

**Schooling for the Future:
Preliminary Report of Six Cases from the Asia-Pacific Region**

Researchers:

**John J. Cogan, Chair
University of Minnesota, USA**

**Christine Halse
University of Western Sydney, Australia**

**Kerry Kennedy
Hong Kong Institute of Education, Hong Kong SAR, China**

**Meesook Kim
Korean Educational Development Institute, Korea**

**Carol Mutch
Christchurch College of Education, New Zealand**

**Ernesto Rangel
University of Colima, Mexico**

**Panel at the 29th Annual Meetings of the Pacific Circle Consortium
Hong Kong Institute of Education, Hong Kong SAR, China
21st April 2004**

Schooling for the Future
Preliminary Report on the Interview data from Australia
Christine Halse, Ph.D.
University of Western Sydney, Australia

Introduction

This paper provides a brief report of some of the preliminary findings from the Australian interview data, conducted as part of the PPC research project: *Schooling for the Future*.

Data collection

Interview participants comprised five high profile, influential educational leaders and heads of the following organizations: NSW Department of Education and Training, Australian Teacher Education Council, Chair of the *Public Education Inquiry* (2002), Independent Schools Parents Association, NSW Board of Studies. Interviews varied in length from 1-2.5 hours, and were transcribed verbatim. In one instance, two participants (Director General and Deputy Director General of Education) were interviewed together, at their request. Theoretical sampling was used to identify participants, resulting in representatives from a range of agencies central to the development and conduct of schooling, but not representing the full range of relevant stakeholders. The following section profiles the participants and their organizations

Analysis

Given the space constraints, the interview questions are used as a framework for reporting the preliminary analysis. Participants raised interesting additional issues that are address briefly in the discussion of the final question.

1. What do you believe is the most desirable and most likely scenario for the future of schooling?

Participants generally expressed the view that the ‘most likely’ scenario for schooling in the future would be the continuation of a bureaucratic model, in part because of the desirability of public education, a centralized curriculum, and the need for quality control and quality assurance:

We have a tight framework of curriculum, we have strong expectations in terms of standards, we have a very strong external assessment process, and that can drive the quality of what we are producing because we an measure [and to provide] a strong framework [to] in fact tie together the various threads that you might otherwise have in an entirely market driven environment..

There was a strong view that a bureaucracy did not mean a ‘one-size-fits-all’ model, but a range of different ‘types’ of schools (specialist high schools, general comprehensive schools, selective schools, etc), and that this model was entrenched and necessary in public education to maintain “market-share”, reflecting the concern of government and public education leaders about the growing exodus of students from the public to the private sector.

Participants argued that none of the scenarios were ‘desirable’, but preferred a mix of different scenarios. For instance, the Chair of the Public Education Inquiry argued for strong involvement between schools and the communities, both in terms of curriculum content and delivery; the Head of the Teacher Education Council argued for schools that addressed Australia’s social diversity, and that employed more innovative pedagogies to meet the increasing broad curriculum requirements imposed by the government.

2. How can we explain the views expressed by education leaders through the survey findings?

Participants found this question difficult, preferring to elaborate on their own views of the how schools could/might look in the future. In general terms, however, they believed the educators found it difficult to envisage just *how* schools might operate in a diverse society spread across large geographic distances, particularly in an era when learning outcomes and quality teaching are government priorities. Participants argued that social justice and equity made a market model was undesirable, and expressed moral objections to the commodification of education inherent in a market model.

2a) Why are the most desirable scenarios of *re-schooling* described in scenarios 4 and 3 (focused learning organizations and core social centers) perceived as unlikely to be implemented?

Participants found elements of these scenarios desirable but did not endorse them unreservedly. One described Scenario 4 as motherhood statements that lacked meaning: *Nobody could dispute that; everybody must have that as their goal, right?*

2b) What factors are perceived as inhibiting their development?

The politicization of education was seen as inhibiting the development of scenarios 4 and 3, or any of the mixed models that participants advocated. It was argued that politicians had assumed a more interventionist education but using the media to articulate populist policy that eroded the capacity for innovative reform. Dismantling of existing structures seen as problematic given strong investment in the status quo by teachers, unions, Department of Education and Board of Studies. The DET representatives believed that parents were reluctant to participate in innovative change, reading the exodus from the public to private school sector as a desire for more conservative, ‘traditional’ models of schooling. Several examples were cited of innovative educational initiatives started by dynamic principals or teachers. The question of how to perpetuate and “institutionalize” innovative change remained problematic.

2c) If education leaders believe that bureaucratic models are the most likely to remain, even though they are perceived as relatively less desirable, what factors are likely to maintain this status quo?

In broad terms, participants considered that the factors that inhibited the development of alternate models of schooling would also maintain the status quo i.e., unions, existence of large educational structures, politicians with a vested interest in maintaining public education, lack of ideas about *how* to institutionalize innovation without acquiescing to a market model, etc.

3. What do you believe would need to happen for the most desirable scenarios to be implemented?

Despite the survey findings, participants found this question difficult because they did not consider any of the scenarios to be desirable. This response indicates an interesting methodological issue. The survey results were reductive by nature, collapsing the potentially diverse views of senior educators into a number of pre-determined categories that paralleled the earlier OECD study. The interview data, on the other hand, articulated the more nuanced and different perspectives of educational leaders. This finding is potentially significant in terms of educational policy and practice. The educational leaders hold positions of responsibility, authority and influence in Australian education, and are positioned to articulate and to implement visions and directions for schooling that could well differ from the consensus models that emerged from the survey data. What is unclear, however, is the extent of each participant's influence and how this might play out in the development of models of schooling in the future.

Schooling for the Future Preliminary Report on Hong Kong Interviews

Kerry J Kennedy
Hong Kong Institute of Education, Hong Kong SAR, China

Introduction

This paper provides a preliminary report on interviews conducted with six elite education policy makers in Hong Kong in 2002/2003 as part of the *Schooling for the Future Project*. The HKIEd Research Committee funded the project that involved three researchers and one Research Assistant.¹

Sample

Eight people were initially identified for interview but two refused and one could not find a time to schedule the interview. One additional person was identified during interviews and was subsequently followed up.

Interviews

The interviews were 45 to 60 minutes long and were conducted in the interviewees' office or meeting room. The interviews were audiotaped, transcribed and analyzed thematically.

Results

For the purposes of this paper, the results will be reported in relation the three key questions that were raised with all interviewees.

¹ Professor Kerry Kennedy was the PI, Dr LO Yiu Chun and Dr Greg Fairbrother were team members who conducted interviews and Mr James CY LUK was the project's Research Assistant.

1. *What do you believe is the most desirable and most likely scenario for the future of schooling?*

There was reluctance on the part of some interviewees to commit to a single scenario and for these there was little consistency in their views. One interviewee commented:

I will look at the continuum...because you can actually see a continuum and then see where they (i.e. the scenarios) are located and how they are related. May be three...exist together (Govt.1)

Three other responses were quite pessimistic although for different reasons. One predicted that Hong Kong's current financial problems "*would constrain the (government's) capacity*"(NonGovt1)² and therefore "*probably things will not change a lot*". Another focused entirely on the implementation problems with the current reforms and therefore, while endorsing Scenarios 3 & 4, actually saw the status quo as being more probable, just like the survey respondents. These views supported the status quo scenarios although they were not identified explicitly. A third interviewee actually used the word "*pessimistic*" (NonGovt.2) and forecast the kind of scenario that was similar to Scenario 5, not has a preferred scenario but as one that was inevitable if the system could not change.

The final two interviewees, one Govt. and one Non-Govt., supported what amounted to Scenarios 3 and 4 as the only viable scenarios for the future. One of these interviewees endorsed the idea of the school as a "*social center*" (Govt.2) while the other saw the focus as being "*the development of students' all round ability*" (NonGovt.3)

How can we explain the views expressed by education leaders through the survey findings?

For two of the interviewees, the disparity was not seen as unusual. "*Change by definition is difficult. It is about changing mindsets*"(Govt. 2). This suggested that the problem was with schools and the second interviewee supported this view: "*there are two things: one, they don't want it, they don't really like it, because they don't know what to do, they haven't seen the merit of flexibility, therefore they would like the government to tell them everything*" (Govt. 1). On the other hand, the Non Govt. interviewees saw the lack of capacity more with the government: lack of professional support, lack of resources, the hurried pace of the current reforms and the history of failed reforms in Hong Kong. Thus the reason for the disparities is explained in concrete terms with reference to the current educational reforms in Hong Kong and here is a difference of perspective between Govt. and Non-Govt. interviewees. The "problem" is either with the reluctance of schools to envisage and operational change (Govt. view) or with the government's

² In the course of analyzing the interviews it became clear that our sample was stratified according to whether they represented the government or were outside the government, possibly as advisors or as university academics. Thus we have labeled the interviewees in this report as either "Govt." or "Non-Govt."

capacity to manage change (Non-Govt. view). Perhaps these two views together represent the beginning of a fuller explanation for the disparities.

What would need to happen for the most desirable scenarios to be implemented?

To some extent, this question can be answered from the responses to Question 2 above. Greater capacity and commitment are needed from both the government and from front line educators if the favorable scenarios are to be implemented. Yet the issue is somewhat more complex than this. Three of the interviewees referred to distinctive cultural characteristics of Hong Kong people that make any simple solution more problematic. *“Nobody in Hong Kong is prepared to be first, to take a risk. Everybody waits for somebody else to jump”* (Govt.2). *“..in Hong Kong..people in general are more inward looking. Educators in particular...They don’t really feel change in the outside world, because they have their own institutions. They work for..they define what they want to do..with no regard to what is happening on the outside”* (Non-Govt. 2). Thus there are no simple solutions in the Hong Kong context because of the personal dimensions associated with the change process.

Schooling for the Future Project Summary of the Phase II - Interview Study with Korean Subjects

Reported by
Meesook Kim and Bangran Ryu
Korean Educational Development Institute
at the 28th Pacific Circle Consortium Annual Conference
on April 21, 2004 in Hong Kong

Subjects of the Study

The subjects of the study contain 10 people composed of 2 high profile policy makers (high ranking officials of ministry of education), 5 university professors, 3 top present or former authorities of teachers’ organizations and parents’ association. Among these ten people, four participated in the first phase of the survey study.

Interview Process

The interviews took place intermittently in March, April, and August 2003 either by the second author or by her research assistant. Each interview lasted for about thirty to forty minutes. It was difficult to secure longer time due to tight schedules of the interviewees. For the first seven interviews, the interviewer summarized interviewees’ words in her notebook during the interview and put into a computer shortly after the interview was over. Although use of a tape-recorder was attempted at the beginning, recording did not occur because the interviewees did not want it. The other three interviews were tape-recorded and later transcribed verbatim in Korean.

Data Analysis

Since the interview records were basically qualitative data, the contents of each interview were first restructured by the three big questions asked, and then categorized into common themes reflecting interviewees' beliefs and reasoning about rankings. Further analysis was done with background information of the interviewees.

Findings

1) The most desirable and most likely scenarios of the interviewees (Question 1)

The views of the interviewees accorded with the earlier Korean survey data, where the respondents tended to select scenario 4 as the most desirable one and scenario 2 as the most likely one. In the present study, seven out of ten interviewees picked the re-schooling scenarios as the most desirable scenario (five for scenario 4 and four for scenario 3 with two double responses). On the other hand, five interviewees selected scenario 2 as the most likely one while two people thought scenario 1 as such. The results reconfirmed the existence of the discrepancy between the most desirable and most likely scenarios in the minds of educational leaders in Korea.

2) The discrepancy in educational leaders' rankings on desirability and probability (Question 2)

The interviewees provided several reasons why scenarios 4 and 3, being the most desirable ones, were unlikely to be implemented and also some possible factors inhibiting the development. While many of them did not think that the changes towards scenarios 4 and 3 'risky,' they thought that the re-schooling scenarios were too ideal or vague to be implemented as the educational system for an entire society. Another reason was found in the lack of trust in the future and in the possibility of change since the advantaged groups would prefer to maintain the status quo, and it would be very difficult to reach social consensus on educational goals or directionality. Other reasons included lack of investment in education and limitation in government's control to lead the society into the re-schooling models. Two interviewees said that ordinary people's lack of understanding on the alternative roles of schools might become a hindrance to the development of those scenarios.

They also reasoned why bureaucratic system (scenario 1) would likely be maintained despite being relatively less desirable. Two people said that people don't like to take risks, especially with their children's education, and future is predictable in the current system. Another person emphasized usefulness of the system as the most effective way to achieve a goal and to perform basic education for K-12. Another argued that bureaucracy would be maintained due to its function of socializing people into the system. So bureaucracy, being kept by advantaged groups is too strong to change, and Korean people are familiar with centralized control as Korea has been a small country.

3) What should happen for the most desirable scenarios to be implemented (Question 3)

The interviewees provided various ideas on the necessary conditions for the re-schooling scenarios to be implemented. An interviewee said that if the current bureaucratic system

failed to meet and negotiate the different needs of various groups, there might be a kind of anomie that would lead to the advent of a new system. Another person emphasized full development of democracy and guarantee of free and open communications among the entire members of the society for implementation of re-schooling models. Others believed that educators should first accept the pressures coming from the hard-to-catch up changes in the society and recover the trust in schools by improving quality of teachers and school education, and then schools could develop into social centers or focused learning organizations upon this foundation. Also some others ordered a gradual change with a balance between ideals and reality and some initial analyses of the outcomes and problems of education so far before trying anything new. Furthermore, there was an argument that changes in thoughts of parents and ordinary people as well as policy makers and teachers should precede re-schooling because such a change could not occur as a result of changes in school system, but through overall social change.

Specifics of the Study

Not alike with those from some other countries, the Korean subjects in both survey and interview studies selected scenario 2 (extending the market model) as the most likely one. The reason might be that scenario 2 was explained to them under the rubric of *'maintaining the status quo'* instead of *'de-schooling.'* That is, it is highly possible that these subjects understood scenario 2 as an advanced, revised form of scenario 1 rather than as one of the radical *'de-schooling'* models.

Schooling for the Future
Preliminary report on the Interview data from Mexico
Ernesto Rangel, Ph.D.
University of Colima, Mexico

Introduction

The following information shows some of the preliminary findings according to the point of view of each of the persons interviewed, as part of the PCC research project: Schooling for the Future.

Data collection

Interview participants comprised three high profile, influential educational leaders and heads of the followings organizations: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Research Department of Education; Vice direction of Educational Development at the Ministry of Education of Mexico; National Institute for Evaluation of Education. Interviews varied in length from 1-2 hours, they were voice recorded, transcribed and translated from Spanish to English Language. A student from the Faculty of Pedagogy was helping in this process.

Analysis

Through an interview carried out with officials that participate in the decision making process of the educational system and/or are directly involved in it, the following three questions were asked:

1. Which do you believe is the most desirable and the most probable scenario for the school of the future?
2. How can you explain the points of view expressed by educational leaders in the previously survey applied?
 - a) Why do you believe scenarios 3 and 4 were considered unlikely with respect to their implementation?
 - b) What factors do you consider inhibit their implementation? For example:
 - Are the scenarios perceived as risky changes?
 - Are they characterized by the need for investment (spending) in the current bureaucratic system? Are there other reasons?
3. What would have to happen for the most desirable scenarios to be implemented?

It is important to consider comments provided by the interviewees that represent an important focal point for the possible construction of new educational scenarios that are geared towards the reorganization of the educational system. These are points that in one way or another are recaptured from different points of view but implicitly lead to the same end result.

Therefore, the continuation of this report presents information that is important to mention but was not presented within the previous table.

With regard to the changes that are needed to build a desirable scenario, Dr. Carlos Ornelas speaks of the need for social change that involves parents, where they have a greater capacity to participate in schools. Additionally, Felipe Martínez R. mentions that presently, the participation of parents is quite small, and it is only strong in a very small segment of society that correlates with high revenues. Felipe Martínez also states that the present lack of participation is due to the low educational level of the parents, which is, in part, the result of an authoritarian and paternalistic system.

Carlos O. and Martínez R. also agree that another factor that blocks the transformation of the educational system is Historical Inertia within the bureaucratic entities, understanding the special role (and power) that is exercised by the union, the institutions that created their own rules and operational norms, and the resistance to change. Dr. Carlos O. refers to this phenomenon as the colonization of the administrative structures of the National Teachers Union (SNTE), which presently poses an obstacle that impedes an evolution towards a desirable scenario that favors the educational system.

Francisco Miranda proposes an interesting hybrid scenario. He discusses an intelligent organization that is permeable to knowledge and its proper incorporation, where a more plural system is generated in which different actors participate in the taking decision making process of the federal system; a hybrid system that is more democratic and shows a greater decision making capacity with respect to educational policies.

The three interviews reflect the need to effect change from the structure to the policies that govern the educational system. They also express that change should begin with improved formation of professions and the professionalization of the teaching in order to modify educational practices. Furthermore, the curriculum needs to be more flexible, requiring complex strategies that need to be well-articulated and global in nature and formally and explicitly in documents to provide greater stability and consistency.

They discuss the need to have an institution that can develop as learning organization that centers its attention on knowledge, research and development (scenario 4). It must also represent the nucleus for equitable quality instruction (scenario 3). For the above-mentioned reasons, the interviewees present a panorama that reflects possibilities that confront considerable barriers against change.

**Schooling for the Future Phase 2 research: The New Zealand responses.
Carol Mutch, Ph.D.
Christchurch College of Education, New Zealand**

Sample

The sample size was 7. Although the researcher originally intended to approach 5 participants, she was recommended to others and in the context of interviewing elites it was important to follow these leads.

The participants were all met the following criteria for selection:

- Educational policy-making at a high national level (and often high profile level);
- Many years experience in a range of educational and/or policy-making settings;
- Represented a key department, agency or organisation in education policy-making;
- Represented a key sector of education (e.g. early childhood, primary, secondary, tertiary, private, Maori, Pasifika or special education);
- Able and willing to participate in at least one half hour interview.

Because of the small size of New Zealand it was necessary to grant the participants anonymity as far as possible, especially as some were political appointments and needed to be sure their comments did not adversely affect their careers. The participants came from the Ministry of Education (representing early childhood, primary and secondary interests), the Minister of Education's office, the Prime Minister's office, the private school sector, the tertiary sector and a national educational research body. There were four men and three women. A key area not able to be covered was indigenous (Maori) education.

Methodology

Ethical and research clearance was obtained from the researcher's institution. Interview participants were approached from the original list of survey participants or from recommendation by those in the field of educational policy-making. They were provided with the summary sheet of Phase 1, the purposes of Phase 2, a list of the original

scenarios and a consent form to sign. Interviews mainly took place in participants' offices in Wellington and lasted between 30 and 90 minutes. All agreed to be tape-recorded. Transcripts were typed up verbatim.

Tentative Results

In general, the interviewees thought the scenarios (with some adjustments and overlaps) reflected the range of possibilities facing New Zealand education. One suggested that we were moving from the market model scenario of the late 1980s/early 1990s back to bureaucratic model. One felt we were dangerously close to a meltdown scenario, another that we were moving to a network society. Most thought that elements of schools as learning organisations or social centres already existed in part.

Question 1. Why do you think that the policy-makers in the survey selected Scenario 4 (followed by Scenario 3) as the most desirable?

One respondent suggested that it was a response to the market driven education reforms of the 1980s/90s, another that these options provided the flexibility to meet our changing needs. Four respondents felt that either, or a mixture of both, were logical progressions from the innovations currently happening in schools. One respondent felt the strength of them was that they were "high trust" models and that schools were still basically trusted by their communities.

Question 2. Why do you think that the policy-makers in the survey accepted Scenario 1 as most probable?

The most common response was around the lack of agreement or understanding between stakeholders as to where we should be headed so that the status quo would prevail. One respondent felt that there was no sense of urgency about educational change. Another respondent felt that as the market reform model didn't provide schools with the right support we would return to a bureaucratic model for stability. A further respondent agreed and felt that "creeping centralism" was already evidenced in the current government's policies.

Question 3. If scenarios 4 (and/or 3) are the most desirable, what are the barriers to achieving our goals?

This question received the most detailed responses. Again the notions of polarised views, tensions between stakeholders, and the lack of an agreed vision were raised. A common theme was the lack of medium to long-term thinking at all levels and one respondent suggested the fact that we use economic modelling instead of social modelling did not help. Teachers were seen as barriers because of their conservatism (due either to their need to survive or the fact that they are an aging workforce). Principals who were strong leaders were lacking, schools were seen as 'conservatising' institutions and parents were seen as "risk averse". The structures, roles and systems already in place were seen as difficult to change. The phrase "silo mentality" was raised in relation to teachers, schools and government departments. The way we conceptualise teachers' work and the school day were seen as inhibiting factors. The legislation and regulations governing schools prevented innovative ways of reorganising schools and educational delivery. Finally,

teacher education and beginning teacher induction were seen as ineffective by several respondents.

Question 4. What factors are already in place to help us achieve our goals?

The most common response was that many innovations were already happening and cited the Secondary Futures Project, Aim High Schools, Schools Making A Difference, Gateway programmes, the National Certificate in Educational Achievement, Discovery School, Te Whariki, Cantatech, and other less high profile innovations. The new generation of teachers and the overall quality of people in education were seen as positive factors. The wealth of recent research into teaching and learning was a useful tool to support the reasons for change and finally, the size of New Zealand meant that with a united vision anything was possible.

Question 5. Where do we need to go from here?

A better understanding of how change occurs (for example the relationship between bottom-up change and top-down change) was important. Investing in leadership training, whether for pre-service teachers or aspiring principals, was seen as a key tool. Reviewing resource allocations – financial, human, specialist and ICT were suggested. The most common response, however, was around some form of structured debate and consultation to determine the purpose of, and direction for, education in the New Zealand context and how we could move forward with a shared vision that reflected our unique identity, protected our diversity and aimed at high standards and equitable outcomes for all.

Schooling for the Future
Preliminary Report on the Interview Data from the United States of America
John J. Cogan, Ph.D.
University of Minnesota

Introduction

This paper reports briefly on some of the key initial findings from the USA interviews that were part of the PCC *Schooling for the Future* project.

Sample and Data Collection

Ten highly visible and regarded educational leaders and policy makers in the United States participated in these interviews. They represented national organizations and professional societies as well as local school and public officials. These individuals were representative of policy elites in education across gender, local/state/national agencies, and political ideologies. All major professional society and agency heads were invited to participate. Ten elected to do so. These represented a mix of figures at the national level as well as those at the state and local levels who impact educational policy. Research clearance was obtained from the Institutional Review Board of the University of Minnesota.

Interview Procedures

After the invitation to participate had been tendered and individuals had responded, those who had indicated in the affirmative were invited to set a telephone interview date of at least one hour. These phone interviews took place over the period from 7 September to 17 November 2003. They ranged in length from 20 minutes to one-hour and 15 minutes. They averaged about 45 minutes each. Each individual was sent two copies of the Informed Consent form prior to the scheduled interview and then was asked first thing in the phone conversation if they understood the purpose of the study and agreed to participate in the research. All did and were then asked to sign both copies of the Informed Consent form and to post one back to the PI, keeping the other. They were also asked if it were permissible to audio-tape the interview. All agreed to do so.

General Assessment

The US participants were in general optimistic about the future of public education with several notable exceptions. It was interesting that the closer one got to the actual implementation of public education policy, the local school district, the more optimistic individuals were about the future. Most pessimistic were those elites in Washington, D.C..

Preliminary Findings

In response to research question #1, *What do you believe is the most desirable and most likely scenario for the future of schooling?*, like those responding to the survey in Phase 1 of the study, all felt that some variation of a combination of Scenarios 3 and 4 would be most desirable; some believed that we were already well on our way to achieving those; others felt we had a long way to go. Again, as with the survey results, the Scenarios 1 (bureaucratic) and 2 (market) were the models viewed as most likely to prevail. While many felt that there was some distance to go to achieve Scenarios 3 and 4 as reality, others felt that they were already being implemented. One local school administrator commented that,

I actually think that the ones that are most desirable to me, the re-schooling scenarios, 3 and 4, are the ones that are possible. I don't think that it's all without possibility that they can occur. I do think that they require a certain level of political and resource prioritization energy but I think it's entirely possible for us to get to scenarios 3 and 4 and I think that there are people all within and without the educational community and I would advocate for that (CJ, 9/29/03).

This same individual, along with several others at the national level, felt that this paradigm shift was already underway and that local education policy leaders were far ahead of national figures in this regard.

In response to research question #2, *How can we explain the views expressed by education leaders through the survey findings?*, i.e. they found Scenarios 3 and 4 most desirable but 1 and 2 most likely to occur, with Scenario 5, the network society as a more distant possibility. While most suggested that educational bureaucracies are simply too longstanding and firmly entrenched to allow for major transformation, indeed, that it's

not in their best interests to change, and that the business community wants to apply a corporate model to schooling and thus Scenario #2, most felt that it was the lack of visionary leadership that was the greatest impediment to fundamental change and restructuring that would lead to the realization of Scenarios 3 and 4. “Most educators and policy makers can’t see beyond the status quo”, remarked one interviewee. Still others contended that the public-at-large really didn’t want major change; that although they complained about the quality of schooling in general, when it came to their own local schools, they rated them good or better in most instances. Public apathy was cited as the greatest impediment of all.

Other barriers cited were political ideology, cost efficiency (one interviewee stated that what the U.S. public really wants is the best schooling system in the world for the cheapest cost), tensions between educators and the publics they serve, application of business and other models that really aren’t relevant to schooling, and failure to convince the public of the purpose and function of public education in a democratic society.

In response to question #3, *What would need to happen for the most desirable scenarios to be implemented?*, interviewees cited that the barriers identified above would have to be eradicated and that the tensions that currently exist between educators and the public-at-large would have to be eased considerably. Also, teachers would have to be respected for the knowledge and skills that they have and that a more supportive environment would need to be created wherein teachers could do their work. When asked about the impact of the federal education legislation, *No Child Left Behind*, upon the future of public schooling, most were positive in their belief that, with modification, this could be a powerful force for achieving the actualization of Scenarios 3 and 4.