

What's in a Name?

The answer when it comes to some of the names chosen by Schools to designate buildings or houses is a great deal. The recent newspaper report that Holy Trinity Church of England Primary School in Richmond was changing the names of houses bearing the names of Winston Churchill and J K Rowling resulted in the usual backlash about woke gone mad and widespread scepticism of the claims that *"the children across school have been keen to change the names of some of the school houses to be more diverse"* and that *"the change was entirely driven and led by our pupils . . ."*

The decisions taken should, of course, be respected although one hopes that the reasons for change were properly explained to the pupils (aged three to eleven) and that they understood what is meant by transphobic and racism. Teaching diversity is a challenging, yet vital part of education today and schools do have a moral responsibility to take a lead – as I am sure the Headteacher Alison Bateman and the governors and Diocese of Southwark who were behind her decision, would agree. What is less explicable is why they chose the names of public figures in the first instance and continue to do so, rather than using the names of people who are connected to the school or of some incorruptible sentient beings, such as plants. After all, putting aside the concerns raised about Churchill and JK Rowling, the views and relevance of leading public figures can be transitory, set in time and place. Safer by far to look elsewhere, to their founders and alumni, to their geography and their own history.

Most public schools are traditionally more cautious: Harrow, who count Churchill amongst their alumni, has a tradition of naming most of its boarding houses after their founding housemasters (a title that was still being used for their first woman 'housemaster' appointed in 2014). Others such as Radley, where they call their houses 'socials' label them simply A – L; Sherborne, where houses are named after previous headmasters and buildings; and nearby Sherborne Girls, where the names of several former Headmistresses are commemorated all take a more conservative view. Of other leading girls' schools, Benendon has a mix of names, most from established local families whose land and buildings have become part of the School and tree names (Oak, Elm, Birch and Ash are always a safe bet); while Heathfield uses the names of inspirational women: Austen, Somerville, De Valois and Seacole. In some of the other schools I have known, the houses were called red, green, yellow and blue (although I can see even these would draw comment today); Aiden, Cuthbert, Oswald and Durham (clearly a good ecclesiastical institution); and Greeks, Romans, Trojans and Normans, reckoning that going back that far was safe.

I can sense today that those schools with houses named after Raleigh or Cook and certain battles of historic events or particularly, with connections with slavery are feeling a little nervous, but rather than being defensive, what is needed is a conversation and a re-

examination about what the school stands for and the choices it made, and continues to make, in relation to its values and mission statement. Attitudes and values change and there is nothing shameful about reappraising past decisions and rectifying them if needs be. We are all learning, and if there is a lesson for us, it is for the need to listen and to learn what to hold onto and what to change – for change we must. Society is moving at a pace that is often bewildering to the older generation whose default position is too often blinkered or even reactionary instead of accommodating. Samantha Price Headmistress of Benendon wrote last week:

"This so-called 'woke' generation are actually simply young people who care about things: about causes, about the planet, about people. It ultimately comes down to something very simple: being kind"

cautioning against the older generation dismissing the

"energetic changes of this generation" in "derogatory tones and sighs".

It is a point well made. Our children are growing up thinking differently about the world – and as adults, we should be thinking differently too.

Our History: A Problem of Definition

"I won't apologise for Britain or who we are as a nation and will stand up to people who talk down our country, our history and our values. I reject dehumanising identity politics, cancel culture and the voices of decline."

Liz Truss 21 July 2022

The reaction from Government ministers towards those promoting views contrary to the perceived national narrative – portrayed as 'our history' - have been hardening since the end of lockdown. The suggestion that showing aspects of British history that present the country in an unfavourable light are either woke or disloyal has become a common mantra with the best response to such movements as 'Black Lives Matter' and 'White Privilege' or to such ideas and movements as 'Critical Race Theory,' 'Gender Equality' and 'Women's Empowerment', being to ignore them.

This backlash to challenges to the status quo, led by conservative politicians and historians, claims that history is being held to ransom by non-partisan left-leaning academics has, in turn, placed pressure on schools and universities who are charged with delivering a curriculum determined by their paymasters. Historians, so often caught in the middle, have struggled to protect their subject from being subsumed to

fulfil a social or reactionary role or becoming marginalised, bobbing about on an ideological ocean.

All of which has left schools struggling with how to respond to the new ideas and interpretations, within the wriggle room of the national curriculum. The challenge to see history not just from one limited perspective, but from that of other perspectives, other cultures, other methodologies, is not new, but seldom addresses the fact that there are other places to start from when it comes to defining, researching and interpreting knowledge than just our western model. Indigenous historians, for instance would see 'decolonisation' quite differently to the colonisers from those who were (and are still) colonised: in one history, decolonisation is talked about in the past tense while in another, it is very much about the present and the future.

The government's argument is that the national curriculum provides the flexibility for history to be approached and interpreted in different contexts and across a wide range of topics, albeit more notable for what isn't included than what is, especially with the absence of any mandating. The curriculum remains a safe place to be, for teachers (and government), guarding a carefully crafted narrative, but that is not what History should be about.

The fear, tacitly encouraged, is that History, as a subject, is ready to implode into meaningless and divisive rhetoric, or worse still, disappear from our classrooms, an idea which seems as nonsensical as any of the theories that challenge it.

History might need to re-examine itself, but contrary to some scaremongering, that process does not have to threaten the national fabric or lead to hand wringing on behalf of the general populace. What it does require is an adult debate, freed from attempts to personify the subject and from political interference: simply, an answer to the question: what skills, processes, content should we be teaching our children under the banner of history.

It is the concern about the subject being hi-jacked that should worry us, and the failure of the subject to keep abreast with the latest research. For instance, to ignore the failings of positivism and the unconscious bias of language and content in so much we teach, we are failing our children, as we assume that new courses are the way to keeping history relevant. Yet it is not the content of the current curriculum that is caught in a sand-trap, but the skills and attitudes that students bring to each and every topic they study, so they can deal with 'intruder' knowledge and learn to see history from a better vantage. Even the nations favourite historical showcase, the Chalke Valley History Festival, is delivered almost exclusively in accordance with traditional western scholarship, methodology and research, with its obsession on war, (usually victories), adding to a national narrative wrapped round lineage and the maintenance of power, extolling travelers' tales and combining observation and opinion with a

potpourri of mythology, religion, capitalism and consumerism the latter two sitting alongside other better known -isms such as imperialism and colonialism), as well as legality and authority. When venturing offshore, there is a reluctance to explain the implicit power evident in our narrative / scholarship, by ignoring the polarity of language, faith, culture and social norms. Words like 'discovery', 'post-colonial', 'decolonization', 'tribe' 'primitive' 'self-determination' are used freely in our histories, as well as our interpretation of benefits bestowed, based on our western definitions of time and space, gender and land. All of this is supported by our positivist research, implying that there is only way that history can be presented. History has always been about power and the ownership of the story which is why its representation is disproportionately white and male. While we are mindful to try and tell both sides of History, the reality is we are telling both sides of our History, our story, which is not the same thing at all. It seems we accept that much of our History was something we did to others and our success in doing so was justification enough for owning the story and the methodology used to argue it.

But, to return to the main argument, it is not an insurmountable problem to address; nor will making students better informed to make their own judgements threaten national unity or seed division. If children are taught to see history as a moveable feast of facts from which we select and can understand the concept of contested knowledge, and to know that we present only one view, one history amongst many others, then we are half-way there.

E. H. Carr's acclaimed and influential book 'What is History' which became a key text in the study of historiography for the past sixty years first made the case that the facts of history are simply those which the historian selects for scrutiny. His fluent and wide-ranging account of the nature of history and the role of the historian argued that all history is to some degree subjective, written by individuals who are above all people of their own time. His attack on positivism, the idea that facts would simply "speak for themselves" and that gathering information is not influenced by the issues of language and translation, had a significant impact on how we look at history. His criticism of our dependence on 'facts' which had to be sifted, interpreted and analysed for their relevance and value in relation to the prevailing historical knowledge, reinforced his view that history could never be neutral, that historical facts were essentially *created* by the historian and not merely *discovered*. Although time has moved on and there have been many counter-arguments, much of what Carr expounded upon remains relevant today.

History has a number of roles, some complementary, some divergent. History can be used to provide a basis for national self-justification, to inform, to explain, to promote thought and discussion, to make us aware of differences and similarities etc. It is to inform us about the past and to do that, we need to first challenge a number of presumptions that existed at various times in our history and, indeed, in some

instances, are still prevalent. As an introduction to the idea of history as contested knowledge, these 'presumptions' can form the basis of discussion in which differences and bias are acknowledged resulting in a more balanced view of history

It is worth starting with some of the arguments presented by E H Carr when he first suggested a paradigm shift in the way we see history:

+ History is ultimately a subjective enterprise simply because the historian will always be limited by his subjective worldview.

+ Historical facts are never neutral nor objective. Students of history must study the historian before the historical facts

+ History is never neutral

+Historians pick and decide which facts deserved to be shown, the order they are shown, and their context. Since the past is itself filled with facts, these facts must therefore be sifted, interpreted and analysed for their relevance and value in relation to the prevailing historical knowledge

+Historical facts are thus seen as being essentially *created* by the historian and not merely *discovered*

+Nineteenth century historians believed that the meaning of history was implicit and self-evident and that everything will just fall in their proper places once the facts have been ascertained. Positivism is the philosophy behind this approach to History

In an article a decade or more ago, I suggested that we should challenge our students with a series of presumptions common to western scholarship:

These presumptions include:

1. An inherent belief that it is right to convert other peoples to a particular religion and that other faiths, especially polytheistic faiths, or simple belief systems are inferior to the Christian faith or other major world religion.
2. A belief in capitalism with GDP as its measure and the accumulation of wealth, both as a society and personally, through the private acquisition and ownership of land and property
3. A belief in the broad principles of Social Darwinism, particularly in the late 19th century and early 20th century.

4. A belief in the superiority of one race over another, of the cultures, habits, traits, behaviours of one race or culture over another, the use of the English (or other) language over other languages. Note Cecil Rhodes and Churchill on the subject.
5. An implicit master / servant, teacher / pupil, Britain / colony attitude to other countries often manifesting itself in cultural or racial language and actions.
6. A belief that technological superiority and the accumulation of wealth is a measure of civilization
7. A belief that the western attitude to land ownership overrides the lifestyles of nomadic, shared ownership and common land (ie Australian Aborigines, American Indian)
8. An acceptance of our written history, based on western research and scholarship, is the definitive history. We need to ask who wrote it, why and for what audience, to differentiate between myth, national narrative and history, and to consider other methodologies, especially those of indigenous peoples.
9. That our value judgements, based on our own experience and learning, are somehow superior to other interpretations of history.
10. That our definitions of taste, fashion, smell, culture, manners, cleanliness have primacy.
11. That our sense of decency, courtesies and moral code are a standard by which to make judgements.

Process: That we teach history by teaching understanding, by creating objective viewpoints, by getting children to question their own attitudes and ways they look at the world by using The Atticus Principle, even at a very young age

First of all," he said, "*if you can learn a simple trick, Scout, you'll get along a lot better with all kinds of folks. You never really understand a person until you consider things from his point of view - until you climb into his skin and walk around in it.*" Atticus talking to Scout in To Kill a Mockingbird

Linked-in August 2022

Lessons from the Reign of Elizabeth II

"It's all to do with the training: you can do a lot if you're properly trained."

Queen Elizabeth II

"Like all the best families, we have our share of eccentricities, of impetuous and wayward youngsters and of family disagreements."

Queen Elizabeth

The passing of Elizabeth is a profoundly moving moment for our Nation. Seventy years is a scarcely conceivable period of time for children to imagine, beyond the scope of their parents' lives and their imaginations. You need to be in your seventh decade to have lived under any other Monarch. During her reign as Queen of the United Kingdom and head of the

Commonwealth, the world changed beyond recognition, sometimes bumping from crisis to crisis and yet she remained steadfast, a seemingly unflappable presence, a touchstone in a topsy-turvy world.

Earlier this year, the country celebrated the Platinum Jubilee, a time for national celebration. Up and down the land, schools and classrooms were decked in bunting, as children studied the history of the Monarchy and celebrated the Queen's remarkable life. Children made special Jubilee cards and drew portraits for Her Majesty to add to the more than 200 Official portraits she had sat for; flags were raised and schools and communities celebrated with street parties as the Queen was talked about and celebrated. President Obama said of the Queen at the time, *'that Presidents come and go, (as do Prime Ministers – she has managed to see in fifteen), but that she remains a constant in our post-war history'*.

Of course, there were critics who felt the monarchy was an anachronism, remote and out-of-touch. But that would be to gravely under-estimate her own significance to our post-war history and to miss the most important lessons of her momentous reign.

For she did know her subjects. And despite never attending a school, she was very well-informed and had a greater grasp of people's realities than most of our politicians. She was beloved of her people and had the ability to communicate with people from every walk of life. While schools might focus on her place in history, on the statistics that inevitably are part of a reign of such duration, and on what happens next, it is her manner of her life that may well prove the greater legacy. When teachers talk of her reign over coming days, as well as lessons on constitutional monarchy, one hopes they will go beyond the façade to look what can we take from her life of service to teach our children that will endure: her selflessness; her unflagging energy and unwavering standards; her ability to deal with crises in a dignified way; her unflappable manner; her presence as an antidote to the celebratory culture; and her subsuming of self to the role for which she was destined.

These are the values we will remember her for: her ability to keep her head when all around her people were losing theirs; her sense of family values; and the mutual tolerance and understanding of person, country and Commonwealth. Values that fill school assemblies, yet need to be made real. How can we teach that?

We could start by highlighting this aspect of the Queen's life in our schools as a justification for revisiting the teaching of values, so popular in our schools three decades ago. We could pitch her legacy against the celebrity culture which highlights the showy and pretentious, the loud and the trivial, the cult of self and try to understand why she was who we turned to for moral leadership. We could talk of her modesty and humility – rare traits these days - and how willingly she accepted her birth-right as a duty and did not waver in executing it. She lived to serve her people. She had the same family difficulties faced by so many of her subjects and sometimes got things wrong. Yet, despite her age, she never talked of retirement or hardship, nor did she dwell on the hundred and one frustrations and irritations she laboured with day after day. Even the death of her beloved husband, the Duke of Edinburgh was met with stoicism

and dignity. Her life was one of unstinting service, accepting the duties she had placed upon her without a murmur or feeling of imposition; a life of service that is an exemplar for all of us.

How will our children understand that? And how will our schools respond in drawing from her life the most important lessons of all? At a time when people just want their ten minutes of fame, she represented an antidote to the superficial and the trivial. In the selfish world of 21st century Britain, her selflessness stood out like a beacon. As we educate our children to be aspirational and measure their achievements in grades, we would do well to replicate her example and promote success in more human terms, through manners, humility, service, devotion, and selflessness. They may sound old-fashioned traits, but they epitomised her reign and are surely worth a more prominent place in our schools over the weeks ahead.

Building Trust: The Challenge for Independent Schools

Published on February 1, 2022

'Those are my principles, and if you don't like them . . . well, I have others.' Groucho Marx
'Intelligence plus character - that is the goal of true education' Martin Luther King Jr

In December, the results of the latest IPPR thinktank poll on what we think of our politicians showed a significant decline in the confidence we have in our leaders. The findings stated that 63% of the population believe politicians are in it for themselves while only 5% believe they are in it for the country's best interests.

Recent polls in mid-January make even worse reading with only 27% of Conservative voters from the 2019 election believing that Prime Minister was telling the truth about the Downing Street parties. Yet as questions about truthfulness and integrity mount, there is also a seemingly contradictory view amongst his own party, namely that it is better for the Prime Minister to stay in post. It appears that truth and trust have become expendable.

There are many reasons for this decline in trust, including the various scandals and allegations about donors and the recent debacles about parties at Number Ten, exacerbated by delayed reports, accusations of fraud and impropriety, all adding to the rhetoric of one law for politicians, another for everyone else. With the publication of the abridged Sue Gray report, the country is once again in limbo, as the credibility and integrity of the Prime Minister is weighed up against his appeal as an electoral asset and political expediency. Trust, it appears, is not the issue.

Yet there is no more important validation for a leader than being trusted. Questions about the integrity and honesty of our politicians are not new, and – considering the expenses scandal of 2009 - nor are they just the property of one political persuasion, but the indubitable conclusion of recent goings-on is that most of the public no longer trust those who purport to lead us - and that should worry us all.

There is a particular reason why this should be of particular concern to the independent sector and that is the fact that most of the current crop of leaders, notably those implicated in the various acts of impropriety, were educated at independent schools. From that evidence, it might be assumed that the failure sits within these schools and that instead of embedding the principles of service and a sense of civic responsibility in their students, they have fostered instead, however inadvertently, a sense of entitlement and self-interest.

While the media make much of the schools that many of these individuals attended, the schools find themselves in an invidious position, being judged by the deeds of former students whose characters and values were wrought long before they entered the school gates and nurtured after they left by like-minded peer groups. It is a situation largely outside of each school's control, and while mitigated to some degree by the actions of the schools, the main fault, it can be argued, lies elsewhere, in the social and economic divisions of British society.

We have always placed too much emphasis on the ability of schools to shape the character of their students, and for schools to be constantly called out for the sins of their alumni is neither fair nor helpful. After all, just as state schools are responsible to the state, independent schools are responsible to their constituents, dependent on the very families who choose to send their children to them. Independent they may profess to be, but they are tied in almost every regard to the values and expectations of their parents, governors, and old pupils and to market forces. Often the values of the parents are foisted on the school, for good and bad. One recently retired Head explained the dilemma by saying, rather unkindly, that there was nothing wrong with the schools, only that the wrong children went to them. However, when we ask why have so many leaders who came through independent schools in the seventies and eighties behaved with such disdain, arrogance and lack of empathy towards those they purport to lead, we should start by acknowledging that some of the leading schools were perceived as behaving the same way. Traditionally, these schools, that make up only a small percentage of all independent schools, are populated by children from similarly privileged backgrounds seeking aspirational, safe, socially segregated environments bound by strong and cohesive parental networks that inevitably reflect their values. However, some of the less savoury aspects of this group are invariably present, as evident in the recent scandals, which means that schools still have a significant part to play.

When considering those who have travelled this highly selective educative journey and seeing some of the results, we can see the challenge to schools to change deeply rooted views, prejudices, and attitudes by endeavouring to instil values and ethics consistent with their own mission statements. And even when doing so, there are invariably contradictions. Self-confidence, for instance, is one of the traits that independent schools take pride in encouraging (and surely a prerequisite for leadership), yet leadership is also be rooted in humility and an awareness of others. The recognition of character, likewise, needs to be valued as much as academic success, accepting that it is not easily measured (and therefore not always valued). Hence, while schools may feel that it is unfair to be held hostage to past failings, they should not expect complete absolution. It is right, after all, that we ask why some of those who have had a privileged education, apparently learned so little about basic human values in their time at school.

Any list of miscreants that emerges in times of crisis, (and especially the names of leaders), is, like Viscount Gage's drive, full of potholes and arguably, a product of contemporary society. Schools are always morphing, reinventing themselves, dealing with the day to day challenges and responding pragmatically to the challenges of the marketplace. The foundations of our historic schools, such as Eton and Harrow, established under Royal Charter as charity schools to provide free education to the poor of their Parishes, were undoubtedly well-intended. The same could be said of the many schools founded in the mid 19th century including Cheltenham College (1841) Marlborough College (1843), Radley College (1847), Wellington (1853) and Haileybury (1859), each established around principles of public service and a readiness to contribute to society, whether under the auspices of the Oxford Movement, or with links to the East India Company, the military, and the Colonial Office. In recent years, especially as schools have been made accountable for their charitable status, more attention given community involvement and charitable works and state-independent partnerships. But there is a way to go.

While striving to protect their ethos and values in the face of changing societal expectations is challenging, most independent schools today adhere to an ethos based around service and community as a bulwark against criticism. There are many examples of teachers, largely through historic reports, trying to address behaviours and values in their students that are contrary to those of their school, few better expressed than Boris Johnson's Housemaster, Martin Hammond who noted in a letter to the student's father:

'Boris sometimes seems affronted when . . . criticised for what amounts to a gross failure of responsibility. I think he honestly believes that it is churlish of us not to regard him as an exception, one who should be free of the network of obligation which binds everyone else.'

Such refreshing honesty, alas, is no longer countenanced. Schools attempting to change the behaviours and views of individual students who have the unequivocal support of their parents has been a timeless challenge; affecting a change in the culture of a whole school without alienating the parent body is quite another matter. At the Henley Literary Festival in 2019, Tony Little, the previous Headmaster at Eton was quoted acknowledged that some Tory Etonians were giving the school a bad name and that *“we’d all be better served as a nation if this particular clutch of people hadn’t been educated at the same school,”* but, as he went on, it was the individual’s choice how they used the opportunities life had given them and not the fault of a School that had, after all, also produced the founders of Friends of the Earth and Amnesty International.

It is a mistake to see independent schools as one homogenous entity. They are not. Most independent schools, one senses, take pains to distance themselves (or are themselves distanced) from the public utterings and historic actions of their more prestigious colleagues. Only a small number of schools get all the airplay with their heads held up as leading figures in education and mouthpieces for the sector. For most independent school parents, however, the focus is not on status and influence, but on the well-being and happiness of their children. Prep schools, in particular, have little voice and are often implicated in attitudes and behaviours they are not party to and would never countenance. Whatever the agenda, however, all schools still have a role to play in challenging bias, prejudice and inequality, even if their influence will always be slight compared with the influence of the world their children come from.

So, we should be wary of dismissing the concerns and perceptions of the public as historic, forged in the days of bullying and class hierarchies, in the “greed is good” excesses of the 80s, as just another club to beat independent schools with. It is not that long ago that issues of town and gown prevailed, elitism was tacitly marketed by schools and practised by students and schools that often stood aloof from their local communities. Even today, independent schools are still seen by some critics, to put it crudely, as businesses selling safe places and advantage. Thankfully, that perception is changing, and the Charities Act can take the lion’s share of the credit for bringing down walls. Yet there are still attitudes and behaviours that schools need to keep chipping away at, both to keep meeting their charitable goals, including actively eschewing the trappings of elitism, still embraced, and promoted by some schools; helping redefine the definition of what constitutes a successful education; and because it is the right thing to do. Of course, independent schools will argue that, by and large, being held accountable for the actions of schools of thirty or more years ago is an historical overshoot, that the days of swagger and a sense of entitlement are long gone, referring to a whole raft of community service programmes, the Duke of Edinburgh and similar service schemes, bursaries for poorer families, the reiteration of school values and ethos. They will talk about community ventures, involvement in academies, in local groups, and in a proverbial red herring, how much they contribute to the economy.

They might cite the coming together of the state and independent sectors, or the internationalisation of British education and the not altogether salubrious argument that by selling their franchises abroad they are generating funds for UK bursaries – but is that even relevant?

Social stratification, class, privilege and the insider trading of contacts and networks in the elite independent schools are not going to go away, regardless of what schools do, but they can be mitigated. It is not easy managing expectations, and it may be argued that diluting a student's sense of entitlement may even affect their aspirations which may not always be a bad thing. In some instances, the actions of schools have merely served to exacerbate the problem. The awarding of bursaries to talented children from local state schools simply removes their top students, from classes and sports team (would be that bursaries were given to struggling students); likewise, the proliferation of school networks, set up to provide support after leaving school through the rest of their lives, well-meaning though they may be, and important selling points for schools, are undoubtedly seen by critics as entrenching privilege yet further. Schools need to be more outspoken in lining up education alongside citizenship, about being a part of, not standing apart from, society, even challenging the fine line between evasion and avoidance, that life should not be about what you can get away with, but what you can contribute to it.

It is encouraging that in many schools, there is a new generation of better informed, socially responsible and committed students, as advocates for societal and environmental change. Students who know they are privileged, but without an accompanying sense of entitlement and a desire to use the opportunities they have in order to make a difference. Most independent schools today have parent bodies and governors who believe in societal values and who want their children to be well-adjusted and able to fit into their communities. But in terms of education, or what students are leaving their schools believing and committed to doing, in some schools the veneer is still thin. The proof, as they say, is still in the pudding.

It is not difficult to communicate values and beliefs to intelligent students in lessons or assemblies (defined, as our schools do, by IQ rather than by EQ) and to receive the superficial responses sought without anything taking root. What is less easy to achieve is to teach children to think ethically, to challenge their presumptions, about rights and responsibilities, to question their aspirations and goals and to engage them more deeply than PSHEE and Philosophy lessons, or assemblies based around values or the school's mission statement allow. Channelling IQ needs to be matched with a similar focus on EQ, the importance of character and the value of reflection and the responsibility that comes with learning. The fear is that if something is not measured, it isn't important. Such questions need to be an inconvenience, itches needing to be scratched.

Students should be challenged to think outwardly and to have their aspirations challenged and channelled. They need career advice linked to ethical considerations, so that it is not just about accessing the best universities and the very best jobs, but about what roles and responsibilities they want to take on when they go into the workplace. They would benefit enormously by including mindfulness (as some do) in their curriculum so that they can learn more about themselves on a deeper level, and their place in relation to others.

Schools should endeavour to teach them, implicitly, to accept that we are all part of society and sign up to the same rules, whether about behaviours, travel, paying tax, about internships and adherence to the law, even to be prepared to give back in ways that may be personally uncomfortable. They need to be taught how to develop greater empathy, to understand the challenges for those not so well-off or those involved in occupations and vocations that they would not consider for themselves; and the personal value of moving out of their own comfort zones and widening their social groups. If they aspire to be leaders in any field, they need to understand what leadership means and not just see the Nolan Principles as something that exists for others, while also learning how to serve, and the value of the menial, the repetitive, the physical. They should not always expect to start halfway up a ladder based on factors other than their own achievements and ability. Humility, service, and a good work ethic are important attributes and should be treated thus. The task for schools is to work harder at embedding core values and changing attitudes by challenging students rather than just teaching them some superficial intellectual construct. The government's levelling up agenda points to the need to nurture and encourage a different mind-set to ensure we get the right sort of leaders from either sector. That might come at some short-term reputational risk that independent schools feel they cannot afford, but that would be to put a pessimistic slant on what is an opportunity to make a difference. Which is what education – and leadership - should be about.

For those schools that have produced so many of our leaders, and especially those who have drawn so much adverse attention to independent schools, the challenges are even greater, but several are addressing the challenges head on, including Eton College under the Headship of Simon Henderson, who has focused on the civic responsibility and emotional intelligence of students. Many other Heads are similarly disposed, conscious of their social responsibility and keen to drive change, although realistic enough to know their job is a balancing act and to achieve anything more than superficial change is not easy. They feel frustrated, no doubt, that changing the attitudes and values of each cohort will always be a matter of degree, but then every degree counts. Parents pay substantial fees to help their children succeed in the company of similarly like-minded families, but like their children, they might also appreciate clarity and boundaries, knowing and embracing the values of the school if they respect and trust its leaders to do well by their children. To maintain their integrity, schools will need to keep re-visiting their offering, focusing on such traits as

honesty, trustworthiness and respect for others and staying true to their founding principles.

Trust and reputation are not earned lightly. The fact that we have leaders whose relationship with the truth is so fleeting is something independent schools and universities need to confront more aggressively, in their selection, in their offering and in their pedagogy, to find ways to integrate integrity and trust into what they say and do, even in their selection. It would be useful if part of having the very best education meant focusing on EQ as well as IQ and character as well as attainment. For independent schools, who are still likely to have a significant role in shaping tomorrow's leaders, consideration should also be given to educating their parents and the wider school community and bringing them on board. Such initiatives may not come without some cost, even parental kickback, but restoring and protecting the reputation of the sector by overcompensating for the failings of the past, by developing leaders who think and act ethically, is the proper response.

(i) Prominent leaders who have come from the independent school stable include Boris Johnson (Eton, Oxford), David Cameron (Eton, Oxford), Jacob Rees-Mogg (Eton, Oxford) Owen Paterson (Radley, Cambridge) Dominic Cummings (Durham, Oxford), Allegra Stratton, (Latymer Upper School and Cambridge), Matt Hancock, (Kings Chester, Oxford), Rishi Sunak (Winchester, Oxford) Robert Jenrick (Wolverhampton Grammar School, Cambridge), George Osborne (St Paul's, Oxford) and Michael Gove, (Robert Gordon's school, Oxford).

Others who went to independent schools and who either went to different universities or didn't attend university include Nigel Farage, Lord Feldman, Esther McVey, Nadhim Zahawi, Carrie Johnson and Sir Peter Viggers. Others were either educated in part abroad (Liz Truss) or at grammar schools (Dominic Rabb) before attending Oxford.

(An edited version of this article appeared on the www.independentschoolmanagementplus website under the headline, 'Are independent schools really to blame for Boris Johnson?') January 2022