CORA Cork Open Research Archive
Cartlann Taighde Oscailte Chorcaí

Title	Schools and values
Authors	Hyland, Áine
Publication date	1986;1986
Original Citation	Hyland, Á. (1986) 'Schools and values', Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review, 75(299), pp. 250-266. Available at: https://www.jstor.org/stable/30102928 (Accessed: 21 February 2025)
Type of publication	Article (peer-reviewed)
Link to publisher's version	https://www.jstor.org/stable/30102928
Rights	© 1986, Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review 2023. All Rights Reserved.
Download date	2026-10-31 11:58:18
Item downloaded from	https://hdl.handle.net/10468/17106



UCC
University College Cork, Ireland
Coláiste na hOllscoile Corcaigh

SCHOOLS AND VALUES

Áine Hyland

Áine Hyland lectures in Education in Carysfort College in Dublin.

IT is generally believed that schools have an important role to play in the transmission and development of values. Most educationalists would subscribe to this theory and educational philosophies throughout the world reflect this belief. Christian and non-Christian Churches throughout history have recognized the importance of education in the transmission of values. Governments through the ages have also relied on the formal educational system to instil their ideologies in the youth of their countries.

Is there any evidence to suggest that schools are successful in transmitting values? If one equates values with the educational aspirations which successive governments have formulated in relation to Irish education, one might well question the effectiveness of the Irish school system in this regard. An overview of these aspirations in relation to the Irish system for the past 150 years will make the point.

Irish National Schools in the 19th and early 20th centuries.

The State's formal involvement in primary education in Ireland dates back to 1831. In that year, the Westminster government decided to set up a Board of commissioners in Ireland to administer an annual parliamentary grant for the education of the poor of Ireland[1]. The government stated that the main object of the exercise was to unite in one system children of different creeds[2] and with this object in mind, rules and procedures were set down to encourage the development of a mixed system of primary or national education[3]. The main Christian Churches were opposed to this type of system. In due course, the government conceded to the Churches and by mid-century, over 90 per cent of national schools in Ireland were under denominational management[4].

The values to be transmitted through the national school system in

the 19th and early 20th centuries included values of peace and tolerance. Schools were expected to instil these values in their pupils and to this end, the rules of the National Board required that the following Lesson be displayed prominently in all national schools:

> *Christians should endeavour, as the Apostle Paul commands them, to live peaceably with all men even with those of a different religious persuasion. Our Saviour Christ, commanded his disciples to love one another; he taught them to love even their enemies, to bless those that cursed them, and to pray for those that persecuted them. We ought to seek for the truth, and to hold fast what we are convinced is the truth; but not to treat harshly those who are in error. Jesus Christ did not intend his religion to be forced on men by violent means. He would not allow his disciples to fight for him.*
>
> *If any person treats us unkindly, we must not do the same to them; for Christ and his Apostles have taught us not to return evil for evil. If we would obey Christ, we must do to others, not as they do to us, but as we should wish them to do to us.*
>
> *Quarrelling with our neighbours, and abusing them, is not the way to convince them that we are in the right and they in the wrong. It is more likely to convince them that we have not a Christian spirit. We ought to show ourselves followers of Christ who when He was reviled, reviled not again, (1. Pet. ch. 2. ver. 23) by behaving gently and kindly to every one*[5].

In addition to displaying the Lesson, schools were exhorted to inculcate in the pupils the principles which it set out[6]. They were also given clear guidelines as to the type of teacher they should employ.

> *National Teachers should be persons of Christian sentiment, of calm temper, and discretion; they should be imbued with a spirit of peace, of obedience to the law, and of loyalty to their Sovereign; they should not only possess the art of communicating knowledge, but be capable of moulding the mind of youth, and of giving to the power which education confers, a useful direction. These are the qualities for which Patrons or Local Managers of Schools, when making choice of Teachers, should anxiously look.*

They are those which the Commissioners are anxious to find, to encourage and to reward[7].

With such lofty and laudable ideals, one might well expect that Irish national schools in the pre-1922 era would have produced peace-loving, co-operative and loyal citizens. Unfortunately, the facts of history bear testimony to a different outcome. Strife, division and revolt against the Crown were the hallmarks of our country during the period, despite the rule which required that the principles of the Lesson be inculcated in all children.

With the coming of independence in 1921, another set of values was emphasized in the educational system. These values reflected the priorities of State and Church. On the dissolution of the National Board in 1922, the intentions of the new Free State government in relation to education were stated as follows:

In the administration of Irish education, it is the intent of the new government to work with all its might for the strengthening of the national fibre by giving the language, history, music and tradition of Ireland their natural place in the life of Irish schools[8].

The dominant value of the State was nationalism and the new curriculum, which was introduced in all national schools in 1922, emphasized Irish language, history and culture.

The available evidence would suggest that the concentration of so much time and attention on Irish had only limited success. After more than half a century of implementing the National Programme in primary schools, it was found that only 9 per cent of the (non-Gaeltacht) population of Ireland had high verbal competence in the Irish language and a further 7 per cent had adequate verbal competence. At the other end of the scale 55 per cent of the population had either no conversational ability in Irish or had no Irish at all[9].

The new Free State government was anxious to accommodate the values of the Churches, particularly the Catholic Church, within the national school system. The British administration had insisted on retaining a clear delineation between secular and religious instruction and during the nineteenth century, school authorities had been forbidden to display religious emblems or to engage in public prayer during the period of secular instruction. The Catholic Church had objected to this situation on a number of occasions in the 19th

century[10]. In 1926, some of the concerns of the Church were allayed when the state recognized the integral role of religious education in the life of a school. In that year a government-sponsored conference on the national-school curriculum under the chairmanship of Rev. Lambert McKenna, S.J., included the following statement in a report to government:

> *Of all the parts of the school curriculum Religious Instruction is by far the most important, as its subject-matter, God's honour and service, includes the proper use of all man's faculties, and affords the most powerful inducements to their proper use. We assume, therefore, that Religious Instruction is a fundamental part of the school course. Though the time allotted to it as a specific subject is necessarily short, a religious spirit should inform and vivify the whole work of the school. The teacher — while careful, in the presence of children of different religious beliefs, not to touch on matters of controversy —should constantly inculcate the practice of charity, justice, truth, purity, patience, temperance, obedience to lawful authority and all the other moral virtues. In this way he will fulfil the primary duty of an educator, the moulding to perfect form of his pupils' character, habituating them to observe, in their relations with God and with their neighbour, the laws which God, both directly through the dictates of natural reason and through Revelation, and indirectly through the ordinance of lawful authority, imposes on mankind*[11].

The government endorsed this statement and inserted the above paragraph into the Rules and Regulations for National Schools, where it became enshrined as a fundamental tenet of the national school system[12]. It is still a fundamental rule for national schools except for one change — the admonition to teachers to be careful in the presence of children of different religious beliefs not to touch on matters of controversy was removed from the rules in 1965 and is no longer included[13]. A subtle distinction, perhaps, but it might be read as indicating that at a crucial juncture of our history the value system of the State had become less sensitive to the views of the minority religions and that less emphasis was to be placed on tolerance in schools.

The Secondary School Curriculum after 1878

During penal times, Catholics were forbidden to run schools. Therefore, most of the so-called superior or secondary schools which developed in the 17th and 18th centuries in Ireland were under Protestant management. Following the repeal of the penal laws, schools under Catholic management were opened throughout the country. By and large, these schools were managed and staffed by Diocesan clergy or by religious orders and congregations, male and female. As such, these schools had clearly defined value systems, usually based on the philosophy of their founders.

In 1878, the government agreed to provide limited funding for secondary or intermediate schools in Ireland[14]. The Churches made it clear that they would not accept any method of funding which would undermine their autonomy and independence. Neither would they tolerate any development which would interfere with their ethos or with the system of governance and management which individual schools had evolved[15]. The government's solution to the problem was to introduce a system of payment by results. Under this system, written examinations would be conducted annually by a Board of commissioners (the Intermediate Board). Schools which wanted a share of the funds of the Board had to submit their pupils for examination; each pupil who passed the examination would earn results fees for his or her school.

Secondary education after 1878 became dominated by examinations. Examination syllabuses largely determined what went on in schools and the curricular emphasis of many schools must have undergone significant change as a result. A competitive ethic permeated the system and the legacy of the examination-oriented system has remained with us to the present day.

Conflicting values?

It would be an interesting exercise to compare the values of the State in relation to education in Ireland with the philosophy of religious orders who chose to accept State aid. Was there an inherent conflict between the values of the State as implemented through a policy of payment by results and the more religious and spiritual values of the Church?

On many occasions in the past hundred years or so, ecclesiastical

spokesmen have referred to the essentially spiritual purpose of Church involvement in education. In the early years of this century, Rev. Michael Maher, S.J., explained the motive of the religious in education as follows: 'It is not the diffusion of general knowledge, nor the advancement of secular learning .... It is the salvation of souls'[16]. Archbishop Byrne of Dublin, speaking of the Catholic ideal in education some years later, echoed this view: 'The Church has only one ideal — to save the immortal soul of the child'[17].

More specifically, the main aim of the diocesan seminaries which were set up throughout the country in the nineteenth century was to train young persons for the clerical state[18]. Religious orders — both male and female — who conducted Secondary schools, also encouraged young people to enter the religious life and their success in this regard is evidenced by the high number of vocations in the first half of the twentieth century. In 1861, there were 5,955 priests, monks and nuns in Ireland. By 1901, this number had increased to 14,145, despite a decrease of 27 per cent in the total population of the country. By 1951, there were over 20,000 priests, brothers and nuns in the 26 counties alone. In addition, large numbers of Irish men and women became missionaries in overseas countries[10]. In this regard, many of the Catholic schools of the period were successful in inculcating their declared values.

Equality of Educational Opportunity

After the Second World War, many European countries sought to revitalize their education systems and gave support to the concept of equality of educational opportunity. Free secondary education was introduced in many countries in the late 1940s and 1950s, but in Ireland, the Council of Education, which was set up in 1950 to advise the government on the function and curriculum of primary and secondary education, did not favour the introduction of free secondary education. In a report published in 1962, the Council maintained that the unqualified scheme of 'secondary education for all' is utopian: if only for financial reasons. It also objected to secondary education for all on educational grounds, arguing that 'only a minority of pupils would be capable of profiting by secondary education'[20].

The 1960s were a period of stocktaking and change in Irish education. A survey of the educational system published in 1966

found that equality of educational opportunity was far from being realized in Ireland[21]. Young people from lower socio-economic backgrounds were much less likely to attend second-level education than their better-off peers. Almost one-third of all young people never went beyond the primary school, and these were mostly children of parents who were unemployed or who were employed as semi-skilled or unskilled workers. Only 44 per cent of the relevant age group sat for either the Group or the Intermediate Certificate and less than one in five of the population sat for the Leaving Certificate. The dice was even more heavily loaded against young people from underprivileged backgrounds when it came to third-level education. Children of professional families were up to 40 times more likely to enter university than young people from the lowest socio-economic background.

During the early decades of the Free State, many religious orders had done their best with very limited resources to provide secondary education at a very low fee, but this did not help families with a very low income or those who lived at a considerable distance from the nearest secondary school. Secondary schools were essentially for the élite of society and the State did nothing to change the system until 1967 when free secondary education was introduced.

With the decision to introduce free secondary education, the government overtly subscribed to the concept of equality of educational opportunity. A superficial analysis of participation rates in second and third level education might seem to indicate that this aspiration has been realized. 98 per cent of young people nowadays transfer to post-primary schools on completion of primary education and 85 per cent of these sit for either the Group or the Intermediate Certificate examination. The number of pupils sitting for the Leaving Certificate has increased fourfold and about one-third of the relevant age-cohort go on to third-level education[22]. But this does not mean that equality of educational opportunity has been achieved. Young people from professional families still have a much greater probability of going to university than children from less privileged backgrounds. At the beginning of this decade it was estimated that about three-quarters of the children of white-collar workers entered third-level education compared to only 4 per cent of the children of unskilled workers[23]. In 1983, an American researcher argued that far from reducing the disparity between children from different social groups, the Irish educational system is a major barrier to social mobility. He maintained that the huge expansion in second-level

education during the past twenty years has been disproportionately availed of by the middle and upper middle classes, stating that 'middle-class dominance is strongly evident at Leaving Certificate level and at third-level, proprietorial and upper middle class families form a share of the student population vastly out of proportion to their numbers'[24]. He went on to state that

> *More than in any other area, studies have clearly shown the extent to which the taxpayers' money is being used as a massive subsidy to the middle and upper middle classes in education . . . taxpayers' money is being used as a huge income-enhancing mechanism for the middle classes.*

While other researchers would take issue with the above conclusions, there seems to be general agreement that the Irish education system is still a long way from achieving the value of equality of educational opportunity.

Selection

Although there is widespread support for the theory of equality of educational opportunity, the practice of some school authorities seems to be at variance with the theory. In 1967, additional grants were introduced by the government to compensate existing secondary schools who had previously had to charge fees. School transport facilities were made available throughout the country. The majority of the voluntary secondary schools entered the free scheme and fees were no longer charged by these schools.

However, some schools retained a policy of selective intake. A minority of schools continued to charge fees; in other cases, where demand for places exceeded the number of places available, school authorities either introduced or continued to operate a policy of selection, while opting into the so-called free scheme. A survey in the mid-1970s indicated that 16 per cent of secondary schools throughout the country did not accept all first-year applicants[25]. In Dublin County Borough, the proportion of schools in this situation was over 50 per cent. It might be opportune for such schools to ask themselves what criteria they use to select their pupils. Are financial criteria used, i.e. the ability to pay fees? Is attendance at a related fee-paying private primary school an advantage? Are social factors a

consideration? Is intellectual ability or achievement a factor in selection? Can such criteria be justified? School authorities will reply that they must select if they have more applications than they have places. In this event, certain criteria such as ability to pay, social background or academic ability might be ruled out and other criteria such as proximity to school, first-come first-served, or a lottery-system, might be considered. There may not be easy solutions to the problem of selection but an honest appraisal of the situation with a view to reducing discrimination might help in identifying some solutions.

Social and economic disadvantage

In many urban areas of Ireland, families with social and economic disadvantage tend to live in a ghetto situation. From the point of view of education, this often results in a situation where one school has to cope with a very high proportion of children who have started off life at a disadvantage.

At both national and secondary levels, State funding towards current costs such as heating, cleaning, equipment, etc., is paid to school authorities on a flat *per capita* basis, regardless of where the school is situated. This funding does not cover total current costs; school authorities must make up the remaining costs from voluntary sources. As one might expect, wealthier areas or parishes contribute more to the upkeep of their school than poorer areas with the result that schools in better-class areas are often considerably better equipped and resourced than schools in less-privileged areas. As a result of this, the dice can be doubly loaded against children from disadvantaged areas — they start school with a disadvantage and because of lack of facilities schools may find it very difficult to reduce this disadvantage.

In recent years, this situation has been recognized and the current Programme for Action in Education states, in relation to primary education, that special funding should be directed to disadvantaged areas. It also states that

> *A proportion of primary schools, principally in certain urban areas, encounter special difficulties in that they have to cater for a high proportion of children who are disadvantaged in respect of social and educational*

background and who receive little support in the home environment which would motivate them towards educational achievement . . . It is proposed that such schools will have priority in the allocation of teaching posts for the purposes of combating educational backwardness. . . Extra resources have been made available to provide supplementary funding to such schools . . . to enable them to meet operational costs and to purchase books, equipment, materials and requisites[26].

A sum of about £1 million was made available in the current financial year for this purpose — about one-tenth of 1 per cent of the total education budget. Much of this money is being spent on salaries for extra teachers to reduce the pupil-teacher ratio in these schools or to provide in-service courses for these teachers. How confident can we be that the parents of children in these schools, if given a say in the allocation of this money, would feel that their children's needs are being best met by spending the money in this way?

The Education of Travellers' Children

Children in this country are required by law to attend school from the age of 6 to 15. Statistics for the country as a whole show that there is virtually full attendance by children from the settled community within this age-group. But this is not the case with the children of travelling people. Even the most optimistic figures indicate that only 58 per cent of these children attend school regularly — only about 3,500 out of a total of about 6,000, leaving an estimated 2,500 travellers' children who do not attend school regularly[27]. Despite reports from various bodies during the past ten years, this problem has not been adequately addressed. Many travellers have indicated a preference for separate education for their children (separate from the children of the settled community) and some provision has been made in specially provided facilities for such children, but this provision is inadequate. Others prefer their children to attend ordinary schools. But do we, the settled community, actively support the integration of the children of travellers within the ordinary school system, where this is the preferred option of their parents? How many of us publicly expressed our concern when a south Dublin national school refused, last September, to enrol two small children — aged 6

and 7 — from a travelling family who had recently settled in the area? Why was the issue not resolved until it reached the courts?

Tolerance and Prejudice

The importance of tolerance in society is continually stressed by the Churches and by the State. The religious education syllabuses of the main Christian Churches at both primary and secondary levels highlight the value of tolerance. Both the Primary School curriculum and the Secondary School curriculum stress the importance of tolerance in the field of history teaching. The Secondary School Curriculum includes in its aims and objectives the statement that

> *pupils should feel a responsibility... to understand what it is like to be in someone else's position and to respect the views of others to be different and to hold different points of view*[28].

The findings of Rev. Michael MacGreil's major study, *Prejudice and Tolerance in Ireland,* published in 1977, suggest that Irish people as a whole do not rate very highly on a tolerance scale. Over 77 per cent of those surveyed indicated that they would refuse to welcome into kinship relationships, people from certain ethnico-racial backgrounds such as Nigerians, Zambians, Pakistanis or American Negroes[29]. Over 60 per cent would refuse to welcome agnostics or atheists and 77 per cent would refuse to welcome Communists. 70 per cent would refuse to welcome itinerants. However the evidence indicates that younger people are more tolerant than older people and that the longer one remains at school, the more tolerant and the less prejudiced one becomes. So perhaps schools make some contribution to reducing levels of intolerance in society. (Or perhaps the more educated people know the right or acceptable answers!). In summarizing the findings, Fr. MacGreil states that the more educated or the higher his or her occupational status, the less illiberal, the less fundamentalist and the less pro-establishment he or she tends to be[30].

Multi-denominational education

One of the more striking findings of Fr. MacGreil's survey was the degree of support for what was referred to in the survey as interdenominational mixed free community schools. 78 per cent of those surveyed expressed themselves in favour of such schools and only 16 per cent were against them[31]. Referring to this result, the author states that in the Irish context this is considered a highly liberal position, since the vast majority of schools are single-sex, denominational, non-community schools[32].

In the earlier section of this article, I have indicated how our educational system at both first and second levels evolved along denominational lines during the nineteenth century. As a result of this, virtually all national schools in this country are under the management of the main Churches — Catholic and Church of Ireland. A small number of schools in the three Ulster counties are under Presbyterian management and a handful of urban schools are under Methodist management. There is one national school in Dublin under Jewish management.

One might ask whether our education system is sufficiently responsive to the needs of the members of minority religions or to those who, while being committed to their own religions, would prefer to have their children educated in a multi-denominational environment. The 1981 census showed that 1,803 children (aged 5 to 14) in this country (26 counties) belonged to religions other than Catholic, Church of Ireland, Methodist or Presbyterian. 7,827 were returned as having no religion. A further 14,000 chose not to respond to the question of religion[33]. The findings of various surveys have shown that many members of the main Churches, including inter-church families, would prefer to send their children to multi-denominational schools if they were available[34]. In recent years, such people have got together in a few areas to set up integrated schools. As a result, there are now three multi-denominational national schools in the system and there are a further three groups working towards the setting up of such schools in other areas[35]. A similar development has taken place in Northern Ireland in recent years[36]. The demand for places in these new multi-denominational schools is considerably greater than can be accommodated.

The decisions of the northern and southern governments to allow multi-denominational schools to be recognized within the State-aided school system are a positive response to the growing pluralism

of our society. The challenge for a central authority in a pluralist society is to provide a framework within which schools of different traditions can function effectively without losing their uniqueness.

Schools and values in a changing society

The world in which we live is undergoing rapid change. Many of the so-called certainties of previous generations will not apply in the future. This is due to many factors — changing patterns of enterprise and employment, changing interpretations of work and job, increasingly diverse and expanding opportunities for leisure, changing perceptions of gender roles and rapid developments in technology and information processing. We are more aware to-day of world problems such as the growing gap between developed and developing countries, the unequal distribution of wealth throughout the world, the consequences of irresponsibility towards each other and to the environment, than we were a generation ago. Our schools must respond to a changing society.

Recent publications from national curriculum bodies, north and south of the border, recognize the need for schools to re-assess their educational goals and values. The Dublin-based Curriculum and Examinations Board in a report published in March of this year stated that schools must ensure that they contribute to the development of those attitudes and attributes which will enable young people to avail of the opportunities of life in the twenty-first century[37]. It goes on to elaborate:

> *There is need therefore to foster confidence in young people... Overcoming the fear of failure is one of the most significant contributions schools can make in preparing young people for adult life. They must be encouraged to think in terms of identifying problems and considering solutions rather than always seeking absolute right or wrong answers to problems. An imaginative failure can be more educationally worthwhile than a correct, but poorly understood response*[38].

A statement like this indicates a significant change in the values which we have traditionally associated with our schools. Success and failure have tended in the past to be synonymous with right and

wrong answers. The examination system encouraged this association and in the process, undermined the confidence and self-esteem of many young people. Can our schools and our examination system in the future adjust to the value system implicit in the above statement?

The Curriculum and Examinations Board suggests that school programmes in the future 'should be framed within a cultural context which emphasizes creativity, enterprise and innovation rather than conformity and passive learning'[39]. It indicates that greater emphasis should be placed on student learning as distinct from teaching, on personal responsibility in learning, on contractual learning (i.e. where a pupil contracts with the school to undertake certain courses), on sharing and co-operation with others in learning and on developing positive attitudes to coping with and learning from successes, failures and mistakes[40].

A first step towards the development of student confidence and creativity might well be the involvement of young people in certain decisions within the school. A recent report of the Northern Ireland Council for Educational Development recommends that pupils should assume positions of responsibility within the school, where they may exercise judgment, initiative and leadership and where they may be called upon to justify their actions[41]. This has implications for school structures and for relationships between pupils and teachers. The active involvement of pupils in decision-making structures may well lead to the questioning of traditional values and attitudes and thus could well cause tension in the short term. However, involvement in decision-making will involve a sharing of responsibility and in the long term this should benefit both pupils and teachers.

The report referred to in the previous paragraph also emphasizes the role of the school in developing the pupils' self-confidence:

> *The self-confidence of pupils should be enhanced through the enjoyment of an appropriate measure of success, and not broken through the experience of repeated failure. There should be concern for pupils as individuals, for their personal welfare and for the development of personal qualities, such as reliability, self-discipline and flexibility. Pupils should be trained to think independently, to investigate, to analyse, to synthesize, to discriminate and to evaluate. The aim should be to develop the mind, rather*

than to fill it, and to encourage pupils to acquire an imaginative approach and a sense of curiosity[42].

The Hidden Curriculum

It is clear that the hidden curriculum of schools has played and will continue to play a significant role in the development and transmission of values. Stated values within schools are one thing, covert values and hence custom and practice are another. It would, for example, be quite inconsistent to attempt to promulgate values related to the resolution of conflict by non-violent means in a school where corporal punishment was used as a method of resolving conflict within the school. It might also be difficult to encourage democratic values in a school which does nothing to encourage democracy within the school. Can a school effectively develop the value of co-operation if success is always measured by the grade achieved by its pupils in examinations which are essentially competitive rather than co-operative? Will pupils become concerned and caring citizens if they do not experience concern and caring within the school?

The role of the teacher

The role of the teacher in the development and transmission of values is considerable. The personal example set by the teacher within the classroom and within the school can often influence a pupil's behaviour at least as much if not more than the written word. This is recognized in such curricular documents as 'The Curriculum from 5 to 16' produced by the HMI in England in which it is stated that if pupils are to understand concepts such as fairness and justice, they must see those concepts exemplified by the adults with whom they deal[43]. A similar view is expressed in a Northern Ireland report which recommends that

pupils should have opportunities to . . . experience at first hand illustrations of such concepts (e.g. fairness, tolerance, fidelity, a sympathetic attitude towards the feelings and opinions of others, a willingness and ability to work towards the rational resolution of disagreement) in the day

to day life of the schools, in the example set by those in positions of authority, in the structures established for pastoral care, in the institution and application of rules governing conduct and in the relationships between members of staff and between staff and pupils[44].

Pupils should recognize that teachers have rights and they should learn to understand and respect these rights. But the obverse is also true. Young people also have rights and these rights should be respected within the school. There seemed to be an inconsistency in the values of some teachers earlier this year, who exercised what they regarded as their own right to boycott examinations in protest against the government's handling of their pay dispute, but at the same time called for the suspension of pupils who boycotted classes in an effort to highlight their own plight in the same dispute. As teachers, we have often exhorted our pupils to good behaviour with the saying: 'Action speaks louder than words'. As teachers, we must remember that our own actions and our example will influence our pupils at least as much as, if not more than, our words.

Notes

1. See J. Coolahan, *Irish Education — History and Structure* (Dublin: Institute of Public Administration, 1981), chapter 1.
2. *Letter of Lord Stanley to the Duke of Leinster,* October 1831. (Quoted in D. H. Akenson, *The Irish Education Experiment: The National System Of Education In The Nineteenth Century* (London; Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1970) Appendix 1.
3. 'Rules and Regulations for National Schools'. Appendix to *Annual Report of the Commissioners of National Education,* 1835.
4. *Annual Report of the Commissioners of National Education,* 1850.
5. 'Rules and Regulations for National Schools', 1835.
6. *Ibid.*
7. *Rules and Regulations for National Schools,* 1898.
8. Quoted in *The Irish School Weekly,* 11 February 1922, p. 127.
9. *Report of the Committee on Irish Language Attitudes Research* (Dublin; Stationery Office, 1975).
10. See D. H. Akenson, *The Irish Education Experiment.*
11. *National Programme Conference — Report and Programme* (Dublin: Stationery Office, 1926).
12. *Rules and Regulations for National Schools,* 1947 edition.
13. *Ibid.,* 1965 edition.
14. *Intermediate Education (Ireland) Act,* H.C. 1878 (275) III, 543.
15. T. J. McElligott, *Secondary Education in Ireland 1870 — 1922* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1981).

16. Michael Maher, 'Religious Instruction in Irish Catholic Intermediate Schools', *Studies* (March 1916): 61.
17. *Irish Catholic Directory* 1927, p. 619.
18. Quoted in Jean Blanchard, *The Church in Contemporary Ireland* (Dublin: Clonmore and Reynolds, 1963) p. 44.
19. E. Brian Titley, *Church, State and the Control of Schooling in Ireland, 1900 —1944* (Ireland: Gill and Macmillan 1983) p. 146.
20. Department of Education, *Report of the Council of Education on the Curriculum of the Secondary School* (Dublin: Stationery Office, 1962) p. 252.
21. *Investment in Education — Report of the Survey Team* (Dublin: Stationery Office, 1966).
22. *Annual Report of the Department of Education,* 1982/3.
23. David Rottman speaking to Christina Murphy in 'Perpetuating the Class Barrier' *Irish Times,* 24 February 1983.
24. *Ibid.*
25. Desmond McCluskey, *Access to Secondary Education* — abridged report, p. 34.
26. *Programme for Action in Education 1984-7,* (Dublin: Stationery Office, 1984), par. 3.3.
27. *Report of Travelling People Review Body* (Dublin, 1984) p. 64.
28. *Rules and Programme for Secondary Schools,* 1982/3.
29. M. MacGreil, *Prejudice and Tolerance in Ireland* (Dublin: College of Industrial Relations, 1977) pp. 233 and 523.
30. *Ibid.* p. 422.
31. *Ibid.* p. 411.
32. *Ibid.*
33. *Census of Population of Ireland 1981, Vol. 5, Religion* (Dublin: Central Statistics Office, 1985).
34. See M. MacGreil, *op. cit.;* Also, Dalkey School Project, *Survey of Attitudes and Preferences Towards Multi-denominational, Co-Educational, Democratically Managed National Schools,* (June 1976).
35. *1985 Progress Report on the Programme for Action 1984-87.*
36. *Act-Lett, The Voice of All Children Together.* Vol. III, No. 1, April 1986.
37. Curriculum and Examinations Board, *In Our Schools — A Framework for Curriculum and Assessment,* (Dublin: March 1986) p. 9.
38. *Ibid.*
39. *Ibid.*
40. Curriculum and Examinations Board, *Transition Year Programme — Guidelines for Schools* (Dublin: January 1986) p. 8.
41. *Planning the Curriculum 11 — 16* Part I. Northern Ireland Council for Educational Development, Curriculum Papers, 1986.
42. *Ibid.*
43. *The Curriculum from 5 — 16.* HMI Series (London: HMSO, 1985).
44. *Planning the Curriculum 11 — 16.*