Amsterdam
School

for Social science Research

ASSR Working paper 04/03

February 2004

WHEN NEGOTIATION FAILS

Private Education as a Disciplinary Strategy

Ali de Regt and Don Weenink

Ali de Regt is senior lecturer at the Department of Sociology of the University of Amsterdam

Don Weenink is PhD-student at the Amsterdam School for Social Science Research

ASSR WORKING PAPER SERIES
[HTTP://WWW.ASSR.NL/](http://www.assr.nl/)
EMAIL: ASSRWORKINGPAPERS@FMG.UVA.NL

ABSTRACT:

The pressure on children to stay in education for an extended period of their lives is high. Such protracted school careers require a large amount of self-control and the ability to defer gratification. Students who lack the necessary discipline to do so may become school dropouts. For upper-middle-class parents, class reproduction demands the transmittance of their cultural capital, resulting in a level of schooling at least similar to their own. However, parents can never be sure they will succeed. If educational success is lacking, the danger of their children's future downward mobility is real. At the same time, parents feel they cannot force their children to work for school if these are not motivated, especially so because middle-class child-rearing practices have changed in the direction of negotiation instead of command. When regular schools, too, are unable to discipline the students sufficiently, parents may resort to private education. Private schools, characterised by strict rules and permanent supervision, take over the discipline parents nor regular schools can provide.

Ali de Regt is senior lecturer at the Department of Sociology of the University of Amsterdam and a researcher at the Amsterdam School of Social Science Research. She wrote a dissertation on the history of the Dutch working class family and a book on financial relations between family members. Her current research is on private education in the Netherlands, which resulted in a book and several publications in Dutch journals

Don Weenink is PhD-student at the Amsterdam School for Social Science Research. His research concerns current differentiation within the highest level of Dutch secondary education in the perspective of differentiation within the middle class. Together with Ali de Regt he has been studying private education in The Netherlands since 1998 which resulted in several articles in Dutch journals.

1. INTRODUCTION

Today, graduation from secondary or high school is considered to be the minimum educational level all children should achieve. And for entrance into upper-middle-class positions an advanced education on tertiary level even has become almost a requisite. This is true for all Western countries. Young people who are not able or willing to follow a long educational career and leave school without a certificate of an institution of higher learning, diminish their chances to enter (upper) middle-class employment in adult life.

These educational demands put a heavy burden on parents and students alike. Parents must socialize their children into sustained motivation for education, and induce them to forego or defer the more pleasurable activities which are nowadays so abundantly offered to young people. Students have to submit to an educational regime which above all requires self-motivation and self-discipline. For upper-middle class parents, class reproduction demands the transmittance of their cultural capital to the next generation, resulting in a level of schooling at least similar to their own. Although educational success is generally expected in these social circles (Power et al. 2003), parents can never be sure that they will succeed in their efforts and that the outcomes of their socialization will be according to plan.

Modern child-rearing practices, which have become dominant in upper-middle-class families, contribute to this uncertainty. In the last decades of the twentieth century parent-child interactions changed towards more negotiation and less rule-enforcement and control. Children got a larger amount of behavioural freedom, and adolescents in particular strengthened their position vis-à-vis their parents, as their collective power as consumers grew and the temptations of the consumer society vied with parental rules. In this family constellation, parents are not inclined to authoritarian control, but try to strike a precarious balance between allowing freedom and enforcement of discipline. When this balancing act fails, and the scales tip to the side of freedom, children may withdraw from parental demands. If this implies frolicking around, negligence of school work or outright rejection of the educational pathway their parents have in mind they endanger the continuation of the parental class position and may even head towards downward mobility.

This article focuses on the question how Dutch upper-middle-class parents tried to solve the problems that arose when they did not succeed in motivating their offspring to conform to the educational standards that were expected of them. To bridge the gap between a relatively lenient family socialisation on the one hand and the requirements put forward by

the educational system on the other, they took recourse to a relatively new arrangement in the Netherlands: private education.

Although offering discipline has been one reason for parents to choose for private education in many Western societies, considerations like religion, special needs, social exclusiveness and above all academic excellence are paramount in these countries (Fox 1984; Walford, ed. 1984, 1989; Salter & Tapper 1985; Cookson & Persell 1985; Teese 1986, 1998; Johnson 1987; Maxwell & Maxwell 1995; Langouet & Leger 2000; Van Zanten & Robert 2000). In the Netherlands, where religious and special schools are state funded and the schools on the highest level of academic excellence also belong to the state-funded sector, these considerations do not apply. Here, the increase in private schooling is best explained as a strategy to overcome the failures that middle-class socialisation can generate.

2. PRIVATE SCHOOLS IN THE NETHERLANDS

Although it is well known that the private sector in the Netherlands is more extensive than in most other Western countries, one often forgets that Dutch private schools (*bijzondere scholen*) are only private in organizational and administrative form. They are founded and governed by private bodies, but are completely funded by the state. Just like state schools, state-funded private schools are free from fees, and parents can only be requested to pay a limited 'voluntary' contribution. Since the 1970s, however, a number of secondary schools have been founded on a strictly private basis. Parents have to pay the full costs, which means a tuition fee ranging from 9,000 to 18,000 Euro for a full one-year program.¹ These private schools do not offer the same four-, five- or six-year programs as the state or state-funded secondary schools, but teach the subject matter of the last two years of the official curriculum in one year. In this way they prepare pupils for the final examinations that allow for entrance to higher forms of education.²

In 2002, the Netherlands counted 11 private schools, with a total number of nearly 2,300 pupils. Luzac College is by far the largest, with more than 1,300 pupils, spread over 14 branches. The other schools are much smaller, ranging from about 12 to 250 pupils. The schools offer programs on the same levels as the non-private Dutch secondary schools. In

¹ Next to a full program, the schools offer the possibility to study for certificates in one or several subjects.

² In the Netherlands, secondary schooling is a hierarchical system characterised by a high degree of formal differentiation, from pre-university (VWO) at the top, followed by HAVO, which prepares for higher vocational college, till vocational education (VMBO) at the bottom. Students are selected for the different types of education at the end of primary school, at the age of about twelve, on the basis of the results of a formal test and the advice of the primary school.

2002, around a third of the students studied on pre-university level, nearly half on a level that qualified for admission to higher vocational colleges and 15% attended courses giving access to secondary vocational schools only. The schools do not provide courses at the lowest level of the Dutch secondary educational hierarchy, lower vocational training.

The schools emphasize their pedagogical approach: intensive coaching, personal attention, assistance with learning problems, enforcement of strict discipline regarding attendance and punctuality, and very strict rules for behaviour in class. All schools have long school hours, approximately from 8.30 a.m. to five or six p.m. and work with much smaller groups than in the regular schools: six to twelve pupils in most courses versus about twenty in regular schools. The main characteristic of the private schools is their strict regimen. They have an intake procedure in which the student's motivation is assessed and the rules are explained. At some such schools students are required to sign a contract in which they promise to follow these rules. In the first place, the rules apply to homework and attendance. Students do their homework under supervision of a teacher or supervisor in fixed 'study hours'; during the lessons homework is inspected. Those who do not finish their homework or fail a test must remain in school till six or seven o'clock in the evening, stay longer on Friday night, or return to school on Saturday morning. School attendance is enforced strictly. Everyone who is even five minutes late in the morning, no matter what the cause is, must come earlier the next day, remain after school hours that afternoon, or return on Saturday. When pupils miss a class, their parents are promptly informed; in cases of illness parents are immediately requested to provide a written statement to confirm this. Students are under intensive surveillance. The headmaster or -mistress knows every student personally, he or she takes to task anyone who misbehaves or does not perform well and reports unsatisfactory grades to the parents. Teachers are constantly trying to keep the students in line. The small classes allow them to see everything the pupils do and whoever is boisterous, sits and stares or does not pay attention is noticed immediately. Strict control goes hand in hand with attention to personal problems, and help is offered with learning problems.

In recent years, the number of students attending private schools has increased considerably: from 1368 in 1988 to 2284 in 2002. In these years, private schools have extended their market position from 0.9% to 1.8% of all students on the school levels offered by private schools.³ In this article, we will try to offer an explanation for the growth of private

³ We calculated these percentages on the basis of statistics provided by Statistics Netherlands (1998, 2000). The number of students attending private schools was compared to all students attending the final year of secondary education, except for lower vocational education.

education by focusing on the ambivalences in family socialization and the educational problems which result from these.

3. THEORY

A host of research from various countries shows that, on the average, children from the middle and upper-middle classes perform better in school than children from lower classes and that they more often attend the higher forms of education (cf. Bourdieu & Passeron 1977; Lareau 1989; Shavit and Blossfeld 1993; Ball et al. 1995; Gewirtz et al. 1995; Goldthorpe 1996; Breen & Goldthorpe 1997; Power et al. 2003). One of the explanations is that their parents are more ambitious about educational achievements, are oriented towards high levels of school performance, know the educational field better and, more in general, have more opportunities to provide their children with the cultural capital required for school success. These parents have not only high expectations of educational success of their children, but the overall rise in levels of qualifications has made them aware that such success is needed for entrance into middle-class jobs.

However, this goal is not always attained. Statistics indicate that a substantial amount of children do not reach their parent's level of education (Van der Werf 2002; see for England Power et al. 2003).⁴ The transfer of cultural capital to the next generation is far from automatic. Children may lack in cognitive skills, they may resist parental demands or reject the educational goals of their parents altogether. So, parents can never be sure that their offspring will be able or willing to follow the long educational trajectories that are needed for reproducing the social position of their parents. The 'middle-class anxiety' (Ehrenreich 1989) about downward mobility is grounded in the realisation that the outcome of the socialisation process can never be secured and that educational success is never guaranteed. Parents cannot pass down their cultural assets or 'class capital' like an heirloom; their cultural capital has to be converted into educational qualifications by their children. The chance that this will fail makes them into a 'fearful middle-class' (Ball and Vincent 2001). Fearful, because 'contemporary educational perspectives and practices of the middle classes are shaped and informed by a set of fears and concerns about social and economic reproduction' (idem: 183). In general, reproduction theorists paid too little attention to the micro processes of intergenerational reproduction (cf. Bourdieu and Passeron 1977; Bourdieu 1984, 1996; De

⁴ In the Netherlands, 40% of children of fathers with a college education and 20% of children of fathers with a university degree followed secondary education on a level not preparing for college or university (Van der Werf 2002).

Graaf et al. 2000). Such analyses show that parents have to put in a lot of ‘work’ to manage their children in an effective way in order that these learn to activate the social and cultural resources presented to them (Lareau 1989; Power et al. 2003). Chin (2000) explored the different forms of ‘emotional labour’⁵ parents perform to push their children through the application process for an elite private high school. ‘Creating motivation’, even if children are themselves dead set against entering such a school, demanded the use of incentives and punishments, emotional support and threats regarding the future, pushing and comforting in a precarious balance.

On the part of young people, a successful conversion of parental cultural capital into educational credentials asks for self-regulation, self-motivation and self-restraint. Adolescents have to defer gratification of needs and wishes and to practice foresight where immediate pleasures are tempting. This self-discipline has to be learned from an early age on.

The typical socialization practices that have developed in the decades after World War II are implicitly and explicitly oriented to teaching these capabilities. Beginning in the upper-middle classes, relationships between parents and children have become more egalitarian, requiring new and different forms of control and self-control from both parents and children. Disciplinary techniques changed from what Basil (1971, 1975b) has called a ‘visible’ to an ‘invisible’ pedagogy or, in De Swaan’s (1984) words, from ‘management by command’ to ‘management by negotiation’ (see also Elias 1978; Wouters 1999). This new mode of control, characterised by implicit and flexible rules and an ‘elaborated code of communication’, allows for a more personalised mode of interaction and offers children more freedom of expression. Such socialisation is oriented towards the learning of a flexible and differentiated management of emotions and a high degree of self-control.

Bernstein, Elias, Wouters, De Swaan, and others have pointed out that the invisible pedagogy originated in the new middle classes, precisely the positions in social space in which cultural or symbolic capital increasingly replaced economic capital as the most important resource for the intergenerational transfer of class positions, and educational qualifications became paramount. Various empirical studies on parent-child relations have documented this change. More than parents from lower social strata, middle- and upper-middle-class parents negotiate about which behaviour is appropriate in particular circumstances instead of obedience and enforcement of fixed rules (Bernstein 1971, 1975b;

⁵ The concept ‘emotional work’ or ‘emotional labour’ is borrowed from Hochschild (1983). See also Stearns (1994).

Du Bois-Reymond 1992, 1995; Torrance 1995). In this way they try to socialise their offspring into self-determination, self-responsibility and self-control.

Although Bernstein and others show that an invisible pedagogy is in general more pervasive, and brings about the internalisation of expected behavioural standards that are conducive to academic success, this mode of control also knows ambiguities which may hamper its success. Parents have to prepare their offspring for self-development and self-responsibility, but also for functioning in the hierarchies of school and social class. This asks for a great amount of fine-tuning, of restraining and letting go in a precarious equilibrium, and makes the outcomes of the socialization process uncertain. If parents are too lenient or too strict, children may not learn to regulate their emotions according to expectation. In the upper-middle class upbringing based on negotiation and agreement, giving in is the greater risk, and children may not sufficiently be socialized in the discipline needed to function in the demanding educational hierarchy. If adolescents are inclined to act on spontaneous impulses and yield to the many temptations that are offered to them, they will come in conflict with the demands the school put to them, and may be unable to follow the educational pathway that is required to continue the parental class positions (Bernstein 1971; 1975a; Power & Whitty 2002).

The ambivalences that are part of modern child rearing may lead to the kinds of disciplinary problems that secondary schools at all levels face. Schools are confronted with ‘emancipated’ pupils averse to hierarchical and authoritarian control. Moreover, teachers, too, lean towards a more egalitarian style of interaction, negotiate with pupils about rules and conduct. But by doing so they expect from students a fair amount of self-discipline. After all, when young people cannot subject to the requirements of the school, they may fail to reach the expected level or even drop out. For upper-middle-class parents, who are deeply aware of the importance of the highest qualifications for the reproduction of their class position, the failure to live up to the parental expectations may turn into a threat of downward mobility.

The choice for private education in the Netherlands will be analysed in the light of the foregoing processes. We will focus on the relationship between the increasing importance of educational qualifications, the habitus needed to attain these qualifications and the ambiguities in the modes of control which have developed between adults and children in the decades after World War II.

4. THE RESEARCH

We present the results of a research among Dutch upper-middle-class parents who resorted to one of the eleven private schools mentioned above. The study consisted of two parts. Firstly, in 1998 we held in-depth interviews with 37 Dutch parents who had one or more children in a private school. We interviewed 21 mothers, nine fathers, and seven couples. Part of the respondents were found via the website of the largest school, Luzac College, giving the names and places of residence of all pupils passing their exams in a certain year. From this list we took a sample of 50 names, covering the whole of the Netherlands. By letter and telephone this sample was requested to give an interview. In this way we contacted 25 respondents; 12 were approached through contacts with the other schools, through personal contacts. In addition to the parents, we interviewed 20 pupils (thirteen boys, seven girls), fifteen of them were children of the adult respondents.

The interview questions focused on the school career, educational problems and their causes, choice of a private school, financial considerations, experiences with the private school compared to the regular school and ambitions for the future. The interviews were transcribed verbatim and linked up in a database. With the help of a computer program for the analysis of qualitative data we looked for patterns in the narratives and distilled the main themes which will be presented in this article.

In a follow-up study in the year 2000 we distributed a questionnaire to a larger sample of parents. The addresses were provided by the schools. From the larger schools we took a sample, from the smaller schools we sent questionnaires to all the parents. In total 836 questionnaires were distributed, 365 were returned, a response rate of 44%. We posed similar questions as in the interviews and asked to give an opinion on a five-point scale about a variety of statements. In this article we will mainly analyse the interview data and only give some descriptive statistics from the survey to back up this analysis (see for the results of the whole research de Regt & Weenink 2003; Weenink & de Regt 2003).

4.1 Description of the sample

From the interviews as well as the questionnaires emerged that the educational and occupational level of the parents were far above the Dutch average. Of the 37 fathers, 25 had a university degree, nine had higher vocational college and only three had no more than secondary schooling. Mothers were somewhat lower educated than the fathers: twenty had a degree from a higher vocational college or university and fifteen only secondary education; two were unknown. This was in line with the data from the questionnaire; three quarters of the fathers and nearly 60% of the mothers had finished tertiary education, compared to about

30% of the Dutch population. Fathers worked in a variety of professional and higher managerial jobs: they were doctors, lawyers, professors and managers, and more than a quarter were self-employed entrepreneurs; a third of the mothers were housewives, the others worked (mostly part-time) in jobs ranging from judge and doctor to infant teacher and home attendant for the elderly. Their net household income, as was indicated in the questionnaire, was between 68.000 and 80.000 euro, which means they belong to the 0.5% most affluent households in the Netherlands. More than a third of the families reported a net household income of 91.000 euro or more. On the basis of education, occupation and income we classified the fathers in the EGP-class scheme (Erikson and Goldthorpe 1992). Three quarters were upper service class (large entrepreneurs, higher managers and professionals), 15% lower service class (lower managers and semi-professionals) and 10% small self-employed.

Of the students we interviewed, seven were in private school at the time of the interview, thirteen had left the private school, with or without a certificate and were in advanced education (seven of them) or had taken on a job (six of them).

4.2 Why private education?

The data from the interviews and the survey showed that parents and children turned to the private sector after a prolonged period of educational problems. These problems became acute when students had to repeat a full year's curriculum, failed their examinations, were referred to a lower school type, played truant, or were expelled from school. Asked why they had chosen for private education, parents in the survey mentioned a great variety of reasons. From a given checklist they could tick all the reasons that applied to their child. In total they marked 1,152 reasons, which we condensed in the following table. From the interviews it became clear that parents and students defined and explained these problems in various ways. Although some pointed to learning problems like dyslexia or fear of failure, the large majority mentioned reasons that can be subsumed under the headings of motivational and behavioural problems. We speak about motivational problems when students failed in school because - in the words of parents and youngsters alike - they did 'nothing at all' or 'mucked around'. Some of the adolescents did nothing because they had more exciting things to do than going to school and completing their homework.

Table 1 Reasons for choosing a private school

<i>Reason</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Child repeated a class (twice)	127	11,0
Child was no longer motivated	124	10,8
Lack of attention of teachers	121	10,5
Child no longer did schoolwork	90	7,8
Child no longer interested in school	79	6,9
Too much distraction	76	6,6
Fear of failure	68	5,9
Wanted individualised education	49	4,3
Failed final examinations	49	4,3
Fear of upcoming curricular innovations	46	4,0
Referred to lower level	39	3,4
Child did not fit in at school	38	3,3
Dyslexia	38	3,3
Bad friends	33	2,9
Truancy	32	2,8
Wanted to obtain higher marks	32	2,8
Behaviourial problems	27	2,3
Wanted to obtain certificate faster	21	1,8
Child expelled from school	20	1,7
Heavy drug use	5	0,4
Other reasons	38	3,3
Total	1.152	100,0

Source: survey data on parents, collected by the authors in 2000.

To their parents' exasperation, they spent much of their time amusing themselves: seeing friends, engaging in sports, watching television, playing computer games, and other pastimes. These young people had the happy-go-lucky attitude of 'tomorrow is another day'. As one of the boys said: '*why work if you can have fun*'. Looking back to this period of their lives, adolescents explained that they could not focus on their homework and were easily diverted when something more pleasant turned up. As one boy explained: '*I could not get*

down to it.... Yes, I had good intentions, but ... I never could find the time. I had other things to do, go out, sports. I really neglected it. Yes, you think, school is important, I have to do it too, but ...'. Parents tell similar stories. A couple living near a lake explains what happened with their sons: *'Here is always something to do. When there was ice, the grades on their Christmas report fell by several points. Really! Friends came along.... Skating ... And in summer boating started again'*. Parents point out that 'nowadays' there is a lot to distract their children from schoolwork, much more than in their own youth. But while they complain about the many diversions available to their children, they are also proud of their children's 'sociability' and stress the usefulness of social activities. Not all unmotivated adolescents were involved in more pleasurable activities. Some parents told their children just detested school so strongly that they could not go on anymore, without being able to point out what it was that they hated so much.

Behavioural problems at school as well as at home were mentioned as a second reason to opt out of regular education. The exact behaviour was not extensively discussed, but parents referred to unruliness, wildness, bad tempers, and so on. These students not only 'did not do anything', but were extremely troublesome as well. At school they were insolent, inattentive, and unruly; they did not do homework, played truant or did not attend school at all. They were expelled from school, had to go to another school or were referred to a lower school type. A mother tells about her son's behaviour: *'He was such a pain in the neck. You know them, those troublemakers in class, did nothing at all. So at home I was in constant conflict with him. At a certain moment, I was more in school than he was; there was always something bad he had done'*. In four or five cases the problems worsened when the adolescents used drugs. According to the parents, the effects on their children were severe: indifference, total lack of motivation, and lack of concentration: *'So he did nothing at all. Was home a lot, went out a lot. He also smoked pot [marijuana] a lot'*. Some of the boys had run-ins with the police because of stealing or drug dealing; they could not stay in a regular school any longer and had to go to a school for troublesome kids. The adolescents themselves who, according to their parents, had severe behavioural problems, did not explain what their difficulties were. They called their conduct 'childish' or 'immature'. Perhaps it was too painful for them to talk about the past or to present themselves in an unfavourable light to an interviewer. With the concepts 'childish' or 'immature' they normalised their earlier behaviour. An extreme example is a boy who started secondary education at pre-university level, was expelled from school, went to increasingly less demanding schools and ended at a

special school for students with behavioural problems. He described what happened: smoking pot, associating with bad friends, and explained his conduct as follows: *'I mean, yes, you are growing up and you have fun, and in a way your parents are right, and you know it, but still you do it'*. Other students with similar backgrounds of behavioural problems and drugs use, spoke in analogous terms about their failure at school. Where parents described how desperate they were about the troublesome behaviour of their children, the adolescents themselves spoke more lightly about adolescent conduct, they told that life became 'too pleasant' or they were not inclined to say anything at all.

The motivational and behavioural problems of the students in this research can be conceptualised as problems of discipline, as defined by parents and students alike. The students could not bring themselves to give up instant pleasure for long-term goals. The extended schooling trajectories require students to have a strong orientation towards the future, which implies the ability to concentrate on schoolwork, even if it is experienced as boring and a waste of time, and defer gratification to a later period. Both parents and children saw this as exactly what was lacking. It is remarkable that the students themselves, even more frequently than the parents, used the words 'discipline' and 'self-discipline' in this context. A girl related why she failed at school: *'Well, I think that as to brains or IQ, I am a VWO-kid [pre-university level], but I don't have the discipline and the other skills that go along with it'*. A boy expresses a certain amount of jealousy towards others who succeeded at his regular school: *'Well, they just have the discipline to sit with their books. And that's what I am missing absolutely, and I hate that about myself, really. Because I should like to have it, but yes, I cannot get it done'*.

Parents, too, used the word 'discipline', but more often in the sense of control from outside. They talked about adolescence as a turbulent period in young people's lives and stressed that in this period their offspring needed more pressure from outside. Other adolescents did, in their opinion, 'just' what they had to do, went to school and put enough time and effort into homework, but their own children were different. They needed a 'strict hand' or a 'rod'; they 'asked for discipline' and had to be kept under control. In this sense the parents declared that their children had not internalized enough self-discipline to succeed in school. In the survey three quarters of the parents (strongly) agreed with the statement 'my child needed more discipline'.

The definition of school failure as a 'lack of discipline' was more frequently offered than other interpretations like learning problems and personal problems, although dyslexia

and fear of failure were also often mentioned, mostly in combination with other problems.⁶ Another explanation, lack of ability, was however denied. The respondents tried to convince us that failure had nothing to do with cleverness. They repeatedly argued that their children did not lack the cognitive capacities for the regular school, saying that they were ‘smart’ or ‘intelligent’ enough for the level at which they were enrolled, and pointed to the results of elementary school grades and tests to prove their point. Nor did the students refer to a lack of cognitive skills. They used the concept of ‘adolescence’ even more often than their parents to explain why they missed the discipline to succeed in school

The parents we interviewed belong to the higher social strata in Dutch society. In these strata in particular, self-discipline is seen as an essential attitude. It is indispensable for maintaining one's position in the complex webs of interdependencies which characterize the new work settings in which the more powerful sections of the middle-classes are involved. The types of occupations which gained dominance in the course of the last century require cultural capital and ‘people skills’ (Stearns 1994) more than inherited economic capital (Bourdieu 1984; 1996). But even when economic or organisational assets are the basis of middle-class positions, as is the case with for instance employers and managers, our data show that higher education often goes along with it (cf. Savage et al. 1992; Butler 1995). And all members of the upper-middle classes experience the necessity of self-discipline as central in their professional lives. Their positions give them autonomy, which asks for self-regulation, responsibility and a capacity for cooperation and coordination. Because their occupations are central junctions in the networks of interdependence in modern post-industrial societies, their actions have far-ranging consequences for others. Norbert Elias has argued that people, in order to attain and maintain powerful positions in such webs of interdependence, need a ‘constant hindsight and foresight in interpreting the actions and intentions of others’ (Elias 1978: 456). This does not only apply to their occupational positions, but to their position in society in general. People who are unable to conform to the standards of upper-middle-class social life may suffer loss of prestige. The anxiety to lose one’s status position presses members of the higher classes to control their affects and socialize their children into self-restraint. In addition, as Bourdieu has argued with regard to the ‘rough’ treatment of the students of the French *grandes écoles*, the ‘public proof of one’s self-control stands as proof of one’s right to control others’ (Bourdieu 1996: 110).

⁶ As we saw in table 1, of the 1152 reasons mentioned to choose for a private school, 5.9% was fear of failure, 3.3% dyslexia.

So, it is no wonder that the parents in our research worry about their children's lack of self-discipline. Without this orientation, children will not be able to get the type of high school certificate which is required for entrance into college, and a college degree in its turn is what provides entry to the same prestigious and well-paid jobs as the parents have. Added to that: when children are not able to internalize the right habits, they cannot maintain their place in the social circles of their parents. In those cases the threat of downward mobility becomes very real.

4.3 The difficult process of negotiation

At the interview, we asked the parents why they thought their children had failed in the regular school. It is not surprising that, in that context, they discussed their own role in explaining the educational problems of their children. In their stories, two themes came to the surface. Firstly, they asked themselves if they might have been too lenient, secondly, if they might have been too ambitious.

Most parents we interviewed pointed out that they were in favour of a certain degree of equality between parents and children and rejected rigid discipline. They stressed that adolescents need a fair amount of freedom and should have an important voice in what they do and how they spend their time: management by negotiation is clearly their ideal. But most parents denied that they have been too lax. They told that they are 'fairly strict', that they apply certain standards of behaviour and ask for a certain amount of 'discipline'. They said not to be inclined to give in to every wish of their offspring, and not to avoid quarrels about getting up in time for school, homework, friends, hobbies, television, and other daily activities which conflicted with school work. Sometimes, they told, the family atmosphere was tense because of shouting and slamming of doors.

Yet, they also intimated to find it difficult to bind their children to the rules. Some pointed to specific circumstances, like illness, work demands or divorce, which prevented them from keeping to the rules. A mother who helped her husband who was a general practitioner: *'I tried to be consequent. But then I had to deal with phone calls from patients. And then I was distracted and I had forgotten what had happened and he was gone already'*. And a father who went to see a child therapist with his difficult son: *'And those people thought we were not strict enough. Did not set enough limits. Yes, how is it with such a child. You tell him to stay inside. And then he escapes through the window'*. But more often the parents' problem was how to be strict when the egalitarian parent-child relations made it difficult to delineate the boundary between freedom and lack of control. In these families,

where person-centred modes of control with negotiation as the main technique were current, parents had to confront the dilemma of how to make their children do what they wanted them to do and yet not seem to be dictating their behaviour. Problems occurred when negotiation did not work and adolescents disregarded their parents' wishes. In those cases, parents felt unable to force their playful, lazy, unwilling or unruly child to conform to the minimum standards they had in mind. *'What can you do?'*, they asked. One couple expands on how difficult it is to get their sons to do homework: *'You cannot force them'*, a father says. And the father who was thinking about locking up his son to do homework but expected him to escape through the window: *'You cannot stop him'*. Parents also feel unable to be more strict in enforcing the rules, because it disturbs the family atmosphere as everybody suffers under the nagging, the quarrels and conflicts.

On the point of parental discipline, the children agreed with their parents: in their opinion their parents were strict enough. Although they conceded that maybe their parents gave in a little too quick sometimes, they argued that when their parents tried a more severe regime, this mainly worked out the other way round. A boy told how 'sick' he got from his mother's nagging: *'A small example. Tidy your room. Did you tidy your room? Why didn't you tidy your room? Your room is a mess. At a certain point I get so fucked up that I knock the place about'*. Another boy told that he 'totally flipped' when his father tried a more strict approach, others said they became 'recalcitrant' by too much enforcement of rules.

A second consideration when asked about the reasons for school failure, is ambition. Although parents often say they do not want to 'reach too high', or to be 'pushy', they clearly demand that their children, if they have the intellectual ability, at least complete a secondary school that allows entry to tertiary education. Parents know from experience that one can only achieve something in life when one is willing to work hard for it. They hate it when their children 'just idle', make fun, are not serious enough, and do not think about their future. Explicitly, parents told us that their children should do whatever they themselves want to do with their lives and not what their parents have in mind, but implicitly they showed that they have high ambitions. Parents stimulate their offspring to reach for the highest levels of education that will 'take them somewhere'. A mother commented on what she had in mind for her son: *'He wanted to go to a secondary vocational school. But I said, get your pre-university certificate first, and then you can go everywhere'*. Children should not 'waste' the talents that are so clearly there, but 'bring them into the open'. Parents demanded for instance that they strive for the highest marks - not a B or a C when an A is possible - and do not skip difficult subjects. A girl who aspired to go to drama school, was advised by her parents to

choose a more profitable occupation. Then she wanted to be a doctor, like her father. Because she was weak in mathematics, she considered dropping that subject. Her mother described how she and her husband reacted: *'Then we said: come on, add a little extra work'*.

Parents expected that their children would finish high school, go on to higher vocational college or university, and finally end up in 'attractive' jobs. In a way they succeeded in transferring those aspirations to their offspring. The students at the interview said to aspire to hold future positions that are not very different from those of their parents, that is to say: a service class job, a high salary, and all the other privileges of an upper-middle-class lifestyle. To attain that lifestyle, they knew that they had to sacrifice some immediate pleasures and subject themselves to the educational regime in the first place, and they admitted that their parents had a point. However, they were not able or inclined to translate their aspirations into action, and rebelled instead against parental pressure to achieve in school.

In these circumstances, a vast amount of 'emotional labour' is needed. In our research, parents tried in the first place to stimulate their children by helping with homework. On the one the hand, students appreciated this support. *'My mother always tried to help me, because I had such difficulties to learn. Especially the first year, which was so important'*, told a boy. But even he said he rebelled against the intensive surveillance this implied and tried to escape. Especially with the most problematic children, help with homework led to more and deeper conflicts. Another way to motivate children was to make an appeal to their 'own good'. Parents tried to convince their offspring that they have to work 'for themselves', 'for their own future' and not because their parents or teachers want them to. They argued that compliance would guarantee them a good job, a high income and a nice house. The opposite technique was to present a dismal future if children did neglect their schoolwork. In that case they were threatened to end up as 'garbage man', a 'cashier in a supermarket', a 'shop assistant' or in another position at the bottom of the occupational hierarchy. A girl explained how her parents argued: *'If you did not want to study, my parents said 'all right, why don't you go and work as a cashier at Albert Heijn [a well-known super market chain]'*? And at a certain moment, Albert Heijn upgraded its demands. Then they said, *'If you don't study a bit harder, you won't even be taken on as a cashier at Albert Heijn'*. And a father told what he said to his son: *'If you continue like that, then you get somebody above you who says: 'do this and do that'. That's not pleasant'*. When persuasion, seduction, threats, pleas or the promise of gratification in the future did not change the adolescent's behaviour, parents sometimes resorted to more open sanctions: no pocket money, no television, locking up the computer

room, home arrest. But they themselves had little faith that these sanctions would help: *'that does not work at this age'*. To promise material rewards was an alternative that some parents tried: money, a scooter, a holiday. But those promises did not work either. As one boy explained: *'It sounded OK, but I did not feel like it and so it just did not happen'*.

The interviews led us to conclude that parents were intensively involved with their children's schooling. This fits the results of a research about the stronger academic orientation and the higher level of involvement among high socioeconomic status parents in the USA (Crosnoe 2001). Such research also showed that when their children grew older and performed well, the children of higher socioeconomic status families were granted more autonomy. As the students in our study did not perform well, parents' involvement in their children's schooling remained at a high level, even when the students were far in their teens.

In general, the adolescents responded to such pressure with ambivalence. On the one hand, they agreed that education is important. Therefore, they could understand that their parents worried and pushed a bit. But on the other hand, they hated the involvement of their parents. They said to 'go crazy' when their mother interfered, inquired about homework or grades. They rebelled against the pressure of parents, did not listen to their father's 'preachings', became angry and even obstinately refused to do anything at all. Some not only rebelled against their parents' interference with school, but against their high ambitions in general. They told their parents were 'never satisfied', that they set their goals too high and paid too little attention to their children's limitations. They felt that their parents believed that they had to achieve in everything they did, and tried to resist that pressure by 'doing nothing'. This was for instance very clear in the case of a boy who told his father was never content with his achievements. He rebelled against the pressure to succeed, not only in school, but also in sports and music; because they kept hounding him, he became 'recalcitrant', did nothing for school and reacted with deviant behaviour.

When parental strategies did not take effect, and students rebelled overtly or covertly against the demands, parents had no alternatives. When the negotiation process failed and adolescents could not bring themselves to the self-control needed to succeed in school, parents were left empty-handed. In those cases they saw a solution in more external control: their children should be disciplined by an external agent. They confessed that they themselves are unable to provide that outside control: their emotional labour had had no effect, and they did not have the power to force their children. Therefore, they argued, social control must come from authorities outside the family, from 'strangers' who have the power to force young people to do what they should do. Teachers should be such authorities. But to their

disappointment, teachers too failed to discipline the adolescents, as parents point out in their criticisms of the regular school.

4.5 Indifferent schools

Asked what went wrong in their offspring's school career, parents have as much to say about the regular school as about their own role in the process. In one way or another, they blame the regular school for failing to discipline their children. But in this respect, too, they show a fair amount of ambivalence about how disciplinary the school must be. None of the parents expressed nostalgia for the past when schools functioned much more as disciplinary institutions (cf. Maynes 1985; Paterson 1985; De Swaan 1988; De Vries 1993). The shift from traditional disciplinary methods based on strict obedience and corporal punishment to more permissive socialization techniques and to negotiations between teachers and pupils on a more egalitarian basis, was approved by all parents. Only one mother, used to the more formal interactions in a British international school, criticized teachers for being too informal and disapproved that teachers and students were on first-name terms.

While expecting non-authoritarian relationships, parents demanded at the same time that schools should be more strict. What is meant by 'good discipline' is open to interpretation (cf. Coldron & Boulton 1996). In our interviews, it depended on the interpretation of the student's problems how discipline was defined. Parents talked about a lack of control, too much freedom, too little supervision of homework, too much ignored truancy, and '*too little structure*', as one mother put it. One father, exasperated about his son's troublesome behaviour explained: '*But the principal point was that the schools did not have the means to control these children. Classes contained 30 or more students, and teachers went from one class to the other, with hardly any time to assess and deal with difficult students*'. Parents complained that there were too many free hours, that lessons were cancelled frequently because of teachers' illness, meetings, or courses, and that pupils were left on their own during these times. In such circumstances the students went into town, visited coffee shops, roamed the streets, or engaged in all kinds of activities parents did not want them to do. Maybe, they admitted, this freedom is not problematic for most students, but for their offspring, who lacked self-discipline, it is disastrous. The complaint that rules were not enforced, was especially strong when students were frequent truants. Some parents indignantly told that the school did not alert them in time: their children were absent for weeks before they received any notice of it. Because they could not depend on their children

being in school when they were supposed to be there, parents felt that they did not receiving help from the school in disciplining their offspring.

Interestingly, however, the plea for stricter enforcement of rules and the demand for more structure was intertwined with a demand for a child-centred, understanding attitude. All parents, irrespective of their children's problems, complained most about the lack of attention to the individual needs of their children. In the survey, more than 85% said their child got not enough attention. According to parents, that was the main reason why the problems could not be solved. If teachers had only noticed the particular needs of their child and dealt with these needs, a solution would have been possible. Parents offered various explanations for what they call the 'indifference' of schools towards individual students. But although they admitted that teaching is not easy, they still reproached the schools for its lack of attention. They argued that teachers are not involved enough, do not address the problems, and do not confer with parents about what should be done. There is too little time and attention for students with learning problems, and students with motivational and behavioural problems are not stimulated but demoralized. *'Teachers were always negative'*, they said, *'he was always in the picture when something happened'*, *'they could not stand his behaviour'* or *'had got enough of him'*.

In this respect, parents ask from teachers the same attitudes towards children as has been developed within the family. They expect what in a family context is called a 'love-oriented' socialization, in which adults identify with children, take their impulses, needs and wishes serious and act upon them, differentiate between individual children and treat them according to their capacities and peculiarities. This socialization pattern gained dominance after World War II and is part of the 'invisible pedagogy' in upper-middle-class families. Parents believed that only individual involvement and working on the heart of their children could motivate their offspring to conform to the standards.

The regular school has difficulties to provide what parents asked. An individualising approach is hard to attain in schools, where classes are often crowded and class teaching is the norm. A successful school career demands adjustment to certain general standards of behaviour. This asks for self-discipline, motivation to follow the lessons, subordination of individual needs to the order of the group, and self-control to forgo certain pleasures in order to study. At the same time, the more egalitarian relationships between teachers and students have complicated the teaching process. Teachers can no longer rely on their position of authority. Just as parents, they have to negotiate, stimulate, cajole and seduce students to conform to the standards and engage in academic work. To succeed, teachers are more than

ever dependent on the self-motivation of students and when motivation is low, it becomes nearly impossible to discipline pupils.

Thus, the parents in our research asked from the regular school a combination of intensive surveillance and enforcement of strict rules with personal commitment and attention to individual needs. And although they recognized that their complaints about the regular schools stemmed from the fact that their children did not conform to the standards, and admitted that the regular school is 'OK' when students behave as they are supposed to and achieve as they are expected to, they demanded a different approach for their children. Only with a combination of more discipline and more individual attention could their undisciplined or unmotivated children be brought back on the right track, achieve in an expected way and finally pass their examinations. As these demands were not met, they turned to the private sector, to schools which promised to offer exactly that system.

6. CONCLUSION

Fee-paying private schools in the Netherlands, although increasing in number and in student population, attract only a fraction of all students in secondary education. Still, the emergence of these schools has wider implications, because the societal trends that gave rise to private schooling have touched much more children and their families.

The first development is the overall rise in levels of educational qualifications between successive generations. The intensified pressure to obtain educational credentials is true for all young people, and most parents urge their children to acquire qualifications. Middle-class parents are not special in this respect. They are special, however, in the high hopes they have for their children's level of education - preferably a college degree - and in the expectancy that their offspring is 'destined for success' (Power et al. 2003). But the reproduction of cultural capital is never unproblematic and middle-class parents, too, may be confronted with unexpected failure: their children perform on too low a level or reject the aspiration of educational success altogether. Extended school careers require a habitus that enables young people to subject themselves to the educational regime for a long period of their lives. The 'creation' of such a habitus asks from parents a great amount of emotional work, in a family context in which children have gained in power.

The form of socialization that is now dominant in the middle and upper-middle classes is oriented to self-direction and self-reliance. The pedagogy is person-centred, directed to the creation of flexible personalities who are able of a differentiated management of emotions. Parents rely heavily on negotiation instead of command and control and do not use their

positional authority to enforce obedience to their standards. This 'invisible' pedagogy allows for a thorough and all-pervasive control, and is conducive to the transmittance of the kind of cultural capital and the self-discipline that are needed for an extended educational career. However, this style of upbringing has its own difficulties and ambiguities. Parents have to attune their rules to the personal characteristics of their children and stand them freedom to develop in their own way, but also must teach them to meet the demands that schools and other institutions dictate. To succeed, they have to balance between leniency and strictness, between freedom and discipline in such a way that their offspring internalises the appropriate standards needed for success.

The parents in our research noticed that they had not succeeded in achieving the right balance. Their adolescent children did not show the motivation and self-discipline that were needed to complete the lengthy period of education that was expected of them. They did not so much reject the educational goals of their parents or were indifferent to class continuation, but rebelled against the means to reach these goals. They 'did nothing' because they 'preferred' leisure and having fun to schoolwork, or would or could not conform to the behavioural standards the school asked of them. When support, enticement, pleas and threats did not work, parents had no power to control their children. Teachers in regular schools met with similar problems. They presuppose, especially at the higher educational levels, a certain degree of motivation, ambition, self-direction and willingness to work for school. When students miss the self-discipline to do so, or demand too much attention, regular schools are not equipped to help them or to take much pains to discipline them into conformity.

Of course, educational problems of this type are not confined to the middle- and upper-middle classes. As the parent-child relationships in all social classes have shifted towards more equality, and negotiation substituted hierarchical control in a greater or lesser degree, all parents are confronted with the threat that the balance between freedom and discipline tips to the side of freedom. And all secondary schools are confronted with the challenge to provide a teaching environment in which the mix between an invisible pedagogy and the need for external control is attuned to the cultural capital students bring with them.

However, our research points out that the solutions for these disciplinary problems are class-related. The parents that we interviewed used their financial resources and their knowledge of the educational system to procure an alternative route in the educational process. This route is hardly known to the members of other social classes: familiarity with the existence of private schools is limited. But even if these parents had have heard of this

route, the high tuition fees of private schools would have made this choice unaffordable for them.

Private education is confined to members of the wealthier sections of the population. When upper-middle class parents are confronted with the failure of their children to reach the higher levels of education, the continuation of their class position is at stake. When they find themselves unable to motivate their offspring for school or train them into the essential self-discipline to be successful, they may take recourse to private schools as a last resort. The disciplinary approach of these schools compensates for the lack of self-discipline of students and provides the social control that neither parents nor regular schools can give. In this way the private schools can enable students to pass their final examinations, prepare them for college or university, and so fend off the danger of a descent on the social ladder.

References

- Ball, S.J., Bowe, R. and Gewirtz, S. (1995) Circuits of Schooling: A sociological exploration of parental choice of schools in social class contexts, *The Sociological Review*, 43, 52-78.
- Ball, S. and Vincent, C. (2001) New Class Relations in Education: The Strategies of the 'Fearful' Middle Classes, in J. Demaine (ed.) *Sociology of education today* (Basingstoke etc.: Palgrave), 180-193.
- Bernstein, B. (1971) *Class, Codes and Control. Vol. 1, Theoretical Studies Towards a Sociology of Language* (New York: Schocken Books).
- Bernstein, B. (1975a) *Class, Codes and Control. Vol. 3, Towards a Theory of Educational Transmissions* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul)
- Bernstein, B. (1975b) *Class and Pedagogies: Visible and Invisible* (Paris: OECD).
- Bourdieu, P. and Passeron, J.C. (1977) *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture* (London: Sage).
- Du Bois-Reymond, M., Peters, E. (1990) Jongeren en hun ouders: van bevelshuishouding naar onderhandelingshuishouding [Young People and their Parents: From Management by Command to Management by Negotiation], *Amsterdams Sociologisch Tijdschrift*, 17: 171-207.
- Du Bois-Reymond, M. (1995) The Modern Family as a Negotiating Household. Parent-Child Relations in Western and Eastern Germany and in the Netherlands, in M. du Bois-Reymond al. (eds.) *Childhood and Youth in Germany and the Netherlands* (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter).
- Bourdieu, P. (1984) *Distinction. A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste* (London etc.: Routledge & Kegan Paul).
- Bourdieu, P. (1996) *The State Nobility: Elite Schools in the Field of Power* (Ca: Stanford University Press).
- Breen, R. and Goldthorpe, J.H. (1997) Explaining educational differences. Towards a formal rational action theory, *Rationality and Society* 9, 275-305.
- Butler, T. (1995) The debate over the middle classes, in T. Butler and M. Savage (eds.), *Social Change and the Middle Classes* (London: UCL, 1995), 26-39.
- Chin, T. (2000) Sixth Grade Madness: Parental Work in the Private High School Application Process, *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 29: 124-163.
- Coldron, J. and Boulton, P. (1996) What do parents mean when they talk about 'discipline' in relation to their children's school? *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 17: pp. 53-65.
- Cookson P. and Persell, C. (1985) *Preparing for Power. America's Elite Boarding Schools* (New York: Basic Books).

- Crosnoe, R. (2001) Academic Orientation and Parental Involvement in Education during High School, *Sociology of Education*, 74: 210-230.
- Erikson, R. and Goldthorpe, J.H. (1992) *The Constant Flux. A study of Class Mobility in Industrial Societies* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Ehrenreich, B. (1989) *The Fear of Falling. The Inner Life of the Middle Class* (New York: Harper Collins).
- Elias, N. (1978 [1939]) *The Civilizing Process. The History of Manners* (New York: Urizen Books).
- Fox, I. (1984) The Demand for a Public Education: A Crisis of Confidence in Public Schooling? in G. Walford (ed) *British Public Schools*. (London: The Falmer Press), 45-63.
- Gewirtz, S., Ball, S.J., Bowe, R. (1995) *Markets, Choice and Equity in Education* (Buckingham etc.: Open University Press).
- Goldthorpe, J. H. (1996) Class analysis and the reorientation of class theory. The case of persisting differentials in educational attainment, *British Journal of Sociology* 47, 481-505.
- De Graaf, N.D., De Graaf, P.M., Kraaykamp, G. (2000) Cultural Capital and Educational Attainment in the Netherlands: A Refinement of the Cultural Capital Perspective, *Sociology of Education*, 73, 92-111.
- Hochschild, A. (1983) *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling* (Berkeley: University of California Press).
- Johnson, D. (1987) *Private Schools and State Schools: Two Systems or One?* (Milton Keynes: Open University Press).
- Langouet, G. and Leger, A. (2000) Public and Private Schooling in France: An Investigation into Family Choice, *Journal of Education Policy*, 15: 41-49.
- Lareau, A. (1989) *Home Advantage: Social Class and Parental Intervention in Elementary Education* (London: Falmer Press).
- Maxwell, J. D. and, Maxwell, M. P. (1995) The Reproduction of Class in Canada's Independent Schools, *British Journal of Sociology*, 16: 309-326.
- Maynes, M. J. (1985) *Schooling for the People. Comparative Local Studies of Schooling History in France and Germany, 1750-1850* (New York/London: Holmes & Marks)
- Paterson, F. (1985) *Out of Place* (New York: The Falmer Press)
- Power, S. and Whitty, G. (2002) Bernstein and the Middle Class, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 23: 595-606.
- Power, S., Edwards, T., Whitty, G. and Wigfall, V. (2003) *Education and the Middle Class* (Buckingham: Open University Press).

De Regt, A. and Weenink, D. (2003) *Investeren in je kinderen. Over de keuze voor particulier onderwijs in Nederland*. [Investing in your children. The choice for private education in the Netherlands] (Amsterdam: Boom).

Salter, B. and Tapper, T. (1985) *Power and Policy in Education: the Case of Independent Schooling* (London/Philadelphia: Falmer).

Savage, M., Barlow, J., Dickens, P. and Fielding, T. (1992) *Property, Bureaucracy and Culture. Middle-class Formation in Contemporary Britain* (Routledge: London).

Shavit, Y. and Blossfeld, H.P. (eds.) (1993) *Persistent Inequalities: a Comparative Study of Educational Attainment in Thirteen Countries* (Boulder Colorado: Westview Press).

Statistics Netherlands (1998) *Yearbook Education 1998. Facts and figures gathered by Statistics Netherlands* (Voorburg/Heerlen: Samsom H.D. Tjeenk Willink bv).

Statistics Netherlands (2000) *Yearbook Education 2000 in numbers*. (Voorburg/Heerlen: Samsom H.D. Tjeenk Willink bv).

Stearns, P. N. (1994) *American Cool. Constructing a Twentieth-Century Emotional Style* (New York/London: New York University Press).

De Swaan, A. (1984) *The Management of Normality* (London/New York: Routledge).

De Swaan, A. (1988) *In Care Of The State: Health Care, Education and Welfare in Europe and The USA in The Modern Era* (Cambridge: Polity Press).

Teese, R. (1986) Private Schools in France: Evolution of a System, *Comparative Education Review* 30: 247-259.

Teese, R. (1998) Curriculum Hierarchy, Private Schooling and the Segmentation of Australian Secondary Education, 1947-1985, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 19: 401-417.

Torrance, K. (1995) *Contemporary Childhood: Parent-Child Relationships and Child Culture* (Leiden: DSWO).

De Vries, G. (1993) *Het pedagogisch regiem. Groei en grenzen van de geschoolde samenleving* [The Educational Regime. Growth and Limits of the Schooled Society], (Amsterdam: Meulenhof).

Walford, G. (ed.) (1984), *British Public Schools. Policy and Practice* (London: Falmer).

Walford, G. (ed.), (1989) *Private Schools in Ten Countries* (London/New York: Falmer).

Weenink, D. and De Regt, A. (2003) Particulier voortgezet onderwijs in Nederland: wie kiest ervoor en waarom? [Private Education in the Netherlands: who and why?] *Mens & Maatschappij*, 78: 100-118.

Van der Werf, G. (2002) Het succes van de middelbare scholier [The success of secondary school students], *Didaktief & School* 6, 30-32.

Wouters, C. (1999) Social Stratification an Informalization in Global Perspective, *Theory, Culture and Society*, 7, 69-90.

Van Zanten, A. and Robert, A. (2000) Plus ca change ...? Changes and Continuities in Educational Policies in France, *Journal of Education Policy*, 15: 1-4.