

Formation of the Rand Change Agent Study: The Pursuit of School Reform for Social Equity

Yuta Suzuki*

This paper focuses on the formation of the Rand Change Agent Study, characterizes it as the pursuit of school reform for “social equity” and attempts to demonstrate anew its significance.

First, the paper finds that “social equity” was among the main motivations for the Rand Change Agent Study. It was clear in the earliest report that the Rand Change Agent Study was motivated by criticism of “Colemanism”. The pursuit of “social equity” was also central to the “progressive agenda” of “open education”.

Second, there are differences between the views of the Rand Change Agent Study and those of the North Dakota Study Group regarding the decline of “open education”. The characteristics of the Rand Change Agent Study are clear—it studied the “implementation” of educational policy and created the concept of “mutual adaptation” through its formation, and continued to focus on the development of school reform for “open education” as a process of “implementation” in the midst of social changes that created the “progressive renaissance” and “backlash” against “sixties values”. The Rand Change Agent Study was an attempt to clarify how the “mainstream” could continue to move toward the “promised land” beyond the limitations of its experience with the concept of “mutual adaptation”.

Keywords: Rand Change Agent Study, social equity, school reform, mutual adaptation, open education

1. Issues

This paper focuses on the formation of the Rand Change Agent Study (1973–1977) (below, Rand Study), which was conducted by the Rand Corporation (Santa Monica, CA), and

* Institute for Liberal Arts, Tokyo Institute of Technology
e-mail: yutasuzuki@ila.titech.ac.jp

aims to characterize it as an initiative toward school reform for “social equity”. It is thus possible to gain a basic perspective on the results of the Rand Study as a basis for considering “social equity” from the perspective of educational policy implementation in today’s world. This will demonstrate anew the significance of the Rand Study. The Rand Corporation, founded in 1948, was a think tank that developed primarily through the research and development of military and economic strategies; in the 1970s, it was beginning an expansion into the field of public policy. First of all, the Rand Study was a landmark study for the Rand Corporation itself (Suzuki, 2018).¹

The Rand Study was a multi-year, national evaluation study funded by the U.S. Department of Education in the form of federal grant programs designed to introduce and disseminate “innovative practices” in public schools (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978; Suzuki, 2018). These grant programs were referred to as “change agent” programs. The Rand Study was an evaluation study with several different names at first, including “Rand study of change agent programs” and “Rand’s Change Agent Study,” finally arriving at “Rand Change Agent Study” (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978, p. v, 2; McLaughlin, 1976, p. 340). As mentioned later, the *formation* of the Rand Study can be found.

The Rand Study evaluated the following federal programs: Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title III, Innovative Projects (ESEA Title III), supporting local “innovative practices”; Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title VII, Bilingual Projects, supporting bilingual education; Vocational Education Act, 1968 Amendments, Part D, Example Programs, supporting career education; and the Right-to-Read Program, supporting literacy practices (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978, pp. 2-3). The development and evaluation of ESEA Title III was the focus of the Rand Study (Mann et al., 1975).² Overall, the Rand Study covered 293 reform programs in 18 states across the U.S., with questionnaires administered to 1,735 educators and fieldwork conducted in 29 cases within 25 school districts over a 4-year period from July 1973 to April 1977 (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978, pp. 7-8). The timing of this execution should be noted.

The Rand Study marks a milestone in research on policy implementation (Odden, 1991; Honig, 2006). Yuta Suzuki has discussed elsewhere the development of research beginning with the Rand Study and leading to the formation and development of a “professional community” of teachers, which marked a milestone in the study of teaching and teacher education as part of the genealogy of school reform research (Suzuki, 2018).³ This paper characterizes the *formation* of the Rand Study itself in its context of the time, rather than viewing it as a genealogical formation of school reform research, as in Suzuki’s previous book. Since the Rand Study acquired a reputation, its findings have tended to be taken out of the context specific to its time. This paper focuses on the motivations and moments of the Rand Study and characterizes it in terms of “social equity,” which was considered the “promised land” and “progressive agenda” by its advocates as discussed below, to clarify the novelty of the Rand Study. In doing so, the goal of the paper is to gain a basic perspective on “social equity” from the perspective of educational policy implementation, and to build on the results of the Rand Study.

Sections 2 and 3 discuss the *formation* of the Rand Study. Section 2 clarifies the motivation and background of its formation. Section 3 clarifies the moment in which the Rand Study was conceived and examines the two concepts that drove the study: “adoption” and “implementation”. Section 4 examines the “open education” approach supported by ESEA Ti-

tle III, which was at the heart of the Rand Study. In particular, it characterizes the “progressive agenda” that was proposed by the research group, which created the “mainstream” of “open education”. “Open education” refers to a form of “progressive education” that originated and flourished in the United Kingdom in the late 1960s, and developed in the United States as a “revival” of John Dewey’s early-20th-century “progressive education” (Kittaka, 2023). Finally, Section 5 discusses and describes the remaining issues.

2. Motivation for the Formation of the Rand Change Agent Study

This section presents the motivation for the formation of the Rand Study. For this purpose, a good foundation is the pioneering *Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. I: A Model of Educational Change*, published in September 1974 after the first year of research starting in July 1973 as the first of a series of reports for the Rand Study (Berman & McLaughlin, 1974). This is in part because it was written while the Rand Study was underway.

It should be noted that the Rand Study was motivated by the criticism of “Colemanism”. Paul Berman (project director) and Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin (deputy director, later of Stanford University) of the Rand Corporation, who led the Rand Study, noted that the “disappointing outcomes” of “innovative projects” that had accumulated up to that point merely confirmed many of the conclusions of the 1966 Coleman Report. Berman and McLaughlin characterized the doctrine of “Colemanism” to the effect that “education is an ineffective and inefficient focus for federal intervention efforts and that the government should turn to alternative social policies to remedy *social inequities*” (Berman & McLaughlin, 1974, p. 1, emphasis added). They questioned the “Colemanism.”⁴

First, Berman and McLaughlin consider several hypotheses in opposition to “Colemanism,” including “[i]nnovative practices have not been properly *implemented*” (emphasis added). It is important to note that this hypothesis in fact emphasizes “the complexity of the implementation process” and finds that the essence of the problem lies in “the bureaucratic nature” of the educational system rather than in the “inadequacies of innovative plans.” This hypothesis argues that the educational system is highly resistant to “innovations” that transform “innovative projects” into “new ways of doing the same thing,” creating much apparent “*movement*” but little effective “*change*” in local educational practices, which lead to little “improvement” in student outcomes (Berman & McLaughlin, 1974, pp. 1-2). The concept of “implementation”, to be examined later, is key to this report. Adhering to this perspective, Berman and McLaughlin explore ways to resist “Colemanism” and pursue school reform for “social equity”. Herein lies one of the main points of significance of the Rand Study in the specific context of its time: that is, it was motivated by criticism of “Colemanism”.

Let us note here that Berman and McLaughlin define the term “innovative” as “a practice or plan that is new to a particular school or local education agency (LEA) and that, because it is new, requires (or assumes) some degree of modification (or change) in the behavior of principal actors.” They then emphasize that innovation is a “neutral” usage that does not include any “value judgment” and assert that the Rand Study focuses its analysis on the “*process* of change” (Berman & McLaughlin, 1974, pp. 1-2). This attitude of neutrality attitude can also be found in a later single-authored article by McLaughlin in a special issue of

the *Teachers College Record* in 1976, subtitled “Change in Classroom Organization”; McLaughlin uses the phrase “classroom organization projects” frequently in the article, which does not focus on the term “open education” but uses its own terminology for this concept (McLaughlin, 1976, pp. 339-340). It is in this attitude that we find the focus of interest of the policy implementation evaluation researchers. While in possession of a deep understanding of progressive education, McLaughlin’s analytical focus was on policy implementation (Suzuki, 2018, p. 42).

3. Moments in the Formation of the Rand Change Agent Study

This section identifies moments in the formation of Rand Study, continuing with Berman and McLaughlin’s publication *Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. I: A Model of Educational Change*. This report presents the theoretical perspective acquired through the first year of research (July 1973 to July 1974), and thus indicates various moments in the formation of the Rand Study (Berman & McLaughlin, 1974, p.v).

Berman and McLaughlin specify that Rand Study is intended to move beyond the status quo, characterized by “the absence of systematic theory of planned change,” to a “more systematic understanding of the process of innovation” (Berman & McLaughlin, 1974, p. 2). Let us note here that the report contains two important moments: first, in “analyzing the current state of knowledge of planned change in education,” and second, in “proposing a conceptual model of factors affecting change process within school districts.” This section characterizes each of these with an examination of the concepts of “adoption” and “implementation.” (Berman & McLaughlin, 1974, p.iii,xi). In that “mutual adaptation” is a representative concept for the results of the Rand Study, it is interesting to note that the concepts of “adoption” and “implementation” rather than “*mutual adaptation*” were foregrounded in the process of the formation of the study during its first year (McLaughlin, 1976). Here, the formation of the Rand Study is clear, as it moves toward the concept of “mutual adaptation”.

(1) Concept of Adoption

Berman and McLaughlin note that the predominant school of thought of their time was attempting to formulate and specify “management principles” that could promote the “adoption” of educational “innovations”. They draw attention to Ronald G. Havelock’s four-model formulation, noting that it is premised on a “rational model of bureaucratic behavior.” That is, this approach assumes that those who work in schools are always seeking better practices, “have reliable means of identifying superior procedures,” and are “eager and able to adapt proved innovations.” Therefore, any obstacles to “change” are seen as “deficiencies” in the “planning, communication, and dissemination” of an approach or in the “quantity and quality of available information” (Berman & McLaughlin, 1974, pp. 6-7).

Berman and McLaughlin find three problems with this “rationalistic” view of the “adoption” of educational “innovations”. First, the “rationalistic view” does not account for the “*modal*” process of change in the educational institutions. In other words, it ignores the problems of “implementation” and “institutional adaptation” of “innovative strategy”. Hence, according to Berman and McLaughlin, we cannot learn from the successes and failures of attempts at “innovation”, and we cannot have a basis for discerning when “change” has actual-

ly occurred (Berman & McLaughlin, 1974, p. 7). It is clear that the ideas of “implementation” and “adaptation” are being contrasted with the concept of “adoption.”

Second, the system of education has no “selection mechanism”, such as is assumed by the “rationalistic perspective”. Public schools do not have a market-type “selection mechanism” or “profit-maximizing incentives”, and the “survival of an educational institution” is guaranteed by society. Berman and McLaughlin note that the following features of the educational reform process arise inconsistently with a “rationalistic perspective”: decisions are not made to “adopt” or reject “innovations” based on the first impressions thereof, the normal process of reform is top-down, and the pressure for “change” usually arises from outside the school, rather than from the school’s own assessment of its needs. Hence, the reality of decision-making in the local school context does not correspond to the hypotheses of the “rationalistic perspective” on “educational innovations” (Berman & McLaughlin, 1974, pp. 7-8).

Further, Berman and McLaughlin note that an approach that focuses on the issue of “adoption” in “change” is not consistent with the actual experience and theoretical conclusions of the observation of educational “innovations”. Instead, both experience and theory show that “adoption” is only one of the difficulties in successfully causing “change” in educational practice (Berman & McLaughlin, 1974, p. 8). Berman and McLaughlin go on to identify various issues in “adoption”. Herein lies the first important moment.

(2) Concept of Implementation

In contrast with “adoption”, Berman and McLaughlin emphasize a second school of “planned change” that defines the problems of successful “innovations” in terms of “*implementation*”. This school of thought, they maintain, embodies a type of “institutional approach”, represented by a small number of theorists who have examined the realities of educational “innovation” in terms of an “*organizational model*” of “institutional behavior”. They indicate that this type of research explores the inner dynamics of institutions and the characteristics of “innovation strategies” that affect the potential for “planned change” (Berman & McLaughlin, 1974, p. 8).

According to Berman and McLaughlin, analytical case studies of educational “innovations” reveal that the most difficult and complex part of the “problem of innovation” does not concern “*preadoption* behavior” but rather “*postadoption*” or implementation. In other words, “adoption was not at issue”—“problems of “implementation” dominated the outcome and the success of the innovative projects.” Berman and McLaughlin note that innovations typically result in failure despite high levels of faculty enthusiasm and support, because of underestimation of the difficulties and barriers in the process of project implementation (Berman & McLaughlin, 1974, p. 8). The observation that “problems of implementation dominated the outcome and the success of the innovative projects” forms the heart of the results of the Rand Study: “mutual adaptation”.

Berman and McLaughlin use Donald Schön’s concept of “dynamic conservatism” to emphasize the persistence of “resistance” to “change” through a process of “adaptation” and “implementation” following the decision to “adopt” an innovation. It is also important to emphasize that “resistance” to “change” persists through “adaptation” and “implementation”: the process that follows “adoption” is key. Berman and McLaughlin grasp that the “regressive tendency” of this type of system is indicative of the fundamental character of the institution (Berman & McLaughlin, 1974, p. 8).

Berman and McLaughlin point out that these formulations of “implementation” as opposed to “adoption” differ from the role of “information,” a factor emphasized in previous models of “adoption”; when Berman and McLaughlin take an “organizational perspective”, the role of “knowledge and communication” grows, dependent on “the role that the principal actors play”, “the institutional structure of incentives and constraints”, “the institutional policy setting”, and “the characteristics of the innovation” (Berman & McLaughlin, 1974, pp. 8-9). The formulation of this “implementation” entails this shift in perspective.

Berman and McLaughlin go on to emphasize that “innovative strategies” in education tend “*not to be invariant*,” unlike technologies such as that of a “new pill” or a “new airplane”. They cite the following text by Matthew B. Miles, who considers that “innovations” in education should be viewed as “evolutionary”: “The installation of an innovation in a system is not a mechanical process, but a developmental one in which *both* the innovation and the accepting system are altered” (emphasis added) (Berman & McLaughlin, 1974, p. 9). This is important: here we recognize the germ of the idea of “mutual adaptation”. Miles points to “both” changes: a change in the “innovation” itself and a change in the “system” that accepts it.

Let us also note that Berman and McLaughlin use the term “*mutation phenomenon*” in their own way. They argue that the “*mutation phenomenon*” is created by the “variability” of “institutional response” to an “innovation” that is the result of “different sets of actors” and “different institutional patterns of routinized behavior”. In other words, “the nominal adoption of an innovation” cannot be assumed to provide an accurate prediction of actual “implementation” or “use”. Rather, in the case of educational “innovations”, the process of “implementation” is essentially a two-way process of “*adaptation*”, according to which “innovative strategies” are modified to suit the situation, and institutions also change, as they adjust to the “innovation”. Therefore, the “implementation” of educational “innovations” is an “*organizational process*” that creates “change” in two directions (Berman & McLaughlin, 1974, p. 10). It should be clear that the concept of “mutual adaptation” is being prepared here.

(3) Definition of Implementation

Berman and McLaughlin then set out to define “implementation”, finding it problematic that educational research and other related fields of study lack a “theory” or “analytical understanding” of “implementation” (Berman & McLaughlin, 1974, p. 12).

Berman and McLaughlin note the following reasons for this lack. First, due to the “mutual adaptation” of projects and institutional situations, a “theory” of “implementation” must go beyond the details of “innovative projects” to incorporate the “characteristics of a complex organization”. This leads to the speculation that instead of a “single” “theory” of “implementation”, “a number of” “theories” based on “various discrete organizational realities” will ultimately emerge.

Second, they find that social changes of an “evolutionary” nature prevent the conceptualization of “implementation”. The “[d]ecisions” that are made in “implementation” are not the sort made by the president in dealing with an overwhelming crisis but reactions to ongoing problems that are routine, incremental, and faced daily by many individuals. Therefore, if a “theory” of “implementation” is to be formulated, it must capture the accumulation of this continuous problem-solving (Berman & McLaughlin, 1974, pp. 12-13).

Third, the issue of definition arises. The most widespread meaning of “implementation”

is an “administrative” one: carrying out a directive. However, Berman and McLaughlin note that this view does not capture the essence of the “implementation” of an “innovative project” in the complex policy system of American public education. An “innovative project” is a plan that has a statement of “goals” and “means” designed to “change standard behaviors, practices, and procedures.” It has abstract “goals” and lack specificity and clarity of “means”; in it, the relationship between “goals” and “means” is fraught with great “uncertainty”. Therefore, Berman and McLaughlin emphasize that an original “plan” must be “developed, operationalized, often revised, and, in short, changed” in accordance with the realities of the “institutional setting” (Berman & McLaughlin, 1974, pp. 12-13).

Based on these considerations, Berman and McLaughlin define “implementation” as “the change process that occurs when an innovative project impinges upon an organization.” Using this definition, the focus of the study shifts from measuring “compliance” or “degree to which a project fulfills its stated ‘goals’” to asking “what changes actually occurred as a result of the introduction of a new project, how and why they occur, and how they affect the operation of the organization” (Berman & McLaughlin, 1974, p. 13) This is how Berman and McLaughlin came to define “implementation”. Thus, a second important moment of opportunity was prepared.

Shifting perspectives, the next section approaches the perspective of the founders of the group of practitioners of “open education”, which was the central focus of the Rand Study.

4. Characteristics of the Progressive Agenda

Vito Perrone defines the “progressive agenda” in his eponymous essay (Perrone, 2005). The “open education” school reforms of the 1970s were at the center of the Rand Study. The North Dakota Study Group on Evaluation (NDSG), founded by Perrone, created the “mainstream” of “open education”. The first meeting of NDSG was held at the University of North Dakota in November 1972, while Perrone was working there (Kittaka, 2023, pp. 115-118).

This section takes Perrone’s essay “The Progressive Agenda” as its cue for characterizing the “progressive agenda” from Perrone’s perspective, as approached by the Rand Study. This essay is the opening chapter of *Holding Values: What We Mean by Progressive Education*, a NDSG-led book that clarifies the “values” that NDSG was to “hold”. The essay is based on Perrone’s speech at NDSG’s annual meeting in February 2000; *Holding Values*, published publicly in 2005, is dedicated to Perrone, “our moral and intellectual lodestar,” as if to pray for his recovery after his collapse following that speech (Engel, 2005).

(1) Seven Agendas

Noting the diversity of NDSG’s membership, Perrone nevertheless emphasizes that NDSG shares “important social commitments” and “particular visions of what is possible in schools and communities.” He formulates seven points as forming “the progressive agenda” (Perrone, 2005, p. 30). They are “the fabric that has bound us over these many years” (Perrone, 2005, p. 31)

- Children and young people possess unlimited potential for making personal meaning of the world; powerful learning is in their grasp.

- Creative energies are universal, though too often unacknowledged and supported.
- Responsibility, a sense of personal and community empowerment, can be cultivated.
- Teachers can be curriculum builders, decision makers, serious learners of teaching.
- Education can be conceived as expansive, as intensely personal and simultaneously co-operative, as living and interpretive, and imaginative.
- Constructive pluralism and democracy are both possible, worth struggling for.
- The longtime promise of equality along with personal and community well-being should, and can, be translated into reality (Perrone, 2005, p. 30).

The seven points of the agenda can broadly be divided into two categories: the first five refer directly to education, while the latter two concern the state of society and only indirectly refer to education.

In particular, it should be noted that the latter two both juxtapose what should be and what can be. Furthermore, it can easily be imagined that it would seem less easy to pursue the values of “constructive pluralism” and “democracy,” and also to balance these with “personal and community well-being” together with simultaneously pursuing these values and that of “equality.” This is acknowledged by Perrone, who quotes Martin Luther King, Jr.’s desire for “the promised land” of “social justice for children and young people, for the schools, for the larger society” (Perrone, 2005, p. 31). It is by no means, as King asserts, quoted by Perrone, “accommodation” or “the easier path.” The progressive agenda, as Perrone formulates it, is to pursue “social equity” as “the promised land.” Here, an overlap is visible between the motives of the Rand Study and the “open education” it targets. As noted, the Rand Study shares the motivations of “open education” as well as the consistent “neutral” attitude it is aimed at.

The significance of the five agenda points thus becomes clearer. The first point emphasizes the “unlimited potential” for “making personal meanings in the world”, and declares that it is truly “powerful learning” that is in the grasp of children and young people. The second point emphasizes that “creative energies”, which can be overlooked, are also universally available to youth. Third, the concept of “responsibility” is defined as including the “empowerment” of the “community” as well as that of the “personal”; it can be “cultivated” in education. Fourth, the concept of the teacher is given a novel definition. Teachers here are the “builders”, rather than merely the transmitters, of the “curriculum”; they are a subject rather than an object of “curriculum” decision-making. Teachers are characterized as learners in teaching, and they continue to learn to teach. Education itself is the topic of the fifth point. Education is to be “expansive” rather than reductive, “personal” and “cooperative”, and “interpretive” and “imaginative”, rather than predetermined, and its creativity is emphasized (Perrone, 2005, p. 30). These points are highly abstract and practically complex. In addition, they are linked to the pursuit of “social equity”. The logic of emphasizing the “community” at the same time as the “personal” is an important feature common to the agenda point regarding society described above. This logic is the logic of pursuing “social equity”. Perrone thus formulates the seven points of the “progressive agenda” for “social equity”.

(2) Progressive Renaissance and Backlash

Note that, according to Perrone, the decade or so preceding the first NDSG meeting in 1972 was a time of a “progressive renaissance”, both “socially and educationally”.⁵ These

were the “sixties values”. This was a time when “the civil rights struggles were often bitter,” but “the shackles were breaking, that a new America, a more racially democratic America, was in view. It was a time of educational hopefulness—around new schools, integrated learning, greater inclusiveness” (Perrone, 2005, p. 31). There was a wind of the “progressive agenda”, something like a “progressive renaissance”.

What Perrone goes on to say is also interesting. “Students were engaged in long-term projects—actually doing something in depth based on their own interests and intentions—in classrooms and schools where genuine performance mattered,” “there was discourse about learning making connections to students’ lives beyond school and the importance of schools and communities becoming more integrated,” “teachers were being spoken of as scholars, intellectuals, readers, and writers who saw their work as contributing to making their communities better, providing their students and families a larger view of possibilities,” “there was support for pluralism, for equity, for democracy,” and “caring and respect were formulations with meaning, and efforts were being made to put them into practice” (Perrone, 2005, p. 31). This clearly states the significance of the student’s learning, the teacher’s work, and the values that society pursues. Here, we may find the power to realize the “progressive agenda”—Perrone’s description presents a true “progressive renaissance” in the 1960s.

By as early as 1972, however, Perrone saw that a violent “backlash” against the “sixties values” was growing. It was “against much of the language of freedom and in opposition to the democratic localism” that facilitated “variation of practice.” Here, the situation of “open education” becomes even more complicated. Interestingly, Perrone sees the decline of “open education” as early as the early 1970s.

5. Discussion

This paper focuses on the formation of the Rand Study and characterizes it as the pursuit of school reform for “social equity”, attempting to demonstrate anew its significance. By doing so, it aims to gain a basic perspective on “social equity” from the perspective of educational policy implementation, based on the results of the Rand Study. Two points are discussed below, followed by the issues remaining for future study based on this paper.

First, the paper finds that “social equity” was a main motivation for the Rand Study. It was clear in the earliest report from the Rand Study that it was motivated by criticism of “Colemanism”. The implication of this critique was to promote school reform for “social equity”, in opposition to the approach of Coleman, who also hoped to pursue “social equity” by means of social policies other than education. The pursuit of “social equity” was also central to open education’s “progressive agenda”.

Second, there are differences between the views of the Rand Study and those of NDSG, particularly those of Perrone, regarding the decline of “open education”. Interestingly, the Rand Study, which was to become a milestone in the study of education policy implementation, continued its evaluation study of “open education” until April 1977. It used the concept of “mutual adaptation” to elucidate the “implementation” of education policy, including the continuation of school reform for “open education” (Berman, & McLaughlin, 1977). NDSG, conversely, as Perrone states, was forced to bear the social “backlash” at the moment of the creation of NDSG in 1972, marking the decline of “open education”.

How are we to understand this difference? First, NDSG created the “mainstream” of “open education”, and related school reforms around the United States as, so to speak, tributaries; the time difference can be identified. Even with this in mind, the characteristics of the Rand Study are clear—it studied the “implementation” of educational policy and created the concept of “mutual adaptation” through its formation, and it continued to focus on the development of school reform for “open education” as a process of “implementation” in the midst of social changes bearing the names of the “progressive renaissance” and the “backlash” against “sixties values”. The Rand Study was an attempt to clarify how the “mainstream” could continue to move toward the “promised land” beyond the limitations of the experience of the “mainstream” with the concepts of “mutual adaptation” and a “neutral” attitude. Here, we can identify the new significance of the Rand Study. From this point of view, the Rand Study can be positioned as the basis for pursuing “social equity” from the perspective of educational policy implementation. “Social equity” needs to be pursued as a process of “mutual adaptation” of educational policy implementation.

Finally, in relation to the previous question, and observing the mutual work of the Rand Study and NDSG, we can see the outline of a new research question: what kind of research should be imagined? While the Rand Study’s image of “open education” is clear, it is not necessarily clear how its results would be accepted by NDSG. With reference to the other work of NDSG, this is a potential issue for future research.

Notes

1. The Rand Study was an important study for McLaughlin herself; she later wrote a paper reflecting on it herself: McLaughlin, 1990.
2. For example, the Japanese literature on the innovations of “open education” and the ESEA Title III as a contemporaneous historical study: Inagaki, 1977.
3. McLaughlin’s significant studies of “professional community” include the following: McLaughlin, 1993; McLaughlin, & Talbert, 2001; McLaughlin, & Talbert, 2006.
4. This study will not examine the Coleman Report itself, but Lagemann’s study (Lagemann, 2000, pp. 193-200), for example, is one that places it properly within the history of education research.
5. For example, the Japanese literature examining the theory and practice of “progressive renaissance”: Sato, 1990.

References

- Berman, P. & McLaughlin, M. W., 1974, *Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol.I: A Model of Educational Change*, prepared for the U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, CA.
- Berman, P. & McLaughlin, M. W. with the assistance of Bass, G., Pauly, E., & Zellman, G., 1977, *Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol.VII: Factors Affecting Implementation and Continuation*, prepared for the U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, CA.
- Berman, P. & McLaughlin, M. W., 1978, *Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol.VIII: Implementing and Sustaining Innovations*, prepared for the U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, CA.
- Engel, B. S. with Martin, A. C. (ed.), 2005, *Holding Values: What We Mean by Progressive Education*, Heinemann, Portsmouth, NH.
- Honig, M. I., (ed.), 2006, *New Directions in Education Policy Implementation: Confronting Complexity*, State University of New York Press, Albany, NY.
- Inagaki, T., 1977, *America Kyoiku Tsushin: Okina Kuni no Chiisana Machi kara (American Education News: From a Small Town in a Big Country)* (Tokyo, Hyoronsha) (Japanese).

- Kittaka, Y., 2023, Open Education no Honryu: North Dakota Group to sono Shuhen (*The Mainstream of Open Education: The North Dakota Study Group on Evaluation and Its Surroundings*) (Tokyo, Toshindo) (Japanese).
- Lagemann, E. C. 2000, *An Elusive Science: The Troubling History of Education Research*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.
- Mann, D., McLaughlin, M., W. Baer, M., Greenwood, P., W. McCluskey, L., Prusoff, L. L., Wirt, J. G., & Zellman, G. 1975, *Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol.III: The Process of Change, Appendix A. Innovations in Classroom Organization and Staff Development*, prepared for the U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, CA.
- McLaughlin, M. W., 1976, Implementation as Mutual Adaptation: Change in Classroom Organization, *Teachers College Record*, Vol. 77, No. 3, pp. 339-351.
- McLaughlin, M. W. 1990, The Rand Change Agent Study Revisited: Macro Perspectives and Micro Realities, *Educational Researcher*, Vol. 19, No. 9, pp. 11-16.
- McLaughlin, M. W. 1993, What Matters Most in Teachers' Workplace Context? In Little, J. W. & McLaughlin, M. W. (ed.) *Teachers' Work: Individuals, Colleagues, and Contexts*, Teachers College Press, pp. 79-103.
- McLaughlin, M. W. & Talbert, J. 2001, *Professional Communities and the Work of High School Teaching*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London.
- McLaughlin, M. W. & Talbert, J. 2006, *Building School-Based Teacher Learning Communities: Professional Strategies to Improve Student Achievement*, Teachers College Press.
- Odden, A. R., (ed.), 1991, *Education Policy Implementation*, State University of New York Press, Albany, NY.
- Perrone, V., 2005, The Progressive Agenda, Engel, B. S. with Martin, A. C. *Holding Values: What We Mean by Progressive Education*, Heinemann, Portsmouth, NH., pp. 30-34.
- Sato, M., 1990, *Beikoku Curriculum Kaizoshi Kenkyu: Tange Gakushu no Sozo (A Study of the History of Curriculum Reform in the United States: The Creation of Unit Study)* (Tokyo, The University of Tokyo Press) (Japanese).
- Suzuki, Y., 2018, *Kyoshi no Senmonka Kyodotai no Keisei to Tenkai: America Gakko Kaikaku Kenkyu no Keifu (Formation and Development of Teachers' Professional Community: A Genealogy of Research on School Reform in the United States)* (Tokyo, Keiso Shobo) (Japanese).