things have developed in a context of seemingly unremitting government commitment to building and sustaining a performance culture and a 'what works' criterion for judging the value of new initiatives. This may explain the highlighting of voice in the context of school improvement and individual achievement rather than the highlighting of voice as an element in the development of individual identity.

Student voice has had 'greatness' thrust upon it and there is a worrying prospect that as more and more agencies become involved (which is of course a good thing in itself), as more and more pupil voice websites are set up, and as more and more 'how to do it' resources are produced, we may have 'mile-wide' promotion with only 'inch thick' understanding: schools need to take time to think *why* they want to develop student consultation and what the risks and benefits will be for them. There is some evidence of a growing sense of obligation—and this can lead to compliance rather than to thoughtfully committed action: 'doing student voice' might come to be seen by some teachers as just another burden rather than a significant opportunity to review the capabilities and identities of children and young people in schools and in society.

The papers in this Special Issue

The Economic and Social Research Council's (ESRC's) Teaching and Learning Research Programme (TLRP) is probably the largest coordinated set of research-based initiatives that the UK education system has experienced.[1] The TLRP Director, Andrew Pollard, and his core team take very seriously their stewardship of such an enterprise and have had the foresight to think about dissemination and impact well before the Programme ends. One of the many strategies adopted was to suggest that educational journals might devote an issue either to papers from a number of related projects[2] or to a particular project within the Programme.

I was asked by the executive editor of *Educational Review* to put together a Special Issue about the project that I had coordinated—the 'Consulting Pupils about Teaching and Learning Project'. This was one of four projects funded during Phase 1 of TLRP's activity.[3] The project started in 2000 and 'ended' in 2004; our grant was just under £450,000, including a sum of £30,000 for dissemination in 2003–2004.

I deliberately put the word 'ended' in inverted commas because things do not just stop when the money runs out. By 2004 members of the project's core team and many of the teachers who worked with us had already published accounts of their experiences[4] as well as a number of academic papers; we are also contracted to write a cross-project account of our work for the TLRP's Improving Learning Series (published by Routledge). While I was keen to edit a Special Issue I was reluctant to repeat what had already been, or was soon to be, published. And I was also aware that the former members of the Project team were all now working on other things, some (but not all) growing out of the Consulting Pupils Project. I suggested therefore that we use the opportunity of a Special Issue to show how enquiry had moved on among members of the original project team and some of our close associates, both academics and teachers. So, while the papers focus on aspects of student consultation and participation, the sub-text is about how ideas flow out from the original core, are shaped by other ideas that they meet and by the contexts in which they settle.

The Special Issue is not therefore a 'state-of-the-art' set of critiques of the student voice movement, its advocacies, its claims and the issues it raises but an altogether more parochial presentation—a sort of project 'family snapshot' a couple of years on which manages to show something of the passage of time and the new arenas that consultation is moving into as well as the stronger recognition of the need to explore links between children's and young people's voices in and beyond school. At the same time it is important to remember the very different levels of interest, commitment and experience that exist within the system and to represent the teachers for whom listening to students is still a novel and bold step.

The papers are shorter than in many journals—between 4000 and 6000 words. Although they were invited, they were all subject to the usual external refereeing process; the careful and constructive comments of the referees were greatly valued by the contributors. Additionally, this editorial was sent to all contributors to review.

One task for the editor of a journal is to decide on the order of the papers. There were many ways in which this particular pack of cards could be cut and I spent a long time pondering different groupings and sequences. At the same time my more realistic and rational side kept telling me that few readers read journal papers in the order in which they are presented—and that probably even fewer readers bother to read the opening editorial! Roland Meighan's editorial for the Special Issue in 1978 was a model of uncluttered brevity: the 23 lines included a one-line summary of each of the nine papers—which were presented in alphabetical order!

The first three papers focus, from different perspectives, on consultation and the classroom; the next three on pupil voices outside the classroom—and outside school. In the first paper, David Pedder and Donald McIntyre draw on social capital theory to make sense of the different ways in which the teachers they worked with responded to what their pupils had said about their teaching and what they felt about sustaining the approach. In this enquiry, transcripts of the students' comments were made available to the teachers concerned and the teachers' responses were recorded as an additional layer of data (see Pedder & McIntyre, 2004). The authors identified

different modes of teacher responsiveness which characterized different processes and outcomes of consultation and they discuss, in relation to their data, the extent to which 'instrumentality', 'communicative equality', 'mutually respecting and trusting relationships', and the pursuit of 'shared goals' could be said to reflect the main differences in the classrooms they studied.

Fotini Mitsoni, who wrote the next paper, was a student whom I supervised (jointly with the archaeologist, Dr Kate Pretty) during the final stages of the Consulting Pupils Project. Fotini was caught up in our enthusiasms and the student perspective became a central theme of her M.Phil. thesis. Her data suggested that what students valued was content that connected with their everyday lives, opportunities for active participation and being trusted enough to be allowed to exercise choice and to carry responsibility. A few months later, in her first teaching post in a small Greek secondary school and uncertain how to motivate the more reluctant learners, she drew on the insights of the students she had interviewed during her field work in 10 schools in Greece. Her paper both summarizes her higher degree research and considers its relevance to her work as a classroom teacher.

Madeleine Arnot and Diane Reay (2004) had already written about student voice and the social dynamics of the classroom in relation to the secondary classrooms they had worked in during the Consulting Pupils Project. Here Diane extends the analysis to the primary classroom, exploring the complex process of reputation-building and the subtle influence of peer group hierarchies of respect. This paper maintains the tradition of the 1978 issue of *Educational Review* where researchers go into schools, gather and analyse data and communicate findings— primarily to an audience beyond the school (although summaries of Diane's data were shared with the class teachers involved). The paper documents the ways in which consultation can throw light on peer group cultures and the complex classroom dynamics that work against fairness, collegiality and a sense of community in the classroom.

Julia Flutter was also responsible for one of the project's six constituent enquiries and during her work with schools she became increasingly interested in new arenas for consulting students that were opening up, especially those that linked schools with other agencies. Perhaps the most prominent was the school environment and it is this topic that she writes about in her paper. Nationally, student involvement in the design of new buildings became a big issue and was given publicity through initiatives like the Sorrell Foundation's 'joinedupdesignforschools'—which brought architects into dialogue with students of all ages as well as with teachers. Such initiatives give students a role as clients. The spirit of cooperation and involvement that characterizes recent approaches to school design is far removed from the ecclesiastical tradition of Victorian school building which conveyed clear messages about the low status of young people in the context of deliberately awe-inspiring architecture.

John MacBeath, working with Kate Myers and Helen Demetriou, led the Project's enquiry into different ways of consulting children and young people in schools. Here, however, he works on a broader canvass, moving from school-based

consultation to explore the potential of student researcher teams in a global context. He tells the inspiring story of The Learning School, an initiative which brought together young people from other countries and cultures to work together in visiting and reviewing each other's schools. The experience leads them to revalue their own experiences in school and their own sense of national and personal identity. Whereas many student voice initiatives are fired by concerns about school improvement, this paper explores issues of agency and the idea of voice as an 'internal dialogue which re-shapes a sense of identity and extends the possibilities of the self'.

Mike Wyness was one of the expert consultants who contributed to the series of Project seminars which Julia Flutter organized. In his paper he suggests that while support for young people's voices may have grown, 'the extent to which they are articulated within spaces for participation over which children can genuinely claim ownership' remains limited. He offers two examples of civic participation in youth councils and examines the ways in which the young people involved relate to adult structures and understand their role as representatives of other young people. The paper also discusses the relationship of civic councils to school councils and the responses of students who have experience of both.

In the final paper Michael Fielding and Jean Rudduck reflect on the growth of interest in student voice and on key issues of power relations, authenticity and trust as well as the practical problems that developing consultation and participation can present to teachers and to schools. Michael was responsible, with Sara Bragg, for two of the Project's enquiries and went on to support the development of student voice across schools, both primary and secondary , in one LEA; he is also co-director of an ESRC seminar series that is taking a critical look at where student voice is going.

The Project

Given that the Consulting Pupils Project was the starting point for this Special Issue it seemed reasonable to include an outline of the Project.

Members of the Project's core team were Madeleine Arnot, Sara Bragg, Nick Brown (editor of Newsletters and Web pages), Nichola Daily (Project secretary), Helen Demetriou, Michael Fielding, Julia Flutter, John MacBeath, Donald McIntyre, Kate Myers, Dave Pedder, Diane Reay, Jean Rudduck (Project coordinator), Beth Wang . Together we managed six school-focused enquiries; a network for over 300 teachers, advisers and others; a meta-study and a seminar series that brought together people from outside the team whom we knew had something to offer to our thinking.

The Project's framework

Two arguments framed our approach. First, schools in their deep structures and patterns of relationship have changed less over the last 20 years than young people have changed. In school, young people often have less autonomy than they do

outside school and their social maturity may not be recognized; we were concerned to get a closer match between the capabilities young people demonstrate out of school and what happens in school—and consultation is one way of signalling respect for young people and inviting greater involvement. Second, it is important to avoid the habit, built into existing structures and expectations in schools, of underestimating pupils. Their insights into the social dynamics of school and classroom are built up from observation from their earliest days in school and they can often offer valuable guidance on ways of improving learning and the conditions of learning in schools. The curriculum does not always allow sufficient space for activities that they rate highly such as the sharing of ideas through discussion, problem-solving and collaborative action.

Consultation and participation

These are our 'working definitions' of the two key terms, consultation and participation. Towards the end of the Project, participation became a more dominant term—perhaps because it can be easier to implement and to contain or perhaps because consultation may be perceived as perpetuating a hierarchy in which pupils can only contribute if and when teachers authorize them to speak.

(1) Consultation is about talking with pupils about things that matter in school. It may involve pupils in:

- offering advice about policy and other initiatives
- commenting on their experiences of teaching and learning and offering suggestions for improvement
- reviewing recent major initiatives at school or year-group level or of changes in classroom practice.

Ideally, consultations are conversations that build a habit of easy discussion between teachers and pupils, and among pupils, about learning in school.

(2) Participation is about involving pupils in the school's work and development

- through a wider range of roles and responsibilities
- through membership of committees and working parties, and focusing on real issues, events, problems and opportunities.

At classroom level participation is about

- opportunities for decision-making
- understanding and managing your own learning priorities.

Although the Project's main concern was with consulting pupils about teaching and learning in the classroom, some of our enquiries followed where students and teachers wanted to go—and some led us outside the classroom to focus on aspects of school organization and their effect on pupils' motivation to learn and on their sense of membership of the school as a learning community.

Aims and structure

The Project's main concerns in 2000, when consultation was for many teachers a new and somewhat risky venture, were:

- to map the territory and potential of consulting pupils;
- to meet teachers' basic needs for guidance
- to identify and encourage critical reflection on key issues of planning and implementation.

Our longer and rather more elegant formulation described our aims in these terms:

- to understand and document the process whereby giving attention to pupil perspective and participation in schools can contribute to enhanced pupil engagement and achievement
- to understand and document the conditions in schools in which pupil perspective and participation can be constructively used to enhance pupil engagement and achievement
- to offer support to teachers who want to develop ways of enhancing pupil engagement and achievement through consulting pupils and increasing opportunities for participation
- to ensure that the growing interest in pupil consultation is grounded in worthwhile and defensible educational principles and practices.

We added an additional aim that we would meet after the end of the project by reflecting on the data from across the Project as a whole (see Rudduck & McIntyre, 2007):

- to integrate a theory of teaching, learning and achievement with a theory of pupil consultation and participation.

The six enquiries, or mini-projects, provided the main research and development opportunities; each had its own director and team. They represented a compromise between the kinds of enquiry that seemed important for the informed development of pupil consultation at the time and the interests and strengths of the members of the team. The enquiries ranged in duration from 12 to 18 months and in their funding from £25,000 to £45,000. These were the titles of the six mini-projects or enquiries:

(1) How teachers respond to pupils' ideas on improving teaching and learning in different subjects (Donald McIntyre and David Pedder)
(2) How the conditions of learning in school and classroom affect the identity and participation of different groups of pupils (Madeleine Arnot, Diane Reay and Beth Wang)
(3) Ways of consulting pupils about teaching and learning (John MacBeath, Kate Myers and Helen Demetriou)

(4) Pupil perspectives and participation: starting and sustaining the process (Michael Fielding and Sara Bragg)
(5) The potential of pupils to act as (co)researchers into the process of teaching and learning (Michael Fielding and Sara Bragg)
(6) Breaking new ground: innovative teacher-led initiatives involving pupil consultation and participation (Julia Flutter)

Teachers and pupils from 48 primary and secondary schools were involved in the six projects.

What we learned about consultation

First, a summary of observations. These are drawn from data from the six projects:

- Student consultation can, in some settings, contribute to the improvement of classroom teaching and learning.
- Students to varying degrees, but consistently, take advantage of opportunities to offer ideas for improving their learning opportunities.
- Some students can do this more confidently and articulately than others.
- In classrooms where the pupil group is diverse in terms of social class, ethnicity and motivation to learn, consultation can reveal the different ways in which pupils (differentiated by social class, gender, ethnicity and ability) experience and respond to opportunities for learning.
- In particular, consultation offers less successful learners a chance to explain why they find classroom life difficult and the kinds of support they need.
- Although pupils may recognize that fractious peer group cultures disrupt learning and divert teacher attention they often have no way of negotiating a different classroom climate. Pupils' accounts of what goes on in particular classrooms can guide teachers towards ways of achieving a more collaborative learning culture.
- What pupils say offers important insights for teachers—not only about the practice of teaching and learning, but also about issues of influence and inclusion (for instance, which voices get heard in the acoustic of the classroom and school).
- Consultation can empower pupils by demonstrating that what they say is taken seriously and can lead to change.
- Some things pupils say have sufficient status with teachers to contribute to their professional learning and therefore to changing practice in ways that can enhance pupils' learning.
- Overall, teachers can see the potential of consultation for developing 'a listening approach to teaching' that can guide planning and practice.
- However, while teachers may recognize the merit and educational value of pupils' suggestions they may not feel they can always take them on board.

Second, a summary of the potential impact on pupils of being consulted. Pupils have a lot to say about teaching and learning that can make a difference. Both the process of

being consulted and the changes of approach made as a result of the consultation can yield positive outcomes. Being able to talk about learning and teaching—and having your account taken seriously—can help pupils develop a stronger sense of:

- self-esteem and respect so that they feel positive about themselves as learners
  - the personal dimension;
- control over learning so that they are better able to understand and manage their own progress
  - the pedagogic dimension;
- membership so that they feel more included in the school's purposes
  - the organizational dimension;
- sense of agency so that they feel that what they say is taken seriously and can make a difference
  - the political dimension.

People also want to know whether consulting pupils and extending opportunities for their participation has any impact on achievement.[5] Our evidence suggests that it can, although indirectly. Being consulted about things that matter can positively affect students' learning in two ways.

First, what students say provides a practical agenda for reform that they recognize and will endorse. If their suggestions are acted on, or if there is an explanation of why some cannot be acted on, then students are more likely to feel that they have a stake in school and they are more likely to commit themselves to its learning purposes.

Second, being consulted and knowing that what you say is taken seriously builds students' self-respect and gives them a sense that others respect them and this, in turn, can also strengthen their commitment to learning. There is of course a danger in the present climate that young people may be consulted about their learning in the hope that 'standards will rise and attainment increase' (Fielding, 2004b, p. 203) rather than for reasons to do with their personal and social development or their active sense of membership of their school.

Overall, however, teachers' enhanced awareness of students' capabilities as courteous and constructive critics can lead not only to a continuing review of pedagogic practice but also help build more open and collaborative teacher–student relationships.

Third, a summary of the potential impact on teachers. Teachers are the gatekeepers of change and developing consultation often entails quite risky shifts of perception and of status *vis-à-vis* pupils. As a consequence of consulting pupils, many teachers said that they were better able:

- to understand what leads to disengagement and supports engagement, both at particular moments in lessons and more generally;
- to recognize and harness pupils' capacity for contributing constructively to the improvement of teaching and learning;
- to see taken-for-granted aspects of teaching and learning from a different angle.

In addition, some teachers said that listening to what pupils had to say about teaching and learning and schooling gave them:

- a sense of professional excitement and 'animation';
- the confidence to try to build more open and collaborative working relationships.

Across the participating schools, pupil commentaries on pedagogic practices and on the conditions of learning prompted a questioning of assumptions and led to some changes of practice—for example:

- at classroom level, in relation to
  - target setting
  - teachers' questioning techniques
  - feedback
  - ways of opening lessons, setting homework and dealing with constant low level noise;
- at school or year group level, in relation to
  - the designing of new reward systems
  - improving the working of the school council
  - contributing to the training of new teachers through commenting on teaching and learning in specific lessons.

Conditions for the development of consultation

Consultation has the potential for re-defining the status of pupils in school and for creating a more collaborative teacher–pupil relationship where learning is accepted as a joint responsibility. But although we can define its potential from studying the work in different schools, the realization of that potential will depend on the mix of pre-conditions and commitment in a particular classroom or school.

We identified three broad conditions for the development of consultation—to do with climate, reciprocity and a valuing of social- or civic-skills alongside academic achievement.

(1) Climate: Consultation needs a climate in the classroom or school that is marked by trust and openness—one where pupils are not anxious about reprisals if they comment on teaching. In many schools, building such a climate will take time.
(2) Reciprocity: The development of consultation is often constrained by traditional conceptions of childhood, in particular adherence to an 'ideology of immaturity'; it depends on teachers being able to see pupils differently, to recognize different capabilities and to believe that pupils can offer insightful comments that can make a difference. But it is also about young people seeing teachers differently, with both parties believing that they can have open and constructive dialogue about their work. However, as Michael Fielding has warned, developing this degree of trust is not easy in a context where performativity is so high on the agenda: 'a narrowly conceived, incessant

accountability leads too readily down the path of a carping, antagonistic relationship between students and teachers, one in which students become the new agents of external control' (2004a, p. 308). And it can also lead to a 'regressive pedagogy' which dares not stray far from the 'dull and the dutiful' (Fielding, 2004a). Fielding looks forward instead to 'new spaces emerging in schools where students and teachers acknowledge and delight in their mutuality, in their reciprocal responsibilities … in their radical collegality' (2004a, p. 310).

(3) Valuing of social- or civic-skills: Consultation and participation support the development of qualities that are often valued as much for 'adult life beyond school' as for interaction within school as a social community; these include such capacities as being able to see things from the perspective of others, being ready and able to negotiate where there are differences of opinion; a readiness to share expertise and to offer support to others; a readiness to seek support from others without fear of mockery.

We also constructed a set of basic guidelines for policy-makers in schools that help to define the more specific conditions in which consultation can flourish:

- Re-assuring teachers, pupils, parents and governors that consulting pupils and strengthening their participation are recognized nationally as legitimate moves.
- Building support among teachers (who may be sceptical) by presenting evidence of the positive outcomes of consultation.
- Being sensitive to the anxiety experienced by teachers who have not before consulted pupils about teaching and learning.
- Ensuring that other policies and initiatives are in harmony with the values that underpin pupil consultation.
- Making time for consultation and for developing pupils' and teachers' confidence and competence in handling consultation.
- Ensuring that consultation is pursued through a range of avenues and not seen as something simply for a school council.
- Giving pupil voices a central place in school self-evaluation.
- Ensuring that newly appointed teachers understand the potential of consultation and feel confident about developing it.

We also identified a number of issues—to do with power relations, trust, authenticity and inclusiveness that are raised by consultation. These are discussed in the final paper in this Special Issue.

Notes

1. By summer 2005 the Teaching and Learning Research Programme was able to list 47 projects across several areas: early years, primary and secondary education, post 16 and further education, higher education, workplace learning, professional learning and lifelong learning. The Projects are complemented by a series of six thematic seminars. (see www.tlrp.org)
2. For example the journal, *Research Papers in Education*, published a Special Issue (volume 20, issue 2, 2005) edited by Professor Mary James, deputy director of TLRP, which brought together material on teachers and learning from several TLRP Projects. The issue included a paper on the Consulting Pupils Project (see Mclntyre *et al.*, 2005).

3. The other TLRP Phase 1 Projects were: Towards Evidence-based Practice in Science Education (director Robin Miller); Understanding and Developing Inclusive Practice (director Mel Ainscow); Improving Incentives to Learning in the Workplace (director Helen Rainbird).
4. The Consulting Pupils Project's book publications: The Pearson series (series editor: Jean Rudduck)
   - Arnot, M., McIntyre, D., Pedder, D. & Reay, D. (2003) *Consultation in the classroom: Developing dialogue about teaching and learning* (Cambridge, Pearson Publishing).
   - Fielding, M. & Bragg, S. (2003) *Students as researchers: Making a difference* (Cambridge, Pearson Publishing).
   - Macbeath, J., Demetriou, H., Rudduck, J. & Myers, K. (2003) *Consulting pupils—a toolkit for teachers* (Cambridge, Pearson Publishing). Other books
   - Rudduck, J. & Flutter, J. (2003) *How to improve your school: Listening to pupils* (London, Continuum Press).
   - Flutter, J. & Rudduck, J. (2004) *Consulting pupils: What's in it for schools?* (London, RoutledgeFalmer).
5. Interestingly, the Chief Inspector's Annual Report for 2004 included information (Figure 12) which suggests a clear link between inspectors' judgments of the overall quality of a school and pupils' levels of satisfaction with 'the extent to which the school involves pupils through seeking, valuing and acting on their views'.

References

Arnot, M. & Reay, D. (2004) The social dynamics of classroom learning, in: M. Arnot, D. McIntyre, D. Pedder & D. Reay (Eds) *Consultation in the classroom: developing dialogue about teaching and learning* (Cambridge, Pearson Publishing), 42–84.

Davies, L. (1978) The view from the girls, *Educational Review*, 30(2), 103–110.

Fielding, M. (2004a) Transformative approaches to student voice: theoretical underpinnings, recalcitrant realities, *British Educational Research Journal*, 30(2), 295–311.

Fielding, M. (2004b) New wave student voice and the renewal of civic society, *London Review of Education*, 2(3), 197–217.

McIntyre, D., Pedder, D. & Rudduck, J. (2005) Pupil voice: comfortable and uncomfortable learnings for teachers, *Research Papers in Education*, 20(2), 149–168.

Meighan, R. (1978a) Editorial, *Educational Review*, 30(2), 1.

Meighan, R. (1978b) A pupils' eye view of teaching performance, *Educational Review*, 30(2), 125–138.

Pedder, D. & McIntyre, D. (2004) The impact of pupil consultation on classroom practice, in: M. Arnot, D. McIntyre, D. Pedder & D. Reay (Eds) *Consultation in the classroom: developing dialogue about teaching and learning* (Cambridge, Pearson Publishing), 7–41.

Rudduck, J. & Flutter, J. (2004) *How to improve your school: giving pupils a voice* (London, Continuum Press).

Rudduck, J. & McIntyre, D. (2007) *Improving learning through consultation* (provisional title), for the TLRP Improving Learning Series (London, Routledge).

Wade, B. (1978) Responses to written work: the possibilities of utilising pupils' perceptions, *Educational Review*, 30(2), 149–158.

Wagg, S. (1996) 'Don't try to understand them': politics, childhood and the new education market, in: J. Pilcher & S. Wagg (Eds) *Thatcher's children? politics, childhood and society* (London, Routledge Falmer), 8–28.

Weston, P., Taylor, P. H. & Hurman, A. (1978) Clients' expectations of secondary schooling, *Educational Review*, 30(2), 159–166.

Woods, P. (1978) Relating to schoolwork: some pupil perceptions, *Educational Review*, 30(2), 167–176.