

## **Extended schooling and community education: mapping the policy terrain**

Catherine A. Simon\*

*School of Education and Childhood Studies, Bath Spa University, Bath, UK*

*(Received 9 March 2012; final version received 7 June 2012)*

New Labour's extended schools initiative added to existing models of community schooling. The paper identifies the key principles behind extended schooling, making comparisons with historical models and contemporary trends in community education. Part one examines New Labour's use of extended schools to deliver their social policy agenda. Part two focuses on alternative models of community schooling used in England and Scotland, suggesting alternative solutions to issues of social disadvantage and educational underachievement. Part three examines the European tradition of social pedagogy exploring the potential contributions it brings to educational and welfare practice in England given the new Government's approach to localism and the 'Big Society'.

**Keywords:** community education; education policy; extended schools; social pedagogy

### **Introduction**

By 2010, all English schools, following injunctions by the Labour Government of 2001–2005, were encouraged to operate as 'extended schools' Department for Education and Skills (DfES 2005), becoming in essence the hub for a range of family services and activities for children and young people. Locating schools at the heart of their communities was central to this agenda. This raises significant questions about both the role of schools and the nature of 'community'.

The development of extended schools is not specific to England; it is part rather of a wider international movement towards community-orientated schooling, particularly in areas of disadvantage, although the rationale for this is not entirely clear (Dyson and Raffo 2007). As Williams says, 'community acts as a warmly persuasive word [used] to describe an existing set of relationships' (1976, 76) which suggests connections based on kinship, cultural heritage, shared values and goals. Such bonds also imply stronger and deeper associations than the mediated and contractual communities represented by schools and other organizations of the state or market (cf. Held 2006). But whose community is it that schools are being urged better to engage with and what does it mean, in any event, for schools to be at a community's centre?

Notwithstanding these questions, particular notions of community fit well with the current political scene in England. Although the duty for all schools to operate extended services singly or in federation has been removed (Carpenter et al. 2011), the Coalition

---

\*Email: [c.simon@bathspa.ac.uk](mailto:c.simon@bathspa.ac.uk)

Government continues to lend its support to the notion of extended schools. As its Education Secretary says:

Locally, we will rely on schools to work together with voluntary, business and statutory agencies to create an environment where every child can learn, where they can experience new and challenging opportunities through extended services, and where school buildings and expertise are contributing to building strong families and communities. (DfE 2010, 2.51)

This fits with the Coalition's conception of the 'Big Society' whereby communities, represented by key individuals, interest groups or institutions, including schools, are encouraged to take increased ownership of and work more collaboratively towards local area reform. In this connection, it is noteworthy that a number of recently created academy schools, such as the Cooperative Academy, Manchester, Oxford Academy and those run by Absolute Return for Kids, all offer extended services. This marks a subtle shift from New Labour's approach of encouraging local involvement in services as a vehicle for modernisation and change. Indeed, underpinning the extended schools agenda is the imperative that schools engage with a range of service functionaries, traditionally beyond their remit, so as better to dispense a 'core offer' of services to their community, including child care, parenting support and family learning. New Labour stated, 'extended schools – both primary and secondary – [should] increasingly act as hubs for community services, including children's services' (DfES 2004a). This repositioning of schools as central to the delivery of children's services was underpinned in England by wholesale workforce remodelling and public sector reform. But what are the underlying assumptions of community and community education embedded within this concept of extended schooling?

Labour's *Extended schools: providing opportunities and services for all* (DfES 2002) set out a model of extended schooling which has been largely assumed by the Coalition administration (DfE 2010). The model called for an expansion, not only of the hours of the school day and the school curriculum, but also targeted users and associated workforces. Schools, either individually or in clusters, are envisaged as being open from 8 am to 6 pm for 48 weeks of the year.

This model of provision does not stand on its own, however, forming part of a wider social policy initiative that includes the modernising of the welfare state via collaborative working within and between public, private and voluntary sectors. New Labour's aim was to produce a holistic, joined up service of welfare, based on multi-agency collaborative practice that would be responsive to the needs of an inclusive and broad-based clientele. The rationale was not just to provide better access to a range of health and social services, but to improve pupil attainment, behaviour and motivation through greater parental involvement and support. This was also central to the wider social policy of tackling generational worklessness through family intervention and an emphasis on skills and workfare to work. It has been widely noted that a deficit model of some families, communities and schools (cf. Vincent 2000; Levitas 2005; Tomlinson 2005; Ball 2008a) tacitly underpins the initiative.

### **Understanding community**

At the heart of this approach is the idea that schools should engage better with the community. However, as indicated earlier, 'community' is a slippery concept. The term can mask a number of different meanings and interpretations. At its most basic, 'community' can relate to a geographical area, physical neighbourhood or a group of people linked by common interest (Simon and Ward 2010, 72). Smith (2001) elaborates on all of this, using the

concepts 'place' (locality) and 'interest' non-place forms of community and 'communion' (a spirit of community) to explore different, sometimes competing, meanings of community, adding to the mix the idea of social networks. The fact that people live in close proximity to each other does not itself create a community. It is the social networks they fashion with family, friends and associates that ultimately count the most, helping to produce and reproduce community cohesion and continuity (Lee and Newby 1983; Held 2006).

Community can also be a powerful organising tool in political discourse. It defines who is 'included' and, by default, who is 'excluded'. It identifies collective values and highlights perceived threats that may undermine cohesion. The notion of 'community' apparent in the construction of extended schools and in the wider social policy of New Labour is certainly political in the sense that it is defined by conceptions of the 'right' and the 'good'. Such conceptions articulate with 'community' as a core constituent of New Labour's social policy and a means of countering the individualist theory and culture which arise from neoliberalism, although in the process of policy implementation by schools community benefits were often subjugated to the needs of individual pupils and attainment targets. (cf. evaluations of the full-service extended schools (FSES) pathfinders Cummings et al. 2005, 2006, 2007; Cummings, Dyson, and Todd 2011, 104.)

Communitarianism makes an appearance in this analysis as well, chiefly as a critique of liberalism and libertarianism (Olssen, Codd, and O'Neil 2004). The notion embodies two schools of thought – on the one hand, a belief in the interconnectedness and interdependence of individuals and, on the other, a belief in the value and quality of the community itself that ought to be protected. Both suggest a positive role for the central state in protecting freedom and maintaining a balance between the choice of the individual and the needs of the community. Communitarianism, thus conceived, is about understanding, promoting and protecting certain shared experiences, beliefs, and values. For schools, this inevitably raises fundamental questions about the purposes of education in promoting or challenging those underpinning values, practices, and moral dimensions of community living.

It is against this background that education may represent an attempt to extend the value of schooling beyond the expected or intended benefits accrued by the individual. In other words, it may be regarded as a means of (re)connecting individuals with the wider community, promoting in them an active and positive role for the school as an institution of the state. Citizenship and social cohesion were key elements of New Labour's education policy agenda, notions it articulated through a rights-and-responsibilities emphasis. With this in mind, it set out five outcomes that it expected all children and families to achieve following their engagement with children's services. In return, parents were to promote healthy choices, ensure the provision of safe homes and stability, support learning and promote positive behaviour (DfES 2004b).

Thus, what is apparent in this kind of analysis is a complex relationship between the state, its institutions, and the individuals and communities of which they are members. But it raises the question of whose community and whose values are endorsed here. For schools, this is a particular dilemma, given that school choice policies in the UK have determined that the local school may not in fact serve the local community or neighbourhood in which it is situated. How that community is conceptualised may also put the school at odds with the agenda of central government. These tensions link to fundamental questions of the moral purposes of education, most notably those defined by the school, and the role of the state in progressing them. Therefore, the debate about community education is centrally about the extension of educational goods.

### Squaring the circle: models of community-orientated schooling

Despite some success and an increase in the numbers of working class students gaining top grades in public examinations, the overall picture remained patchy (Perry and Francis 2010). Extended schooling represented New Labour's attempt to create a fairer distribution of educational advantage, with an emphasis on targeted intervention in areas of (perceived) deprivation. To this end, the positioning of schools within the community became actively linked with the promotion and acquisition of educational goods as the antidote to low attainment, poor skills acquisition and 'worklessness' in the lowest performing districts. This was in essence the underpinning rationale of New Labour's approach to social welfare reform, reflected in such interventions as the creation of SureStart Children's Centres, the Child Poverty Strategy and the Neighbourhood Renewal Strategy. Extended schools provided New Labour with an additional vehicle through which it could target the most disadvantaged families and communities, with the aim of tackling educational underachievement and altering the life trajectories of the most vulnerable children. The objective was a holistic approach to education service provision that would cater for the needs of the whole child and thereby address the requirements of the wider family, neighbourhood and community.

A mass of literature pertaining to full-service and extended-school delivery conveys the message that existing schools and education systems are failing in their contemporary contexts because they no longer meet the complex needs of their students (Wilkin, White, and Kinder 2003, 6). Muijs (2010, 347) reinforces this view, arguing that traditional school-effectiveness and school-improvement strategies have focused largely on schools as single-purpose institutions, attempting to improve in-house processes for the benefits of their intake. While not without some success, these strategies have made little impact on social disadvantage or the attainment gap between the classes.

The common maxim that complex problems require complex solutions characterised New Labour's approach to social policymaking and the expedient of multi-agency working. No one service, it argued, is able to meet the multiple needs of its individual clientele. New Labour's answer was to 'modernise' public services so that they were responsive, effective and fit for purpose in a time of rapid social change. The policy gained political traction because it embraced a deficit assessment of certain communities and types of parenting (Levitas 2005). Based on this rationale, 'community focused schools' became the means through which the cycle of deprivation in such communities could be reversed, with education providing the passport out of unemployment, underachievement and social exclusion: the moral imperative was one of improved educational opportunity, achievement and standards.

However, it is this very thesis that Dyson and Raffo (2007) question, noting that it focuses on proximal (central) factors associated with schooling and disadvantage, rather than on addressing any distal (peripheral) factors that may explain or underpin these. They argue that there is no attempt to address how worklessness arises, why there are concentrations of workless people in particular neighbourhoods, how low expectations account for differential achievements or how a combination of such factors can explain poor health or increased street crime.

What they invite us to question here is Labour's *raison d'être*, based on what they regard as inadequate cultural explanations of, and remedies for, disadvantage, constructing certain communities as lacking in resources and unable to help themselves. According to Dyson and Raffo, Labour's very rationale for community-orientated schooling itself raises concerns. How far can community-orientated schools be expected to counter the reproduction of educational disadvantage found in other, more traditional, types of schooling? Indeed,

community schooling itself may even contribute to the production and reproduction of education inequalities, particularly in relation to interventions concerning parenting and parent involvement. Parents and communities become 'enlisted' into agendas determined by professionals (Dyson and Raffo 2007, 307) whose agendas serve largely to impose the cultures and norms of (middleclass) professionals on poorer families (de Carvalho 2001; cited in Dyson and Raffo 2007, 308).

Without ignoring the ameliorative effects of community-orientated schooling on individuals and local communities, Dyson and Raffo go on to point to the lack of any large-scale research evidence for the aims or claims of this model of schooling. This they attribute to the inherent focus on proximal rather than distal factors. What they call for is an approach that capitalises on the positive opportunities offered by the 'democratic spaces' afforded by community-orientated schools and a wider policy commitment to social change. Embedded within this more traditional view of community education are assumptions around voice, power and agency. The democratic spaces made possible through community education, they conclude, offer the potential for marginalised groups to engage with state institutions such as schools from an empowered position, thus challenging the status quo. Although some may be sceptical about the empirical evidence available for such claims, the potential to dialogue openly must of itself be seen as a positive, even intrinsic, and good. Giddens (1994, 117–24), among many others, for example, supporting this view, has argued for the 'reinvention of democracy' in the modern age, by which he means the need to develop now and in the future new opportunities for a greater dialogic and more cosmopolitan democratic participation (see also Held 1995, 267–86).

Thus conceived, a key intention underpinning community schools is that they should seek to be embedded within a wider social inclusion policy context rather than regarded as mere add-ons to it. One example of such an approach is found in Scotland's New Community Schools (NCS) project, 1999–2002 (Sammons et al. 2002). Unlike their English counterparts, the Education Action Zones (1998) and latterly, the Extended Schools agenda, NCS emphasise the need to work *within* the public sector, using target setting to facilitate public sector reform. Nixon, Allan, and Mannion (2001) argue that this approach not only makes the NCS more public service friendly, but also that it highlights the potential for increasing local democratic practice by developing strategies *with* rather than *for* communities. This approach wrests (in theory, at least) power, voice and agency from institutions of the state and the professionals directing them, more equitably towards the community. Notwithstanding the limitations in the Scottish experience in terms of qualitative impact on communities, improvements in attainment or in the quality of support through teaching and learning, the initiative demonstrated potential for clusters of schools to work together and with other local agencies to support the education and development of children, their families and communities (Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Education 2004, 29).

However, the notion that better participation results in a strengthened civil society via enhanced opportunities to engage with policymaking processes is not a straightforward one and is also open to challenge. New Labour's approach to localism insisted that communities should play an augmented role in the development and implementation of government policy at local level. This entailed a shift in the relationship between the state and the governed. The state takes a positive, proactive role in that it promotes and facilitates opportunities for civil engagement via new public management. Local people take an active role in tailoring services and programmes to local need, orchestrated at national level by a benevolent central government. Localism, understood in this way, is a way of legitimising state intervention into the lives of local communities. The legacy of this approach is heightened bureaucracy, attention to systems and processes, and depreciated levels of trust in professionals with a

corresponding increase in accountability measures. In contrast to such 'big government', the Coalition has set out its stall for a 'Big Society', with which its Free Schools initiative and the new Open Public Services Bill are linked. This represents the handing over of institutions of the state to local communities, minimising, it is claimed, both bureaucracy and malevolent government involvement, whilst maintaining high levels of accountability and professional trust. However, questions emerge about what is meant by 'civil society' here and the power relationships that exist between its various elements. In relation to schooling and educational outcomes, this invites scrutiny of the links between schools and their communities. Who is it that represents civil society (individuals or groups), and what does their accountability look like? What is the nature of their motivation and what is the capacity of such individuals and groups to act? What are the real opportunities for the co-construction of school policy and engagement or the physical spaces/places in which (state) education can take place? What is the nature of the professional workforce involved, its professional status and espoused moral values?

Questions such as these beg others, notably about the relationship between 'extended' schooling and 'community' schooling. As examples of community-orientated schooling, extended schools and community schools represent two sides of the same coin. The notion of extended schools should indeed challenge what is understood by traditional schooling in a number of ways. At its most basic, the term 'extended' relates to the act of extending or being extended and thereby suggests an actual physical or conceptual change; extension in relation to *extent* or *range* as well as extension in relation to *prolongation* and *enlargement*. One might refer to the extension of a limb or to an addition that extends the physical area, operation or contents of something. Extension can also refer to additional time in terms of the repayment of a debt. University or college tutors may offer an extension for the submission of an assignment. Extramural courses are also examples of extension, in that they are offered *in addition* to the standard University or college courses on offer. In terms of extended schooling, extension may refer to an augmentation of the influence, jurisdiction and remit of a single institution (the individual school) or to what is understood as the schooling system as a whole. Furthermore, it has implications for the numbers and nature of employed and voluntary staff, the nature of the students or clientele including parents and other members of the community, the curriculum, opening hours and the physical space and place in which instruction may occur.

In England, according to the DfES (2005) prospectus, all schools were expected to operate as 'extended schools' by 2010, extending not only the hours of the school day and the school curriculum, but also its targeted users. Schools, either individually or in clusters, were to be open from 8 am to 6 pm for 48 weeks of the year. This involved head teachers brokering, marketing and running a 'core offer' of services and enrichment activities in partnership with local authorities and local providers including other schools. The core offer included a varied menu of activities, combined with childcare in primary schools, parenting support and community access to school facilities (Wallace et al. 2009), representing an extension in real terms, of the school staff, activities, curriculum, space and influence.

More broadly, a renewed focus on collaborative and partnership working charged all schools with an explicit focus on the wider community. This presented a change to the education landscape in line with the wider Every Child Matters (ECM) (DfES 2003) social agenda, extending the remit of schools beyond their physical boundaries and shifting the focus of activity to include the wider community service providers from the public, private and voluntary sectors. The assumption was that all agencies working for improved outcomes for children and young people would engage in collaborative practices once the needs of the community were made explicit.

One significant inhibiting factor in the drive to shift the focus of all schools towards engaging with the community in England is that the organisational structure at local authority level nearly always separates schools and social care from other key services and providers. Under New Labour, it was the Children's Trust that sought better to manage this organisational configuration, so that by 2007, schools were placed under a statutory duty to cooperate with all key services and providers whilst maintaining their managerial independence. This reflected a similar responsibility for local authorities to ensure cross-sector collaboration and service delivery across the children's workforce.

Although there was intentionally no national 'blueprint' for the delivery of extended services, compliance was to be assured through a revised Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) inspection framework (Ofsted 2009), local authority duties detailed in the Children Act, 2004, and the legal requirements of school governance. The focus was on the delivery of the ECM five outcomes and attainment targets. The Training and Development Agency for Schools also ensured acquiescence through the professional standards for teachers and head teachers. Other national organisations, such as ContinYou and 4Children, provided advisors, 'toolkits' and frameworks which focused on the systems and management of service delivery.

Cummings et al. (2007, 78), in their evaluation of FSES, note that this approach produced convergence around 'outcomes for pupils, and a more holistic focus on pupils in the context of families and communities'. In other words, it was providing a form of community education that seemed to add significant value. Head teachers also found that they were positively constrained in this direction by the strategic direction of their local authorities. It was further noted that local authorities were beginning to enjoy a wider area overview than schools and their immediate neighbourhoods and were able to facilitate networks and partnership working more broadly (Cummings et al. 2006, 34; see also 2005, 15). In essence, extended schools seemed to identify a new interface between a traditionally hierarchical education system in the control of local councils and a more collaborative model of public service delivery under more direct control of the Children's Trusts. In reality, however, the managerial freedoms devolved to schools since the late 1980s meant that schools which engaged enthusiastically with the extended schools agenda did so on the basis of short-term, proximal concerns of educational improvements in standards, with little regard to wider social and community reforms (cf. Cummings et al. 2005, 2006, 2007).

An alternative model to extended schools, and one developed almost in parallel, was the Scottish New (latterly, 'Integrated') Community Schools referred to earlier. NCS were developed by the Scottish Executive as a flagship of devolved government. According to Nixon, Walker, and Baron (2002, 408), the initiative was designed to 'establish a different kind of schooling, offering a wide range of educational, health and social services, and working in close partnership with its community and local government'. The aim was that every local authority should have at least two NCS projects by 2001. The Scottish Office had previously published *Schools and Community Education for the Learning Age* (Kay et al. 1998) which identified the impact of individualistic/particularistic and holistic/community development approaches to community education. Those practices that supported 'low' boundary maintenance were most favoured. Community development, as well as life-long learning, was regarded as essential to the initiative. The aim of collaborative partnerships was to 'ensure the effective provision of education to enable members of the community to participate as citizens in the practice of local democracy' (Ibid., 8). Nixon et al. (2001) argue that the early NCS projects highlighted the role of the local authority in the pursuit of community empowerment, integrated service provision and authority-wide impact. They identified four 'fundamentals' of change which they argue represented the aims of those working with and within

the project: enhancing community well-being; enhancing pupil well-being; enhancing family well-being and enhancing professional well-being. Well-being here refers to that broader concept defined by Sen (1999) (cf. Clarke 2005) namely the freedom to lead a life that one can value which includes both positive freedom (opportunities) and negative freedom (freedom from restraints and inequalities) actualised as *achievement*. Each of these fundamentals is centrally concerned with learning, while relating it to the wider aspiration of improved 'quality' of life. In other words, the local authority is seen to have the capacity to create those 'democratic spaces' for community empowerment favoured so much by Dyson and Raffo. Absent is any sense that community-orientated schooling should be dependent upon a deficit model of families and communities.

Such 'alternative' models of community education in England are not new. Early examples include the Village College system established by Henry Morris in the pre-war years of the 1920s and 30s. Built on the necessity for community regeneration in rural Cambridgeshire, Morris (1925) envisaged the Village College as 'the community centre of the neighbourhood' (cited in Smith and Jeffs 1998). The boundaries that divided school and the community were to be removed, so that the 'daily routines and experiences of schooling become an expression of community life' (Ibid.). Underpinning this was a philosophical idea: 'every local community becomes an educational society and where education becomes not merely a consequence of good government but good government a consequence of education' (Morris 1925 cited in Rée 1984, 144).

Morris's vision stresses the idea of education from the cradle to the grave. More recently, Cooperative Schools, with their roots in the nineteenth century Cooperative movement, have become headline news since the promotion of Trust Schools under New Labour and the Coalition Government. Cooperative values are cited as self-help, self-responsibility, democracy, equality, equity, solidarity and social responsibility – values that articulate positively with notions of social cohesion and community participation, as well as the moral purpose of socialisation.

Indeed, the idea that schools should serve not merely their pupil intakes, but also whole families and communities stretches back to the very origins of formal education (Craig 2004). Moss and Haydon (2008), for example, see this trend as being based on a broad notion that understands 'education as fostering and supporting the general well-being of children and young people, and their ability to interact effectively with their environment and to live a good life' (Moss and Haydon 2008, 2). In other words, education is regarded on this basis as a 'process of upbringing and increasing participation in the wider society, with the goal that both the individual and the wider society will flourish' (Ibid.). This is 'education in its broadest sense' which

takes a broad view of the scope of intentional learning, going beyond the cognitive or academic to encompass the social, aesthetic, ethical, cultural and physical domains. Such learning is understood to be inextricably linked to care, health and other conditions needed to live a good life and for democratic community to flourish: learning contributes to these conditions and these conditions contribute to learning. (Ibid., 3)

'Education in its broadest sense' challenges traditional assumptions about schools as institutions; the school becomes just one setting for educational endeavour and practice in the effort to increase equality of outcome. Its aim is the fairer distribution of educational benefits, which are seen as primary social goods. To this end, 'education in its broadest sense' calls for professional partnerships and integration that shift the focus of education beyond



the boundaries of formal learning and into the everyday lives and experiences of children, family, and communities.

### The social pedagogic approach

This idea of 'education in its broadest sense' is closely associated with the German notions of *Bildung* and *Haltung*, each of which refers to a much broader concept than the English word 'education' permits. *Bildung*, for example, incorporates not only teaching and learning, knowledge and skills, but also values, ethos, personality, authenticity and humanity. *Bildung* therefore embraces 'not just schooling but also the cultivation and elevation of character' (Stephens 2009, 344). Closely aligned to this concept is *Haltung*. Loosely translated as mind-set, attitude, or ethos, *Haltung* stresses values, notions of morality and views of humankind (Eichsteller and Holthoff 2010). It is this notion of *Haltung*, or more specifically a social pedagogic *Haltung* in Continental Europe, that both determines social pedagogy's emphasis on the interactions of professionals in the everyday lives and experiences of children, families, and communities referred to above.

Social pedagogy, therefore, offers another useful framework for understanding and practising education in its broadest sense, and for reconceptualising what is meant by community education. It is another example of lifelong learning, from cradle to grave, this time characterised by a belief that all children, young people and adults are in need of educational guidance in order to develop their capabilities. Throughout Continental Europe the term 'pedagogy' is used to embrace much more than the narrow application of the word as the science of teaching and learning favoured in the UK. In the German context, pedagogy came to represent the manner in which social culture is reproduced in society. At the level of the collective, this concerned the values, laws and rules regulating the relationship of individuals to each other, and the manner in which they were explained and put into practice to ensure progress. According to Lorenz (2008, 629) this represents socialisation into the lifelong process of formation. This implies both emancipation and adjustment at the same time, in other words a process of self-actualisation both as an individual and as a socially active and responsive being. *Sozialpädagogik* is the term adopted to express this social mandate and the comprehensive role of education.

In practice, this means that the European notion of pedagogy is related to a much wider set of services for children and young people beyond traditional schooling, including parent support. Pedagogy, according to this definition, stands for the convergence of education and care – it is education with a profound community focus. It is about working with the child, young person and adult as social beings: a concept that demands a holistic approach, addressing the physical, psychological, emotional and spiritual aspects of the individual. The work of the social pedagogue reflects this, and as in the example of the Scottish Community Schools presented earlier, it is not deficit orientated, seeing individuals rather as capable and proactive instead of vulnerable and weak.

Nevertheless, the aim of social pedagogy is not solely in the social realisation of the individual, but of society as a whole. It is about defending and promoting democracy, human rights and the rights of the child, valuing children and young people as human beings now rather than adults in waiting. Socialisation via social pedagogy, therefore, has significant implications for the individual, for the education and social welfare professions, and for the role of the state in creating, maintaining and legitimating social bonds. According to this analysis, the role of the social pedagogue has potential for capitalising on those social democratic spaces afforded by community-orientated education discussed earlier, acting as a bridge between the individual, community and the processes of the state in organising and maintain-

ing social order and culture. In the UK, social pedagogy is already beginning to gain some traction in areas of youth work and social welfare. An interesting next step would be to explore its potential as an alternative expression of community education in England.

## Conclusion

This paper has attempted to map the complex policy terrain of community-orientated schooling from its early inceptions in England such as Morris's Cambridgeshire Village Colleges. This and the example from Scotland of the New (Integrated) Community Schools suggest a positive role for schools as part of a much wider whole community project which relates life-long learning to aspirations of improvement and quality of life for the corporate body of the community and by implication for its individual members. However, the separation of education and care in the English context, and the advance of the neo-liberal state in which correctional models of social reform have flourished, have nonetheless encouraged responses to social problems at the level of the individual, even under the more holistic policy agenda of ECM. New Labour's interpretation of extended schooling is an example of this which was constructed upon deficit interpretations of certain individuals, families or communities. Such interpretations have been powerful in the hands of policy makers and schools. Evaluations of extended schools in England (and regrettably of the New Community Schools project in Scotland) have identified tendencies for schools to pursue those proximal elements that support core educational (school) aims rather than longer-term, distal strategies that develop a lifelong process of education and socialisation into and of the community.

The relationship between the state, education and community still remains uncertain in a climate of political and economic change. Nor are they any longer the only arenas for action given the growth of new philanthropy networks (Ball 2008b; Ball and Junemann 2011). Social pedagogy, whilst not promoted here as a panacea for all the tensions inherent in the UK system of education and social care, at least has resonance with the wider, more positive aims of community education outlined above and may provide a useful tool for exploring and developing those 'democratic spaces' afforded by this model of education and lifelong learning. The shift in social policy away from children and families to the 'Big Society' might allow for the growth of a social pedagogic tradition within the UK, one which acts as the philosophical, ethical and moral social 'glue' at a time when Government rhetoric speaks of being less bureaucratic and prescriptive, encouraging and empowering communities to take responsibility for themselves.

## Notes on contributor

Catherine A. Simon is senior lecturer in Education at Bath Spa University where she specialises in the teaching of Education policy, multi-agency working, and education research methods. Her main areas of interest are the relationships between education, schools and the community, and the development of social pedagogy in the UK. She is currently completing her EdD at the University of Bath under Professor Hugh Lauder.

## References

- Ball, S. 2008a. *The education debate*. Bristol: Polity Press.
- Ball, S. 2008b. New philanthropy, new networks and new governance in education. *Political Studies* 56, no. 4: 747–65.
- Ball, S., and C. Junemann. 2011. Network governance and Coalition education policy. In *No country for our young*, ed. R. Hatcher and K. Jones, 51–68. London: The Tufnell Press.

- Carpenter, H., C. Cummings, A. Dyson, L. Jones, N. Kassam, K. Laing, D. Muijs, I. Papps, M. Peters, and L. Todd. 2011. Extended services in practice – A summary of evaluation evidence for head teachers. DfE. <https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/DFE-RR155.pdf> (accessed June 2, 2012).
- Clarke, D.A. 2005. Sen's capabilities approach and the many spaces of human well-being. *Journal of Development Studies* 41, no. 8: 1339–68.
- Craig, J. 2004. *Schools out: Can teachers, social workers and health staff learn to live together?* Demos: Hay-Group. <http://www.demos.co.uk/publications/schoolsout> (e-book accessed August 11, 2010).
- Cummings, C., A. Dyson, and L. Todd. 2011. *Beyond the school gates: Can full service and extended schools overcome disadvantage?* London: Routledge.
- Cummings, C., A. Dyson, I. Papps, D. Pearson, C. Raffo, and L. Todd, eds. 2005. *Evaluation of the full service extended schools project: End of first year report*. Nottingham: DfES.
- Cummings, C., A. Dyson, I. Papps, D. Pearson, C. Raffo, L. Tiplady, and L. Todd, eds. 2006. *Evaluation of the full service extended schools initiative, second year: Thematic papers*. Nottingham: DfES.
- Cummings, C., A. Dyson, D. Muijs, I. Papps, D. Pearson, C. Raffo, L. Tiplady, L. Todd, and D. Crowther, eds. 2007. *Evaluation of the full service extended schools initiative: Final report*. Nottingham: DfES.
- Department for Education (DfE). 2010. *The importance of teaching: Schools white paper*. Norwich: The Stationery Office.
- Department for Education and Skills (DfES). 2002. *Extended schools: Providing opportunities and services for all*. London: DfES.
- Department for Education and Skills (DfES). 2003. *Every child matters*. Nottingham: DfES.
- Department for Education and Skills (DfES). 2004a. *Five year strategy for children and learners*. London: DfES.
- Department for Education and Skills (DfES). 2004b. *Every child matters: Change for children*. Nottingham: DfES.
- Department for Education and Skills (DfES). 2005. *Extended schools: Access to opportunities and services for all*. Nottingham: DfES.
- Dyson, A., and C. Raffo. 2007. Education and disadvantage: The role of community-orientated schools. *Oxford Review of Education* 33, no. 3: 297–314.
- Eichsteller, G., and S. Holthoff. 2010. The social pedagogy development network. <http://www.Children-webmag.com/articles/social-pedagogy/the-Social-Pedagogy-Development-Network> (accessed December 17, 2011).
- Giddens, A. 1994. *Beyond left & right: The future of radical politics*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Held, D. 1995. *Democracy and the global order*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Held, V. 2006. *The ethics of care: Personal, political and global*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Education (HMIe). 2004. *The sum of its parts: The development of intergrated community schools in Scotland*. Edinburgh: The Scottish Executive. <http://www.educationscotland.gov.uk/inspectionandreview/hmiepublications/index.asp> (accessed May 29, 2012).
- Kay, H.L., L. Tett, I. Martin, P. Munn, S. Ransom, and J. Martin. 1998. *Schools and community education in the learning age*. Interchange 56. Edinburgh: Scottish Office Education and Industry Department.
- Lee, D., and H. Newby. 1983. *The problem of sociology: An introduction to the discipline*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Levitas, R. 2005. *The inclusive society?* Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Lorenz, W. 2008. Paradigms and politics: Understanding methods paradigms in historical context: The case of social pedagogy. *British Journal of Social Work* 38: 625–44.
- Moss, P., and G. Haydon. 2008. Every child matters and the concept of education. *Viewpoint* July 17: 1–7.
- Muijs, D. 2010. Leadership in full-service extended schools: Communicating across cultures. *School Leadership and Management* 27, no. 4: 347–62.
- Nixon, J., J. Allan, and G. Mannion. 2001. Educational renewal as democratic practice: 'New' community schooling in Scotland. *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 5, no. 4: 329–52.
- Nixon, J., M. Walker, and S. Baron. 2002. The cultural mediation of state policy: The democratic potential of new community schooling in Scotland. *Journal of Education Policy* 17, no. 4: 407–21.
- Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted). 2009. *Framework for the inspection of maintained schools in England*. Manchester: OFSTED.
- Olssen, M., J. Codd, and A.M. O'Neil. 2004. *Education policy: Globalisation, citizenship and democracy*. London: Sage.

- Perry, E., and B. Francis .2010. The social class gap for educational achievement: A review of the literature. RSA Projects. [http://www.thersa.org/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0019/367003/RSA-Social-Justice-paper.pdf](http://www.thersa.org/_data/assets/pdf_file/0019/367003/RSA-Social-Justice-paper.pdf) (accessed May 29, 2012).
- Rée, H. 1984. *The Henry Morris collection*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- Sammons, P., S. Power, K. Elliot, P. Robertson, C. Campbell, and G. Whitty. 2002. *National evaluation of the New Community Schools pilot programme in Scotland: Phase 1 (1999-2002): Interim findings and emerging issues for policy and practice*. Interchange 76. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive Education Department.
- Sen, A. 1999. *Development as freedom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Simon, C., and S. Ward. 2010. *Does every child matter? Understanding New Labour's social reforms*. London: Routledge.
- Smith, M.K. 2001. Community in the encyclopedia of informal education. <http://www.infed.org/community/community.htm> (accessed May 29, 2012).
- Smith, M.K., and T. Jeffs. 1998. Henry Morris, the encyclopedia of informal education. <http://www.infed.org/thinkers/et-morr.htm> (accessed May 29, 2012).
- Stephens, P. 2009. The nature of social pedagogy: An excursion in Norwegian territory. *Child and Family Social Work* 14, no. 3: 343–51.
- Tomlinson, S. 2005. *Education in a post-welfare society*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Vincent, C. 2000. *Including parents? Citizenship, education and parental agency*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Wallace, E., K. Smith, J. Pye, J. Crouch, A. Ziff, and K. Burston. 2009. *Extended schools survey of schools, pupils and parents: A qualitative study of the perceptions and usage of extended schools*. Ipsos MORI: Department for Children Schools and Families.
- Wilkin, A., R. White, and K. Kinder. 2003. *Towards extended schools: A literature review*. Nottingham: NFER.
- Williams, R. 1976. *Keywords: A vocabulary of culture and society*. London: Fontana.