

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository: <https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/id/eprint/124488/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

James, David 2020. 40th anniversary special issue: the current and future shape of the sociology of education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 41 (6) , pp. 757-767. 10.1080/01425692.2020.1801222

Publishers page: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2020.1801222>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies. See <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.



## EDITORIAL

### **40<sup>th</sup> anniversary special issue: the current and future shape of the sociology of education**

#### **Introduction**

A warm welcome to this 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary Special Issue of the *British Journal of Sociology of Education*.

This editorial offers a brief account of the nature of the sociology of education before the arrival of BJSE and then for the first decade or so of its life, drawing particularly on earlier pieces by Olive Banks (1982) and Martyn Hammersley (1996). It then turns to the Journal as it is today, offering a view how and why it is so successful. We then introduce the ideas behind the special issue, and indicate something of the flavour of the 11 articles included. A final section notes some ideas about yet further broadening of the range of topics represented in the journal, and offers some thanks to people who have done so much – and continue to do so much - to make the Journal what it is today.

#### **Before BJSE: the sociology of education in the UK**

Despite the word ‘British’ in the title, the Journal is an international one, and had international editorial board members from the outset. Nevertheless, its original conception and launch can be understood primarily in the UK context. Olive Banks, a founding editorial board member, wrote an overview account of the sociology of education covering the three decades before the Journal’s first appearance (Banks, 1982). She describes: the growth of post-WW2 sociology at the London School of Economics; the prominent concern with social mobility, social class and ‘educability’ through the 1950s and 1960s; the ‘largely American’ functionalist theoretical stance at this time, nevertheless distinctive in the UK where it was combined with a ‘critical attitude towards a wastage of working class ability, which was seen as both unjust *and* inefficient’ (pp 18-19, original emphasis); a high level of engagement between policy-makers and sociologists of education. As well as a general ‘boom’ in sociology (including the sociology of education) in the 1960s, the growth of departments of education and colleges of education further extended its reach: here, sociology was often (along with psychology, history, philosophy) a prominent foundation in the programmes leading to teacher qualification.

The core concerns of the field continued to develop, turning increasingly towards closer study of the processes of schooling. Partly inspired by longer-standing ethnographic work in social anthropology, an approach widely termed ‘the new sociology of education’ championed interactionism, taking the focus away from ‘educability’ and towards such matters as how success and failure were constructed, generated and experienced, or what comprised knowledge and the content of education, and the social realities generated and maintained in and through day to day interactions in schools. Banks points to the centrality of both the *Knowledge and Control* reader (Young, 1971) and the Open University’s *School and Society* course (OU, 1972) in articulating this new approach, which appeared to offer possibilities for change toward a more equitable schooling, mainly through the raising of teacher consciousness. However, the ‘new sociology of education’ did not quite live up to its early promise, and by the second half of the 1970s critical assessment had pointed to a range of problems, including inadequate attention to social structure, romantic and relativist tendencies, and even naivety, the latter referring to the expectation that by examining the social implications of their practices, teachers would then be in a position to transform schooling. With the benefit of hindsight, it also seems that the ‘new sociology of education’ was attributed an unwarranted level of coherence. In terms of theory, the work was actually quite catholic. *Knowledge and Control* was originally conceived in a discussion between Young, Bernstein and Bourdieu at a British Sociological Association conference

at the University of Durham in 1970, and was motivated by a broad concern with the construction and transmission of curriculum content. It does not have the kind of epistemological coherence sometimes attributed to it. For example, the book included the first English translations of two key Bourdieu texts, emphasising socially pre-existing cognitive structures: immediately adjacent to one of these is Keddie's more phenomenological contribution which emphasised agency and analysed classroom transactions (see Robbins, 1998).

Disenchantment with the approach was also bound up with re-discovery of more structural concerns around the relationship between schooling and the society or economy. Whilst this was in some ways similar to the prominent work of the 1950s, functionalist optimism had now been replaced by a neo-Marxist pessimism, reflecting for Banks the world-wide recession and the replacement of 'the buoyancy of the affluent 1960s' with 'the pessimism of the 1970s' (p. 22). The shift also signals what she terms 'an end to the belief in education as a panacea which had been so marked a feature of the postwar years in all industrial societies'. Banks is correct to highlight this shattering of a general consensus, though we might add that in the period since, perceptions of educational provision-as-panacea have a habit of re-forming and re-emerging, especially in highly influential transnational policy discourses about economic growth, poverty alleviation, social mobility and lifelong learning (see Brown & James, 2020).

In short, the decade leading up to the launch of the *British Journal of Sociology of Education* saw the re-establishment of a more structurally-oriented sociology of education, built in part on a critique of the shortcomings of earlier approaches. Again, an Open University publication, *Schooling and Capitalism* (Dale *et al.*, 1977) is a kind of barometer, combining Marx – inspired approaches with some interactionist work. There was a strong influence from America, but this time in the form of Bowles & Gintis (1976). For Banks, it is key that 'educational systems were once more the unit of analysis, rather than schools, or classrooms, and these systems were analysed in terms of their *function*' (p. 23). The interest had however shifted from education working more or less efficiently for the society as a whole, to education functioning in the interests of a dominant class.

The decade also saw the sociology of education reshaped by feminist scholarship, presenting a sharp critique of most previous work for its focus on boys and its neglect of sexual inequalities. Banks points to several publications appearing in the last two years of the decade which between them signalled a substantial rise in activity and interest: *Women and Education* (Byrne, 1978); *Women and Schooling* (Deem, 1978); *The State, the Family and Education* (David, 1980); *Schooling for Women's Work* (Deem, 1980). However, it is notable that Banks makes no mention of the sociology of education engaging with issues of race and ethnicity around this time. Whilst there was a Centre for Research in Ethnic Relations from 1970 at Bristol University, and important studies of race and ethnicity in Britain (e.g. Smith, 1976), UK scholarship with a sociological and educational focus on race or ethnicity was still rare (the edited collection by Verma & Bagley [1975] is an exception) and, it seems, ignored (see Delamont, this issue, who argues that this was the fate of an important study by Furlong [Furlong, 1976]). Stone's ground-breaking study *The Education of the Black Child in Britain* appeared after the end of the decade (Stone, 1981).

### **The BJSE arrives**

By the time the Journal appeared, then, there had been great expansion of activity under the umbrella of sociology of education in the UK, though work concerned with race, ethnicity and racism was much less visible. Banks detected a more optimistic atmosphere with less rancour and more willingness to accept the co-existence of different positions. BJSE is one part of her evidence for this view:

'The first issue, in March 1980, of the *British Journal of the Sociology of Education* also declared its intention of trying to reflect different points of view. There is no doubt therefore of a growing will to co-operate. What is more in question is whether such a move has any chance of success' (Banks, 1982, p. 28).

Whilst acknowledging Andy Hargreaves' view that progress towards more synthesis across the more structural and agentic perspectives was as yet slow and not very productive, Banks was heartened by the fact that attempts *were* being made. It is surely no coincidence that the first page of the first article in the first issue of the Journal signals precisely such an intention. Entitled 'Weberian perspectives and the study of education', Ronald King's paper declares:

'...the study of education using the methods of Weber enables explanations to be made which combine the voluntarism of phenomenology and its important stress on the subjective meaning of social action, with the structural constraints on social action which are emphasised in functionalism and some kinds of Marxism' (King, 1980, p. 7).

There were six other papers in the first issue: 'Sociology of Education, Politics and the Left in Britain' by Jack Demaine; 'Teaching the Class: the practical management of a cohort' by George Payne & David Hustler; 'New Developments in the New Sociology of Education' by Richard Bates; 'Women, the Other Academics' by Sandra Acker; 'Sex Differences in the Infant School: definitions and "theories"' by David Hartley; 'Problems, Conflicts and School Policy: a case study of an innovative comprehensive school' by Andrew Hannan. The issue also included book reviews, arranged in a three-part structure that the Journal still uses today (a review symposium, an extended review and a review essay). The second and third issues that made up Volume 1 contained fewer articles than the first one, but demonstrated more of a balance between male and female authors (six female, five male). The first five volumes of BJSE included articles focused in some way on both sex/gender and race/ethnicity, though the former area is better represented than the latter. Writing in 2003, Delamont noted that 'BJSE...was founded with anti-sexism as one of its basic tenets, and had eight women and 17 men on its initial editorial board. Throughout its 22-year history it has showcased feminist work. In 2001 there were 17 women and 23 men on the board' (Delamont, 2003, p. 132). Today, BJSE's very much larger editorial board is evenly split in this regard.

### **Sociology of education: under siege but 'going strong'**

As others have described very well (e.g. Tomlinson, 2010; Arnot et al., 2012), the journal reflected the energy and vision of Len Barton and to some extent built on the series of conferences he had initiated and established, held at Westhill College in Birmingham from 1978 (McCulloch & Cowan, 2018). Also important is that the journal was launched in something of a hostile environment, that is, ten months after the arrival of the Thatcher Conservative government in the UK. Arguably the most salient ideological features of Thatcherism were: (a) strong advocacy of individualism, entrepreneurialism and property rights; (b) a concomitant denial of the existence or significance of the social (Thatcher's 'there is no such thing as society'); (c) a neoliberal denial of debate and the assertion of the inevitability of specific forms of free market and free trade as *the only* viable economic logic (famously 'TINA', or 'there is no alternative') (see Harvey, 2005). Conservative politicians had long been sceptical about the value of the social sciences, but the Thatcher administration were more strident in this regard. Although the Secretary of State for Education, Sir Keith Joseph, had been supportive of social science in general, he was soon to commission an independent review into the 'scale and character of the Social Sciences Research Council' which, following some leaked correspondence, was widely expected to recommend abolition. Ultimately, it led only to a shift in emphasis and change of name (ESRC, 2005). With hindsight, it seems likely that this political climate will have increased the appetite for greater 'synthesis' of the sort mentioned by Banks, and will also have emphasised the value of opportunities for collective activity and mutual support amongst sociologists, perhaps especially those concerned with education and inequality.

During the early years of the journal, sociology of education was as much a teaching activity as it was a research activity. Having grown substantially through its relationship to teacher education, in the 1980s and 1990s the sociology of education suffered a decline when the whole disciplinary approach to the education and training of teachers came under new pressure from inside and outside the educational realm. Hammersley (1996) describes how disciplinary courses came to be seen as overly theoretical and lacking in relevance to practice, and for some political viewpoints, teacher education providers were inculcating a 'progressivism' that was held responsible for various effects including a decline in teaching quality. Sociology was seen by some as a direct threat to high quality teacher

education. In this environment, courses were closed and/or transformed. Hammersley notes that the Open University withdrew ‘the last course teaching the sociology of education in an explicit and systematic way’ in 1988 (p. 397). At the same time, the sociology of education as a field of *research* seems to have continued much as it was – Hammersley mentions the established conferences and refers to BJSE, then in its 16<sup>th</sup> year, as ‘still going strong’ (p. 398). However, Hammersley’s overall assessment was that the sociology of education had grown in breadth but had fragmented into ‘effectively autonomous’ strands (principally social justice, especially concerning gender and ethnicity; the formation and effects of government policy; investigations of school effectiveness). Alongside some persistent differences of approach and perspective, for Hammersley the outcome was that in the mid-1990s, ‘the sociology of education no longer represents a well-defined and well-integrated field of study’ (p. 398). We could question the extent to which it ever was these things, and perhaps argue that high definition and integration are signs of relative immaturity. Hammersley goes on to point out that this fragmentation was accompanied by a spread of sociological influence. Adopting a more general definition, ‘compared to the past, a much larger proportion of educational research is sociological in orientation’ (p. 399).

Although it is beyond the scope of this Editorial, it would be interesting to investigate the relationship between BJSE and the formation of other cognate journals. Perhaps three of these would be of particular interest. Firstly, the *Journal of Education Policy* was launched in 1986, and its editorial board continues to have considerable overlap with that of BJSE. Three years later, in 1989, *Gender and Education* was launched, though with only a small overlap in board membership (which also continues). A further nine years on saw the launch of *Race, Ethnicity and Education* in 1998, again with a substantial board member overlap with BJSE. The Editorial in the first issue of the latter argues that the journal is long overdue, and that the absence of any similar journal has reflected the marginalisation of racism and related issues in the academy<sup>ii</sup>. It is a sign of the general growth of the field that today, BJSE includes many articles that might equally have found a home in the three journals just mentioned.

### **The BJSE today**

By any measure, the Journal is a success. It has wide substantive, methodological and theoretical range. Whilst most articles are initially published online, they now fill eight Issues per year, and the last complete Volume (2019) included 69 articles and several book review sections. The number of submissions is rising, and around half of these come from outside the UK. Article downloads continue to rise, and on current trends can be expected to reach half a million per year in just a few more years. The Journal also has a rising impact factor and some articles attract significant news and social media attention.

The Journal’s distinctive structure, which in many respects is unchanged since its launch, has played a large part in this success. Editors of many journals can be heard to complain that their task is becoming increasingly difficult, because (a) the volume of submissions is rising, and (b) it is getting harder to persuade people to carry out peer reviews of articles. Within BJSE only the first of these two is a major issue, because all reviewing is carried out by the Editorial Board, who currently number just short of 100 members. There is a strong sense of commitment to the Journal across this group. Care is taken to match submissions as closely as possible to the expertise of at least one of the two reviewers allocated to each article (on average, each Editorial Board member will review around 5 items a year). I have the privilege of seeing all the reviewer’s comments, and I am continually impressed by their quality, quantity and constructive nature. I receive messages of thanks from authors, and even from some of those receiving a ‘reject’ decision.

The journal is steered by a smaller group, the Executive Editors, who are drawn from the wider Editorial Board. This group meets twice a year though there is a considerable amount of correspondence in-between meetings as well. The publisher’s representative attends these meetings. The Executive Editors make all the key decisions regarding journal strategy and policy, whilst also keeping oversight of all the key processes involved in submissions, reviewing, decisions and publication. Additionally, the group handles key operational matters such as special issues,

commissioning and editorial work on book reviews and the annual early career best paper competition.

Whilst it has changed in terms of size, the structure outlined above is essentially the same as that established 40 years ago by Len Barton and the other founding editors. The only significant change, made in recent years and phased in gradually, was to move to defined terms of office (of 5 years) for members of the Executive Editors group.

### **The 40<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Special Issue**

The Executive Editors decided that it was appropriate to make a 'limited open' call for submissions to this special issue. All current members of the Editorial Board were invited to propose sole or co-authored papers that would address the current and future shape of the sociology of education. The call suggested that 'shape' could refer to present contours or outline, and/or to the future (as in HG Wells' 'the shape of things to come'), or perhaps health or condition ('in good shape?'). It also mentioned the word as a verb, in that we might seek to form something or influence something, or perhaps work on a stance or position, akin to how the term is used in sport or athletics. Overall, the hope was that the special issue could assist with both a taking stock and some shared consideration of what the sociology of education now was, and what it would, could or should become in the next decade or two. Three groups of questions were suggested:

1. *Global and societal*: What 'purchase' does the sociology of education have on and in contemporary society/societies, relative to other perspectives and disciplines (perhaps including neuroscience and genetics)? What sort of 'voice' does it have? Can it (and does it) 'speak truth to power'? If it speaks, who listens?
2. *Institutional and individual*: To what extent does the sociology of education enable understanding, engagement or changed/confirmed practices amongst people such as teachers, lecturers, managers, governors, policymakers, students, pupils, parents? If this is less than hoped, what prevents and what might facilitate these things?
3. *Distinctiveness and direction*: What is the sociology of education's current and future distinctive contribution – latent or manifest - to knowledge, institutions, educators, learners and learning, democracy, the public good? Are there particularly promising or exciting directions – methodological, empirical, theoretical? Where is the sociology of education 'going'? How will it look in the next 10 or 20 years?

The call produced excellent responses which between them, and in various ways, address all the questions listed above. The first, from Delamont, is primarily an examination of the sociology of education as a sub-discipline of sociology. Delamont revisits earlier work in which she used Mary Douglas' term 'anomalous beasts': this described how hooligans had become revered anomalous beasts in the sociology of education, whilst the sub-discipline itself had remained a (feared) anomalous beast in the wider discipline of sociology. The paper presents a challenging account of the dominance of the 'quantitative grand narrative' in which sociology of education had been heavily focused on class inequalities between white men: however it also goes on to show that the rising 'qualitative grand narrative' between 1950 and 1980 retained the focus on white males, and none more so than those who were deviant, anti-school, 'hooligan boys', who were thus valorised and 'revered'. The paper concludes with a revision of some earlier predictions and an assessment of strengths and weaknesses in the sociology of education.

The paper from Power & Rees makes use of a comparison between papers published in BJSE and the nearest American equivalent, the journal *Sociology of Education*. Focusing on work that addresses social inequalities, the authors look at the representation of two different approaches in the work published over the last 40 years, which they term 'political arithmetic' and the 'cultural turn'. They find that the former dominates in the US journal and the latter is prevalent in BJSE. Of particular interest is their argument that the approaches and their prevalence have implications in terms of the prospects for cumulative knowledge in the sociology of education, and the senses in which the field can engage with policy.

Gewirtz & Cribb's paper, prompted in part by Geoff Whitty's earlier work, confronts the fundamental problem of criticality and academic integrity in a climate where a 'what works' instrumentalism dominates. The authors argue that the relationship between research and policy is predominantly conceived as that of an engineering model, as opposed to a critical-democratic model. Having unpacked some examples of the dilemmas this throws up, the paper offers a serious challenge to any sociologist of education interested in research that works towards a more socially just and democratic education system. As the authors say, 'how we live out these values as academic researchers in the choices we make' is itself constitutive of our selves and also the work that gets done, and this matters a great deal.

Bhopal's contribution presents a compelling argument about what it would mean to take intersectionality seriously, and how intersectionality could be used to unmask the racism in education. The institutions in which many sociologists of education work are heavily engaged in equalities processes and mechanisms, but in their prioritisation of gender, these processes play a key role in the positioning of Black and minority ethnic staff and students. Bhopal argues that the sociology of education itself has been - and continues to be - dominated by White privilege, in both the construction and the communication of knowledge. Her paper presents a fundamental challenge to the field: 'In order for the sociology of education to challenge and confront populist, racist ideologies it must confront and address its own White (gendered) privilege'.

Reay offers an account that is grounded in both a personal reflection on a sociology of education career and an exploration of the structure and composition of the field in relation to sociology, education and politics. Wide-ranging, it is of particular interest for the way in which it highlights how some strands of the sociology of education, or areas which grew out from it (such as those focused on school improvement, school effectiveness, leadership and 'powerful knowledge') have had a disproportionate and regressive impact on policies. This is a helpful reminder that policy adoption, especially in education, is a highly politicised process. Reay also provides an account of the 'disciplining' of the sociology of education, including the attacks it received in the late 1990s, before setting out a more hopeful agenda for what the sociology of education might best focus on next.

Pinson & Arnot begin by revisiting some earlier work, from 2007, in which they had noted the invisibility of the lives and education of refugee children. Their paper then examines work appearing in BJSE since 2005, finding it focused on student global mobility and the school experiences of migrant children. Having noted the value of this work, Pinson and Arnot go on to point to what is missing, at least in the pages of the Journal, namely a consideration of 'the age of migration', its characteristics in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, and how it challenges values, policies and practices in education systems. The authors argue that we are collectively in danger of repeating a fundamental error, articulated by Bauman: a failure to distinguish between *emigration/Immigration*, and *migration in a globalised world* and leaving unchallenged the use of 'instruments designed in the past' which cannot tackle a contemporary phenomenon.

The paper by Maxwell, Yemeni, Engel and Lee has concerns that overlap with those of Pinson & Arnot. The authors propose a concept of *cosmopolitan nationalism*, building upon both *cosmopolitanism* and the '*glonacial*' (the former derived from Beck's work, the latter being Marginson and Rhoades' portmanteau term for the interdependence and connectedness of flows of ideas, desires, people and education 'products' across the spaces and scales of the local, national, regional and global). *Cosmopolitan nationalism* is also an attempt to get beyond the unidirectional, top-down conceptualisation of global pressures, recognising that 'the global' is used or harnessed in various different ways in national politics and policy. The presentation and comparison of three national settings (South Korea, Israel and the US) demonstrates the strong promise of the concept and its potential for our understanding of inequalities. It is also a helpful reminder that good sociological work needs constantly to question the constitution and reconstitution of frames like 'nation' or 'international'.

Grace's contribution is a powerful argument for taking religion (more) seriously in our sociological research on education. Whilst acknowledging the many ways in which the sociology of education has widened, deepened and matured to be a multi-dimensional and international field, Grace argues that the religions of the world and their many social and cultural implications for education are 'largely ignored', and that this runs risks of over-simplification and can compromise the authenticity and validity of the work we do. The paper is particularly interesting for its reminders of the presence and centrality of religion in the work of Durkheim and Weber, but also for pointing to the significance of religion in the work of Paulo Friere and in that of Michael Apple, amongst others.

For Ball, the sociology of education is stuck in and by its relationship to what it studies. It is 'mired in unreflexive, redemptive, Enlightenment rationalities' and has 'failed to distance itself from the metaphysics, optimism and oppressions of modern schooling'. The paper includes an exploration of various phases the relationship between the sociology of education and the state, including the struggles between social eugenics and population studies at the LSE in the 1930s and the later 'heyday' of the 1970s to 1990s when sociology of education was a fundamental element of the state professional formation of teachers. Ball argues that we need to replace 'contestation' with *critique*, in Foucault's sense, for example by realising that the Enlightenment narrative is itself one of the ways in which we are historically determined.

A further set of possibilities for how the sociology of education may develop is addressed in the paper by Youdell, Lindley, Shapiro, Sun & Leng. The article offers a view of transdisciplinarity from the inside, focusing on the 'generative potential' of encounters between some areas of the biosciences and the sociology of education. The discussion is a helpful reminder that social and educational processes - especially those we call learning - are in continual transformation and redefinition, not least by virtue of the various and shifting uses of digital technology. The paper is both insightful and provocative in its suggestion of new roles for the sociology of education.

The final paper by Archer outlines three challenges for the sociology of education, namely: the rise of populism and declining faith in experts; inequities that are within and produced (and reproduced) by the sociology of education itself; how we can enact a sociology of education that can make a difference to social inequalities. One of the most impressive aspects of the article is Archer's insistence that these matters are intimately related, that (for example) we cannot expect to make progress on 'making a difference' without confronting the second, i.e. putting our own house in order. Archer offers a vision which is to some extent clearly evidenced in the work she and her colleagues are doing. It includes strong concepts of praxis, partnership and service (conducting research *with* - not 'on' or 'for') which together can offer greater engagement for change in some areas of the sociology of education. Part of the same vision is that the 'impact agenda' can be appropriated so that it supports work that is emancipatory and participatory.

### **Where next?**

The eleven papers in this collection offer a series reflections and diagnoses around the shape of the sociology of education and how it travelled and arrived at its current place. They also offer strong suggestions for how we should do our sociology of education in the years ahead, and some real challenges to do with the extent to which we need to 'put our own house in order'.

I will resist the temptation to offer specific endorsements or challenges to any of the papers, but would like to add a couple of further brief thoughts about how the Journal might help to shape the field in the next few years. Firstly, I hope that we can continue to widen the range of articles - in terms of their methodological, theoretical and substantive concerns. We *are* doing well, overall, in these terms: yet at the same time, there are areas where we might do more to make visible the vital and distinctive contribution that the sociology of education has to make. For example, it would be good to see submissions which deal with how climate change activism, so much of which is in the hands of young people otherwise engaged in schooling, is challenging or augmenting the curriculum and the institutional, regulatory, and disciplining aspects of formal education. We might do more to encourage submissions on sociological perspectives on curriculum decolonisation in schools or in



higher education, or on how the Black Lives Matter movement presents rich opportunities for learning that are conventionally side-lined or omitted. Or again, the rapidly changing nature of work, mainly but not only through digital transformation, is an absolutely key issue for the sociology of education. Of course, to some extent topics like these will be dealt with in more topic-focused journals, but I would argue that we should see more of them in BJSE as well. The question of how to achieve further broadening of this sort is already partially answered: the Executive Editors recently decided to move away from a mainly 'reactive' model for special issues and instead set up a more structured invitation process, probably annually, which invites proposals but which could also offer a light steer as well.

Finally, there are a few people I want to thank, whose efforts have made it possible to bring this special issue together. First and foremost, I am grateful to Len Barton – not only for founding the Journal and its ways of working, but for the personal, professional and scholarly example he represents for the rest of us. I would also like to thank Madeleine Arnot, who chaired the Executive Editors when Len retired from the Journal in 2009, and who kindly oversaw my 'apprenticeship year' before she stood down in 2014. I am endlessly grateful to Helen Oliver who has served the Journal with energy and enthusiasm for many years, and her wisdom and efficiency continue to be absolutely central to the Journal's success. I have had invaluable advice and guidance from the current and recent Executive Editors, and several members of the wider editorial board were of course involved in reviewing the papers that are included here. Lastly, we are very fortunate to have had such wisdom, integrity and professionalism in all of the key publisher representatives – currently Hannah McCluskey, and before her, Helen Wheeler and Ian White.

David James  
Chair of the Executive Editors  
July 2020

## References

- Arnot, M., Brown, P., Coffey, A., David, M., Davies, L., James, D., Naidoo, R., Reay, D., Reid, I. & Vincent, C. (2012) 'Framing the sociology of disability and inclusive education: an introduction', in M. Arnot (Ed) *The Sociology of Disability and Inclusive Education: A tribute to Len Barton*. Routledge.
- Banks, O. (1982) 'The Sociology of Education, 1952-1982', *British Journal of Educational Studies*, XXX (1), 18-31
- Bowles, S. & Gintis, H. (1976) *Schooling in Capitalist America*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul
- Brown, P. & James, D. (2020) 'Educational expansion, poverty reduction and social mobility: Reframing the debate', *International Journal of Education Research* Vol 100  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2020.101537>
- Byrne, E. M. (1978) *Women and Education*. London: Tavistock.
- Dale, R., MacDonald, M., & Esland, G. (1977) (eds.) *Schooling and Capitalism*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul
- David, M. E. (1980) *The State, the Family and Education*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Deem, R. (1978) *Women and Schooling*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Deem, R. (1980) *Schooling for Women's Work*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Delamont, S. (2003) *Feminist Sociology*. London: Sage

ESRC (2005) *ESRC: The First 40 Years*. Swindon: Economic and Social Research Council.

Available at:

<https://esrc.ukri.org/files/news-events-and-publications/publications/ssrc-and-esrc-the-first-forty-years/> (Accessed 20<sup>th</sup> June 2020)

Furlong, V. J. (1976) 'Interaction sets in the classroom', in M. Stubbs & S. Delamont (eds.) *Explorations in Classroom Observation*. Chichester: Wiley. pp 23-44

Hammersley, M. (1996) 'Post Mortem or Post Modern? Some Reflections on British Sociology of Education', *British Journal of Educational Studies* 44 (4), 395-408

Harvey, D. (2005) *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford University Press.

King, (1980) 'Weberian Perspectives and the Study of Education', *British Journal of Sociology of Education*. 1 (1), 7-23

McCulloch, G. & Cowan, S. (2018) *A Social History of Educational Studies and Research*. Routledge

Robbins, D. (1998) 'The Need for an Epistemological Break', in M. Grenfell & D. James *Bourdieu and Education: Acts of Practical Theory*. London: Falmer Press.

OU (1972) *E282 School and Society, Units 1 – 17*. The Open University

Robbins, D. (1998) 'The Need for an Epistemological Break', in M. Grenfell & D. James *Bourdieu and Education: Acts of Practical Theory*. London: Falmer Press.

Stone, M. (1981) *The Education of the Black Child in Britain*

Tomlinson, S. (2010) 'A tribute to Len Barton', *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 31 (5), 537-546.

Troyna, B. & Hatcher, R. (1992) *Racism in Children's Lives: A Study of Mainly White Primary Schools*. London: Routledge

Troyna, B. & Williams, J. (1986) *Racism, Education and the State*. London: Croom Helm

Verma, G. K. & Bagley, C. (1975) *Race and Education Across Cultures*. Heinemann Publishers

Young, M.F.D. (1971) *Knowledge and Control*. London: Macmillan.

---

<sup>i</sup> Two of the three editors, Roger Dale and Madeleine MacDonald (later, Arnot) were founding board members of BJSE.

<sup>ii</sup> The Editorial also expresses a regret that the new journal was not quite in time to be seen by the late Barry Troyna, who had died earlier the same year and who was 'a particular inspiration to those working against racism in education, especially in the UK' (p. 6). Troyna had been part of the Centre for Research in Ethnic Relations, a unit which had started life in Bristol University in 1970 and, via Aston University, ended up at Warwick until it was wound up in 2011 (see <https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/crer/>). His specific focus on racism in education, whilst not unique, was still quite unusual until the mid-1980s (see Troyna & Williams, 1986; Troyna & Hatcher, 1992; and <https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/crer/>).

---

[JamesDR2@cardiff.ac.uk](mailto:JamesDR2@cardiff.ac.uk)