

## The role of the OECD peer review process in Irish education policy in the 1960s

Imelda ELLIOTT

Université du Littoral Côte d'Opale (ULCO), Boulogne

### Résumé

Les historiens de l'éducation ont beaucoup cité et analysé le rapport *Investissement dans l'éducation* (1965), cependant celui de l'OCDE (1969) n'a fait l'objet d'aucune étude détaillée. Ces deux documents font partie du processus d'examen du système éducatif irlandais par les pairs de l'OCDE. À travers sa contribution, l'auteur examine le pré-rapport de 1965, *Investissement dans l'éducation*, le rapport de l'OCDE de 1969 ainsi que l'évolution des rôles du ministre, du ministère et des évêques devant les réformes suggérées. Il apparaît finalement qu'en dépit des résistances de la part du Ministère des Finances et de l'Église catholique, le processus d'examen par les pairs de l'OCDE a légitimé des réformes prévues par les pouvoirs publics, telles que le système de collège unique ainsi que des programmes et des examens identiques dans toutes les écoles du second degré. Cet article apporte une contribution supplémentaire à l'histoire irlandaise en s'appuyant sur des documents d'archives, sur le rapport de l'OCDE de 1969 et sur des entretiens menés par l'auteur au cours des vingt-cinq dernières années auprès d'acteurs de premier rang du système éducatif irlandais.

**Mots-clés :** examen par les pairs de l'OCDE – OCDE – éducation irlandaise – Investissement dans l'éducation – écoles du second degré – écoles secondaires – écoles techniques – Irlande

### Abstract

Although much has been written about the *Investment in Education* report, the 1969 OECD review has not received any detailed attention. As both are part of the OECD peer review process in Irish education in the 1960s, this paper explores the 1965 background report called *Investment in Education*, the 1969 OECD review and the evolution of the roles of the minister, the department and the bishops and their reactions to the reforms suggested by the OECD review process. The author concludes that despite resistance to change mainly by the Department of

Finance and the hierarchy, the OECD peer review process legitimated policies and educational reform that the Prime Minister, the Minister for Education and senior Department of Education officials wanted to implement, for example, a common curriculum and examination (Intermediate Certificate) in all second level schools in Ireland and also the comprehensive school system which included existing secondary and vocational schools and also new comprehensive schools. This paper contributes to the historiography of the period by exploring the 1969 OECD Review, archival material and interviews with important actors in Irish education which the author has conducted over the last twenty-five years.

**Keywords:** OECD peer review process – OECD – Irish education – Investment in Education – educational planning – comprehensive schools – secondary schools – vocational Schools – Ireland

In 1989 when I was beginning my research on Irish secondary education policy, I was informed that an OECD team was preparing a report on Irish education. As the OECD is based in Paris, I took the opportunity to interview the members of the OECD involved in January 1990. They gave me a copy of the review which had been finished in December 1989. This document was however only published in June 1991, apparently because the Irish State wanted to delay it<sup>1</sup> (OECD, 1991). The 1991 OECD Review is well known in Ireland and has been commented on by many academics. The background to this report coordinated by a Department of Education Review Team was not published although it was made available to researchers and educationists (DoE, 1989).

The author will use her knowledge of the process of publishing the 1991 OECD report to focus on the role of the OECD peer review process in Irish education policy in the 1960s. The review process took place in several steps as shown later. The influence of the OECD review process is often referred to as soft law or soft policy (Schäfer, 2006) as opposed to legally binding instruments or laws. Pagani explains that the “effectiveness of peer review relies on the influence and persuasion exercised by the peers during the process” and that “when the press is actively engaged with the story, peer pressure is most effective” (Pagani, 2002). This article will explore the OECD peer review process to see whether the international body introduced innovative policies in Irish education or whether it legitimated policies already planned by the Irish national government but which only the authority of an international organisation could enable it to implement. We will concentrate on the background report *Investment in Education* (Investment, 1965) and the OECD Review (OECD, 1969) and lastly we will explore the evolution of the roles of the minister, the department and the bishops and their reactions to the reforms suggested by the OECD review process. The 1969 Review is not well known in Ireland and has not been studied in any detail by any specialists of Irish education. By contrast, the background report called *Investment in Education* prepared by the Irish team is the most famous document in the history of Irish education. According to a well-known historian of Irish education, it is “one of the foundation documents of modern Irish education” (Coolahan, 1981).

<sup>1</sup> Confidential information.

## The Background to the OECD Review

The OECD<sup>2</sup> which officially came into being on 30 September 1961, encouraged investment in human capital (education) to promote economic prosperity, greater employment and social cohesion (CERI, 1998). The apparent technological superiority of the Soviet Union in the 1950s gave impetus to educational expansion in Western countries (Loxley et al., 2014). The first phase of OECD education policies in the 1950s and 1960s can be called the cold war and “big science” phase. At the time, research into space, nuclear and military technology permeated everything, including education policy (Rinne et al., 2004). In October 1961, Ireland was represented at the OECD policy conference in Washington on Economic Growth and Investment in Education by senior civil servants from the Departments of Finance and Education (Walsh, 2009).

Expenditure on education was seen as an investment which would contribute to economic expansion (Hyland, 2014). Ireland was the first Member country to follow up the proposal made at the Washington conference to undertake a national survey in connection with the adapting of its educational system to the present and future requirements of scientific progress and economic growth (OECD, 1969). The OECD established a process to report on education in a nation state in six stages (Kallo, 2009) and this was implemented for the first time in the case of Ireland as follows:

1. Agreement on the need for the study (1961)
2. Background report prepared by the country concerned (December 1965)
3. Visit of the review team (June 1966) which prepares a draft report
4. Confrontation meeting at the OECD Education Committee (October 1966)
5. Producing the final report (1966–67)
6. Distribution of the report (1969).

The background report was prepared by a survey team of Irish people appointed by the Irish Minister for Education. The director of the survey team was Patrick Lynch, a Lecturer in Economics in UCD and a former civil servant of the Department of Finance. William (Bill) Hyland was the statistician. He was Irish but he had spent ten years working in the United Nations in New York (Hyland, 2014). Martin O’Donoghue was a lecturer in Economics in TCD. Pádraig O’Nuallain was an inspector of mathematics. Charlie Smith was secretary to the team and Áine Donlon<sup>3</sup> was the research assistant. This committee has been referred to as “cultural strangers” (O’Sullivan 1992: 447). Denis O’Sullivan has defined cultural strangers as “non-native commentators” (O’Sullivan, 1996) and as “non-indigenous

<sup>2</sup> Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

<sup>3</sup> She later married William (Bill) Hyland and became Áine Hyland.

commentators” (O’Sullivan, 2005: 461). He was well aware of the fact that the members of the *Investment in Education* survey team were Irish, but for the purposes of his article, he stated that they were “conventionally represented as working to an OECD agenda” (O’Sullivan, 1992). This can be seen as the general perception of *Investment in Education* in Ireland. It suited the State that it should be represented as such for reasons that we will see later. In fact they were all Irish even if Bill Hyland, the statistician who wrote most of the report, had spent ten years working in the United States.

The survey team worked under the guidance of a fourteen-member steering committee which was chaired by Seán Mac Gearailt, Assistant Secretary of the Department of Education. The Reverend Jeremiah Newman, who was a professor of sociology at the University of Maynooth, was also a member. The other members represented the Departments of Finance, Agriculture, Industry and Commerce, the Economic Research Institute and the Central Statistics Office, the Congress of Trade Unions, industry (Bord Fáilte and the ESB), agriculture and the universities. The steering committee met a few times during its first year of existence and rarely met after that and it would appear that no official minutes were produced for these meetings (Hyland<sup>4</sup>, 2014). The description of its functions (Investment, 1965) did not mention any number of meetings and it would appear that meetings between the chairperson of the steering committee and the survey committee director were the main mode of communication between both committees (Hyland 2014).

The Irish survey was carried out during the period 1962 to 1965 with the help of the OECD and within the framework of its Educational Investment and Planning Programme (EIP). Before publication, the total draft report was subjected to a series of technical reviews and discussions by the group of national planning directors in the EIP Programme (OECD, 1969). The final draft of *Investment in Education* was finished in early 1965. The two-volume background document was published in December 1965 in Dublin and in 1966 in Paris. It is indeed very unusual for the OECD to publish the national background survey to the OECD Report. The terms of reference were very precise and included an inventory of skilled manpower, framing of educational targets for the following ten to fifteen years, assessment of demand for educational facilities, estimates of future enrolments, of educational resources needed (teachers, buildings, equipment) and evaluations of expenditure necessary, consideration of arrangements necessary to review the position and the additional statistical data needed (Investment, 1965).

4 Áine Hyland, the author of this article, was the research assistant on the *Investment in Education* survey team.

## Main findings of Investment in Education

The survey team surveyed the manpower patterns and estimated the composition of projected employment and the size and qualifications of the potential working population available to fill such jobs. The team identified types of education deficit: (1) deficiencies in basic education, (2) need for re-training arising from redundancy and change of occupation and the need for updating knowledge due to the rapid growth in new knowledge (*Investment in Education*, 1966). It estimated that there would be a future shortage of people with the necessary educational qualifications for the needs of the economy. Using the *Training of Technicians* in Ireland study and the teams’ own statistics, it accepted that the number of suitably qualified technicians was inadequate (OECD, 1964). The author was careful to use words like “may” to show that the conclusions were not prescriptive and the team was not making decisions on policy: “The discussion in this chapter suggests that there may be a need on manpower grounds for providing more education and training, not only to persons in the educational sector, but also to those who are already in the labour force” (Investment, 1965). The team’s purpose was to analyse the existing provision for education and to provide a statistical basis for decision-making in education. These statistics were widely interpreted as in fact suggesting the necessary policies for the future.

The statistics in *Investment in Education* showed high levels of social and geographical inequalities and in particular a very low participation rate in post-compulsory education by children of the lower social groups. One third of children did not receive any second level education. Only half of children aged 15 were at school, a third of 16 year olds, a quarter of 17 year olds and less than 10% of 19 year olds (see Table 1). The top three social groups (ABC) represented 45% of the population but their children formed 64% of the entrants to secondary school, 68% of those sitting for the Leaving Certificate and 85% of university entrants in 1963, whereas the corresponding figures for the children of the lower social classes (DEFGH) were 36%, 32% and 15% (Investment, 1965). Although *Investment in Education* claimed to be a neutral technical study, these statistics obviously pointed to the need to provide more educational opportunities at secondary and at university level for the lower social classes.

**Table 1: Rates of School Attendance 1963–1964 and projection for 1970–1971 (percentages)**

Age	1963–1964	projection for 1970–1971
11	58	60
12	98.8	99.5
13	94.6	98.4
14	66.4	95.8
15	51.5	69.7
16	36.8	48.6
17	24.8	32.7
18	14.5	18.6
19	8.8	12.2
20–24	6.6	6.3

Source: Adapted from OECD 1969 and *Investment in Education, 1965*, tables 1.2 & 3.2.

There was a large number of small primary schools, located mainly in rural areas, and a small number of larger urban schools. 38% of national schools had less than fifty pupils and 76% had less than 100 pupils. The smaller schools with less than 100 pupils employed 50% of the teachers to cater for 38% of the pupils. Larger schools of over 200 pupils catered for 45% of the pupils with 34% of the teachers. Pupil-teacher ratios were much lower in the smaller schools, class sizes were higher in the larger schools. Over 50% of the pupils in larger schools were in classes of fifty or over. Classes of over forty were the norm for the large schools (Investment, 1965).

Although the background report did not officially recommend new policies, the statistics on primary schools made it obvious that the closure of small primary schools in rural areas was one way of reducing inequalities as these schools cost more to run given the low pupil-teacher ratio. The author attended one of these small rural schools and as the teachers had generally four classes to teach at the same time, the curriculum could not be as wide and varied as in a larger school with one teacher per class. It was also necessary to reduce class sizes in large towns and cities as over half of the nation's pupils were in classes of over fifty and many more were in classes of over forty.

The situation at second level was different. Secondary schools were private. The Catholic secondary schools were generally run by religious orders or diocesan

priests, although a few were run by lay people. The protestant secondary schools were also private foundations. There were a large number of small units (64% of secondary schools had under 150 pupils) and they were spread unevenly over the various regions. The curriculum was limited and was of a classical grammar type. Schools lacked specialised facilities and teachers for science, mathematics and modern languages. Secondary schools were fee-paying and children had to travel long distances to school. In secondary schools in 1962–63, modern languages were studied by 45% of boys and 83% of girls in the Intermediate Certificate and by 21% of boys and 64% of girls at Leaving Certificate, whereas Latin was studied by 95% of boys and 48% of girls in the Intermediate Certificate and 88% of boys and 39% of girls at Leaving Certificate. Science was taken by 74% of boys and 25% of girls in the Intermediate Certificate. Chemistry was studied by 22% of boys and 2% of girls and physics by 29% of boys and 2% of girls (Investment, 1965). *Investment in Education* brought attention to the fact that most schools lacked a varied curriculum and also that a relatively low percentage were studying modern languages and science compared to Latin. There were not enough teachers of mathematics and science who had studied these subjects at degree level. These statistics showed a need for the improvement of the teaching of modern languages, mathematics and science, even if there were differences between the sexes.

**Table 2: Percentage of secondary school pupils studying certain subjects**

Subject	Boys		Girls	
	Intermediate	Leaving	Intermediate	Leaving
French	45	21	83	64
Latin	95	88	48	39
Science	74		25	
Chemistry	–	22	–	5
Physics	–	29	–	2

Source: Adapted from *Investment in Education, 1965*, table 10.12, p. 276.

The Investment Report purported to be a technical study of trends in Irish education and of the use of human and material resources in that system (Investment, 1965) but it was much more than that as it contained very detailed statistics on all aspects of primary and secondary education. In the last chapter of Investment, the authors explain that their report is essentially analytical and that “it contains no recommendations on policy”. On the same page we find that the only formal recommendation of the document is the proposal to create “in the Department of Education an educational development unit” (Investment, 1965). The idea was to initiate and plan the development of education policy rather than

be content to manage routine administrative tasks. Chapter Twelve of the report contains sophisticated policy options and costings for increasing the participation rates in secondary education taking into account efficiency considerations. Many of these were used by policy-makers in the 1960s. The attempt to play down the effects of the survey and to say that it was not involved in policy would appear to have been written to avoid controversy. The civil servants would have been very aware of the fact that the politicians in government decided on policy and they did not want to be seen to interfere even if in fact the very presence of the statistics in this study helped to bring about change. Sean O'Connor, head of the newly-created development unit in the Department of Education, remarked that Investment "signposted the direction of educational reform and, by highlighting our deficiencies, has offered a challenge that cannot be ignored" (O'Connor, 1968).

The Second Programme for Economic Expansion promoted the idea of investment in education: "Better education and training will support and stimulate continued economic expansion. Even the economic returns from investment in education and training are likely to be as high in the long-run as those from investment in physical capital" (GoI, 1963). The *Investment in Education* survey was well publicised in the newspapers at the time. In February 1963, the *Irish Times* published an article about a speech by Patrick Lynch entitled "Wide Expansion of Education Planned":

Mr. Patrick Lynch, director of the Irish educational project, sponsored by the OECD, and supported by the Minister for Education, Dr. Hillery, announced yesterday at a conference in Dublin, that the report will be ready in about 18 months. It will give a picture of education in Ireland today which will assess the needs of education in about 10 years' time (*Irish Times*, 12/2/1963).

The article went on to mention a wide expansion in all education in Ireland and the fact that "the son of the working man will have the same right of entrance to all forms of education as others". The article also announced that as techniques would become obsolete with the development of automation, mechanisation and the computer, it was necessary to introduce a modern curriculum in mathematics, physics and chemistry. In reply to questions, Patrick Lynch stated that the Irish language was not a barrier to technical education. Concerning free education, he did not make any promises but stated that Ireland was not as rich as Britain and France. He appealed to schools, universities, parents, trade unions and industry to provide information which would be treated confidentially. This was no doubt an exercise in communication to get the necessary level of co-operation to carry out the survey. The article went on to mention that the project was undertaken as a result of a suggestion from the OECD. The paper mentioned the names of the survey team and also that a representative steering committee under Seán Mac Gearailt had been appointed. Nine days later, another article appeared with the title "Must invest in right kind of education" (*Irish Times*, 21/2/1963). Patrick Lynch

is reported as having said that no student should have to choose between practical skills and a liberal education and that vocational education should have a greater emphasis on liberal subjects (*Irish Times*, 21/2/1963). The government trusted Patrick Lynch, who had formerly worked as a civil servant in the Department of Finance, to publicise the idea of investment in education.

The opposition parties also wished to reform the education system. Fine Gael announced that investment was needed in secondary education and Labour promised free education as far as university entrance (*Irish Times*, 22/2/1963). An article written about Minister Hillery's opening a European conference on education under the auspices of the education investment and planning programme of the OECD quotes him as having said, "I have no doubt that education is [...] the most decisive element in economic growth". The presence of Henning Friis, Chairman of the Committee for Scientific and Technical Personnel in the OECD is also mentioned (*Irish Times*, 25/5/1963) and showed that key figures in the OECD were advising the Irish survey team. The *Investment in Education* report was welcomed by all parties in the Irish parliament as can be seen for example in Senator Sheehy-Skeffington's remarks:

I turn now to *Investment in Education*. This is an excellent report which we have, and to me, as to other Senators who have spoken, it seems a quite remarkable document—one might say a unique document—and one which provides a basis for our thinking about education, and the basis for the Minister's policy proposals. I think he has taken it very closely into account. It is also the basis for the Fine Gael policy put forward in their document. As I read it, it is a well-coordinated and coherent presentation of well-documented facts about Irish education, many of which have never been put together so clearly, or even collected. It also gives the implications of these facts, and a wide variety of alternative methods, or "strategies" for eradicating demonstrable defects (Seanad Éireann, 1967).

Garret Fitzgerald's article on Investment, published in the periodical *Studies*, was typical of the reception that the report received:

[...] it is to be hoped that in the months ahead this report, which is a tour de force that will command a considerable audience among educational experts abroad as well as in Ireland, will become a subject of debate, discussion and critical analysis so that we may make the most of this immense contribution to the evolution of educational policy in Ireland. (Fitzgerald, 1965)<sup>6</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> Dr. Patrick J. Hillery was Minister of Education from June 1959 to April 1965.

<sup>6</sup> Garret Fitzgerald was a Fine Gael (opposition) deputy.

Minister Hillery continued to make speeches about education as an investment and he is quoted as having said “our returns from investment in education are likely now to be as high in the long run as our returns on capital investment” (*Irish Times*, 27/9/1963). He also defended the project when it was criticised (*Irish Times*, 21/11/1964). Members of the survey team also spoke to the media and the study received regular coverage in the newspapers as articles with titles such as “Investment in Education – Inadequate date is a problem” (*Irish Times*, 18/3/1964), “Investment in Education – Startling results not expected” (*Irish Times*, 19/3/1964), “Proposed expansions in education” (*Irish Times*, 1/3/1965). The idea of investing in education was popular and the media was obviously prepared to report on the survey team and on speeches made by the government and the opposition on this theme. The *Investment in Education* team contained only Irish people and the report was mainly written by Bill Hyland who was the statistician in the group (Hyland, 2014). The OECD international group of examiners spent a week in Ireland in June 1966 to assess Irish educational policy and planning in preparation for the confrontation meeting held in October 1966 in Paris as part of the programme of the OECD Committee for Scientific and Technical Personnel (OECD, 1969). *Investment in Education* was the background report for the OECD study *Reviews of National Policies for Education, Ireland*, which was published in 1969.

## Contents of 1969 OECD Review of Irish education

The 1969 OECD Review contains the examiners’ report, an account of the confrontation meeting and appendices, which include a summary of the *Investment in Education* survey. Most of the review is about the problems arising from a planning point of view at each level of education and the overall strategy of educational development having regard to the aims of economic and social development in Ireland (OECD, 1969). The 1969 Review includes sociological perspectives on participation rates in education. According to Papadopoulos, European sociologists of education contributed to the social aspects of OECD policy on education, with the result that the economic aspects are counterbalanced by the social policy agenda (Papadopoulos, 1994). The group of examiners consisted of Professor Henri Janne, former Belgian Minister of Education, Bernhard von Mutius, director of the Permanent Conference of Ministers of Education of Germany and Arthur Tremblay, Deputy Minister of Education of Quebec. The American rapporteur, Beresford Hayward, was the Head of the OECD–EIP Programme Section. They spent a week in Ireland in June 1966.

The confrontation meeting, which lasted for two days (19–20 October 1966), was organised at the OECD headquarters in Paris. The examiners were joined by 38 members of the OECD Committee for Scientific and Technical Personnel

who came from 21 countries including 17 European countries, as well as Canada, Japan, Turkey and the United States. They were joined by a representative of the Council of Europe and of EURATOM. The delegation from Ireland included Terry Ó Raifeartaigh, the Secretary of the Department of Education, Sean O’Connor assistant–secretary, M.J. O’Flanagan Chief Inspector for Technical Education, who was also a member of the steering committee of Investment in Education and three members of the *Investment in Education* survey team, Martin O’Donoghue, lecturer in economics, Bill Hyland, statistician and Charlie Smith, secretary to the team (OECD, 1969). The Minister for Education did not attend this meeting whereas Mary O’Rourke, Minister for Education, attended the Paris meeting for the 1991 report on 30 November 1989. The examiners defined a list of seven specific issues for discussion during the confrontation meeting: the planning mechanism for education; manpower planning and targets; social participation; primary education; post–primary education; higher education; and adult education (OECD, 1969).

During the confrontation meeting, the examiners noted the aspects of the Irish education system which were common to all countries: the problem of financial resources, of establishing priorities, of re–defining the role of the State when using planning and programming methods for education, raising participation rates, locating schools to avoid excessive scatter and wasting resources, improving the training of teachers and the pupil/teacher ratio, providing equipment and developing the teaching of mathematics, science, technology and modern languages, facilitating access to higher study for all young people of ability, promoting technical teaching, developing higher education and research (OECD, 1969).

They also drew attention to some specific features of Irish education. Firstly, the educational system was decentralised and private institutions or bodies played an important role. Secondly, there was the problem of teaching a national language little used in the population’s ordinary life but of great cultural importance and thirdly, many of the country’s graduates emigrated. The examiners noted that, even with its limited resources, Ireland provided much more prosperous countries with technical assistance by sending them substantial numbers of graduates (OECD, 1969).

The head of the Irish Delegation, Dr. T. Ó Raifeartaigh began by saying that Ireland’s economy was open in particular to Great Britain and the United States. He added that Irish freedom of movement to these countries certainly had advantages for the individuals concerned, but it also entailed serious difficulties from the point of view of educational planning; for example, it was impossible for the very short term to establish an exact correspondence between the number of medical graduates which should be produced and the country’s own requirements. Dr. Ó Raifeartaigh emphasized that Ireland’s policies reflected the pride attached to the individual’s well–being and rights as compared with the State’s demands on its

citizens (OECD, 1969). This still remains a problem today as many doctors trained in Ireland emigrate to English-speaking countries. It would appear that the idea of encouraging or making newly-qualified doctors work for a few years in Ireland in order to repay the cost of their training and to avoid shortages of qualified doctors was not even considered.

As regards the Irish language, Ó Raifeartaigh said that while it was national policy to preserve and promote it, they intended to develop continental European languages with a view to Ireland joining the European community (OECD, 1969). The teaching of modern languages was modernised later and more emphasis was placed on the oral aspect (Coolahan, 1981). As one of the criticisms of the examiners was the extent of the general academic education, Ó Raifeartaigh added that Ireland was also developing technical and science teaching. In fact the curriculum and examinations of all second-level schools were unified from 1963 (Bonel-Elliott, 1994). Vocational schools, with their emphasis on technical education, could now prepare pupils for the Leaving Certificate and entrance to university or technical colleges. Science teaching was also being developed at second level and more schools were being equipped with science laboratories (Coolahan, 1981).

As regards the question about the role of private institutions in a decentralised system, Ó Raifeartaigh answered by saying that one of the fundamental objectives of Irish educational policy was to establish as rapidly as possible quality educational opportunity for young people from all areas and all social classes. He accepted that the decentralised nature of Irish second-level schools was a difficulty, but said that they sought to associate the local educational authorities and the teachers (OECD, 1969). He completely eluded the main interest group, which was the Catholic Church. The senior civil servant was very active in helping successive ministers to avoid conflicts with the Church while reforming second-level education to enable all young people to benefit. This is clear in much of the bishops' correspondence available in the Dublin diocesan archives (Elliott, 2015a). Most secondary pupils (89%) were enrolled in Catholic secondary schools which were owned and run by religious orders and diocesan priests (Cannon, 1966) and the Catholic bishops were hostile to the State reforms announced in 1963, and in particular to setting up comprehensive schools and to enabling vocational schools to prepare pupils for the Intermediate Certificate (Bonel-Elliott, 1994). Reforming second-level education involved asking schools to co-operate and to share specialist equipment (Colley, 1966). This was not easy as the schools were in competition and they felt threatened by these recent developments (Coolahan, 1981, Randles, 1975). In the sixties, talking openly about the role of the Catholic Church in education in Ireland was taboo and the Irish delegation obviously had no desire to be quoted as criticising the Church in an international report. It was far easier to speak about the proposed development unit in the Department of Education.

As education planning was a relatively new concept, much of the discussion was about the planning mechanism set up in the Irish Department of Education called the development unit as the examiners felt that Ireland would be an example for other countries. Details were discussed about the membership of this unit, set up in 1965–1966. Sean O'Connor became assistant-secretary and was appointed as head of the development branch in 1965 (O'Connor, 1986) and Bill Hyland was also appointed as statistician in 1966 (Hyland, 2014). By the time of the confrontation meeting at the OECD headquarters in Paris, this unit was already in existence. S. O'Connor replied to the questions of the examiners about setting up and running an educational planning or development branch, the technical machinery, the investigations and the research programmes needed for educational planning and how the community was to be associated with the preparation and realisation of policies (OECD, 1969).

When a British delegate suggested that an inspector was necessary to establish communication between the planners and the teaching world, S. O'Connor was not favourable as he feared that people of high qualifications would produce strong differences in points of view and delay decision making. He did not mention the fact that he was afraid of conflict between the administrators<sup>7</sup> and inspectors<sup>8</sup> even if it is fairly obvious from his comments. The same delegate noted that experts of a high calibre were necessary, even if this made the work of those supervising them more difficult. He noted with satisfaction the presence of a “statistician of high repute” in the development branch. S. O'Connor also noted that a new research unit attached to one of the Dublin teacher-training colleges had been set up. A research programme in the development unit was awaiting the recruitment of a sociologist. The Department of Education also planned to provide financial assistance for research for Master Degrees on topics related to problems of priority in education (OECD, 1969).

As regards the technical machinery, B. Hyland replied that the development unit intended to use computers to help them to introduce a modern system of educational data assembly and processing. The development unit aimed to carry out surveys to fill in the gaps in the information required for planning. S. O'Connor explained that the public would be consulted in every county about the reorganisation of post-primary education (OECD, 1969). These county surveys were organised and meetings were held in every county. Later this senior civil servant said that he felt that these meetings achieved very little (S. O'Connor, 1986). Secondary school teachers and indeed religious orders were worried about co-operation and about losing control of private schools (Randles, 1975). When the international experts

7 Those who joined the Department of Education straight from school and who had risen through the administrative ranks.

8 Former teachers who had university degrees.

asked questions about the level of priority given to the elimination of educational inequalities between regions and social classes, the civil servants provided a careful reply. Free second-level education had been announced to journalists by the Minister for Education in September 1966, a month before the confrontation meeting (Bonel-Elliott, 1997). It is generally agreed that he had the approval of the Prime Minister but not of the government for this announcement. The civil servants would have been aware of the position and in the report we find: “As this plan had not yet been the subject of a final government decision at the time of the meeting, the Irish Delegation was not in a position to state its content definitively” (OECD, 1969).

## The OECD, the Minister, the Department and the Bishops

In the early 1960s, it was very hard for an Irish Minister for Education to establish that his role was to plan the education system, as an oft-quoted speech by a previous minister, Richard Mulcahy, appeared to show that the role of the minister was subsidiary:

Deputy Moylan has asked me to philosophise, to give my views on educational technique or educational practice. I do not regard that as my function in the Department of Education in the circumstances of the educational set-up in this country. You have your teachers, your managers and your Churches and I regard the position as Minister in the Department of Education as that of a kind of dungaree man, the plumber who will make the satisfactory communications and streamline the forces and potentialities of the educational workers and educational management in this country. He will take the knock out of the pipes and will link up everything. I would be blind to my responsibility if I insisted on pontificating or lapsed into an easy acceptance of an imagined duty to philosophise here on educational matters (Dáil Éireann Debate, 1956).

Dr. Patrick Hillery saw his role very differently (McManus, 2014). He was thirty six years old when he became Minister for Education and he was keen to reform the education system for social and economic reasons. He was helped by civil servants who wanted to improve the education system: “They were pretty demoralised. I was at a dinner one night [...] and a young middle way up inspector Tomás Ó Floinn said to me the real name of this department is éadóchas (despair) not oideachas (education)” (Hillery, 1991). The Irish language was widely used in the Department of Education and the inspector played on the close pronunciation of both words in Irish. The minister understood that the civil servants in the department were unable to bring about reforms as they were “refused by everyone” (Hillery, 1991).

In 1962, the minister set up a secret internal committee of civil servants from the Department of Education to advise on the changes needed. Five school inspectors under the chairmanship of Dr. Maurice Duggan sat on it. The Duggan Committee was confidential. It was unknown to school managers, school trustees, teacher unions and the public generally. Even the members of the *Investment in Education* survey team who worked in the offices of the Department of Education from October 1962 were unaware of its existence (Lynch, 1993). Its conclusions were never published by the Department of Education and they only came to light when the senior civil servant, Finbarr O’Callaghan, who, as secretary to the committee, had written the document, gave a copy to the author in 1993 (Bonel-Elliott, 1996). Dr. Hillery used the Duggan Report to help him to prepare to reform the education system. The Committee proposed a common curriculum at junior cycle level and this reform was announced by the minister in May 1963 (Bonel-Elliott, 1996).

Some of the senior civil servants also aspired to reform the system and when they were informed that the OECD was about to sponsor studies of education systems, they felt that this was an opportunity to give education a greater profile and to be able to finance reform:

One day S. Mac Gearailt came (they knew what I wanted – I had told them and I had written it down) and he said that there was this OECD study (they had done under-developed countries and now they were doing developed countries). I said but Seán, I know what I want, but he said this is the way to get it and he was right. Now you had the force of an international body. So we picked a steering committee... (Hillery 1991).

The minister and the Department wished to get involved in the OECD study as they faced so much obstruction to educational reform. Indeed although the chairman of the main association representing religious orders, Father John Hughes, was of the opinion that Catholic school authorities should cooperate to the fullest extent with the *Investment in Education* committee, his association instructed him to seek the views of the Hierarchy on the matter (Hughes, 1963). The bishops delayed giving instructions to the schools and decided to put the “Lynch questionnaire” for the OECD on the agenda for their June 1963 meeting. The Bishop of Achonry was worried that the Catholic private secondary schools would lose out if they did not fill out the forms on the cost of running their schools (Fergus, 15/5/1963). Archbishop McQuaid, put a handwritten note on the letter adding: “Mr McGearailt, without any reference to his chief Mr Lynch, refused to leave for an extension. Mr Lynch cannot publicly disown him. But I have arranged with Father Hughes who saw Mr Lynch to inform schools unofficially that they have until 15 July” (McQuaid, 16/5/1963). The bishops therefore used delaying tactics but fearing that Catholic private secondary schools would lose out on funding decided to cooperate with the survey team.

The Minister for Education announced a reform of second-level education in May 1963 (Keogh, 2005). All second-level schools would have a common curriculum and would take the same examination, the Intermediate Certificate. A new type of school financed by the State, a comprehensive school, was to be established in areas where there was no provision for post-primary education. The bishops put pressure on the State and obtained the financing of buildings for private secondary schools. The representatives of the Catholic Headmasters Association were worried about losing their private status if they accepted State money for their buildings. The secretary of the Department of Education stated the official position on the role of the State:

The Minister for Education is the person on whom is placed the final responsibility for the programme followed and the work done in the schools. While it is true that recognised secondary schools are under private ownership, they have, of their own volition, in return for State convention, elected to form part of what must be regarded as an official public service. In discharging such a service they cannot operate as if they were private individuals. The Minister, on whom, as mentioned, the final responsibility in the matter falls, must reserve his right to take on occasion a decision, when the public good demands that, without prior consultation with any particular group or groups (Ó Raifeartaigh, 1963).

The Minister and the officials of the Department were making clear that the State could decide on education policy and that even if they consulted the Church, each party had a different role. This was revolutionary in Ireland where the Church had taken most decisions concerning secondary education from Independence in 1921 up to 1963. The fact that the Department was willing to get the OECD to organise a survey of the Irish education system marked a change in attitude. After the prime minister made a speech announcing a new type of post-primary school, the bishops voiced their opposition to State second-level schools in October 1962: “[...] The bishops would naturally view with grave concern any proposal what would appear to be the establishment of state secondary schools” (Hierarchy, 1962). The two Bishops in charge of education matters were deputed to interview the Department on the matter, and to report back. John Charles McQuaid, Archbishop of Dublin was of the view that the new schools were contrary to the constitution (McQuaid, 5/1/1963). The Bishop of Elphin, Vincent Hanly, who was more aware of international changes in education, was more pragmatic:

In my humble opinion the bishops should enter the field immediately as other parties are getting active. If possible the bishops should take a hand in framing the proposals for new legislation as the authorities appear to be friendly and anxious to invite suggestions. Some form of comprehensive education – free for all – is due to come and we should be ready to welcome it and direct it into proper channels (Hanly, 1963).

The Catholic Hierarchy objected to vocational schools having the right to propose the same examinations as the secondary schools (Fergus, 20/2/1963). The bishops, especially the Archbishop of Dublin, considered that co-education was not acceptable for Catholic children: “The Bishops would oppose anything in the way of mixed education as well as any system of transport where boys and girls would be obliged to travel together” (Hierarchy, 1963). Martin O’Donoghue, a member of the *Investment in Education* survey team, remembers that the Church representative on the Steering Committee, Dr. Newman, objected to the State organising transport to schools on the grounds that the Church would not accept teenage boys and girls travelling together. Bill Hyland suggested dividing the buses into two parts, one for boys and the other for girls. As he had lived in the United States, he was aware of the international debate about apartheid on school buses. His suggestion caused some conflict and was probably one of the reasons the Steering Committee did not often have meetings with the survey team (Hyland, 2014).

The Church wished to maintain its influence over secondary schooling and the private status of its schools. By referring to “proper channels”, Bishop Hanly meant that the Church should cooperate with the State to obtain Catholic comprehensive education in single sex schools run by priests and religious orders. The bishops based their position on the fact that they represented Catholic parents who wanted denominational schools:

Our system of both primary and secondary education is quite different from that in England and Wales. Article 42 of our Constitution recognizes that the Family, not the State, is “the primary and natural educator of the child”. Hence, speaking constitutionally, our schools are Family or Parental institutions. And in fact the parents – Catholic, Protestant and Jewish – have chosen religiously-controlled schools. We Catholics especially, under the British regime, have fought a prolonged and finally successful campaign against State undenominational education. The Constitution is the final record of our victory. Article 42 further declares. “The State shall not oblige parents, in violation of their conscience and lawful preference, to send their children to Schools established by the State or to any particular type of School designated by the State” (“Memorandum”, 1963, p. 1).

In parliament, George Colley<sup>9</sup>, a member of the party in government, in a statement in parliament, showed clearly that referring to the rights of parents was often hypocritical:

A lot of lip service is paid to the primary rights and duties of parents in regard to education. I do not think it unfair to say that interest by parents in education is actively discouraged by the teachers, the Churches, and the Department... Indeed, they are regarded as interlopers. This is a shocking state of affairs, especially in a Christian country where we are taught as part of our religion, that the obligation, the responsibility and the right of educating one's children is vested primarily in the parents, and that the State has no right to interfere except to lay down certain specific standards (Colley, 1964).

Despite the opposition of the Church representatives, the Minister and the Department of Education continued with the OECD survey and with the plans for reform. Almost three decades later, the former minister remembered the difficulties: "There was definite Church obstruction. It is hard to understand it now. They have survived and private schools have survived". (Hillery, 1991). Although in fact there is no evidence that the State ever tried to manage schools or to force private schools to become State schools, the religious congregations were genuinely worried as Sister Eileen Randles a secondary school principal explained in her book (Ó Buachalla, 1988, Randles, 1975). Instead the Department of Education worked hard on increasing access to second level education and controlling expenditure. This was a time when some senior civil servants dared to criticise the role of the Church and Sean O'Connor, head of the development unit, stated clearly that he felt that the Church had equal rights to other partners; "No one wants to push the Religious out of education; that would be disastrous, in my opinion. But I want them in it as partners, not always as masters" (O'Connor, 1968). Bill Hyland felt that after the OECD process, the Department of Education developed a new concept of the right of children to certain educational facilities whereas up to then, the role of the Department was to facilitate the providers (Hyland 1991). Until the early 1960s, secondary education was in private hands and the Department of Education saw its role as facilitating the financing of those schools. Tom Garvin states that the "Church insisted on having a monopolistic control of the education of young people in a Church-owned and state-financed system" (Garvin, 2004). It was not until 1963 that the State announced that publicly-funded schools such as vocational schools and the comprehensive schools could provide secondary education.

When I wrote an article entitled "Lessons from the Sixties: Reviewing Dr. Hillery's Educational Reform" in 1994 (Bonel-Elliott, 1994), the bishops' correspondence was not available to researchers. Marie Clarke has stated that my opinion in 1994

9 George Colley was Minister for Education from April 1965 to July 1966.

about Minister Hillery's use of communication is negated by the existence of the bishops' correspondence (Clarke, 2010). The fact that the representatives of the Church were in contact with ministers and civil servants was well known in Ireland as several authors had done some research on the subject, for example Cooney, Inglis, Titley and Whyte. Moreover Noel Browne had attributed the failure of the implementation of the Mother and Child scheme mainly to the role of the Church in his autobiography<sup>10</sup> (Browne, 1986). I was well aware of this and the content of my interviews with ministers and civil servants confirmed the role of the hierarchy, but I could not provide any written proof in 1994<sup>11</sup>. My reference to "open communication" was to the fact that Minister Hillery had made a speech at a press conference to inform the population of the plans for reform while at the same time "he dissimulated the real nature of his reform when he announced in a veiled sort of way during his speech that he was setting up a comprehensive system in 1963, by making the vocational school equal to the secondary school in terms of curriculum and examinations" (Bonel-Elliott, 1994). The prudent speech, written by a civil servant, "enabled the Minister to announce a comprehensive system in such an obscure manner" (Bonel-Elliott, 1994) that it was not obvious to those who were not involved in the discussions what the details of the reform were. I used the term "open communication" as it is referred to in management theory (Griffin, 1990, Daft, 2010) which means that a manager, or in this case a minister, communicates his plans. That does not mean that he gives all the details but his communication is purpose-directed towards the desired goals of the organisation and influences people to act in a way to achieve the goals (Daft, 2010). And it must be remembered that the hierarchy were not the only actors resisting change.

Minister Hillery informed the author that the Department of Finance had tried to obstruct his reform (Hillery, 1991). Civil servants felt that "the Department of Finance would not tolerate the idea of the spending necessary, that the Church would obstruct it and would not like to see the State coming into the field of education" (Hillery, 1994). In an earlier interview he said that "the big opposition of the Church was the excuse for the others" (Hillery, 1991). By this he meant the Department of Finance, the Minister for Finance and the government (Horgan, 1997). Minister Hillery informed the author that Sean Lemass, Prime Minister, supported him in his efforts to reform education:

<sup>10</sup> He also mentioned the role of the doctors, but with far less detail (Brown 1986).

<sup>11</sup> Sean O'Connor, a Department of Education official, stated in an interview in 1986, that although there was strong opposition on the part of the bishops in 1963, "they never made it public" (Mulcahy & O'Sullivan, 2014).

At the time it would be difficult to get [a reform] through the government. But you'd have to say that Sean Lemass [...] was positive. If you came up with ideas, Lemass was for you. Jim Ryan was Minister for Finance. At some stage I came to Lemass. Now, I had been doing this through the channels, [but] it was most disappointing, being turned down, turned down, turned down. And the officers of the Department were quite demoralised when I got there. They didn't expect to get anything through. I remember being out in Dun Laoghaire one night [...] and I said I'd try once again. I tried Lemass and he got Jim Ryan and he said "Jim Ryan, you and I'll talk". and that's [when] Jim Ryan and Lemass came in on it so that it wasn't a matter of going through the civil service of Finance, it wasn't a matter of going through the government with it... Lemass said to me "you won't get this through the government, announce it" (Hillery, 1991).

Professor Brian Farrell did considerable research into Sean Lemass's management style as prime minister and stated that he used the "technique of mobilising popular support as a means of accelerating executive action" (Farrell, 1983). It would appear that this was also the case for Hillery's reform in 1963 (Elliott, 2015b). The OECD review process in education in Ireland in the sixties played a key role in facilitating the implementation of reforms as the Minister and the Department of Education were keen to bring about changes and the press was also active in relaying the ideas expressed about "investment in education".

## Conclusion

The OECD peer review process corresponds to a period of new policy formulation and fresh perspectives on the roles of the different actors in Irish education. From Independence until the 1950s, the Ministers and the Department of Education did not have a pro-active stance. Instead they deferred to the most powerful interest group, the Catholic Church and also to the Department of Finance which was not well disposed to increasing spending on education. The very fact that the Irish government invited the OECD to survey the education system demonstrated a radical approach and a desire to depart from the status quo. The government and the Department of Education shared the view of the OECD on investment in education. The Church also wanted more finance for schools but on its terms, insisting on the private nature of its secondary schools, the necessity to have separate schools for boys and girls, and to avoid having State second-level schools. The *Investment in Education* survey team highlighted the need to expand the Irish education system to have more qualified manpower but also to provide equality of educational opportunity. It also focused on the need to improve the teaching of mathematics, science and modern languages.

Although *Investment* was theoretically a technical study, it provided the statistical basis to show the need for reform. The OECD idea of investment in education was publicised by the media following on speeches by members of the government and by Patrick Lynch. This background report was used as a basis for the 1969 review. During the confrontation meeting in Paris, the OECD members present were very interested in the development unit in the Department of Education. There was broad consensus on most questions and the Irish delegation provided suitable replies to questions and avoided any controversy. No mention of the role of the Church appears in the review although it was the major actor in the education system. Both the Church and the Department of Finance operated to retain the status quo but for different reasons.

The minister, Dr. Patrick Hillery wanted to formulate and implement expansionist policies in education. The OECD process was used to get approval for more spending on the education system. Although the chairman of the Catholic Headmasters Association was favourable to cooperating with the survey team, the bishops used delaying tactics but finally decided that it was in their interest to provide the necessary information. Parallel to the *Investment in Education* survey team, a secret internal committee of civil servants worked on the contents of reform. Members of the survey team were unaware of the existence of this Duggan Committee. Reforms – new State-funded comprehensive schools in rural areas, common curriculum and examinations for all second level pupils – were introduced from 1963. The bishops objected to some of the content of the reforms, basing their claims on the fact that they represented parents.

The *Investment in Education Report*, the background report to the OECD Survey, got great coverage in the media and was discussed in parliament. By the time the confrontation meeting organised by the OECD was organised in Paris in October 1966, free secondary education had just been announced and the Department of Education and the Minister were busy trying to convince the government and the Department of Finance to implement it. Moreover, the contest for the replacement of Sean Lemass as Prime Minister (Taoiseach) would have taken up a lot of time in the government party until Jack Lynch finally became Taoiseach in November 1966. The main purpose of the government had been to survey the education system in order to provide the statistical basis to justify reform and the OECD legitimated spending on education as an investment. The timing of the *Investment of Education* report and its contents suited the purpose of the minister and the Department of Education.

The 1969 Survey was published very late – four years after *Investment in Education* – and by the time it appeared, the department had taken on board the findings it needed to justify expanding the education system, improving the teaching of science, mathematics and modern languages, but it had no desire to upset the status

quo too much by questioning the rights of private, mostly clerical, schools or asking graduates who emigrated to reimburse the cost of their university education. The OECD influenced Irish policy but at the same time the Irish government used the OECD to legitimate policies that originated in Ireland. Kjell Eide from the OECD stated in 1990 that the OECD review process was used as a starting point for education reforms in several countries including Ireland (Kjell Eide, 1990). According to Ioannidou, the instruments used in the OECD reviews have always been based on consensus and shared values (Ioannidou, 2007). Contrary to what is often written, the *Investment in Education* report was written by Irish people and even if they participated in international meetings with OECD experts, they were not foreigners. The 1969 Review was an international document written mainly by an American who was the OECD rapporteur. The examiners came from three different countries, Belgium, Canada and Germany, and not less than twenty one countries were represented at the confrontation meeting in Paris.

At a time when the Department of Finance was opposed to investing in education and the Church only accepted changes on its own terms, there is no doubt that the OECD peer review process legitimated policies that the Prime Minister, the Minister for Education and senior Department of Education officials wanted to implement. The presence of representatives of the OECD at meetings in Ireland and the references to the international body enabled the Irish State to justify its ground-breaking education policies. The role of the OECD in promoting the idea of education as an investment to improve the economy and the relaying of this idea in the media thanks to speeches by the government and the leader of the *Investment in Education* team helped to justify the increase in spending. The expansion of the provision of secondary education was generally welcomed by parents as it provided more opportunities for young people. The OECD peer process provided the statistical basis necessary for a future minister to introduce the most popular of all education policies: free secondary education for all from September 1967.

## REFERENCES

- Bonel-Elliott, I., 1994, "Lessons from the Sixties: Reviewing Dr. Hillery's Educational Reform", *Irish Educational Studies*, 13 (Spring), pp. 32-45.
- Bonel-Elliott, I., 1996, "The role of the Duggan Report (1962) in the reform of the Irish education system", *Administration*, 43 (3), pp. 42-60.
- Bonel-Elliott, I., 1997, "La politique de l'enseignement du second degré gratuit pour tous (1967) en République d'Irlande", Brennan, P., *L'Irlande : identités et modernité*, Lille, Presses de l'Université de Lille III, pp. 125-139.
- Browne, N., 1986, *Against the Tide*, Dublin, Gill and Macmillan.
- Cannon, P., 1966, "Denominational Education in the Republic of Ireland", in Bereday, G., Lauwerys, J., *World Yearbook of Education, Church and State in Education*, pp. 328-331.
- CERI, 1998, *Human Capital Investment, an International Comparison*, Paris, OECD.
- Clarke, M., 2010, "Educational reform in the 1960s: The introduction of comprehensive schools in the Republic of Ireland", *History of Education* 39 (3), pp. 383-399.
- Colley, G., 1964, *Dáil Debates*, 15/02/1964.
- Colley, G., 1966, "Letter to the authorities of Secondary and Vocational schools", Department of Education.
- Coolahan, J., 1981, *Irish Education: its History and Structure*, Dublin, IPA.
- Cooney, J., 1986, *The Crozier and the Dáil*. Dublin, Mercier Press.
- Daft, R.L., 2010, *Management*. Mason, Ohio, Thomson/South-Western.
- Dáil Éireann Debate, 19 July 1956.
- DoE (Department of Education), 1989, Background Report – *OECD Review of Education (A Review of the Irish Education System with particular reference to Teacher Education and Supply)*.

Eide, K., 1990, *30 Years of Educational Collaboration* in the OECD, 1990.

Elliott, I., 2015, “L’Église et la modernisation de l’enseignement du second degré en Irlande au début des années soixante”, *Enjeux contemporains en études irlandaises: In Memoriam Paul Brennan, Etudes irlandaises*, Vol. 40, No. 1.

Elliott, I., 2015, *Irlande : La politique de l’enseignement du second degré 1963–1998*, Paris, L’Harmattan (sous presse).

Farrell, B., 1983, *Sean Lemass*, Dublin, Gill and Macmillan.

Fergus, J., 1963, “Letter from Bishop of Achonry (James Fergus) to the Archbishop of Dublin (John Charles McQuaid) 20/2/1963”, McQuaid Papers, Dublin Diocesan Archives.

Fergus, J., 1963, “Letter from James Fergus, Bishop of Achonry to Archbishop McQuaid, 15/5/1963”, McQuaid Papers, Dublin Diocesan Archives.

FitzGerald, G., 1965, “Investment in Education”, *Studies, An Irish Quarterly Review*, pp. 361–374.

GoI (Government of Ireland), 1963, *Second Programme for Economic Expansion*, Part 1.

Griffin, R., 1990, *Management*, Boston, Houghton Mifflin.

Hanly, V., 1963, “Letter from Bishop of Elphin (Vincent Hanly) to Archbishop McQuaid, 4/1/1963”, McQuaid Papers, Dublin Diocesan Archives.

Hierarchy, 1962, “Minutes of the general meeting of the Irish hierarchy 1/10/1962”, McQuaid Papers, Dublin Diocesan Archives.

Hierarchy, 1963, “Interview with the Department of Education 24/4/1963”, Reference XV/23/19, McQuaid Papers, Dublin Diocesan Archives.

Hillery, P., 1991, Interview with the author.

Hillery, P., 1992, Interview with the author.

Hillery, P., 1994, Interview with the author.

Horgan, J., 1997, *Sean Lemass: the Enigmatic Patriot*, Dublin, Gill & Macmillan.

Hughes, J., 1963, “Letter from Chairman of the Catholic Headmasters’ Association to the Hierarchy, 6/4/1963”, McQuaid Papers, Dublin Diocesan Archives.

Hyland, Á., 2014, “The Investment in Education Report 1965–Recollections and Reminiscences”, *Irish Educational Studies*, pp. 1–17.

Hyland, B., 1991, Interview with the author.

Inglis, T., 1987, *Moral Monopoly*. Dublin, Gill and Macmillan.

*Investment in Education, Ireland – Report of the Survey Team appointed by the Irish Minister for Education*, Dublin, Stationery Office, 1965, also published by the OECD in 1966, *Investment in Education, Ireland – Report of the Survey Team appointed by the Irish Minister for Education*, Paris, OECD.

Ioannidou, A., 2007, “A comparative analysis of new governance instruments in the transnational educational space, A shift to knowledge-based instruments”, *European Educational Research Journal* 6.4, pp. 336–347.

*Irish Times*, 1963–1964.

Kallo, J., 2009, *OECD education policy, a comparative and historical study focusing on the thematic reviews of tertiary education*, Jyväskylä, Jyväskylä University Press.

Keogh, D., 2005, *Twentieth Century Ireland*, Dublin, Gill and Macmillan (2nd edition).

Loxley, A., A. Seery, and J. Walsh, 2014, “Investment in Education and the tests of time”, *Irish Educational Studies*, 33.2, pp. 173–191.

Lynch, P., 1993, Interview with the author.

McManus, A., 2014, *Irish Education, The Ministerial Legacy, 1919–99*, The History Press, 2014.

McQuaid, J.C., 1963, “Letter from Archbishop of Dublin to Bishop of Elphin 16/5/1963”, McQuaid Papers, Dublin Diocesan Archives.

“Memorandum on Irish Secondary Education, 1963”, Reference XV/23/23, McQuaid Papers, Dublin Diocesan Archives.

Mulcahy, DG., and O’Sullivan, D., 2014, “Extract from an interview of Sean O’Connor: 8 September 1986”, *Irish Educational Studies* 33.2, pp. 141–153.

Ó Buachalla, S., 1990, *Education Policy in Twentieth Century Ireland*. Dublin, Wolfhound.

OECD, 1969, *Reviews of National Policies for Education, Ireland*, Paris, OECD.

OECD, 1964, *Training of Technicians in Ireland*, Paris, OECD.

O'Connor, S., 1968, "Post-Primary Education: Now and in the Future", *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review*, pp. 233–251.

O'Connor, S., 1986, *A Troubled Sky, Reflections of the Irish Educational Scene, 1957–1968*, Dublin, Educational Research Centre.

O'Sullivan, D., 1992, "Cultural Strangers and Educational Change: The OECD Report Investment in Education and Irish Educational Policy", *Journal of Education Policy*, 7.5, pp. 45–469.

O'Sullivan, D., 1996, "Cultural exclusion and educational change: Education, church and religion in the Irish Republic", *Compare: A Journal Of Comparative Education*, 26 (1).

O'Sullivan, D., 2005, *Cultural Politics and Irish Education since the 1950s, Policy Paradigms and Power*, Dublin, IPA.

Ó Raifeartaigh, T., 1963, "Letter from T. Ó Raifeartaigh to John Hughes, 9/10/1963", McQuaid Papers, Dublin Diocesan Archives.

Papadopoulos, G. 1994, *Education 1960–1990: the OECD perspective*, Paris, OECD.

Randles, E., 1975, *Post-Primary Education in Ireland*, Dublin, Veritas Publications.

Rinne, R., Kallo, K., and Hokka, S., 2004, "Too Eager to Comply? OECD Education Policies and the Finnish Response", *European Educational Research Journal*, 3.2, pp.454–485.

Schäfer, A., 2006, "Resolving deadlock, Why international organisations introduce soft law", *European Law Journal*, 12.2, pp.194–208.

Seanad Éireann Debates, 8/2/1967.

Steiner-Khamsi, G., 2003, "Blazing a Trail for Policy Theory and Practice", in *Lessons from Elsewhere, The Politics of Educational Policy Borrowing and Lending*. New York, Teachers College Press.

Titley, B., 1983, *Church, State and the Control of Schooling in Ireland 1900–1944*, Dublin, Gill and Macmillan.

Walsh, J., 2009, *The Politics of Expansion, The Transformation of Educational Policy in the Republic of Ireland, 1957–72*, Manchester, MUP.

Whyte, J., 1971, *Church and State in Modern Ireland 1923–70*, Dublin, Gill and Macmillan.

## Pour citer cet article

---

### Référence électronique

Elliott, Imelda, «The role of the OECD peer review process in Irish education policy in the 1960s», *Revue Miroirs* [En ligne], 2 |2015, mis en ligne le 15 juillet 2015, consulté le 9 août 2015, <http://www.revuemiroirs.fr/links/2/article6.pdf>.

---

### Auteur

Imelda Elliott  
 Professor and Head of the School of Modern Languages  
 Université du Littoral Côte d'Opale (ULCO), Boulogne  
 Imelda.Elliott @ univ-littoral.fr

---

### Droits d'auteur

© RevueMiroirs.fr

## Community development: origins and hybridization in Northern Ireland

Joana ETCHART  
 Université Paris-Sorbonne (Paris 4)

### Abstract

This article will study the emergence of community development (CD) as a peacebuilding strategy in the 1970s in Northern Ireland. It will demonstrate that CD went through a successful *hybridization* process in the early 1970s. *Hybridization* refers to the process of cross-fertilization between international peacebuilding activities and local practices. It takes place when peace activists locally reshape international models through everyday practices (Richmond & Mitchell 2011). In Northern Ireland, CD stands as a case in point as the initial model, which was conceived by the Colonial Office in order to empower local communities and elites in the colonies, was adapted to local circumstances by the members of the NICRC (1969-1974) and was then readily adopted by community activists on the ground. This article will also demonstrate that CD was conceived as a peacebuilding strategy which tried to prevent the occurrence of violence in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Its promoters believed that CD could represent an alternative to violence as it was based on the needs of the community and sought to develop organisational skills.

**Keywords:** community development – Northern Ireland – peacebuilding – history of the 1970s

### Résumé

Cet article propose d'étudier l'émergence de *community development* (CD) en tant que stratégie de construction de la paix dans les années 1970 en Irlande du Nord. Il démontre que CD a subi une étape *d'hybridation* au début des années 1970. *L'hybridation* fait référence au croisement entre les activités internationales de construction de la paix et les pratiques locales quotidiennes. Il a lieu lorsque des praticiens de la paix remodelent des pratiques internationales en les adaptant à leurs défis et pratiques quotidiens (Richmond et Mitchell 2011). Le modèle original, conçu par le Colonial Office britannique en vue d'émanciper les élites locales dans les colonies, fut adapté en Irlande du Nord aux circonstances locales par les membres de la NICRC (1969-74) puis repris avec enthousiasme par les militants associatifs sur