

where research and development go hand in hand. The priority given to the acquisition of intellectual property rights in these accounts is a clear example of the danger of enslavement to another culture's ideas when those ideas have moved on.

A second aspect of technology transfer and, supposedly, entrepreneurialism is the payment of overheads by industry for research undertaken in universities, a topic which is simply not mentioned at all. Unless properly calculated overheads are paid, universities are essentially subsidising their industry sponsors. This is a surprising omission in any discussion of academic entrepreneurialism and one can only assume that it does not appear because the pressure on universities to undertake industrial collaboration is such that indirect costs will always be borne by the university. This implies an unequal relationship in which one partner in the collaboration is, in an important sense, subordinate to the other.

From a UK perspective, one of the benefits of the book, notwithstanding the occasional self-serving nature of some of the contributions, is the insight it gives to the development of individual universities in systems over which one cannot claim expert knowledge. There is little evidence here that the systems in China and India are going to challenge the intellectual creativity of Western universities, as it is sometimes alleged they are about to do: Tsinghua is obviously a powerful institution and the dramatic expansion of science and technology centres across China is most impressive but the instrumental nature of the investment does not suggest it will lead to creativity in science but primarily to R&D support for Chinese industry and commerce. The Institutes of Technology in India may offer more in this respect, but they are tiny, at around 2000 students each, and by any calculation fail to meet the scale of India's needs or the demand there for high-quality university education. The National University of Singapore is a strong institution but its entrepreneurial freedom is very obviously shackled to the demands of the state. Only Tokyo University and the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology have the requisite history of autonomy and intellectual freedom to compete with the kind of academic innovation, which one would find at ETH Zurich or Imperial College London.

The message one takes from this book is that in Asia the pursuit of the university's third mission is restricted to the commercialisation of research and support for the economy, and is dictated by a blueprint based on other cultures. Rather, what Asian universities need to do is to trust their own intellectual resources and release the entrepreneurial instincts of their staffs so that they offer an intrinsically Asian model of university development.

Reference

Clark, B.R. 1998. *Creating entrepreneurial universities: Organisational pathways of transformation*. Oxford: IAU Press, Pergamon.

Michael Shattock
Institute of Education, University of London, London, UK
shattock@he.u-net.com
 © 2012, Michael Shattock
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14748460.2012.729894>

Politics and the primary teacher, by Peter Cunningham, London, Routledge, 2012, 144 pp., £90.00 (hardback), ISBN 0-4155-4958-5; £21.99 (paperback), ISBN 0-2031-3589-1

Teachers are back in the political spotlight in Britain, following the publication of the White Paper, *The Importance of Teaching* by the Conservative-Liberal Coalition Government at the end of 2010. Whereas, twenty years ago, in the view of the then Conservative Government,

where research and development go hand in hand. The priority given to the acquisition of intellectual property rights in these accounts is a clear example of the danger of enslavement to another culture's ideas when those ideas have moved on.

A second aspect of technology transfer and, supposedly, entrepreneurialism is the payment of overheads by industry for research undertaken in universities, a topic which is simply not mentioned at all. Unless properly calculated overheads are paid, universities are essentially subsidising their industry sponsors. This is a surprising omission in any discussion of academic entrepreneurialism and one can only assume that it does not appear because the pressure on universities to undertake industrial collaboration is such that indirect costs will always be borne by the university. This implies an unequal relationship in which one partner in the collaboration is, in an important sense, subordinate to the other.

From a UK perspective, one of the benefits of the book, notwithstanding the occasional self-serving nature of some of the contributions, is the insight it gives to the development of individual universities in systems over which one cannot claim expert knowledge. There is little evidence here that the systems in China and India are going to challenge the intellectual creativity of Western universities, as it is sometimes alleged they are about to do: Tsinghua is obviously a powerful institution and the dramatic expansion of science and technology centres across China is most impressive but the instrumental nature of the investment does not suggest it will lead to creativity in science but primarily to R&D support for Chinese industry and commerce. The Institutes of Technology in India may offer more in this respect, but they are tiny, at around 2000 students each, and by any calculation fail to meet the scale of India's needs or the demand there for high-quality university education. The National University of Singapore is a strong institution but its entrepreneurial freedom is very obviously shackled to the demands of the state. Only Tokyo University and the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology have the requisite history of autonomy and intellectual freedom to compete with the kind of academic innovation, which one would find at ETH Zurich or Imperial College London.

The message one takes from this book is that in Asia the pursuit of the university's third mission is restricted to the commercialisation of research and support for the economy, and is dictated by a blueprint based on other cultures. Rather, what Asian universities need to do is to trust their own intellectual resources and release the entrepreneurial instincts of their staffs so that they offer an intrinsically Asian model of university development.

Reference

Clark, B.R. 1998. *Creating entrepreneurial universities: Organisational pathways of transformation*. Oxford: IAU Press, Pergamon.

Michael Shattock
Institute of Education, University of London, London, UK
shattock@he.u-net.com
 © 2012, Michael Shattock
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14748460.2012.729894>

Politics and the primary teacher, by Peter Cunningham, London, Routledge, 2012, 144 pp., £90.00 (hardback), ISBN 0-4155-4958-5; £21.99 (paperback), ISBN 0-2031-3589-1

Teachers are back in the political spotlight in Britain, following the publication of the White Paper, *The Importance of Teaching* by the Conservative-Liberal Coalition Government at the end of 2010. Whereas, twenty years ago, in the view of the then Conservative Government,

it was parents who knew best the needs of their child, the emphasis is now once again on teachers being held responsible for meeting such needs. According to the White Paper, teachers should be accorded maximum freedom to do so, although the price for failure will be high.

With the stakes raised in this fashion, into the maelstrom steps Peter Cunningham with this excellent and admirably well-timed study of politics and the primary teacher. Aristotle regarded politics as the 'master-science', and the often fraught relationship between education and politics has attracted many distinguished contributions ever since. Cunningham provides a more than worthy addition to this long list, demonstrating in the process just why, especially in the current context, education and politics form such a heady brew. The overall purpose of the book, as Cunningham explains, is 'to enable and encourage a critical, reflective and more informed approach to the politics and practice of primary teaching' (3). From the institutional demands of teaching in primary schools to the nature of the curriculum, to the issues around pedagogy, to the conflicts involved in the teacher workforce, to changes in initial teacher education, and accountability to national requirements and to the local community, politics is never far away.

Cunningham also brings history very much to the fore, in his analysis of primary teachers. This is highly appropriate both for the author, who is one of the leading historians of education in the UK, and for the topic itself, which benefits greatly from historical understanding. The book thus constitutes an excellent example of the contemporary importance of historical insights in education. The assessments involved are clear and precise. The time-charts of politics and primary education, provided both for longer-term historical developments since the seventeenth century and for recent changes since 1964, are models of their kind. Apt commentary is given on a wide range of subjects such as the role of league tables, the position of health education, and the changing role of local education authorities.

Most importantly, the book demonstrates how teachers should be informed about these broader political and historical contexts, for after all, as Emile Durkheim insisted, it is the teacher who is expected to implement the latest policy changes, and so should be aware of their wider implications.

There is an instructive comparison to be drawn between this new book and Cunningham's earlier work on curriculum change in the primary school, published over twenty years ago (Cunningham 1988). Curriculum has always been a key concern of Cunningham's work, and he demonstrates this again here, not least in chapter 4 which explores the politics of citizenship, health and well-being in the primary curriculum. On the other hand, the previous volume, which was published at the time of Kenneth Baker's Education Reform Act in 1988, placed an emphasis on the 'dissemination of the progressive ideal'. It highlighted the significance of this ideal and its vulnerability to political attack. There is much less room for discussion of progressivism in this new book, and the author is less sanguine about progress in general and about the future. Indeed, as he concludes, 'Going forward we go into the unknown'. (124).

Yet at the same time, it would be misleading to characterise this as a pessimistic work. It is one that brings out both the problems and the possibilities of primary teaching. Bernard Crick is cited as offering a democratic socialist model of politics, and Cunningham endorses his ideas about democracy more than once, while also stressing the ideas of the conservative libertarian, Kenneth Minogue. Ultimately, it is written in the spirit of Crick's avowal of the potential of politics and the dangers that it faces, no less than of the importance of politics for the exercise of freedom. Cunningham argues strongly that politics provides a forum for making the professional voice heard (124).

At the end of a balanced and careful account, Cunningham enters a spirited claim that

Those who work in, with and for primary schools need to maintain a critical consciousness of the political context, to defend the measure of autonomy needed to promote children's development and all-round learning, to respect children's rights and to model habits of good citizenship. (127)

It is the signal achievement of *Politics and the Primary Teacher* that it expresses so well the bright promise of primary teaching and yet also offers a sober reminder of the dangers that lie ahead.

Reference

Cunningham, P. 1988. *Curriculum change in the primary school since 1945: Dissemination of the progressive ideal*. London: Falmer.

Gary McCulloch
Institute of Education, University of London, London, UK
g.mcculloch@ioe.ac.uk
© 2012, Gary McCulloch
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14748460.2012.729895>