

Enquiring Minds

Position paper: Student voice and the 'marketisation' of school reform?

Ben Williamson, Learning Researcher, Futurelab

Overview

This article explores the theoretical and cultural dimensions of student voice in order to highlight both its limitations and its potential, and it draws particular attention to the ways in which schools, economic policy and consumer culture act as 'ventriloquists' in the production of students' voices¹. Implicated in this debate are a series of 'constructions' of childhood, notions of what childhood should be at the present time and in the future, which, I argue, risk jeopardising the transformative potential of student voice. The paper, then, is organised as follows. It begins by discussing the origins of student voice, then in the second section explores theories of voice in school contexts. In the third section, I discuss the ways in which student voice may be regarded as tied to wider public sector shifts that are explicitly related to private sector economics and to consumer culture. The fourth and final section explores the idea that valorising student voice constructs a particular view of childhood that is at once positive in its outlook but problematic in the daily reality of the classroom and the social relations of children to their schools as well as potentially damaging to school reform initiatives.

Student voice(s)

When did educators begin talking of 'student voice'²? In common parlance, student voice offers the possibility of egalitarian and democratically-informed educational reform. In some cases, it can take the form of consultation on school environments, such as toilet blocks. More radical opportunities present themselves when children take on important roles in defining how teaching and learning take place. In the research literature, the term does not really emerge until the first years of this century, yet it is dependent upon much longer traditions of 'voice' research in sociological and cultural studies analysis.

A particularly acute interest in 'voice' in the 1970s and 80s was in the relationships between social class and forms of resistance 'voiced' by young people. Indicative examples include Paul Willis's analysis of the 'voices' of working class 'lads' in relation to their class confrontations and resistance to school, Dick Hebdige's analysis of adversarial punk styles, and Peter Aggleton's study of disaffected middle class teenagers³. Others have attended specifically to voices 'marginalised' on account of their ethnic and sexual differences. Angela McRobbie, for instance, has provided accounts of the voices of girls, while Máirtín Mac an Ghail and Richard Connell have studied the construction of masculinity in social and educational contexts⁴. While many of these earlier studies were largely concerned with working class young people, more recent accounts have emphasised the many and various ways in which middle class children - the "absent centre" of educational research, according to Mary Jane Kehily and Rob Pattman⁵ - can feel hostile or recalcitrant towards school⁶.

The significance of these diverse attempts to identify and 'make audible' the voices of young people growing up in very different circumstances is precisely

that they are diverse. They demonstrate different forms of opposition and resistance as well as acquiescence and assent in the everyday experiences of children. In the face of such diversity and pluralism, then, what can the category 'student voice' really mean?

It is increasingly recognised that speaking of 'voice' actually means speaking of 'voices'. John Macbeath, for instance, has argued that student voice is "something of a misnomer since it implies a form of homogeneity, whereas we know... that young people speak in many and varied tongues", while Carol Robinson and Carol Taylor argue that a "monolingual assumption" that students have "only one voice" is "illusory"⁷. This is of course related to wider discussions of childhood in contemporary times. "We cannot talk about children as a homogeneous category: what childhood means, and how it is experienced, obviously depends on other social factors, such as gender, 'race' or ethnicity, social class, geographical location, and so on," David Buckingham argues⁸. Although this sounds straightforward enough, it has important, and complex, implications for educators.

Often advertised as part of a recent trend in school improvement, student voice initiatives aim to involve learners in making decisions about the educational provision offered to them. It has been motivated, in part, by the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) which, since 1989, has been ratified by every country in the world, except, since Somalia signed in 2003, the USA. Fostering a dialect of rights, the UNCRC is intended to supply a series of unquestionable and inalienable entitlements for children, covering everything from protection from physical and mental abuse to having freedom of expression⁹.

In the educational context, the UNCRC is often referenced by advocates of student voice to support their contention that children deserve to have their opinions respected and taken seriously on decisions that will affect their learning. Article 12 of the convention states that "Parties shall assure to the child who is capable of forming his or her own views the right to express those views freely in all matters relating to the child being given due weight in accordance with age and maturity of the child."¹⁰

John Smyth has claimed that providing students with decision-making power is a genuinely transformative alternative to the "distressing" international trend amongst western educational reformers to strengthen accountability schemes and punitive testing, and to "perpetrate 'deficit' and 'blaming' views of students, their families, and neighbourhoods". He claims that for educational reform to be effective, "then it will have to be one that includes the lives, experiences, cultures, family backgrounds, aspirations, and hopes of young people themselves."¹¹

Michael Fielding, Lawrence Angus and Michael Wyness are among those who have argued for radical change to the current emphasis on teacher 'performance' and student 'quality', and to the view of students as more or less adequate products of mainstream schools¹². What this means, very simply put, is that schools should adapt according to what students say instead of, as Angus puts it, "hardening the policy regime" and forcing schools towards "impersonal and remote standards" demanded by "the managerial norms that now characterise education as an institution"¹³. Only slightly less simply, this also means being adaptable to the many different voices heard in school at any one time instead of only engaging with students from an idealised middle class template¹⁴.

Government policies and school prospectuses are increasingly keen to follow this line, but it poses significant challenges. Jean Ruddock and Michael Fielding, for example, warn of the perils inherent in the sudden popularisation of student voice in recent years. Some of its most important and challenging aspects, they suggest, are in danger of being sidelined by the urgent pressure in schools to implement new ideas quickly (to take the initiative on board without thinking it through), amongst them the "challenge to traditional power relations" between teachers and students and the "need to be alert to issues of inclusion and exclusion"¹⁵. It has also been argued that there is real danger in students being consulted about their learning in order to raise standards and increase attainment rather than to enhance social and personal development and to heighten students' sense of their membership in a school community¹⁶.

As Cathy Burke has argued, student consultation and participation should be viewed as a "shared dialogue" between adults and children who occupy "shared spaces". She asks, however, whether it is possible "to talk of the authentic voice or view of the child - one finite, universal view which represents all ages, backgrounds, situations and cultures that can be harnessed to school renewal?" and suggests that "recognising diversity of views and experiences can help to develop the notion of the child and of school as realities that adults and children can construct together."¹⁷

The central question in this building of shared dialogue and in the construction of the realities of schooling and children, then, is who speaks and who listens? Furthermore, in what languages and through what voices do they speak?

Schooled voices

The issues for those concerned with the potential of student voice initiatives are that schools may be both "hard of hearing" when it comes to listening and responding to students and, moreover, tend to affect the very things that students say. In Mikhail Bakhtin's terms, schools have a ventriloquist's hand in the production of student voice¹⁸. All sorts of social, cultural and economic factors also have effect on what students say and how schools hear.

Sara Bragg, for example, has shown how some student voice can be highly challenging, offering the kinds of commentary that many educators find "incomprehensible, recalcitrant, or even obnoxious"¹⁹. Yet even the most repugnant student voice must be considered important if educational reform is to have any democratic legitimacy at all. The difficulties inherent in the homogenising category of student voice go further than simply recognising that some young people have more voice than others - or different voices expressing different socially-situated values. The school language itself is the problem²⁰.

Following Basil Bernstein, Madeleine Arnot and Diane Reay have recently developed the concept of 'pedagogic voice' and an analytical approach to interrogating the relations of power and control which create voices. They suggest that school itself produces and shapes the voices of students, to the extent that teachers or researchers who claim to listen to student voice may be only listening to the voices that they have had a hand in shaping. These are, we might suggest, 'schooled voices' coloured by the impact of the authority of adulthood, rather than the authentic voices of childhood.

For Arnot and Reay as for Bernstein, what needs to be distinguished in voice research are the differences between the social identities which children develop outside school and the identities generated within the relations of schooling. Neither of these are neutral or unitary, and nor are they possible to separate

completely from one another. Thus, students are often acutely aware that some voices in classrooms are dominant while others are dominated. This is not only a case of teachers' voice being dominant, but of other factors such as age, ability, class, ethnicity and so on affecting the extent to which children feel dominated by others' voices.

The issue for carrying out student voice-based consultation exercises is that school centres on an ideal type - the child "whose voice is heard and whose voice is listened to in what [Bernstein] called the 'acoustic of the school'" - with the consequence that it is possible for student voice activities to "hide the social stratificational aspects of schooling". As Arnot and Reay conclude, "although student consultation appears democratic, it is a clearly bounded pedagogical event."²¹

Despite these boundaries, student voice initiatives may offer the opportunity for reflective teachers to consider the sorts of specialised identities that their teaching has created and to identify the effects of their pedagogic practices on children from diverse contexts. Another opportunity presents itself for learners to be supported to recognise and evaluate the ways in which they are positioned by the institution and practices of the school and, moreover, their own social positioning through the workings of everyday society.

The realisation of these opportunities would certainly legitimate the transformative potential of student voice, although, as Carol Robinson and Carol Taylor point out, "listening to pupils is not sufficient, it is what happens with the information" and the "degree to which pupil voice work is taken seriously and acted upon" that is of most importance²². This will be especially important in coming years if educators are to help shape learner identities in the context of educational reforms that seem increasingly informed by commodification, consumerism, and the marketisation of mainstream schooling.

Market voices

The reformist agenda in British education has taken on a particular characteristic at the beginning of the 21st century as the concepts of 'voice' and 'choice' have been allied to New Labour's public sector reform. What appears to be happening in mainstream schooling is that standards and accountability measures are being tightened at the same time as student voice initiatives are introduced, with the consequence that student voice appears to legitimate a reformist agenda in education that actually has its basis in economic policy. It is worth unpacking this situation in a little more detail.

Jim McGuigan offers a cultural policy critique of neo-liberal market politics that is particularly germane. According to McGuigan's analysis the "rigidity" of the state has been replaced in New Labour discourse by the "freedom", "openness", "flexibility", "dynamism", "diversity" and "growth" of the market. This is reflected for McGuigan in the "personalised services" offered both to consumers and by the public sector. He argues that there "is undoubtedly a curious homology between the active audiences, cyber surfers, readers, shoppers, spectators, strollers and visitors" that cultural studies have erected "with the sovereign consumer of neo-liberal market ideology"²³.

In other words then, the language that underpins student voice, in the shape of 'personalised learning' opportunities for children, is identical to the language of consumerism and of the market. Student voice initiatives, with their emphasis on choice and voice are part of a public sector reform movement that is ostensibly

legitimated by the voiced concerns of responsible citizens whilst at the same time perniciously subject to the logic of the market.

As a result, Stephen Ball argues that the intrusion of private sector discourses into educational policy has subordinated "moral obligations to economic ones", and observes that "education is increasingly, indeed perhaps almost exclusively, spoken of within policy in terms of its economic value and its contribution to international market competitiveness". He contrasts this with the need "to move beyond the tyrannies of improvement, efficiency and standards", and "recover a language of and for education articulated in terms of ethics, moral obligations and values"²⁴.

Others have also begun to question the hidden coercion of student voice work in schools, highlighting the ways in which it has become compatible with the aims of 'school improvement' initiatives, thus raising concerns that it might be cynical and manipulative, using student voice to buttress entrenched assumptions and intentions²⁵. Sara Bragg, for example, has identified how senior leaders in schools often conceive of students as 'consumers' whose statutory rights are served when schools (service providers) give privilege to their insights²⁶. At least part of this must be attributed to the common conception that children identify themselves more strongly with consumer culture than with school culture.

The language of consumerism may seem innocuous enough in this context. Some commentators have suggested, for instance, that consumer culture has more advanced pedagogies than schools, and that increasingly the task of teachers is going to be to match its slickness²⁷. Michael Bottery argues that the view of the consumer in the private sector business world, and increasingly in public sector areas such as education, is shifting from a pattern of mass consumption to a more individualised one - characterised, again, by 'personalisation'. He suggests that this has both benefits and drawbacks as it begins to affect the images and concepts that teachers and students attach to schools.

On the positive side, forms of 'personalised' consumption oriented towards the individual emphasise the "individual's desires and wishes, rather than the individual having to conform to organisational wishes". Since ICT offers consumers increasingly individualised consumption opportunities (for example, booking holidays online independent of travel agencies or buying and selling goods via online auctions), this model is becoming more and more pervasive. It also underpins some thinking about educational services, where "a national curriculum would only be acceptable if it did no more than spell out general areas of entitlement, which were then translated... into the experience and needs most suitable to individual students."

However, on the downside, Bottery argues, this conception sees the consumer in an adversarial relationship with the supplier of services or products. The consumer is not obligated to use any single supplier exclusively or to exercise any other responsibilities once a transaction has been completed, while the supplier has no responsibility other than a profit motive. To take a consumption model of schooling, then, produces an educational image in which there exists a tense supplier-consumer relationship rather than any agreement to pursue the public good²⁸. An example of this kind of model at work in a school in the UK is supplied by Tim Rudd et al, describing a situation where "students are being regarded more as 'customers' who might choose to go elsewhere if they do not have their voices heard and the service provided is not up to scratch."²⁹

David Hartley puts it in terms of technological efficiency versus egalitarianism and consumer culture. He notes that in trying to reconcile efficiency with

consumerism, policy tends to emphasise the skills associated with the new 'postmodern' or 'post-Fordist' workplace. Thus, the new dispositions of creativity, flexibility, self-management, so celebrated by a neoliberal emphasis on the market, become "functional or instrumental for the economy", so that the habits associated with consumer culture can be co-opted by schools³⁰.

In a specific student voice context, then, to view students as consumers with insights into the services supplied by schools simply reinforces a market-based notion of education that is predicated on the rights of students to demand what they want and for schools to withhold products or services if they cannot supply them, rather than for any mutually-reinforcing dialogue to take place. It positions students as neoliberal subjects inculcated by the logic of the market. It also assumes that students have the 'capital' to make informed choices about their educational consumption habits, when it is clear that this is simply not the case in a straightforward way. David Buckingham observes that taking advantage of the opportunities offered by schools is a "matter not just of economic capital, but of educational and cultural capital as well"³¹.

The assumption that student voice privileges children as active, responsible and choosing individuals in a marketplace of educational opportunity is too simplistic and overly optimistic as well as worryingly complicit in neoliberal ideology. It risks aggravating rather than ameliorating social inequalities. Perhaps more prosaically, though no less importantly, there can be little doubt that many schools are currently operating more and more like private sector businesses in their managerial emphasis on performance and standardised efficiency. In this context, student voice simply looks like an appealingly marketable though essentially ephemeral strategy; cotton wool to the hot water of standards. To use student voice initiatives to buttress such trends will intensify the educational dissatisfaction of students, as they see the invitation to participate in decisions about their schooling used to toughen up existing regulatory measures.

(Re)constructing student voice

I have been arguing that the language of student voice is being used to construct a new view of children as active, choosing, and vocal both in their dealings with wider popular culture and with schools. This, as other commentators have been increasingly keen to stress, is largely bound to a market-based language derived from an economic paradigm of 'personalised services' as well as to (or in tandem with) growing educational policy emphases on choice. A reasonable objection to the largely sceptical tone I have adopted would be that since children are growing up in a world in which the private sector has a huge role, then it is necessary for them to develop attitudes, outlooks, and skills which equip them for it. This is the sort of argument made to support claims that schools are failing to adequately prepare children for entry into industry and employment. It may have some truth to it from an instrumentalist perspective of schooling.

My response, though, would be that this perspective privileges a particular construct of childhood: the homogenised and idealised template of the child who possesses the relevant educational and cultural capital to have a voice and make choices in it. Furthermore, it does little to alleviate existing school arrangements where teachers possess a curriculum that students are expected to access; it simply reconfirms that schools need to do more to equip children for adulthood.

Throughout, I have argued that 'student voice' is in danger of becoming little more than a ventriloquist's trick, a tactic claiming inclusivity that is used to legitimate existing perspectives on both childhood itself and the direction of reform in mainstream schooling. In particular, two perspectives have been

described. One sees students' voices as a construct of schools, a "bounded pedagogical event" as Arnot and Reay described it. Critics in this area are concerned, I observed, that student voice is too homogenous a concept as well as that it may only be used to buttress schools' accountability and regulatory regimes. The other critical perspective sees students' voices being used to reconfirm existing notions about children as active consumers in a marketplace of opportunity. This second line of thinking is lately to be found in student voice initiatives which see schools as service providers and children as customers. Other concerns, such as the idealisation of the middle class child, have also been seen to be implicated in both of these views of student voice work.

Student voice work can, though, offer genuinely transformational opportunities to educators and learners³². The range of books and articles attesting to its potential now available, many of which are written for classroom practitioners, demonstrates the importance which has been placed on such voice initiatives to alleviate current educational concerns³³. Most of the critical analyses of student voice surveyed in this paper have also been motivated less by desires to rubbish the concept altogether and more by concerns that unless it is properly understood and practised then it risks offering students no more than tokenistic participation in defining the future of educational transformation.

The challenge for educators and researchers, then, is to adopt strategies and theoretical perspectives which lend children genuine participation in defining the content, form and outcomes of their learning. As a preliminary heuristic to assess their confidence in the validity of their advocacy of student voice initiatives, Michael Fielding has devised a series of questions:

- How confident are we that our research does not redescribe and reconfigure students in ways that bind them more securely into the fabric of the status quo?
- How clear are we about the use to which the depth and detail of data is likely to be put? Is our more detailed knowledge of what students think and feel largely used to help us control them more effectively?
- Are we sure that our positions of relative power and our own personal and professional interests are not blurring our judgements or shaping our advocacy?³⁴

These questions are useful points of embarkation. A fuller set of coordinates to the complexities of managing, maintaining, and acting upon student voice will also need to take account of the pressures upon schools and teachers from larger educational reform agendas as well as other cultural policy and economic emphases. Otherwise, despite all intentions, student voice activity will prove to be damaging to the relations between schools and students.

Notes and references

¹ The concept of 'ventriloquism' in everyday speech was theorised by Mikhail Bakhtin, for whom it referred to the ways in which one's own voice transmits what others have said before. See Bakhtin, MM (1981) *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by MM Bakhtin*, ed M Holquist, trans C Emerson and M Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press).

² Often referred to, alternatively, as 'pupil voice' or 'learner voice'. For the sake of simplicity (rather than for any semantic preferences) I shall use 'student voice' throughout.

³ Willis, P (1977) *Learning to Labour: How Working Class Kids Get Working Class Jobs* (Farnborough: Saxon House); Hebdige, D (1979) *Subculture: The Meaning of Style* (London: Methuen); Aggleton, P (1987) *Rebels Without a Cause? Middle Class Youth and*

-
- the Transition from School to Work* (London: Falmer Press). The seminal introduction to the literature of 'resistance' is found in Hall, S and Jefferson, T (eds) (1976) *Resistance Through Rituals: Youth Subcultures in Post-war Britain* (London: Hutchinson).
- ⁴ See, McRobbie, A (1991) *Feminism and Youth Culture: From 'Jackie' to 'Just Seventeen'* (London: Macmillan); Mac an Ghaill, M (1994) *The Making of Men: Masculinities, Sexualities and Schooling* (Buckingham: Open University Press); Connell, RW (1995) *Masculinities* (Cambridge: Polity Press).
- ⁵ Kehily, MJ and Pattman, R (2006) 'Middle-class struggle? Identity-work and leisure amongst sixthformers in the United Kingdom', *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 27(1): 37-52 (38).
- ⁶ See, for example, Whitty, G (2001) 'Education, social class and social exclusion', *Journal of Education Policy*, 16(4): 287-295.
- ⁷ Macbeath, J (2006a) *School Inspection and Self-evaluation: Working with the New Relationship* (London: RoutledgeFalmer): 71; Robinson, C and Taylor, C (2007) 'Theorizing student voice: values and perspectives', *Improving Schools*, 10(1): 5-17 (6).
- ⁸ Buckingham, D (2003) *Media Education: Literacy, Learning and Contemporary Culture* (Cambridge: Polity Press): 21.
- ⁹ For the full text of the UNCRC articles, see www.unhcr.ch/html/menu3/b/k2crc.htm.
- ¹⁰ In the specific context mainstream schooling in the UK, these moves are also at least partly a consequence of the 2002 Education Act which requires schools to consult with students, and Ofsted criteria which require inspectors to report on the degree to which schools act on the views of students. See Ofsted (2005) *Conducting the Inspection: Guidance of Inspectors of Schools*. Document reference: HMI 2502, July. Online: www.ofsted.gov.uk.
- ¹¹ Smyth, J (2006) "'When students have power": Student engagement, student voice, and the possibilities for school reform around "dropping out" of school', *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 9(4): 285-298 (285 & 288).
- ¹² See Fielding, M (2004) 'Transformative approaches to student voice: Theoretical underpinnings, recalcitrant realities', *British Educational Research Journal*, 30: 295-311; Angus, L (2006) 'Educational leadership and the imperatives of including student voices, student interests, and students' lives in the classroom', *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 9(4): 369-379; Wyness, M (2006) 'Children, young people and civic participation: Regulation and local diversity', *Educational Review*, 58(2): 209-218.
- ¹³ Angus (2006): 369-70.
- ¹⁴ See Fielding, M (2007) 'Beyond "voice": New roles, relations, and contexts in researching with young people', *Discourse*, 28(3): 301-310. For an accessible introductory discussion on the pitfalls and potential of student voice initiatives, particularly insofar as they incorporate students' perspectives into the existing status quo, also see Fielding, M (2000) 'The person-centred school', *Forum*, 42(2): 51-54.
- ¹⁵ Ruddock, J and Fielding, M (2006) 'Student voice and the perils of popularity', *Educational Review*, 58(2): 219-231 (220).
- ¹⁶ For example, Ruddock, J (2006) 'The past, the papers and the project', *Educational Review*, 58(2): 131-143.
- ¹⁷ Burke, C (2007) 'The view of the child: Releasing "visual voices" in the design of learning environments', *Discourse*, 28(3): 359-372 (361).
- ¹⁸ Bakhtin (1981).
- ¹⁹ Bragg, S (2001) 'Taking a joke: Learning from the voices we don't want to hear', *Forum*, 43(2): 70-73 (70).
- ²⁰ The French cultural historian and philosopher Michael Foucault famously compared schools (alongside other apparently benevolent institutions) to prisons in his book *Discipline and Punish*. Foucault's claim was that schools, through their routines, bureaucracy, measurement, categorisation and regulation, maintain existing power relations between staff and students akin to the relations between jailer and prisoner but

that, moreover, these relations are worse because they are hidden and subtle. He argued that language itself reinforces this status quo because mastery of language and the knowledge it permits a person to gain provides the opportunity to exert supervision, control and authority over others. See Foucault, M (1977) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (Harmondsworth: Penguin).

- ²¹ Arnot, M and Reay, D (2007) 'A sociology of pedagogic voice: Power, inequality and pupil consultation', *Discourse*, 28(3): 311-325 (321 & 322).
- ²² Robinson and Taylor (2007).
- ²³ McGuigan, J (2005) 'Neo-liberalism, culture and policy', *International Journal of Culture Policy*, 11(3): 229-241 (234).
- ²⁴ Ball, S (2007) *Education plc: Understanding private sector participation in public sector education* (Abingdon: Routledge): 185.
- ²⁵ See Fielding, M (2001) 'Beyond the rhetoric of student voice: New departures or new constraints in the transformation of 21st century schooling?' *Forum*, 43: 100-109.
- ²⁶ Bragg, S (2007) "'Student voice" and governmentality: The production of enterprising subjects?' *Discourse*, 28(3): 343-358.
- ²⁷ A critical account is provided by Kenway, J and Bullen, E (2001) *Consuming Children: Education-Entertainment-Advertising* (ref).
- ²⁸ Bottery, M (2005) 'The individualization of consumption: A Trojan horse in the destruction of the public sector?' *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 33(3): 267-288 (279 & 281).
- ²⁹ Rudd, T, Colligan, F and Naik, R (2006) *Learner Voice: A Handbook* (Bristol: Futurelab).
- ³⁰ Hartley, D (1997) *Reschooling Society* (London: Falmer Press): 4.
- ³¹ Buckingham, D (2007) *Beyond Technology* (Cambridge: Polity): xx.
- ³² Perhaps one of the most ambitious examples is the Learning School initiative first established in a secondary school in the Shetland Islands in 1999. By creating partnerships with other schools around the world, the Learning School project sends students on 4-6 week research assignments during which they explore the organisation of teaching and learning in other contexts. The project now involves schools from 11 countries. See www.learningschool.org. For an account of Learning School in the context of student voice discourse, see MacBeath, J (2006b) 'Finding a voice, finding self', *Educational Review*, 58(2): 195-207.
- ³³ See, for example, Arnot, M, McIntyre, D, Pedder, D and Reay, D (2003) *Consultation in the classroom: Developing Dialogue About Teaching and Learning* (Cambridge: Pearson); Fielding, M and Bragg, S (2003) *Students as Researchers: Making a Difference* (Cambridge: Pearson); Macbeath, J, Demetrious, H, Ruddock, J and Myers, K (2003) *Consulting Pupils: A Toolkit for Teachers* (Cambridge: Pearson); Ruddock, J and Flutter, J (2003) *Consulting Pupils: What's in it for Schools?* (London: RoutledgeFalmer); Flutter, J and Ruddock, J (2004) *How to Improve Your School* (London: Continuum); Rudd, T, Colligan, F and Naik, R (2006) *Learner Voice: A Handbook* (Bristol: Futurelab); Ruddock, J and McIntyre, D (2007) *Improving Learning Through Consulting Pupils* (London: Routledge).
- ³⁴ Fielding (2004): 302-304.