



**UNIVERSIDAD DE SALAMANCA
DEPARTAMENTO DE SOCIOLOGIA**

MATERIALES DE TRABAJO

SERIE PROPUESTAS

Paper A/02/E 97

**SCHOOLS, TEACHERS, AND SOCIAL CHANGE:
A QUESTION OF PACE**

Mariano F. Enguita

Paper presented to the XIV WORLD CONGRESS OF SOCIOLOGY
Montreal (July 27-August 1 1998)
Research Committee 28: SOCIOLOGY OF EDUCATION

ABSTRACT

The fate of the teaching profession and of the school as an institution must be understood against the background of the pace of social change. An adequate time unit to measure this pace is not found in nature-based scales such as years, etc., but in the individual human life span. Along most of its existence, mankind experienced a slow rate of change that would have been almost imperceptible to most individuals, who lived and died in a world similar to that which their parents and kindred had known, and so this period can be considered as one of supragenerational change. Primary institutions such as the family, the neighborhood, etc. were enough to socialize children. Industrialization, urbanization, the modern state, printing, modernization, etc., brought about a period in which children must incorporate themselves into a world different from and opposed to their parents' world, a period which can be termed as one of intergenerational change. These were the alcyonic times for the school, which represented city vs. country, print vs. oral, universality vs. particularity, progress vs. tradition, etc., and the school was needed to socialize children when primary groups were no longer sufficient. Now we live in an epoch of constant, multidimensional, accelerated and unforeseeable change, which can undoubtedly be referred to as a period of intergenerational change. Initial training of teachers reveals itself totally insufficient; professional consciousness and incentives are not enough to assure updating; teacher competence and status are questioned by families with higher educational levels, etc., all of which leads to an identity crisis and greater stress for teachers. Unequal development, international labor division and globalization add the feasibility of the coexistence of the three stages, represented by different sections of the population, in the same country and even in the same school.

In our culture and epoch, education is linked to such a degree with social change, that it is difficult to reflect on either of these terms without finding oneself immediately reflecting upon the other. In fact, evocating the one almost necessarily leads to evocate the other, and viceversa, so that it is surely not surprising that we find the interrelationship between the two presented in varying forums. On the other side, it would be tremendously pretentious to attempt to cover all that could be touched upon concerning such a complex relationship just within the physical and temporal space of an article or a conference. Therefore, I will limit myself to looking at certain aspects, which I consider of principal importance, and, in any case, paradigmatic. First, I will deal with the role of the school in an epoch of major historical changes such as the contemporary ages. Then I will address myself to the relationship between educational reform and social reform. Finally, I will look at the effects of change upon change or, more concretely, of the acceleration of the rate of change.

School in the transition to the contemporary world

There are certainly many options available when summarizing the processes which have lead humanity from traditional to modern society, from the endless unfolding of sectional processes (in population, family, production, consumption, politics, property, the use of information, the establishment of States, the nature of war, etc.) to an attempt to reduce all of these into one which will claim the dominant position (rationalization, industrialization, the division of labor, capitalism...). Making no attempt to justify my choice, I will center my view on four aspects: industrialization, the making of nations, the constitution of citizenship, and the modernization of attitudes. In each case I will briefly examine the role of the school in the transition produced and permit myself to speculate a bit on the future role of the school in relation to those processes already occurring or foreseeable.

For millions of people (and for millions more still in the Third World) industrialization represented a change from subsistence production

or the beginnings of market production though still based on small ownership, to organized wage labor subject to the impersonal regularity of machinery and to the pressure of competition.¹ For adults, this transition at times produced dramatic situations, from the wanderings of peasants thrown off their land, to the impoverishment of independent artisans, even to all types of forced labor imaginable.² For the generations that followed, the principal instrument of the transition was the school. In school, students learned, as they still do today, to follow a schedule, to be regular in their work, to follow instructions whenever and however they are given, even when they are not interested; to place their abilities at the disposition of another, as do three fourths to nine tenths of all adults economically active —wage laborers. Many more schools were created in the shadow of the factories than in the shadow of pedagogical thinkers which generally fill the pages of books on the history of education, confusing history with cultured thinking about it. The question is whether nowadays, when the world of the business enterprise seems to be evolving, at least partially, toward forms of organization based on initiative and worker co-responsibility, and when the changes in the labor market point toward the precariousness of employment and the need for constant professional updating or recycling, etc., the school will not still be too anchored in its role as a socializing institution for future wage workers. I believe that it is so, even if we should add numerous nuances and look at the matter from various points of view.³

In the making of the nation-states, the school has performed a no less central role. If the thesis put forward by E. Gellner that a nation is not something essentialist which develops from the bottom to the top but is

¹ See, among many others, De Grazia, 1964; Thompson, 1967; Pollard, 1965.

² Foucault, 1976; Furniss, 1965.

³ See Enguita, 1990, on the conformation of the school in the process of the unfolding of capitalism.

instead built top down, specifically from the diffusion down to the masses of a culture initially the domain exclusively of the élite, be they the feudal lords loyal to a common king, or cultured bourgeoisie,⁴ is correct —and, in my opinion, it is—, then the function of the school becomes clear: to ease communication by unifying language, to create a common past through history, to rub out inner boundaries and underline outer boundaries through geography, to prepare the path toward a unified market through homogenization of the systems for weights and measures, to bring about adhesion to the existing powers through political and ideological indoctrination. This serves just as well for dictatorial or authoritarian regimes (fascism, communism, traditional monarchies, military dictatorships) as for democratic regimes: otherwise think of the role assigned in the 19th century in France to teachers as “priests of the Republic”, in the content of the campaigns for literacy in the revolutionary regimes or in the shocking patriotism in North American schools.⁵ And it also serves for nation-states (nations in the strictest sense) as well as for those which are not true nations (nationalities), for those which are and for those wishing to become: what the Spanish state previously did with its schools, that is what the autonomic mesogovernments and national movements are doing today with theirs, although ranging from regionalist nothingness, through the relatively gentle “linguistic immersion” of Catalonia, to the ideological brutality, past and present, of many *ikastolas*. The problem nowadays is that this use, as traditional as current, may set badly with the reality, the possibilities and the risks of ever-more-multicultural societies in which nation-states gather in ever-larger immigrant minorities, autochthonous minorities demand greater recognition and domestic migratory movements result in a loss of homogeneity in the

⁴ Gellner, 1983.

⁵ As an example of this, see Conant, 1959.

territorial communities at the middle level (for example, the autonomous communities).⁶

By constitution of the citizenship, the other aspect characteristic of the modern state —or simply the state since it is really all the same thing— I refer here to the emergence of a new relationship between the individual and the state. The innovations are, in historical time, the recognition of equal rights for all adults (this must be clarified: for men before than women, for owners before than non-owners, etc) and the establishment of a relationship with public authority free of intervening bodies (such as previously had been all types of corporations from cities to families, then guilds, fiefdoms, or religious or knightly orders). The school was and is still an ambiguous instrument in this process. On the one hand, it represents in itself a certain liberation of the individual with respect to his particular home environment, treatment as a autonomous subject with rights and obligations.⁷ On the other hand, among its functions is to cause this individual to internalize and make his own (rather than reject) the social order which recognizes him. As Foucault correctly pointed out, disciplines represent the reverse of Enlightenment, and, as Kant noted much earlier, inner law is the counterpoint of external liberty, and both form the self-determination of the individual. But education has contributed in a deeper sense to the generalization of the citizenshipship. Marshall spoke of three stages in the implantation of the latter, or to three successive and accumulative forms of citizenshipry: juridical (equality before the law), political (democracy) and social (public services and social welfare).⁸ The school is an essential instrument for the existence of the first two, since exercising civil and political rights requires their recognition and a certain skill in their management, and an integral part of the third, since it is by

⁶ Enguita, 1992.

⁷ Parsons. 1959.

⁸ Marshall, 1950.

itself, as an is the main institution, the main accomplishment of the welfare state . However, we find limits and risks here also: in the best case, we must ask whether the school is not lagging continually behind in relation to the growing complexity of civil, political and economic life; in the worse case we may ask ourselves whether it will not play an active role in the division of the population into two large groups, those who manage to get into the mainstream and those who find themselves thrown to the edges, outcast. In some countries such as England in which the politics of privatization and deregulation of the new right created havoc, a new class-dividing force is beginning to be spoken of: one which separates those who acquire a set of goods and essential services from the marketplace and those who acquire these goods and services from the state, from the public sector: education would be a shining example (as a class theory, this statement makes very little sense, but what is noteworthy is that it is made with a certain degree of truth with regard to a public service so symbolic of welfare as the school is).

Finally, we must point out the much more vague though not for that reason any less arguable role of the school in what, in some imprecise way, we may call the modernization of individual attitudes.⁹ For a significant portion of humanity, passage through the classroom continues to be perhaps the only opportunity to transcend the narrow limits of family and local community. Elements so apparently insignificant as the presence of a clock on the wall of the classroom imply in themselves (as innumerable studies on economic and social development demonstrate) an attitude toward time —and, consequently, toward activity and the life project itself— radically different from that of rural societies and subsistence economies. The management of knowledge in its abstract forms, whatever the content be, represents a distancing from one's own experience which is a necessary condition, though not sufficient, for a critical vision of oneself and one's

⁹ Inkeles and Smith, 1974.

environment. The cultivation of worldly knowledge, though it be adorned with a covering of religious indoctrination, as in recent Spanish history, signifies in itself a decisive step toward the secularization of material and spiritual life. Search and formally egalitarian assessment of individual achievement (grades, competition) detach the individual from the group in order to subject him to the institution, but also, whether intended or not, open new perspectives to him in the development of his capacities. Undoubtedly, the school has been and continues to be an main instrument for exposing to culture, for "enlightenment" or "taming", as one prefers, for many groups. The question today is whether, with its notable inertia, it continues to be such or whether, on the contrary, for some or for many — certainly not for all— it has become more an obstacle than a stimulus, in a world where opportunities for accessing culture have multiplied.

Education reform and social reform

All social reform or revolutionary movements have believed the institution of the school to be a potent instrument for change. For some, it represented the platform from which to set in motion and launch that change (for example, a portion of the members of the Enlightenment, anarchists, Spanish *regenerationists*, etc.); for others, it seemed to be a tool for consolidation once in power. Taken the other way around, the whole of the defenders of educational reform has presented this as a perfect lever or, at least, a very good one, for social reform. Along the way, educational reform has kept up a complex dialog with social reform, at times conciliatory and at times with great disagreement. There are two permanent motifs of reform, and therefore of change, in which we may clearly observe this ambiguity: freedom and equality. We have already found it necessary to say something about the first when we spoke of the relationship between the school and the State, and we can go no further now along these lines. In general terms, let us say, paraphrasing Lerena, that the educational

institution has “liberated and repressed” with an ambiguous simultaneity or with an endless swinging of the pendulum.¹⁰

Of the second, which is more frequently identified with “social change” (undoubtedly because freedom is now taken for granted on the one hand, and requires a long process in order to be able to see it on the other, as its fragility at times shows) we must speak more at length. On one side, education is one of the mechanisms which most strongly influences people’s opportunities in life —especially as regards people who do not inherit sufficient capital, which includes the majority of persons, nor position, which includes practically everyone—. With the disappearance of landed society and the enormous concentration in the holdings of wealth and means of production, opportunities for people depend to a great extent on their school performance —in real skills acquired or consolidated in the school as well as in the formal credentials obtained. For this very reason, the school has always been at the center of attention in the struggle against social inequality, and especially against its cruder forms —class, gender or ethnic inequality.

What has been the role of the school up to now? In the first stage —chronologically different according to which type of inequality we are looking at, but morphologically very similar—, the educational institution excluded those lower-ranking groups within each of these social dividers: workers, women, ethnic minorities. In a second stage these were subjected to segregated education, different from that of the dominant group in terms of budget and prestige, public schools in all their varieties (*petites écoles*, *Volkschulen*, modern secondary schools, “German schools”), feminine or ethnic (schools for blacks in the United States, special schools for Gypsies in Spain, etc.). Finally, those lower-ranking groups were incorporated into the

¹⁰ Lerena, 1983.

schools of the higher-ranking groups through corresponding reforms: globalization, coeducation, and integration.¹¹

The results, as I have explained elsewhere, have been quite dissimilar: mediocre in terms of incorporating workers, brilliant in terms of educating women, typically disastrous with regards to ethnic minorities. Dozens of global reforms —from the general Law of Education of 1970 to the LOGSE, currently being instituted in some of our schools, though it will not be instituted for at least a decade in others— have not kept class origin, as we generally define it according to the occupation of the parents, from exerting a strong influence on the opportunities for success or failure for children in school. However, a much more discreet and hidden reform, coeducation, has brought about a change so that women now pass, continue, promote and conclude their studies with greater success than do men — though indeed at the moment still not pursuing the same types of studies—. At the other extreme, the incorporation of ethnic minorities has proved disastrous, as in the current case of traditionalist Gypsies in Spain or of the past and still present case of blacks and Hispanics in the United States (but not that of the Asians, nor of the Jews among other notable exceptions). I will not attempt here to give possible explanations for these differences.

If we must summarize, let us say that the school has taken giant steps forward in universalization in quantitative terms, having reached the point of including all social groups without exception, though not entirely without distinctions. Nevertheless, universalization has not been achieved in a qualitative sense. At the risk of over-simplification, but to only a small extent, we can affirm that workers have been incorporated into the schools of the middle-class, women into that of men, and ethnic minorities into that of the dominant group. All this has not been the result of some perverse plan, but the mere effect of the dominance of those groups in the general society and, above all, of their much earlier presence in the educational

¹¹ Enguita, 1996.

institution. There are, of course, subtleties: teachers from humble origins who have not been able to break their ties with the working class, feminization of teaching staffs, incorporation of ethnic minorities in the professions for public services in some cases (not here, certainly).

We must place other less visible but no less serious inequalities beside those mentioned above. I am referring to inequalities based on setting, be they those seen between city and country, among different regions of the same State, or between the metropolis and its colonies. If less attention is given to these inequalities it is because they are somehow farther away. Our awareness of inequality, just like our awareness of injustice, always emerges from a comparison with that our surroundings, which normally includes that which fits into our sphere of action. The school has also followed similar patterns in these cases: the countryside, poor regions, and colonies, always to a different extent according to which group we are looking at, find themselves at first excluded and then assimilated. From a historical point of view, the school is an urban product, and for rural communities it has been as much a window to the world as a disintegrating element. For the colonies, the school was above all a form of cultural imperialism —it still is to a great extent: from the well-known westernizing and northernizing of education in many ex-colonies, to the systematic gathering up of the best-educated elements for the metropolis—. Regional inequalities are more varied, and without wishing to admit over-generalizations, we may say that they range from irrelevancy to what could be considered domestic colonialism.

During the sixties and seventies great expectations were placed on educational reform as a corrector of social injustices. A brief review of the literature of the times will permit us to see that it was replete with expressions such as “human capital”, “education as in investment”, “education and development”, etc. Leading the western world, the United States looked with concern at its educational system during the period of

the struggle for civil rights and after the trauma produced by the putting in orbit of the first Russian satellite (or, more exactly, after the alarm concerning how far they would be able to launch a missile); heading the other side, the Soviets and other self-governing socialist countries were especially proud of their achievements in education. International organisms recommended one thing above all others to underdeveloped countries: to invest in education. Moderate social-democratic and conservative parties in most of Europe agreed on the importance of pushing forward with global reforms. Even in Spain, the technocratic wing of the Franco regime promised in the preamble to the General Law of Education “a peaceful and silent, but efficient, revolution”. All this fell in with other trends of thought. Capitalist “ownership” took second stage in favor of administrative control. Western societies became more and more open and socially mobile. The incessant scientific and technical developments promised a future dependent on the educational system in which the hardship aspects of work would disappear.

Certainly these were not simply beliefs or propaganda put out by governments. To a great extent they were shared by the left and by the right, by workers and businessmen, by the old and the young, in the countryside and in the cities, in the ex-metropolis and its ex-colonies. Definitely, they were upheld by the public in general. Not in vain was this a period of great global reform —prolonging the core curriculum for students up to the end of the period of compulsory school attendance— and “democratization” or “massification”, depending on whether one tends to celebrate the change or to lament it, of higher education. But most of these hopes did not come to fruition. Global reforms did not sweep away class inequality. Poor countries continue to be poor, in most cases they became even poorer in a relative sense and, in some cases, in real terms —in spite of flaming new educational reform. Follow-up reports and research studies — Coleman, Westinghouse, Halsey...— threw more cold water on the reforming spirits, at times with the additional effect of providing unexpected arguments for counter-reformists.

However, it must be pointed out that the promise was partially kept. Some countries are able to attribute their favorable world position, at least in part, to their educational systems and the professional training they provide: Germany and Japan, for example—which indicates, by the way, that the question is not simply whether to reform or not, nor even whether the system be “good” or “bad”. Although school reform certainly did not do away with domestic social inequality, it did allow a significant number of individual minority-group members to escape the poverty or rejection characteristic of their class, type, ethnicity or society. On the other hand, those who did not manage to receive an adequate education found it much more difficult to free themselves from the disadvantages of unequal relationships. While it may be said that education is not especially efficient as a means to open doors, it must be added that its lack is indeed an efficient way of closing doors, especially for those who possess no other resources for opening them. In any case, if, from an egalitarian point of view, social reform consists of assuring access to a greater number of people to a series of goods and services, there can be no doubt that education itself is one of these services, and one of the most valuable. Besides being a means to other goals, education may be fully considered as an end in itself. Educational reform, then, is probably not the most important instrument for social reform, but it is certainly one of the mechanisms available for encouraging social reform and one part of its objectives, that is, of social reform itself.

The effects of speeding up change

From an educational point of view, the pace of social change is as important as its content. We are not dealing here with whether the economy grows at such or such an annual percentage rate, nor whether churches lose or gain members more quickly or more slowly, nor with any other conventional way of measuring speed. The unit of measurement for time here can be no other than the lives of people and the passing of generations.

For thousands of years, society remained practically the same. Certainly, if we compare the Neolithic period with classical Antiquity, or the Middle Ages with the Renaissance, we can observe important changes, but the question is: up to what point were those changes important to the people living in those times. In the first place, most of these changes occurred over generations, so that they were practically imperceptible to any individual. They were cumulative changes, spectacular from a historical perspective but insignificant for individual experience. In the second place, many of these changes took place, let us say, on the surface of human society. However striking the advances made by the Greeks in philosophy, astronomy, or mathematics may seem to us, the effects of these advances on the labor performed by the slaves must have been practically null. The same may be said concerning many scientific, political, and even economic changes brought about in modern Europe, which scarcely affected the lives of millions of basically self-sufficient country folk.

In these societies, education was essentially a process for cultural and social reproduction. It could be safely left in the hands of the adult generation that possessed no particular specialization, because it consisted to a great extent in the transmission of beliefs, values, behavioral patterns, and traditional techniques. For this reason, the best educators were old people, and the principal means of transmission was oral. The authority of age, and in particular of the aged, was based to a great extent on their role as holders, guarantees, and transmitters of that tradition. There need be a specialized teaching staff only to the extent that there is also specialized knowledge, and thus formal education, to the extent that it began to exist, was restricted to the world of priests, civil servants, perhaps warriors, and some urban professions. The rest of the population learned to work the land by working it, to work in specific skills by working, to wage war by waging war, etc., in the same way that the housewife today learns to keep a home by keeping one.

But at some point the speeding up and intensification of social change caused a new situation to appear, letting change loose within change. The exact moment isn't important here and will naturally vary from one society to another and, within each, from one social group to another. From a certain moment on, in any case, change reaches the speed of generations: children grow up and become adults in a world which has become different from that of their parents, which their parents, not to mention their grandparents, cannot easily prepare them for. This speeding up of change, longitudinal difference shows up also in unevenness in the change, transversal difference. Some groups change more rapidly and/or before others; the middle class before the working class, the city before the countryside, etc. This is perhaps the golden age of teaching, the age in which the grade-school teacher —and, in another setting, the high-school teacher— represent for and before the public an opening up to the world, culture in singular and with a capital C, the enlightenment, progress. He offers what the family and the immediate community can't provide. And so, by different routes, there emerges a specialized teaching body, which supplements the adults in the family in the task of educating and which, aware of its participation in this great transformation, plays a role similar to that of the disciples in early Christianity: teachers-missionaries, profession-vocation, pedagogical missions, schools as "temples of learning", enlightenment as a form of evangelization... and a thousand other possible parallels. In comparison with parents in traditional families, we may say, paraphrasing Ortega, that teachers and professors are of the same epoch as they are but are not contemporaries: they are at least a generation apart.

But change is not satisfied with this change and takes another qualitative leap. This occurs when the pace of change is no longer simply generational, or to be more exact inter-generational, but faster, intra-generational. Not only do we grow up and live in a world which is different from that of our elders, but we grow up in one world and live as adults in another. When I went to school we were never allowed to use slide rules or

to draw with "Rotring" type pens, while today teachers push students to use calculators as a humble substitute for the computers the school cannot buy (and which many teachers would not know how to use). This implies that students nowadays are not so much taught skills as capabilities; rather than learn, they learn how to learn, rather than leaving school with their bags full of the knowledge necessary to join the adult world, they leave prepared to follow changes all through their lives. I do not need to pause here to explain what all this means for teaching content and methodology and for the relative positioning and links between the two. Truly, we may say that the dividing factor today in terms of basic elementary and even secondary education is not between those with knowledge and those without, nor between those who have reached a sufficient level and those who haven't, perhaps not even between those who have acquired one kind or another of knowledge in a specific educational setting or in very unequal institutions, but between who leave school prepared to continue learning, whether it be in the context of a different educational institution (for example, in the type of school next higher up), or in an informal context (for example, in the workplace), or on their own, and those who will not be capable of continuing to learn because the schools they attended were not able to create, develop, and preserve in them the corresponding capacities.

I do wish to point out how drastically this alters the position of teachers. First, because their initial training may now be quite insufficient, not only to follow outside changes, in the world of work, in citizenship, in the media, etc., but also to keep abreast of its tenuous reflection inside the school, in objectives and teaching methods. Like any professional, or any worker, teachers find that they must keep up with the constant evolution in either what they teach, especially those who teach specialized areas, or in how they teach, especially those who work with children and young people in the most difficult stages of development (some for their germ importance in spite of their apparent easy management, others because of they represent a crossroads in spite of and also because of greater personal

maturity), or both. However, while in other jobs or professions the signs of mis-adaptation are unmistakable and emerge from a simple comparison between one's own production or work with that of a colleague or competitor, and, if not seen directly is pointed out by the supervisor or the marketplace, in teaching, the indicators are always confusing, since anyone has his opinion about how responsibility is shared among the teacher, the institution, the "system" (educational), the family, the environment, the streets, living conditions, means of communication, the other "system" (social), a particular "crisis" (of values, of models, religious, economic..), etc. Just like members of any other professional group, then, teachers feel the need for and push toward permanent adaptation, but, as opposed to the majority of groups, they are able to shut themselves up in a castle with the knowledge and know-how they initially acquired, with familiar methodology, using their particular *little book*; or, alternatively, following something which will leave them free of doubts—normally, the textbook. They may also, of course, try to keep up with the rate of change, even try to anticipate change and control it, in the sense of foreseeing it and making the best use of it. There are no lack of means, from officially available courses, of which there are many types (seminars, workshops, CPR's, special programs, none of which have been seen to overflow capacity), to an infinity of other courses available and which may be found through self-initiative. But it will be easy for the outward-looking teacher to clash with his inward-looking colleague and receive a hostile reaction, a total lack of support, or simple indifference, and on the part of his companions as individuals, of the school as an institution, or of the educational administration as an authority.

Second, the position of the teacher change also because there will probably be an increase in a particular deterioration already patent in relative terms, a problem which is at times manifest in difficult relationships with the families of students. While training for teachers is practically the same now, or at the same level, as it was half a century ago, the training of the teacher's indirect public, the parents of his direct public, has been

spectacularly improved. Some members of his indirect public have found themselves obliged to follow the pace of social and cultural change much more closely than professors have, and especially closer than elementary teachers have. In one way or another, families, most in professions and work places less closed-in than the teaching staff and the school, perceive, either critically or emotionally, that the social stream does not pause and that they themselves, according only manage to stay in the stream with great effort (running in order to remain in the same place and having to run much faster in order to get to anywhere else, just like Alice in Wonderland). Or they find themselves in the discard pile due to lack of means and/or personal capabilities, and ask themselves, and ask educators, whether the school is moving along with society. Then the thousand questions emerge: why don't they learn to read? And English? And computer science? Are there sexist attitudes? Is self-esteem nurtured? Etc., etc. The teacher can then see his labor revalued, given the great interest all around in his efforts, but he may also feel —and, sadly, this is the most common reaction— that his efforts are being put to question, that someone is invading his territory. And, once again, certainly, change in time is experienced as well as change in space, longitudinal as well as transversal. The school's public is comparatively more diverse because society is more diverse and because broader sectors have access to education over a longer period of time, because particular groups emerge from different mediums and conditions and because the process of change sharpens those differences. The educator finds then that what is too much for some, is not enough for others; that, while some do not grasp the sense of his labor and some families do not offer the school the necessary individual and collective support, others would say that nothing would be too much for him to give, are never satisfied, do not value and even underrate his work.

But that's the way things are. Change means alternatives, options, freedom, but it also means uncertainty and insecurity. Margaret Mead, in her famous study (famous especially among educators) on Samoa, Coming

of Age in Samoa, said that the exceptional child who stood out above the others in learning was not congratulated and stimulated, but reprimanded and halted. Samoan society reproduced itself generation after generation, each generation practically identical to the one preceding it, and that it was that, among other things, which kept adolescent Samoans from the tremendous crisis typically experienced by their North American counterparts. We really know something else about Samoa —consider the revealing book by the unrestrained D. Freeman, *Margaret Mead and Samoa*—. ¹² We know that Mead's idyllic island already possessed an imposing American military base, that the islanders are still laughing decades later at the things they told the candid anthropologist, that they were then especially given to having to appear before colonial tribunals for acts of violence and that alcohol was making inroads there just like among all peoples who have been suddenly swept by a wave of change from the outside. The disjunctive is not between change and permanence, or between reform and conservation, but between being part of the change in progress or being thrown to the fringes. These are not times for homeostasis but for homeorresis; it will serve no good to long for or try to reestablish the old balance, because what we need now is to create a new balance.

¹² Freeman, 1983.

REFERENCES

- CONANT, J.B. (1959): *The American high school today: A first report to interested citizens*, N. York, McGraw-Hill.
- ENGUITA, M.F. (1990): *La cara oculta de la escuela*, Madrid, Siglo XXI.
- ENGUITA, M.F. (1996): "Los desiguales resultados de las políticas igualitarias: clase, género y etnia en la educación", in MARIANO F. ENGUITA, ed., *Sociología de la Educación*, Barcelona, Ariel, 1999
- FOUCAULT, M. (1976): *Vigilar y castigar*, Méjico, Siglo XXI.
- FREEMAN, D. (1983): *Margaret Mead and Samoa: The making and unmaking of an anthropological myth*, Harmondsworth, Pelican, 1985¹⁺¹.
- FURNISS, E.S. (1965): *The position of the laborer in a system of nationalism: A study in the labor theories of the later English Mercantilists*, N. York, Augustus M. Kelly.
- GELLNER, E. (1983): *Nations and nationalism*, Oxford, Blackwell.
- GRAZIA, S. DE (1964): *Of time, work, and leisure*, N. York, Anchor.
- INKELES, A. and SMITH, D. (1974): *Becoming modern*, Cambridge, Mass. Harvard UP.
- LERENA, C.: *Reprimir y liberar. Crítica sociológica de la educación y la cultura contemporáneas*, Madrid, Akal, 1983.
- MARSHALL, T.H. (1950): *Citizenship and social class*, Cambridge, Cambridge UP.
- PARSONS, T. (1959): "The School System," *Harvard Educational Review* 29 (Fall).
- POLLARD, S. (1965): *The genesis of modern management*, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard UP.
- THOMPSON, E.P. (1967): "Time, work discipline, and industrial capitalism", *Past and Present* 38 (December).

THE SCHOOL IN THE TRANSITION TO MODERN SOCIETY

Process	Industrialization	Nation-state	Citizenship
Objective	Incorporation to salaried work	Forming national identity	Minimum common provision, equal opportunity
School role	Isomorphism with production of social relationships	Spreading of the culture of the elite	Individualization as opposed to public institutions
Current limits	New ways of organizing work	Multi-directional migratory flow, multi-culturalism	Division between public/private, state/market

THE SCHOOL AND SOCIAL EQUALITY: CLASS, GENDER, AND ETHNIC GROUP

Inequality	CLASS	GENDER	ETHNIC GROUP
Exclusion /segregation	Exclusion/ popular school	Exclusion/ schools segregated by sex	Exclusion/ special schools, etc.
Reform	Comprehensiveness	Coeducation	Integration
Incorporation to	Middle class, urban school	School for males	National school, non-gypsy, etc.
Results	Unequal and mediocre	Homogenous and brilliant	Casuistic and disastrous
Institutional limits	School culture = middle class culture	Nonexistent: feminization	Ethnocentrism, universalism

CHANGE IN CHANGE, EDUCATION, EDUCATORS

TYPE OF CHANGE	SUPRA-GENERATIONAL	INTER-GENERATIONAL	INTRA-GENERATIONAL
Corresponds to	Pre-industrial societies, super-structural currents in history	Industrialization, urbanization, nation-state, literacy, modernization, etc.	Elimination of time and space boundaries (change as regularity, globalization, mass media)
Perception	Stability, time cycle	Crisis, progress, history	Uncertainty
Life passes by in	A constant world, familiar and unvarying	A world different from that of the parents	A world constantly changing
Educational institution	Family, community	School	School, civil society
Educational agents	Parents, elders	Teachers, professors	Teaching staff, experts in the field
Basis for the educators	Experience	Initial training	Continuous training
Educational objective	Tradition, cultural reproduction	Modernization, progress	Orientation, selection
Position of the educator	Associated with age	High personal status	Ambiguous