iojes
www.iojes.net
International Online Journal of Educational Sciences, 2010, 2 (3), 640-665

Justifications of Educational Reforms in Norway (ca 1965-1995)

Ove SKARPENES[1]

Abstract

In the era of neo-liberalism, Western societies have gone through a process of implementing New Public Management as the main instrument for governance. Also the educational sector is influenced by this change in ideology and practice. At the same time, western society have witnessed a new form of individualisation. In the educational system this is translated into pupil-centred learning. We catch eye of the establishment of a culture with new institutional arrangements that simultaneously seek justification by referring to market and competition and by referring to individual authenticity and individual self-realisation. This article put forward an analysis of how justifications of educational reforms in Norway changed from beginning of the 1960s to the 1990s. I will discuss sociologically the historical process by which the compromise between market liberalism and romantic individualism was designed and given legitimacy.

Key words: Justifications, education, Norway, pedocentrism, neoliberal market ideology, pupil-centred, modernity

Introduction[i]

Few educational researchers disagree that the implementation of New Public Management in the educational sector has changed schools and universities in an instrumental direction. Key words are modularising, planning, documentation, management by objectives, goal-attainment, measurement, performance control.[ii] Legitimacy for this neoliberal ideology of governance is woven into the different sectors (health, transport in addition to the educational sector) through the establishment of new institutional arrangements. It might be argued that traditional knowledge (as taught in schools and universities) and the carriers of such knowledge, namely teachers are squeezed when

[1] E-mail: ove.skarpenes@sos.uib.no

© 2010 International Online Journal of Educational Sciences ISSN: 1309-2707

increasingly more time is spent on adapting to these bureaucratic procedures. While this ideology has gained practical and ideological hegemony, the societal development has at the same time been influenced by a process of individualisation (whether it is real or rhetorical). In educational policy we catch eye of the individualisation process through an outspoken desire to put the pupil/student at the centre of all attention. The German sociologist Thomas Ziehe (2001) points out that school practices is dominated by the pupils personal life-worlds. Again we witness a tendency that traditional knowledge and traditional knowledge carriers come under pressure, in this case from the pupils and students' wishes, demands and legal rights. Educational changes in our time seek legitimacy in both a neoliberal market ideology, and at the same time by referring to romantic-individualism. In this article I will argue that this compromise must be understood historically, as a result of the crisis in organised modernity. By using educational reforms in Norway as empirical case, I will discuss the historical process by which the compromise was designed and given legitimacy, and I will show how this process created a new type of pupil/student.

Theory, Methods and Data

The central problematic in this article is therefore to explore the historical work done in the construction and justification of new general educational categories, and the way these categories are translated into different pedagogical practices. The cases discussed are two educational reforms in Norway; Reform 74 and Reform 94. Both reforms concern education at the gymnasium; that is upper secondary level (age 16-19). The old knowledge based gymnasium was constructed in close relation to the university. The gymnasium reform in 1896 led to the establishment of philological sets of courses/ school disciplines (foreign languages in addition to Latin) and science sets of courses/school disciplines (natural sciences in addition to mathematics and physics) in the gymnasium. These changes were the background for the university reform in 1905, where new master's degrees (hovedfag) were given in philological and science subjects. It cemented the discipline-based university in the Humboldt tradition, and the university extended the area of activity beyond its traditional role as educator for governmental positions in the

young state (i.e. education degrees in law and in theology). Now the teachers in the new gymnasium needed master's degrees in their teaching subjects, and they attained much the same social position that lawyers and priests (Slagstad 1998, 2000). This gymnasium emphasized the connection between the school subjects (as knowledge disciplines) and the university subjects, that is, they focused on the subjects *per se*. The status of the gymnasium teacher was acquired through the means of his/her master's degree and the authority this entailed. This gymnasium changed with the school reforms in 1974 and in 1994. The analysis of the construction and justification of the educational categories and the pedagogical practices in Reform 74 and Reform 94 is empirically based upon official documents, reports and curriculum as prescription. I especially pay attention to arguments and justifications used in the general curriculum as prescription in Reform-74, (Læreplanen generell del 1976, L-76), and the general curriculum as prescription in Reform-94, (Læreplanen generell del 1993, L-93). L-76 and L-93 are the terms I will use her.[iii]

The reforms might be seen as critical moments, "*moments critiques*", (Boltanski and Thévenot 1999: 359) where the actors involved in reforming the school are occupied in the activity with constructing educational categories, curricula and pedagogical solutions, and where these constructions, taking place in a public space, have to be justified according to a collective principle of a common good (Boltanski and Thévenot 1999).[iv] I analyse in particular the justifications of these activities, using the theoretical approach developed by Luc Boltanski and Laurent Thévenot. They have formulated an analytical approach that looks upon the modes of justification, and examines the type of appeal to a common good characteristic of different 'orders of worth' (cités). They demonstrate the existence of six 'orders of worth' in contemporary social reality, each order of worth governed unequivocally by a single dominant principle (see also Wagner 2001b: 113). From this perspective justifications always move beyond a particular or personal, idiosyncratic viewpoint. The justification will therefore always refer to a principle of a common good. Unlike political and moral philosophers, they approach this issue by empirically analysing how people put their arguments to the test. They are also concerned about how persons

find material proof that their arguments are grounded, drawing here on Bruno Latour's work on how objects/things also work as 'spokespersons' for an interpretation (Lamont and Thévenot 2000: 7). In the 1999 article six orders of worth were introduced: inspired, domestic, civic, opinion, market and industrial. Their mode of evaluation (worth) is as follows: *inspired*: grace, nonconformity, creativeness; *domestic*: esteem, reputation; c*ivic*: collective interest, solidarity; *opinion*: renown; *market*: price; and *industrial*: productivity, efficiency.[v] Further more, I draw upon Durkheim's argument (1977) that historically informed educational research can grasp the relations between institutional changes in society and knowledge and pedagogical changes in educational reforms. Durkheim showed through his historical studies how "(E)ducational transformations are always the result and the symptom of the social transformations in terms of which they are to be explained" (Durkheim 1977: 166).[vi] So, by combining Durkheim with Boltanski and Thévenot, one can argue that the justifications used by the educational reformers, are both a consequence of, and a co-producer of societal changes in general. A sociology of knowledge approach to the historical changes in justifications, is also a story about institutional changes in the educational system and in society in general. Using this theoretical framework and approach, I want focus on three periods in the process of educational justification, paying special attention to pedagogical changes. The construction of the Reform 74 started in the early 60s. The first part of this process took place within a period of organised modernity (Wagner 1994), the latter part of the process occurred in a period conceptualised as crisis of organised modernity (from 1968 onwards). The next school reform, Reform 94 was a partly a product of the neo-liberal tendencies in the 1990ies. The discussion is chronologically arranged following the three periods outlined above.

Organised Modernity

Construction and Justification of Educational Categories – Reform 74

This is not the place for a detailed presentation of changes in Norway in the 1950s and 1960s; but a few remarks are necessary. The economy expanded, it was state-regulated, with national economists being the experts. The welfare state expanded through the work

of different 'state-engineers'. Economic growth carried with it optimism and a strong belief in scientific, planned societal development. The Labour Government's policy and its regime of knowledge were more positivistic than socialistic (Slagstad 1998: 368). Economic growth was connected to the development of the welfare state and social policy, with the intention of strengthening democracy. This optimism in the social planning relied on economic models, statistical tool, and the epistemic certainty of an unchallenged positivism. The construction of Reform 74 started in the early 1960s, at the end of what Peter Wagner (1994a) calls organised modernity. Organised modernity was characterised by growth, wealth, trust and epistemic certainty, and this was certainly the case for Norway.

The educational reform of 1974 was part of a transformation from the old elitist gymnasium for the 'chosen few' to a comprehensive school/ high school with more differentiated groups of pupils. The school entry was democratised. This was a large collective project of mass socialisation. The principle of school uniformity (same type of school for everyone in Norway between the ages of seven and fifteen: *enhetsskolen* [the general, uniform school], which is the term I will use) was taken one step further, according to the principle of providing 'more general education for a larger group of pupils'. The structural changes in the school had the following intended consequences: A larger group of pupils/students went on to further education; more general theoretical themes entered curricula in vocational education; and more pupils studied general "academic" subjects which qualified them for university education. These structural changes had been proposed by two State committees that evaluated the educational system in the 1960s; Gymnasutvalget (The Committee on Gymnasium Schooling) and Skolekomitéen (The School Committee). They both legitimated the educational reform by claiming that society was changing rapidly, and therefore the school had to adapt to these changes. So, the intention of the reform was not to create a school in order to change the society, the logic of the reform was to create a school that easily could adjust to the development in society. That logic of reform was important for the construction of the new educational categories. It was an attempt to give more general-theoretical education to a

larger group of individuals, but at the same time was this general knowledge seen as useful skills (reading, writing, speaking, in calculus), and also, the ability to learn was seen as equally important. Knowledge as such, subject *per se*, was reckoned less important than 'useful general knowledge'/ 'skills' and 'the ability to learn'. Those were the basis general educational categories. Gymnasutvalget emphasised technical developments, which in the future would change the labour market. Both committees argued that the growth would continue, and that it was important to develop the industrial society and the welfare state in harmony with individual development. All this had to be based on an increase in general theoretical knowledge (Gymnasutvalget 1967: 63, Skolekomitéen innst. I 1967: 32-38). The arguments in favour of more general skills were utilitarian in a long-term social planning perspective. Both Gymnasutvalget and Skolekomitéen treated the double imaginary signification of modernity (Wagner 2001a: 4) that is - individual autonomy and societal rationality - as though they were free of problems and contradictions. These committees constructed 'more useful general theoretical education' and 'ability to learn' as the long-term effective solution of the times, not only for the economy, but also for the welfare state and democracy. Particular importance was given to the ability to learn. Everyone had to develop the ability called 'learning to learn'.

In the construction of these categories different arguments, statistical evidence, prognosis etc were used. Thus, to establish this as facts or categories "which hold together", as Desrosières has put it (1994: 209), there was a long process of "making equal". Increasing the general useful theoretical component of education was considered important for Norwegian economic growth, for social policy and our democracy. The process of making this view general and acceptable was related to what the actors in that time in history could accept as "a common good within a public regime of critique and justification" (Thévenot 2001: 58). Expert statements, statistical models, pedagogical methods that measured pupils' skills effectively, were all 'spokespersons' or 're-presentatives' (Latour 1983) that were mobilized to establish an agreement on which principle of equivalence that were to be used in the justification. Here, the constructionists of the reform appealed to what Boltanski and Thévenot call an 'industrial order of worth' when justifying more

general theoretical education to a larger group of individuals (Boltanski and Thévenot 1999). General theoretical education was effective in a long term social planning perspective, and could be realized in the following ways: as a mean for individual self-development, as preparation for further studies and work, and as the correct road to a rational societal development. This emphasis on long term planning, efficiency, utility and especially skills meant that the gymnasiums former mission, giving the pupils as much theoretical knowledge as possible, was reckoned less important. The school disciplines canons of knowledge, their heritage, the authoritative teacher, etc lost some of the hegemony as educational re-presentatives; the 'domestic order of worth' lost importance in the justification of the new school. But the 'industrial order of worth' was combined with other justifications. In relation to what Gymnasutvalget and Skolekomitéen of the reform called "the explosion in the educational system" of pupils entering the new school system, increasing the amount of general knowledge was justified by arguments about solidarity and equality. This way of putting arguments to a reality test appealed to the 'civic order of worth' which was strong in the Social Democratic era. Education is a scarce good, and the general uniform school was seen as a social mechanism that could increase vertical mobility and give a larger group of persons the opportunity to enter higher education. This compromise between justifications based on long-term efficiency and utility; 'industrial order of worth', and justifications based on solidarity and equality; a 'civic order of worth', gave the new school its legitimacy. Nevertheless, the reports and documents did not discuss the normative aspect in any detail. Reflections upon the potential problematic character of the normative justifications were nearly totally absent. The reports articulated the view that it was self-evident that more general theoretical education for a larger group of individuals would continue to advance society in a positive way. Thus, the school was seen as a *neutral player*, a player that had to change in order to conform, in a utilitarian way, to the teleological and positive development of Norwegian society.

The Implementation of the Categories: A Process of Instrumental Pedocentrism

The reform was a result of a process of construction through experimenting, testing, evaluating and changing. The very thought that the reform should be tested and evaluated can be connected to the views of early progressivism. John Dewey was the founding father of progressive pedagogy, but very early on, he became aware of the limitations of the project. The progressive movement in USA was based upon a theory about content and pedagogical tools. Yet it was also a theory about how reforms should be administrated and implemented through experiments and evaluation. In Norway, the reform was administrated by Forsøksrådet (which directly translated is the Council for Experimentation). R-74 was a product of long-term experiments and evaluations. This scientific centralization of the process was not unique to Norway. In the US this was known as the Research and Development model (RD&D) in other Scandinavian countries it was known as Undersøkelse, Utvikling og Spredning (UUS [Research, Development & Dissemination]). Forsøksrådet was thus following an international trend, but it was especially powerful in Norway (Telhaug 1990: 77, Slagstad 1998: 324). Forsøksrådet cooperated closely with the political leadership of the day, and had almost total control over school politics (Telhaug 1990: 77-78). Useful general theoretical knowledge as skills had been successfully constructed as an individual good, and as an effective means for the ongoing rational development in society. This optimism was transformed to the implementation of the reform. The epistemic certainty of the time manifested itself in a strong belief that the reform could be realized in a positivistic-scientific manner, through experiments and evaluations. The qualified persons were pedagogical and psychological experts, and the qualified objects were their methods, projects, and statistical evidence. The arguments for the way the reform should be implemented and tried out, also appealed to an 'industrial order of worth', where the main modes of evaluation is efficiency and reliability.

The arguments of more useful general theoretical education, and the extensive focus on the ability to learn, meant a move away from the old knowledge-based gymnasium, and even if the school did not want to drop everything from the old knowledge-based

gymnasium system, it was a new focus upon the individual pupil. There was a strong belief that pedagogical differentiation could solve the problems that one knew would arise with the entrance of a larger and more heterogeneous body of pupils. The old gymnasium had concentrated the curriculum around the different subjects of the commonly accepted canon. It had demanded a certain level of academic proficiency at the time the pupils entered school. The new comprehensive school/high school would not accept such elitism. It was argued that the school was there for the pupils, not the other way around, and instead of demanding certain theoretical abilities, the teaching should begin at the level each individual pupil had reached when school started. That meant differentiated speed, different topics and different pedagogical tools had to be utilized (see, for instance, Skolekomitéen inst. II 1969: 94-96). At the same time, there was a desire to keep the classes together, which was seen possible through individualized arrangements. Different experiments were carried out according to protocols of planning, testing, evaluation and then change. The results were published in reports. One example of this process was the "material method system" where the material was supposed to be "self-instructive" and "self-controlling". The pedagogy had been developed by the behaviouristic psychology of E. L. Thorndike, J. B. Watson and B. F. Skinner. Knowledge should not be adapted through authority and force, but through play. The new progressive pedagogy grew fast and convincingly (without any competing theoretical paradigms at the time). Thus, the realization of education providing more general, utilitarian knowledge to a larger group of pupils, and the realization of the ability to learn, and the use of the new pedagogy, joined together in rejecting that knowledge and subject itself should play the central role, and replacing them with pedagogical learning methods. This is what might be seen as a process of *instrumental pedocentrism* in the Norwegian high school system.[vii] More importance were given to learning skills in general education rather than traditional knowledge, focusing on educational tools, equipments and methods rather than the teachers' authority as knowledgeable persons. In short, justifications based on an 'industrial order of worth' became more important at the sacrifice of the 'domestic order of worth'.

Crisis in Organized Modernity

A New Critique of Schools and of the Establish Pedagogy

In the end of the 1960s a crisis in organized modernity occurred in western countries. Obviously, there were great differences between states, but some common changes were identifiable in the economy, in the political sphere, and in science. These changes occurred in the middle of the reform construction, and some of them had an impact on the reform. Wagner discusses changes in the late 1960s and 1970s. "The Keyesian consensus to develop a national consumption-based economy eroded; the organizational rules that fixed and secured position and task for each actor were reshaped; and technical innovations whose applications tended to break existing conventions were no longer upheld" (1994a: 125). In addition to the economic crisis, there was a "bureaucratic crisis of the welfare state'", and there was a crisis in "the organized mode of representation" (1994a: 141). A key year was 1968 with its social revolutions in the name of economic equality, and its cultural revolution in the name of individuality and emancipation. The cultural revolution (and especially the "*artistic critique*", Boltanski 2002: 6) was an attempt to break away from those social conventions and collectives that were supposed to prevent individual self-realization. The critique of organized modernity was directed towards the growth ideology of industrial capitalism, the environmental threat became a theme, and the values connected with bourgeois society were made problematic.[viii] Closely linked to the cultural critique was "the crises of representation" (Wagner 1994a: 147). Together, these processes contributed to de-stabilizing organized modernity. This is not the place do give an adequate account of this process in Norway, but Norwegian historians have identified some of the same processes, describing the situation as "the new uncertainty" (Bull 1982: 436), the "storm after the quiet years" (Furre 1992: 320), "the radical departure" (Benum 1998: 28). What is essential to my argument here is that the crisis of representation was important in Norway (Slagstad 1998: 367- 429), and especially the critique of positivism. One of Norway's most central characters in this respect was the philosopher Hans Skjervheim. He, and thinkers in the circle around him, formulated a critique of the existing regime through the critique of positivism, and it was at the same time a critique of

the established pedagogy. This circle of philosophers and thinkers in pedagogy was formulating an explicit critique of the new secondary comprehensive/ high school. Their critique was very understandable in the context, but it might have had unintended consequences. Was society heading in the right direction? Could there not be alternatives - socially, economically and politically? What about academic subjects? Was positivism not simply legitimizing the established order? And would not a positivistic construction of school reform with a behaviouristic pedagogy do the same? This critique was massive. Here political radicalism associated with the fight against the war in Vietnam, the fight against EEC, connected with critical theory in academia. Skjervheim and the group around him, was important in this respect. In different articles and essays Skjervheim had developed an epistemological argument, claiming that a positivistic science (social sciences, sociology and pedagogy in particular), that only engaged in collecting and registering data, in an already alienated society, would contribute to the justification of that alienated society. Therefore, a critique of positivism was at the same time a critique of society. Theory in the social sciences and pedagogy could not be anything other than normative, according to Skjervheim. The established pedagogy had not understood, for being a participant itself, it was already engaged in contexts of practice. Attempts to detach from this practice had reduced pedagogy to an instrumental technique, and the pupils had been reduced to objects (for a recent collection of his essays, see Skjervheim 2001). In short then, the critics argued that the pupils had to be treated as participants and not silent spectators, they wanted a symmetrical dialog between teachers and pupils. These objections against the reform and the pedagogy were obviously theoretically very well formulated. The consequences of the critique of positivism and pedagogy led to new attempts to develop different kinds of emancipatory pedagogical theories. The search for emancipatory pedagogy was an international trend. Carl R. Rogers, *Freedom to learn* (1969) gained influence. His pedagogy appealed to emotions, care, freedom, the individual's authenticity (Løvlie 1984). Paolo Freire's *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (1972) was more influenced by critical theory. These were just two symptoms of an emancipatory pedagogy.

The critique in Norway appealed to both a 'civic' and an 'inspired' order of worth. From a history of ideas perspective, one might say that the Norwegian philosophical critique of positivism and pedagogy drew on a phenomenological-critical position (the German way: Kant, Marx, Husserl, Apel, Harbermas). Obviously, they referred to a 'civic order of worth', but also in a compromise with the 'inspired order of worth'. In Norway these new thoughts gained influence in the curriculum at the Institute of pedagogy in Oslo, in the seminars for teacher education and also among political actors (Dale 1998, Sørbø 2002). So, in the last period of the reform process these views made an impact on the reform and the L-76. Translated from theory to practice, 'inspired' values became more obvious, and again teachers authority as knowledgeable persons suffered, in order to establish the dialog as pedagogical method. Therefore, I claim that the demand for emancipation led to a *dialogical pedocentrism*.

The School and Pedocentricm: Instrumental and Dialogical

Gymnasutvalget's report and the first two reports by Steenkomitéen [the Steen Committee] treated the school as an actor that simply had to adjust to the general (and positive) development in society. Within this thinking, more general theoretical education was the solution. Behavioristic pedagogical models were the means. But, as argued above, by the end of the 1960s, this view suffered a major attack from critical philosophers and pedagogical thinkers. The different institutions were not neutral, on the contrary, they were filled with values, norms, rules and ideology that could be criticized. There was a new awareness of value pluralism, and connected to that, the epistemological certainty of positivism was placed under suspicion. This new normative and epistemic uncertainty opened the way for a new radicalism in schooling and pedagogy. I claim that the insight in the *normative problématique* made an impact on the school reform; the school should now play a normative part in changing society, and that view became visible both in the last report of Skolekomitéen, and in L-76. A draft of L-76 was send to different official bodies for comments. In the draft, the school had become an active and normative participant in society. The critique had influenced Forsøksrådet and its active representatives. It is stated in the draft that the school will be a *major deciding* force in society. Economic crisis,

poverty, north-south disparities, the environment, class, gender, epistemology, morality, were all connected in a critique of the industrial-capitalistic school with its instrumental and disciplining rationality. So, not only did the 'domestic order of worth' lose some of its former strength, also values such as long-term planning, efficiency, utility, values connected with the 'industrial order of worth', lost some legitimacy. The school could no longer uncritically adjust to society. But at the same time, there was an epistemic and normative uncertainty on *how* the school was going to influence society's direction. Consequently, the uncertainty can be viewed as an effect of the awareness of the normative problématique, but it did not lead to any clear normative choices. What kind of repertoire of justification could be used in order to legitimate the reform?

L-76 contained elements of both behaviouristic pedagogy and elements from the more phenomenological oriented pedagogy. It kept the belief that differentiation, self-instructive and self-controlling teaching equipment, to a certain degree could leave the pupils to develop on their own (L-76 Del 1. 1976: 38). L-76 contains plenty of statements confirming that behavioristic pedagogy had survived (for instance p. 32-33). However, the dialogical pedagogy was also integrated into L-76 (for instance p. 41, p. 43-44). Both these pedagogical paradigms focussed on the individual pupil. The pupils gained larger influence through school democracy and they had more opportunities for choosing subjects, and themes within subjects; a variety of teaching methods were also introduced. My point is that the process of pedocentrism started with behaviouristic pedagogy, and furthermore, this was strengthened by the critique of positivism and the critique of the behaviouristic pedagogy. Thus, with the transformation from academic gymnasia to comprehensive /high schools, the principle of commonality, or "enhetskolen" was introduced on a higher level in the school system. The school reformers argued that 'useful general knowledge'/ 'skills' and 'the ability to learn' was as important to learn as the traditional knowledge based school subjects. Justifications based on an 'industrial order of worth' gained importance at the sacrifice of the 'domestic order of worth'. Behavioristic pedagogy took over in the first phase of the reform construction, drawing attention to educational methods and educational equipment rather than the

dissemination of knowledge by the traditional teacher. But with the critique from the late 1960s, even this utilitarian perspective of general knowledge was criticized epistemologically and normatively, and also the behaviouristic pedagogy. With the new uncertainty about school, knowledge and pedagogy an even stronger focus on the individual pupil's activity occurred. L-76 was a mixture of a view advocating a behavioristic pupil-centered school, and a view underlining the importance of a pupil-centered school with ambitions toward emancipation. The last pedocentric step was justified as a compromise between a 'civic' and an 'inspired order of worth'. Reading L-76 shows that inspired values (the pupils being creative, listening to their emotions, etc); had a major influence. Arguments demanding emancipation from a suppressing school and an alienated pedagogy grew in importance in the period that follow after 1968; in this climate, justifications based on the 'inspired order of worth' were easier to employ.

A Period of Liquid Modernity

Construction and Justification of Educational Categories – Reform 94

Reform-94 continued the project of building an unified school in the period of "liquid modernity" (Bauman 2001), a time characterised by economic liberalism, and cultural and academic diversity. Peter Wagner claims that after the crisis in organized modernity, a new anxiety concerning the "intelligibility" and the "shapeability" of social reality arose (Wagner 1994a: 176). In other words a "widely diffused awareness of the constructedness and constructability of the social world has strengthened doubts in the possibility of valid, natural knowledge" (Wagner 1994a: 176). Keyensian economic models lost credibility, and the belief in stately institutions was weakened. A process of individualization was strengthened in western countries. Also, the ability to re-present reality was analysed in detail in the sociology of science, and in postmodern- and poststructuralist theory.

So why was a reform needed?[ix] The actors behind the reform had to translate their pictures of reality into school educational categories and pedagogy. There was an idea of creating whole and integrated humans beings. "Our future depends on how far we can take the general level of education", argued Gymansutvalget in the 1960s (Gymnasutvalget 1967:

63). Reform-94 started out with a report that argued in much the same way: "Our wealth depends on our ability to produce and use knowledge. There is a connection between the growth in knowledge and the growth in economy" (NOU 1988: 28, p. 7). In report from the state-appointed committee: "The challenge for Norwegian politics of knowledge is that it does not draw enough competence out of the talent in the population. The results we get are not good enough compared with the skills and abilities than can be developed. This is not just a question about raising the performances for those with higher education, we need a better exploitation of everyone's skills and abilities" (NOU 1988: 28, p. 7). There are similarities between the two arguments. But, the R-94 rhetoric is more explicit in its references to the market using word like "competition", "results," and "goal attainment". The international economy and competition provided an adequate test for the justification of a new reform, according to the reformers. The justification of the reform continued in the following documents (St. meldingene (nr. 43 (1988-89) and nr. 33 (1991-92)). The markets changed rapidly, leading to the need for constantly readjustments. School pupils needed to understand this (NOU 1988: 28, p 10). The committee talked about a society in a constant state of change, and within this "knowledge- and science based society, what is constant is the need for the readjustment and refreshing of knowledge" (p. 10). The school reformers appealed to a 'market order of worth'. The category 'ability to learn' was introduced in R-74 as a necessary skill in a complex society. R-94 followed up that. The pupils in the R-94 are given a task; namely, they should take responsibility for their own lifelong self-construction in the knowledge-based capitalistic society. The actors behind the reform needed a new concept of knowledge, and a new concept of the individual. This is clearly articulated in NOU 1991: 4). "The society will need human beings who are creative, curious, who can act together, be flexible, and who can satisfy demands about quality, order and discipline. The extremely rapid development in economic life has actualized the question about the relationship between specialization and width" (p. 23). They found a German concept - 'handlungskompetenz', that in the German context was used to describe vocational training. In the Norwegian variant, it should however cover "all the social roles that a man can enter, i.e. the whole person" (p.23). These new concepts were constructed and reiterated in many reports and documents, and established the

educational category, 'the broad concept of knowledge'. In the course of preparing for this reform of Norwegian education, also the category 'the perpetual student' was constructed. For instance: "The term 'the perpetual student' can be given a new meaning in the science-based society where readjustment and knowledge-renewal are stable elements. And this knowledge is not something one passively gets - it is something one actively acquires, and everyone has the responsibility to do that" (NOU 1988: 28, p. 11). The rhetoric uses a 'broad concept of knowledge' to construct similarity between a knowledge intensive labour market and the pupils' self-development. The economy needs a 'broad concept of knowledge' and the individual should be able to use her/his *whole personality* at the workplace. The categories tied together 'whole and integrated personalities' with economic growth, and they also tied together 'whole and integrated personalities' with creativity, authenticity and self-realisation. The reformers translated reality in their way, and to stabilise the new categories they mobilised arguments and things related to the technological development, the new work organisation, creativity, flexibility, etc. The justifications relied on two different reality tests, one in which market-competition and money would decide what could be judged as a successful education, and the other test was the pupils' enthusiasm, their ability to create themselves. Those were the most appreciated common goods, so the political ambition to develop 'a broad knowledge' together with integrated harmonious personalities through 'the perpetual student', was justified by means of an appeal to two orders of worth; 'market' and 'inspired'. There was a convergence between utilitarian individualism (the rational actor), and romantic individualism (the expressive/emotional actor).

The Implementation of the Categories: Project Pedocentrism

Even though the categories relied on the normative evaluations mentioned above, the story of Refom-94 is more complex. The work of rhetoric construction continued in the general curriculum being developed as prescription, L-93; this was accompanied by definite methodological instructions. In the late 1960s and 70s, during the crisis in organised modernity, the normative aspects had been debated because of the new normative and epistemic uncertainty. Forsøksrådet had changed its opinion during the

reform process, and in the end it launched a school that the government hoped would have ambitions to take part in the general development in society. But what was unclear was how and what the school should do to participate, because Forsøksrådet seemed uncertain about what kind of society it really wanted, and what could be justified in a proper way. L-93, on the other hand, took distinctive normative choices about what kind of society it wanted, and what part the school should take in the development. But when translating the ideas to classroom activities, the reformers used the same orders of worth. L-93 is divided into chapters with the following headlines: The creative human being, the working human being, the meaning-seeking human being, the general educated human being, the collaborative human being, and the environmental human being. The list ended with the integrated human being. What interpretation of the human being, that is, the category, 'perpetual student', was expressed in L-93?

The pupil and goal-rationality. L-93 emphasised the pupil as an independent and rational actor. Page 4:" Goal in this connection is: a) something one is working towards b) something one can understand when one is getting nearer." One aspect with this rationality is that L-93 (and the curriculum for the different school subjects as well) formulated learning in terms of imperatives. "The training must …, the pupils have to understand …" etc. These imperatives are paradoxical when the individual pupil had to take care of her/his own choices and actions, but has to do so only at the command of the authorities. L-93 mediated an understanding of a rational actor, who will learn to formulate goals and find the right means to realise them. "The training must teach the pupils the ability to look forward, and the skill to use reason when making decisions" (p. 5). The individual pupils had been made responsible subjects in the text, and life-long learning had been made a mean for the individual and the society.

The pupil and the protestant work ethic. Success in this life by means of hard work and an ascetic life - a protestant work ethic - could be a predestined sign of forthcoming success in the hereafter. This self-disciplined work ethic, described by Weber, has many parallels in L-93. One can read that the training will look at human beings as moral creatures, with responsibility for their own choices and actions (p. 9), the pupils

have to understand the moral obligations and let the morality lead them in their everyday life (p. 8). They must develop the ability to keep on going, the training must "give them the will to get further, give them energy and develop resistance towards laziness" (p. 11). Words like 'discipline', 'struggle', 'strain' were used, but always in a positive and optimistic way. "Everyone should have the chance to experience the joy of hard work when giving feelings a form, thoughts an expression and the body exercise" (p. 13). L-93 is not marked by a pessimistic *emancipation-from-ideology*, instead it is an *emancipation-to-ideology*. By working hard and effectively, everyone can reach their own goals, and realise their own skills and personalities. In addition to these two aspects, the romantic view was also included, as is so prevalent in so many pedagogical traditions.

The pupil and creativity and authenticity. The progressive demand that everyone had the right to education and training based on their own skills and abilities was included in L-93. Even more evident in the text was the progressive focus upon the pupil as creative, as an individual seeking the meaning of life, being curious, inventive, experimental, full of fantasy (p. 11-14). Everyone is a creative artist, and this romantic view on the individual was justified by reference to these inspired values. The romantic human being was also strongly emphasised in L-93. In this respect, L-93 followed pedagogical the demand for emancipation, so strongly articulated in the last reform and in mainstream pedagogy since the beginning of the 1970s. The 'perpetual student' in L-93, was a hard-working and goal-oriented person, with a strong will for self-realization. We can follow the categories 'a broad knowledge' and 'the perpetual student' a step further, and see how the reformers wanted them translated into classroom activities. This is related to the belief in project based teaching, and the justification of the project.[x]

In a society characterised by economic liberalism, cultural and social differentiation, the actors supporting the reform advocated a strong integrated human being, goal oriented, with a Protestant work ethic, and a will for self-realisation. Society seems to 'hold together' in this strong individual. This formulation simultaneously called for the fulfilment of individual autonomy and societal rationality, and this is closely connected to an ideology of authenticity. The pedagogy of R-94 is an expression of this ideology. L-93 demands

more teamwork and project-based learning methods, where the teachers are to be partners, working leaders, instructors and guides. In a text that follows L-93, concerning the methodological guidelines for the new education, one finds the following: "In a society and within a labour market that demands flexibility and constant change in relevant competence, skills such as creativity, initiative, ability to collaborate and ability to learn, become increasingly more important. Active participation and responsibility in democratic processes in society demand a broad basis of knowledge, and a common set of Christian and humanistic values. R-94 is a mirror of this broad concept of knowledge (Metodisk rettleiing for vurdering, Nasjonalt læremiddelsenter 1997: 3). In L-93, this is the integrated human being. The pupils will learn to realise their creative personalities, and that is of utter importance, since economic life demands these new creative and flexible individuals. One point is essential to emphasise. Just as the new organisation of work and production might be seen as a result of the critique of the former, the new organisation of classroom activities can be seen as a result of the critique of the former. The critique of fordistic work organisation, and the critique of the behaviouristic pedagogy were both demanding *emancipation from* suppressing mechanism. What is important here is the close affinity between the new organisation of work and production, and the pedagogy in Reform 94; they both emphasise the need to organise their activities in problem-based projects in a larger scale than before. The justifications are also the same; *emancipation to* authenticity by the use of the whole personality in work and learning. Flexibility, adaptive abilities, creativity, competence to change, are descriptive words for a knowledge-intensive globalized economy, but the words were at the same time adequate for developing "whole and integrated" individuals in school and at the new working place. The rhetoric in R-94 constructed equivalence between market liberty, and the freedom to be oneself. The flexible specialisation ideology, now prevalent in the organisation of production, melded together with the flexible project-based teaching methods advocated by new emancipating pedagogy.

This critique of work organisation and capitalism, and the critique of instrumental reason, positivism and pedagogy, both arose in the crises of organised modernity. I think this

critique links Reform-74 with Reform-94, and I will close this article by developing that argument. With accelerating speed, working life in all kinds of businesses, has started to organise work through problem-based projects. Luc Bolanski and Eve Chiapello have analysed this process (Boltanski 2002). Boltanski starts his argument by looking back on the critique of capitalism by the "68-generation". Even though France in many respects differs from Norway, Bolanski makes a point about transformation in capitalism, which can be used to show a similar transformation in schooling. He argues that the 1968-critique demanded authenticity, flexibility and creativity through emancipation from disciplining institutions (such as school, marriage, and the police). He claims that this critique became the new spirit of capitalism. The spirit was integrated within the rhetoric of management literature, a rhetoric that criticised Taylorism and Fordism for being contra-productive, and for not giving the individual a chance for self-realisation. The new credo for the new working life was self-realisation and authenticity through flexible jobs with opportunities and variations, and this became a new force in a capitalism that constantly creates new markets and new products. Long-term activities, belonging to a locality, and trust was replaced by short-term activity and motion. "The reference to authenticity, a term borrowed from the critique of capitalist modernity to become a catch-phrase in capitalism's self-exaltation – sums up these new demands for a more 'authentic' professional life in terms of its facilitation of self-achievement and for the appropriation of more 'authentic' goods in the sense that they constantly adapt themselves to the malleability and one's most intimate and singular desires" (Boltanski 2002: 13). At the same time, the networks grew, and the work was organized differently. People work in autonomous teams with short contracts - in projects - one changes colleagues, projects and working tasks. Moreover, workers are more often "forced" to change jobs and relocate elsewhere. Boltanski reckons that in the new economy the "project" might develop into a new ideological figure (that can turn into another order of worth). He argues that this alliance between a network economy and individual authenticity is gathered in the concept of "project", and that constitutes a new understanding of what might be positive for the individual: "one proves one's worth by being able to fully engage in projects while being aware that they are transitory and while remaining flexible, that is, being always

ready to seek new more improbable and, therefore, more valuable connections. In this new conception of human value it is exactly by being as light, as adaptable, as flexible, as in tune with the demands of the current situation and as tolerant as possible of others that one has the best chances of becoming oneself, of being most authentic" (Boltanski 2002: 14). Boltanski makes reference to the left-oriented critique from 1968 that demanded the development of integrated and authentic human beings, and he has shown how the critique was assimilated by the economic new-liberalism, and became a major force in society. The materialization of this is the "project". The ideology of authenticity was integrated into business rhetoric.

According to the critical philosophical and pedagogical discourse from the end of the 1960s onwards, implementation of a goal-mean rationality in teaching would reduce pedagogy to technique, students to objects, and therefore destroy the ethical and dialogical practice which pedagogy was all about. The strengthening of constructivism and phenomenological based pedagogical theories might be seen as a reaction to the fall of epistemic certainties (like for instance the behaviouristic reform-pedagogy). This idea of emancipation from instrumental rationality can, and have been, developed in different pedagogical direction, and it is of utter importance for the pedagogy that developed in Norway from the late 1960s. This pedagogy was implemented on a large scale in R-94. So, the business ideology and the progressive pedagogy, both partly being a product of the critique that demanded emancipation from suppressing mechanism, are melting together in Reform-94, and its thoughts about development of a holistic and integrated personality. In the late period of the construction of R-74, emancipation oriented pedagogical theories were a reaction to the crisis of legitimation in late organized modernity. The pupils should develop freely. Learning should stimulate creativity and individuality, and in 1974 this was connected to emancipation from industrial capitalism and its rationality. The pupils' creativity and individuality were features that R-94 emphasized as well, but without the underlying wish for emancipation from disciplining practices. The work ethic, goal rationality, and creativity connected with the rhetoric that constructed strong and autonomous individuals. Therefore words like creativity, flexibility and authenticity in R-

94, are so intertwined with adjustability, lifelong learning, the labour market, and flexibility. Realization of the new school, depended on creative and rational individuals who will punish themselves if they fail to succeed in the project of self-realization during a lifelong learning process. The belief in, and the demand for, permanent self-construction in a contingent and unstable world, put into play justifications from different orders of worth, but two normative repertoires were used more often and seemed more important; the market and the inspired. Both these repertoires grew in importance. The new educational categories were translated into the *project pedocentrism*, and the project was justified normatively by drawing on 'market' and 'inspired' values. This new translation of knowledge and human value as "exactly by being as light, as adaptable, as flexible, as in tune with the demands of the current situation and as tolerant as possible of others that one has the best chances of becoming oneself, of being most authentic" contradicts the more long-term, in depth teaching in school subjects.

Conclusion

Justifications based on civic equality and solidarity and justifications based on tradition and heritage are weakened. On the other hand, justifications referring to market and competition and justifications referring to individual authenticity and self-realisation have strengthened their position. The critique of capitalism became the new spirit of capitalism, and the critique of the established pedagogy gave ammunition to the possibility of constructing a compromise between justifications that connected market liberalism with individualistic romanticism. As Michael Young (2008) argues, it is important to bring knowledge back in, but the culture of the knowledge society creates arrangements that dissolve the very knowledge one would expect to be constitutive for the knowledge society's own development. Instead a somewhat 'anomic culture' has been created where knowledge, school subjects and teachers are squeezed between the bureaucratic control routines following the logic of NPM, and a desire to fulfil the pupils educational demands. It makes perfectly sense within this culture of thought that the pupils themselves are left with the possibility and responsibility for their own learning: the customer is always right. The pupils who are most likely to succeed in this culture are those with parents that

closely follow their children's academic achievements. In a broader perspective, the relations between individualisation as a process of formal emancipation from suppressing institutions, and the subjectivism as a new process of alienation in the era of liquid modernity might be better understood in light of the strong compromise outlined above.

Literature

Bauman, Z. 2001. *Flytende modernitet*. Oslo: Vidarforlaget.

Bénatouïl, T. 1999. A tale of two sociologies. The critical and the pragmatic stance in contemporary french sociology. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 2 (3), 379 - 396.

Benum, E. 1998. Overflod og fremtidsfrykt. In *Aschehougs Norges historie.* Oslo: Aschehoug.

Boltanski, L. 2002. The left after May 1968 and the longing for total revolution. *Thesis Eleven*. 69, 1-20. London/ Thousand Oaks/ CA/ New Delhi: Sage.

Boltanski, L. and Thévenot, L. 1999. The sociology of critical capacity. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 2,(3), 359-77. London: Sage.

Boltanski, L. & Thévenot, L. 2000. The reality of moral expectations: A sociology of situated judgement. *Philosophical Explorations*. 3, 208-231.

Bull, E. 1982. *Norgeshistorien etter 1945*. Oslo. J. W. Cappelens Forlag A.S.

Bulle, N. 2001. Les changemenets idéologiques de l'enseignement dans l'école secondaire "de masse". In R. Boudon, N. Bulle, & M.Cherkaoui, (eds) *École et société. Les paradoxes de la democratie.* Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Dale, E. L. 1999. *De strategiske pedagoger*. Oslo: Ad Notam Gyldendal.

Desrosières, A. (1991). How to make things which hold together: Social science, statistics and the state. In P. Wagner, B. Wittrock & R. Whitley (eds.), *Discourses on society. The shaping of social science disciplines*, 195-218. Dordrecht/ Boston/ London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Dodier, N. 1993. Review article: Action as a combination of 'common worlds' *The Sociological Review*. 41 (1), 556-71.

Durkheim, E. 1977. *The Evolution of Educational Thought*. London, Henley, Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Furre, B. 1992. *Norsk historie 1905-1990*. Oslo: Det Norske Samlaget.

Halsey, A.H. (ed.) 1997. *Education: Culture, economy and society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hernes, G. 1973. *Om ulikhetens reproduksjon*. Arbeidsnotat / Levekårsundersøkelsen; nr. 28.

In Goodsen, I. F. and S. Ball 1985 (eds.). *Defining the Curriculum*. London & Philadelphia: The Falmer Press.

Goodson, I. F. 1993. *School Subjects and Curriculum Change. Studies in Curriculum History*. Washington DC/London: The Falmer Press.

Lamont, M. & Thévenot, L. 2000. Introduction: toward a renewed comparative cultural sociology. In M. Lamont, L. Thévenot, (eds.), *Rethinking comparativ cultural sociology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Latour, B. 1983. Give me a laboratory and i will raise the world. In K. Knorr-Cetina & M. Mulkay (eds). *Science Observed*. London/ Beverly Hills/ New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Løvlie, L. 1984. *Det pedagogiske argument*. Oslo: Cappelen

Ozga, J. Governing education through data in England: from regulation to self-evaluation. *Journal of Education Policy*. Vol. 24, No. 2, 149–162

Sakslind, R. 2002. Utdanningssosiologiens tideverv. Et kunnskapssosiologisk tilbakeblikk *Sosiologisk tidsskrift*. 10 (2), 112-142.

Severud, J. 2003. *Ubehaget i skolen*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Skjervheim, H. 2001. *Deltakar og tilskodar og andre essays*. Oslo: Aschehoug.

Slagstad, R. 1998. *De nasjonale strateger*. Oslo: Pax Forlag A/S.

Slagstad, R. 2000. *Kunnskapens hus*. Oslo: Pax Forlag A/S.

Sørbø, J. I. 2002. *Hans Skjervheim – ein intellektuell biografi*. Oslo: Det Norske Samlaget.

Telhaug, A. O. (1990). *Forsøksrådet for skoleverket 1954-1984*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Thévenot, L. 2001. Pragmatic regimes governing the engagement with the world. In T. R. Schatzki, K. KnorrCetina & E. V. Savigny (eds.), *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory*. pp. 56-74. London and New York: Routledge.

Thévenot, L, Moody, M & Lafaye, C. 2000. Forms of valuing nature: Argument and models of justification in French and American environmental disputes. In M.

Lamont & L. Thévenot, (eds.), *Rethinking comparative cultural sociology*. pp. 229-273. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wagner, P. 1994a. *A sociology of modernity. Liberty and discipline*. London & New York: Routledge.

Wagner, P. 1994b. Dispute, uncertainty and institution in recent french debates. *Journal of Political Philosophy*. 2/3, 270-89.

Wagner, P. 1999. After justification. repertoires of evaluation and the sociology of modernity. *European Journal of Social Theory.* 2 (3), 341-57.

Wagner, P. 2001a. *Theorizing Modernity.* London. Thousand Oaks. New Delhi: Sage.

Wagner, P. 2001b. *A History and Theory of the Social Sciences*. London. Thousand Oaks. New Delhi: Sage.

Young, M. F. D. 2008. *Bringing Knowledge Back In*. London and New York: Routledge

Ziehe, T. 2001. De personlige livsverdeners dominans. *Uddannelse*, 10, 1-8.

Reports and Documents

Innstilling I om det videregående skoleverket fra Skolekomiteen. 1967.
Innstilling II om det videregående skoleverket fra Skolekomiteen. 1969.
Innstilling III om det videregående skoleverket fra Skolekomiteen. 1970.
Kirke- og undervisningsdepartementet 1976. Del 1. *Læreplan Generell del*.
Kirke-, utdannings- og forskningsdepartementet 1993. *Læreplanen. Generell del*.
Nasjonalt læremiddelsentert 1997. *Metodisk rettleiing. Vurdering i vidaregåande opplæring – skule*.
NOU 1988: 28. *Med viten og vilje*.
NOU 1991: 4. *Veien videre til studie- og yrkeskompetanse for alle*.
St. meld. nr 33 (1990-91). *Kunnskap og kyndighet. Om visse sider ved videregående opplæring*.
St. meld. nr. 37 (1990-91). *Om organisering og styring i utdanningssektoren*.
St. meld. nr. 48 (1988-89). *Mer kunnskap til flere.*
Tilråding om REFORM AV GYMNASET, frå Utvalet til å vurdere reform av fagleg innhald og indre oppbygging i gymnaset 1967 (Gymnasutvalget).

[i] The article is based on some parts of my Ph.D-thesis (published in 2007, .[name deleted to maintain the integrity of the review process]).

[ii] And process of self-regulation through self-evaluation as Jenny Ozga (2008) points out.

[iii] L-74 and L-93 contained the ideological arguments behind their respective reforms, and the major principles for curriculum and pedagogy. Inspired by the curriculum history approach, associated with the works of Stephen Ball and Ivor Goodson (for instance Goodson and Ball (eds.) 1985, Goodson 1993), I also analysed curriculum changes in three school subjects (Norwegian, Mathematics and Social studies) [name deleted to maintain the integrity of the review process]. However, I will not discuss these changes here.

[iv] Focusing then on the "critical operations undertaken by the actors" (Boltanski and Thévenot 1999: 364) might open a "interpretative space" (Wagner 2001a: 5), for a different "historical sociology of modernity which takes the idea seriously that social institutions are created by human beings but which remains capable of recognising the specific historical limits and boundaries, as well as opportunities and enablements, which they entail" (Wagner 2001b: 116).

[v] The development of the orders of worth was based on empirical studies on how persons solve their disputes. In the formal identifications of these orders of judgement, they read classical texts in political philosophy. In addition they used contemporary guides for everyday practices that could be matched with the classical political texts (Boltanski and Thévenot 1999: 368). My understanding of this approach is based on articles in English (Boltanski and Thévenot 1999, 2000, Thévenot, Moody,and Lafaye 2000, Lamont and Thévenot 2000, Wagner 1994b, 1999, 2001b, Dodier 1993, Bénatouïl 1999). As mentioned above, in the 1999 article six orders of worth were introduced, Thévenot et al suggest a possible green order of worth (2000: 241), and Boltanski suggests a possible 'project order of worth' (2002: 11).

[vi] It is a somewhat strange that educational research into knowledge about schooling and pedagogy have gradually over the course of recent decades been disconnected from the discipline of sociology, and have been handed over to different entities within faculties of education. In the development of "a knowledge society" the field of sociology has often ignored this important field of study. Research on this subject has by and large not been taken up with the rigour of sociological tradition and perspectives (Sakslind 2002).

[vii] I have the term "pedocentrism" from Nathalie Bulle (2001).

[viii] See *Thesis Eleven* nr. 68, 2002. See also Boltanski's article in *Thesis Eleven* no. 69, 2002.

[ix] There are three basic characteristics of R-94. First, it offered educational rights to every youth between the ages of sixteen and nineteen. Second, they changed the structure. Before the reform there were 109 different first year courses; this was reduced to thirteen. And third, it was a reform that changed the content. A common core of general theoretical subjects were introduced in every first year course; in other words, more theory for everyone. All subjects were divided into smaller units - modules - intended to simplify the opportunity to take whatever quantity of general theoretical subjects that was needed for further university studies. This was supposed to open doors for those who initially had taken vocational training.

[x] The actors behind Reform-94 wanted to do many different things at the same time. It can indeed be argued that they had an ambition to re-establish more traditional knowledge and put a new focus on the school subjects and the authoritative teacher. Curriculum justification based on the 'domestic order of worth'. But, at the same time, the reform was influenced by an ideology of management by objective, and that led to new bureaucratic routines, and new ways to control and evaluate teacher. This lack of freedom for the teacher, some argued, made it difficult to realize the knowledge ambitions (Severud 2003). This strong stately control of the educational system and the reform combined with a more general market rhetoric had some similarities with what Halsey, et al., argue that there had been a fundamental restructuring of the education system in the 1980s and 1990s all over the western world. In the USA and Great Britain this was connected to the New-Right ideology (in the era of Reagan and Thatcher). They integrated a "neo-liberal view of the virtues of individual freedom and the free market with a traditional conservative view that a strong state is necessary to keep moral and political order" (Halsey et al 1997: 19).