AN OUTER-

TVEI IN a LONDON BOROUGH:

THE EVALUATION OF

A VOCATIONAL INITIATIVE

THE   CURRICULUM ·

IN MAINSTREAM SECONDARY ~~EDUCATION~~

Richard M. Cotter

Dissertation

submitted in fulfilment

of the requirements for the degree

Doctor of Philosophy

University of London Institute of Education

1991

ABSTRACT

This is a case study of TVEI as exemplified in one local setting. The study begins with events and conditions in an outer London borough prior to its announcement in November 1982 and breaks off in July 1989. The field work is in two phases: the first was based on a two year evaluation, the second on a return visit to the borough in the Summer of 1989. The study is largely focused on the local setting, though additional chapters, supporting the study, examine (a) the larger national issues, (b) and the circumstances and orientation of the research. A further chapter examines philosophical concepts arising out of the vocational issues within the case.

Three identifiable themes emerged from the case study: management of structural change, technology and vocational education. These are explored largely through the narrative which forms the bulk of the work. First, as TVEI became increasingly linked to changes in mainstream curriculum, the study came to focus on organisational change in the borough as a whole, which was intimately connected with changes sweeping through the curriculum. Second, Technology was a central issue for curriculum content and the study reveals the emergence of a balanced definition of technology as both related to artefacts and human contexts. From this flowed a cross-curricular policy of provision. The third theme, pursued within the narrative, as well as in the final chapter, consists of philosopical and cultural issues associated with vocational education. In the process, modern and Aristotelian concepts of the practical which inform vocational education, are explored. Overall, the study reveals that a team-oriented management structure emerged to deal with changes significantly influenced by TVEI. The curriculum became more integrated, community-orientated and flexible. The research ended, however, before specific, long-term local effects of the National Curriculum could be ascertained.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Commenced in September 1983, the Technical and Vocational Education Initiative (TVEI) was by far the largest single curriculum initiative ever undertaken in Britain. It emerged in a time of high political tensions and was at times a controversial programme. Throughout the 1980s it aimed to promote courses in the middle and upper secondary curriculum that shifted the orientation of schooling towards the world of work. Studies relating to technology, business and industry, and personal and social development, were central to the aims of TVEI. A national scheme, with national aims, it was yet implemented locally in significantly - and deliberately - different ways. This work is a case study of the implementation of TVEI in one outer London borough, namely, Enfield.

The more important of the work's salient features are set, one might say, by the nature, contexts and timing of TVEI itself, and include the following:

i   As a work describing the unfolding of a national initiative in one local setting it focuses on the working of one Local Education Authority (LEA). At the time of the research the major functions of administering education still fell to LEAs - though the LEAs were diminished by the 1988 Education Reform Act (and are at present under further attack.)

ii   Given the aims of TVEI, issues of technology and, more especially, vocational education are central to the work. But though targeted at particular curriculum areas and concerns, TVEI impacted on the curriculum as a whole by virtue of its insertion into mainstream schooling. Thus the study comes also to address whole-curriculum issues.

1

iii Implementing TVEI represented a major curriculum change, one which, furthermore, - particularly towards the the end of the period of study - coincided with massive change. Organisational development within the LEA, that was an inevitable concomitant of this change, is another major focus of the work.

Some other features of this work may be seen, rather, as deriving from the interests and circumstances of the researcher:

iv It is a study by an Australian "visitor" using his experience in Australian vocational education to come to terms with an initially somewhat unfamiliar British educational scene. Also, it is written with an eye to a secondary Australian audience as well as a primary British audience.

v The writing reflects my philosophical training and bent, most prominently in its concluding discussion of vocational education, but elsewhere as well.

vi The work draws heavily on my work as a contracted evaluator, which occupied two years near the beginning of my period of research.

The Research Questions

My interests developed and changed in the course of the research, with implications for the precise nature of the research questions.

At the outset I had two major interests, case study methodology and vocational education: the first from former studies, the second from having taught in Australian vocational schools and vocational teacher education programmes, and also from having conducted research in British FE. The opportunity to evaluate TVEI in a particular local setting appealed initially

for both these reasons. But, of course, a contracted evaluator is, to a significant extent, controlled by his or her terms of contract. In general the LEA looked to the evaluation as part of its overall development strategy for TVEI and, the narrative will reveal, for the mainstream secondary curriculum. Given my commitment to the naturalistic approach, I could hardly complain if the weighting of interests in participant perspectives came to influence the relative weighting of my research interests. A reflexive interest in case-study methodology did not arise in the case in the same way as, say, issues in vocational education did. So I became a practitioner of, rather than a direct researcher into, case study methodology. Later, freed from the constraints of contract research, I returned to the methodological issues. But by that time the mass of data already collected had largely determined the direction of the main research questions. Case study issues had moved from from being a substantive interest of the research to being an element in the methodological self-reflection that is a conventional requirement of a thesis - though, it should be added, an element that is discussed at quite some length and in a way that draws significantly on the experience of the contracted evaluation.

By contrast the evaluation exercise sharpened my initial interest in vocational education - as well as adding other interests. In general, the gestation of these substantive interests and their eventual formulation into research questions should be seen in relation to two important features of the research as a case study conducted in the naturalistic mode. First, the case required a certain integrity and singularity in its definition and in the "reality" portrayed. Second, issues were to an extent allowed to emerge naturally from the case and from the data gathered from a wide range of sources within the case.

The first feature meant that a strong interest developed in the case _per se_, in all its particularity (TVEI, not some other project; an LEA, not the nation or a school or a class). Quite simply, Enfield TVEI was a major event in a major curriculum initiative, and the substantive narrative account of it in this work can, therefore, purport to be of some intrinsic interest. There is, therefore, the "broad background" research question of what the "reality" of this case and this authority was; and how, and how well, the authority functioned in relation to this case. And we might anticipate, perhaps, that the coherence of a narrative answer to this question would be an index of the authority's integrity as a case.

In relation to the second feature of the naturalistic mode, certain key questions did indeed come to "emerge" from the case. Or, as it would be better to say, they emerged from my interaction with the case. For, of course, I did not approach the case as a _tabula rasa_. In addition to the initial terms of reference set by the evaluation contract, there was, for instance, my pre-existing interest in vocational education, and again the likelihood that my sensitivity to, and analysis of, data were going to be influenced by my background in philosophy. Such factors, however, were of a kind to influence the treatment of, rather than to determine, the research questions. Three key questions emerged, in the final analysis, from my interaction with the unfolding events of the case:

i   What organisational structures emerged as an adaptive response to the changes accompanying the implementation of TVEI, and what was their significance for educational management philosophy?

ii   How did TVEI contribute to the definition and provision of Technology Education?

iii   How was vocational education approached in TVEI and with what effects on the wider curriculum, and how may this experience contribute to our understanding of the philosophy of vocational education?

These three specific research questions are not altogether discrete from, or additional to, the earlier "broad background" question of the nature and reality of the case. The relationship between them is in the nature of a dialectic which facilitated the focusing of each. The three issues-based questions sharpened the broad and rather general "reality" question, while the latter helped to integrate the three separate questions within the boundaries of the one case, as well as indicating the way in to these questions - in large part through the narrative of the case study. The broad question of the nature of this particular LEA is generally not addressed directly but is rather implicit in the narrative as a whole. This diffused but important aspect of the dissertation gains in interest, I venture to suggest, because of the present critical point in the history of the local administration of education.

Themes Generated by the Research Questions

Central to the understanding of the case was the perception by the participants of a collaborative culture, often referred to as the "Enfield Way". Team building and the sharing of professional expertise were persistent themes that defined the Enfield "reality". For most participants, also, Enfield was a positive professional reference point. Even judgements which questioned aspects of Enfield practice were made largely against a background of shared values - educational, social and moral - which gave integrity to local educational agendas and stability to the case study.

My focus on the Enfield Way came to be sharpened by themes arising from the three specific questions. That of changing management structures, closely connected with curriculum change, was the first of these. The commitment, at different levels within Enfield, to a whole-curriculum focus, Borough-wide provision and whole-school planning pushed the issue of management structures to the fore. TVEI, with its cross curricular focus, was intimately connected with the process of change in Enfield management; it both influenced and was influenced by these changes.

The theme of technology is also a central aspect of the content of the case study. Its development and implementation within TVEI raised issues that overlapped with both the management and the vocational issues. Among issues critical for technology were cross curricular planning, the nature of practical studies, and group- and assignment-based learning, all of which had importance in other parts of the curriculum. The role of artefacts in the definition of technology also proved to be a critical educational issue.

TVEI was often spoken and written about as a "vocational" or "pre-vocational" initiative. This aspect of TVEI subsumes a number of related issues. Among the more important are: the significance of work in educational programmes (indeed, in conceptualizing education), the meaning of the practical and its relationship to theory, the role of objectives in curriculum planning, personal and social development outside the school, and the struggle for the control of education between different agencies and sections of the education service.

<u>Organisation</u>

The design underwent considerable change in the course of the work. I had originally intended, until a late stage of the writing, to include an Australian case study of mine to increase the comparative *interest* of the work. I had also intended to develop extended discussions of the three major emergent themes (vocational education, technology and management change) which were to be philosophical in nature and bring Enfield data in contact with relevant philosophical literatures. I found, however, that the space needed to do justice to the Enfield data crowded out some of these intentions. As the Enfield study grew, the Australian case study had to be curtailed to a mere summary (although a significant one), and only the most central of the major themes, vocational education, is addressed in a decontextualized or generalized way and to the length of a whole chapter, the other two themes having to be restricted to a section of a chapter and kept within the context of the case narrative.

The core of the study, which focuses directly on the Enfield story, consists of four chapters - Chapters Three to Six - and falls into two phases. Chapters Three, Four and Five describe respectively the first three years of the implementation (1983-6), highlighting issues that emerged in each of those years. Chapter Six is a snapshot three years on. Overall, the core of the study begins with events and conditions in the authority prior to the announcement of TVEI in November 1982 and breaks off in July 1989 at the conclusion of my return visit to Britain.

The first two chapters are preparatory to the case study. Chapter One describes and analyses the larger national story of TVEI, its political origins, its aims, and its changing structure

and policy against a background of other national changes. In Chapter Two, I address the methodology of the case study and how the circumstances of the research impacted on it. Philosophical issues arising out of this are also addressed, including the contrasting circumstances of the two phases of the research.

The final chapter is a philosophical overflow from the case. Both the case itself and the literature on TVEI identified the "new vocationalism" and "prevocationalism" as the pre-eminent issues. These issues are addressed in this final chapter where I examine philosophical and cultural issues associated with vocational education. Included, too, is an examination of modern and Aristotelian concepts of the practical which may be said to inform vocational education, and a summary of an Australian study I conducted in 1987 on links between work and study.

Perspective-shifts

The main bulk of the Enfield story is allowed to unfold for the most part without any "determined" imposition of my three specific research questions in Chapters Three, Four and Five. These chapters represent my first (though subsequently revisited) fieldwork phase. In them the complexity of organisational and individual interaction is allowed a good deal of free play and the issues arise out of the action. Issues in vocational education, for example, are implicit rather than explicit in the action. Chapter Six, however, which reports the work of my return visit in 1989, is somewhat different. It is based on a much shorter and less comprehensive interaction with participants, and the framework of the researcher, by comparison, more directly shapes the collection of data. Thus, Chapter Six has specific

sections on Technology and Vocationalism, whereas the earlier chapters allowed, by comparison, a freer narrative flow.

The two phases are characterized by rather different perspectives. Each phase has strong elements of case study, but the first has a focus on the action of the programme, while the second is relatively more issues-based. Adelman, Jenkins and Kemmis (in Simons, 1980, p 49) speak of case studies as "bounded systems" which may be identified in terms of either programmes or issues. These perspectives are not, of course, mutually exclusive. The second phase of the research is still clearly focused on the Enfield TVEI programme, though issues are somewhat more important to its identity. A shift occurs in the grammar of the research: in the first phase the subject is the action, and issues are in a sense "predicated" of the action; in the second, the issues are closer to being the subject itself.

A related subtle change of perspective arises from the difference between my being a publicly accredited evaluator in the first phase and a "private" researcher in the second. In the first phase I was much more an insider, although this is very much a relative term. In addition, the first phase of research was during a period of several years residence in Britain, whereas in the second phase I was a short-term visitor.

TVEI was ostensibly about vocational and technical education but became increasingly embedded in main-stream secondary education. Accordingly, the scope of the dissertation is not confined to the "vocational" dimension of TVEI but focuses on issues fundamental to education generally and, indeed, to society at large. Such concerns as the relationship between work and study, the meaning of the "practical" in human affairs, personal and social

development, require an expanded context in which to understand the local TVEI study. Similarly, technology education raised issues connected with the wider curriculum, in particular the interconnection between curriculum and organisational change.

CHAPTER ONE: TVEI - THE NATIONAL STORY

And what rough beast, its hour come round at last,

Slouches towards Bethlehem to be born?

(W.B. Yeats "The Second Coming")

Section 1: Context

When TVEI was announced on 12th November 1982 it was not a peripheral initiative directed at a sectional issue, area or problem. It should not be seen as contained within a specialist educational domain. While ostensibly about technical and vocational issues, it was centrally embedded in the educational politics of the time. Certain issues in the national educational debate were associated with the introduction of TVEI. It may be too much to say that these were the real factors driving TVEI on the ground but they were part of the rhetoric in justifying it and, therefore, in preparing the ground to some extent.[1] These issues included Britain's decline as an economic power, youth unemployment, the theoretical and academic nature of the curriculum as a cause of an anti-industrial culture (Holt, 1987; Wiener, 1981) and the desire by some, such as Sir Keith Joseph, for curriculum differentiation, especially relating to technical and vocational education. This chapter will, among other things, examine some of these as factors helping to define the larger, national background to TVEI, including also previous, largely unsuccessful attempts to establish a

---

[1] We can say that at a later point in the process the ground was watered by lavish resources in an otherwise starved educational environment.

viable technical/vocational education sector in Britain. These factors cannot be considered causes of TVEI, in a strong sense, but they contributed to a climate that made TVEI, or something like it, possible. In that weaker sense they can be considered "causal".

What were these factors enabling? The question as to what were the factors behind TVEI was complicated by the nebulous nature of TVEI itself, both in its initial description by the Manpower Services Commission (MSC) and in its chameleon variety on the ground. A causal question raises an ontological one. What was TVEI? An ontic bulge developed as different practitioners and observers discovered multiple realities in TVEI. Indeed it became a commonplace that TVEI took on the coloration of the host community. Even between individual TVEI schools (Barnes, 1987b,) there were to be significant differences in course structure, management and teaching styles, amounting, it might be said, to significantly different "realities". TVEI, as Roger Dale pointed out:

> is never merely imposed on schools. It is always accepted on certain implicit or explicit conditions based largely on the existing history, ideology, structure and location of the school, to produce a TVEI effect unique to that school."
> (Dale, 1986, p 44)

Causal and ontological questions are, however, fundamentally connected because the range of factors seen as influencing the emergence of the programme also fed into people's perception of what TVEI was to accomplish. And it was in terms of what it was to accomplish, ie, the solution to certain social, pedagogic, personal and economic problems, that it was frequently identified. But an identity in terms of solutions did not constrain definitional extravagance any more than did focusing on practices or curriculum structures. I don't quite agree with Roger Dale's comment that local variations in TVEI are constrained by "the problems it was created to solve". (Ibid. p 44) The identities of the problems are

12

themselves problematic: different interpretations amount to identifying different problems. The problems TVEI is meant to solve are not identified in a purely "denotative" way, to use Dale's own phrase when he acknowledges variations in TVEI ideology. (Ibid. p 39) What TVEI had to accomplish or "solve" could not be reified as a set of given purposes independent of the actors in the different settings. These purposes, which TVEI had supposedly to address, had to be described anew in the processes and meanings integral to each setting.

This chapter is background to the main study and therefore will be more in the nature of setting the scene than a full blown scholarly examination. The issues here may be said to lie across two dimensions - latitudinal and longitudinal. On the one hand there were those "latitudinal" events and issues at the national level impinging on TVEI at that time. They include the thoughts and actions of a variety of actors in government, the education service, industry, academia and educational development agencies such as the Further Education Unit (FEU). On the other hand, there is also the longitudinal dimension - that longstanding set of problems and attitudes relating to British technical and vocational education. TVEI did not fall neatly into the traditional domain of vocational education. Indeed, many actors in the main study made this point. However, much of its funding, rhetoric and political clout (perhaps, even the sudden rush of blood that marked its unexpected announcement) owes something to the growing realization that the history of technical education in Britain had been a succession of disastrous failures, eg the failure to provide adequate day release for apprentices. These failures were not only economic but social and political in nature. Among CDT teachers interviewed in the main study this awareness was a corrosive,

historical memory. This is corroborated by Harland's (1987, 47) perception of them as having "in many schools led rather isolated and low-status professional lives".

Support for TVEI came from a range of interests not all with the same educational experiences, traditions and visions. Both dimensions contribute to our understanding of TVEI - the broad one of the educational scene at the time, and the narrower focus of technical and vocational education over several generations.

The Public debate

A useful vantage point to begin developing a perspective on TVEI is the public debate in which the cultural and economic future of Britain became entangled with the structure, content and methods of schooling. It has become a commonplace that the Great Debate began with James Callaghan's speech at Ruskin College on 18 October 1976. While this speech was a significant acknowledgement by the Prime Minister that education was on the nation's mind it was not a kind of starting gun that began public discussion. Education had been moving onto the public agenda prior to this.

The old post-war consensus had been eroded and writers have remarked on the beginnings of this erosion through the 1960's. (Kogan, 1978; Lawton, 1980; Chitty, 1989) During the 1970's amid growing criticism in the press of alleged falling standards and the irrelevance of the curriculum for a large number of youngsters staying on at school, after an unflattering OECD report on the DES (Lawton, 1980), after the internal circulation of the Yellow Book within the DES critical of a number of general features of the education service (Lawton,

1980; Chitty, 1989) the Prime Minister finally acknowledged the influences building up in

his own government and the Civil Service. In that speech he remarked:

> I have been concerned to find that many of our best trained students who have
> completed the higher levels of education at university or polytechnic have no desire
> to join industry. Their preferences are to stay in academic life or to find their way
> into the Civil Service. There seems to be a need for a more technological bias in
> science teaching that will lead towards practical application in industry, rather than
> towards academic studies.
> (From: Chitty, 1989, p 170)

Clyde Chitty makes reference to the loss of commitment to the comprehensive ideal that had

occurred in some quarters of the Callaghan Labour government. In particular there was

pressure to increase parental choice and to expand "variety of provision" which would

compromise the ideal of a common 11 to 16 curriculum. (Chitty, 1989, Ch. 6) Given the

Prime Minister's remarks, there was also pressure to make the secondary curriculum, or part

of it, more vocationally oriented. Mrs. Shirley Williams was considering legislation towards

expanding differentiation of the curriculum but opposition from party sources saw this off.

(Chitty, Chapter 6) This restraint was removed with the Conservative government coming

to office. High profile members of the new government such as Norman Tebbitt and Sir

Keith Joseph (and an influential supporter, David Young, soon to be brought into

government) went on the offensive against the reluctance of schools to relate to the world of

work. (Holt, 1987; McCulloch, 1987; Lawton, 1988)

Some writers linked the economic decline of Britain with the orientation of schooling (See

Holt, loc. cit. p 68). Martin Wiener (1981, 1985) and Corelli Barnett (1986) attributed

Britain's difficulties to the underlying national culture reproduced by an excessively narrow

liberal education. This kind of social commentary offered intellectual underpinning to a new

promotion of technical and vocational educational. It helped create the atmosphere that made

15

TVEI acceptable to enough people, in the belief that it was solving an important educational and national problem. However, the precise nature of the problem was rarely defined and certainly not in a way that attracted agreement among stakeholders such as the industrial unions, teacher unions, employers, political parties, parent groups, the civil service and the industrial trainers, eg, the Royal Society of Arts (RSA) and the City and Guilds of London Institute (CGLI).

The technical and vocational dimensions of TVEI must be understood in a context wider than that of education. TVEI was born in an ideological climate of economic rationalism in which terms like "technical" and "vocational" were waved like slogans and wielded as weapons. In the rhetorical language of the time, TVEI was going to focus on work, would be practical and would reverse the alleged distain in which British education traditionally held industry. TVEI sprung from the heart of Thatcherism and aspired to reverse what had been claimed by critics such as Barnet and Wiener as a decline in the British industrial spirit. Martin Wiener argued that elements of British "literary" culture had led the nation into decline. Such central figures as Mill and Dickens, Arnold and Ruskin (members of Leavis' "Great Tradition") stand accused by him:

> In the end, Dickens turned away from the values of industrial capitalism, not to take up some protosocialist stance, but to join in the renovation of older gentry values. His fictional world led from the Old England of John Bull and stage-coaches through the feverish new urban society to end in a cathedral town among public school men. (Wiener, 1985, 35)

This was, of course, an attack on traditional, genteel Tory images. Wiener's preference for rubust commerce, however, would have appealed to the newer Thatcherite conservatives when he commented:

> The rejection by Mill and Dickens of commercial society was taken up more explicitly and fervently by the younger writers, Arnold and Ruskin, who in this

harked back to the Romantics of the generation before. Arnold's consistency was questionable ... (propagating) traditionalist prejudices against the class whose energies drove the modern world (with which he anxiously urged England to keep up) - industrial capitalists." (Wiener, 1985, 35)

The educational establishment, according to Wiener, was tainted by anti-industrial traditions stemming from 19th Century educators:

> Although they differed in a many ways, Arnold's contempt for the values of industrial England was shared and amplified by that great thunderer, John A Ruskin. ... (who) poured into his sermons on art and society a loathing of capitalism, technology and industrial society". (Wiener, 1985, p 37)

Wiener sees Ruskin's influence on "all future thought in Britain" as particularly negative by "bringing competition into disrepute", and making preoccupation with "material production ... clearly a vice". (Ibid, p 39) This concern is echoed in James Callaghan's statement at Ruskin College in 1976 and later by Sir Keith Joseph and Lord Young. The liberal tradition of the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake stood condemned.

Given the domination of politics by the media, issues are often not so much discussed as dramatized. Across modern democracies, the style of political debate is as redolent of the theatre, as of the lecture hall. Educational issues requiring thoughtful analysis fare badly in such a climate. The educational debate, which formed the background to TVEI, was often characterized by highly emotive rhetoric. An example is John Rae's review of Correlli Barnett's The Audit of War: The Illusion of a Great Nation in The Listener, 6th March 1986. Rae writes:

> Corelli Barnett identifies the guilty men. Who betrayed Britain by encouraging it to pursue wrong priorities? They were high-minded well intentioned Christians, whose education at public school and at Oxford or Cambridge left them ignorant and contemptuous of manufacturing industry and international trade. The arch-villain was Sir William Beveridge, the father of the Welfare State. He was educated at Charterhouse and Balliol (of course) where he read classics (what else?) and was infected by the Master's sermons on Christian ethics. Liberal, arrogant, self-rightous,

authoritarian, he pointed Britain unswervingly towards the rocks. (The Listener, 6/3/86, p 23)

Rae goes on to berate the educational establishment:

> Education - as Correlli Barnett points out - is a good illustration of the damage done by the Enlightened Establishment. Dr. Cyril Norwood (classicist, President of St. John's, Oxford) was no less successful than Beveridge in pointing post-war Britain in the wrong direction. (Ibid)[2]

In a style of the writing that is dramatic rather than analytic, ideological rather than factual, Rae describes Britain's alleged decline in a rather lurid way, with education deeply implicated. Rae quotes Barnett's own description of the dream of the New Jerusalem as:

> turned to a dank reality of a segregated, subliterate, unskilled, unhealthy and institutionalized proletariat hanging on the nipple of state materialism". (Ibid)

This head of ideological steam is not from the tabloids but from a respected weekly. It was not surprising, therefore, that efforts to vocationalize education were so well supported.

Gradually, too, the atmosphere was prepared for a programme that was selective (as TVEI was) through public statements supporting a policy of educational differentiation. As Chitty (1989) shows, this was a continuing policy under Mark Carlisle, Secretary of State until 1981, and thereafter under Sir Keith Joseph until 1986, by which time TVEI had been well and truly launched. Only a few months after TVEI had commenced, Sir Keith made a particularly important public statement in Sheffield (Jan 1984) in which he laid down the basis of his educational philosophy which resonated in varying degrees through TVEI schemes. Four principles formed the basis of his message: breadth, balance, relevance and

---

[2] No mention is made that Britain's European partners have equally strong classical traditions. M. Mitterand reads Plato in spare time at international conferences, Signor Andreotti quotes publicly and easily from classical languages and the Germans are noted for the high value they place on classical learning.

differentiation. While many TVEI teachers were alarmed by the Secretary of State, out of their mouths nevertheless we shall hear comments that would have been music to Sir Keith's ears. A certain kind of rhetoric spread among many professional educators, some associated with TVEI, which could be interpreted as unwittingly sharing some assumptions with those leading politicians they opposed. Much of this new educational "dialect" emanated from the FEU which will be looked at in a later section in this chapter. In the main study, some teachers and administrators spoke of the need for a "more practical" curriculum that promoted personal and social development, that allowed "choice" to individual students and the opportunity to mature outside the school in "real life situations". Moreover, for much of the first two years, many TVEI teachers conducted a very separate kind of programme inimical to comprehensive education but defended on grounds of being "school-based". This pointed up the rhetorical looseness that resulted from slogans that sometimes served as battle banners. There was disagreement on what much of this rhetoric meant in practice, but the agenda for debate was being set by the government and many TVEI teachers accepted the form of this agenda, though disageeing about its content. Only a handful of the many TVEI teachers I interviewed raised the quite fundamental issues of the meaning of a liberal education as it impinged on TVEI, and whether the discourse associated with TVEI was acceptable. While many teachers opposed what they thought the MSC was allegedly including in the category of "skills", very few indeed questioned whether the concept of "skill" adequately covered the range of human capacities.

TVEI had the effect of intensifying the educational debate. It was a lightning rod for many already raging arguments. Little was new but TVEI did provide a concrete focus for principles and in the process raised the level of feeling. At the local and national level

people ranged themselves on opposite sides. For example, within Enfield TVEI was described by some teachers as the lever that allowed them to open up the curriculum and break the grip of the subject-based curriculum. At the same time others saw it as an attack on the liberal tradition. At the national level most educational writers were suspicious and some were hostile. For those writers it represented an attack on the comprehensive ideal and was inspired by a utilitarian, if not a philistine, vision of education.

A few did offer support to TVEI. Ann Jones, an influential secondary head, wrote supportingly of TVEI (Jones, 1983) and Prof. Richard Pring, closely associated with the Devon scheme, saw possibilities for TVEI breaking the rigid academic mould that had little to offer a large proportion of youngsters (Pring, 1985). At a later stage Helen Simons acknowledged that TVEI had "in some circumstances enabled teachers to promote liberal values within a vocationally-oriented government initiative". (Simons, 1988) Further support from the educational sector came from an organization to which schools and LEA's subscribe, the Centre for the Study of Comprehensive Schools (CSCS). It came out in support of TVEI (Holt 1987, pp 68-9). It is worth noting that some of the funds for CSCS came from industry. We shall see that it became a close ally of TVEI and cooperated in TVEI's public relations campaign in the Extension phase.

There existed two separate domains of reporting and commentary about TVEI with what appeared to be two different readerships. Each was characterized by a very different style of presentation. In the main-stream educational press, journals and book publications a great deal of hostility was expressed towards TVEI on educational grounds: its differentiation (and, therefore, opposition to the comprehensive ideal), its elitism, its utilitarianism. (O'Connor

1984; Dancy, 1984;; Maw, 1985) Outside the domain of academics and main stream educational writers were several "magazine-style" publications which reported TVEI very differently. These radiated a kind of educational faith in TVEI. The writing was "happy" rather than "critical"; the focus was on people, places and programmes, rather than on abstract ideas and fundamental philosophical issues. The in-house, magazine-style publication TVEI Insight, at first a monthly and later a quarterly, was expensively produced, attractively designed and very professionally produced. It was "quality", expensive publishing, redolent of the up-market commercial sector, an expense that is rarely lavished on schools and teachers. The style was chatty, optimistic, pleasant and not too cerebral in contrast with the more intellectual, analytical tone of the TES and other serious journals that had taken up the TVEI debate. Similarly, the Journal of the RSA, News Check (a publication of the MSC) and publications of CSCS were short-circuiting the negative views critics were expressing in the serious journals. These attractive, picture-laden magazines were published for a wide readership. Quite clearly they saw themselves as "magazines". News Check so describes itself in the editorial of the July 1984 issue which had a special feature on TVEI.

One can only speculate on how effective these publications were in getting across their optimistic message about TVEI but I know that teachers read them and I never encountered any criticism of them. There continued to be a degree of hostility at an abstract, ideological level - one only had to read the TES. But on the ground enough support was generated, including some from "progressive" educators looking for a strategy to break the subject-based curriculum.

<u>The Industrial Trainers</u>

Industrial trainers, eg. RSA, CGLI, who had been developing programmes with a more "skills orientated" curriculum, familiarized some teachers with ideas and practices that were to be important features of TVEI. Teachers were searching for an alternative curriculum diet from the academic one. The Humanities Project and others like it had earlier offered quality alternatives. These required from teachers a degree of conceptual understanding and familiarity with materials and practice, and towards these ends appropriate staff development was provided to the extent that resources permitted. Industrial trainers like CGLI and the RSA offered easy "packages" which could be taken off the shelf by hard pressed teachers. They differed from many of the earlier Schools Council's projects in having an orientation to the "world of work" and having a less difficult conceptual rationale. It was all so much easier and critically less demanding. The industrial trainers also offered nationally accredited qualifications considered to be important in a time of high youth unemployment.

The CGLI programme <u>365 - Course in Vocational Preparation (General)</u> was used in schools in the period immediately leading up to the introduction of TVEI. (See Joe Goodall, 1982) The target population for the <u>365</u> was

> students of around average ability who are over the age of sixteen and are staying on at school for sixth form studies, or have elected to leave school for further education, and who have not yet expressed a particular interest in any particular area.
> (CGLI, July 1981, p 1)

There were important differences from TVEI. The <u>365</u>, being aimed at the burgeoning sixth forms in schools, did not attack the comprehensive ideal for the 11 to 16 group.[3] Moreover, a different ability range was also targeted. "Students of around average ability" is obviously

---

[3] This was to change later somewhat, as we shall see.

a euphemism for the less able. While there was some early uncertainty, as Chitty demonstrates (op. cit. Ch. 6) regarding the precise target group for TVEI, it was certainly a more mixed ability cohort than the 365. Similarities with TVEI, however, are to be found in the list of aims (CGLI, op. cit., p 2). Not all of these match those of TVEI but common to both are the focus on the world of work, personal relationships, study skills, problem-solving including planning and evaluating courses of action, political and economic literacy, and an appreciation of the physical and technological environment. A further similarity was the access to alternative national qualifications.

Perhaps the impact of courses like the 365 was that schools began to think about alternative content and methods. It was a "practical" course not solely in the sense of being manipulative or manual but in offering examples of how to organize teaching and learning in non book-based strategies. This was quoted as a positive aspect of TVEI by several Enfield interviewees. It was the kind of learning that Richard Pring found absent in the traditional curriculum. (Pring, 1985b)

It would be incorrect, however, to assume that TVEI was simply a development out of 365. One clear discontinuity was that 365 was a post-compulsory course originating in the FE sector though taken up by many schools looking for alternative 16+ curricula, whereas TVEI was an intervention in main-stream school curriculum at the level of 14+. TVEI, unlike 365, was operating in a comprehensive curriculum and was only a part of the whole curriculum. It had to be more responsive, therefore, to the general features of secondary education.

The Royal Society of Arts (RSA), another organisation involved in industrial training, sponsored the "Education for Capability" committee whose chairman, Charles Handy, spoke of the need "to change the ethos of the whole educational system". (cited in McCulloch, loc. cit. p 16) A co-signatory of this committee was John Tomlinson, Chairman of the Schools Council and Director of Education for Cheshire. It was another source of public criticism of the narrow academic curriculum that made certain aspects of TVEI acceptable to the public and sections of the education community. Furthermore, RSA, like CGLI, offered nationally accredited qualifications in specific vocational areas and in more general areas like "Communications". RSA is a commercial organisation and had been marketing its courses and qualifications at a time when teachers were looking for an alternative diet for a section of its students. It had developed an extensive range of student assessment profiles for which many TVEI schemes subsequently became a large market. (And, of course, TVEI had money to spend.)

Influence of FE

The FEU through their publications had been influencing not only the FE sector but had a growing audience in the schools. As Dale points out a new "FE ideology" and "FE pedagogy" had grown up (Dale, 1986, p 37-8). A factor which contributed to the growth of a sympathetic audience was the earlier Raising of the School Leaving Age (ROSLA) and the increasing numbers of uninterested youngsters staying on at school. Teachers were increasingly concerned by the "dissaffection" of a range of students. (Enfield interviewees also referred to this though Enfield had a good deal less of it than many other places.)

An example of an influential FEU publication was A Basis for Choice (1979a). (See J. Goodall, op. cit. for its influence in Hounslow.) Several interviewees in Enfield gave credit to its influence. The very first sentence of the CGLI course 365, whose significance in schools we have discussed above, referred to it in self-justification. It was no accident that the Enfield TVEI planning document produced in the Summer Term 1985 had an echoing title, TVEI - A Basis For Development.

Another indication of the influence of the FEU was the publication, Active Learning - A Register (Part 1 and 2), a register of "experiential and participatory learning" (FEU, 1979b, reprinted 1981). Most of the entries are from FE establishments. However, there are some school entries which shows the FEU's growing interest in the school sector. Within its terms of reference it states: "Examples might be taken from the final year of compulsory schooling". (Ibid. p 1) Many of the approaches mentioned foreshadow TVEI practice. Categories specifically mentioned include:

> The Project Approach,
> The Survey Approach,
> The Work Experience Approach,
> The Commercial Enterprise Approach,
> The Twinning Approach,
> The Integrated Course Approach,
> The Activity Centre Approach,
> The Residential Approach.
> (Ibid. p 2-3)

These ideas were underpinned by a confessional fervour in this same introduction:

> Life has never been something which can be understood solely from books. Traditionally, however, the academic curriculum has drawn far more from the Library than from the factory or the hospital or the market place and this has been true not only for the intellectually able but also for courses produced for students with less aptitude for academic work. Discovery methods and other new approaches may be used in such cases but too often only as part of a watering down of the original content of subjects rather than in taking the opportunity to adopt wider criteria for the curriculum. Those who favour experiential and participatory learning feel that a

redressing of the balance in education towards a preparation for the realities of life is essential. This applies to students of all levels of ability from those in need of basic education to those capable of some form of Higher Education.

(FEU, 1979b, pp 3-4)

Much of this rhetoric was to be heard in defence of TVEI. It is important to realize again that much of the drive to vocationalize the curriculum was inextricably bound up with a "progressive" educational philosophy. Many of the people associated with TVEI in Enfield were "progressives" in the sense that their major concern was with developing in their students a sense of personal independence and a commitment to worthwhile projects. "Empowering the student" was a phrase heard many times.

The FEU's Beyond Coping - Some Approaches to Social Education (publ. Aug, 1980) also anticipated many features of later TVEI practice. Jack Mansell, in his letter accompanying the publication, favoured enquiry-based learning as in the School's Council History 13-16 (note the growing interest in the general school curriculum). He also supported experiential activities outside the school, specifically in the three areas of the Trident Scheme, viz. work experience, community service and Outward Bound type courses (the first two of which were to be adopted by Enfield TVEI). Reference was made in the same letter to reflective group activities such as T-Group training and it is significant that intensive group interaction was to be introduced from FE right at the beginning of Enfield TVEI as a form of staff development but was rejected as too threatening by many of the younger staff from schools. Mansell also mentions learning through modelling adults outside the school. This was to prove a much more acceptable notion to the broad range of TVEI teachers in Enfield and was a key developmental concept; "maturing with adults outside the school" was a concept much favoured by teachers.

In September 1982 the FEU published <u>Profiles</u> which was a review of issues and practice in the use and development of student profiles. This was followed in October 1984 by <u>Profiles in Action</u>. The research is reviewed in an early chapter of the latter by Desmond Nuttall and Harvey Goldstein. They sound a warning:

> We are quite clear that the technical problems surrounding profiles are just as difficult as in these other areas and to ignore them would seem to be folly. In our view, it would be wise to spend time now reflecting on these technical matters before too widespread and too rigid systems are developed.
>
> Nuttall and Goldstein in FEU, 1984, p 10)

Much of the remainder of this FEU publication sets out in graphic form examples of profiling from the Business Education Council, the Technician Studies Course, CGLI and RSA and Avon Profile Initiative. Most of these are based on grid structures and content supplied from comment banks. There is a clear tension between the Nuttall and Goldstein article and the examples in the rest of the book. This tension has also fed into TVEI.

Not only did the FEU contribute to the educational climate that made TVEI possible, but it would seem that the FEU deliberately targeted TVEI issues after the scheme had been established. In another publication, <u>Progressing to College: a 14-16 Core</u> (1985), the FEU moved beyond FE and aimed its message at the TVEI age group in schools. Generally the FE ideology stressed skills-based rather than content-based learning, though this was open to the most diverse interpretation. It also stressed active, student-negotiated learning in settings beyond the traditional classroom. Academic, subject-based curriculum was criticized for its artificiality and a problem-solving, cross-curricular approach was recommended as serving students' real needs and developing personal "capability" for the world of work. Profiling, linking work and study, becoming socially confident and developing "personal" skills, were all part of the "FE agenda" which was getting increasing notice in schools.

Growing role of central government

Through the 1970's, central government developed a growing interventionist role. This partly prepared the ground for the centralist strike that TVEI surely was. Denis Lawton (1986) documents this centralist progress from a previous collaborative stance to a more openly interventionist one. DES Circulars and publications had influenced the thinking of individuals. This was certainly so in Enfield where several interviewees acknowledged the influence of Curriculum 5-16. (HMI, 1981) Furthermore, circulars such as 6/81[4] had prepared institutions for responding to central authorities.

State intervention in Science and Technology as McCulloch remarks (loc. cit. p 15) had been on the increase. The Labour government in the Sixties had established a Ministry of Technology which had later been abolished by the Conservatives. In 1981, however, Kenneth Baker was appointed to a newly created post of Minister of Technology. This interest in Science and Technology had already appeared in educational dress in the form of Project Technology, (Walker, 1980; Morris, 1980; Harrison 1980) easily the highest spending curriculum project until TVEI came along. Nuffield Science, while privately funded, was strongly supported by the central government. A few months before the announcement of TVEI the DES published Science Education in Schools: a consultative document in which Science teaching was criticized as being in many cases too academic and not in tune with the needs of industry.

---

[4] An Australian audience may not be aware of the attempts of the central administration to gain influence over the curriculum in the late 70's and early 80's. A number of circulars were sent to local authorities requesting action in the area of curriculum. "6/81" was a request for schools to supply information on how they were planning a balanced and coherent curriculum.

The Failed Partnership in Technical Education

There had been several disappointments in the previous 100 years for those seeking a better deal for technical education and for the individuals whose lives might have been expanded through a broader, fairer provision. This was not just an educational or even an economic matter in the broad sense; it was also perceived by many as social justice denied to that sector of the nation who earn their living from manual work, much of it requiring high levels of skill, knowledge and judgement. However, as Walsh points out, egalitarian considerations by themselves are insufficient to make a case for upgrading Technology (Walsh, 1978).

It was in the area of apprenticeship that most of the effort for increased educational resources for technical education was historically concentrated. This was the traditional entry for skilled work. The economic and utilitarian arguments were always prominent but there were also voices raised on behalf of the broader education of workers and the inclusion of humane content was a matter of educational debate throughout the history of apprenticeship education (Bristow, 1970; Cantor and Roberts, 1972; Gleeson and Mardle, 1979; Whitehead, 1932). Historically, the campaign has centred on making off-the-job education and training compulsory for all apprentices through what has been termed "day release".

Apprentices on day release have always been a minority. Cantor and Roberts claim that between 1971 and 1975 the percentage of those on day release out of the population not in full time education has remained at about 20% (1979, p 43). Karen Evans shows that the numbers released actually declined between 1967 and 1976 (1980, Fig. 1.7, p 33). The apparent contradiction is due to the declining numbers recruited at that time into the manufacturing sector, the traditional area of day release, accompanied at the same time by

declining numbers in those age groups not in full-time education from which apprentices were drawn. (The latter resulted from the "Raising of the School Leaving Age" to 16 - commonly referred to in Britain as "ROSLA".)

Three major Acts of Parliament (1918, 1944 and 1964) each attempted to advance the cause of day release by mistakenly relying on voluntarism within a framework based on a partnership of employers, industrial unions and the colleges. The first of these, the Fisher Education Act of 1918, intended that there should be universal day release but failed to make the necessary provision. A national system of day release for all in employment under 17 years was envisaged (Evans, 1980, p 4). However, the Act left the responsibility of providing "day continuation schools" to the local authorities. With a few exceptions the local authorities did not use the power of compulsion, the use of which, under the Act, was left to their own discretion. The hoped for increase in the release of apprentices by employers did not occur. Had the Technical Colleges been upgraded they might have attracted support from the employers. But this did not happen. Moreover, as Karen Evans points out, the depression which followed resulted in a reduction of resources. The Fisher Act was no more than enabling legislation: local authorities were free to go ahead with compulsory day release but were not resourced to do so.

In the 1944 Education Act, Section 44 recommended that County Colleges be set up and that young people in employment under the age of 18 would be required to attend for the equivalent of one day per week. Such arrangements were not to depend on the grace and favour of individual employers. Unhappily, the fateful let-out clause appeared once again: compulsory attendance depended on the "completion of the provision of the County

Colleges". The critical feature of the Act was the open time-table for the completion of the

colleges. Karen Evans quotes from a Ministry of Education circular and notes that its

closing words were not encouraging.

> (The Order in Council of 10th March 1947) ... has no reference to a possible date for
> the completion of the provision for County Colleges, as to which no reliable forecast
> can be made in the present circumstances, nor to the date on which a duty to attend
> the County Colleges is likely to be imposed under the terms of Section 44 of the
> Education Act 44.
> (Ministry of Education, 1947, Plans for County Colleges, Circular 139)

At this time expanding the full-time school sector, particularly the secondary level, was given

priority. This was unjust to some degree as it discriminated against what was largely a

working class group. Under-resourcing of technical and vocational education persisted and

was a consideration in establishing TVEI, although the windfall went mainly to schools rather

than colleges.

The Crowther Report (1959), perhaps recognising the fact that Section 44 of the 1944 Act

had borne little or no fruit in making day release compulsory, decided to recommend its

extension. This was, in effect, to accept the voluntary principle as too entrenched to change.

"In the long term, however, the committee was firmly convinced that compulsion must be

introduced". (Evans, p 12) But this was only to affirm the policy and avoid the politics.

The committee knew that under the voluntary principle the employers would not deliver.

The recommendations of the Crowther Committee, under the aegis of the Central Advisory

Council, prompted the government to set up its own Henniker-Heaton committee which

reported in 1964. Like all previous reports and Acts on the subject it favoured day release

but, as on previous occasions, "more important" priorities intervened. The Robbins Report

on higher education had appeared the previous year and the Henniker-Heaton committee

stated that "neither compulsion in day release nor the right to claim release could be granted at that time without holding back the prospects for other urgent educational developments" (cited in Evans, 1980, p 14).

At that time the appeal of the meritocratic society was very powerful as was the view that educational opportunity held the key to social and economic improvement. The Prime Minister, Harold MacMillan, in a speech at Sussex University pointed to the rise of his own family through educational opportunities. Money spent on universities was seen as offering more opportunity for social and economic advancement than day release at the local tech. If higher education offered fewer prizes they were larger and more glittering and in keeping with the aspirations of social mobility in the 1960's.

The major stake-holders in technical and vocational education were the teaching unions (professional educators), the employers and the Trade Union Congress (TUC). In the Industrial Training Act (1964) the employers were again effective in steering the government away from compulsory day release. This was a set back for the teaching unions and the TUC. A gesture was made to encouraging release by striking levies which were returned to employers if they conformed with the recommendations. One aspect of the Act which drew criticism was the separation of education and training. The training component was seen as pre-eminent and was funded through the Department of Labour. It left the educators as unequal partners with the trainers. Ethel Venables deplored the passing of this Act:

> It has demonstrated the absurdity of relying on that reified entity "Industry" to provide education as distinct from training for a large proportion of young people who leave school at 16. ... The colleges are not yet able to free themselves from the dictates of their "users" and they can only hope to become equal partners when the government is prepared to back educational opportunity for all beyond the school leaving age". (Ethel Venables, 1975)

Looking back through the history of apprenticeship education no satisfactory resolution of the tension between education and training seems to have been achieved. The interests of employers, apprentices and the broad community were in fundamental conflict while the voluntary approach to apprenticeship education persisted. Compulsion would have meant increased resourcing and that was not forthcoming.

The accumulation of these failures was coming home to roost. The "lack of skill" that James Callaghan found employers complaining about was not surprising. But it was employers who had resisted schemes which might have given broad and flexible post-school education and training to all young workers. Not all the blame can be placed on employers, however. Industrial unions viewed the apprenticeship system as a way of controlling entry and sometimes resisted curriculum change that might open up a trade.

Apprenticeship had failed as a means of creating a skilled work force because it did not seem to be able to grasp the full dimensions of technical education. Something else had to be tried. This led to the creation of the MSC with its unprecedented budgets and indirectly led to the setting up of TVEI.

M.S.C. Comes to Town

With apprenticeship numbers falling and British manufacturing dropping behind its competitors, the Employment and Training Act (1973) marked the beginning of the Manpower Services Commission (MSC). This body replaced the Central Training Council which, through the Industrial Training Boards, "had only limited success in increasing the quantity and improving the quality of training". (Cantor and Roberts, 1972, p 3) The MSC

was set up as a statutory body within the Department of Labour and possessed wider powers than its predecessor. It was a political response to the public's perception of economic decline and growing concern about youth unemployment. As unemployment grew the power of the MSC increased, as did its budget; by 1981 the MSC had a budget of one billion pounds. (Most of this was being spent on the Youth Training Scheme (YTS), a one year course later extended to two, for young people to continue full-time education Post 16, ideally with a mix of work and study.) By comparison, the Central Training Council (MSC's forerunner) had had a budget of 50 million pounds (Cantor and Roberts, 1972, p 82). The contrast is further demonstrated by comparing the recommendation of the Carr Report (1958) "that the state should continue to leave industrial training to industry" (Ibid. p 8), with the policy of the early eighties that

> MSC and industrial bodies have helped maintain intakes of young people into long term training during the recession mainly by deploying Exchequer funds.
> (MSC, July 1980, p 15, 3.25 c)

While the Labour Party publicly opposed TVEI there was ambivalence on the part of the TUC. Holt (Op. cit. p 80) quotes Jackson (1986) "The MSC is the brain-child of the TUC ... Its creation is seen by the TUC as a great historical achievement to be preserved at virtually any cost". As a statutory partner in the MSC, the TUC did not want to destabilize that institution. While many educators may have opposed TVEI, to the TUC it was an unprecedented investment in some form of "technical" education through an organisation in which the trade union movement had some representation. To many trade unionists in the traditional, embattled, "sunset" industries the rhetoric of technical training would have had considerable plausibility and they gave at least passive support to TVEI.

The PM's announcement of TVEI in Novemeber 1982 displayed an extraordinarily confident sweeping aside of past structures. Even her own government processes seem to have been by-passed as she ignored the DES as the appropriate locus for an initiative that was essentially focused on the secondary sector. McCulloch refers to the "Falklands factor" as promoting a "resolute approach" in the style of government. The announcement took everyone by surprise. It had been the subject of little, if any, consultation and only the broadest indications of intentions. The PM referred to "growing concern about existing arrangements for technical and vocational education provision for young people". The plan was to commence a "pilot" project in 10 LEA's with an annual intake of 250 students for each LEA. This meant that at full strength TVEI could embrace no more than 1000 students per LEA. The targeted cohort was the 14 to 18 age group. Originally TVEI was meant to replace the participants' entire curriculum. (McCulloch, op. cit. p 23)

At this point there was no framework, no master concepts or curriculum plans, no central support structure with a developmental or research function; there was simply a statement that LEA's could bid for resources to set up a scheme described rather sketchily, and in rhetorical, even ideological, terms. In the coded language of the first announcement, LEA's had to bid for a programme which would

> widen and enrich the curriculum in a way that will help young people prepare for the world of work, and to develop skills and interests, including creative abilities, that will help them to lead a fuller life and to be able to contribute more to the life of the community.
> (Quoted from Dale, 1986, p 31)

There was uncertainty and risk attached to bidding for TVEI but there were also considerable incentives. Resources would flow. By 1986 the MSC was planning to spend 40 million pounds per year. (McCulloch, op. cit. p 23) The initial statement asked for a wide range of abilities in a gender-balanced intake who would pursue a mixed programme of general, technical and vocational education. These were buzz words whose meaning were still to be tested in practice. But in political terms they were "evoking the right rhetorics" (Holt, op. cit. p 65).

There was strong support for technical schools within the Conservative Party. "The spread of comprehensives helped to strengthen Conservative support for technical education". (McCulloch, 1987, 21) Technical colleges after all were part of the tripartite system as envisaged by the 1944 Act. At the outset David Young threatened to use the powers of the MSC to set up its own technical schools if TVEI was ignored by the education service. (Education, 19 Nov. 1982) As will be seen in Chapter Three, the local interest in separate technical schools by the Conservative Education Committee was a factor in Enfield bidding for TVEI. The Labour Party, on the other hand, had comprehensive education, without curriculum differentiation, at the centre of its official policy. But, as we noted earlier from Clyde Chitty, there was some unofficial misgivings about comprehensivization within the cabinet of the last Labour government. Furthermore, TUC represention on the MSC went along with TVEI. We must wonder, therefore, to what extent was the public criticism of TVEI by the Labour Party and the trade union movement a representative view.

Connected with the initial absence of any curriculum content and structures was the unprecedented style of application and negotiation, unprecedented at least in the school sector of education. It represented a departure from a civil service model of the "one-shot"

application for a position, programme or contract whose identity is clearly specified and published at the time applications are invited. In the traditional model, the terms of the application process are fully documented, including a strict closing date and the outcomes are clearly specified. Both the applicant and advertiser have one chance to get it right. Hence the expectation is that great care is taken on both sides of the process. But TVEI, following processes developed by the MSC, (see Harland, 1987, 40) engaged LEA's in an on-going interaction of bidding and negotiation between sponsor and client. Each side seemed to learn as they went along.

Another frequently noted feature was the speed with which everything had to be done. Some referred to the "quick fix" and it was reminiscent of the FE style of "fast-track" development. "Conceived in haste and born of Caesarean section", was how an LEA officer described TVEI to Fiddy and Stronach, who go on to comment, "...much alarm was expressed about the speed of events, a speed unknown in previous educational innovations with which this county had been involved". (Fiddy and Stronach, 1987, p 97) In hindsight, with the subsequent introduction and implementation schedules of the General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE) and the National Curriculum, Britain was to become very familiar with speed. TVEI schemes were planned to commence by the following September 1983, which meant that all planning needed to be completed by July. LEA's had five weeks at the end of 1982 to respond initially, involving a scramble that seemed somewhat unseemly to those educators familiar with the more sedate and considered style of educational planning in schools. When modifications were required these were expected rather quickly. In those Authorities where collaborative and consultative planning was the norm, this kind of speed threatened the underlying organisational values. The hectic pace seemed to favour prompt,

executive decision-making on the model of corporate managerialism rather than consultation through professional teams.

A practical illustration of these matters can be found in the development of the "Aims and Criteria" document which was the basic guide in applying for TVEI and in continuing to fulfill the TVEI contract with the MSC. This was a three page document that had something for everybody: world of work; gender balance; mixed ability groupings; active, practical learning; a mix of general, vocational and technical learning; personal and social development and understanding of the world of business. Neither at the time of the announcement, nor at the time initial applications closed, is there any evidence that this document existed. It would appear that it was generated through interaction with the applicants. McCulloch states that the "broad criteria" for LEA schemes were approved in Jan 1983. This corroborates my findings of the earliest documentary evidence being a typed copy of the "Criteria", dated February 1983 (sent to the LEA); and, subsequently, a copy of the "Aims" dated April 1983. Both these documents were brought together without alteration as TVEI's "Aims and Criteria" in the TVEI Review of 1984 pp. 22-4.

Despite the Labour Party rhetoric against the scheme, many Labour Authorities applied for TVEI. Whatever the political colour, TVEI meant resources and those who applied believed that as part of the game they could influence the process. To be left outside in the untainted air was not in the best interests of the authority. The Director of Education at Gateshead commented that while TVEI's initial approach might be "objectionable" the "best way for LEA's to make a significant contribution is to be part of the arrangements from the start and to mould them, in the interests of all youngsters, in the way we think important".

(McCulloch, 1987, 26) This view was echoed by senior Enfield administrators as we shall see in the main study.

Sixty-eight applications were made by sixty-six Authorities and fourteen were accepted. These included five metropolitan districts, seven counties, one London borough and one Welsh authority. The increased number showed a change in the intentions of the MSC. According to interviewees in the main study there was strong political pressure to have a London Borough in the first wave and this worked in Enfield's favour. Other similar pressures may have added to the expansion. The requirement for TVEI to consist of the whole curriculum was dropped, another departure from the original design.

Section 3: The First Fourteen

TVEI commenced in September 1983 with fourteen authorities: Barnsley, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bradford, Clwyd, Devon, Enfield, Hereford and Worcester, Hertfordshire, Leicestershire, Sandwell, Staffordshire, Wigan, and Wirral. These authorities were to become to become magnets for resources and foci of attention. Some of this attention was negative, arising out of resentment at the lavish funding.

While the ideological storm raged above their heads, on the ground the first TVEI cohorts and teachers embraced the new experiment with extraordinary enthusiasm. Indeed, why wouldn't they? There was lavish funding for a small group of staff and students. This meant superior equipment and furniture which was reserved, under the contract, for the primary use of the TVEI programme. An early TVEI experience was a fully funded residential.

Generally classes were small and teaching was not bound by the external constraints of the public examination system. My own research found an extraordinary degree of commitment and fervour from this first group. This is supported by other researchers. Janet Harland, for example, compares the experiences of some TVEI teachers to that of the prisoners emerging from the prison in Beethoven's Fidelio. (Harland, 1987, 46-7)

Because TVEI had very little definition beyond its confessional rhetorics there was a great diversity of interpretation and practice across the first fourteen LEA's. Stuart Maclure commented in the TES, "TVEI has proved to be very varied - so varied that there is no such thing as a TVEI stereotype". (Quoted by McCulloch, 1987, 28) There was lavish funding but no supporting curriculum development, no educational structure, no clear educational direction beyond general "criteria" many of which were generally agreed by educators to be part of good practice, eg., mixed ability intakes, gender balance, blending theory and practice. Money was being thrown at the most general ideas whose firm details were still to emerge.

It was a time not only of extraordinary uncertainty, however, but also of development. Money, curriculum space, and a certain freedom led to a good deal of experimentation with new teaching and learning styles. This process of trial and error in an unsupported, open-ended programme was exciting, but it could also be somewhat stressful. Not all authorities and schools were risk takers and some resorted to off-the-shelf courses in CDT (Dale, 1986). Others such as Enfield struck out, in new cross curricular initiatives, to break the mould of traditional schooling.

An important dimension of difference was the variety of approaches to technology. Some TVEI schemes approached technology as a specialist subject in the curriculum. Harland describes Croydon TVEI schools as having

> a common course structure: in each school TVEI occupies three slots in the option structure. Each student has a choice between Technology and Business Studies and these options are each taught to two or more banded groups in each school. (Harland, 1986, 52)

This approach to technology education favours highly visible products; it is also concentrated, both in terms of schools and subjects, thus reducing risks. One Enfield administrator disparagingly referred to this approach as "technology castle". Opposed to this is a broader concept of technology across the curriculum with equipment dispersed to more schools and subjects, as occurred in Enfield.

TVEI was a high profile phenomenon that attracted a great deal of envy. The equipment, the publicity, the residentials, the freedom to innovate and the improved teaching and learning conditions were all so obvious. Comment could not be supressed when computers rolled past the Maths room, very short of equipment, to the TVEI room, already brimming with new shiny gadgets. The envy factor was a commonplace observation from many of the evaluators.

Correspondingly, in this first period TVEI groups felt embattled, and as a result protective and loyal to their new initiative. Apart from the envy in their schools and LEA's, the educational press was at its most hostile to TVEI at this period. There were, besides, the additional pressures that any teacher is under in a time of radical curriculum change that is unsupported by any central structure.

And yet the central agency did not remain neutral as to what they were prepared to fund. At this time, according to many of the key people in the main study, the MSC favoured spending on equipment over staff and programme development. It also favoured the vocational aspects of the programme. (McCulloch, 1987, 24) This may very well have had something to do with the political rhetoric associated with the General Election that occurred close to the commencement of TVEI.

But this was not to last. Organisations are not usually monolithic, nor are their key people unchanging - either in their views or their identity. Participants in the main study, who were critical of the educational understanding of the early MSC, commented on how quickly key people learnt, and on the calibre of new people recruited. There was a clear shift towards broader understandings, culminating in the MSC being renamed (or replaced by?) the Training Agency in 1987. McCulloch comments that "TVEI since 1982 has involved widening its appeal to include [a] more liberal outlook". (1987, 24) Comments by key Enfield negotiators would support this.

A start was made at this time on the evaluation of TVEI which was mandatory for all schemes. With so much else to do in the first year, evaluation programmes were not fully established till the second year. But it marked the beginning of a minor industry (Harland, 1987, 38), one that changed the dynamics of curriculum development. It offered opportunities for career change to a variety of teachers and researchers and involved the tertiary education sector in the experience of dealing with a new kind of research bidding and contract that was not unlike those that LEA's had undertaken earlier. This will be illustrated in Chapter Three.

<u>Section 4: The Later Pilot and GCSE</u>

The second round of TVEI began in Sepember 1984 with an expansion of the scheme to 60

LEA's (Cross and McCormick, 1989, p 218). The following September the third round went

nationwide, with a few notable exceptions including the Inner London Education Authority.

In each round participants received progressively less funds. The first fourteen continued

to be rewarded for having gone on the long march.

As the pilot progressed, more support was available for new and continuing TVEI teachers

through INSET and an elaborated information network. The national TVEI Unit through

their magazine <u>Insight</u> publicized programmes conducted in different parts of the country.

Enfield teachers and administrators were aware of any article publicizing the Enfield scheme.

It is difficult to say whether they read other articles with the same interest. Money for

conferences was provided and there was a good deal of inter-school visiting and regional and

national sharing of practical ideas. This occurred within Enfield as money for staff

development began to flow. (This will be documented in more detail in later chapters.) The

writer also met with a group of Devon TVEI teachers visiting TVEI sites in London. Money

was available for this kind of exercise. However, Fiddy and Stronach point out:

> The norm was for individuals to depend on local networks, chance encounters, and
> the occasional conference and workshop. The constraints of time and task made that
> inevitable. Few people knew what other TVEI projects did; fewer still were familiar
> with the numerous developments in the transitional and prevocational fields since
> 1977. The decentralization of curriculum development led to a systematic loss of
> memory that applied as much to evaluations as to developments." (Fiddy and
> Stronach, 1987 p 115)

There is no doubt that many TVEI teachers and administrators experienced varying degrees

of isolation, but it is equally true that, by the third year of the scheme, opportunities for

43

contact were available for those who were interested. The experience that Fiddy and Stronach describe is one of the hazards of the teaching profession in general. It is not a special effect of TVEI. (However, they did identify TVEI's special ignorance, rightly described as "systemic", of the history and lessons of previous educational change and research.) On the other hand, Defries, Goodman and Harland (1990, 39) echo the Enfield experience: "In common with TVEI schemes nationally, it is evident that this TVEI programme has promoted greater inter-school liaison than had previously been the case."

Within Enfield, conferences on profiling, technology, counselling, curriculum negotiation, the contribution of individual subjects to TVEI, and cross curricular assignments were some of the activities that were now available to support teachers. Some of these conferences were residential. TVEI also funded production and dissemination of curriculum materials by advisory teachers, known in Enfield as the Central Support Group (CSG). Defries, Goodman and Harland (1990, 38) describe another CSG doing similar work in another borough. By the third year this kind of spending was MSC policy.

By this time also, TVEI began to expand more widely across the curriculum (McCulloch, 1987, 24). This was certainly true of Enfield TVEI as it expanded to include a broader range of the curriculum. The Bradford TVEI Co-ordinator is quoted by McCulloch as saying "We aim to broaden people's options not funnel them towards technology". (1987, 28) In Wirral, Ian Godfrey describes how a more practically orientated French course was developed for the Sixth Form as part of the TVEI programme. (Godfrey, 1987) Enfield TVEI students were being offered Integrated Science and Integrated Humanities and a more broadly based Design Technology that extended beyond CDT departments. These

programmes were also offered to non-TVEI students within Enfield, a development that looked forward to TVEI Extension. (Indeed, the development costs involved were a strong argument for extending these integrated studies beyond TVEI. From a school's point of view it would have been a poor use of human resources to develop new curriculum structures and pedagogies for the TVEI group alone.) Clearly, given the new funding guidelines that allowed this to happen, MSC and its successor, the Training Agency, wanted to influence a wider range of the curriculum than originally contemplated.

At this time also, the GCSE[5] was being introduced, adding considerably to the work loads of teachers and admininstrators. (Fiddy and Stronach, 1987, 115) Many of the new developments, like the inclusion of new, practical forms of assessment, group and problem-based learning, and cross curricular assignments and the team teaching that supported them, were practices that had been trialled in TVEI. New teaching and learning styles in TVEI were a valuable resource for some teachers who were looking for ways of adapting to the new GCSE. In some instances where TVEI came late to an LEA, the transfer of expertise went the other way. Defries, Goodman and Harland (1990, p 37) comment: "The school co-ordinators attributed their success (in developing TVEI courses) to the fact that both groups had had the task of writing modules and assignments for new 100% course-work assessed

_____

[5] The GCSE has many similarities with the Victorian Certificate of Education (VCE) currently being introduced into the school system in the Australian state of Victoria: the emphasis on practical application of knowledge, assignment based work and assessment, development of "folios" of work and, most importantly, the increased work loads on teachers in planning, monitoring and student assessment. VCE, like GCSE, replaced differentiated certification.

GCSE courses." Clearly much work in TVEI and GCSE were mutually supportive. This view was expressed to me by a retiring Enfield Head in June 1989.

Management structures had to be thrown up very quickly in the early scramble. So it was only to be expected that as TVEI became broader in scope and numbers increased, reorganisation would occur. This certainly happened in Enfield. Fiddy and Stronach (1987, 100-101) provide an instance of reorganisation under somewhat strained circumstances. Peter Smith, Northampton LEA TVEI Director, pin-pointed the later re-organisation that occurred in another LEA as the TVEI expanded and matured:

> In terms of school management the notion of a "co-ordinator" as developed under the pilot would seem a redundant concept. To deliver TVEI in relation to the curriculum model requires a senior management team approach to look at the whole curriculum and delegate particular functions to a range of staff. (Smith, 1990, 29)

Smith, occupying a central role in the management of TVEI, perceived TVEI's later focus as being "the whole curriculum", thus providing another witness to the significant shift from the early technical and vocational concerns.

A complicating, and very stressful extra factor for the early management was the politicization of schools, associated with the teachers' industrial action that built up through 1984, 85 and 86. Local government was under attack from central government through rate-capping in particular. It was a darkening educational climate with lowering morale among teachers and administrators.

In this gloomy context, however, TVEI appeared as an oasis of plenty in which teachers and students received favoured treatment and status. TVEI teachers received increasing recognition as providing answers to the "problems" of education: how to plan and conduct

cross curricular projects, how to emphasize the applied aspects of learning and how to use the new teaching styles to support this learning.

Section 5: TVEI Extension and the National Curriculum

TVEI Extension was announced in 1986 and began in September 1987 with some 48 Authorities. Eligibility consisted in having run the pilot for three years. Of course, there was the now familiar hurdle of negotiating each individual contract with the MSC. Eligibility did not mean automatic acceptance. Broadly the aims of TVEI Extension was to extend the TVEI experience to the rest of the curriculum. This included new forms of assessment, a problem-solving approach to learning, more practical and applied activities and relating the curriculum to the world of work.

The clearest (and apparently official) statement of this is found in the glossy, four page document, TVEI in Extension, published by the Centre for the Study of Comprehensive Schools (CSCS), but which was distributed by the TVEI Unit and featured the TVEI logo as well as that of the CSCS. It is reasonable, therefore, to assume that this publication in high quality, coloured printing, was to be taken seriously as a statement of TVEI's broad position. (While undated, this document's reference to a 1989 publication places its own date of publication in that year.) It was made quite clear that TVEI was attempting to influence the curriculum for all 14-18 year olds towards the "demands of working life in a rapidly changing society". It announced that TVEI aimed to "influence" the curriculum "in 5 explicit ways". The first three are about the connection between work and study. The

rhetoric becomes increasingly confident and sentimental as the final two forms of influence

are stated:

> 4. By making sure that young people learn how to be effective people, solve
> problems, work in teams, be enterprising and creative by the way they are taught.
>
> 5. By making sure that young people have access to initial guidance and counselling,
> and then continuing education and training, and opportunities for progression
> throughout their lives.
> (Original emphases)

The rising tone has an emotionally charged quality which is strengthened by the attractive,

coloured pictures of youngsters in various poses of rapt attention. There is a reverential,

even religious, quality in the language and the pictures. Behind this stands an enormous

confidence born of perceived success and victory. Much of the document's rhetoric is

promotional hype: at the theoretical level, it is redolent of New Age philosophy; on the

ground, descriptions of the TVEI experience are reminiscent of the "happy", magazine-style

reporting of other TVEI publications.

This same document emphasizes how the extension differs from the pilot. It states:

> ALL pupils and ALL subjects areas in ALL schools and colleges will be involved
> (not just a limited cohort of pupils or range of subject).
> (Original capitals and emphases) (CSCS, 1989, 2)

The funding available will be 900 million pounds over ten years and will be distributed to

LEA's on the basis of the numbers involved. The same document makes a crucially

important claim that TVEI extension is "complementary and consistent with the National

Curriculum", picking out particularly "cross curricular issues" and the "curriculum's

relevance to working life". (Ibid) It quotes the DES approvingly on the National

Curriculum:

> Schools which are introducing TVEI in accordance with its aims and criteria will
> already have a curriculum which, if applied to all pupils, will meet the main

requirements of section 1 of the Education Reform Act 1988, Chapter 40, and will also offer all pupils aged 14-16 study of the foundation subjects. TVEI criteria reflect the statutary requirements to teach all the foundation subjects, whilst allowing for the particular emphases of TVEI. The stimulus given by TVEI to thinking about curriculum organisation and delivery should stand schools in good stead in planning for the introduction of the new statutory requirements.
(National Curriculum From Policy to Practice, DES, 1989)

(The date of the DES document supports the dating of the CSCS document as 1989)

TVEI Extension's relationship with the National Curriculum is not as unproblematic as this optimistic assessment by the DES might lead us to believe. This will be examined below. But firstly, mainly for the benefit of Australian readers, we will summarize the background to the National Curriculum and consider the critical issues arising out of its establishment.

The National Curriculum[6] coincided with the onset of TVEI Extension. The Education Reform Act (ERA), in which the National Curriculum was enshrined, was at the centre of the Conservative election campaign of 1987, being finally launched in the Parliament on 20th November and passing into law the following year. Of particular importance in the whole process was the publishing at Christmas 1987 of the commissioned report, Task Group on Assessment and Testing (TGAT), the work of a group headed by Prof. Paul Black. This became the basis for DES policy and subsequently set guidelines for those groups set up by the government to bring forward reports for each subject in the proposed National Curriculum. TGAT proposed blanket, standardized, criterion-referenced testing at the "key stages" of ages 7, 11, 14 and 16. Results were to be published school by school and

---

[6] For a British audience the following account is rehearsing familiar material, but to Australian readers, in view of the Federal Education Minister's repeated calls for a national curriculum, it should be of significant, if not ominous, interest. At the meeting of state education ministers in early November 1990, he urged the setting up of common "national standards" across all the states.

authority by authority. It also recommended teacher assessment. Perhaps, the most original

aspect was the proposal for ten "levels" in each subject, with overall attainment targets for

each level to be arranged in groups of "profile components". This report was subjected to

sustained opposition from many professionals in the area of assessment, particularly with

regard to the early "key stages". (Gipps, 1988a, 1988b, 1989; Gipps and Goldstein, 1989;

Thomas, 1988; Simon, 1988) Gipps' criticism of early testing in particular, has been at least

partly vindicated by the government's later decision that "seven-year-old pupils will not have

to take national standard tests in six out of the nine curriculum subjects". (Forum Editorial,

Summer 1990) The same editorial quotes the Education Secretary announcing in January

1990 that "after the age of fourteen, able pupils would be able to follow their own individual

programmes; while vocational exam bodies would be left to organize qualifications for the

bottom 40 per cent". Clearly there must be some doubt as to the final shape of the National

Curriculum, particularly its testing programme which places the most critical constraints on

what schools do and, therefore, on how the TVEI Extension is implemented. This doubt

must give some pause to any consideration of how it will affect the operation of TVEI.

Be that as it may, the Educational Reform Act (1988) was a watershed in education in

England and Wales. ERA increased the powers of the Secretary of State for Education and

Science. Stuart Macluve points out:

It restored to the central government powers over the curriculum which had been surrendered
between the Wars, and set up formal machinery for exercising and enforcing these powers
and responsibilities. (Macluve 1988a, ix)

Richard Aldrich (1988, 22) demonstrates the striking similarities between the subjects in the

1987 list and that of 1904.[7]

Aldrich adopts the viewpoint, shared by other commentators at the time (eg. Simon,

1988), that the

> consultation document, though entitled the The National Curriculum, is essentially
> concerned with testing, and that the list of core and foundation subjects is simply
> designed to facilitate that testing." (Aldrich, loc. cit)

Not only the substance of ERA, but the process of its development and legislation outraged

the education community; it united radical and traditional educators in opposition. The early

document as a "consultation document" was true only in name. The consultation documents,

in the words of Stuart Maclure

> spilled out at the beginning of the holiday season (1987), and respondents had eight
> inconvenient weeks in which to forward their considered replies". (Maclure , 1988b,
> xii)

Julian Haviland led a team of researchers with access to the Commons Library and worked

through the mountain of responses from institutions. (Access to letters from individuals was

withheld by the Secretary of State on grounds of confidentiality.) They hurriedly compiled,

in time for the passage of the Bill through the Lords, a detailed and comprehensive profile

of the public's criticism of the concept and the process of implementing the National

Curriculum. This was published under the title, Take Care, Mr Baker!. A very wide range

of groups and organisations expressed concern, particularly at the lack of consideration given

to the practicalities of many of the details.

---

[7] Australian readers may be interested in the subjects
listed as mandatory in schools. There are three "core" subjects:
English, Mathematics and Science. To these are added a further
seven "foundation" subjects: History, Geography, Modern Foreign
Language, Art, Physical Education, Technology and Music.

Critical among the provisions of ERA (1988) were those falling under what came to be known as Local Management of Schools (LMS) which devolved the financial management of schools from local authorities to secondary schools and larger primary schools. With this went the responsibility for staffing which had to be managed within each individual school's budget. It represented another diminution in the power of local authorities. The Act required certain processes to be followed and formulae to be applied in providing a common approach to costing within each LEA. Space is not available to discuss these issues[8], nor is it necessary to our purposes. Its relevance to TVEI Extension was that schools now had to manage its funding in terms of "unit costing" (Smith, 1990, 29), requiring all money coming into the school to be included in new formulae, thus avoiding the costly duplication of development and resources which a separate TVEI would involve. LMS had the virtue for TVEI of requiring a whole school focus which Enfield LEA and school administrators had always favoured for TVEI.

Other aspects of the National Curriculum, however, were problematic for the operation of the TVEI Extension, in particular, a rather rigid, subject-based orientation. TVEI had a more integrated, cross-curricular focus just at the time when the curriculum was legally constrained by a subject-based structure. For example, Business Studies, an area that TVEI supported, did not appear on the National Curriculum.[9] TVEI Extension, therefore, had to address at least a prime facie containment caused by the National Curriculum. Peter Cornall,

---

[8] A full description is provided by MacIure , 1988a, 37-55

[9] Interestingly, the curriculum "Frameworks" adopted by the state of Victoria for its schools has "Commerce" as one of its nine Frameworks or curriculum areas.

a Senior Inspector in Cornwall, recalled the way in which these two developments rubbed

against each other:

> Then came the first details of the Extension, and an increasing certainty that the deployment of these resources, remarkably, would be consistent with the purest of comprehensive principles. Even if the scale of funding was to be very much lower, it could be used in the interests of all students to 16, and of all who made themselves available to the age of 18. What was more, the TVEI expectations were far more explicit in the areas of personal development, civic awareness and at least some aspects of social justice, than were the current pronouncements of the DES, where curricular traditionalism, 1902-style, seemed at least temporarily dominant. (Cornall, 1989, 13)

The relatively positive image of TVEI and, no doubt, of the Training Agency, that appeared

to be emerging in Cornwall, matched my observations in Enfield in June and July of 1989.

Hostility which had previously been directed at the MSC was now focused on the DES.

Educators may be said to have domesticated the TVEI animal only to find that the whole

farm was under an alien regime. The broad flexible educational policy that had emerged in

TVEI was now in conflict with the more rigid requirements of the National Curriculum.

Peter Smith (1990, 25) identifies three dominant issues from this situation:

i   What will be the consequence of having a curriculum where certain studies - Business Studies, Computer Studies, Home Economics - do not have a place in the National curriculum on a subject basis?
ii   What should TVEI resource in terms of the development and delivery of Technology?
iii   What are the consequences of the new curriculum model for school management, in particular the role and status of a TVEI Co-ordinator? (Smith, 1990, 25)

Smith does not answer these questions directly, although his third question is more rhetorical

than real: the TVEI co-ordinator in the school had no clear role in the merging of TVEI with

the rest of the curriculum. The abolition of this position in Enfield by 1989 corroborates

Smith's doubt.

Cornall (1989) poses the problem in more general terms and does try to provide some answer in terms of modular planning. He sees the problem thus:

> Was there a means by which what could appear to be totally distinct and even contradictory expectations, from two branches of government, might be reconciled and even shown to be mutually supportive? (Cornall, 1989, 13)

The proposed solution is a form of matrix planning in which TVEI curriculum structures, as well as other desiderata such as GCSE certification, are mapped onto the National Curriculum (Ibid, 12). Cornall believes that flexible modules, some of them cross curricular, provides some room for manoeuvre. He comments:

> The ready availability of modular or other types of composite course is a sine qua non, for the inclusion of the new foundation subjects of art, geography, history and music in every student's programme, if they are to be certificated." (Ibid, 14)

This offers a genuine starting point in reconciling the differences, though the question of the amount of room to manoeuvre is still contested in the literature. Only time will decide that. Nevertheless, Cornall's suggestion has the virtue of being based on the experience of planning at the grass roots. Even if his optimism is only partly realized, it offers a point at which to begin negotiation. Cornall's views have been echoed in Enfield by LEA and school administrators who believed that the creative development of cross curricular modules could provide some flexibility within the National Curriculum. Furthermore, the signs mentioned earlier of the government's retreat from some aspects of the original plan may create further space. To some this may sound naive, but senior administrators in Enfield point to the TVEI experience and the right to have confidence in the long-term outcomes of serious negotiation. And as one administrator put it, "What is the alternative?"

Conclusion

TVEI began, partly at least, as a response to vocational and technical education but widened its focus across the whole curriculum. Technology was also an early concern and, though this has continued, technology has increasingly been perceived as broader than CDT on the one hand, and Information Technology on the other. Accompanying this interest in technology as an area of curriculum content was a resistance to a certain process of curriculum development that could itself be termed a form of "technology". (Eisner, 1979; Skilbeck 1984)

Development also occurred in TVEI's approach to educational management. In its early manifestation planning could be described as a "technology" in the sense that organisational structures were favoured that facilitated management through (a) means-end planning, (b) pre-ordinate, specifically focused goals and (c) non-ambiguous processes. As time went by, the MSC/Training Agency increasingly understood that educational contexts are characterized by degrees of uniqueness and even ambiguity, and that the necessary flexibility is not managed by simple line management structures but by professional teams. This will be demonstrated more fully in the main study.

TVEI began as an attempt to establish an ideologically separate form of curriculum and educational practice. There even grew up a separate kind of educational discourse. This proved to be too great a dichotomy in much the same way that Skilbeck has pointed out the overpolarisation of the objectives/process distinction. (ibid) The TVEI experience would suggest that the excessive emphasis on vocational education was increasingly subsumed in

55

a wider educational framework. The vocational aspect was not rejected so much as put in perspective.

As TVEI has evolved it has broadened in scope. The emphases are no longer purely in terms of subjects or parts of the curriculum such as technology. Rather TVEI's emphases are cross curricular. Some might argue that TVEI is now less directive. But it has also become more powerful, transforming the very feel of the curriculum. This is best demonstrated in the main study. The Training Agency seems to have learnt that influence in education does not come through crude forms of control. Legitimation is a sine qua non.

Before we begin the main study we shall firstly look at the methodological structures which contributed, as powerfully as the empirical data did, to the shape of the main study. Indeed they are mutually necessary for each other's definition and our understanding.

CHAPTER TWO: METHODOLOGY

Section 1: History of the Research

The Enfield research was in two phases. The first, and by far the larger, was conducted

under an evaluation contract from October 1984 to April 1986, although completion of work

and further meetings continued into June, 1986. Shortly afterwards I resumed residence in

Australia, not returning to Enfield until June/July 1989 for about six weeks to pursue further

research towards updating data on Enfield TVEI, revisiting early material about which there

was some doubt, and developing material on the national educational scene. In addition to

the obvious quantitative difference in the amount of time available to each, the two phases

were qualitatively quite different.

The researcher's role as a contracted evaluator in the first phase contrasted with being a

"private" researcher in the second. The original evaluation contract prespecified certain

outcomes for which the part-time director and I, as full-time evaluator,[1] were responsible:

- evaluation reports,
- early bulletins for formative feedback,
- inservice education for teacher/evaluators, and
- editorial support for teachers engaged in evaluation within Enfield.

---

[1] The division of labour and responsibility will be dis-
cussed more fully when we come describing the evaluation in
Chapter Four particularly. In general the director attended to
matters of principle, broad strategy, contractual arrangements
and their implementation, review of evaluation products, attended
key meetings and made a limited number of visits to sites. The
evaluator was closer to the action, gathered much of the raw data
and had the major responsiblity for the writing of the reports,
though the director had a significant review function.

While there was never any direction on the part of the Authority as to what methods and procedures should be used, the degree and kind of access to sites and people, what issues were to be researched, nevertheless contractual obligations, remained. Agreed guidelines for the conduct of the evaluation were produced, bulletins and reports had to be written and disseminated within a reasonable timetable, and we agreed to provide some in-service and editorial support for Enfield's initiative to develop their own internal evaluators. For example, evaluation workshops were conducted by the director and evaluator in November and December 1984 for about 30 prospective teacher-evaluators, and subsequently, the external evaluators acted as consultants in selecting and guiding the early teams in the "internal evaluation".

Given that the authority funded the evaluation out of its TVEI budget, it was to be expected that the Authority regarded the evaluation as a part of its TVEI scheme and expected educational outcomes from the evaluation. Enfield's overall evaluation strategy was to engage external evaluators who, in addition to conducting their own evaluation, would facilitate an internal evaluation which would continue the work after the external evaluation had been completed. The evaluation was perceived as part of Enfield TVEI development: the Authority was looking for formative curriculum evaluation and assistance with teacher in-service education from me as the full-time evaluator, as well as from the director of the evaluation. As with every other aspect of TVEI in Enfield, the evaluation was regarded as an opportunity for teacher development which would have long term effects beyond the life of TVEI. Clearly, the independence of the evaluation did not exempt the evaluators from their obligations to Enfield's overall and long-term development strategy.

Moreover, the first phase of the evaluation was, in the words of the Director of Education, "an actor in Enfield TVEI". Documents were disseminated throughout the TVEI scheme resulting in the evaluation becoming an internal, active ingredient within TVEI. This was a deliberate policy, with funding provided, to disseminate products of the evaluation to all participants simultaneously. It was agreed at the beginning that there was to be no privileged access. This was especially true of the First Interim Report which described aspects of the early management of the scheme. In this sense at least, the researcher in the early phase was a participant in the scheme's development strategy. By contrast, the results of the second phase research will not be disseminated to participants, unless there is a special request.

In the second, shorter period the researcher was outside the system, in the sense of not having an official role with any attendant obligations, other than those of ethics that any researcher might have. The research did not have a built-in role to influence development in any direct way, nor is there any expectation to this effect. I had become de-institutionalized. Differences between the phases flow from this.

To repeat: in the second phase I was able to pursue issues of interest without having to consider how these matters were to be fed back into the system, while, in the first phase, Enfield had paid for continuous feed-back into the process of development. For example, two early Bulletins provided feedback on a number of individual issues that were of immediate concern to the teachers and administrators of the scheme. Now the significant thing is that these issues were not integrated into the large wholes in which a "pure researcher" would frame his research. They were felt to be the immediate concerns of participants addressing different aspects of the scheme. Issues addressed in this way included the following:

negotiating the curriculum,
personal and social development,
TVEI as a new elite,
autonomy versus whole school planning,
profiling,
TVEI as skills-based learning.

These were immediate and obvious, and had be dealt with quickly. By contrast in the second

phase the issues were conceptually more distant from the data, not so immediately useful to

participants and took more time to formulate. These issues or themes were, in particular,

vocationalism, technology and management.

But, though conducted at a different time and under different conditions, the second-phase

data were not discretely different and independent of data gathered in the first phase. Rather,

the second phase subsumed and built on the first phase. Thus, the major themes of the

second-phase were also present in the first, though they do not enjoy so exclusive a focus.

But the larger themes did sometimes require urgent attention in the first phase. An example

was that the management and mismanagement of the scheme became a hot issue at an early

stage. The political sensitivity of this matter would have been less stressful to deal with in

a longer time frame. Understanding its complexity also demanded a degree of concep-

tualization that was very difficult given the fast pace of evaluation in the real world of

programme feedback and development. Some degree of it was crucial to the success of the

programme. With finite resources, and the need to report while the issue was still live, and

with the health of the programme at stake, after a great deal of care and soul-searching, a

critical report had to be released.

This particular example also illustrates a further difference between evaluation and research.[2] Given the difficulties associated with the management issue, including the evaluator's relationship with some participants, there was at first a very natural reluctance to duck this issue and to turn to less painful themes. But too many participants were aware of it and any evasion by the evaluator would have been regarded as a relinquishment of responsibility on what was of prime relevance to the programme's operation. This illustrates how evaluation has a much sharper political dimension than private research. It has an institutionalized and public aspect, and there is an expectation that findings will feed back into development and will make a difference. This public nature of the evaluator's role generally locks him into the political dimension of his work. The Situation may become painful for both the evaluator and the participants but there is really no exit for either without loss of face or reputation. When the evaluator has had the advantage of an intensive, interactive study of the participants' world, participants will know if the evaluator has not grasped the nettle and has turned to report something more pleasant. This was certainly my position towards the end of 1985. More generally through the first phase, given the open access to evaluation products, the evaluator's conduct was as much on the line as everyone else's.

The political nature of evaluation is well documented by many writers. (Stake, 1980; McDonald, 1974, 1978; Guba and Lincoln, 1981) More recently, Helen Simons (1987) has comprehensively surveyed the political dimensions of evaluation since 1965 in both Britain and America. She portrays it as a political activity, inextricably connected with the power structure of what is being researched, and she describes the complex role of an evaluator who

---

[2] Evaluation is not being conceived here as a category discrete from research but as a sub-category of research.

must maintain independence and fairness to all the stakeholders and yet may not operate as an independent "god-evaluator" outside the power structure. This reflects well the challenge of the first-phase of my research as I pursued it at the time.

This political conditioning and the consequent methodological difficulties did not make the research of the first phase less valid than that of the second. Indeed it made the first phase in many ways more productive by bringing the researcher inside the action. Concomitant with the contracted obligations were quite positive privileges of access, and indeed of some power through a public recogition of the role. As the official external evaluator, access was guaranteed to documents and official correspondence, and meetings and classrooms were open to the evaluator. By contrast, in the second phase the researcher did not have these advantages; there was a loss of authority and power in gaining access. (This was evidenced from only one site, but it was a new experience!) This relative powerlessness, however, was not all bad. Some people were more open than previously, and others were less opposi-tional in their description of the roles of others. The role of "private" researcher in the second phase may have allowed at least some participants to offer cooler judgements.

So the different standing of the researcher affected subtly the kind of data gathered. In summary, the first phase was marked by quick feedback, a shorter time frame for dealing with issues and a less abstract ordering of, and manipulation of the data. In the second phase, freed from the need for quick feedback, the researcher enjoyed a larger time frame

to process data and the issues of vocationalism, technology and management emerged in a more abstract way in which data interacted with theoretical frameworks.[3]

Section 2: The Nature of the Object of Study

In this section I will briefly describe the match between the Enfield environment and the research approach.   My purpose is to demonstrate why a naturalistic approach was appropriate. Guba and Lincoln (1981) contrasts the "naturalistic" and the "scientific" as the two fundamental research paradigms.   In dealing with the difference between them they consider three aspects of research: (a) reality; (b) inquirer/subject relations; (c) nature of truth statements.   (Guba and Lincoln, 1981, 57)   The first aspect, the reality of what is researched (or, as I have entitled it, "the nature of the object of study") will be examined in this section and conclusions drawn as to why the "naturalistic" approach was the most appropriate.[4] The second aspect, viz. the enquirer/subject relationship, already referred to in the first section, will receive further treatment in some later sections. The third category is addressed obliquely in the next section. It is not that this chapter is primarily structured on Guba and Lincoln's schema but it enlists that schema as support for the adequacy of its coverage of topics.

---

[3] THe second phase of data gathering was only six weeks. However, the time for reflection was available without the need to attend to the more immediate issues as in the first phase. Reflection in the second phase encompassed data gathered from both periods.

[4] This examination of the nature of Enfield TVEI is a generalised description. The detailed description that "demonstrates" that reality will come in later chapters.

As already described in Chapter One, TVEI was characterized by significant variability. Although referred to as a pilot study, with the attendant connotations of some replicability, in fact TVEI was continually defining and redefining itself. (Indeed the speed and scale with which the initiative was expanded in 1984 and 1985 nationally and at the local level also belied its alleged pilot status.) Evaluators quickly discovered from published writings and when they met at gatherings that there was no such thing as a definitive TVEI. "Progressive refocusing", to use the phrase of Parlett and Hamilton, was an appropriate way of describing the changing focus not only of the researcher but of the participants themselves.

Because TVEI did not have anything in the way of course materials, or a supporting body of research that might have helped administrators, teachers or evaluators to interpret the early "Aims and Criteria", all of these three groups found themselves engaged in the process of actually defining TVEI. In other words the object of study, TVEI, was not an entity separate from the perceptions and experiences of the participants involved in the scheme. Of course, this is, in part, true of any curriculum. But rarely has there been such difficulty in agreeing on what is to count as a legitimate instance of a programme activity. Enfield TVEI was among other things an initiative in self-definition. This is not to say that TVEI was just whatever individuals thought it was. But debate, much of it philosophical, was at the heart of Enfield TVEI, not simply as a post hoc reflective activity on the part of some participants, but as part of TVEI itself. Staff and students alike treated it as part of the programme itself. Teachers and administrators, at the school and at the Civic Centre, tested each other's perceptions on a number of issues central to their conception of TVEI. A good example of this was, and still is, the concept of technology. It may be conceded that programmes other that TVEI can have a form of self definition as a critical element. For example, a

Mathematics programme may have a reflexive aspect that encourages teachers and students to consider what it is they are really engaged in, and in the process at least partly to define the nature of Mathematics. The case of TVEI, however, was of a higher order of definitional indeterminacy. In that sense it resembled Philosophy itself which takes self-definition as an essential activity. (Danto, 1971) It was largely by participating in some role in the programme that one came to understood the meaning of TVEI. Indeed, given the openendedness of TVEI and of Enfield TVEI in particular, creating and understanding meaning were largely overlapping processes. And the understanding that emerged was in considerable part derived from participation translated into an historical narrative, an idea discussed in more detail below.

Enfield LEA had a distinctive organisational culture. This was remarked on by many interviewees. In general terms it could be described as friendly and informal, with well developed consultative processes; decisions, if not always made by teams, were generally influenced by the many teams of teachers and administrators operating across the LEA. A highly consultative team approach was a mark of Enfield operations. This, "the Enfield Way" will be discussed in Chapters 3 and 4.

For the researcher the informality was reinforced by his role in the in-service development which made him part of a team within the LEA. Being part of the consultative process made it easier for me to "get close" to the object of study and facilitated a naturalistic approach to data gathering. It also posed dangers of being co-opted and settling into cosy, comfortable relationships in a pleasant and civilized educational environment. It must be the ultimate

temptation for an evaluator in an organisation whose values, professed and largely practised, have a degree of congruence with those the evaluator imagines himself to have.

In some ways, however, this picture is somewhat simplistic and misleading. Firstly, while the overall culture was one of friendliness, the values structure was not monolithic. It was not a club culture as a whole (Handy, Charles, 1978, Ch. 7).[5] Different views were held, often passionately. In that sense it was a political (and yet friendly!) environment. Secondly, the TVEI scheme had some characteristics atypical of the general Enfield climate, which will be discussed more fully in the next chapter. Thirdly, different participants had different frames of reference, often originating in outside influences: key people were recruited from outside the Borough; the everpresent weight of the MSC exerted its influence (even if this influence was often more perception than substance); and the changing macro-political climate could not be ignored. Different participants acknowledged different external reference groups and authorities: for one person it might be the "Technology Bus"; for another, Michael Fullan. Sometimes this difference could be seen in the distinction between "locals" and "cosmopolitans". (Weick, K. 1982)

Thus, "getting close to the case" was not simply a matter of understanding phenomena that fitted into neat categories. There were discontinuities and fragmentations of the kind indicated. Nor, as we shall see presently, was the study easily conceived as a "bounded system" because of the mutual causality of the macro (national) and micro (LEA and school) perspectives. Again, because of the differences (whether of interest or philosophy) among

---

[5] One group did evince some characteristics of a club culture which will be described in the main study.

participants, the notion of getting close to "the participants" was problematic. "Getting close to whom?" was an important issue in terms of the overall balance of the researcher's perspective. The "reality" being studied was not monolithic. Groups manifested different interests and expressed different viewpoints. Getting close to one group could jeopardize the researcher's relations with another. (This issue will also be discussed later in the chapter.)

Another difficulty was in gathering documentation of key events. Particularly in the early phase of TVEI events moved swiftly, nationally and within Enfield. Documents, produced hurriedly, were continually overtaken by events and if they were stored they were often undated. Added to this were critical changes in the early management personnel in Enfield TVEI. Adequate administrative structures were established only after the scheme had commenced and early documentation was patchy. This was understandable given the speed of events and the flexibility required from the main protagonists. My data for much of the very early development had to come from direct interviews with the major players of that period.

If it was still possible, despite the differences and tensions, to characterize broadly the overall Enfield culture, this owed something to the fact that differences of opinion did not extend in any large way to organisational processes. There still remained a widespread commitment in Enfield at every level to open discussion and a team approach. A few people were uncomfortable with this style but they remained small in number.

Given those general aspects of Enfield TVEI there was a need for open-ended categories that captured the fluid development and often unpredictable issues that arose. TVEI was self-

defining in the course of its development. Understanding it, therefore, required a broad focus on the meanings that the participants invested in their roles. These meanings were expressed and/or acted out in a changing scene. Thus it was not sufficient to identify such meanings without the context out of which they arose. That context was one of narrative; events were not fully meaningful without their place in the story. For all of these reasons a qualitative or naturalistic approach to research matched the reality of the study. Quite clearly a hypothetico-deductive methodology, abstracting homogenized categories from the gathered data, was not an option. Indeed this traditional methodology is no longer a natural expectation, as Michael Quinn Patton points out:

> The issue of selecting methods is no longer one of the dominant paradigm versus the alternative paradigm, of experimental designs with quantitative measurement versus holistic-inductive designs based on qualitative measurement. The debate and competition between paradigms is being replaced by a new paradigm - *a paradigm of choices*. The paradigm of choices recognises that different methods are appropriate for different situations.
> (Patton, 1980, pp 19-20)

Section 3: Research Orientation

We have compared the two phases of the research with some focus on the researcher's different roles and we have described some key general features of the Enfield environment that favoured a naturalistic approach. In this section we focus more directly on this broad approach to the research. The research may be characterized as:

(a) qualitative,

(b) possessed of elements of the case study approach, and

(c) phenomenological in some key respects.

This section will justify each of these in turn.

<u>(a) Qualitative Research</u>

We have seen that the reality in which the research was located was marked by multiple perspectives and fluidity of development. TVEI was not a pre-specified curriculum; it was rather a sketchily described vision (or series of visionary fragments) of educational, social, political and economic ideals. At the beginning, TVEI was largely rhetoric (and money) and curriculum realities evolved from particular settings. Despite its vocational title it did not in any way resemble those vocational courses that have pre-specified learning objectives. There was little in the way of pre-ordinate categories that would yield quantifiable data; there were no prespecified behavioural objectives, so characteristic of vocational curriculum.

Homogenising the data so that countable categories could support quantitative analysis was not a form of research that would yield interesting results here. The uniqueness, remarked on by many observers of TVEI, established a prima facie case for naturalistic reporting. This was a judgement that was shared by the researcher and by the director of the evaluation project. Given the open nature of TVEI to begin with, a qualitative approach was the most appropriate. Michael Quinn Patton's "Checklist of Evaluation Situation for which Qualitative Methods are Appropriate" (Patton, 1980, pp 88-9) apply to Enfield TVEI (and probably many other TVEI schemes). Two questions from the check list may be sufficient to demonstrate this:

> Is the information needed about the details of program implementation - what clients in the program experience, what services are provided to clients, how the program is organized, what staff do, and basically inform decision makers as to what is going on in the program and how it is developed?

And,

Is there a need for information about the nuances of program *quality*, i.e., descriptive information about the quality of program activities and outcomes, not just levels, amounts, or quantities of program activity and outcomes?

This approach overlaps with what Helen Simons identifies as "naturalistic enquiry":

> ... naturalistic enquiry signifies a commitment to studying programmes in their social contexts, the use of qualitative methods of enquiry such as unstructured interviewing, direct observation and historical/dramatic reconstruction and forms of reporting that allow readers to generalize for themselves, utilizing 'naturalistic generalization' (Stake, 1979, p. 6).
> (Simons, 1987, 22)

Simons is here elaborating a methodology for *evaluation* in particular, which applies directly to the first phase of the research. But even the later phase of private research evinced many of the features identified by Simons and Patton in relation to attitudes to the researched, the data gathering and the researcher's role.

This was not to say that quantitative data were entirely neglected when the use of such data was perceived as appropriate. A case in point was the issue of gender balance in the different "Technical and Vocational Options" in the Enfield TVEI Scheme. Some of these had a traditional gender bias, viz. "Caring Studies" and "Technology and Control". Quantitative data concerning the numbers of girls enrolled for these two options could not be ignored. However, this necessity arose naturally from the qualitative data as gathered from participants.

Of course, too, the researcher had a (developing) point of view of his own. Issues were proposed from the point of view of the researched but judgement had to be exercised by the researcher. If the researched had the advantage, especially at the beginning, in terms of their participatory experience of a particular role, the researcher came to have the advantage in terms of data gathered from many participants in a variety of roles and settings. There were

also the large conceptual issues that the first phase raised even if it did not push them to the limit. For example, participants' comments on technology, in interpreting their educational aims and activities, required a framework to further an understanding of the significance of what were being considered and done. This is another version of that interaction between the macro and the micro referred to by Basil Bernstein.[6] As researcher, I judged that key issues were emerging as the programme evolved and that these were:

- vocationalism as a political and educational concept;
- the organisation and management of the scheme;
- what technology meant to the participants and how this concept organized (or did not organize) the curriculum.

But the ground of this post hoc conceptualising by the researcher was the data provided by the participants before any selection of the issues to be included or to be filtered out. In this respect the research exemplified the approach described by Patton and by Simons.

TVEI was a unique configuration of educational and political events. That a programme for schools was funded by the DOE on such a lavish scale was itself a unique departure. New ground was being covered and new rules forged as the programme progressed. A qualitative approach, involving detailed description of "situations, events, people interactions and observed behaviours" (Patton, 1980, p 22), was required. Patton elaborates further on qualitative methodology:

> The data are collected as open-ended narrative without attempting to fit program activities or people's experiences into pre-determined, standardized categories such as the response choices that comprise typical questionnaires or tests. (Ibid)

Patton's idea of the study as a narrative and Simon's echoing "historical/dramatic reconstruction" are particularly apt. Enfield TVEI (as with other TVEI schemes) did not,

---

[6] Quoted in Cohen and Manion (1980) p 25

like Athena, spring fully developed from the head of a Zeus. It developed over time, and plans of action, categories of activity and standards of achievement evolved in a complex narrative. In this narrative were embedded other interacting, interlocking narratives of individual careers, political initiatives and institutional developments (schools, colleges, LEA's). Alasdair MacIntyre makes a strong case that understanding the intentions and actions of individuals involves placing them in a historical narrative:

> Consider what the argument so far implies about the relationships of the intentional, the social and the historical. We identify a particular action only by invoking two kinds of context, implicitly if not explicitly. We place the agent's intentions, I have suggested, in causal and temporal order with reference to their role in his or her history; and we also place them with reference to their role in the history of the setting or settings to which they belong. In doing this, in determining what causal efficacy the agent's intentions had in one or more directions, and how his short term intentions succeeded or failed to be constitutive of long term intentions, we ourselves write a further part of these histories. Narrative history of a certain kind turns out to be the basic and essential genre for the chacterization of human actions. (MacIntyre, 1985, 208)

MacIntyre, in arguing for narrative as the "basic and essential" genre is not, presumably, dismissing quantitative, statistical data from social science, but merely claiming that if there are such they must be embedded in a "historical narrative" for their significance. His argument points to a presumption of intentionality being a key to understanding. It puts the onus of justification clearly with the quantitative researcher to justify the employment of sets of prespecified homogenized behavioural categories in furthering our understanding of a particular environment.

In understanding Enfield TVEI the narrative dimension is essential. The importance of diachronic understanding of events, ideas, intentions (which is what MacIntyre's point is partly about) is particularly evident here. Key ideas, people and events are important to the development because of their place in the story. Had they entered the action in a different

way, or at another time, or with different interacting conditions, the story may have been very different. The elements of the story have to be understood as they developed inside the action. Enfield TVEI constituted the ground of being for the interacting events. Quantitative analysis would have driven categorial fissures through the story.

Qualitative research does not try to manipulate the study for the purpose of observing, measuring and correlating particular variables. Rather the aim is to understand the particular settings in their totality. So, the researcher observed a programme, an institution, a network of institutions as interrelated by unfolding events without preselecting particular categories of data. This wholistic aspect is really quite central to qualitative research. (Patton, op. cit. p 40)

(b) Elements of Case Study

The research approach included elements of case study. Adelman, Jenkins and Kemmis (Simons, 1980,) regard the case as a "bounded system" and describe two ways of establishing a "bounded system". In the first approach, "an issue or hypothesis is given, and a bounded system (the case) is selected as an instance drawn from a class". (Ibid) From the stand-point of this definition, my research did not set out directly to identify Enfield TVEI as a "case". Of course, Enfield could be characterized as one of a number of LEA's subscribing to a basic set of MSC criteria, but the research did not focus strongly on aspects of this common membership. Given the variety of TVEI, I was reluctant to rely solely on this definition.

A second and, from my view-point, stronger way of conceiving a case, the authors suggest,

is when

> a "bounded system" (the case) is given, within which issues are indicated, discovered
> or studied so that a tolerably full understanding of the case is possible. The most
> straight forward examples of "bounded systems" are those in which the boundaries
> have a common sense obviousness, e.g., an individual teacher, a single school or
> perhaps an innovatory programme.
> (Ibid. 49)

However, a case cannot be studied in quarantined isolation from its background, nor do the

authors suggest this. We might say that its boundaries can be more or less permeable (to

continue the systems metaphor). No case is an island and background cannot be wholly

eliminated from our understanding of a particular case; but background should relate,

nevertheless, to the case in the way "field" relates to "figure". Thus, a case-study TVEI

school may have the Borough TVEI programme as background; at another level a Borough

TVEI case study may have the National TVEI scene as background to the study. Le Roy-

Ladurie's history of the village of Montaillou had the Inquisition and the Cathar religious

movement as background. (Le Roy-Ladurie, 1979) Whatever the size of the case being

studied it should have a certain integrity in containing the major locus of meaning within its

boundaries. Thus, to speak of the case as a "system" suggests a mutually supporting set of

meanings that give a certain independence and particularity to the conceptualizing of the case.

These points have a bearing on how we may view the methodology of the Enfield study.

Case study depends on being able to maintain some kind of case boundaries, even if only

roughly. Boundary definition may be endangered in at least two ways. Firstly, the case can

be fragmented into smaller units to the extent that these develop autonomously. Some

degree, at least, of this occurred in the very early development of Enfield TVEI with the

independent "Base Programmes" in each school. Secondly, in another direction, the

boundary of the case may become so weak that it becomes part of a larger whole. This partly occurred as TVEI Extension became more integrated with the general upper secondary curriculum, particularly with the implementation of the National Curriculum.

While data were gathered for the most part at the school level, the story is broadly that of Enfield TVEI. From the early independence developed a more interdependent and integrated Borough scheme. In the later Extension there may have been some blurring of the boundaries with the rest of the curriculum, but there remained identifiable roles at the LEA and school levels. Another factor that helped to preserve the integrity of the case was its small size. The annual intake was only 250 overall and the LEA organisation was intimate and interactive. Any blurring was only partial, and then limited to certain phases of the narrative, waxing and waning like the hole in the ozone layer. I am claiming, therefore, that Enfield TVEI is sufficiently "a case" for my study to be - inter alia - a case study.

By implication, case study is also identified in terms of its describing both what is singular and what has a "wholistic" structure. After all, those are the qualities that gives the case more or less firm boundaries. This point is analogous to the distinction and the relationship between the denotation and the connotation of a concept: there are boundaries to the case because there is a certain integrity in the set of meanings that mark off the case as in some way unique. Helen Simons (1987) refers to this quality of uniqueness as its "singularity". She emphasizes the significance of:

> the single instance on the assumption that individuals operating in highly idiosyncratic situations themselves appreciate descriptions of individual instances in action because they can relate them to their own experience.
> (Simons, 1987, 73)

The quality of singularity (or uniqueness) is what prevents the categorizing of experience, a preliminary to quantification. Whereas large surveys homogenize data with the consequent possibility of quantitative analysis, case study with its "highly idiosyncratic situations" tends to be small scale. (Of course a large study may still resemble case study if there is a focus on narrative and not on narrow, standardized categories of data which provide the "values" for prespecified "variables". Indeed, broadly, that is historical method.)

Patton links the uniqueness of case study with its wholistic structure (1980, 40):

> ... each case, event or setting being studied is treated as a unique entity with its own particular meaning and constellation of relationships emerging from and related to the context within which it exists.

Patton emphasizes the interrelatedness or "wholistic" quality of case study (which also confers uniqueness). This echoes the kind of unity that is the ideal of works of art, as discussed by art critics from Aristotle onwards. It is certainly the quality of good narrative. A case study therefore requires key unifying themes, participants, influences and points of organisational reference. These were present in the Enfield case. In this sense "unifying" does not exclude conflict. A case may include conflict, even persistent conflict, within a broad agreement on what is important. This resembles, on a smaller scale, Alasdair MacIntyre's concept of a (healthy) tradition as one which renews itself through meaningful debate because there are shared terms of reference. (MacIntyre, 1985, Ch 1)

Simons (op. cit.) argues that case study provides a special kind of understanding that is not provided by the large survey. The *intelligibility* of case study is linked to the fact that much participant experience is *sui generis*. It is a paradox of case study that our understanding of another's experience increases with particularizing the situation. This paradox is contained

in the principle that the more we know about a particular situation, the more it is marked off from any other. Understanding is increased through reflecting on the settings in which participants operate, the decisions they face and how their particular world may have appeared to them. Explanation and understanding comes from the particularity of the experience rather than the generality of the data. Case study is analogous to historical understanding as explicated by the philosopher R. G. Collingwood who contrasted historical and scientific understanding. The latter he interpreted as searching for a cause and then "assigning it to its class and determining the relation between that class and others". (Collingwood, 1956, 214) In history, on the other hand, we must attempt to reconstruct events from the agent's point of view. As an example Collingwood considers how an historian might analyse the actions of the Roman Emperor Theodosius:

> In order to do that he must envisage the situation with which the emperor was trying to deal, and he must envisage it as that emperor envisaged it. Then he must see for himself just as if the emperor's situation were his own ... thus, he must go through the process which the emperor went through in deciding on this particular course.
> (Collingwood, 1956, p 283)

The Enfield study certainly attempts to convey the particularity of a case, and many of its unique features, as these appeared at least to many of the protagonists.

(c) The Phenomenolological Aspect

As just implied, the research can also be said to reflect a phenomenological orientation which is a further elaboration of what qualitative means in this particular study. This orientation stems from the Weberian doctrine of "verstehen" - a form of understanding based on considering empathetically the point of view of the agent. The researcher's understanding arises out of interaction with the understanding of the researched. This requires the

researcher spending sufficient time observing, listening to, and learning from the researched. As a full-time evaluator, I was able to devote this kind of close attention in the first phase. Patton describes this as "getting close to the phenomenon under study" which "... makes possible description and understanding of both externally observable behaviours and internal states (world view, opinions, values, attitudes, symbolic constructs, and the like)." (1980, p 43-4) In practical research terms this means describing the avowals and the actions of the researched, in terms of the meanings these have for the speaker/agent. Moreover, this first person point of view cannot be recorded as isolated data but must be understood against the background of the agent's web of belief.

Whether avowals and actions can be distinguished from each other depends very much on the research context. For example, in a private interview a TVEI administrator may express strong support for empowering individual students. If, however, he expressed this same ideal publicly at a meeting of TVEI teachers that would be an example of Patton's "externally observable behaviours." Though, in a strict philosophical sense, the private avowal is also externally observable behaviour, it does not constitute an action in the life of the object of study, viz. TVEI. In practice it is not always possible to observe the theoretical distinction between actions and avowals (or in Patton's terms - "external behaviour" and "internal states"). Indeed the adage that actions speak louder than words encapsulates the interdependence of these distinctions: actions are often likely to be a better indicator of internal states than avowals (even if the avowals are sincerely expressed). In general, then, the discovery and description of the internal state overlaps with that of the external behaviour.

This points to a dynamic relationship between the public and the private. The "first person" point of view of the agent is in constant interaction with the "third person" point of view of observers and/or other participants. This "third person viewpoint" is a legitimate and indeed necessary element in approaching some kind of wholistic understanding of the object of study. Part of the researcher's task is to develop a "third person" perspective. While this may include and "express" the experience of the actor at critical points of action, the researcher has the ultimate responsibility to develop a picture of the whole. It would be naive to regard the phenomenological approach of "getting close to the actors" as simply describing each action purely from the first person point of view. For one thing actors may have conflicting descriptions of the action. More importantly, insisting that the terms of description be solely those of the individual agent is, in the final analysis, to legitimize private worlds and, even, private languages. The researcher must empathize with individual points of view but must also provide a framework and perspective in which those individuals can be recognized as participants within the same case study.

It is not being claimed that the point of view of the agent is inherently unreliable because it is subjective and that the third person view point is objective because it is public. It is rather that the latter provides a publicly accessible framework that can be contested. Within such a framework are a variety of elements not all of which will be perfectly integrated. The researcher, therefore, offers an agenda for debate very different from the view point of an agent at the point of action whose "committed" views, at that time, are often epistemically incorrigible. This defence of the third person view point is not to diminish in any way phenomenology's focus on the world as the agent conceives it, but to avoid a simplistic approach that endorses an anarchic epistemology, expressed in the approach of simply

"turning on the tape-recorder". Thus, the research community's endorsement of triangulation

is not merely to accumulate more and more data from more and more individuals but to

construct debatable, defensible, if provisional, conclusions.

The role of the third person view point has an analogue in the relationship of the macro and

the micro perspective as described by Basil Bernstein who puts into critical focus the

overriding concern of interpretive researchers with the *meaning of situations* and the ways

these meanings are negotiated by the actors involved. What is overlooked about such

negotiated meanings, observes Bernstein, is that they

> presuppose a structure of meanings (and their history) wider than the area of
> negotiation. Situated activities presuppose a situation: they presuppose relationships
> between situations; they presuppose sets of situations. (quoted in Cohen and Manion,
> 1980, p 25)

The very process whereby one interprets and defines a situation is itself a product of the

circumstances in which one is placed. One important factor in such circumstances that must

be kept in mind is the *power* of others to impose *their* definitions of situations upon

participants.

Section 4: Methods

(a) General Approach

A combination of research methods was employed, chiefly observation, interview and

document analysis. These will be dealt with in order, but first some comment is required

on the general approach to the study. A central feature of the Enfield research was allowing

the issues to emerge from the participants themselves. This was initially costly in time and

required my remaining open to a large number of sources of information before focusing on

particular issues. Hence, at the outset I interviewed every school Co-ordinator and Head, and key Civic Centre administrators. This provided a rich base for identifying issues and many of these were reported in the two early Bulletins which announced the nature of the evaluation, presented participants' major responses and described our initial impressions. In the return visit to Enfield in 1989 the same overall approach of allowing participants to indicate the initial agenda was adopted. In the second phase I came with some prior concerns based on the first phase of the research, but soon refocused as participants built up a very different picture in terms of management and curriculum structures, and changed attitudes towards the Training Agency. This time there had been an absence of three years and the need to "get close" to participants was all the more necessary.

The initial round of interviews did not include the Director or Deputy Director of Education whom I had assumed incorrectly would be above the action. This omission left an unexpected gap in the data for the First Interim Report. I had had initial contact with senior management when the evaluation was negotiated and had intended to conduct in-depth interviews later. This early omission illustrates the danger of making major assumptions at an early phase of research as the Director was subsequently to contribute some important data, particularly on the early development of TVEI, that would have improved the perspective of the First Interim Report. Despite this particular data gap in the initial focusing phase (and there may have been others), there was a large initial data base to begin focusing on issues.

Some might consider this initial focusing phase to have been longer than necessary. But I had been absent from Britain for most of the year in which TVEI was established. Such

issues as the resentment felt by other non-TVEI staff and students, the tensions as to the nature of technology and its role in the curriculum, I had to discovered "independently". Whereas I took two to three months to allow issues to coalesce, other researchers may have assumed more in the initial phase and begun to focus earlier on specific points. Nevertheless, the "discoveries" made by the researcher, as a relatively "blind outsider", had greater validity when they matched similar views made by other researchers, such as TVEI's variety, its elusive nature, favourable student response, and the resentment from those outside the scheme.

Data were not gathered on the basis of statistical sampling but on what was most illuminating in terms of practice, usually identified, at least initially, by what teachers and administrators saw as significant. "Decision-makers and evaluators think through what cases they could learn the most from and those are the cases that are selected for study." (Patton, loc. cit. p 101) Nevertheless, there was a rough kind of representativeness available to the researcher in the manner of data recording. As will be described in the section on data recording, extensive notes were kept and an index in each notebook recorded where issues were raised. Thus it was a simple matter to check on the number of times a matter was raised, who raised it and what were the aspects on which there was some consensus. It was also obvious when certain groups were under-represented on issues relevant to them.

Generally, as issues emerged from participants' data or general developments, the researcher sought those people who were centrally involved. For example, when the early TVEI school co-ordinators began raising the issue of the new Technical and Vocational Options, I went directly to the option tutors whom I now perceived as requiring more "representation". It

was not always possible to determine who should be interviewed until issues emerged and their significance was clarified. An important aspect of both phases of the research was establishing a network of significant participants (Patton, op. cit).

The major methods are treated separately below, but they were often used in combination. For example, one's observations could not but influence interviews related to the same environment or set of questions. Helen Simons puts it succinctly: "One does not, of course, interview without bringing in observations. All field work in naturalistic enquiry is a combination of both" (Simons, 1987, 95). It should be said, however, that in the 1989 return visit, formal observation was at a minimum, for reasons of time and timing. What follows is a brief description of how observation, interviewing and document analysis were employed in the studies and how this relates to some significant writers on these methods.

(b) Observation

It will be useful to develop a classification of observational styles and then place the research in one or more of the styles. Fundamental in any exercise of this kind is the work of Gold (1958) who outlined four ideal types of research observation. These are outlined by Burgess (1984, pp 80 ff.) who acknowledges Gold's "basic typology". I will briefly describe each of these and give reasons why they were or were not used.

i   The complete participant

In this field role the researcher merges into the action so that his role is hidden from the researched. This is very much the role of the undercover evaluator. "The complete participant conceals the observer dimension of the role with the result that covert observation

is involved." (Burgess, loc. cit. p 80) Clearly, with the well publicized official status of a contracted evaluator, this was never an option. There must also be some moral doubts about not informing the researched about the ultimate purposes of the researcher. It may be defensible in some forms of undercover reporting in which forms of injustice and crime are brought to light. Even in those cases there is a clear onus on the reporter/researcher to justify his dissembling.

ii   The participant-as-observer

Here the research role is not concealed. It resembles the previous role, however, in that the researcher may merge into the landscape, or into the action itself. He is likely to move about freely without a pre-ordained schedule. Burgess quotes Donald Roy: "the participant-as-observer is not tied down, he is free to run around as research interests beckon; he may move as the spirit listeth". (Op. Cit., 81) The degree of participation can vary greatly. An educational researcher can actually get involved in the planning and teaching of courses, or, s/he may simply stay close to people as they work, listening, asking questions and engaging in informal discussion which, in the case of students, may border on a form of informal teaching.

This was very much the style of my research approach during the first Enfield stage. It is reflected in Robert Burgess' description of Donald Roy at work:

> hanging around union headquarters, observing mass meetings, and other observational situations such as accompanying organizers on calls to the homes of the mill workers to obtain signatures for a petition, standing at the mill gates to watch organizers distribute union leaflets to workers and joining picket lines. (Op. Cit. p 81-2)

But some of these activities are partisan in nature. The fact that this research was also evaluation required me to be less"free-wheeling" than Roy, in particular, to exercise caution

in not becoming publicly identified with factions or "causes". (The implications of research as evaluation, particularly contracted evaluation, is taken up below.) The following activities were central to the Enfield research experience:

1   I attended some meetings not only to observe but to participate. For example, I had an active role in the evaluation Advisory Committee which supported the newly established teacher-evaluator programme.

2   I sat in on class activities, engaging in open-ended discussions with teachers and students that at times resembled informal teaching.

3   I spent time in staffrooms having morning tea or lunch, as often as not reading notes and listening to the sounds of school life, but sometimes getting involved in discussion and debate among staff.

4   I had informal discussions with teachers and administrators on a wide range of topics. Some of these were of a personal confidential nature and could not be divulged even when they bore on the understanding of the scheme. They did feed into more generalized descriptions, eg., the stressful nature of some teachers' experience, and became part of the general considerations in the development process.

5   I also assisted the evaluation director in conducting formal classes in the in-service programme. Though distinct from the TVEI programme itself, it constituted an indirect form of participation in the main programme.

6   I also participated in social occasions, both in formal functions, such as a "Wine and Cheese", and various forms of informal socialising. The latter had both advantages and difficulties. For example, going to the pub on a Friday evening with a particular

group could provide a different range and quality of data.[7] But if the group were widely known to be critical of key people in the TVEI scheme, such interaction could create a problem for the researcher because of the possibility that other participants would come to see him as partisan. On such occasions I was careful not to appear sympathetic to hostile discussions about individuals, sometimes withdrew altogether from company in other respects pleasant and convivial, and generally "rationed" such contacts, in the same way I rationed time spent in the Head's office.

This last example illustrate how the openness and unstructured informality of the field role of participant-as-observer, far from abolishing discipline, requires more subtle and exacting care from the researcher. He must facilitate (and be seen to facilitate) equal access to different interest groups among the participants, for the researcher, in the field role of the "participant-as-observer", runs the danger of being informally co-opted by a particular faction. The problem of co-option into the micro-politics of organisations is noted by Gold who:

> indicates that a disadvantage of this role lies in combining data collection with an area of social conflict especially in union-management relations where researchers will find themselves at odds with the opposition. (Burgess, 1984, p 82)

Getting the right balance between the different viewpoints is not always easy and judgement on what is the right balance may be open to challenge and correction. Thus, the comment of the Director of Education that "the view from the seventh floor" was under-represented in the First Interim Report had some substance. In the role of participant-as-observer, I had given a good deal of attention to teachers, school administrators and middle management but

---

[7] One is reminded that the ancient Celts, in an early example of triangulation, took major decisions twice, once drunk and once sober.

had not stayed close to senior management. The report may have been valid, but, in the words of the Director, "was a view from the trenches". This is suggestive of some of the strengths and weaknesses of the participant-as-observer.

iii   The observer-as-participant

This role is conceived by Gold as involving a more formal approach to observation. Burgess notes that the contacts between researcher and researched are briefer and the relationships more formal. There is at least a partial retreat from naturalistic evaluation in the way that formal schedules were used by such researchers as Flanders.

I made little, if any, use use of such formal observational techniques. But a minority of formal interviews had some elements of the role of "observer-as-participant" in that there was little contact beyond the interview itself, and so little opportunity for the researcher to interact with those participants in any other role than as interviewer. This applied to a minority of the Civic Centre interviewees.

Much more commonly, and because understanding usually grows out of multiple and varied interactions, I followed up opportunities for contact beyond the restricted world of the interview. Those interviewees who, for whatever reasons, did not provide data beyond the interview itself, may very well have been at a disadvantage by comparison with "proactive" participants in the evaluation. The question also arises of whether skills of wider social interaction can advantage a participant in the programme being researched: do the gentle arts of close up communication give them greater influence in the creation of the agenda? In varying degrees many participants were able to draw the interviewer into a range of further

contacts. These were the participants who "followed up" suggestions made during interviews. This may have taken the form of providing documents followed up by some explanatory commentary at a later date, or the suggestion of a visit to a school or contact with another key person. What such people were able to do was to build themselves in a central way into the researcher's active network. This kind of reliance on proactive participants is also described by Michael Quinn Patton (1980). Of course, the researcher has to guard against a pattern of data that may be marginal to the main action of the case. But as so often happens, the proactive participants in the evaluation are also the key actors in the story. This was certainly so in the Enfield study.

Naturalistic reporting affords many participants the democratic opportunity to influence the agenda, that is, the major foci and the key questions of the study. If a study is responsive to participants who, in turn, take some responsibility for its success, the incidence of the "participant-as-observer" role is reduced. But when, for whatever reason, (and it may have had as much to do with the researcher as the interviewee), the response was not forthcoming, there was a retreat towards the role of the observer-as-participant. This was, however, atypical of the Enfield pattern.

iv   The complete observer

This represents a research approach which eliminates interaction with the researched. It is sometimes referred to as the "fly on the wall" style of observation in which the researcher observes while being himself ignored. This method of observation was used in a minority of cases. For example, I was present regularly, but did not take take part, in Co-ordinators' meetings. These were extremely lively, often heated, meetings of twelve to sixteen people

in which I took notes silently. Debate flowed, often heatedly. It was important that eye contact was avoided by the researcher at those meetings. But it is difficult to judge to what extent the researcher was ignored. Certainly, in these meetings strong feelings were expressed which the same individuals did not manifest even in private conversation with me. This suggests my presence was not affecting the action. On the other hand, some participants may have been aware of the researcher in the way that politicians are aware of the presence of the press - as an opportunity for possible air-play for their viewpoint.

In addition, there were occasions in classrooms when the researcher felt his frequent attendance earned him invisibility. But the role of the "complete observer" was not prolonged on those, or on other, occasions.

(c) Interviewing

A major difference between interviewing and observation is that, in interviewing, data are mediated through the participants' own language. The interviewee presents the first-person's or the agent's point of view. It is not simply a matter of the range of data but of putting data into the participant's own framework, for data come trailing their own clouds of emotional colour and individual connections. Thus, Patton considers _perspective_ to be a key dimension of qualitative interviewing:

> The purpose of interviewing is to find out what is in and on someone else's mind. The purpose of open-ended interviewing is _not_ to put things in someone's mind (for example, the interviewer's categories for organising the world) but rather to access the perspective of the person being interviewed. (Patton, 1980, p 196)

Patton also points to the different reach and grasp that interviewing has from observation:

We interview people to find out from them those things we cannot directly observe. The issue is not whether observational data are more desirable, valid or meaningful than self-report data. The fact of the matter is that we cannot observe everything. We cannot observe feelings, thoughts and intentions. We cannot observe behaviours that took place at some previous point in time. We cannot observe situations that preclude the presence of an observer. We cannot observe how people have organized the world and the meanings they attach to what goes on in the world - we have to ask people questions about those things. (Ibid.)

A number of these points applied to the research undertaken. Thus, some of the data were historical. The TVEI story began officially before the first stage commenced and crucial data could only have been gained through interview.

Just as the participant perspective is especially significant in educational settings where underlying epistemological assumptions are crucial in driving the programmes and critical for understanding what is happening, so the interview was especially suited for revealing these in the Enfield setting. The open-ended nature of TVEI was leading to broad interpretation at the local and school level. Interpretative reading of guidelines by individuals was critically important, a fact which only reinforces the importance of Patton's "feelings, thoughts and intentions of the participant". For example, it was necessary to know what meaning participants put on such concepts as "technology". Meaning generally is important in educational settings because so much of the reality is in the act of communication itself. This is true whether we focus on processes, such as those of teaching and learning, or content, as for example, the areas and kinds of knowledge that TVEI should include. In either case, participants are involved in interpretation and meaning-making in implementing TVEI.

90

The distinction between observation and interviewing, however, must not be exaggerated. The concept of the interview is, in some respects, a convenient post-hoc methodological category, whereas in the field the distinction between "observation" and "interviewing" was sometimes blurred. A good deal of observation was intermixed with participants' commentary, though at other times this distinction could be very clearly drawn. In elaborating this point further it may be useful to refer to Patton's three ideal types of qualitative interviewing:

i   the informal conversational interview;
ii   the general interview guide approach; and,
iii the standardized open-ended interview.
          (Patton, 1980, p 197)

The researcher made use of all three of these approaches, sometimes within a single interview. Of course, these are ideal types and in the field they were no more that strong emphases. As ideal types they may be said to form a continuum along which I moved according to my interpretation of situations.

(i)   Patton (loc. cit. 199) describes the informal conversational interview as the "phenomenological" approach to interviewing. Questions "flow from the immediate contexts". The interviewer in this mode will simply "go with the flow". Particularly in the first Enfield phase, it was difficult to specify data as collected in the field role of the "informal, conversational interviewer", as opposed to that of the "participant-as-observer". These field roles quite clearly overlap. Frequently significant conversation with students and teachers grew out of time spent in classrooms. Some of these conversations began as part of what might be regarded as "observation" and continued afterwards over coffee.

This conversational open-ended interview requires interviewees to be forthcoming. If they are to have a role as partner in the setting of the interview agenda they must have some confidence in themselves and the interviewer. That can be a problem in the case of some students who perceive a power imbalance between themselves and the researcher. In those cases group interviews were conducted, a strategy which gave them a greater degree of security in open discussion. Peter Woods makes much the same point:

> The company of like-minded fellows helped to put them at their ease. The bond between them and the way it was allowed to surface shifted the power balance in the discussion in their direction. As long as my interventions were not too intrusive, it might facilitate the establishment of their norms, and I might become privy to their culture, albeit in a rigged way. (Woods, 1986, 73)

Burgess also used group interviews because "he believed this would give them some control over the discussion and questions posed". (Burgess, loc. cit., p 118) Much of the data in the open-ended type interviews with Enfield students came from such groups. Because of their common TVEI experience, there were friendship bonds between these students and this helped to make interviews more open, lively and spontaneous.

The conversational open-ended interview might be thought of as unstructured. This is not entirely correct. If a conversation arises spontaneously out of another activity it might make sense to speak of the occasion as an unstructured interview. But when I had arranged to interview a participant always I did some preparatory work and provided some minimal direction for the interviewee. This might be a list of possible issues or simply some opening questions such as "What things can you do in TVEI that you can't in other classes?" or "What attracted you to TVEI?" Any interview in the context of social inquiry is more than personal interaction or therapy. Peter Woods makes the point succinctly:

> Though these interviewees are often termed "unstructured", they are not completely so. There will be themes and aspects of the subject of the research that are self

evident, and that you will wish to cover. The interviewee also is going to need *some* guidance as to what to talk about. I find it useful, therefore, to have a "prompt" card, to ensure that I cover all of these aspects. (Woods, op. cit. p 77-8)

Robert Burgess makes a similar point regarding his use of an aide memoire. (loc. cit. p 108)

I also had such an "aide", consisting of a list of questions, the use of which will be discussed below.

(ii) The general interview guide approach involves preparing a list of issues whose coverage is broadly the aim of the interview. Prior to interviews I prepared such a list of questions as a rough guide, though just as frequently it was not followed in all details, particularly when the interviewee brought up new issues or provided an in-depth analysis of a limited number of issues. The interviewer made a decision in those cases that to bring some issues to an early close in order to cover the full agenda would have resulted in a loss in the richness of the data.

A typical list in approaching a TVEI teacher would be:

> negotiating the curriculum,
> cross curricular projects,
> profiling,
> student assessment throughout the rest of the school,
> the breadth of the TVEI teaching team,
> contact with non-TVEI teachers in the particular school,
> contact with the Civic Centre,
> contact with other TVEI teachers in other schools,
> behavioural change in students,
> travel by students between schools,
> elements of technology in the Base Programme.

Usually, these issues were chosen because they had been raised , without prompting on prior, recent occasions with other participants. Thus, the researcher's list was not generated purely by him. Nor did it form a rigid agenda to be followed in order. The interviewee was

allowed to follow his or her sense of priority without much interference. My experience was that those interviews which yielded rich insights frequently covered a large proportion of the listed issues, not as a list of topics but in a connected way. In other words when the interview was successful the data came with a perspective. A less successful interview was one in which the interviewer was forced to "go through his list" and the resulting data often had the ragged appearance of fragmented information.

(iii) The researcher also used elements of the third approach to interviewing, the standardized open-ended interview. This involved framing questions precisely before the interview and then using them consistently in a set of interviews. However, no interview consisted entirely of such questions. But many had a single prepared question, often at the end. An example was a question put to TVEI students at the end of an interview:

> When you look back in five years time, is there one word that might sum up what you got from TVEI?

This strategy allowed comparisons to be made without diminishing the unique contribution of each interviewee, as might have occurred in an interview that had been wholly standardized. Such questions also came after the interviewee had the opportunity to engage in a more interactive way with the researcher, with a great deal of freedom to talk about issues that s/he thought important. A common answer to such a question, therefore, would have a great deal of validity because interviews taken as a whole differed in the attitudes and opinions expressed. And, with one exception, this question was always given the same single-word answer.[8]

---

[8] Even though I came to predict the answer, I always marvelled at the consistency of the reply, "Confidence".

A fairly standardized format somewhat closer to this approach was prepared for six MA students who each conducted several interviews with TVEI students. Precise questions were framed for these interviewers. Most of them had not previously done any formal interviewing. With one exception they were not familiar with the Enfield scene and most of them knew very little about TVEI. So, they were briefed about TVEI generally and Enfield TVEI in particular, and the significance of individual questions discussed. They were allowed, even encouraged, to improvize on those questions in the field, where such preselected questions may not always have been well matched to the individual situation. However, by and large the framed questions were followed which bears out the findings of Barry McDonald on teacher-evaluators (cited in Simons, 1987, 207-8).

Despite the usefulness of categorising different observational and interviewing strategies, it is important not to regard individual interviews and observations in isolation. All took place in a context of ongoing data collection. It is also significant that most interviewees were known to the interviewer through a wide range of interactions outside of interviews. There was always a setting or context to interviews.

Peter Woods makes the point that "interviews need to be used in conjuction with other methods" (1986, p 62) and that (p 89) "the two methods combined also permit a fuller participation". Helen Simons (1987, 95), already quoted, makes the same point. A good example of this began from the observation of four girls sitting together at the back of a technology class while the boys seemed to be monopolising the attention of the teacher. The situation developed into a familiar pedagogical cliche and the researcher drew the obvious conclusions about gender inequality. However, in subsequent conversational interviews with

both the teacher and the girls this issue was naturally raised, and it then transpired that this was anything but the familiar cliche. From both interviews it became clear that the teacher and the girls, who had been advised to do technology <u>because</u> they were high achievers, had a strong, common commitment to the advancement of girls in technology. The boys were seen by the teacher as low achievers from another school, and disparagingly referred to by the girls as "thick". The girls were busily engaged in a project in which they enjoyed long term direction and supervision from the same teacher who was from <u>their</u> school and gave them extra time beyond the normal class time. They girls sat apart from the boys because they did not have the same work habits and said they worked better apart from the boys. They clearly viewed the attention the boys were getting as compensatory. It might be suggested that all this data could have been gathered from interview alone. Data of this kind, however, emerges from the dynamic interaction of interviewer and interviewee and it is extremely unlikely that it would have emerged without the interviewer's prior observation. This illustrates the methodological point that understanding frequently required both observation and interview.

(d) Document Analysis

As remarked earlier, documents were not a major primary source of empirical data, particularly in the earlier stages of the first phase. Even when documents were available in the later stages, their analysis needed to be supplemented by other methods. In the critical early development of TVEI, both at the national and local level, very little documentation existed. The early culture was very much an oral one and centred on the early core of School Co-ordinators. The written aims of Enfield TVEI were extremely broad and derived

direction through the tacit understandings and communication of the participants. Administrative, professional and developmental structures were developed as the scheme was implemented. But these structures were not in place at the beginning and so, the crucial, early history of the scheme was not revealed to any great extent by official documents. Furthermore, when the documents did start to come, the speed of the early development and changes in personnel made reliance on them problematic. When they could be found, they were often undated and, therefore, hard to fit into the story.

But the infrastructure developed which helped the production of documents. In the third year of the scheme the early aims were clarified by consultative teams of administrators and teachers, who spelt out what these aims could mean in different curriculum areas. These documents quickly became actors in the evolving Enfield story and their existence facilitated the documenting of change. However, by themselves these documents did not tell the full story. Participants' responses to these documents, rather negative at first, but later more favourable, were an integral part of that story. As the Enfield TVEI infrastructure grew and wider inputs were possible, documents were perceived as increasing in quality.

The increasing documentation made a great difference in the task of discovering the broad intentions of the course. The documents by themselves did not so much reveal intentions: different interpretations were made and different intentions were attributed. However, the documents were now more detailed and widely distributed, which provided a focus for developing shared understandings. They provided an agenda for a kind of hermeneutical clarification as actors moved between text and context.

There are at least two reasons why documents did not independently provide a major source of data in the Enfield study. Firstly, in the early stages it was sparse. Secondly, even when documents were available their production and dissemination did not drive developments: the critical ideas and processes described in these documents were already in full practice in key schools. Actual practice preceded and drove the documents, not vice versa. It was part of the "Enfield Way". These documents did not tell the full story in terms of the teaching and learning experiences behind these developments. (Indeed, does any document?) Readers of these documents already had a tacit understanding of their own learning environments and, no doubt, the writers of these documents wrote with that in mind, if only unconsciously.

Finally, a distinction should be drawn between the role documents served in TVEI development and in my research. They provided an important development process for those producing and responding to them. In my research I had wide and constant contact with the actors, a fact which provided a powerful context for the documents. They did not exhaust, but simply emerged from, the wider story to much of which I had privileged access. Another research situation may have been relied much more heavily on such documents.

(e) Data Recording

In both phases of the research, notebooks were kept which recorded interviews, summaries of phonecalls, observation sessions and any other field notes that the researcher took. These notebooks contained the "faircopy" written often from furiously scribbled notes in the field. The latter were often not very legible but were available to the writer's comprehension on the same day. Thus after a day in the field I usually spent the evening rewriting the field

notes and making additional comments. These post-hoc reflections were indicated as such. Tape recorded interviews were also transcribed into the note-books. Phone calls were recorded on note-pad and usually written up in the notebooks straight after the call.

The researcher found it very useful to leave the left page blank so that additional comments could be added at a later date. But more importantly, to record the issues raised. This made it very easy to flip through a notebook and locate where a particular issue was raised and how many times. I used the last page of each note-book for an index of issues constructed from consulting the left-hand side of the note-books.

Arranged interviews were mostly tape-recorded. Only very occasionally would interviewees prefer interviewing without the tape recorder. When informal conversations extended into serious data gathering sessions, I would usually record data on the rough note-pad.

Transcribing interviews was a major and time-consuming task. In the first phase of the Enfield research we had the assistance of a secretary for two days per week. Apart from attending to correspondence, typing and helping with the layout of the Bulletins and reports, she also transcribed some of the interview tapes. These were in addition to the interviews which I transcribed and those interviews conducted and transcribed by the six MA students. Overall the first phase of the Enfield research had a heavy interviewing schedule. All interviews in the second phase of the Enfield study were transcribed in similarly organized notebooks.

Changing technology had a significant impact on the speed with which recorded data influenced the documents in the evaluation project of the first phase. The early bulletins and the first report were produced on an electric typewriter. Changes to early drafts of the first report required the traditional scissors and paste and sometimes retyping whole portions. This situation improved dramatically when the evaluation project acquired a word processor on which the later interim reports were produced. The new technology greatly facilitated the sensitive refocusing and and fine tuning that naturalistic reporting demands; it allowed greater flexibility in responding to the constant stream of new data.

Typically this shift in the technology of research also led to an unforeseen difficulty. Funding for our secretary terminated in March 1986. She had typed the draft of the Third Interim Report but subsequently the researcher needed to do further editing. It was at that time that I had to make rapid progress in the new word processing skills. In this I had valuable assistance from a colleague and from a journalist friend.

Section 5: Use of the Evaluation Reports

A number of evaluation reports, produced by me in the first stage of the Enfield study, were drawn on substantially in drafting the empirical section of the dissertation. This proved possible despite the differences of purpose and audience between academic writing and commissioned evaluation writing. However, subsequent reflection, later data, various responses to the reports and the greater freedom offered by academic dissertation writing, prompted considerable modification and amplification.

The focus of the first three reports were respectively:

i   an early history of Enfield TVEI, tracing its origins and initial management and curriculum structures, (disseminated Nov, 1985);

ii   curriculum development at a critical stage of the programme's expansion, (disseminated Feb, 1986);

iii the students' perspectives on the programme, (disseminated, May, 1986.

The fourth report was a summary drawing together the major developments up to May 1986. The reports were generally well received, although some objections were raised to the first report by senior management on historical grounds - a matter examined in Section 7 of the next chapter.

Evaluators, faced with timelines and the fact that they are part of the political processes, work under certain constraints. Often there is not sufficient time to reflect on the evaluation process itself, including a reflexive look at one's own role. While using the reports as descriptions of events and attitudes at the time new data were added. Much of these came from the second phase of the research, which, although strongly focusing on later developments, also shed light on the earlier phase which the reports described. This occurred in two ways. Firstly, in revisiting issues, additional, and, in some cases more accurate, data were obtained on the early period. Data on the origins of the Enfield initiative, a focus for Chapter Three, were an example. Secondly, the later developments provided a perspective for the early phase. For example, earlier aspiratations became clearer in the light of later developments, exemplified by the way in which I came to see Integrated Humanities, as it eventually developed in some schools, as largely an outcome of the old Base Programme, the original core of Enfield TVEI. Thus, later data represented a kind of

completion, although this must always be provisional: the later period itself needs to be reviewed at a still later point.

Data were also available from the carefully indexed journals I kept during the first phase. Thus, extra material from the first phase expanded, and at times modified, the original reports. Some of this material was of a political nature which, given the context and audience at the time, was not aired in the original reports. The comments of one politically active senior administrator, who suggested that the real reasons for Enfield's selection by the MSC were political, were an example of this. Other material added was simply supportive, as, for example, the use of more direct quotes from participants.

Some criticisms of the reports, particularly the first report, needed to be incorporated into my dissertation. Obviously, this was not a matter of simply adopting dissenting views but of acknowledging them and dealing with them fairly. Here too, the journals, with their accounts of meetings and phone calls, were indispensible in revisiting these issues.

As well as the content, the context was also expanded. Further reading in the TVEI literature, the research into the larger issues pursued in Chapter One, and, simply, the time to reflect on the significance of data, were all important influences. Data and issues from the macro perspective of Chapter One began to resonate with data in the Enfield reports. Writings by other evaluators (eg, Fiddy and Stronach, Harland, Barnes) provided comparisons and contrasts that sharpened the focus. Examination of the broad issues raised by commentators on the TVEI scene (eg, Dale, Pring, Holt) helped to expand the

significance of the events of the original reports. An example was the vocational dimension of TVEI and its significance in Enfield.

The director of the evaluation played a central and critical role in the preparation of the original reports. She made a considerable contribution to their structure, readability, layout, fairness, accuracy and educational relevance. Indeed, her editorial role transformed the general appearance of the reports and I learned a great deal from working with her. Any perceived gaps in the reports (and given the pace of responsive reporting some are inevitable) are my responsibility as I was close to the data, and had first-line responsibility for their selection and organisation in the original drafting of the reports. Given the depth of my contact with participants, the evaluation had to rely on my judgement on some critical issues. The later amplification was due to my improved understanding from further data, reading, reflection and audience response. Later "improvements" in no way reflects on the critical work of the director but rather to my own need to develop a fuller and more mature understanding. While the later perspective in some regards transcends that of the original reports, much of what was achieved in the early reports was due to the efforts of the director who established a critical floor for the Enfield study and its extension into this dissertation.

CHAPTER THREE: ENFIELD PRIOR TO THE WRITER'S ARRIVAL

Section 1: Plan for Empirical Chapters

The dissertation's empirical base, in the form of the story of Enfield TVEI, will account for the next four chapters. Developments prior to the arrival of the writer will be examined in this third chapter, which will encompass not only the first year of TVEI, but events leading to its adoption and significant features of the host environment prior to TVEI which were to shape the scheme's development. Chapter Four will describe the second year of Enfield TVEI and the first year of the evaluation that the writer conducted for the LEA from 1st October 1984. Its focus will be largely on management and curriculum development. Chapter Five will describe the third year of Enfield TVEI and the second year of the evaluation which was significantly different from the first in two major ways, namely, by its production of evaluation reports (which in the process become "actors") and by its focus on student perceptions.

A significant break occurred between the events of Chapter Five and Chapter Six. In the (Northern) Summer of 1986, at the conclusion of the evaluation, the writer returned to Australia. Three years later, in June 1989, I returned to Enfield for a short six week visit to be surprised by the changes that had taken place. These are the foci of Chapter Six. While the story from 1986 to 1989 is not researched, Chapter Six provides a longitudinal perspective that adds significantly to our understanding of the story as a whole. We cannot say that it completes the story. That would commit the researcher's sin of Hubris: the story goes on regardless.

Describing the early period (Chapters Three to Five) is particularly complex because it involves not only the development of TVEI but the writer's external evaluation. The following calendar, show*ing* the Phases of Enfield TVEI mapped onto the activities of the evaluation, may be a useful reference in these chapters.

TVEI Development   Evaluation activities

TVEI Mark I (Sept 1983)

TVEI Mark II (Sept 1984)

HMI TVEI Visitation (Oct 1984) Evaluation Commences, Oct, 1984

           Evaluation W/shops Nov 1984

           1st Bulletin Dec 1984

           2nd Bulletin April 1985

TVEI Mark III (Sept 1985)   1st Report Nov 1985

           2nd Report Feb 1985

           3rd Report May 1986

           Summary Report May 1986

Section 2: Point of View of the Writer

A basic distinction should be drawn between the concept of the "writer" and the "researcher". The "writer" can be understood as the "timeless" persona that speaks in this, the finished document. The "researcher" is more time-bound in the tasks that succeed each other, as he struggles with a confusing and sometimes contradictory flow of data and

storyline. He is symbiotically connected with the action, either weakly or strongly, by the very fact of being an observer. (The stronger the connection, the closer to action research.) The distinction, however, is not an absolute one. The researcher, in the midst of the action, reaches backwards and forwards in memory and imagination in order to make sense of his observations. Neither is the view point of the "writer" a God-like grasp of the One, True Theory. What we can say is that the concept of the writer and the researcher each represent a different emphasis, a different stage and function in the research process itself.

Data are never neutral but are noticed, structured and sequenced through the observer's Weltanschauung. The experience and understanding that I brought to the research and then to the writing, were important background factors in the outcome. It may be useful, therefore, to indicate briefly some critical factors in my background. In significant respects, my perception and conception of Enfield TVEI were those of an outsider. My background in education was largely Australian and something of a learning curve was required in approaching the evaluation task. In this there were pluses and minuses. Certain qualities were new and fresh which to an insider might have been taken for granted. For example, I found myself always entertained by the humour and subtlety of students' use of language, gesture and intonation, the novelty of it helping to concentrate the mind wonderfully.[1] More onerous was learning to understand the culture of reserve, at times of secrecy, that marks the British bureaucracy, as exemplified by the MCS's dealings with Enfield.

---

[1] English children appear to use language more extensively in their daily lives than their Australian counterparts.

I was not, however, a total outsider, having done one post-graduate degree in Britain, involving some empirical research in the FE sector, and having begun another. In addition I had been teaching in a University Education Faculty for nearly a year. Furthermore, my earlier school teaching in Australia included some time in Secondary Technical schools whose curriculum aspirations had some themes in common with those of some of the protagonists in the TVEI story.[2] In any case, where a new departure like TVEI is concerned, any researcher is something of an outsider. Not being totally familiar with the rich cultural context in English education did present some early problems, particularly in aspects of LEA management, but it was a rewarding experience. Victoria (and some other Australian states) has been experimenting with local management but has not achieved anything like genuine local government. Regional administrations there are not much more than branch offices representing Central Office.[3]

Of course, the researcher's view point changed over the course of the work. As a full-time evaluator for nearly two years, I did become thoroughly familiar with the local scene. The writer, qua writer, benefitted from the researcher's learning curve over these two years and this was clearly reflected in the evaluation reports published at this time. The view-point changed in other respects in the longer term, from that of contracted to independent

---

[2] Victorian Technical schools are now no more. The researcher, faced with a collapsing Latin market, taught Humanities in those schools for several years. They were an interesting phenomenon, dating from the beginning of the century and providing some of the most significant radical innovation in that state.

[3] Budgets cuts in October 1990 have led, if anywhere, to a reversal in the growth of regional management functions. In 1991 the conservative opposition, pressing for office, want radical devolution to the individual school.

researcher. The extra freedom afforded by this was available not only for researching and writing the second phase of the investigation, but for the business of quarrying the evaluation reports and other sources in writing chapters three to five.

Section 3: A Methodological Point Specific to this Chapter

The early, as told here, story is not a simple telling, but a re-telling. It is a retelling, first, because, like the material in the next two chapters, it was revisited in 1989 and many of the key players retold the story from the perspective of hindsight. Data were revisited and either confirmed, modified or expanded. Some questions were never entirely answered, not because of any lack of candour from the participants but from the nature of the data. Indeed, in 1989 participants shared some puzzles with the interviewer on the nature of the Authority's early relationship with the MSC. The early events were so fluid, the action so swift and the whole experience so strange that some residual mystery inevitably remains. These interviewees did not exhibit faulty memory so much as a sensitive awareness of the interpretative nature of this kind of narrative data.

Second, it was a retelling in a sense specific to this chapter in as much it had to rely completely on the accounts of others. Variety across the country marked TVEI from the start. The very breadth of the "Aims and Criteria", offered as central guidelines, made local interpretation inevitable. Local concerns and aspirations were bound to influence how the scheme was to be developed and implemented in different settings. The organisational values and management styles of each TVEI authority were critical for each TVEI story. It was essential for the researcher, therefore, in understanding the beginnings of TVEI in Enfield,

to examine what Enfield was like when TVEI started, and in the period immediately prior. But he didn't get to Enfield, it will be recalled, until October 1984 and the scheme had commenced in September 1983 and negotiations with the MSC as early as late 1982. (I had had some informal contact with selected Enfield administrators in the Summer prior to October 1984 but it was not part of any formal data gathering.) The story, therefore, has two methodological phases: pre and post October 1984. There is a qualitative difference: the Pre October 1984 phase resembles an exercise in contemporary history[4] whereas post October 1984 the researcher was not only present for much of the action but was to some extent part it. However, the difference should not be exaggerated. The past was, after all, the very recent past and was continuous with the present through common though developing issues (in a way analogous to Barraclough's (1964, 20) definition of contemporary history). Certainly, the actors in 1984 carried their understanding of that past into the current action. In interviews, participants went to the past without prompting to explain their understanding of the environment in which they acted.

Section 4: Enfield Prior to TVEI

Events in Enfield just prior to TVEI were highly significant for the subsequent direction of TVEI and, indeed, for the decision to become involved in TVEI in the first place. When the Manpower Services Commission (MSC) announced its plans for TVEI in November 1982,

---

[4] Geoffrey Barraclough in An Introduction to Contemporary History denies that "contemporary history" is a contradiction in terms (p 14 ff). He states his definition as follows: "Contemporary history begins when the problems which are actual in the world today first take visible shape". (p 20) This definition, applied to world history, can also be applied to case study.

the Enfield Education Authority had already been engaged in its own curriculum initiatives for the 14-18 age group. This was at least partly in response to requests at national and local levels. Firstly the Enfield Education Committee had requested the Education Department to look at the technological aspects of the secondary curriculum in the Borough. Secondly, DES circulars, in particular 6/81 had prompted a good deal of thinking about secondary curriculum within the Borough.

In March 1982, a week-end conference was held at Danbury attended by the Secondary Schools Adviser, the Warden of the Teachers' Centre, and a small group of secondary teachers. This "Danbury Group", as it was sometimes referred to, was responding to the Director's request for a statement of principles for Enfield Secondary Education that would guide policy and establish at least a provisional framework for on-going curriculum initiatives.

Later in that same year the Enfield Education Committee took up the problem of the re-organisation of Secondary Education in Enfield because of falling rolls. As part of the re-organisation, the politically Conservative Education Committee entertained the idea of technical schools at 14+. According to one senior administrator the suggestion of introducing Technical Schools "sent shivers down our spines". It would have undermined the consolidation of comprehensive education which was taking place at this time, but which had experienced some political opposition in the more distant past.[5] In the Autumn of 1982, the "Danbury Group" was augmented by people from Further Education, the Careers Service

---

[5] A legal challenge to exclude Enfield Grammar School from the LEA's comprehensive plan had gone to the House of Lords.

and the Youth Service and was formally asked to respond to the Education Committee's specific concern about the technological aspects of Enfield education. This broadly based group, now formally named the Curriculum Initiatives Group (CIG), started work on appropriate curriculum initiatives or "Options" for the 14-18 age group. Discrete working parties developed five quite different options.

In the Autumn Term 1982, these CIG options, with some limited LEA funding, were offered to the Heads. The options ranged across: Option A described by one adviser as "core areas of experience"; Option B, a Curriculum Review Option designed to facilitate a broad core; Foundation Programmes (Options D and E); and a programme called "Option C". The last, destined to play a critical role in the development of Enfield TVEI, was based on individually negotiated curricula for individual students having difficulty in accepting the routine of mainstream schooling. None of the Heads accepted Option C although, as a senior adviser commented, "given that it was developed largely by F.E. teachers with a strong input from the Youth Service, there was a possibility that F.E. might take it on". At this distance we can only speculate why the schools passed over Option C. Perhaps, it was because it was aimed at individuals rather than a being an initiative within a whole school programme. Also, Option C represented the point of view of the Youth Service rather than the schools: interviewees spoke of the programme as aimed at the "disaffected", rather than providing conventional remedial support.

Prior to the introduction of TVEI, Enfield could be characterized, firstly, by a focus on certain curriculum initiatives and, secondly, by a certain organisational style. These two sets of characteristics were important features of the host environment, critically affecting the

entry and development of TVEI. Let us firstly try to sum up the curriculum concerns.

Many interviewees made the point that these fitted what TVEI required. According to one

person from the Civic Centre:

> ... the MSC did appear to be asking for something which ... we were doing. So it
> was a matching of what we were doing with what the MSC were asking for... The
> other thing is that we were going to fund it very modestly. We had got this agreed
> by the Education Committee that they would fund it at a modest level which was all
> they could afford. The plans that had been put forward by the Curriculum Initiatives
> Group had the possibility of a much higher level of funding from the MSC.

If this matching of local aspirations with TVEI were not true then Enfield was simply

applying for badly needed resources, which seems a perfectly legitimate motive for anyone

who wants to do the best for their students. Roger Dale (1985, 54) points out that claims

by LEAs of congruence with TVEI aims were common. But was the above comment on

Enfield a true picture? In fact, curriculum concerns emerging at that time were said to be:

i   investigating technology education;
ii   resisting, nevertheless, specialist technology education;
iii   developing options for the 14-18 age group;
iv   focusing on cross-curricular issues rather than specific subjects.

Each of these were cited by interviewees as areas of initiative but what other evidence of

them was there? This varies from case to case.

(i) Interviewees claimed that in 1982 technology was a planning issue. While technology

may have been addressed at a conceptual or policy level there is no documentary evidence

from that time that specific technology content was planned in any of the options.[6]

---

[6] Indeed, as will be seen later, TVEI Mark II was developed
to remedy the lack of Technology content.

However, in late 1984 and early 1985 the evaluator observed CIG Foundation Programmes in a couple of schools which focused on cross curricular Technology tasks, such as the design and construction of automatic traffic lights. These were outside TVEI though drawing on the TVEI experience and resources. It was a broad approach to Technology with several departments contributing: Art, Science and CDT. It would seem then that, prior to November 1982, while (a) was on the Enfield agenda, it was at the stage of broad concepts and policy commitment. However, from later observation it would seem that commitment was strong enough to be realized in practical course implementation.

(ii) A more definite statement can be made here. While a specialist approach in technology did emerge for a time after September 1984 because of MSC pressure, it was not widely supported and was strongly criticized, as we will describe in due course. It occurred through the Technology and Control Option which was part of the specialist options which will be discussed later. The broad approach to technology education was demonstrated to the researcher in meetings, classroom observations and in the kind of technology courses that were subsequently developed when the options were discontinued. (See Chapter Six).

(iii) There was a strong commitment to Foundation Courses for the 14-16 age group which were subsequently developed outside TVEI. As already indicated, the researcher observed several of these classes. Additionally, commitment to the 16+ age group was shown by the inclusion of the CGLI course 365 in the first year of TVEI but subsequently forced out by the MSC, on the criterion that TVEI had to be a four year commitment.

(iv) The evidence for commitment to cross curricular initiatives, develops throughout the Enfield story.

To sum up, there was significant matching between Enfield directions at this time and what MSC invited applicants to engage in. Debate existed about technology and it is not surprising that this became a stumbling block between MSC and Enfield. Suffice it to say now that Enfield's aim for a "broad" technology did not have neat boundaries with a ready made category of teachers. This contrasted with some subject based, CDT views of Technology. Broad technology involves organisational as well as curriculum development and takes time to develop. The cross curricular focus required in this approach was to emerge as a point of ambiguity between Enfield and the MSC in the early years. On the one hand, MSC favoured moving learning away from subject based content but, on the other, had difficulty early on with Enfield's whole school approach which Enfield administrators and teachers regarded as integral to the cross curricular organisation of learning, as for example, in the Foundation Courses. Enfield and MSC aspirations lacked congruence at some points in the early developmental stages. Initially, a large part of the problem was the contextual naivety of the MSC, as instanced by the policy of separating a cross curricular initiative, such as TVEI, from whole school concerns. Enfield administrators and teachers found that some of the early representatives from National TVEI had little or no experience of schools and demonstrated little understanding of educational contexts. (As we will see, this was to change.)

The second important influence on the development process was a certain organisational style. Senior administrators spoke of "planning through broad-based teams" whose

membership was open to interested people at all levels of teaching and administration across the education service. Teachers and school administrators expressed similar values. Meetings, workshops and residential seminars generated debate, some of it quite intense. Many interviewees subsequently referred to this feature of the Enfield organisational culture ("the Enfield way"), either to support current procedures or to criticize what were perceived departures from cultural norms. The evidence for the team based approach is very clear and emerges from the whole story. It is reflected in the comment of a Senior Officer that Enfield from the start wanted "reform on a large scale while the MSC wanted reform on a small scale". Some early problems with the MSC arose partly from what one Enfield administrator described as their difficulty in dealing with groups and committees. "They preferred to deal with a single person". This preference was clearly one of "line management", a central aspect of management as a social expression of technology. Cross curricular and cross institutional teams were the Enfield strategy for large scale reform. Key Enfield Education Officers saw this as "slow" but the only kind of reform that would survive; they believed that isolated reforms which may be easier to establish initially would not be stable in the long term. So broad organisational structures was to come to characterize Enfield TVEI. The fact that the team approach was to come under pressure for a time was due to the sudden change in the educational landscape brought about by TVEI and the impact of the accompanying processes. Also important for a time were clashes between some key personalities at the level of implementation, one of whom was an external appointee unfamiliar and uncomfortable with the Enfield organisational culture.

<u>Section 5: The Early Bidding</u>

Enfield's consultative approach came under some pressure in the early negotiation with the

MSC. From the beginning haste was a mark of TVEI: interested parties were required to

respond quickly to the MSC's invitation. On 12th November 1982 TVEI was announced and

in December Enfield LEA submitted all of its already-formulated CIG options to the MSC

for consideration. With the typically short lead time required by the MSC, the Authority

quickly edited the CIG Options in a format suitable for a single submission: five options from

five groups working separately had to be included in a single framework. This first contact

with the MSC exemplified a process of negotiation which characterized generally the early

bidding for TVEI, and which was described in Chapter One. (See also Harland, 1987) MSC

style negotiation was not premised on simply accepting or rejecting submissions "a la carte",

like passing or failing an examination script. Interaction with the MSC required on-going

development of original submissions. This was a new experience in education and likely to

be misunderstood by many who were not directly involved. Enfield had entered a process

that was to alter perceptions and styles of development in a permanent way.

In the period from Christmas 1982 till the introduction of TVEI in September 1983 Enfield

was drawn more and more into the bidding conducted by the MSC. Enfield Officers

involved in meetings with the MSC at that time commented on the "fluidity" of commitments

and the provisional, evolving nature of agreements. Re-drafts were frequent and arbitrary

deadlines set by the MSC introduced a new kind of writing pressure on some LEA staff.

One Education Officer recalled a writing marathon during a Christmas Vacation. In some

respects, this new process represented the fluidity and informality of private sector

negotiation rather than the more public, rule-governed style of the public sector, with its emphasis on bureaucratic due process.

In January 1983 Enfield was told that Option C had been considered provisionally for TVEI funding. The other options were rejected by the MSC because they were not "voluntary" in that they were intended for whole year levels. "Selectivity" was an essential attribute of TVEI in its early format. This was not a final acceptance and MSC style negotiations continued. Not until a meeting in May, between the MSC and Enfield Education Officers and Advisers, was acceptance given for TVEI to commence in September 1983. Even then nothing was committed beyond the first year. Enfield's TVEI proposal contained details for the first two terms of operation; a programme for the third term and beyond was still to be presented to the MSC.

In addition to Option C the Enfield submission included:

i)   City and Guilds of London Institute, Course 365 (CGLI 365), for a 16+ cohort, and

ii)   foreshadowed technical and vocational elements (later to become known as the

        "Technical and Vocational Options"). The CDT Adviser was to collaborate in these.

The 16+ initiative did not survive: a Senior LEA Officer explained:

> We were planning for the entrants to TVEI at 16+ (as well as 14+). Initially and provisionally this was accepted by the MSC and for one year we had a cohort of 16 year olds in the scheme. However, when the MSC indicated their reservation about the complexity of the Enfield scheme one of their points referred to the inadvisability of having entry at 16+ and so this came to an end.

The prospect of TVEI funding transformed the situation and there were fresh invitations to Heads after MSC had indicated where their interest lay. On this occasion Heads showed strong interest in Option C!

Enfield overcame opposition from the MSC to win agreement that all twelve Enfield schools which expressed interest would be included in the scheme. A staggered start was agreed - seven schools in the first year and an additional five in the second year of the scheme. This stood out from other schemes right from the start in the number of participating schools. It was Enfield policy not to be exclusive in the development of its initiatives and schools that wished to be involved were included. This was in contrast with the overall intention of the MSC for a limited intake with a specialist focus, and in other authorities the number of participating schools was much fewer. MSC applied a general policy of an annual intake per LEA of 250. For Enfield, with a larger spread of schools, this meant a smaller number of TVEI students in each school. Two contradictory policies caused this: the exclusive policy of the MSC and the non-exclusive policy of the Enfield administration.

The MSC expressed some unease with this structure, according to senior LEA staff, but accepted it nonetheless. It was Enfield who decided that implementation would be easier by staging TVEI's introduction over two years. The seven schools which commenced in the first year (1983) were those which had the closest contact with the developers of the original material. This temporary restriction on the number of participating schools may or may not have made the MSC more comfortable but the reasons given by Enfield officers for this arrangement were developmental ones: it was more manageable to begin with a first round of seven schools and disseminate the changing practice to the second round schools beginning in 1984. In effect, it was a pilot within a pilot.

118

The MSC had some residual questions about content and so delayed committing funds beyond the first year pending further development of the scheme. According to officers involved in the preparation and negotiation of the submission, full extension of the MSC contract was provisional on:

i)   a strengthening of the technological elements of the curriculum to meet criteria laid down for TVEI;

ii)   a greater share of the budget being spent on equipment as against human resources, especially staff development.

Furthermore, Enfield Education Officers involved in the negotiations said that the idea of a negotiated curriculum was new to the MSC and it wanted to know more about a curriculum in which pupils had a say about their learning. Officers also said that a Senior MSC Officer with previous experience and a strong commitment to negotiated industrial work practices showed a positive interest in this side of Enfield's submission. Indeed, the concept of "negotiation" (though in variable senses) was to became a common focus of TVEI schemes across the country. (Douglas Barnes, 1986 and 1987)

That early position of the MSC represented a "technologized" view of educational planning and organisation. The emphasis on technology was not simply a subject or content focus but a curriculum orientation characterized by linear planning. (See Skilbeck, 1984; McNeil, 1985; Lawton, 1983; Chitty and Lawton, 1988) It was an attempt, and no doubt with the best of intentions, to implement a set of aims with little knowledge of the operating environment and the needs of those in it. For example, the hard, simplistic division between equipment and personnel betrayed little understanding of the fact that teaching and learning are complementary, intentional and interactive processes.

Section 6: The Issue of Option C

Option C was at the centre of the early Enfield TVEI story. The significance of Option C has been the subject of widely differing interpretations and, in some cases, deep and divisive feelings. It remained for a long time the subject of much debate within the scheme, though by 1989 only an occasional distant echo was heard.

At the beginning it was the most marginalized of the CIG Options. This is clear from the fact that no school chose it when it was offered prior to TVEI funding. Then quite unexpectedly, early in the bidding process, Option C was the only option left on the table, whether because the MSC had positively chosen it or because it rejected all the others.[7] Views within the Authority varied greatly on how central Option C was to Enfield TVEI. When the researcher arrived on the scene in 1984 one strongly-held opinion in the schools regarded TVEI as Option C. (In at least one school, "Option C" appeared on the time-table, not "TVEI".) Furthermore, Option C and its philosophy were passionately defended against alleged encroachments on its open structure.

Given the negotiating style, no record remains of the MSC's precise valuation of Option C in January 1983. Nor is it clear in what terms the MSC's (provisional) decision was announced by the Authority. Certainly different interpretations were put on the MSC decision in May 1983. Beyond those immediately involved in the negotiations, many

---

[7] According to at least one Enfield Senior Officer, the MSC for political reasons wanted a London Borough in the first round. It may, therefore, be idle to speculate on the philosophical attraction of Option C to the MSC.

assumed that the initial announcement meant a "pass" for the original Option C and a "fail" for the others. With a better understanding of the new style bidding this must now be seen as too rigid an interpretation. Certainly the other options dropped out of sight but it was unlikely, given the subsequent story of the negotiations, that Option C was accepted *carte blanche*. Three pieces of evidence will suffice to disprove the view held by some that Option C as presented in January 1983 was the "original TVEI", and that subsequent developments were departures from agreed, original intentions. Firstly, as already pointed out, permission to proceed did not come until May, and then the initial commitment was not beyond one year. Secondly, CGLI 365 was also included, though subsequently withdrawn. Thirdly, a commitment was given that additional technical and vocational elements would be developed, subsequently realized in the "Technical/Vocational Options" that commenced in September 1984. Of course, it could be argued that Option C had an educational philosophy that deserved to be supported. That may be so. The point at debate at that time, however, was more frequently the interpretation of the "contemporary history" of Option C and its role in defining Enfield TVEI. What was perhaps often remembered by the Option C purists were the early perceptions of, and responses to, the January position rather than the underlying negotiated reality that emerged over time. Even after the May announcement there was still a lot to play for.

Certainly at the time, given that none of the schools had accepted Option C, the impact of the MSC decision was dramatic. As one adviser said, "People couldn't believe their ears ... Pandemonium broke out." Cinderella Option C managed to fit the MSC glass slipper. A school administrator remarked: "A feeling of sour grapes was around after the announcement, but it soon passed."

Interpretations of the role of Option C in the development of TVEI were significant because they deeply affected attitudes towards the ownership of TVEI. It came to be felt by the original developers of Option C that any developments in TVEI that did not hold constant the original format and status of Option C was a departure from some original, non-negotiable commitment. From the above description of the negotiation processes we can see that this was pressing too much out of the situation. Interpretations were important, nevertheless, as beliefs that drove action. Actors came to espouse a range of views on Option C:

a)   It was TVEI;
b)   It was the basis of TVEI;
c)   It was an element among others to be added later;
d)   It was a starting point with open-ended possibilities for development.

Clearly, (a) is difficult to sustain. (b) is probably true at a philosophical level, given that the original "objectives" of Option C were adopted for TVEI as a whole. At the practical, operational level (c) and (d) were true at different times to different degrees.

Enfield's usual management style had been distorted by the speed of the MSC's bidding process. This distortion, of course, was unintended. At first senior management was not fully aware of how the MSC's "adoption" of Option C was being interpreted at different levels. This was understandable in the light of the new bidding process and also early changes at the lower levels of management responsible for TVEI. It is not that senior management did not communicate, but that a TVEI management structure was not yet in place to facilitate feed back fast enough to keep up with the pace of development and communicate the provisional nature of MSC announcements. In hindsight it is too easy to say more attention should have been paid to communication. By 1985 a senior administrator commented that the lesson learnt was that single announcements were not enough; continual

follow up was required. But in 1983 the hectic pace of negotiation and development was carried by people who had full time jobs apart from TVEI. It was a "Catch 22" situation: a well developed structure was needed to facilitate communication, but that could not be had until the contract was won.

Researching the role of Option C in the overall story presented peculiar difficulties. Subtleties arising from an understanding of the narrative were not immediately available to the researcher when he arrived in 1984. Tensions on the status of Option C were visible but the historical grasp only came later. The researcher remained close to the action and reported responses in the programme. This perspective had strengths and weaknesses. The First Interim Report contained some historical comment but it was not comprehensive enough. Greater depth was required but so much else needed reporting at that time. The historical aspect of Option C could not be put on hold until a fully comprehensive account of Option C was available because actors' interpretations of their current action were expressed frequently in terms of the immediate past history of Option C. Reporting the early history at that early stage was problematic for the evaluator in that actors' perceptions were of a fast-moving and not always clearly documented process. It took time to discover, analyse and interrelate the range of perceptions discussed above. "A good view from the trenches" was one summation of that first report. It pin-pointed the strengths of reporting the experiential reality of TVEI in the schools but also the weakness of writing history from the trenches.

Curriculum development and supporting staff development for the new scheme was provided

by the F.E. originators of Option C. They produced a substantial document <u>Option C - An</u>

<u>Integrated Course</u> which provided a broad framework and a rich array of ideas for the major

"core ideas" of the Base Programme. A staff development seminar, emphasising and

exploring personal and interpersonal questions, was organized late in the Summer Term 1983

by a member of the Option C group, a Head of Department at an F.E. College.

Option C was described by TVEI school co-ordinators as "not a course but an approach to

study". (This very phrase was echoed by at least two school administrators in 1989, long

after the position of school co-ordinator had been abolished.) Its curriculum framework was

a matrix of five broad "aims" and ten "core themes". The five aims were in fact the five

"objectives" set out in the original Option C document, though in general discourse they were

called aims:

> Students should be enabled to

> (a)   <u>adapt</u> to changes in personal circumstances and adapt their views and opinions in response to changing local, national and international situations;
> (b)   <u>anticipate</u> the responses of him/herself and others to changing circumstances;
> (c)   <u>gather</u> information in order to identify needs and solve problems;
> (d)   <u>construct</u> a strategy by selecting accurate and relevant information in order to cater for a need and solve a problem;
> (e)   <u>communicate</u> his/her needs and ideas effectively verbally and visually.

(From <u>Option C: Integrated Course for 14 - 16s</u>, p 3)

By October 1984 when the evaluator arrived, these seemed to be available in general

currency only in the cryptic, shorthand form of: "adapt, anticipate responses; gather

information; conduct, construct and evaluate a strategy; communicate". Even those school

co-ordinators who were most passionate about Option C did not know, or have access to, the full text.

The ten "Core Themes" were comprised of seven original themes:

> World of Work;
> Alternatives to Employment;
> Budgeting and Handling Money;
> Health Education;
> Environmental Education;
> World Studies and Political Education;
> Creativity and Aesthetic Awareness

(Enfield TVEI Proposal, June 1984, p 8).

Three others were added in an updated staff development document, in early 1984:

> Technological Awareness;
> Vocational Awareness;
> Computer Literacy.

Interview data suggested that the group within CIG which developed Option C was strongly influenced by the Further Education document A Basis of Choice. We have already discussed "the new FEU pedagogy" in Chapter One. (See also Dale, 1985, 48; and Harland, quoted in Ch. One.) Similarities can be noticed in the emphasis Option C gave to negotiation of curriculum, learning from direct experience wherever possible, personal and social development, skills-based learning, work experience and the avoidance of a "content-led curriculum". Enfield TVEI, as it operated in its first year, resembled Option C in all these respects, especially in its focus on individualized negotiation.

In both curriculum and staff development much was attempted very quickly. A staff development residential, about which many participants reported scenes of extraordinary conflict, was organized by F.E. staff late in the Summer Term 1983. It aimed at attitudinal

change but several teachers spoke of the emotional difficulties experienced in handling this programme which went beyond some teachers' expectations. Younger teachers were embarrassed by one or two older participants sharing reflections on private as well as professional issues. These training sessions, encouraging "open communication" proved difficult for some and led to a degree of antagonism between school and F.E. staff. Some participants put this down to the speed of development; others to the newness of what was being attempted (especially moving from a traditional pedogogy to a more personal engagement with students); others cited the "F.E./School divide". In retrospect these events have an ironic aspect because after the eventual resignation of the staff developer from that role it was the early co-ordinators from the schools who continued to defend Option C against later developments in TVEI. Perhaps it points to the confusion of personal and philosophical differences that occur in a time of haste and pressurized development.

These strains were further aggravated at a student residential in September at which disagreements arose about the appropriate degree of student supervision and direction. Again it appears an "F.E./School divide" was in evidence, particularly on issues of staff-student relationships in which, according to two Education Officers present, FE staff favoured less formality and supervision. Feeling somewhat isolated, especially from school co-ordinators, the main staff developer withdrew from TVEI in October, a fact lamented by some and welcomed by others. This and later withdrawals were symptomatic of personal tensions between the originators of Option C and a significant number of those who had the task of administering and teaching TVEI. It is difficult to say what differences these withdrawals made but it affected the early development in such ways as the loss of the original "aims" from general currency, lack of documents generally, and the fact that second-round co-

ordinators commencing in September 1984 generally did not have background source material prepared for Option C by its original developers. (This same material had been in the possession of the original co-ordinators who began their Base Programmes in September 1983 but seems not to have been passed on.) In general these withdrawals caused a temporary set-back to the cumulative growth in understanding that characterizes good development. However, it was only temporary and, given the accounts of the bitterness generated at that time, was probably a necessary cleansing.

Section 8: Commencement of the Programme (Mark I)

In September 1983 TVEI commenced in seven Enfield Schools. It largely consisted of what was known as the "Base Programme",[8] based on the development work described in the last section. Frequently referred to as a Core Programme because of a shared framework of broad aims and "core-themes", considerable discretion was exercised by individual schools who adopted more or less open approaches to learning. The aims and core-themes, of course, were those of Option C, as was the development work. TVEI students were able to negotiate individual programmes and very generous staffing ratios facilitated individualized assignment-based learning.

Given the haste, and uncertain future of TVEI, the risk of failure must have appeared considerable. Yet despite this, TVEI teachers and students alike were intensely committed

---

[8] There was also a small 16+ intake undertaking a CGLI course which was discontinued after the first year. It was significant in the development of TVEI only in so far as it showed the early strength of the FE influence in TVEI.

to the innovation. In a time of educational cuts and few educational opportunities TVEI

offered a rare challenge to be involved in change. One of the original seven co-ordinators

remembers:

> I think the seven of us came to the conclusion that really it was a golden opportunity
> here to begin to change and re-direct activities in the school. Therefore, we worked
> very very closely together and we met an awful lot, and met not just in the formal
> Borough meetings but privately and socially to discuss the course and the way we'd
> approach it and the teaching strategies we'd employ and the nature of the kids we'd
> select.

Several TVEI teachers after years of teaching with subject department spoke of the need for

professional change.

> I suppose I'd been a year head for several years and I'd become a bit stale...The head
> said "You've been shouting your head off for four or five years about the problems
> of these students. Here's an opportunity, find out whether that works".

Of another co-ordinator an LEA administrator said:

> (He) is very bright but his career was getting nowhere ... TVEI got him running
> again.

Clearly TVEI was grasped, in the words of another co-ordinator, "as a golden opportunity",

in an otherwise grey professional world.

Students also took risks for something that was perceived as a potential realization of deeply

felt needs. In that first year academic students in TVEI dropped one or two "O" levels - a

heavy penalty in some people's eyes. A few bright students accepted this to try a new

approach to learning. In fact, several TVEI students recalled, "I wanted to try something

different". Another commented: "I wanted to do something for myself, not in formal

lessons". One teacher described that initial intake as "more adventurous and imaginative".

> (TVEI) didn't offer them another examination course, any immediate tangible rewards
> ... but, hints of excitement ... a more independent approach to study, a chance for
> them to develop their own skills and talents and initiative.

In the early planning stage initial responsibility for TVEI fell to the Secondary Advisory. This was in addition to an already full administrative load. In May 1983 an Assistant Education Officer in FE within the Enfield service was offered the position of Borough Co-ordinator. In September, however, another Assistant Education Officer in FE was appointed on the understanding that she would take over as TVEI Borough Co-ordinator in January 1984, when the first appointee would return to his previous duties.[9] While her appointment was in FE she was described by a senior administrator as having "a strong schools' background". This second co-ordinator did a great deal of course writing for TVEI even before officially taking up the position of Borough Co-ordinator. She also developed a role that resembled that of an Adviser more than that of an administrative Officer, visiting TVEI base-rooms and keeping close personal contact with school co-ordinators.

Section 9: Planning for Mark II

From November 1983 planning began for the "Technical/Vocational Options" to be added to the scheme in September 1984. The trigger for this occurred when, according to the TVEI Borough Co-ordinator at that time, Enfield became aware that the MSC had reservations about Enfield's submission for the continuation of the scheme. It was decided that, rather than wait for the MSC to respond unfavourably in an official capacity, a new submission from Enfield would be drafted immediately. A small group of LEA administrators completed a revised version in three days of intensive work. The urgency felt is indicated by the submission's being taken directly to the MSC at Holborn, still in hand

---

[9] Roger Dale (1985, p 53) notes that in some Authorities the FE sector had a strong influence in the development of TVEI.

written form. This pre-emptive, proactive strike also speaks of Enfield's adapting to the new style of negotiating. It generally raised the suspicion of the first round co-ordinators (which in some cases was strongly expressed to the evaluator when he arrived in late 1984) that these new options contradicted the philosophy of the Base Programme (and ultimately Option C) which was claimed to be central to TVEI.

The new document, however, was more acceptable to the MSC. It guaranteed that all TVEI students would be involved in <u>one</u> of the following options:

Caring Studies for Family and Community
Computer Studies
Environmental Education for Land-based Industries
Introduction to the Business World
Technology and Control

A more detailed submission, however, was required and this was put together during the 1983 Christmas Vacation. This document, <u>London Borough of Enfield TVEI</u> was the first public statement of "TVEI Mark II". The aims of the course (the short-hand version from Option C) and the Base Programme are included unchanged from previous documents but there is considerable development of the options structure along with the implications for the overall structure. The January 1984 document reflected the "collegiate" style of Borough-wide planning for the use of resources. It involved an agreed time-table across schools and colleges, and sites were designated for the different options.

This new development embodied a more complex structure. Overall, TVEI was to represent 30% of each student's curriculum. The school-based <u>Base Programme</u> (occupying 20% of a student's time) would continue to operate independently in each TVEI school, while the new <u>Technical/Vocational Options</u> (occupying 10% of a student's time) were planned as

Borough-wide courses conducted at specified schools. Clearly, the new "Tech/Voc" Options did not represent the same kind of open structure as the Base Programme. They did, however, as many student interviewees pointed out, offer an extra CSE or "O" Level. This attracted many students into the second intake, a fact which distinguished their motivation sharply from the first.

An expanded version of the January submission was produced in June 1984. It involved no structural or substantial changes from the January 1984 document, but included more detailed content for the Technical/Vocational Options from the teachers concerned. On this basis, the MSC ended the uncertainty of its provisional acceptance of Enfield TVEI and signed a full contract with the Borough.

A critical resignation occurred in June 1984 when the Borough Co-ordinator, after only a few months in the position, left to take up a position with the new Schools Curriculum Development Committee. Once again the Secondary Adviser took on this job as well as her own, until in September 1984, another Borough Co-ordinator was appointed from outside the authority. These changes compounded the problems of continuity occasioned by the previous changes in this position and by the earlier withdrawals of course and staff developers.

The plan for Enfield TVEI's second year, commencing September 1984, was to enlarge the scheme in two dimensions. In accordance with the expansion plans described in the Enfield TVEI proposals of January and June 1984:

(a)   five "second round" schools entered the scheme, and

(b)   five Tech/Voc Options were commenced.

131

These options, requiring some students to travel to other sites, were largely independent of the Base Programmes and the TVEI Co-ordinators in the schools.

Evaluation was mandatory for all TVEI contracts. Enfield's strategy was for a mix of external and internal evaluation. Accordingly, the Borough began negotiations with Dr. Helen Simons of the University of London Institute of Education early in 1984. Enfield and the Universtity agreed on a three year evaluation. The MSC agreed to this in a meeting with Enfield Education Officers in May 1984. In the following month, however, the MSC changed its mind and agreed only to a period of 18 months for the independent external evaluation, to begin on 1st October 1984, and an internal evaluation to be conducted by the Borough through until the end of the project. The present writer was the designated evaluator with additional responsibilities for supporting the internal evaluation.

The evaluation began as planned on the 1st October with Dr. Helen Simons as part-time Director and the present writer as the full-time external evaluator. Co-incidentally, on the same day, ten HMIs began a four-day evaluation of TVEI.

So far I have been giving an account of what happened before the evaluation began. Necessarily, I had to rely on participants' memories and documents. Given the fast moving and informal processes, the latter were not in great abundance. From this point on, however, we are closer to the events being described, at many of which the present writer was actually present.

CHAPTER 4: MY FIRST YEAR - THE TWO TVEI'S

Section 1: Preliminaries

(a) The Scope of this Chapter

This chapter describes the first year of the evaluation and the second year of Enfield TVEI, the implementation of "Mark II". The seven first-round schools were entering their second year of TVEI, five second-round schools were having their first intake, and the introduction of the five Tech/Voc Options was a significant new development. Seven of the twelve schools and two FE colleges were designated sites for one of the five Tech/Voc Options, and an eighth school was the site for two options.

As to the evaluation, activities in the first year included producing two Bulletins, the First Interim Report, conducting evaluation workshops for teacher evaluators and providing editorial support for teacher evaluators in their production of reports. The Director of the evaluation prepared extensive materials for two in-service workshops in November and December 1984. Workshops were conducted by the evaluation Director and myself, with assistance from a visiting academic from Canberra experienced in teacher in-service education. I, the evaluator, interviewed the Heads of all twelve TVEI schools, all the School Co-ordinators, observed classes and other activities in several schools, attended meetings and some in-service seminars for TVEI teachers, interviewed both TVEI and non-TVEI students and teachers, and several key people at the Civic Centre, in some cases more than once. It

was a busy schedule as regards both the demands of the tasks themselves and the familiarization that was required as an "outsider".

(b) First Impressions

Surprise and pleasure were the my first responses to Enfield TVEI when I began as evaluator in October 1984. Early school visits and interviews with the School Co-ordinators for TVEI revealed optimistic teachers and enthusiatic students. These first contacts were with each school's Base Programme conducted exclusively in the "base-room". Great pride was taken by students and teachers alike in these baserooms. Comfortable furnishings - arm chairs, carpet, even indoor plants - provided relative elegance and a sense of exclusive identity. Room space was frequently broken up by well stocked book cases to provide intimate corners, a steaming coffee urn promised refreshment, and computers were ubiquitous. A phone, separate from the main switch-board, was located in each base-room, which encouraged networking beyond the school. This educational idyll was the exclusive preserve of the TVEI cohort in each school, approximately 20 students per year.

Relationships between teachers and students were characterized by equality and a sense of responsibility. Some students (probably in a minority of schools) addressed teachers by first name. When the researcher rang a school it was not unusual for a student to answer the phone, replying, "I'll get Mick". Encouraged to be more socially proactive a student would greet the researcher with an offer of coffee. Teachers regarded such initiatives as integral to the learning process. Later interviews established that while young students felt vulnerable in taking social risks they were assured of the fierce support of their teachers. When the

researcher returned from Australia in the Summer of 1989, he found that some of these early TVEI students still dropped in to see their teachers.

Student morale was noticed by everybody. Among students there was a feeling "I've been chosen", according to one school Co-ordinator at that time. Several Co-ordinators spoke of students being suddenly transformed by the experience. "Some of the students become particularly imaginative and realize there is almost nothing they cannot do", commented one. A boy, described by his TVEI teacher as "a bit soggy", started "wearing a tie and combing his hair". A girl who "had a chip on her shoulder" surprised other non-TVEI teachers as "a different girl". Across the country this personal renewal of TVEI students was widely reported. (See Dale, 1985, p 49.)

This improved self concept was not without its attendant problems. Students realized that being treated as special raised envy in others. In October 1984, the new intake, after only four weeks of TVEI, was already debating whether to allow other students into the baseroom during lunch-time. Some students in one school said, "No, this is our room". Others said, "If we don't let them in they are going to treat us like snobs and that sort of thing". Very early these students were learning the connection between privilege and envy!

But some other first impressions were disturbing ones. In the meetings that the evaluator attended early on, expressions of deep hostility were frequent and sustained between the Borough Co-ordinator and an influential group of School Co-ordinators. The Borough Co-ordinator, newly appointed from outside Enfield, wanted more structure; the School Co-

ordinators interpreted this as an attempt to impose a "content-led curriculum". By October, only a month after the appointee's arrival, meetings were already in uproar.

These first impressions, positive and negative, related to the obvious, most visible and easily observable features of TVEI. There was also the invisible structure and history, discussed in Chapter Three, which came only gradually to the researcher. The story did not present itself as it unfolds on these pages. It emerged piece-meal, out of sequence, and sometimes painfully from often conflicting understandings of participants as they communicated with the evaluator.

(c) A TVEI Borough Policy and its Interpretations

Early developers regarded TVEI (and Option C) as both school-based and a Borough-wide scheme. "We want to provide the same kind of access across the Borough for all youngsters", a senior member of the education service stated. Indeed, all Enfield documents described Enfield TVEI as a Borough scheme with co-ordination of resources and personnel across the Borough. From the outset this had been a central theme. The previous Borough Co-ordinator who had resigned in the Summer commented on the importance of "collegial system" between schools, in particular regarding the Sixth Form curriculum. An originator of Option C and writer of Option C: An Integration Course, the basis of "Mark I TVEI", said that she wanted to break down the isolation of individual schools. She envisaged students having access to a wide range of skills and resources in different institutions. Integration within option C meant not just breaking down subject barriers but institutional barriers to create a more flexible organisation of people and resources.

In the first year, School Co-ordinators were left very much to their own devices and a sense of course ownership, separate from the mainstream curriculum, was firmly established among them. A strong group identity was built up during that time. Data presented in the previous section demonstrated this, and, along with other data, suggested a "club style" of management. Indeed, these teachers were referred to as a "club" by a senior adviser closely associated with early TVEI development. In keeping with the "club style" (Handy, 1984, p 10), the group's cement seemed to have little to do with common tasks. This is not to say that they did not espouse common commitments to certain educational ideals such as cross curricular initiatives, student responsibility for learning, student involvement in assessment, and the promotion of maturity and confidence. But then these ideals were espoused by a great number of people in Enfield and the school co-ordinators still lacked in October 1984 a shared programme of activities for their Base Programmes. These operated, rather, as isolated enclaves in each school. Nevertheless, the co--ordinators were a very close knit group, particularly the first round co-ordinators, and they supported each other at a personal level. This club style was disturbed by the TVEI Unit's new degree of emphasis on the Borough dimension of the scheme. In Mark II, the Tech/Voc. Options were developed, resourced and managed by the Authority's TVEI Unit, which at this time consisted only of the Borough Co-ordinator and one administrative assistant. This marked an important structural change, in both organisation and curriculum. TVEI was no longer wholly conducted within the base-room and some students travelled to other schools for their Options. For the Options there was co-ordinated, corporate Borough planning which some of the School Co-ordinators, particularly those in the original "first-round" schools, owned to interpreting as a threat to the school-based principle. These changes became a source of disagreement between the co-ordinators and the Unit.

In reality, being school-based and a Borough scheme can be complementary and mutually supportive. Educational writing, especially on core curriculum, endorses a dialectic between school-based curriculum development and a central framework and system of support (Lawton, 1983; Skilbeck, 1982, 1984; Ministry of Education, Victoria, 1988).

(d) The Two TVEI's

When I arrived in October 1984, the division and tensions existed between

i   the "Two TVEI's", viz., the Base Programme and the new Tech/Voc Options,

         and

ii   the school co-ordinators and the TVEI Unit headed by the newly appointed

         Borough Co-ordinator.

These were closely interrelated which will emerge as they are dealt with in turn.

Very quickly the implementation of the Technical/Vocational Options began to establish a different and discrete TVEI from the Base Programme. Several features marked the Options off:

-        course planning at the Borough level
-        focus on specific content
-        Option tutors teaching largely within subjects/expertise
-        involvement of subject Advisers in course planning
-        external certification and awards

In contrast, the Base Programme was conducted quite independently by each School Co-ordinator in the splendid privacy of his/her baseroom. This was an inheritance from the previous year. From the beginning, decisions affecting the group had been made collectively

in School Co-ordinators' meetings chaired by the Borough Co-ordinator. As we saw, the position of Borough Co-ordinator changed several times in the first year while school co-ordinators provided continuity in the implementation process and operated with considerable autonomy. This helped to establish expectations of ownership and autonomy.

Previously co-ordinators' meetings were solely concerned with the Base Programme. It was TVEI. With the expansion in 1984 the significance of co-ordinators' meetings changed. Whereas previously they would overview the whole of TVEI, they were now concerned with only part of it, i.e. the Base Programme. Option Tutors did not attend these meetings nor did they make any input through the School Co-ordinators. Their reference group was in their area of expertise, with strong support from LEA subject Advisers.

The researcher came across no collaboration or interchange of ideas between these two groups within their schools in the first year of the evaluation. In some cases he found there was outright hostility: "Oh, we don't talk to them." Organisational reasons militated against communication. First, the Options were not part of the curriculum planning of individual schools. Classes drew their students from across schools, with students travelling to the Option of their choice. Second, the Base Programmes operated as independent units inside each school. In neither case, and for different reasons, was TVEI part of a whole-school focus. Furthermore, different philosophies were evident in the two areas. Several school co-ordinators voiced their distrust of the Options scheme as a "Trojan Horse" imposing "content-led curriculum" on TVEI as a whole, though no documentation ever bore this out, and later outcomes, described in Chapter Six, suggest strongly that senior management had

never this in mind. However, the main hostility was directed at the TVEI Unit, of the full extent of which senior management were not aware during the Autumn Term of 1984.[1]

The Options remained outside the mainstream consultative and decision-making structures and contributed little, if anything, to policy. Little contact existed between the Options and the Base Programme, and indeed, between the Options themselves. Their strong subject orientation was betrayed in Option teachers' lack of concern at not being represented in the broad development of TVEI, as, say, through the co-ordinators' group. The Options' major connection with TVEI seemed to be one of funding. In other respects they operated like any other subject in the curriculum. Option teachers were generally unaware that TVEI had overall aims and criteria, independent of their subjects. The following comments typified their approach:

> I simply have the job of teaching Technology and I don't see it creating that much of a difference between mainstream and TVEI.

and

> All I'm working on is a syllabus that has actually been set down ... by the powers that be (mainly the Technology Adviser at that time, viz, 1985).

Generally Option teachers were quite unaware of any overall TVEI framework, seeing it simply as a kind of buried treasure.

This isolation from mainstream TVEI deprived the Options of the kind of critical educational debate that occurred in the baserooms. Option teachers frequently expressed attitudes that were never voiced in the Base Programme:

---

[1] Evidence for this emerged from the reaction of management to the first report which had adverted to some of the difficulties.

Remedial kids often start being a problem, because they haven't the same self control. Intelligent kids can somehow sit and be bored, bored rigid for hours on end without creating too much of a fuss. But the less able can't. They don't have that self-control over themselves and start being a nuisance. (14/2/1985)

At another school, I had the following response from an Option teacher:

Interviewer   Do you think smaller groups in TVEI will change your teaching style?

Option Teacher   Highly likely, because you have your finger more on the button, discipline wise. Because there will be less discipline problems, I can see getting on with teaching rather than the discipline, and that is a problem with the all-ability thing in the mainstream anyway.

These concerns with class control and didactic content were quite distinct from those of the

Base Programme teachers.

Resources were often simply sources of competition between subjects rather than

opportunities for enriching the curriculum. There could be fierce competition between

Science and CDT departments to control the Technology Option. In one school the Head of

the Technical Department admitted to blocking links with other subjects:

I think the Physicists, particularly, would have the link I referred to. Looking at it selfishly, I'm sure they could do it. But to me, probably selfishly, it is our department. It is the Technical Department.... But at the same time it could be thrown at me that there's a lot of duplication going on between our option in Technology and Physics. (19)

The same HOD admitted that the Physics teachers were keen to make a contribution in some

of the theoretical areas, but the Option teachers kept it all to themselves. He commented:

"We are very much having to learn one minute and having to teach the next". This led to

a mechanistic, programmed approach to teaching from a series of "modular books" which,

in the words of a CDT teacher, were:

a nice way of helping them (the CDT teachers) to teach a subject they haven't been trained for and haven't had the opportunity of going on a course for, either. As I say, we got a course last year, a week's course which I attended.

141

The motivation in becoming involved in TVEI sometimes betrayed a concern with competition and status:

> We would like to start this as an O Level course to attract some of the more able children to this department, because they do tend to get lost to the Sciences and we've fought for years not to be recognized as a sin-bin.

Resources were welcomed by one CDT teacher because:

> I would say it has made the room look more like a laboratory that a workshop or project room, and I think that's got the advantage of attracting the right sort of people.

In another school, a Physics teacher, in somewhat different circumstances, revealed the same divide between Science and CDT:

> In a lot of ways we're lucky in this school because there wasn't a metalwork teacher or a woodwork teacher. And because I'm a Physicist I'm not treading on their toes. So we only had to combine the Art Department and the Science Department to get Technology running. (31/1/85)

These contrasts between the Base Programme and the Options were recalled long afterwards in 1989 when the new Technology Adviser, appointed in 1987 described his deep disappointment with the rigid teaching he found in the Options and his delight in discovering the Base Programme. Other Enfield administrators supported this view.

(e) Growing Curriculum Complexity

A pattern of increasing complexity emerged as new people and new elements were introduced in September 1984 - a pattern to be repeated again in September 1985. Unlike the Base Programme, the Technical/Vocational Options, starting September 1984, relied largely on off-the-shelf courses - a strategy which was to re-occur with the "Core Strands", starting September 1985. Whereas practice in the Base Programme was more uncertain and

experimental, the later innovations were generally trials of fully developed courses with some local adaptations. Teaching to external examinations, Options tutors experienced far less risk though some complained of isolation within their own school and options. "I lack a wider TVEI perspective", was one tutor's comment.

Encountering difficulty in Enfield TVEI (especially in the Base Programme) was not the same thing as in an established curriculum. In general, TVEI teachers were experienced (though not perhaps in the new mode) and many heads and deputies, without invitation, said of their co-ordinators; "Oh, so-and-so is very good with kids" or "so-and-so is very good in the classroom". Difficulty in TVEI was not about professional incompetence but about pushing out the boundaries of pedagogical practice.

Difficulties were complex and not always fully visible to those under pressure. Firstly, the lack of curriculum support and speed of innovation made the Base Programme simultaneously an exercise both in development and in implementation. Secondly, and rather more implicitly, co-ordinators saw themselves as having the additional role of communicating the educational implications of TVEI to all teachers within the school. This was an assumed, rather than a clearly defined, role, in response to statements public and private by teachers, school and borough administrators that TVEI had a responsibility to facilitate improved practice across the curriculum. In the absence of a clear statement as to whose role this was, co-ordinators impicitly accepted responsibility to disseminate examples of "good practice" from TVEI within their own schools, though they had had little preparation for this role. Moreover, at this time there was no obvious institutional structure to facilitate co-ordinators in this role.

(f) The New Borough Co-ordinator

The Borough Co-ordinator appointed in September 1984 entered at a difficult and critical point of development. With five new schools and the Options, the club-style atmosphere was coming under strain. The arrival of the new Co-ordinator was perceived by many school co-ordinators as connected with these changes. In fact, these developments had been in train well before the new appointment, and their implementation happened to co-incide with the appointment. Actually, the philosophical views of the co-ordinators were broadly those that were widely espoused within Enfield. However, the differences between the co-ordinators and the TVEI Unit were becoming an embarrassment for senior administrators. The divisions were creating problems for Enfield's collaborative approach to management.

When the evaluator started work in Enfield in October the new Co-ordinator had already began to take a strong management role which generated some resentment from the school co-ordinators. Implementing the Tech/Voc Options, many of which required expensive material resources, was now a large part of the TVEI budget. The new Borough Co-ordinator, with one newly appointed administrative assistant, described his task at this time as "madly trying to spend the budget". The Tech/Voc Options together with a more independent Borough Co-ordinator changed the style of TVEI. Tension and change were in the air. In October the Borough Co-ordinator remarked:

> Everything is in the melting pot at the moment. Down from the style of management of the operation of TVEI right through to what CIG is doing now ... their style of operation might be going to change ... not necessarily because there's something defective in the old world. We've moved on. We've got the baby and the baby has been safely delivered.

Many of the school co-ordinators opposed decisions made by the Borough Co-ordinator, mostly on alleged lack of negotiation. Opposition was expressed most openly by first round co-ordinators but received some support from among the new second-round co-ordinators.

Clearly this unstable situation could not last. By the following Easter (1985) an expanded TVEI structure was foreshadowed which, by the following September, began to bring the two parts of TVEI closer together. When the evaluator returned in 1989 he found the old fissures had disappeared in a transformed management structure. The events that set up this restructuring were played out from October 1984 to July 1985. We will now look at the main events of this year.

Section 2: The Story of TVEI Mark II

In the previous section I described the tensions that I found in Enfield when I arrived. These tensions are background for the ensuing story. Of course, this story is only one phase in the longer story of Enfield TVEI. Two reasons can be given for telling this part of it detail. Firstly, the evaluator was present and closely involved. Secondly, it was a critical period when difficult problems arose whose resolution had long term implications. It must be emphasized it _was_ an uncharacteristic period for Enfield. In this period a number of key events occurred that represented a focus for debate, marked a turning point or provided an opportunity for resolution.

(a) HMI Visit

Injected into the early tensions was a four day evaluation conducted by ten HMI's, commencing on 1st October, co-incidentally the same starting date as the external evaluation. Comment cannot be made on the report because it was delivered verbally and no written version was available, either through the schools or the Authority. All that can be reported are responses to the alleged statements made by those delivering the report.

Responses by LEA Officers on such points as "curriculum balance" and "economic class sizes" were careful and considered. But the report met with a more personalized response from those teaching in the scheme. The report was resented and rejected by the co-ordinators at whose meeting on November 14th it was variously described as "insulting", "destructive" and "incompetent". One or two co-ordinators, while agreeing with the alleged unfairness of some points made by the HMI's, nevertheless thought they could profit from others. An example of alleged unfairness was that some base-rooms were considered "barren", when the schools referred to were in their first month of TVEI and were still awaiting equipment, furniture and repainting of the rooms. An example of a constructive point made by the HMI's and accepted by many co-ordinators was that the breadth of knowledge and skill required to teach the Base Programme was expecting too much of some co-ordinators working without assistance.

The uncertainty as to the ultimate audience for this report made many teachers uneasy and ill disposed to the HMI evaluation. In view of later developments it was assumed by many teachers and Authority staff that the HMI's reported to the MSC although this was never

publicly confirmed. The Borough Co-ordinator remarked, however, that "within a month the MSC were making noises ... information is flowing". This ignorance about the purposes and audience of the HMI evaluation was quite surprising in view of the fact that the HMIs' report on early TVEI was to become publicly available. (DES/Dept. of Employment, 1986)

(b) Planning Dialogue

On October 29 a "Planning Dialogue" between key MSC and Enfield Officers was held and a follow up letter went to the Borough from an MSC Project Liaison Officer either in late 1984 or early 1985. Evidence for the latter was a reply from the Borough Co-ordinator in early January 1985 stating that the further developments suggested by the MSC would be implemented though these were not specified. This was unfortunate because the original letter was missing from the file.

TVEI Co-ordinators expressed suspicions that MSC wanted to control the curriculum. These beliefs did not seem to be based on precise evidence or any clear communication from the MSC. Nevertheless, the belief formed among teachers at that time (and indeed persisted in 1989) that the Borough Co-ordinator's stronger management role was, at least partly, in response to MSC pressure. Comments by the Co-ordinator himself at a later critical meeting, which will be described below, supports this view.

It is difficult to discover what communication the MSC had with Enfield, in particular with the Borough Co-ordinator, at this time. All correspondence from the MSC in the 1984 Autumn term and the 1985 Spring term was missing from the files, although letters from the

Borough Co-ordinator were on file. The Borough Co-ordinator explained that two administrative assistants resigned in the first month, one within two days and that the replacement assistant with the LEA TVEI Unit "was madly trying to spend the budget on time and just had to let the filing go." Once again critical resignations affected the management of the scheme and made the new Borough Co-ordinator's job even more difficult than it already was.

(c) Tensions between the TVEI Unit and the Schools

Not only the School Co-ordinators but many of the Heads were in disagreement with the TVEI Unit. TVEI funding did not come through school administrators but was administered directly by the TVEI Unit at the Civic Centre. Many Heads felt that they were being ignored in the management implications for their schools. One TVEI teacher succinctly reflected the complexity and difficulty for school management:

> If someone kicks in a TVEI door I contact the Civic Centre (i.e. the TVEI Unit) and the whole thing is handled by them. But if someone kicks in an ordinary door I go to the Head.

Given the large degree of autonomy for the overall scheme and the introduction of the Technical/Vocational Options involving students moving between schools, the Heads' responsibility was becoming more complex.

TVEI was not the first scheme to operate in this way. The Sixth Form Collegiate scheme, for example, also involved students moving between schools. One TVEI co-ordinator commented on this new development:

> Heads want to control things in their schools but a lot of activity is now across schools with students moving between sites, for example, TVEI, the Collegiate

System, the work experience programme. TVEI and Collegiate schemes are Borough-wide and heads can't control them. They often hit out at TVEI as a way of resisting schemes they can't control.

To put this in context, this particular co-ordinator had a school Head who on several occasions spoke at great length to the evaluator of his fear of violence erupting because of the difficulty of controlling those who entered the school. This older Head nearing retirement was obsessed about the possibility of violence. It was his one topic of conversation. He frequently referred to a single incident some months earlier in which an older brother, who happened to be passing by, entered the school and assisted a younger brother in literally putting down a rival. No other Head, however, demonstrated his degree of concern about inter-school movement.

Nevertheless, many Heads felt themselves in a cleft stick: they were responsible for what went on in their schools but a scheme like TVEI was implemented and administered largely independently of school administrators. The Civic Centre was aware of the situation quite early and one senior official remarked in early 1985, "Heads had been left out...We have some fence-mending to do".

By-passing Heads, however, was not a Borough policy. On the contrary, prior experiments in Collegiate planning had involved Heads strongly. It was an unintended outcome of meeting contract deadlines. The Borough Co-ordinator, new to the Heads, just did not have sufficient time for the kind of personal contact that pre-empts uncertainty, the ground of suspicion. More importantly, MSC guidelines, according to the Borough Co-ordinator and school administrators, insisted that TVEI resources be for the exclusive use of TVEI students

and teachers.[2] It was MSC policy (and not Enfield policy) that distinguished between "TVEI doors" and other doors.

One has to appreciate that these tensions between the Co-ordinator and the schools were against a background of intense administrative activity at the Civic Centre. The Borough Co-ordinator commented, "At that time we were just surviving". He was involved in budgeting matters involving the MSC, the LEA and the schools. Budgetary details had to be sent regularly to the MSC. The Co-ordinator remarked, "At that time I had to send equipment lists for approval prior to spending the money". He was responsible for setting up and equipping five new base-rooms in the second round schools and overseeing the considerable resourcing for the new Technical/Vocational Options. The new base rooms were not in a state of readiness in September 1984. Indeed, the evaluator continued to visit base rooms whose refurbishment had not been completed until well into the Spring Term of the following year. Communications with schools was mostly by letter or phone and concerned with finance and equipment. The Co-ordinator himself said that he saw little of the schools at this time and relied on Advisers to tell him what was going on.

> During this period I'm not talking curriculum to the schools or the co-ordinators. I'm a clerk in an office going flat out spending money.

This represented a strongly task orientated management style which greatly reduced the kind of personal interaction, which the situation clearly required. It also represented a sharp change from the style of the previous co-ordinator who had spent a lot of time in baserooms when the scheme had been relatively simple and, perhaps, administratively less demanding.

---

[2] But Dale (1985, p 54) states, "... there appears to be little restriction on their use beyond this cohort, provided that their priority is not infringed."

(d) A Meeting of Heads

It was clear by this time that Heads wanted more consultation about the new high spending scheme they had in their schools. They invited the Borough Co-ordinator to one of their meetings early in the 1985 Spring Term at which the following points were made explicit:

- Management of TVEI should extend beyond the Civic Centre to Heads and Deputies.

- There should be more information on courses, especially to pick up overlap between them.

- There was lack of supply and cover staff for TVEI curriculum and staff development.

- It would be more flexible if the Heads had discretion to build supply into their time-tables by additional staff loading.

- Co-ordinators lacked resources and support.

- Co-ordinators' meetings after school were a burden. There should be one afternoon per week on the time-table for meetings. It was suggested that it should not always be the co-ordinator who benefitted but other teachers whose class could be taken by the co-ordinator.

- The TVEI Management Group and the Borough Steering Group had no TVEI School Co-ordinator, no Head and no school representative.

One of the Heads pointed out that they had to request this meeting with the Borough Co-ordinator towards whom there was a lot of opposition from the schools, but added, "To be fair he is carrying the can from first-round schools who feel the programme has been changed".

The meeting gave feed-back to the TVEI Unit as to how it might modify its management of the scheme. In time a number of actions were taken:

- a Head was appointed to the TVEI Management Group,

- From Sept 1985, Wednesday afternoons were time-tabled for TVEI meetings,

- a Central Support Group (to be discussed below) was operating from September 1985.

This meeting put further pressures on the TVEI Unit which was already in the process of building a new administrative structure: two administrative assistants were appointed early in the Spring Term whose main task was spending the budget before the end of the financial year in March. The Borough Co-ordinator was re-building the TVEI administrative ship plank by plank while staying afloat.

(e) Residential Seminar

Some attitudes came into sharper focus at a residential seminar in Newmarket towards the end of February attended by School Co-ordinators, some Deputy Heads, several Advisers and the Borough Co-ordinator who set the seminar the task of writing objectives for the Base Programme. A senior administrator remarked that many co-ordinators for the first time were given a real opportunity to become involved in collaborative curriculum planning. The evaluator was not at this residential seminar and had to rely on participants' post-seminar reflections. These suggested that the more recent, second round co-ordinators, gained what they regarded as valuable curriculum development experience from the residential. Indeed a number of these people went on to become Advisory Teachers on the new Central Support Group, to be discusssed below. Furthermore, TVEI development activities at this time were to be a launching pad for several career developments. Other comments, however, suggested that some co-ordinators, particularly from among the original first round co-ordinators, continued to oppose what, in his own words, the Borough Co-ordinator wanted, namely, "objectives rather than aims" and to "move school co-ordinators away from the soft

vocabulary to the hard vocabulary of curriculum". This seminar seemed to harden adversarial attitudes among a significant number of the original group but the experience was welcomed by some of the newcomers.

At the residential it was proposed that a TVEI "delivery team" be established in each school with cross curricular and administrative membership. This accorded with the Heads' recommendations, in particular that TVEI be more responsive to its host school. There was general agreement that "delivery teams" would (a) broaden the teaching expertise for the Base Programme and (b) strengthen the institutional position of TVEI. However, even on this issue some of the original school co-ordinators suspected the formalising of the delivery team as a mechanism of control. This has to be seen in the context of the same group's unease about a possible objectives-based structure for the Base Programme which they feared a delivery team might implement and/or manage. Heads did not have these perceptions or suspicions: Base Programmes in their view simply needed to be more integrated within the school structure if they were to be an effective force for educational change.

(f) Continuing Differences

Following the residential seminar, resistance continued at co-ordinators' meetings through the Spring Term against what many perceived as attempts to establish a detailed, Borough, objectives-based framework for the Base Programme. Though one school co-ordinator proposed at a Co-ordinators' meeting in March that "a common checklist of skills and objectives which are testable" be a necessary compulsory element of a TVEI student's curriculum, it lapsed for lack of support. The majority interpreted the specification of

objectives as standardizing students' learning. A representative comment was: "Different students need different things from the Base Programme because of what is happening elsewhere in their curriculum". It was not clear at any time, however, that standardized learning really <u>was</u> the intention of the Borough Co-ordinator. The fear may have stemmed from his particular language. His use of "objectives rather than aims" echoed the FE influence and may have triggered past emotions associated with the previous "FE/Schools divide" that had caused such uproar eighteen months earlier.

Another (partial) explanation of the continuing adversarial position by many school co-ordinators to developing some common objectives can be found in their support for the highly individualized attendance pattern at this time. Students' attendance in most of the Base Programmes depended on when they were not time-tabled for other subjects.. Thus, it was possible that no two TVEI students had the same attendance pattern in the Baseroom. This led to a highly individualized teaching and learning pattern, likened to a "private tutor system" by at least one co-ordinator. It was certainly a fine ideal but not one that could be disseminated to a mass education service when the pilot ceased.

Another issue underlying these continuing differences was that of technology. Many of the Base Programmes observed by the evaluator had very little focus on technology. Tighter specification of activities would have given the Borough Co-ordinator a strategy for achieving more in this area. Most teachers of the Base Programme, however, asserted that tight specification of objectives compromised the principle of the negotiated curriculum. In reality what <u>was</u> negotiable was never spelt out by the Co-ordinators. It was never made clear

whether a student could ignore some of the "areas" of the Base Programme (which, after all, were integral to the stoutly defended Option C).

Most co-ordinators, at least within their meetings, interpreted objectives-based curriculum as a threat to the school-based features of Enfield TVEI. This was never really established because the "dialogic standoff" never allowed the parties to explain what they meant. (Generally it was only in the formal, suspicion-laden, monthly meeting that the Borough Co-ordinator met with school co-ordinators.) Some Base Programmes did, however, introduce "classes" or at least some grouping of students and began to move away from the highly individualized pattern of student attendance (subsequently referred to by some Advisers as the "Robinson Crusoe" curriculum). The Borough Co-ordinator saw it as providing direction and much needed support for some of the inexperienced School Co-ordinators. At that time he considered many of the Base Programmes lacked sufficient technological content and a clear structure, though he had not been able to spend much time in the Base-rooms. (The evaluator's observations, as indicated above, supported this in many cases.) It was not the support in fact that was at issue - there was wide agreement that the Base Programme required more curriculum development to provide support for the hard-pressed School Co-ordinators - but rather the nature and origin of the direction proposed for the development.

Who was going to control that support was the issue. In retrospect, the School Co-ordinators can be seen to have made a tactical mistake in the kind of resistance they offered. It was generally reactive and focused on maintaining the status quo; there was little consideration given to change, how they could contribute to it and in the process have some say in it. The resistance, the Borough Co-ordinator claimed, was "collective rather than singly ... some co-

ordinators individually agreed that change was necessary". My private discussions with co-ordinators supported this to some extent. By late January 1985 one co-ordinator revealed:

> I've changed my mind about TVEI... I can now see that TVEI has to change...there needs to be a Borough framework if it is to be shared more widely when the project ends...In the beginning I was concerned with survival but I can now think beyond that.

In general, opposition to developing common elements for the Base Programme did not come from those co-ordinators who were isolated but from those who were confident, established and had the support of their schools. Considerable opposition tended to be expressed in meetings, which was not altogether surprising given the lack of personal contact between the Borough Co-ordinator and individual co-ordinators in their schools. Contacts occurred primarily in meetings that were widely acknowledged to be adversarial in character.

Speculation, particularly by School Co-ordinators, on how the MSC viewed Enfield's TVEI became a potent factor in the Spring Term. A prevailing view at this time was that the MSC wanted to control the curriculum. The Borough Co-ordinator's comment on this speculation was that the MSC did not tell Enfield directly what to do but simply asked them to deliver what was agreed in the contract. For example, "technological awareness", one of the "themes" of the Base Programme, he pointed out, was not being delivered fully in some Base Programmes. (This had been a particular problem for some second round schools which had experienced start-up problems in the previous Autumn Term due to late delivery of equipment and,in some cases, lack of expertise, a point already noted by the HMI's.)[3] The Borough Co-ordinator also emphasized the positive support given by the MSC: "The MSC are over the moon about the negotiated curriculum and its principles but unhappy about its

---

[3] Indeed there were only two co-ordinators with a Science/Technology background.

delivery ..." There is no written record of the MSC views on Enfield TVEI but on occasions of public debate the Borough Co-ordinator supported his arguments for change by referring to "MSC requirements". People at different levels in schools, however, complained that this phrase was not unpacked in terms of the specific curriculum changes required.

(g) A Critical Meeting and Impasse

Opposition by school co-ordinators to corporate Borough planning on the one hand, and the TVEI Unit's vagueness about MSC requirements on the other, came to a head at a critical meeting on March 19th at George Spicer School, attended by School Co-ordinators, Advisory Teachers, the Borough Co-ordinator, Deputy Heads of most of the TVEI schools, one Borough Adviser and at least one school Head. The meeting called to discuss future curricular directions for the Base Programme, resulted in an impasse. The resulting restructuring was virtually forced on the Authority because of the dysfunctional nature of some personal relationships at that time, evidence of which will be demonstrated in the following description of this critical meeting. From this came radical new developments in the Summer Term.

The meeting began by the adviser-chairperson reminding the assembly of the points agreed at the Newmarket residential in February.

- to maintain commitments to the original five aims
- to clarify aims and objectives of TVEI
- to produce and clarify an explicit curriculum model
- to shift towards skills-based learning
- to profile TVEI skills and activities
- to make the TVEI scheme coherent to students
- to establish in each school a "delivery team" including senior staff
- to negotiate individual students' curricula through identifying learning outcomes

- to support student-centred not student-dominated learning
- to develop an "operational manual"
- to satisfy MSC requirements

At least one voice questioned whether all these points were agreed, a not insignificant query in view of what happened at the meeting.

After two and a half hours of wide ranging debate a decision was taken by the meeting to appoint a committee to collect curriculum materials from the various Base Programmes and report back to another meeting on March 28th (nine days later). Only one co-ordinator volunteered. Another raised the difficulty of finding the time for completing and disseminating the work in time for the meeting: "Who has any time?" The other co-ordinators remained silent. This was a fatal mistake if they wished to retain a shared ownership. At that point the Borough Co-ordinator intervened to say that this would not help him to satisfy "MSC requirements" quickly enough. He explained that he was under pressure from the MSC but did not elaborate to the meeting what these requirements were, beyond stating curriculum areas - "Design, Science, Technical and Vocational, Business, Health, Environmental." The meeting ended in an impasse between the Borough and School Co-ordinators, with no agreed agenda for the March 28th meeting. The conclusion of this meeting marked a turning point after which the School Co-ordinators would never again make credible claims to speak for TVEI as a whole.

It was a crucial series of closing interchanges marked by a fatal hesitation on the part of the co-ordinators that proved to be a turning point in the power structure. These are worth reproducing. (We take up the discussion after it has been generally agreed that a group of

School Co-ordinators were going to gather curriculum materials from the various Base Programmes.)

Bor. Co.	I have people snapping at my heels. We are moving too slowly ... I want a management structure.
Dep. 1	The question is how to organize the programme so that the time-table can be organized within the Borough and know what is going to be taught.
Co-ord 1	Different schools and colleges can supply different lists of objectives, eg. Capel manor could do the Environmental Studies...
Co-ord 2	Is this for the total programme or the TVEI Base Programme?
Dep 2	The total programme is the profile's responsibility.
Adv.	We can't look at everything at once.
Dep. 3	Co-ordinators can write a list of their own objectives and circulate them to everyone else...
Dep 2	That's too much paper. Better a small group.
Adv.	Any volunteers?
Co-ord 3	The others would need to know (what's being planned)
Adv.	Twelve co-ordinators can do it or a small group.
Co-ord 4	Who has the time to do it? It's at least eight hours work.
Dep. 2	(The media specialist) could draw up some of the materials, shape the thinking and school co-ordinators help in the final product...
Co-ord 2	We need a full-day meeting for the co-ordinators to write down what they are doing. Documentation is there already. We don't have to repeat this...We should find out what is being done, not what should be done.
Bor. Co.	The problem is that the Base Programme must change. This has been below the surface for the last six months.
Co-ord 5	That's a problem that some people have but others don't.
Dep.3	(Borough Co-ordinator) said that the Base Programme must change ... But it's too late in the day with twenty minutes left. He must say what way it must change.

Co-ord 2	What are the criteria to be met?
Bor. Co.	We must meet the TVEI criteria from the MSC.
Co-ord 2	What criteria?
Bor. Co.	All of them - Design, Science, Technical and Vocational. It's implicit that you understand the national guidelines, despite the fact that the contract is already signed. You must have a technological element in the Base Programme. There must be a Money/Business element, a Health/Environmental element, a Scientific element, as in the 11-16. We can't rely on the good will of staff with negotiation from day one or bump-starter assignments.
Dep 3	These are still very broad. We must have parameters laid down before teachers go to work on objectives ... (Borough Co-ordinator) should write down the parameters and then the co-ordinators can argue with (Borough Co-ordinator).
Adv.	I suggest (Borough Co-ordinator) draw up the parameters and the MSC criteria ...
Dep. 3	Schools may need to re-timetable so that the bulk of the staffing can be done *[ie, if an expanded Base Programme meant recruiting teachers from different departments.]*
Dep.4	This has already been done in the school. *[ie, staff were already committed in the school for the following year.]*
Bor. Co.	This is TVEI. This is the life we have bought ourselves.
Dep. 4	How long have you known about this?
Adv. T.	The MSC don't work that way. It is only recently that the MSC backed up what (Co-ordinator) has been saying.
Co-ord 6	Is that a threat? *[pause, silence]* What is being said?
Co-ord 7	We ought to be told what the MSC is wanting.
Dep. 5	We have already sold a programme to our clients...
Bor. Co.	The MSC are not amateurs. They are hard-nosed businessmen. The MSC never tell you what to do. But they let you know. They have used a Chief

Inspector who was at William Tyndale. So he has been around[4] ... They are not educationalists. They don't play the educational game.

Co-ord 2   The MSC are shifting the goal posts. (Co-ordinator) should have told us at nine o'clock not at twenty to twelve.

Bor.Co.   I just realized we were not going to get where I wanted us to go.

Three points can be made about this meeting:

i   The hostility displayed was typical of co-ordinators' meetings. This meeting was augmented by at least one Head, several Deputy heads and some Advisory staff, the effect of which was to dilute the hostility from its usual strength.

ii   The School Co-ordinators went a long way towards destroying themselves politically: they refused a leadership role when it was repeatedly offered to them. When the researcher returned in 1989 they were already ancient history.

iii   Given the confused conclusion to the meeting, there was no agenda for the follow-up meeting nine days later, an outcome that the co-ordinators should not have allowed if they wanted a continuing influence.

(h) A Second Meeting and Resolution

On March 28th at the Civic Centre the follow-up meeting took place with the Enfield

Director of Education in the chair. It was a larger meeting attended by many Heads, Deputy

Heads, TVEI School Co-ordinators and several Advisers. The Director, in an opening

address, affirmed "certain principles underlying

Enfield TVEI":

-    negotiation as an interactive process between student and teacher
-    skills-based learning
-    learning based on experience
-    integrated learning "in both content and process"

---

[4] A reference to an MSC adviser visiting Enfield schools.

- profiling and continuous assessment

He also added that the original aims of TVEI (ie, the broad "objectives" of Option C) were "not negotiable".

Start-up difficulties experienced by School Co-ordinators was acknowledged by the Director who referred to the "great burden on the original co-ordinators" who "had to provide their own input for everything ..." Focusing on development needs he announced that a "development team - not too rigid" would be formed, comprising "Co-ordinators, other staff used to thinking about TVEI and people from my own department". Membership was not announced at this meeting but individuals were approached afterwards. Of a team of twelve, four were School Co-ordinators but none of the original first-round co-ordinators who voiced the greatest resistance to the Borough Co-ordinator were approached. This selection process is not surprising given the lack of volunteers at the previous meeting. It is also instructive that the four who were approached responded positively but did not seem able to do so in the group dynamics of that earlier meeting. It points to a central feature of Handy's club style of management, namely, the presence of a person or group at the centre of the "spider's web" with the ability "to infect (others) with her or his own enthusiasms or passions". (Handy, 1984, p 11) In the larger meeting this influence was broken and certain co-ordinators were able to break away from the strong influence of the central group.

There appeared to be broad agreement for the Development team although some objections were raised when the Borough Co-ordinator spoke of "shifting" the curriculum but the Director assured the meeting that the exercise was one of curriculum "development". The outcome of this meeting was a public acceptance (in a few cases, perhaps, acquiescence) of

a broadly based <u>TVEI Development Team</u> which would provide a more detailed framework

for the Base Programme. There was also an invitation from the Director to consider a whole

curriculum structure:

> There is nothing stopping you looking at the rest of the curriculum ... Eventually
> TVEI should be part of every student's package ... The Foundation Programme could
> absorb TVEI elements.

In the event it was not entirely surprising that the Development Team produced a document

in Early June which reverberated well beyond TVEI.

Development through a <u>team approach</u> was underlined by the Director and contrasted with

management by a single decision-maker. In answer to a question by one of the Heads, he

had this to say:

> I have never seen it as part of the (Borough) Co-ordinator's role to make curriculum
> decisions. Control over budget, yes. We (in Enfield) have moved away from the
> position that one person makes the decision, to teams ... and groups. But the (school)
> co-ordinators' group has not worked very well ... We could have appointed someone
> at a Head's salary but we didn't ... Working through groups is painful but fruitful.

In practice it was not always easy to divide budgetary from curricular control. Earlier in the

meeting one of the Heads asked, "We hear about money for TVEI but how do we bid for

it?" The reply from the Borough Co-ordinator emphasized a very real connection between

curriculum and money:

> (In bidding for money there is) a need to specify the TVEI activity. There is a need
> to specify a programme first before money is given, not the other way round.

This interpretation suggested that whoever controlled the money supply controlled the

curriculum. This became an issue for a time in the following Summer Term.

The major achievement of this meeting was to break out from the impasse that had built up. By the end of the Spring Term the new <u>TVEI Development Team</u> had been assembled and dates arranged for working residentials.

An added impetus was given to these developments when the MSC in the words of the Borough Co-ordinator "stopped the budget" until Enfield "delivered the contract". This did not prevent the payment of salaries but all requests for resources were refused by the Borough Co-ordinator who offered his opinion that the MSC would not really refuse to honour the contract but simply wanted to get a "more palatable" curriculum.

<u>(i) The TVEI Development Team and Planning for Mark III</u>

A sense of expectation marked the mood in the first half of the Summer Term. It was generally accepted that changes would occur but in some Base Programmes and Co-ordinators' meetings suspicion was expressed regarding the motives for the possible changes. There was unease that LEA management might conflict with schools' control of the curriculum. Immmediate criticism focused on the timing of the new developments and what late changes might be forced on the schools. Many administrators were concerned that they would have to respond to "TVEI Mark III" after they had already "sold a course". At this time one school Deputy spoke of the "pace at which education as a whole has been used to working. With the introduction of the MSC they want everything yesterday". The same school administrator compared the new process to a "piece of elastic":

> It's a model of being dragged in bumps, not a smooth progression ... (Curriculum) reaches the elastic limits and is then dragged at great speed ... It's a hit and bump progression.

According to this metaphor, in the early Summer Term the elastic was still stretching with many apprehensions of suddenly being "dragged at great speed".

Meanwhile throughout May, the TVEI Development Team, meeting for one full-day session and two residential week-ends, was in the process of writing a new curriculum framework for TVEI. In the TVEI schools, the general expectation was that a new framework for the Base Programme would provide (a) more structure and (b) stronger representation of Science and Technology.

At the outset the Development Team found that it was unable to remain within its formal brief, i.e., to develop a framework simply for the Base Programme. They quickly decided that a Base Programme had to be seen in the context of the whole curriculum. This was not surprising given the "overview" function that many co-ordinators saw for the Base Programme: they saw their role as monitoring the whole of a student's curriculum and on this basis negotiating students' work in the Base Programme. Such negotiation, for example, had led to following up special interests or filling gaps in a student's total curriculum. The Development Team, while not sharing the "Robinson Crusoe" aspects of Base Programme planning, did share a whole curriculum focus. It expanded its task to design a 70% Core Curriculum for TVEI students with the Base Programme fitting within this core. (However, schools were not asked to design any more than a 50% core, a matter discussed in the next section.) During this time the Borough Co-ordinator described the process as working out "explicit criteria on which there will be agreement for a palatable curriculum model for Enfield ... which TVEI can move towards". He explained that it would be after the "curriculum model had been established" and "criteria agreed" that the Base Programme

could be designed. In fact, when the new document, <u>TVEI - A Basis for Development</u>, was unwrapped in early June, the model was clearly that of the HMI's <u>The Curriculum from Five to Sixteen</u>, a point made by the Borough Co-ordinator, other developers and clearly visible in the document. The use of the term "core" followed that of Malcolm Skilbeck's broad interpretation of "core" as a common curriculum, specifying "areas of experience" (as in the <u>Curriculum 5-16</u> document) rather than directing schools to timetable specific core subjects.

It was significant that the spokesperson for the TVEI Development Team was a member of the Option A group, one of the original five options submitted to the MSC. Option A had developed a programme "Curriculum Review" with the purpose of establishing a Core Curriculum. The same group had produced a ten page document entitled "Towards a Common Core Curriculum" (undated) presumably sometime in 1982/3. Such a strong interest in a common core curriculum was an added influence in the direction of comprehensive educational planning beyond the Base Programme, although the latter would continue to operate. This was not a matter, however, of Option A making a comeback through the back door. Indeed, all the original options had an interest in a broad core of essential learnings. Furthermore, the Development Team's interest in the core was addressing a very real issue expressed by many people at that time: "How can Enfield adapt TVEI to a mass education system when it goes beyond the pilot stage?"

(j) Launching TVEI Mark III

The presentation of <u>TVEI - A Basis for Development</u> on June 13th at the Civic Centre was an important meeting, underlined by the presence of the Director, Deputy Director, senior

officers and advisers, Heads and Deputy Heads from TVEI schools as well as TVEI Co-ordinators. The breadth of the audience for this report emphasized what was already a fact: that the co-ordinators no longer acted as a group which proposed major initiatives in TVEI curriculum development. The role of the four school co-ordinators on the TVEI Development Team underlined the changed perception in the status of the co-ordinators. The Director at the previous March 28th meeting had requested that they keep in touch with the other co-ordinators. Some school co-ordinators assumed that the four would refer developments back to the whole body of co-ordinators for ratification, or at least, negotiation. But a Senior Adviser remarked that, given the time constraints, this was not realistic and that all team members were "plenipotentiaries" and did not represent constituencies. This was still not resolved at the school co-ordinators' meeting of June 6th when co-ordinators wanted to discuss the development for the Base Programme proposed by the Development Team. Many School Co-ordinators, especially those from first round schools, naively continued to assume that they were in control and should see the document before release. In the event, the document was released to the broad audience of the June 13th meeting. The Borough Co-ordinator defended the timing of release of the new document by saying that impartiality had to be preserved by a simultaneous release to all groups. The clear message was that the LEA wanted a broad ownership of, and involvement in TVEI.

The new document, TVEI - A Basis for Development, was in two sections. Section One describes the framework; Section Two outlined areas of experience in the core curriculum. The framework was described as a "matrix" of the three elements:

areas of experience,

skills, and

strands.

To many this structure seemed unnecessarily complex and vague and the relationship of a

strand to an area somewhat baffling. Many described much of the writing in Section One

as "gobbledegook", as for example:

> Over a sustained period of time and range of assignments the whole experience can
> be mapped in terms of areas, skills and strands visited. The assignment is the
> instrument which needs careful designing to make explicit the demands it places on
> pupils, the pupils' responsibility and the parameters in which it can operate.
> (TVEI -A Basis for Development, p. 14 - original underlining)

(The writer learned on his return to Enfield in 1989 that soon after his return to Australia

a retiring Head at that time, with a strong language background, was contracted to strengthen

the writing within the TVEI Unit.)

In the document it was envisaged that the three "elements" would "relate to one another"

through assignments, examples of which were given only for Technology in Section Two

(pp. 27-30). While some attempt was made to relate assignments to aims, objectives, skills

and materials, no reference was made to relating the three elements whose relationship at the

outset was stated as structurally central.

At the meeting assurances of flexible implementation were given by the Director and

spokesperson for the Development Team, who said: "It is a flexible plan for the future set

in a broad context of curriculum". It was further stated that schools could proceed at their

own pace. Strong criticism came from the Head and TVEI Co-ordinator of one school. In

particular they objected to a team going beyond their brief and designing a 70% core which

would affect a wide range of teachers within the school.

Schools are peopled by subject teachers who have a right to be negotiated with...No head of an English Department will allow teaching to change without a say.

No other Head spoke in support of this position; another did point to the possibility of compromise.

The Director assured the audience that the Development Team was acting to provide support for the co-ordinators and, to further this end, the Borough had been negotiating with the MSC for an expansion of the Central Support Team. The Director described the document as "an exercise in co-operative development. This is a first report ... some points would change". Furthermore, TVEI schools were invited to develop a 50% core programme; the 70% core was a future option for future expansion if any school so wished.

Of more immediate concern, the spokesperson of the Development Team stated that the TVEI Borough Co-ordinator would discuss the new model with each TVEI school in the Summer and Autumn Term by which time each school would have worked out its own individual response to the new model. Furthermore, by September 1985 the following should have happened:

- each school should have established a TVEI delivery team including a technologist or scientist

- modules for Science and Technology should be prepared (each comprised 10% of the new core)

- each school should have examined individual students' overall curriculum to ensure breadth and depth

- a full programme for Inset should have been planned.

In summary, schools were invited to design a 50% Core, though they were free to expand this to 70%. The important news was that schools could expect support in both curriculum and staff development for whatever they planned.

The new document referred to itself as "this submission" and would seem to have been part of the on-going negotiation with the MSC as well as an exercise in curriculum development. The budget was still "blocked" at the end of June when it was hoped, according to the Borough Co-ordinator the new curriculum would allow "release" of the budget. In reality, what unlocked the budget was a letter from the Director to the MSC "saying we have done what you asked". It was not clear what "blocked" the budget because the scheme continued to run and new staff were acquired. The only perceptible restriction was that schools could not acquire money for equipment.

This situation changed after a meeting on July 1st between MSC and Enfield Officers, including the TVEI Borough Co-ordinator. According to the Borough Co-ordinator, the MSC "freed up the budget" but financial control was not released entirely. The Borough Co-ordinator described the position: "They're not saying yes and they're not saying no ... they said, 'spend the money and carry on doing your job but keep giving us information and tell us what you're doing'". He also added that the MSC were "over the moon with the new developments and didn't want to be difficult", which suggested that the MSC saw the new document or a resume of it. All this left the position in theory still somewhat uncertain but in practice the implications were clear enough: money started flowing into TVEI schools in July.

(k) A Changing Climate

By July Enfield TVEI was beginning to look fundamentally different. To the evaluator this seemed a new departure. However, it may be that Enfield was returning to something more in keeping with its culture. ("We lost our way for a while", was a comment by an administrator in 1989 looking back at this period.) Firstly, planning was in terms of a broad team approach. The new core would be supported by a new *Central Support Group* - a broad based team of four advisory teachers who worked closely with subject Advisers and subject departments in those schools adopting the new core.

Secondly, TRIST money became available to fund the kind of staff development that Enfield had wanted in the first place: "We're now where we wanted to be at the beginning", observed an adviser in early 1986. Money for TVEI staff development was also channelled to other departments. According to the Borough Co-ordinator, a sum of 10,000 pounds was available for staff development by July but "we are targeting less money on co-ordinators". Two conferences on profiling (one day and one half day) were held on June 18th and July 10th. Curriculum initiatives other than TVEI were involved in this. Two residentials were planned for September, one focusing on the 16-19 Curriculum, another for Heads of Science and Technology Departments.

Thirdly, the strongly collaborative and supportive structure was reaching across schools and departments to those who were willing to engage with the new initiative. This included Base Programmes and co-ordinators. Those who continued to resent what was happening were beginning to be isolated as they were swamped by the sheer critical mass involved in the new

expansion. This was manifested in the TVEI Management Teams set up in each school which began the process of establishing a whole school focus for TVEI. Co-ordinators now found themselves operating inside a larger school structure.

Changes now occurring proved less stressful. Curriculum ownership became less personalized as the new core developed through teams and courses. More time and resources for curriculum and staff development were now provided by the LEA as a result of more flexible funding by the MSC. TVEI became an opportunity for many teachers to gain important professional experience.

(l) Bidding

The only serious criticism came with a new pattern of financing which emerged in July. Individual schools received money for particular curriculum proposals. This was a new departure from previous practice in which budgetary and curriculum control were not so closely identified. Clearly those organized schools who were quick off the mark were quite happy with the new arrangement. Criticism expressed to the evaluator came mainly from the tardy and reluctant. This is not to deny that a principle was involved. In the School Co-ordinators' meeting of June 17th, 1985 this anticipated new connection between budget and curriculum was rejected as being opposed to "fair shares for all". Many co-ordinators expressed discomfort at being allegedly invited to compete and bid for resources. One of the co-ordinators describes this as "management from the back ... put up a bid and we'll see what it looks like ..." Earlier that same day the Borough Co-ordinator described this new strategy as "targeting money on individual curricula" and as being "opposed to equal shares

for all". This was putting the LEA position somewhat negatively. A more positive point of view was expressed by a senior administrator who stated that the LEA had ultimate responsibility for facilitating, through broadly based teams, the development of overall policy; and allocating resources to those individuals and schools who wanted to implement that policy was a legitimate, indeed required, part of management's role.

By the third week of July, five schools had been given grants ranging from 2,000 to 6,000 pounds for Science. Money had also been allocated for Maths and Technology. These decisions taken by the groups were now less personalized which took considerable pressure from the Borough Co-ordinator. The grants went to subject departments to implement particular courses, for example, Science at Work, mentioned in the new curriculum document TVEI - A Basis for Development, and which, incidentally, was co-developed by the Borough Science Adviser.

Successful bids went to schools developing Science and Technology courses which were taught by teachers from those departments. The role of the School Co-ordinators had clearly been eroded in the process. The Borough Co-ordinator saw their role now as "delivery agents ... having a managerial role, enabling others to become involved".

By the end of the Summer Term, then, TVEI was undergoing considerable structural change. Through budgetary strategies the TVEI Unit was involving a great range of teachers; TVEI was now directly reaching subject departments in the schools with the help of subject advisers at the Civic Centre. Resentment by some co-ordinators has to be seen in the context of the broadening of ownership and the spread of resources. Some co-ordinators complained that

some schools had entered the fast lane. This certainly was true of some pro-active schools at this developmental period. However, by 1989, when changes had a more permanent, stable look, differential resourcing was not in evidence. But these moves did spell the end of the idyll and a return to the world of mass education.

Section 3: A Retrospective Note

Perspective from different times proved to be particularly important in interpreting now what was occurring then. At that time data were gathered from those who were part of the action and internal to the story. Statements of value and fact were necessarily interwoven in describing what was occurring. Their participation was affected by clashes of personality, situations peculiar to individual schools, the influence of strong characters, even what was happening in their lives.[5] Judgements about the immediate TVEI developments came to some extent out of personal contexts, and it was not always easy to separate the policy from the personal issue. For example, the gradual change in TVEI's second year from the club style of management caused discomfort to some co-ordinators who looked back approvingly to the intimate atmosphere of the previous year as one of "ownership". When they alleged that "content-led" curriculum was the aim of the Unit's implementing a Borough wide system of Options, one cannot simply take this at face value. These are "intentional" data in the

---

[5] This phenomenon has been conceptualised by Cohen, March and Olsen (1972) as the "Garbage Can Model of Organisational Choice". These writers contend that the goals of educational organisations are often shifting and at odds with each other. Participants experience conflict which lacks a specific focus. As a result concerns from one area of an organisation or programme are "dumped" somewhere else. For example, a committee may experience conflict that is largely driven by concerns drawn from another agenda. It simply provides a convenient place to "dump" concerns.

174

sense described in Chapter Two. Interpretation is unavoidable. The researcher not only had to balance the opinions of different people but those of the same people at different times. Revisiting Enfield in 1989 provided an opportunity for the latter. Then a much softer attitude prevailed towards the administration of TVEI, by that time restructured and re-peopled. Again, a good deal of the early tension was focused on the Borough Co-ordinator at that time. That issue has to be seen historically. The view has to be diachronic, as is implicit in the structure of story. Understanding the 1984-85 clash requires an understanding of the 1983 period, and of the tensions it generated. As one LEA Officer suggested the Co-ordinator "acted as a lightning rod" for a lot of frustration. The "Garbage Can Model" of decision-making is again helpful, alerting us to the inherent irrationality of actors bringing concerns from one situation and "dumping" them in another where they are not wholly relevant. (See Levitt and Nass, 1989)

As I said, contextualized perceptions coloured apparently "de-contextualized" philosophical statements, and interpretation required some sensitivity. The researcher had to be aware of more than the philosophical issues when an influential group saw borough planning and the development of *planned courses*, as the Tech/Voc Options were, as an infringement of their rights as School Co-ordinators to manage their own curriculum. He had to know the social context in which comments about school autonomy were made. This importance of context was endorsed when, in 1989, some of the same players allowed Option C philosophy (which by now had developed a certain mystique) to be quite compatible with Borough planning. Option C was still affirmed but no longer as a "Robinson Crusoe" curriculum. This later reconceptualization represented a considerable shift in what was meant by "content-led" curriculum.

Despite my rather negative perceptions of the Options, when I left Enfield in the summer of '86 they seemed to have a more promising future than the Base Programme whose teachers were in some dispute with the Borough Co-ordinator because of its lack of a common structure. The Co-ordinator at that time saw the Options as providing some structure, if only by default. In retrospect, however, their narrow focus did not provide a platform for making any lasting contribution to TVEI. Their lack of an educational philosophy left them exposed some time after I left for Australia, when critical changes occurred in TVEI administration and in the Advisory Team. The Options' isolation from the consultative and decision-making structures was a further source of vulnerability. (Ironically this was something they shared with some of the co-ordinators.)

But this anticipates some of the story. Let us turn then to the third year of TVEI and my second year of evaluation.

CHAPTER FIVE: THE SECOND YEAR OF THE EVALUATION

Section 1: Summary of Evaluation Activities and Enfield Developments

The second year was not in fact a full contracted year, the contract ending on 30th April, though writing up continued to the end of May, attendance at meetings through June, and individual Enfield contacts into July. The mix of activities characterizing the second year was a little different from the first:

i   Time and effort increasingly went into writing Reports as the year progressed. These were disseminated to all TVEI schools and colleges, Education Officers and Advisers and others with an interest in TVEI. Judged by the written and verbal responses they were generally well received, particularly in the schools, though the First Interim Report caused some controversy. Printing, proof-reading, distribution and responding to feed-back took longer than I anticipated.

ii   In the second year of the evaluation, greater support was provided by the evaluator and the evaluation director for the groups of teacher-evaluators who were particularly busy at this period writing up their "Special Investigations" each of which focused on a single issue: Staff Development (October 1985), Profiling (February 1986), Recruitment (March 1986), Work experience (March 1986). Apart from editorial support, these groups, from across schools, also required guidance in the delicate task of reporting issues beyond their own school. With rising confidence their independence increased rapidly.

iii   In the 1986 Easter Term the major data gathering was focused on documenting student perspectives. (Not to say that student perspectives had been ignored prior to

this time, nor that other perspectives were ignored during this period.) Six MA students assisted in the gathering of data by each interviewing six TVEI students. The evaluation director and the evaluator briefed and offered continuing support to the interviewers in this exercise.

At the same time Enfield TVEI plans to expand both curriculum and management structures were being implemented. More teachers and students were drawn into the TVEI ambit and staff development was transforming the scheme. At the macro level, a new understanding began to develop between Enfield and the MSC. In this third phase of Enfield TVEI, many of the extreme stresses of the early years began to soften. The following sections of this chapter will reflect these developments in both the evaluation and Enfield TVEI.

Section 2: The Expanding Universe of TVEI

(a) Curriculum Expansion

In September 1985 the gradual expansion of the TVEI curriculum began. It was not surprising, given the general interest in Core Curriculum in Enfield before TVEI came along. Indeed, all five options which had been originally sub mitted to the MSC were characterized by an interest in fundamentally essential learnings for all youngsters. This was a particularly central concern of the two Foundation Programmes and of Option A, mentioned in the previous chapter, and Option B, a form of curriculum review. Option A was described by one adviser as:

> Not a core in terms of being a broad bank of subjects or ... a block of time, but a core of certain kinds of curriculum objectives, areas of experience and the skills that children ought to have.

TVEI accelerated this development. A certain consistency is evident in Enfield's interest in, and commitment to, the principles of whole/core curriculum.

This interest must not be thought of, however, as a timeless feature of the Enfield culture. Several teachers and administrators spoke of a changing and more favourable attitude towards a whole/core curriculum approach. "The climate has changed because people are now more aware of whole curriculum and whole courses", commented one adviser in Autumn 1985, adding that the dissemination of key documents, <u>Curriculum 11-16</u> and <u>Curriculum 11-16: A Review of Progress</u> from the DES, and the FEU's <u>A Basis for Choice</u>, had a cumulative influence within the Authority. "That reading has made a difference. It has gradually changed people's thinking", he explained.

The Base Programme itself had exemplified this influence. It had certainly aspired to the ideals of core curriculum in its breadth, and in the desire to integrate content; and many teachers and administrators would refer to the programme's potential to promote "cross curricular skills".[1] For such a relatively small fraction of the curriculum (20% minimum) the sheer breadth of the Base Programme across its "ten areas of experience" had been a huge and difficult challenge and had come close to embracing the whole curriculum.[2] The busy and diverse world of the baserooms had often reminded the evaluator of those remote,

---

[1] A few teachers demurred on the uncritical use of the term "skills", pointing out the fact that higher order processes were involved.

[2] As already reported, this was noted by the HMI's in early October 1984.

one-teacher Australian Bush schools where he began teaching. The broad curriculum mission of TVEI was emphasized by many people in the schools and Civic Centre. Typical comments were: "TVEI is not another subject"; "it is not another separate initiative"; "TVEI should permeate the whole curriculum". This contrasted with other TVEI Authorities such as Croydon and Hertfordshire where TVEI was seen as having specific and specialized content and not a whole curriculum focus. In Croydon at that time TVEI was offered as subject options within the larger school framework. (Harland, 1986, p 52) By contrast, in Enfield the Base Programme was a core curriculum trying to get out. And get out it did but not directly from the Base Programme. A separate structure was developed for the expansion of this new core, and here we shall describe some of its emergent features.

Some people in schools felt some anxiety when in September 1985 the TVEI Development Team began its work of negotiating the implementation of the new core curriculum with individual schools (as and when they were ready to implement it). Schools and teachers at the forefront of change generally did not share this anxiety. Indeed they had a positive attitude, especially in view of the resourcing involved. The Head of one such school, revisited in 1989, stated that he had deliberately attempted to stay one or two years ahead of where he thought events were moving. In this way, he contended, his school controlled the policy process, rather than the reverse. In his opinion his school was able to develop, pioneer and interpret policy. He added that staying ahead of the play avoids deadlines and gives staff a sense of being in control of their professional lives. But other schools were uncertain about the implementation of the new core. Thus, when the curriculum document had appeared in the 1985 Summer Term, school administrators were uncertain of their schools' commitment to the foreshadowed core. "Heads are experiencing confusion on the

new document" was a typical comment from one Head. Deputy Heads with responsibility

for time-tables had organisational concerns, a point acknowledged by a letter to schools from

the Borough Co-ordinator, dated 8th January 1986:

> Last term several deputies began to express doubts about the reality of achieving all
> of these goals, which they fully subscribed to, but which circumstances were making
> increasingly difficult in the proposed timetable.

Again there was some early nervousness that the new core strands, Science and Technology,

would be implemented inflexibly, e.g., that TVEI students would not be allowed to do single

science subjects and that Integrated Science 13-16 would make too many demands on the

11-14 curriculum. In the minds of some teachers this would be evidence of the fulfilment of

prophecies in the educational media that MSC through TVEI would come to control more

and more of the curriculum. (Dale, 1985)

These fears receded as schools became involved. Five schools had concluded agreements in

the Summer Term 1985 for the funding of new courses in Science and Technology to

commence in the new school year. Consultation with the Science Adviser established that

those schools could operate Integrated Science 13-16 or Science at Work or both in a flexible

way within the school. Indeed at the June meeting, at which the new curriculum document

was launched, it was stated:

> No institution will be forced to go down a route before they are ready. But if they
> choose then there will be criteria to be met ...

Science and Technology programmes were introduced only to those schools which applied

for them and when their curriculum was already moving towards integration, the major

criterion for the new funding.

For some of the schools implementing Integrated Science there were residual difficulties. At least one of the five did not propose Integrated Science for all TVEI students. The school's TVEI Co-ordinator pointed out that the school "supported the principles" of the new curriculum document, "but", he added, "we insisted on sufficient flexibility to allow some students to study the pure sciences like Physics". This school, characterized by students with a high social and academic profile, wanted a flexible policy accommodating both the school's in-principle commitment to integration and parental perceptions of what was required for entry to professional careers. Not to have done so would have, in the words of the same person, "affected the nature of students recruited" into TVEI. There was some reluctance, perhaps not confined to just this school, to advise all academically ambitious students to enrol for broad science courses. This was recognized and publicly acknowledged by the Borough Co-ordinator in the letter already quoted above (p 181), when he flagged the following question as an item for negotiation with each school:

> Is there room for some particular students to be exempted, in special cases from doing TVEI Science, as opposed to an alternative?

> Again this possibility needs to be agreed so as to allow a comfortable transition period in some schools for some pupils for whom this may present particular problems.

The view of the Science Adviser on this issue was that a change in the wider climate of opinion was evidenced by support from the Engineering Council and Royal Society for broad science courses as preparation for professional tertiary education. She believed that some parental perceptions lagged behind an influential shift in opinion. Despite the strong professional support for Integrated Science and its importance to TVEI developments, this school did not insist that every TVEI students pursue the new science programme, particularly if it involved opposing deep-seated family wishes. The LEA was also well aware of the need for tact and did not want to force immediate and total compliance.

182

The significance of these new TVEI funded Science and Technology courses was put in an Enfield perspective by the same Adviser.

> The publication of the <u>Basis for Development</u> in Summer 1985, clearly had implications for teachers of Science in TVEI schools. In all Enfield Schools, the Science curriculum in Years Four and Five is the traditional one for Biology, Chemistry and Physics with "Science" courses being offered to the least able. Some schools had recognized the need for balanced Science for all pupils and this was reinforced by the DES policy statement <u>Science 5-16</u>. Before the publication of <u>Basis for Development</u>, some schools, including a few from the TVEI group of twelve, were considering introducing modular courses based on either <u>Nuffield 13-16</u> ... or <u>Science at Work</u> ... All TVEI schools were asked if they were willing to ... act as trial schools so there would be Science teachers within the LEA ... who could thus comment and contribute authoritatively and knowledgeable.

This was one context in which TVEI was instrumental in moving the curriculum of <u>all</u> students in new directions: from September non-TVEI students, in the designated pilot schools, were enrolling in two core strands, Science and Technology. Indeed, given the small TVEI cohort in each school, it was the only way that economic classes could be created. Thus, TVEI funding began to benefit whole cohorts of Fourth and Fifth Year Students, and, in the case of <u>Science 13-16</u>, Third Year students as well. This was an important breach in the exclusivity of TVEI and it was beginning now to benefit directly students from outside the privileged world of the baseroom. It was a clear indication also that MSC policy was undergoing a vast shift.

The Options continued alongside this expansion. Though no comment was made at the time, the expansion threatened the Options in the long term, either through absorption or simply through crowding out. Indeed, the Core Strand, "Technology" created problems of redundancy for the Option "Technology and Control", and many of the same staff taught both the Option and the Core Strand. At this time, however, the Core Strands were only in a few designated schools.

A further critical development at this time was that at least two schools began to implement an Integrated Humanities programme for all Fourth and Fifth Year students as part of this same expanding Core. (By 1989 this had been well established in many other schools.) In doing this they drew strongly on teachers and processes of the Base Programme which by and large had had a strong Humanities focus. While these programmes, unlike the Base Programmes, were based on time-tabled classes, they incorporated many of the Base Programmes features, such as profiling, independent supported study and learning outside the classroom. In 1989 the Head of one of those schools recalled that this would not have been possible without the human and material resources of the Baseroom. Clearly as Mark III developed, the exclusivity of TVEI was fast eroding, and skills and resources built up in Baserooms were seeping through the previously impervious membrane.

There was also movement in the other direction. After September 1985 at least one school (and there may have been others) began to time-table the Base Programme as another class. Given the strong humanities orientation of that particular Base Programme, it was already de facto Integrated Humanities. The Head of this school had several times commented to the evaluator that opening up TVEI resources to the rest of the school was a high priority. Even before this phase this school had organized some "creative" time-tabling to frustrate the previous MSC "ban" on the use of TVEI resources by non-TVEI students. Indeed all the TVEI Heads wanted the right to allocate scarce resources within their schools irrespective of the source. Clearly, while School Co-ordinators and the small cohort of TVEI students clung to the friendly world of the Baseroom, other influences favoured more equal access, more flexible use of resources and a whole school focus on a common/core curriculum.

(b) A New Curriculum Structure

A new curriculum was proposed in the LEA curriculum planning document for Mark III,

TVEI - A Basis for Development. The content of the new structure was a suggested 70%

core comprising the following "core strands":

Communications,
Numeracy,
Science and Technology,
Industrial/Social/Environmental (ISE),
Personal and Social Development,
Creative and Aesthetic Development,
World of Work.

On the process side, there was a strong commitment to teams:

> It is perhaps worth recording at this point that all parts of the core are not seen in
> isolation - a cross-curricular team approach is an essential part of the framework
> offered.
> (TVEI - A Basis for Development p. 19)

But the core strands were presented separately without specific plans for collaboration

between the strands. But as I pointed out at the time:

> Cross-curricular work already takes place in the Base Programme but the integrative
> role of the Base Programme within a larger core is not explored in the document.
> (Cotter, Dec. 1985, p 29)

As the structure of TVEI became more complex, the commitment to teams, collaboration and

integration became more ambitious and ambiguous: it was not clear whether integration was

meant in the strong sense of the Base Programme activities or some weaker sense of

collaboration or co-ordination across the separate elements of TVEI. Over a two year

period, the context of integration had became increasingly diversified as the

Technical/Vocational Options made their appearance in the 1984-85 curriculum, and then the

Core Strands in the programme for 1985-86. At the time I drew attention to the resulting

anomalies in the Second Interim Report:

> It remains to be seen whether the development of Core Strands especially
> Technology, affect the curricular responsibilities of the Base Programme to cover the
> same breadth as before. Previously the Base Programme was perceived as requiring
> greater input in Technology, in particular for those students who chose a
> non-technological TVEI option. But if Technology and other strands are now part of
> an enlarged core then the role of the Base Programmme within that core may need
> rethinking. (Cotter, Dec. 1985, p 27)

Typically, difficulties in TVEI continued to be generated by the pace of change: new

developments added fresh demands to those of previous initiatives still being trialed.

This was a re-occurrence of a pattern of inheriting anomalous features of the previous phase

while initiating the new. Just as Mark II had inherited the co-ordinators as the main planners

of TVEI when, in fact, most resourcing had been by-passing them, so Phase III inherited the

TVEI options of Phase II whose status was not very clear. For example, the TVEI options

were shown as not part of the core (TVEI - A Basis for Development, diagram p. 20).

However, TVEI students were still required to do one of the old Options, just as they were

required to take certain activities or subjects that would satisfy the different Core Strands.

It could be assumed, then, that Options were really on all fours with the Core Strands and,

therefore, de facto in the core.

This ambivalence between the explicit and the implicit manifested itself particularly in the

case of Science and Technology. In the section of the document outlining the Strands,

Science and Technology appeared as separate courses. Yet, earlier in the document, the area

"Science and Technology" was listed as a single strand and it was stated, "in the long term the

coming together of Science and Technology in an integrated manner is envisaged" (p. 19).

Many teachers and administrators had echoed the same aspiration. At the meeting called to announce the TVEI Development team, the Director had spoken for a large consensus when he said:

> I'm not entirely happy with the word "technical"...we don't want traditional technical courses....TVEI should emerge showing how we can all use processes involving modern technology.

This formal separation of Science and Technology was understandable given the difficult and long term curriculum development involved in an integration between the two. It could also be argued that such a large commitment to curriculum development should not be left to the resources of a single authority. In the real world education is continuous and educators cannot take time out, and it was entirely understandable that Mark III TVEI had to resort to "off-the-shelf" courses in both Science and Technology. These courses were described by a cross section of teachers, including school co-ordinators teaching in the Base Programme, as broadly-based, integrating material from across the Sciences and Technology.

As we saw in the previous chapter, integration across both parts of TVEI Mark II had not occurred. In many respects the Options had had no greater connection with the Base Programme than many main-stream subjects. They had constituted an "add-on" collection of options with separate personnel, separate curriculum development at Borough level and leading to external certification. School co-ordinators had had little involvement with the options at any stage. Option tutors had commented that they consulted with co-ordinators on "student problems", but this much was also expected of non-TVEI subject teachers.

Option tutors in many cases had felt isolated. They had not attended co-ordinators' meetings and had not had any comparable organisation of their own. At the co-ordinators' meeting of

July 8th 1985 one of the co-ordinators had raised her concern about the isolation of the option tutor in her own school. At least two other co-ordinators had spoken in support: one having remarked, "they don't know what's going on in other schools"; the other, "why have they never been invited to our meetings?". Many of the Option tutors themselves had said that they had been "busy getting through the syllabus" with little time for the "cross-scheme" contacts that might have helped to establish a framework embracing both parts of TVEI.

The Mark III expansion brought new players into TVEI. As already mentioned, funding now went directly to subject departments and was overseen by subject advisors. This had positive and negative possibilities which I pointed out, once again in the Second Interim Report:

> This, in fact, can be turned to good account if it means drawing those areas into TVEI and the making of a common core. But it could also turn into a competition for funds between schools or subject areas across the borough. The continued unfolding of TVEI will be crucially affected by how subject advisers relate to overall TVEI management, what criteria are used to distribute TVEI money to subject department and who makes decisions on what to fund.
>
> Single subject departments represent individual knowledge and skills, often with strong links beyond education. Specialists with extra-mural links are important: indeed they are a valuable source to draw on. But recruiting single subject departments to contribute to a cross-curricular initiative is a complex policy: the expertise TVEI needs is within those departments which, nevertheless, may have interests running counter to integration. It remains to be seen whether inter-departmental collaboration develops from such funding. Furthermore, recruiting a wider range of people to TVEI may make integration a larger task requiring the co-ordination and control of a greater range of curriculum elements. (Cotter, Dec. 1985, p 31)

I was not in Enfield to observe the behaviour of the new players long enough, although in the months left to me in 1986 I heard few complaints. (My return visit in 1989 would provide a new perspective on these issues.)

It would be unreasonable, of course, to have expected this kind of rapid change to be without elements of ambiguity. Indeed, a totally rational approach of tearing down all structures before putting new ones in place has enormous potential for alienation. In both implementing and evaluating curriculum, it has long been shown that highly rational planning models are dysfunctional. (Fullan, 1982 and 1991; House, 1981) And in the larger context, British institutions have traditionally shown a considerable capacity for tolerating ambiguity (Burke, 1790; Elton, 1974; Johnson, 1972), which has afforded the necessary historical continuity for change through precedent and practice. Enfield's Mark III TVEI may have had structural anomalies at a particular point in time, but it had the virtue of allowing some of the actors (eg school co-ordinators) to maintain a degree of dignity which would not have been possible under a more Napoleonic model of change.

(c) Structures New and Old

Organisational development paralleled curriculum development. We have already noted that an incipient core curriculum was already assumed in the Base Programme and that its breadth was beyond the capacity of most individual teachers. Low student numbers in each school prevented a sufficient spread of teacher expertise. That was perhaps the Base Programme's greatest weakness. The old structure based on the collective decision-making of the School Co-ordinators was not going to provide the change processes needed. For one thing it, too, lacked the critical mass of expertise across many areas. The new structures that would remedy this were: (a) the LEA TVEI Development Team, (b) the TVEI Management Team (at the school level), and (c) the LEA Central Support Group.

Ir was the TVEI Development Team who prepared the document <u>TVEI - A Basis of Development</u> which laid down the guidelines for Mark III. These described the broad outlines of curriculum content as well as the processes of negotiation for implementation (already discussed in the last chapter). These processes were continuing into the 1986 Spring Term. The Development Team played a temporary but vital role in the implementation of Mark III. Apart from producing the document, it enjoyed the authority of a broad-based team. Some of this authority now attached itself to the Borough Co-ordinator as the person given the responsibility of following through the implementation of the policy agreed within the Development Team. This structure had the effect of side-stepping much of the former bitter debate. In time, the work of the Development Team in spelling out a flexible policy in a very public way, convinced school staffs that the process would take account of differences at the school level. The Team itself disbanded after initiating the early implementation, leaving the Borough Co-ordinator to manage the plan. Two of the School Co-ordinators on the Development Team became Advisory Teachers on the new Central Support Group (CSG), which we will now examine.

The CSG was of prime importance in the new developments. Despite the tensions (maybe partly because of them) people at all levels had re-iterated the ideal of a cross-institutional scheme. At a private meeting on 7th January 1986, the Enfield Director of Education commented, "What we have is a borough scheme with school-based elements ... but each team will be different ... (there are) borough packages but individual negotiation". This echoed his public statement six months earlier at the June meeting at which the setting up of the Central Support Group was announced:

We want to provide a framework which is supportive and helpful rather than restrictive. I'm looking to mobilize talent in the Borough to provide planning. A team approach is needed.

Public expectations of co-operative arrangements were deliberately encouraged.

The new CSG of four newly appointed Advisory Teachers began work in September 1985 to facilitate the development and implementation of the new core curriculum of Mark III. It was formally a TVEI creation but, because of the reach of the new core, it worked closely with some of the Advisory Staff and provided support for an increasingly wider range of teachers in the expanding core.

Some School Co-ordinators expressed ambivalent attitudes towards the new body. Though its personal contacts with individual co-ordinators were increasingly seen as beneficial and friendly, some suspicion lingered, albeit diminishing, that developments might be taking power from individual schools - a suspicion that must be seen in the context of previous battles with the TVEI Unit. Senior staff at the Civic Centre, however, kept emphasising that the CSG was a developmental not an administrative team set up to help TVEI teachers, and they pointed out that it had been deliberately located at the Teachers' Centre not at the Civic Centre.

A clear need existed for the CSG. At a School Co-ordinators' Meeting late in the 1985 Summer Term one co-ordinator had complained: "We don't want to be managed, we want to be supported". At the previous meeting the same frustration was also expressed: "Let's not talk about agendas, agreements, minutes. We want someone to help us." At those meetings complaints were voiced about TVEI teachers being isolated and unable to share

experiences, as a function of what many in Enfield came to call the "bolt-on" nature of TVEI in the Mark I and II phases, that was largely caused by the MSC's early policy of exclusivity. (Incidentally, at their meetings, co-ordinators did not themselves have any structurally radical answers for ending their isolation.)

A third indication of TVEI moving out of isolation was the establishing of a TVEI Management Team in each school in accordance with the principles laid down in the June meeting. These were broad-based, generally chaired by the Deputy Head, and included, among others, the School Co-ordinator and representatives from Science and Technology. Over time, as we shall see in the next chapter, the Deputy in each school was to take overall responsibility for TVEI in each school and the post of School Co-ordinator would disappear.

None of this is to say that Base Programmes dis appeared in the Mark III phase. Old and new structures existed side by side. Baserooms continued to operate independently, presided over by School Co-ordinators, whose regular meetings continued to be an arena for some verbal jousting with the Borough Co-ordinator. This was somewhat ameliorated by the attendance of other Civic Centre staff, in particular, an advisory teacher who had been appointed to the TVEI Unit to assist the Borough Co-ordinator in the expanding administration of the scheme. This woman quickly became the contact person for the school co-ordinators, even to the point of becoming the de facto chairperson of the co-ordinators' meetings. In hindsight, however, the significance of these meetings now seems diminished. The tilting by school co-ordinators was politically pointless, a Quixotic exercise as change was sweeping all around the old structure. The game had clearly moved on, and the

Borough Co-ordinator's increasing delegation to his assistant of the task of handling the business of those meetings was perhaps a recognition by him of this fact.

(d) Staff Development - the Key

It was in Mark III that a large investment came to be made in Staff development. First, budgetary restrictions were lifted by the MSC and the first of the TRIST[3] money began flowing with dramatic effects. Second, the teachers' industrial action had previously frustrated development plans through bans on out-of-hours meeting, but money was now available to build staff development into the timetable. Third, Enfield decided against trying to cover all staff development needs and to focus on certain specified areas: Profiling, Design Technology and residentials on Integrated Science. Fourth, the sheer extent of this kind of provision was new to the Authority and new strategies and administrative structures had to be developed for its delivery. It was decided that these should benefit wider groups that TVEI teachers alone, where this was possible. For example, Profiling was a Borough initiative independently of its salience in TVEI, and staff development was co-ordinated across TVEI and non-TVEI activities (which was another indication of the blurring of the distinction across the old dichotomy of TVEI and non-TVEI).

Staff development also occurred, or continued to occur, in other, non-prioritized areas. One of these was in general computer literacy in which many TVEI teachers were teaching themselves a great deal. "Nobody knows the thousands of hours we've spent trying to learn

---

[3] Australian readers may not be aware of TVEI-Related In-Service Training (TRIST) which at that time made unprecedented sums of money available to TVEI schools.

how to use computers", commented one co-ordinator. Negotiating, structuring and supporting individual students' projects was another. TVEI school co-ordinators had initially addressed this individually with some informal sharing of ideas, but this isolation was gradually overcome by the CSG collecting and disseminating examples of project management. This initiative illustrates the very close connection between staff and curriculum development: developing new curriculum strategies and materials "through teams" may well provide unintended and welcome staff development.

The new funding aimed deliberately to create a pool of teachers with the skills and understanding to seed further development in the view of many LEA adminstrators. "If a sufficiently critical mass of skilled practitioners comes out of TVEI then we can be assured of long term educational change", was a representative view from one of them in 1985. TRIST money had been targeted on Science and Technology teachers, and participants in the residentials invariably spoke very positively of them. Concern continued among some school co-ordinators that this targeting of certain subjects reflected too great a concern with content. However, advisers and officers, whom the evaluator spoke with, strongly asserted that the staff development effort was focused on changing teaching processes. "Our concern with integrating content in a subject like science cannot be separated from changing teaching processes", was a retrospective comment made in 1989. Whatever the balance between content and process, thanks to the generous staff development programme, the entry of these Science and Technology teachers into TVEI was proving much smoother than that of the School Co-ordinators.

But then the context had changed considerably in two years. To sum up. First, a more flexible approach to funding in general was being adopted by the MSC, as we shall presently see. Second, and flowing from this, Enfield was allowed to devote resources to staff development. Third, funds were available for TVEI support staff who were also able to work alongside subject Advisers, which had the effect of favouring the integrating of TVEI with the wider curriculum. Fourth, this integration was further facilitated by the expansion of TVEI to involve a wider range of students through integrated studies in Science and Technology (and in Integrated Humanities to a lesser extent).

(e) The Hidden Thaw

Behind all of these factors stood a new flexibility from the MSC. Given the MSC style of fluid negotiation it was impossible to get a high resolution picture of what was happening at that time. However, comments made by senior staff at that time and more fulsomely in 1989, were highly complimentary to some MSC officers. Several commented on their "ability to learn quickly". Another commented, "They had some very bright people at the top". One anecdote related by a senior Enfield staff member in 1989 recalled how he engaged a senior member of the MSC in a friendly and critical dialogue about educational change, in the process introducing him to the work of Michael Fullan. "It happened in a surreal setting of a huge carpeted room with no furniture and dozens of phones on the floor. It was just him and the phones." He believed that from Easter 1985, very soon after posting a short Fullan article to his MSC contact, a dramatic change in tone was noticed in correspondence about TRIST. These data are purely anecdotal but anecdote is probably the only evidence to be had about attitude change among the key power brokers at that time.

Whatever the standing of this evidence, the negotiations that freed up Enfield developments were conducted at a senior level of the MSC, and, in the words of this same Enfield senior administrator, "revolved around key people". He commented further, "I have a theory that change always comes about through key people, no matter at what level they happen to be". This anecdote also perhaps illustrates the upside of the new style of MSC negotiation in which the rules are not fixed.

Improved relations with the MSC were also indicated by the reports of a new MSC representative active in the Enfield area. In late 1985 and early 1986 the researcher began to hear Enfield people at various levels speak favourably of her. She was described as "a former successful Head of a Comprehensive school". Clearly people across the education service were able to relate to her as a credible educator and she was often referred to as "a professional". She was also described by one senior administrator as "very bright, very sharp". This contrasted with some previous MSC contacts who were regarded as "not having sufficient understanding of education", "very rigid", "unimaginative", and "uncomfortable with variety". Because of the gathering pace towards the finish of the evaluation, the researcher was not to meet this person until July 1989.

It must be emphasized, however, that the general view of the MSC in the schools at this time was unfavourable. Key people involved in key contacts saw the MSC more favourably and the future as promising considerable improvement, or at least they saw this in retrospect. For most, however, including the evaluator, the sense of an improvement was restricted to the new attitude to TRIST and the professionalism of the new MSC representative. It was not until my return in 1989 that the full extent of the thaw occurring behind the scenes

became clear. I was to find a widespread change of heart towards the now renamed Training Agency which genuinely surprised me.

Section 3: Reporting the Evaluation

(a) General Terms

During this period four reports were disseminated:

- The First Interim Report, disseminated in 1985 Autumn Term, focused on the early History of TVEI, and particularly on the early management of the scheme;

- The Second Interim Report disseminated in 1986 Spring Term, overlapped with the first report in its time focus but picked up more on the curriculum issues of that time;

- The Third Interim Report disseminated in the 1986 Summer Term, described the student perspectives of the scheme;

- The Summary Report disseminated later in the 1986 Summer Term, was based on all the previous documents; that is, the two early Bulletins, the three Interim Reports, and the four Special Investigations by the Enfield teacher/evaluators (Staff Development, Profiling, Recruitment, Work Experience).

The Enfield evaluation was part of a national plan developed by the National Steering Group for TVEI (NSG). The following categories were outlined in the circular (NSG/84/8) to TVEI LEA's, dated 11th May 1984.

        (a)   initiative wide programme

            (i)   TVEI data base

(ii)   In depth evaluation studies

(b)   Special Studies

(c)   Studies of each project.

The Enfield evaluation fell under (c). Its relationship to the other categories needs to be raised briefly. <u>Firstly</u>, it did not form part of any data gathering for an integrated national evaluation. Our reports went to the stakeholders within the LEA. If the national body wanted access they could apply to Enfield. Letters did arrive from the National evaluation requesting all evaluation reports and other products. Our policy, however, was that our contract was with the LEA and it was the LEA's decision to release documents to the National body. Accordingly all such mail was referred to the TVEI Unit at Enfield. <u>Secondly</u>, the products of the national evaluation did not begin to appear until our reports had been disseminated or were well in preparation. Thus, their insights, which might have assisted our conceptualization of the Enfield scheme, were not available. Of the three styles of teaching that Barnes (1987a and 1987b) observed as part of the national evaluation, namely, "controlled", "framed" and "negotiated", Enfield bore most resemblance to the last. Again, the student satisfaction found echoes in another national TVEI report (Hinckley, 1987, p 48) which are all the more significant by not being "contaminated" by a prior or contemporary reading of each other's documents.

While the reports were substantially the work of the evaluator, as has already been acknowledged, the evaluation director, an experienced researcher and evaluator, managed the overall design of the work, as for example, the number and timing of reports, re-drafting and reshaping of the final products, and overviewing much of the layout. She also monitored professional details ensuring that attributed comments were checked and released by the

person quoted, that critical views were balanced, and that a wide range of data were gathered on particular issues.

Perhaps more importantly, she conducted the original negotiations with the Authority. Essentially we had the right to disseminate widely to participants in the scheme, working through an Advisory Group, who both provided a sounding board for the external evaluation and acted as a Steering Group for the internal evaluation. The evaluation director continued to be responsible for the broad definition of the evaluation and any further negotiation of the conditions under which it was carried out. For example, she successfully resisted attempts by an MSC Officer to be appointed a member of the Advisory Group. At that time she explained her conceptualization of the evaluation in the following memo addressed to me:

> As far as the external independent evaluation is concerned there is no steering committee. It is also true, one could argue, that by definition an independent evaluation does not need a steering committee - and this should be our argument. We quite accept of course that projects like this have advisory or consultative committees, but the kind of evaluation we are doing makes it rather unnecessary. The evaluation has been designed to be highly responsive to constitutive groups and to the existing decision-making structure within the LEA and it(s) work is subject to negotiation with constitutive groups. This has been the case with all previous work on this model (and I have been working in this way for fifteen years) and has been considered to render the need for formal oversight unnecessary.   (11th Sept 1984)

(b) Criticism of the First Report

The First Report attracted some criticisms that will prove revealing to consider. In particular it was claimed that it did not represent the perspectives of some Advisers and Officers, with the Enfield Director observing that it "lacked an institutional perspective". This criticism has indeed some validity - but it might be argued that the neglect in question actually mirrored the way in which TVEI itself was positioned at that time, i.e., in relative isolation from

institutional structures at both school and Authority level. It was by pursuing its data "where TVEI was" that the report sidelined the structure to some extent.

One particular matter may be seen as exemplifying this general issue. The difficulty of obtaining documentation of the early developments has been alluded to in Chapter 2. The researcher had requested a copy of the original Option C and of subsequent documents relating to MSC negotiations from 1983. Possession of these would have contributed to "an institutional perspective". The request was put to a range of people that included the Borough Co-ordinator and a Senior Adviser associated with TVEI. They were unable to locate them, indicating that they were not "in circulation", and indeed the critical "five aims" of TVEI were known only in their abreviated - and cryptic - form. The Enfield Director had not been approached for the documents. In the wake of the First Report he was readily able to make them available.

The obvious question is why the researcher had not thought to ask him at the earlier point (and indeed to request a full interview with him) - and this despite a suggestion from the evaluation director that he should do just this. At another level it is revealing to review the factors that led to this error.

Some of these are perhaps not so significant here like the fact that it was known to me that the Borough Co-ordinator had been unable to track the documents down in the files of the Director's secretary. But others are interestingly suggestive of Enfield's management style and its effects. First, many interviewees made strong claims regarding the centrality of their own role, even in a couple of cases against the roles of other actors. Second, none of these

interviewees felt obliged to mention the role of the Director. Third, in my own early contacts with the Director concerning our approach to the evaluation (in which he was always unstinting with information and went beyond what was asked), he staked no claim for his own role - though it was to transpire in an interview after the event that he had helped in the preparation of the submission for the MSC. His style was not to make claims about himself - the frequency of the word "we", when he talked of activities he engaged in, reflecting rather his "team" approach to management. In sum, a devolutionary management style (and the personal virtues that go with it) contributed - along with the institutional isolation of early TVEI - to a subconscious underestimation of the Director's role in the First Report.

(c) Other Reactions

Any deficiencies in the First Report should be put in perspective. It met with wide approval in the schools. Heads, School Co-ordinators and others associated with TVEI expressed praise, even gratitude. Mostly this was verbal but some wrote letters. There was the odd emotional comment like, "It was like being in a dungeon for eighteen months and somebody opened the door". All the Heads who referred to it, did so in positive terms. "It's the first thing I've read on TVEI that I've been able to understand", was one comment.

A further example of support came from a principal developer of Option C who conducted early TVEI staff development before resigning from TVEI. In response to a draft of the early history,[4] she wrote:

---

[4] Several key people were sent drafts of the early history for comment, including the previous Borough Co-ordinator. The Director was not sent a draft because, as already explained, his involvement was not understood.

In broad terms your account of the early evolution of Enfield TVEI is accurate, although you have glossed over the degree of animosity which arose over the schools/FE divide, over the early staff development and the first residential - the early days for me were filled with tension, stress and animosity, which, coupled with my belief that the scheme was departing from the submission to an unacceptable degree, forced me to resign from it.

(Letter from one of the originators of Option C, 24th May 1985)

The letter writer seemed to be asssuming that Option C <u>was</u> TVEI, a position that in hindsight was not warranted. That is not a criticism of the letter writer whose experience of events had to be partial, fast moving as those events were and difficult to characterize from the standpoint of a single point in the story. Nevertheless the comment illustrates the diversity of views on the early development.

As regards the letter writer's charge of "glossing over", the researcher was aware of more friction than he actually reported but did not wish to stir up again a pool that was showing signs of settling. An evaluation report is not just an exercise in accurate revelation; it very quickly becomes a player in the action. It is not just that the complete truth may be at odds with prudence, that there may have to be some important reason for revealing highly charged scenes. Risks have to be considered, not simply in the utilitarian sense of the impact of description on the general climate, but also in the risk to truth itself from recording emotion recollected, not in tranquillity, but often still in deep hurt. Given the sometimes troubled response to our actual report of the early development, how much more difficult would it have been if the evaluator had described the explosive and angry scenes that were reported by some interviewees. An evaluator may legitimately decline to reveal some matters because of their impact on individuals and organisations and their effect on distracting the reader from the major foci and overall themes of the case under study.

The First Report also lacked some of the inside details of the negotiations, in part re-visited in the previous section, "The Hidden Thaw". However, it did reflect the beliefs of a wide range of people at the time, including some Education Officers and Advisers who were involved in those negotiations. Given the closed nature and the novelty of that negotiation process, we should not be surprised that differences of interpretation arose, and that even in 1989 there were some who professed themselves still unsure of the "real story".

The Second Report did not raise the same kind of difficulties. It focused on curriculum development through Mark II and Mark III. Towards the end of that time tensions did not persist at anything like the same levels. The Third Report portrayed the overwhelmingly positive student perceptions of the scheme. This report was felt by many people to have been the real vindication of all the work. "While everyone else has been soaking up the pressure, the youngsters have had a ball", commented a senior administrator. A Head remarked, "The youngsters have had a cracking good educational deal". To that student experience we will now turn.

Section 4: The Student Experience

(a) Data Gathering

The data were gathered throughgout the period from October 1984 to April 1986. Particular emphasis was given to student perceptions in the 1986 Spring Term. At this time six M.A. students from the Curriculum Studies Department assisted with the students interviews. Perceptions are mainly those of TVEI students, though some non-TVEI students were also

interviewed. No students were interviewed on the return visit to Enfield in 1989. The timing of the visit (late June onwards) made this difficult. However, comments by teachers and administrators at the time supported much of the earlier data.

In all about 120 students, including 20 non-TVEI students, were formally interviewed. In addition, classes were observed in over half the sites, some revisited many times. As described in Chapter Two, there was a good deal of informal interaction with students in these observations. Data for the quantitative tables used later were provided by the school co-ordinators own data bases, school records and the Borough TVEI Unit.

Three intakes were available to the researcher, 1983, 1984 and 1985. The 1983 intake left the programme in June 1985 so there was no 16+ programme to observe. The first intake had volunteered on the basis of just the Base Programme, beginning options only in their second year. Intakes in 1984 and 85 were coming into an expanding TVEI and they selected the programme largely on the basis of the new options.

The data tell the students' own story of their experience of TVEI. Of course this needs to be taken for what it is, crucial feed-back rather than a definitive description of the course. This feed back to the programme was provided in the two early bulletins and in greater detail in the Third Interim Report, disseminated in May 1986.

(b) Summary of Student Perceptions

Students consistently described TVEI as "friendly" and "relaxed", claiming to have been surprised and stimulated by the interpersonal dimension of the programme. While TVEI sought to extend the curriculum into new areas such as Technology, students' strongest impressions were of new social and learning processes.

Their reasons for choosing TVEI were divided between:

i   a more open approach to learning,

ii   particular vocational aspirations, expressed through the Technical/Vocational Options, and

iii   a desire to "learn about computers".

The first intake emphasized (a) when choosing to do TVEI, while the later cohorts gave a larger consideration to (b) with a significant minority giving (c) as a reason. Option selection generally reflected a sex role bias, resisted, however, by the Girls' School in the area of Technology.

Initial surprise was noted by students at the independence expected of them. All students interviewed volunteered, without prompting, that they had grown in self-confidence. Very many appreciated the importance of this in work and other post school roles.

Students perceived the negotiated curriculum of the Base Programme as accommodating individual needs and interests. A project approach emphasized individualized and independent learning. Projects were frequently linked to career interests and provided

opportunities for out of school learning which was greatly appreciated by the students. They also enjoyed the personal responsibility though a few expressed concern at its extent and also at the lack of a qualification within the Base Programme.

The Technical/Vocational Options provided specialized and externally accredited courses linked to broad career categories. Students found these courses more directed yet still providing a degree of negotiation within the limits of the specified content. Students were frequently required to travel to other institutions to do the options of their choice. Though many spoke of travel difficulties, they generally appreciated the cross institutional experience extending the variety of learning environments.

Profiling, an important curriculum strategy, for the first two years was too complex and onerous for students. From September 1985 (ie, TVEI Mark III), newly developed "action plans" focused on particular projects, and students saw this more streamlined profiling as a flexible and practical strategy, helpful in negotiating curriculum. R.S.A. profiles were trialed after September 1985, allowing students to choose their own objectives from given lists. Some students objected to the triviality of some objectives offered by the R.S.A.

(c) Personal Development

i   A New Way of Relating

Students interviewed found TVEI "very different from our other lessons". The difference almost invariably centred on a new way of relating to people - students, teachers and other adults outside the school. TVEI was valued because it brought a change of relationships.

Students valued TVEI both for its people- and its task-related orientation. They approved the working environment in terms of "making your own decisions", "working for yourself and not for the teacher", "being together" and "having more friends".

Linked to this was how students came to see themselves. Realising they "were trusted" they accepted that "it was all up to you". On discovering "they (i.e. the teachers) were not checking up on us" many became their own supervisors: "You had to do the work if you wanted to get anything out of the project".

This is not to deny the attraction of technology. Indeed, students acknowledged its importance, especially in their stating initial reasons for selecting TVEI. But students responded to the curriculum-in-action primarily in terms of new personal relationships. Even responses to technology were focused on a context of personal initiative, "The teacher helped me but it's my own design". Technology was also seen in terms of group learning, "It's better working together, we can help each other that way". Vocational Awareness, especially work experience, was similarly seen by students as a way to become "more mature" in real life situations beyond the school.

ii   Independence and Initiative

In the TVEI Base-rooms students were placed in open situations which made demands on them which they had generally not experienced before, at least not to the same degree. One school co-ordinator commented:

> The majority of our students are the products of a system that hasn't allowed them to be particularly expansive ... We are now demanding that of them and they find that hard, very hard indeed. Somebody's saying, "Well, what do you want to do? How

do you want to do it? What do you think is the best way of approaching? Where are you?" And these are questions they have never been confronted with before.

These comments were echoed by many TVEI students. "You're kind of responsible ... So you've just got to do it", was a typical response.

Students were put in situations which forced them to assess their own personal development and maturity:

> I think sometimes he (the co-ordinator) was a bit disappointed because we had good ideas but we didn't have the courage to follow them up. That's just part of the learning, I mean. He just asked us to go and talk to the local newspapers but I didn't have enough courage. I've learnt from my mistakes and if I had my chance over again I'd do it. So I've learnt. It's not been a wasted experience.

The student was recalling a previous incident and, more importantly, her reflection arising from it. Her comments illustrate several aspects of this kind of learning. Firstly, experiential input was critical for facilitating her maturity. Secondly, learning continued long after the original activity. Thirdly, the personal relationship between teacher and student was critical in developing responsibility. Fourthly, though this kind of learning involved interaction, it also involved a highly personal process of reflection on that interaction.

Developing qualities of independence and initiative has been the most commonly stated aspiration of TVEI at all levels within Enfield. It was a common rationale for widely different activities whether it was the work experience programme, the problem solving of the options or the open assignments and out-of-school learning of the Base Programme. Out-of-school activities in particular facilitated students' sense of independence. On these activities several students remarked spontaneously "I did it all myself." Student comment really speaks for itself:

It gives you more confidence to go out and talk to anyone. They make you go out and talk to people you've never met before.
- Fourth Form Student, February 1986

I used to find it hard to go into shops and ask for leaflets ... TVEI has given me the courage to talk to people better.
- Fifth Form Student, May 1985

I couldn't ask for any more ... all the work experience. I got a report from everyone. It tells more about yourself. No-one else got as much to show out of work.
- Fifth Form student, March 1986

I want to be a cashier ... I'm really shy and (in TVEI) I go out a lot. We're going to tape record and video ourselves and see what went wrong ... I'm not much good in exams and things and I hope TVEI would tell 'em I'm not too bad.
- Fourth Form student, February 1986

You grow more confident on the phone and in letters. You learn what to write and say. (TVEI) makes it easier for you.
-Fifth Year student, March 1986

The most important thing in TVEI is being able to live with the outside world and grow up in the outside world.
-Fifth Year student, March 1986

There are many different areas of life, how to get a job, what to do when you're not accepted ... So I could look back and say, well I got this out of TVEI, even though I got a bit bored with it at the end.
- Fifth Form student, May 1985

With very few exceptions, students identified the major, long-term gain from TVEI not so much in terms of learning new technologies but in their personal and social development.

Not all students interviewed spoke of parental response to TVEI, but those who did, reported their parents having observed and approved a new social competence.

Stud	My parents think TVEI is a good thing. They're trying to encourage my sister in Third Year to do it.
Int	Why?
Stud	Because it's changed me and they've actually noticed the changes. (Pause) Personality and things like that.
Int	What have they said about you? How have you changed?
Stud	Ahmmm, got better.

Int	In what way?
Stud	Able to get on with people better. Say (my parents') friends come round for dinner and I meet them. Before I used to just say hello and go up to my room. Now I just get on and talk to their friends that I've never met before. There's various topics to talk about and things. It's helped in that way.

Much student activity was accompanied by and dependent on the development of confidence. When the interviewer asked students to say in a word what what they got from TVEI they invariably said simply "Confidence". The growing realisation that they could handle social situations outside the school helped many students' image of themselves, particularly some shy, high-achieving girls. From role-playing and simulated interviewing (in some respects, resembling business training courses), TVEI students were particularly aware that lack of confidence reduces the value of academic and other kinds of learning.

iii   The Learning Environment

Students' comments on the learning environment are important in understanding the way in which personal and social development proceded. Nearly all TVEI students interviewed experienced a quite different atmosphere in TVEI, especially the Base Programme. The following expresses several points made by many TVEI students.

Stud 1 We learn more because it's a relaxed atmosphere ... It's not what I expected. It's more relaxed.

Stud 2 It sounds like we don't do a lot of work we're so relaxed. But we do. We fit a lot of work into the lesson because it's not all revision.

Stud 1 Not like Maths where we go over what we did in the First Year at a higher level.

- Fifth Year TVEI students, March, 1986

Students identified a facilitative environment which had been, in fact, created by the exclusive aspect of the selective process.

If there's something like a Maths lesson everyone has to do that even if they hate Maths. So you are in a group of people who muck around and that. But in TVEI everyone knows that they are lucky to have got in and most people are pleased and they get on with what they are doing.
- Fourth Year TVEI student, Nov 1984

This was echoed in another school:

Stud 1 (You're) with people who want to work.
Stud 2 Most TVEI students do want to work. They're hand picked from the year.
Int   Are TVEI students high achievers?
Stud 2 No. Because Mr. ------ had to pick a range of abilities not just the clever ones.
Int   Why are they hand picked?
Stud 2 Because they're people who want to learn. They're interested in learning.

The changed atmosphere had a number of related factors. High on that list was friendship: students particularly liked residentials for opportunities to make friends. A more satisfying relationship with teachers was frequently mentioned: "You get more attention when you need it", "Teachers don't nag you" and "You get to know your teachers better" were some of the comments. Respect was another factor: very many students appreciated "being treated more like adults" and "working for yourself and not for the teacher". Mixed ability teaching, particularly in the Base Programme, was important for the friendly co-operative atmosphere. (It is also an issue for selection, see below.) Early in 1985 comments by Fourth Form students were very revealing:

Stud 1 In other lessons, not so many people answer, here everyone wants to answer.
Stud 2 In other lessons people are shy and leave it to the boffy people.
Stud 1 ... We've got boffy people in TVEI ...
Stud 2 But they're treated different. They join in. We don't call them boffy. They're just like us. They're treated the same.

This educational Camelot, like the original, was not without its problems. Over twelve months later at the same school, the "boffy" people were showing signs of restlessness.

Stud 1	I thought it was really good to start off with ... But now TVEI's just got boring ...
Stud 2	Oh, we do about economics and filling in forms about what jobs you do and interviews - and what was that you did yesterday ...
Stud 3	It's 'cos we're in a group with mixed ability. It sounds nasty. But we have to do easy stuff. It's really boring.

The favourable atmosphere was made possible by the favourable teacher-student ratios which, in turn, enabled individualized attendance in the Base Programme. In a minority of schools there was a move towards time-tabled classes in the Base Programme resulting in a more economic use of teaching time. In early 1986 Fifth Year students in one of these schools perceived a change from their first year in TVEI.

Stud 1	You're all doing the same sort of stuff in the group.
Stud 2	Yes, it's exactly the same.
Stud 1	You're not in the Base group choosing what you want to do *(like last year)*.
Stud 2	'Cos Miss ---- has a list of all the things we've got to go through and we have to do them ... Last year we were all sort of talking about things we would do ... Now we do sort of work.
Stud 3	We were meant to go out and see places ... It was all talk really 'cos we never did it.

While these are important perceptions it must be stressed that they constitute a minority view. Most students continued to respond positively to the TVEI environment.

The students' response to the learning environment was generally expressed in the quality of the interpersonal relationships, individual access to otherwise scarce resources and individual attention from teachers. Students spoke of TVEI as "more interesting", "different", and having "more choice" than "other lessons". Several found that the learning environment of TVEI reversed the boredom and alienation experienced in their previous schooling. Of course, this improvement was made possible by very generous resourcing.

(d) Selection

While students' experience of the curriculum-in-action was largely in terms of personal and social development their reasons for choosing TVEI in the first place varied between:

i   the content of the Technical/Vocational Options

ii   the opportunity to study computers

iii   the novelty of "trying something different" in the Base Programme's open learning framework[5]

For a great many students, particularly among the later cohorts the Technical/Vocational Options were the selling points:

- I wanted to do Business Studies. That was my main reason for doing TVEI.

- My Dad used to tell me all about my Grandad's horses ... so I picked Environmental.

- I couldn't do Computers Studies if I didn't do TVEI.

- I needed an "O" Level in Business Studies for my College course next year.

- I'd like to do Nursing and Caring Studies might help me.

Indeed many students claimed that the recruitment process focused so strongly on the Options, that the Base Programme got lost. In November 1984 Fourth Year students recalled:

Stud 1   I never knew that we had the Base Programme as well as the vocational. I never knew nothing about the Base Programme.

Int   Weren't you told about the Base Programme?

---

[5] The 1983 intake, who were in their second year of the programme when the evaluator came to Enfield, were particularly attracted by the adventurousness of TVEI.

Stud 1	Well ... not that we understood.

At another school Fifth students recalled their selection experience:

Int	What were you first told about TVEI?
Stud 1	The Options on TVEI.
Int	What about the Base Programme?
Stud 2	I can't remember. It all had to be fitted into one assembly. That was a bit short. We should have had more information, verbally and in leaflets. The leaflets are not so good. It's the talking that helps.

At yet another school the Head recalled two students who learnt of the existence of the Base Programme only after the course had started. This was not an isolated occurrence.

Options were a selling point in 1984 and 1985. Borough materials were prepared on each option and follow-up presentations were made at selected schools. The significance of the Base Programme did not always get through to students. But it could not have been an easy matter initially to communicate the novelty and diversity of the Base Programme to students in large assemblies. It was only in follow-up interviews that many students said they began to understand the significance of the Base Programme.

In the main, parents were present when TVEI was originally presented by teachers at the end of Third Form. The importance of discussion was highlighted by the role that parents sometimes played in initially explaining and strongly encouraging their children to enter the scheme. One student entering the scheme in September 1984 explained how clarification and understanding came through a parent:

I was thinking about it but my Dad and (Co-ordinator) had a talk and everything. And my Dad made it a bit clearer so I understood it better ... Then we had interviews and I was able to say why I wanted to do the course and things like that after my Dad explained it.

Several students spoke of early parental enthusiasm:

At first my parents did not know much about it ... They just said to me "It's your career and your options. If you want to do it just go and do it". Then they came to the parents' meeting and realized it was a good idea and encouraged me to do it.

For many applicants TVEI was synonymous with "computers". Non-TVEI students (including unsuccessful TVEI applicants) interviewed in the 1985 Spring and Summer terms knew very little about TVEI except that "you do computers". One said, "I wouldn't have done TVEI if I knew I couldn't do computers". (A case of early disappointment due to delivery delays.) Another wrote in her first Profile entry: "I thought TVEI was about computers".

TVEI beckoned a significant group through the novelty of "trying something different", as some students put it.

-       I did it because I wanted to do computers and it looked pretty interesting. We'd be doing all sorts of topics.

-       It was something different from normal things you'd be doing. You got a chance to do things you wouldn't normally get a chance to do.

-       It was just a change from ordinary lessons.

Much of the novelty centred on the learning processes of the Base Programme:

I liked the idea of choosing what I could study.

-       I wanted a change ... to plan my own work ... they kept talking about initiative.

The novelty and adventurousness of the Base Programme were a stronger focus for the first intake in 1983 when the Base Programme was TVEI.

Selecting options <u>within</u> TVEI was an additional issue. Because students were given the

option of their choice, numbers varied between options. Selection figures were as follows

for 1984 and 1985:

	<u>1984</u>	<u>1985</u>
Caring Studies/Working with People	23	51
Computers Studies/Information Technology	64	31
Environmental Sudies for Land-based Industries	18	34
Introduction to the Business World	61	91
Technology and Control	47	48

With the addition of options in September 1984, differences emerged between the first and

later intakes. Several first round school co-ordinators commented on this. One remarked:

> The children who originally opted for that course may not have been the ones who
> would opt for the later, altered course.

In 1989, a Head of one of the original TVEI schools remembered the first cohort as being

"different, more adventurous". Describing the first intake one Deputy Head commented in

1985:

> We looked for, in the first course, a very distinct type of character really, that was
> going to be able to work on his own.

Of the second intake the same Deputy spoke not of <u>teachers</u> looking "for a distinct type of

character" but of <u>students</u> looking for <u>courses</u>. A new kind of student emerges:

> He or she saw Technical and Vocational Options on the horizon ... They were
> looking at Computers or Technology or Business Studies or Management and saying,
> "That's exactly what I want".

Vocational aspirations influenced student choice of options. For example, students claimed

to have chosen <u>Caring Studies/Working with People</u> because they aimed to work as Nurses

or with children; those in <u>Environmental Education</u> spoke of wanting to work with animals, in gardens, parks and farms.

External qualifications in the Options Programme were for some a strong reason for selecting options. Many students commented that they wanted a particular "O" Level which was not available outside TVEI. This consideration could also be reason for <u>not</u> doing TVEI when students focused on what was on offer in some Base Programmes. A non-TVEI Fifth Year student commented in May 1985:

> I applied to join... It sounded alright at the time. But the more I got to know about it the more I got put off ... You wouldn't get any formal exam at the end of it. You wouldn't get any qualification.

These comments were echoed by other 4th and 5th Year <u>non-TVEI</u> students interviewed about the same time.

(e) Experiencing the Negotiated Curriculum

Students were expected to negotiate projects and initiatives, individually or in syndicates, reflecting their interests and considered needs. The process of negotiation, however, was not simply about students following their interests in a "cafeteria" style choice of study topics. Choice was not exercised in an educational vacuum. The role of the teacher was critical in what was a two way dialogue. It was difficult to observe this process because:

i   some of the most important transactions in the negotiating relationship between teacher and student were informal, sometimes quite private and often conducted spontaneously without notice;

ii   the negotiation was on-going and could not be understood from observing a ten minute discussion;

iii   An important emotional dimension of encouragement, support and motivation could be distorted by the presence of an evaluator/observer.

Direct observation of the process is not easy without spending a lot of time in one place to allow the "eavesdropping" to become "natural". Because of these difficulties, students' reporting on their experience of the process is worth recording. The majority responded very favourably to the negotiated curriculum for the expanded opportunities it provided, as this sample demonstrates:

i   to extend the curriculum into new areas;

        -       "I'd never have found out about computers if I hadn't done TVEI."

ii   to pursue individual interests;

        -       "I found out things about the Law I really wanted to know."

iii   to operate a flexible approach to learning;

        -       "(In other lessons) you only do what the teachers want you to, whereas here
                you do what research you want ... Say like you went into History and they
                wanted you to learn about Stalin, right, and they only wanted you to learn a
                certain amount. Say if you wanted to go into more detail on it you could (in
                the Base Programme)".

iv   to explore what different careers involve.

        -       "I did a project about interior design ... I don't want to be an Interior
                Designer, I've changed my mind".

        -       "We set up a mini company for Building ... I really liked it ... I'm going to
                get a job in Building when I leave school". *(This subsequently actually
                occurred.)*

        -       "The project on computers showed me what you can do ... I wouldn't like to
                be a programmer or that, but I'd like to be able use computers".

Negotiating the curriculum, however, made heavy demands on individual learners. Students reported difficulties in starting, sustaining and finishing a project. In 1985 a Fourth Form student revealed his start-up difficulties: "I've only just started my project (after eight months) ... don't know why". In 1986 a Sixth Form student who had left TVEI recalled: "... it was amazingly hard, wasn't it? *[To another student]* It really was, sort of, what shall we do today". A Fifth Form student spoke of the difficulty of sustaining projects: "It's better this year learning about computers. Last year I had projects ... I just got bogged down in the Third World".

Project completion was discussed by Fifth Year students in 1986. One volunteered: "I'd just put it to one side and start another project ... *[others in the group laugh and nod]*. If you want to go back to it, it's there". Another in the same group revealed: "I've got lots of work I've started and never finished". Yet our adult concerns about completion can perhaps be exaggerated, as a student's reflections on this issue suggests:

> I think when you do projects it has no limits because there are lots of things you can find out and you can't write every single thing there is about a subject. So long as you've done a certain amount then it's OK. You don't need to finish it all to the end. If you did you'd never end.

(f) Students' Views on the Technical/Vocational Options

Student responses indicated that options were selected in the first place for their orientation to vocational aspirations. However, responses from more than half of the 1984 intake, when in their second year of the programme, show great variations between options and related career intentions.

OPTION	RELATED CAREER INTENTIONS
Envir. Education	Sample too small
Inform. Technology	24%
Intro to the Business World	83%
Technology and Control	26%
Working with People	Sample too small and category too open

to classify eg. "working in a shop".

Only Introduction to the Business World showed a strong correlation between options and career intentions. (Much of this was related to the large number of girls aiming to do Secretarial Studies.) Assuming the students were generally correct in saying that they originally selected options for career reasons then there must have been something of a shift. (This is related to changes in student attitudes examined below.)

The opportunity to gain an external qualification attracted several students. One typically explained:

> In our options we get something to show for what we've done - like "O" Levels and CSE's. It's something you can show to an employer.

The applied nature of the options also appealed to many as illustrated in the following dialogue:

Stud 1	It's practical - you actually make things. You're not just reading about something ... Sort of looking at it and things. You actually do it. You're making things.
Stud 2	You understand what you're doing while you're writing it down.
Stud 1	You write some notes about it and actually do it, whereas in other subjects it's not always possible to ...
Stud 2	Yeah
Stud 1	You can remember it as well.

This puts plainly the mutual re-inforcement of theory and practice and the resulting enhancement of memory.

The location of the options, however, presented a problem for many students.

Stud 1	The worst of it is the travelling
Stud 2	The buses are terrible ...
Stud 2	My mother stopped me from going. I'm now doing a Grade I in ----- at this school which is a lot better for me. That's a lot higher than Grade III I was doing at the other school. I'm given extra time at lunch time and I can stay here instead of travelling.
Stud 1	You wait for buses in all kinds of weather.
Stud 2	Half the time you've got a cold.

Given the unreliability of some bus services, students time-tabled for options before lunch had difficulty arriving back on time at their own schools. This put some strain on TVEI students' relationships with their non-TVEI teachers:

If you're good at catching up and you're quite good in your lessons then it's alright. But if you find the lesson that you're missing hard and you've got to go back and do it then it's going to be harder. *(Others: "Yes")* And it's going to be harder to cope.

Another student explained: "I catch up on all my work in here (i.e. in the Baseroom)".

Liaison between TVEI co-ordinators and subject teachers helped several students make up work lost through travelling. In a few cases teachers worked after the end of normal school hours to help TVEI students catch up with the work. This put extra pressure on teachers of non-TVEI classes attended by TVEI students. One student commented: "They're not very happy most of the time". But another explained:

That's if you don't do the work. Whereas if you do they don't really mind and some teachers think that this TVEI is good. I don't know why *(others laugh)*, but they do.

Going to other schools and entering other students' territory was an additional challenge. The security of the baseroom was missed: "I prefer the baseroom when we're together". A girl recalled, "We were the only girls in there and all the boys were eyeing us up and everything". *(general laughter)* Mention was made of visiting students being bullied in some schools. However, the weekly change was welcome to most students and, while the difficulties of travelling should not be forgotten, the more adverse comments were made during the worst winter in forty years.

(g) Profiling

Students' responses to profiling changed as the initiative developed. Early in 1985 a Fourth Form student commented:

> I think they are a good idea, I suppose. Yes, to keep a record. But the novelty's sort of worn off because at first you used to get home and write what you've done. But now you find yourself trying to remember what you did six weeks ago to write about it.

In March 1986 a Fifth Form student recalled the early stage:

> In the Fourth Year we did the yellow sheets. They were boring. You got about three months behind. You never done them yourself. You always copied someone else's.

But the same student remarked on changes to Profiling since September 1985:

> Action Plans are much better. The teacher helps us to write down what we'll be doing in the next three or four weeks. Then we decide if we've completed all we said we'd do. And we wrote down our opinions on it.

In the period prior to September 1985 students distinguished between the "diary" sheets and the "joint profile" negotiated between students and teachers. While students found the "diary" sheets onerous and frequently "boring", they expresses a positive response to the

joint profile. A Fourth Form student described as a "mild behavioural problem" commented in the Summer of 1985:

> I really like the joint profile 'cos I got to know my teachers better ... It helped to get on better with them.

Prior to September 1985 profiling was the only aspect of TVEI that students positively disliked. One student put the criticism at its sharpest:

> I think it's a waste of time. A waste of teachers' effort ... Do they get paid?

A few students found the joint profile difficult for quite special reasons. A Fourth Form girl said: "I'm shy, you see, and I don't like going to teachers and discussing things like that" and a Fourth Form boy explained:

> I find the ones you do with teachers quite hard ... because *(laughing)* well, I'm still misbehaving in a lot of my subjects ... In History I can do it 'cos I get on with History but in Home Economics and Physics I don't get on...

Changes in profiling after September 1985 brought a different response from students. In March 1986 one Fifth Form student saw the difference this way:

> In the Fourth Year we had to write down what we were doing week after week. If you were doing a project it wasn't such a good idea because you were doing a project for a month and you wrote the same thing week after week. And it took up a lot of our project time ... Now we do one at the end of each project. And one at the end of the year. This way we have more interest in what we say when we write it up afterwards.

RSA profiles were introduced into the Base Programme though the degree of implementation varied across schools. In one school a Fifth Form student commented: "You used to write what you did during the week. Now you get boxes which you tick". In another school students saw RSA profile "sentences" as a selection to choose from. "I can write my own

course", was how one student put it. In a third school students were enthusiastic about the RSA examination for Information Technology which they choose to take when they felt they were ready. Successful completion was recorded in their profile.

But a significant minority of students, clustered in a couple of schools, made negative comments about RSA Literacy and Numeracy profiles. One student, judged a lower achiever, voiced the feelings of this group:

> We fill in forms all the time. They keep chucking paper at you ... It's a waste of time. Things like "You can talk on the phone", "You can talk to yourself". It's stuff for a five year old ... If you showed that to an employer he's really going to laugh. He's going to think it's a right stupid lesson.

Base Programme teachers have confirmed that "some kids object to phone skills". One co-ordinator explained, "The implication is that this is a less able kid who has learnt to use the telephone". These views clearly support the student just quoted.

Yet co-ordinators and members of the Central Support Group agreed that many students did not know how to use the telephone effectively. One co-ordinator thought the problem lay with the way some of the RSA skills were written. "Some of the stated skills are about more than the use of the phone. Some of these sentences have to be rewritten". Another co-ordinator pointed out that referring to capacities such as effective use of the phone as "skills" could be misleading; more frequently they were high-order processes. In reply to this criticism the Borough Co-ordinator stated that the RSA would welcome comment from Enfield and was willing to re-draft some of their profile "sentences".

(h) Girls and Technology

TVEI understandably inherited the biases and prejudices of the educational environment in which it was implemented. This is reflected in the gender biases within the Options.

	1984 INTAKE		1985 Intake	
OPTION				
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
Working with People	3	20	16	35
Information Tech.	50	14	29	12
Environmental Education	10	8	25	9
Intro to the Business World	9	52	26	65
Technology and Control	42	5	42	6

Technology and Control exhibited the most marked lack of take-up by girls. Of the five Technology girl-students in the 1984 in-take the Girls' school provided four. In the 1985 in-take the same school provided only three of the six recorded. However, in September 1985 this school instituted two additional Technology classes outside the TVEI group.

The first group of four Technology girls from the single sex school were recruited because they were high achievers who had the best chance of succeeding in a pioneering role for girls:

Stud 1	I didn't want to do TVEI at all ...I wasn't interested. They said I should do it ... I'm glad I did it now.
Stud 2	In Technology, things aren't just in books. They're real. You actually make them work.

Interviewed 18 months later these girls saw Technology as a most significant part of the curriculum. Two intended taking "A" Level Technology; the other two while intending to do other "A" Levels were nevertheless glad to have done Technology. As one of them remarked : "Just because you do Art it doesn't mean you want to be an Artist".

Early perceptions of the girls focused on changing gender roles inherent in doing Technology:

Stud 1	It's not all "girls doing their subject". We do sorts of boys' things and their subjects ...
Int	How do you find the boys in Technology?
Stud 1	Thick *(great laughter)*
Stud 1	No, they know more about cars and things than we do but we know more about Maths.
Stud 2	And Physics

The boys' attitudes to the girls also emerged through the girls' comments:

Stud 2	They're sexist
Stud 3	They think the girls can't do anything - "trust the girls to get it wrong".
Int	I noticed today in the class that the boys were doing all the talking and ...
Stud 2	It's usually that way, yeah, they talk more than we do. Or they talk louder.
Stud 1	But they've done this (practical activity) in their First, Second and Third Year. But we haven't ...
Int	I noticed that you all sit together in the corner.
Stud 4	Yeah, we work together down there because the boys all disturb us.

These comments were made by Fourth Formers in December 1984. Interviewed In March 1986 these girls had a more assertive view of themselves:

I don't want to come second place to a man because he's a man. Obviously he's stronger and so on. But if I'm better than he is I should be treated as better, even if I am a woman ... TVEI will give me a sheet of paper to show to an employer, to tell him that a woman can do this job.

And yet in the face of sexist language as reported by the girls in the job descriptions of the Trident Work Experience literature, this confidence could be easily pushed aside.

Stud 1	We'd probably be rejected 'cos we've got a girl's name.
Stud 2	Yeah
Stud 1	'Cos when we're looking through the books and all, the ones that's doing Mechanics and that, Engineering, had "<u>He</u> should be this and <u>he</u> should be that".

This illustrates the fragile confidence of even the most able girls in this situation.

(i) Differences between Early and Later Cohorts

Students themselves commented on the differences between the 1983 and 1984 cohorts. The first cohort perceived themselves as being more independent than the later cohort.

Describing her own group, one of the 1983 in-take remarked:

> You'd be left on your own to do work. If you needed help there was always someone to give it to you. Otherwise they just let you get on with it.

The second cohort was seen by Fifth formers as operating differently from themselves:

Stud 1	They (the Fourth Years) have set things. They have sheets ... If they are doing something on Law they have to go through everything on the sheet.
Stud 2	If I was any younger I wouldn't have done TVEI. It's changed so much. It's just like a normal lesson. I much prefer my year ... It's too rigid. They don't give you enough choice.
Int	Why has that happened?
Stud 2	Perhaps they thought we weren't making enough progress.
Int	Who thought that?
Stud 2	(Co-ordinator), the MSC, the Authority.
Stud 3	They got more discipline and tasks that they must do. Now you've got to do what they give you.
Stud 1	... You can't be blinkered, straight-ahead, narrow, narrow-minded. You've got to keep your eyes open.

But others in the first cohort saw the later cohort as more fortunate.

Int	Has TVEI changed over the two years, (name)?
Stud	It has, yes. Last year it was very much do what you like. And most of us couldn't cope with that because we'd been stuck for three years doing what teachers told us to do. Now, the Fourth Years have

	changed so there are certain things that have to be done - which I think is a better idea in some ways.
Int	Has TVEI changed for you?
Stud	Not really. Some slight changes but nothing big.
Int	How do you know it's changed for the Fourth Years?
Stud	Just looking at them by the way they worked. They have work sheets that are set out and things like that.
Int	Work sheets for the Base Programme?
Stud	Yeah, that we never had.

But a student from the second cohort explained how the support materials were used:

> They are not work sheets to follow up and do. They're just ideas. We're not allowed to follow them up as they are. They're just for help. Ideas and things.

to which a member of the first cohort responded:

> We didn't have any of that ... (They have) more opportunities, trips and things. We were just left to organize our own. The Fourth Years have help with the teachers.

The first cohort had the Baseroom all to themselves at the start and experienced something

of an intrusion with the entry of the second cohort. It was felt keenly by some. Towards

the end of her second year one Fifth Year commented:

> Now the Fourth Years have taken it over with the music and the computers and the noise and the rest of it. So Fifth Years who have to do exams now go into the study room. The Fourth Years seem to have taken it away ... Fifth Years now spend less time in here I find. They tend to rather go to lessons with their friends or study in the library.

Some Fifth Years complained of the difficulties they had with some Fourth Year students.

One Fifth Year girl commented:

> There's only a few (Fourth Years) who get along with the Fifth Years ... Maybe because the Fifth Years are more mature than what the Fourth years are and they don't like the Fourth Year boys and girls acting the way they do, sort of thing.

A Fourth Year boy, perceived by teachers and himself as a low achiever, put forward an

illuminating point of view:

> The Fifth Years in the first year were in here on their own and they were the first lot ... Some people think that the Fourth Years have come into the Base-room and taken

it away. That's why the Fifth Years and Fourth Years don't get on - mainly because the Fifth Years never had anyone in here before. That's only some Fifth Years feel that way.

Only with the first cohort could this situation arise. There was no evidence of resentment

by the second cohort of the third in sharing the Base-room, a point which supports the view

of the last quoted student.

(j) Changing Needs, Interests and Intentions

The continual development and change was not lost on the students. In March 1986 Fifth

Form students from one school commented:

Stud 1	It's got a lot more complex. There's more information to work from ... We've got more typewriters and computers that we didn't have in the first place.
Stud 2	A lot more teachers are doing it now. It's more organized.
Stud 3	You're treated more as an adult, than at the beginning.
Stud 1	More people know about TVEI so more people are willing to help. In the beginning you had to explain to people what TVEI was. They weren't too sure.
Int	Who weren't sure?
Stud 1	Other teachers around the school, when you wanted information or things to borrow.

At another school Fifth Year students echoed these points:

Stud 1	In the Fourth Form we were coaxed a lot more to do our work.
Stud 2	I thought 'twas the other way round. In the Fourth Year we were all enthusiastic and didn't need any encouragement from our teachers. In the Fifth year we have to do set work towards an exam. Computer Studies and Environmental Studies.
Stud 1	I think it's improved a lot. The teachers are learning more about it. Because it was new to them as well.
Stud 2	In the Fourth Year in one single lesson he used to moan all the time - what we did wrong during the week.
Stud 1	In the Fourth Year we used to chat among ourselves. Now we are more in a working situation. We are more mature. We've changed a lot.

A minority of students in their second year showed a falling off in interest. Very high expectations were generated early but as one co-ordinator pointed out it was impossible to maintain the rising expectations. There was a novelty factor that began to wear off in the second year of the programme as several co-ordinators noted. Fifth Year students themselves spoke of a change in attitude:

-       It helped me get a lot of confidence. But now it's got boring.

-       By the time I leave I'll have done most of the things I wanted to do in it. There won't be much point in doing it again. There won't be much more information.

-       It's been really good. (Co-ordinator) has really straightened me out. I now know what I want to do. But I want to go and do something else.

-       It has changed considerably ... In the Fourth Year (it was), you know, really interesting. There was a lot to look at and everything was approached in this interesting "I'm going to explore this". I found as I got to Fifth Year the projects and everything started to drag and, you know, this business of going to companies and asking them what you're going to do began to really drag because I was getting that from the Career Service anyway ... and suddenly I lost interest in it.

For many students the end of Fifth Year represented a significant point of change and departure. Not only were students responding to a changing programme but they were themselves changing. As certain needs for social confidence, technological and vocational awareness, and computer literacy were satisfied, some students were revising their priorities. There was clearly a massive selecting out at the end of the Fifth Year (which ensured the collapse of Post-16 TVEI) with broadly five destinations for TVEI students:

1.   A Levels

2.   Employment

3.   O Level re-takes

4.   College

5.   CPVE

This was not necessarily a negative outcome. The programme, in empowering students, was a victim of its own success. As one student commented: "I got a lot from TVEI, but now I want to move on".

To sum up, an overwhelming majority of students put TVEI among their favourite activities. What TVEI students most valued was a new way of relating to teachers, students and themselves. They found the atmosphere more relaxed and friendly than in other lessons and many were transformed by the co-operative, less competitive quality of the Base Programme. This is not to deny the importance to students of TVEI's new technologies. The Options, in particular, offered courses catering for vocational interests and students reasons for selecting TVEI frequently centered on these. It was only later when they had experienced the curriculum that they became aware of the personal dimension of the programme that they came to value.

This concludes my account of the second year of the evaluation and Enfield's third year of TVEI. The end, as always, came too soon, and in the final flurry of report writing, from March to May 1986, my time in Enfield had to be rationed. Several visits in June brought to an end for some time my contact with TVEI and Enfield. Soon afterwards I found myself back in the relative quiet of Australia.

CHAPTER SIX: RETURN TO ENFIELD

Section 1: The New Educational Ball Game in UK and Enfield

The return to Enfield, indeed the return to England, was full of surprises. In the three years since my departure to Australia the educational landscape in England had been transformed. The writer came in search of Enfield TVEI but TVEI as a discrete programme in the former sense no longer existed. I was distinctly puzzled by many initial comments from former Enfield interviewees whose perceptions of reality in 1989 set up a deep discontinuity with my memory of the TVEI story as it was evolving when I left in July 1986:

- Actually there's no such thing anymore as TVEI.

- TVEI is now much more mature than it was in your time.

- There aren't TVEI classrooms as such.

- The Training Agency are very happy with the way TVEI is shaping up.

These statements were most surprising. At first I experienced confusion, even occasional alarm lest the object of research had been washed out of the system and the journey back had lost its purpose. TVEI was certainly not the clearly demarcated "bounded system" that it once was. It would emerge, however, that in other ways TVEI was a much stronger plant than when last observed in 1986. Its roots were now an elaborate network reaching into almost every facet of the Authority's education policy. TVEI was no longer a "bolt-on" programme that stood outside the mainstream of school life and, indeed, major policy directions of the Authority. Initially I found myself puzzled by a number of issues. What

was the meaning of TVEI's new found respectability?[1]   Had the radical philosophy of the

Base Programme been set aside? And where were the previous tensions? Answers to these

questions were to emerge from the data gathered in interviews as this study unfolded.

The developments in TVEI could not be understood without taking into consideration the

wider developments both in Enfield and at the national level. The Educational Reform Act

1988 (ERA) and in particular the National Curriculum had already had a considerable impact

on the way TVEI developed, as indeed had TVEI on the fortunes of the National Curriculum

in Enfield. The same two-way interaction obtained between TVEI and GCSE. The national

developments have been described in some detail in Chapter One but their significance for

Enfield TVEI may be summarized quickly at this point.

The National Curriculum, driven by statutory requirements and a very determined political

will, modified severely the operating rules under which any curriculum initiative could

operate. Every student now had to fulfill certain general curriculum requirements (however

we may characterize and interpret these) and TVEI could not be seen to be spending its

largesse on a programme that was not contributing to this strong political push.   The

previously discrete TVEI programme in which some students spent a significant part of their

time on sometimes quite specialized projects, would have had repercussions on the chances

of those students covering all the areas of the National Curriculum.

---

[1] The approval by the Training Agency claimed in the sample
of quotes was later similarly claimed by other Enfield
interviewees and also independently confirmed by the T.A.'s
representative in Enfield.

At the national level the MSC had metamorphosized into the Training Agency whose educational focus by 1989 had expanded beyond the narrow confines of a selective technical programme. The Training Agency saw TVEI as making a contribution to the National Curriculum. There was now a more flexible approach to budget controls and curriculum structures. This was evidenced by a broader, more cross curricular approach to the study of Technology, a willingness to free up spending to benefit other subjects, especially Science, and a new understanding about the importance of staff development in moving curriculum towards being more responsive to students' needs.

This change at the national level of TVEI did not come about in a vacuum but through experience of what had been happening at the local level. Several of the interviewees, both in schools and at the Civic Centre commented on how quickly some of the top administrators at the MSC/TA had learned. The early lack of sophistication in planning educational change was widely commented on within Enfield and in the literature (See Chapter 3). In particular there was the obsession with equipment at the expense of staff development. But the TA had recruited experienced educators who had a more informed and flexible approach to educational planning.

Communication with the Training Agency was smoother than it had been three years before. This could be inferred from all interviewees, including those from the Civic Centre, the schools and the representative of the Training Agency assigned to liaise with Enfield. (This last-named person was at pains to emphasize that the views expressed were in no way representative of the TA, nor were there any comparisons made with the past. But clearly there was a vast difference between the favourable impressions held by this person of Enfield

TVEI and the unfavourable views expressed by a former MSC person to the researcher about four years before.) Whereas formerly the MSC was widely distrusted across the Authority, the Training Agency in 1989 was almost invariably referred to positively by teachers, school administrators and LEA Officers. The relationship was referred to variously as "mature", "straight", "understanding" and "reciprocal" in exchange of information. The TA representative assigned to Enfield (referred to Chapter Five) was praised by everybody the writer interviewed. Many interviewees emphasized that person's previously successful educational career.

This was a truly astounding turn-around in educational opinion. Furthermore, the DES was also perceived differently within Enfield. Indeed, the DES and the MSC had changed places in the popularity stakes. At the time of the writer's departure in 1986 the MSC had been an unpopular agency amongst the rank and file in Enfield. The progressive teachers worried about the excessive emphasis on narrow "skills"; while traditional teachers were concerned about the attack on the "foundational" disciplines of a liberal education. The general view at that time was that the MSC, bent on a political mission to vocationalize the curriculum had usurped some of the power of the DES who were seen as still wedded to some kind liberal educational philosophy. In the words of one school administrator: "The MSC were seen by many teachers as the bad guys and the DES as the good guys. This has now changed."

However, senior officers and many school administrators did not share this pessimistic view of the DES. Their view was that they had been down the "contractual" road before (ie, through the TVEI experience) and that requirements on paper in the end had to be realized in particular settings, and that arrangements did not come in precast concrete. It was

premature to be pessimistic, they thought, before one had even begun to negotiate contractual arrangements. Thus, the impact of the National Curriculum on Enfield was not as traumatic as I might have been led to believe from the educational press and some published writings. (Simon, 1988; Lawton and Chitty, 1988) Many interviewees commented that the experience of negotiating with a national agency such as the MSC/TA taught them a great deal about long term negotiation. (This raises issues, outside the scope of this dissertation, about the long term feasibility of negotiating with the DES which requires a perspective from some future point in time.)

A strong indicator of the changed scene since 1986 was the change in the educational discourse of interviewees. Schools were now referred to as "providers"; programmes were often "packages"; and curriculum content was distinguished by the kind of "skills" taught/learnt. The researcher thought in leaving Australia for a few weeks to have escaped this kind of "TAFEtalk"[2], a discourse which might seem more appropriate to a fast freight service than education. Janet Harland (1987) has drawn our attention in Britain to the phenomenon of educational "newspeak". My own research bears her out. The vocabulary of many of the interviewees suggest that the influence of FE has now become diffused to an extraordinary extent.

---

[2] For English readers, "TAFE" represents Technical and Further Education, which is very roughly the Australian equivalent of FE.

Section 2: A Methodological Note

These general considerations could be derived from reading the contemporary literature, though this would only provide an external description of change. Our understanding of the Enfield reality must be concerned with how the participants constructed that reality for themselves. In this regard the ideas, thoughts and feelings of key players are most important. Motives and motivating ideals played a significant part in the story. What really energized the programme? What motivated the change agents? What were the driving vision and values? These questions will be taken up in the next section.

Revisiting Enfield provided a perspective for clarifying what was consistent and what was changing in the continuing vision for TVEI. Clearly there had been changes in the administrative structure and there had been considerable curriculum change. The establishment of this fact did not require the lengthy interviews that were conducted. However, what Patton calls, "getting close to the phenomenon under study", which characterizes qualitative research, requires the researcher to focus on both externally observable behaviours and internal states (1980, p 43-4). Thus, it was helpful in following the external developments to track the views and values of those original actors who were still present and in positions of influence in 1989. Some key people had left, particularly among the Advisory staff. Their places were taken by staff promoted from within Enfield, and by some who were recruited from outside the authority. The latter brought an outsider's perspective to the Enfield scene and these, too, were numbered among the researcher's interviewees. In this second phase I deliberately interviewed some whom I knew from the first study to be critical of aspects of TVEI. With them I was seeking to test critically the

changed perceptions that I found of TVEI as a more "peaceful" and "mature" programme - obeying Popper's injunction to seek to refute the provisional "conjecture".

This chapter differs from the previous one in its approach to narrative. While the previous one developed a story, this chapter is a time slice. Instead of telling the subsequent story it documents the state of development in June/July 1989. The difference, however, should not be exaggerated because reflective data contributes to the story line. However, there is less focus on critical incidents and dramatic interaction, and more reliance on critical opinions and summative recollections.

The next section will document the educational vision of participants involved in the TVEI Extension in a variety of roles. The five subsequent sections examine: teaching and learning styles; the interaction of Enfield TVEI with the National Curriculum and with GCSE; changes in the management structure of TVEI; new directions for technology arising from the TVEI programme; and how the "vocational" aspects of TVEI were developed.

<u>Section 3: Vision and Values</u>

The changes have been emphasized so far. Continuity with the early period, however, was what was most marked in the educational values expressed. Several persistent elements of what might be termed the "Enfield vision" were expressed with significant frequency, and often with some passion, by interviewees. The following subsections focus on the main value emphases of the participants.

(a)   A Student-centred vision

Of prime importance was a continuing commitment towards a student centred curriculum, though this took various forms.   A minority longed for the "original TVEI", a highly individualized programme for students to pursue outside mainstream planned curriculum. This was the old Base Programme.   The overwhelming majority rejected that as an unworkable structure.   An extreme view was that of a former administrator who referred to this period of TVEI as "the dark ages".   It was in some respects a deficit programme in which individuals could "fill" gaps in their curriculum - a "balancing of the diet".   It could also be an opportunity for pursuing a special interest.   Every interviewee, however, acknowledged the important learnings from that programme.   Despite differences in "historical interpretation" about the old Base Programme, there was continuing, wide agreement, at a variety of levels, on a curriculum which focused on student needs, perceptions and intentions.   These commitments were expressed as strongly in 1989 as in 1986. One Headmaster commented:

> The essence of our vision was the approach to learning, the involvement of the child and especially the negotiation side of it. That word could have been printed in neon strip above the school and I think in the Borough as a whole.

This was echoed by a teacher's comment, typical of other interviewees:

> ... commitment to student-centred learning, negotiated curriculum, to resources based learning, all these aspects at the heart of the pilot have been carried through into the philosophy of the extension.

A senior administrator, who played a key role in TVEI and continues to keep in close touch with developments, described TVEI as

> ... still about the empowerment of the individual child. I don't think it's ever lost sight of that".

<u>(b) A Reformist Vision</u>

Another element of the broad vision of TVEI was a strong sense of the need to reform both

school and society. TVEI was frequently seen as an opportunity for reform. One senior

administrator summed up this viewpoint:

> TVEI has contributed to the opening up of the curriculum. It actually opened things
> up. It was one of the levers.

This metaphor of TVEI as a lever was put in the context of:

> the evolution all through the Seventies...in the way a teacher works, the kind of view
> they have of children, the learner ... TVEI just took it up at a point in time.

Many of the interviewees spoke from strong personal conviction on this point.

A strong social reconstructionist quality informed the aspirations of many of the interviewees.

They favoured a more open society into which their students would enter with a greater

degree of confidence and "empowerment". A teacher now summed up the aspirations of

many for their students:

> TVEI (aims) to give students the abilities to recognize the opportunities available to
> them and to make informed decisions ... They need to go out with flexibility of
> thought.

Such comments express a classic liberalism, although many who espouse it may describe

themselves as socialists. The reformist vision is not so opposed to main-stream political

thinking as some of the Enfield actors imagined. At the very beginnings of TVEI a more

critical radicalism may have been expressed by a few people who have since left the

programme or the Authority. But a culture of reform continued in the frequently expressed

commitments to "empowerment", "equal opportunities" and "fair shares for all" from inter-

viewees across the Authority. As political statements of reform these expressions would not

be incompatible with Rawlsian liberalism. (Rawls, 1972)

(c) An Inherent Moral Dimension

A Deputy Head in July 1989 affirmed that "TVEI provides a shove behind what we know

to be right". The TVEI vision was frequently in moral terms, sometimes self consciously

so. Interviewees' moral aspirations expressed a strong sense of social justice. This was

expressed at every level and was responsible for ideological tensions and some agonising

debate. Thus, for example, one school administrator recalled that he had been highly critical

of the Base Programme because it was a quality programme:

> There was this rather difficult situation where you have baserooms with computers
> and comfy chairs, small groups and somebody like D.B. who inspired a lot of
> jealousy in the school but who was a fine teacher and a doer. And so these kids
> really had a rather better education than other kids who were in much larger groups,
> with not such stimulating teachers, without the same resources, without access to the
> same range of courses. So it was rather divisive. So if you believe in fair shares for
> all ... then you had a lot of philosophical objections in the early days. These you
> swallowed because you were given a Technology room that had 60,000 pounds worth
> of equipment in it. How else were you to get 60,000 pounds worth of equipment?

These comments illustrate the dilemma felt at every level because of the tension between

fairness in the distribution of resources and the structures required to attract those resources.

In reality the question was whether a few could be advantaged or none. Some, following

their pragmatic instincts believed that if they could get their hands on the "loot" the

distribution could be resolved later.

> What really interested me about TVEI in the early days was that it brought resources
> into the school (not extra quals for kids). You played an elaborate game and filled
> in forms and went to meetings. And you had co-ordinators who swore on the Bible
> that they believed in everything that people said. But in fact large amounts of money

came your way. You fought for resources and when you got resources it was your duty to make the best possible use of them that you could. And honestly we were like pigs with our snouts in the trough.

This school administrator who was typical of many in Enfield who, in a time of shrinking budgets, fought on behalf of their students. This pragmatism, however, should not be confused with cynicism:

> In the early days I had no great conviction in it. I just made the right noises. But today I actually do believe in it. I'm thrilled to see an Equal Opportunity module in Year I; I'm very thrilled to see a Health Education course being developed. The kids are going to enjoy Enterprise Week hugely... Anybody can do these. Nobody is excluded.

These quotes are representative of the moral stance of many TVEI players and they explain how attitudes have changed as TVEI developed. At first, the exclusiveness of the early TVEI (a function of the old MSC policy) had been at odds with the educational vision of "fair shares for all". But then the democratic access of the Extension removed a major irritant and must surely have been a contributing factor to the more consensual quality of the second phase of Enfield TVEI in 1989.

There were also more traditional moral approbations that might be seen as attempts to "gentle the masses". Yet they still represent an engagement with the learner on a personal level:

> In many ways we can judge how the children are enjoying their schooling. Our attendance record is good. I stand by the gate every morning and they speak to me ... The atmosphere of the school is quite good... I'll stand by the gate at half past three and the children will wish me goodnight.

This is also suggestive of the management style of many Enfield school administrators who, from the limited amount of observation in June/July 1989, continue to spend a good deal of time interacting with students, parents and teachers.

While a certain direction can be seen in the values manifest in the programme, there was also

some ebb and flow. The history of Enfield TVEI was marked by a certain axiological

dialectic: as described in earlier chapters, a tension existed between those aspirations for a

broadly-based and student-centred curriculum and the push to meet the early MSC

"technology" requirements that frustrated these. One senior administrator commented:

> There were certain key things at the beginning ... getting some coherence into the
> curriculum, the child as an individual learner. We were forced into certain positions
> but now we are back on a path that we understand". (4/55)

This dialectic was very evident in the old split between the Base Programme and the

Tech/Voc Options. This split was experienced in a dramatic way by an interviewee recruited

in 1987 from outsider the Authority. He recalled:

> My first impressions were two-fold. (a) I read the documents in June/July back in -
> --- and was very impressed... (b) Then I was incredibly disappointed when working
> with Science and CDT teachers. They didn't know what a negotiated curriculum
> was. They didn't know anything about processed-based education ... There were also
> totally distracted debates going on, which may have been linked to TVEI in some
> nebulous way, but had nothing to do with how children learn, teaching and learning
> styles, negotiated curriculum, cross curricular issues, a whole curriculum. I was
> totally depressed. And I said, "How can people produce documents like this and yet
> schools can be millions of years away from the documents?" ... Eventually I started
> to bump into what were called TVEI teachers, TVEI group teachers ... That took
> quite a while. Then I discovered TVEI was alive and well and the documents were
> being put into practice, but in such a miniscule extent. In other words it had been
> bolted on to the schools. (4/89)

This picture is significant in a number of respects. The TVEI vision, in so far as it was (and

still is) articulated in the documents, was derived from the philosophy of the Base

Programme. This same programme was invisible for some considerable period of time to

a person with a Borough wide remit for areas of the curriculum that impinged strongly on

TVEI. When he finally stumbled on what appeared to him as a small TVEI tribe, it suggests

the discovery of an exclusive religious sect whose practice matched principles that elsewhere were known only in print and verbal debate. At first we might interpret this group as quite marginalized. That would be mistake. Firstly, while small in number they existed in the majority of schools from as early as September 1984. Secondly, they had resources which gave them quite a high profile. Thirdly, TVEI, as was seen in the previous chapter, enjoyed increasing student (and probably parent) popularity. Fourthly, the published, official philosophy of TVEI was that of the Base Programme.[3] Fifthly, it was a philosophy which attracted very committed teachers, including this interviewee who relocated hundred of miles to take up the Enfield position. Sixthly, the subject area for which he had responsibility was moving quickly towards a more process orientated curriculum and would draw on the skills and processes (eg profiling, resource-based learning) built up in the Base Programme. Finally, and most crucially, we must remember that this was a remembered picture from 1987, not 1989. For all of these reasons TVEI was not an insignificant or marginalized programme within the overall Enfield education scene.

Nevertheless the perceptions of this "outsider" are not to be dismissed as simply mistaken. Rather they illustrate a paradoxical aspect of the values debate about TVEI: it had a considerable influence on the broad vision of education[4], and yet that influence was not always obvious. Indeed this interviewee illustrates very dramatically a point made by a

---

[3] It is not being claimed that the original small TVEI group invented an educational philosophy for Enfield, or that they were the sole developers of an educational policy that would eventually be triumphant. TVEI was a powerful vehicle and provided the resources for policy development and experimental practice.

[4] This influence was no doubt mutual: influential values from Enfield education at large had taken firm root within TVEI.

senior administrator that many people were unaware that TVEI was the source of many of the innovations now widespread in the Authority, innovations that went far beyond the introduction of a subject called Technology. If the newcomer, with authority to move across the schools and colleges of the LEA, had difficulty finding the reality that matched the rhetoric, how much more difficult would it be for non-TVEI classroom teachers to know the TVEI story. In other words the influence of TVEI on educational values was often much greater than its visibility. Perhaps as ideas took hold, their source or the vehicle was often forgotten.

These critical data also illustrate the uneven influence of TVEI. Initially this commentator inherited responsibility for Technology in relative isolation from other subjects and, therefore, his initial judgements relied heavily on Technology. His judgement that Base-room practices had not penetrated Technology (and perhaps Science to some extent) is not surprising, given that the Base Programme contained no Technology teachers, and given also the data from Technology teachers themselves in 1985-6 (See subsection, "The Two TVEIs", in Chapter Five). At least two school co-ordinators had strong Science backgrounds and were among the most influential and articulate supporters of innovative practice. However, one took a year's study leave from September 1986, and the other was to pursue a career outside the LEA soon afterwards. These departures may have slowed progress in Science. This commentator's later discovery of TVEI's influence beyond the Base-room can be explained by the changing management structure (See below Sect 5) which brought him into contact with a wider range of teaching areas. As we shall see this structure itself facilitated dissemination of TVEI practice.

(e) An Evolving Consensus

It would also be a mistake to assume that the vision expressed was monolithic or static.

Around a strong core of values there was ebb and flow over the period. One senior

administrator commented:

> The values are really about respect for the individual, people's needs, values of
> collaboration as opposed to top down arrangements. That was one of the points of
> difference with the T.A. (more correctly, the MSC). Those values were there all
> along, though at some points more pragmatic than some might have liked. (At some)
> points some sat outside the general vision in one direction or another, particularly
> wanting to fight their own corner. At one end a totally negotiated curriculum and
> anathema to the Tech/Voc Options - at the other end just workshops here and there.

Disagreement about values typically did not arise at the level of principle but concerned what

the philosophy meant in practice. Practice, indeed, was the ground of the debate. While

everyone may have agreed on a negotiated curriculum in principle, it was only in action in

the particular settings that values could be clarified and negotiated. That experience, of

course, was fed back into the understanding of principles, as meaning was clarified by action.

There was a strong sense among the interviewees that TVEI had got through a turbulent

period of intense debate and had found some kind of consensus on how values might be

expressed in practice. The turbulence of the early period was attested to by people at every

level, both at the time and in recollection. "There's nothing like it in my experience", was

a comment made by at least two senior administrators. School administrators and teachers

echoed the same views. The consensus in 1989 on values and their application was in stark

contrast. From the beginning a core of values existed, but a combination of moral energy,

some personality clashes, lack of experience and feelings of uncertainty contributed to the

early turbulence. Several interviewees point to the departure of one or two key people as

having a crucial, calming effect. Perhaps a comment by a senior administrator expressed a central feature of the Enfield vision - a basic sureness on fundamentals combined with a certain openness in practice:

> But in general the guardians of that vision *(laughing self-deprecatingly)*, if you like, were fairly consistent. I don't think we were together about it in the way we are now. It's easy in hindsight to say that. Our vision, our values were there but they've evolved and matured to the point now when most people would recognize the sort of system of values I'm talking about as an authority, and would clearly be able to relate more of what we do to that. There's inconsistency which comes from us being human and being in a difficult world, particularly in terms of resources.

The last sentence is particularly poignant to anyone who had witnessed the fierce debates earlier between people whose commitment to the education of youngsters was beyond dispute.

A romantic dimension was evident in the deeply-felt sense of having gone against the tide. A TVEI teacher commented in 1989 about the initial phase:

> Everywhere else in the country people were buying computers and technology buses. In Enfield the kids in their rooms were involved in quite heated debate, going out of school, controlling their own learning, working in a way so alien that for HMI's and others (it) was causing confusion.

This could be exaggerated of course. One more recently recruited teacher, playing a key development role in one of the schools, commented that Enfield's educational vision was not unique. That may very well be so. However, Enfield's educational vision is characterized as having endured opposition from the centre, about which there can be little doubt; many interviewees spoke of Enfield being "vindicated" in the tide of opposition turning in their favour.

These shared perceptions endowed the Enfield vision with great mythic strength which generates energy, commitment and corporate loyalty. While this is at present a positive

force, the danger for the future is that the cohesive culture that emerges may repel criticism and retreat into "group-think". Of course, there is no reason why this must happen.

Section 4: Teaching and Learning: anticipating GCSE and the NC

From the beginning TVEI focused on teaching and learning styles. Clear echoes of the past came from a teacher in 1989, "TVEI was not a course. It was a way of approaching study". A Headmaster in another school commented: "I've never believed that TVEI was a course or a curriculum. I believe that TVEI is about philosophy and teaching and learning styles." That was the philosophy of the old Base Programme. However, these views were now espoused by a much wider range of teachers. As another Head, surveying his school in 1989, stated: "There is greater enthusiasm for the new approach to learning by comparison with the early days of TVEI when many staff ignored it." By 1989 it was clear that TVEI had had a large impact on teaching and learning styles across Enfield.

Despite these comments, TVEI was not a choice between a course or an approach to study. In 1989 it was organized through an agreed Borough framework of subjects, in a way that did not happen in the first phase (though it had been beginning to take shape in the Summer of 1986). Now I found that Teaching and Learning Co-ordinators had been appointed within each school to promote active learning through student initiative and independence. (We shall return to this.) So Enfield had broken out of the old dichotomies (as perceived by many) of the early period. Curriculum policy in the Extension did not force a choice between content and process but promoted a mutually supportive approach as TVEI enmeshed with the whole curriculum. But old echoes persisted as rhetoric sometimes lagged

behind reality, supporting Marshall McLuhan's view of the common preference for the rear vision view of reality, as exemplified by Americans living in "Bonanza Land" in the 1960's.

One important difference from the first Enfield phase was the existence in 1989 of a clear curriculum structure and a well developed support system. Now it was easier to sustain an intense concern with process because support with curriculum content was also available. It was very noticable, in regard to the original TVEI Co-ordinators, that those who were the trend setters in new teaching processes in that first phase were familiar with a broad range of content. A leader among this original group was referred to by his Head as "a highly cultured man". The new structure provided support in both content and process for the middle range of teachers. Again, we noted in Chapter Four that some inexperienced teachers struggled at the beginning of the Base Programme: they were committed to open processes but admitted they did not have the familiarity with the range of content required in more integrated curriculum.

It is easy in hindsight to be critical of the early experiment which was necessarily risk-taking. Many interviewees testified to the Base Programme's crucial contribution to new teaching processes. It had been an important learning experiment and, for many teachers, an important opportunity for experiential learning. One teacher commented:

> People realized it was possible to change teaching and learning styles - they didn't have to have the fear of letting go. (1/69)

An administrator stated that the real resources gained from TVEI resided in changed professional attitudes:

> It wasn't about massive amounts of equipment. Our original notion was actually a staff development job. That is it was about re-training teachers in teaching and

learning styles. It now lies in the skills of the schools ... So in a sense we stand vindicated. (4/45)

This exemplifies a persistent Enfield theme, namely, that developments in teaching and learning were the primary justification for TVEI funding: without professional development at the classroom level no innovation would succeed. This sense of vindication was advanced by developments in GCSE and the National Curriculum which could not be carried successfully without new teaching methodologies which emphasized the interrelationship between practical and theoretical learning.

As early as the Summer of 1986 Enfield TVEI had drawn up clear plans to break out of the straitjacket of exclusivity that had been imposed by the MSC. The Core Curriculum being developed by TVEI was a curriculum structure easily adapted for students outside TVEI. Integrated Humanities and Integrated Science, developed with resources from TVEI and trialed within the scheme, were taken up for non-TVEI cohorts by several schools. These initiatives laid the foundations for GCSE and later developments in the National Curriculum. It is difficult to say how much these connections were the result of deliberate policy - at least at the outset. From the beginning, certainly, senior administrators viewed TVEI Baserooms as a place to induct teachers into new teaching and learning styles that would "change the face of Enfield education". By 1989 the understanding and skills of some Base Programme teachers had already been recognized as critical in GCSE and some NC initiatives. Two fundamental areas of change can be identified:

i   new approaches to teaching and learning (which we have already examined), and

ii   more integrated subject structures.

TVEI was viewed as a development promoting curriculum changes that supported GCSE. Again, policy makers may not have deliberately planned to "piggy back" GCSE on TVEI but rather promoted broad approaches that were common to both initiatives. One Enfield Head in 1989 recalled:

> The Enfield model was to use the TVEI pilot as a vehicle for communication change, and not just the 14-16 age range but to give schools an opportunity to review their structures, their processes, their teaching and learning styles, and an opportunity to look more closely at the cross curricular implications which TVEI brought in. (2/67)

While TVEI was part of a wider educational plan, a flexible opportunism was evident at the level of implementation. A Senior Teacher reviewing the work of a colleague had this to say:

> It was fortuitous the way the programmes changed in the Humanities. Bill's work was the key. Integrated Humanities, which is student-centred and resource-based, uses the skills and resources of the Baseroom. This has led to good quality, assignment-based GCSE work. (1/69)

The breadth of curriculum to which TVEI contributed was attested to by a senior administrator:

> What TVEI did was to bring in a core curriculum for all. No denying that. Therefore it's lifted a lot of things. If you asked teachers about it who never knew about TVEI, they would tell you lots of things. The story goes on (independent of their perceptions). But if you know what the actual source is, you'll know it was TVEI, you'll know it was CIG. That's the fascinating thing. They don't recognize it. They don't see it. (4/61)

TVEI was particularly helpful in preparing the ground for the introduction of Technology in the National Curriculum. A great deal had been learnt about both its cross curricular nature and the requirements of a policy of Technology for all students. Interviewees commonly distinguished between "big T" and "little t" technology and the fact that the old Technical/Vocational Options, as "Big T" Technology, represented a strategic mistake. One teacher commented:

"Little t" technology is not contained in any one subject but can be found in Fashion, Textiles, Home Economics, Art and Design, and elements of Electronics and Science.

Other teachers added other subjects, particularly their own subject, eg Business Studies. All interviewees referred to "small t" technology as the preferred option. A Deputy Head explained:

> The "small t" technology as a process in a whole variety of contexts has come through very clearly as the sort of technology that we're trying to get at.

And a middle-level administrator with a key role in TVEI recalled how TVEI contributed to this part of the National Curriculum:

> Part of the contract with the training Agency that we agreed two years ago (was) ... to include Design and Technology for all students Post 14. And that was before the National Curriculum was published. So schools had an advanced run in towards providing for what the government are publishing in their working party report this week. (Friday 23rd June 1989) (2/111)

Another middle-level administrator paid tribute to TVEI's overall role in preparing Enfield for the National Curriculum:

> (TVEI policy) is buried in the first set of TVEI aims. I don't know what they were. But they are manifested in negotiated curriculum, Teaching and Learning Styles, Profiles, Rec ords of Achievement, Equal Opportunities ... TVEI has lost ownership of those and everyone else is now using those ... Look at the National Curriculum, Design and Technology Documents, Science Documents and other documents. TVEI maybe was not the first but the first to resource it. (5/53)

In broad terms there was a great deal in common between TVEI practice and GCSE in terms of learning being more applied, practical and assignment-based. Also, as several interviewees remarked, the TVEI experience was important in learning to negotiate with central agencies.

We noticed in the earlier chapters that TVEI had undergone a number of organisational developments during the first phase. From the data gathered in revisiting Enfield it was clear that this development had intensified. In 1989 TVEI now had a very different structure both at the Authority and at the school level. Several interviewees spoke of TVEI as being "more mature" and as being more part of the school structure and the Authority structure. One Head commented: "TVEI Extension is now part of something much bigger. It's part of our whole school policy". Although the same Head volunteered: "The later (student) groups lost some of the individualism". (1/3)

The most striking new feature was the integration of TVEI into both the structure of the school and the Education Authority. Previously it had been, in a frequently used description, "bolt-on", an aspect already described in chapters Three and Four. What was really meant by this was that the Base Programme was discrete from the management structure of the school. TVEI planning did not have to take account of what was occurring in other parts of the curriculum, except in so far as it affected individual TVEI students. Its resources, human and otherwise, were funded independently. Its teachers were specifically designated, and their time fraction as TVEI teachers funded separately.

The situation in 1989 represented a radical change. TVEI had become an initiative to transform the whole curriculum and involve the whole school. Of course, that had always been its aim. Now, however, it was brought within the planning structures at both the school and Authority level. The big structural change within the schools was the disappearance of

the TVEI Co-ordinator, as we encountered that role in Chapter Three, and the transfer of an

expanded co-ordinating function to the Deputy Head who had overall responsibility for

curriculum.

In 1989 "Feature Co-ordinators" were appointed in each school to take responsibility for

designated cross-curricular "features". There were eight features:

> Careers Education
> Teaching and Learning Styles
> Equal Opportunities
> Economic Awareness
> Information Technology
> Work Experience
> School Industry Links
> Personal, Social and Health Education[5]

This emphasized integration of the curriculum and the cross-curricular philosophy of the old

Base Programme. Now, however, it had a whole school focus.

It was emphasized by several interviewees that the Deputy Head did not relate to the Feature

Co-ordinators as a line manager. One Deputy Head described himself not as a manager but

as "an orchestra leader", emphasizing that "they're playing the instruments". (3/33) The

Features Co-ordinators were part of a planned policy which attempted to implement what was

a deep seated aspiration of the original Base Programme. The difference is that, in 1989,

there were teams of teachers and administrators who had developed policy that had broad

based support. One senior administrator explained it thus:

> Those people (Feature Co-ordinators) meet across the authority. TVEI is legimated
> as a structure within the Authority and the schools. It's forced a matrix into every
> secondary school. In many places they are equal to the Heads of Departments and

---

5 Schools did not necessarily appoint eight co-ordinators.
Some co-ordinators doubled up on responsibility for "features".

254

they go along to HOD's meetings ... So there's a network. So you can have Heads of English all meeting together and TVEI Feature Co-ordinators for each of the eight areas meeting together. So what you've got now is a structure for carrying the beliefs, the values, the content of that area of development. (4/63)

This supported the opinion of several interviewees who saw the new structure as "empowering", "legitimating" or "giving real substance" to the original aims of TVEI.

Of course, there is a natural critical response to such data, namely, that we all imagine ourselves to be more democratic that we really are. However, I received persistent reports of a philosophy of teamwork at every level. Allowing for the usual gap between our "espoused theory" and the theory we use, the data represented a strong commitment. Perhaps the most telling evidence of this was provided by one of the participants, sought out particularly by the researcher, because of his long standing critical stance to the previous management of the programme:

> There's a whole new range of senior advisers and education officers. They're working much more as a team. I suspect they're actually beginning to develop a coherent policy which they will recognize as a curriculum for Enfield for the 1990's and beyond and indeed for Britain, and are writing policy statements about that. They seem to be working in a collaborative and co-operative manner. I suspect, therefore, there is less power for the --- ---'s of this world (a reference to a former administrator). (1/36)

The general effect of the new structure was to bring TVEI out of the closet. Its pedagogical values became institutionalized, and TVEI philosophy and practice had been generally adopted for the wider curriculum. There were many more teachers involved in cross curricular work, student-centred learning, resource-based assignments, independent study, all of which were essential foundations of the original Enfield scheme. In 1989, however, there was enhanced support, agreed frameworks and official recognition. One Head said of

TVEI: "It's now legitimate in schools."[6] This brought with it the notion of "due process" which could handle disagreements and provide a degree of "collegial debate and examination", in contrast with the original "lone ranger" condition of the TVEI Co-ordinators. The new situation was both a more powerful structure for implementing an educational vision and a way of ensuring professional scrutiny and control. When a broad based professional team favoured a particular practice as worthwhile, structures existed for sharing it. One administrator's comment on this was:

> Once you freed the objective from a particular arrangement (i.e. the isolated Base Programme) you can pursue the objective in a number of different ways and locate it where anybody is. And say "Hold on. What the Base Programme was about was a different way of working with youngsters, which was more effective and individual, more empowering". Empowerment is still there. (4/67)

Change, of course, is never without some problems, and presents new demands on those affected. One participant regretted the passing of the old individualistic style of the free-wheeling Base Programme, in which there were few classes and which engaged individual students when they were not otherwise time-tabled:

> I never had that image of TVEI (ie. with a time-tabled curriculum structure) ... and promoted ways in which staff might get used it, whether in their own classromms or allowing students to come up. What the Borough has got now is what they would never have envisaged as a result of the pilot scheme. (1/55)

There was, nevertheless, a broad consensus in favour the new structure. At the same time, many interviewees regarded that early phase of very open and free experiment as an important period of learning which facilitated later development. Interviewees, commenting on the original format, all paid credit to the user-friendly environment that allowed the psychological space for the growth of confidence and skill; the luxury of small groups, the

---

[6] Given its strong support at senior levels and continued funding we could say it was becoming part of the establishment.

freedom from close scrutiny and the feeling of ownership promoted experiment, reflection, and changed practice. Several interviewees also referred to the early policy of the Authority in allowing all schools, that wished, to participate. One consequence of this was to reduce the Authority's central control and to force experiment and self-examination in the early Base Programme. And in the words of one school Head, "It paid off particularly in the Extension. Everyone was in, even Latimer."[7] In terms of change theory, the early free-wheeling style of management represented a powerful process of "unfreezing" in the change cycle of "Unfreezing, Change and Refreezing". (Lewin, 1951) That early period continued to be present as a powerful myth in how traditional moulds were broken. It opened up the curriculum and the possibilities for change in teaching and learning styles. But the general consensus was that it needed to be institutionalized to disseminate the new and often tacit learning that had transformed the practice of those early teachers.

Now that TVEI had been integrated in an overall management structure it is opportune to address briefly some aspects of the broad management changes that evolved in the Enfield LEA as a whole. As philosophies of a whole-school and whole-curriculum focus began to be realized, the previously individualistic role of subject Advisers in the authority and subject specialist in the schools came under pressure. A former administrator tracked the history of those changes:

> Originally, away back as far as I can remember in the early Seventies, we all did our own thing completely and that was accepted. It was never called a team and there was no suggestion that it should be a team. And then what happened in the next 10 years, partly to do with TVEI and partly to do with other things, there was this sense that we ought to work as a team and have co-ordinated priorities but there was no way that we could achieve that. We tried to do that by discusssion but in my opinion

---

[7] Latimer has a very high academic profile with the overwhelming majority of its Sixth Form going on to University.

it doesn't work. In my experience it doesn't work. People will say "yes" and go on doing their own thing...

It helps if you've been appointed with the idea that you should be committed to a common task, which a lot of people were't in the old advisory team... I was originally (Subject) Adviser and I was appointed to promote (Subject) in the Authority, like being a HOD in a secondary school. You know, didn't have to think about what (other subjects) were doing. I just worked for (Subject).

I've always thought that about the Education Authority. Advisers are HOD's or were HOD's writ large. So now they are trying to reflect the more complex task-oriented structure that schools are trying to develop. But part of the tensions are, I guess - because that's not easy to do - that it's superimposed on the old structure.

The advisory team in 1989 was almost a completely new line up since 1986. Those advisers interviewed stressed the interdependent nature of their functions. Cross curricular issues, reinforced by the structure of the Features Co-ordinators, required constant collaboration. All interviewees testified that the TVEI Co-ordinator in 1989 worked very closely with other Officers and Advisers. It is significant that the current incumbent is an Adviser not an Officer, as was formerly the case. A senior administrator compared the previous management arrangement for TVEI with the current one:

We've got (current TVEI Co-ordinator) but he is a member of the advisory team. (Previous Co-ordinator) was an Officer, free-standing more or less. We had gone for the transition to integration. And that's really what it was all about ... It's worth picking out the key person issue. It's always there. We wanted to go towards a more integrated management structure within the Authority to parallel the nature of the innovation itself which was going to become integrated. And that would also appear in the schools. So you can see the transition actually moving towards an integration in curriculum as well an integration in management terms.

These changes require new kinds of professional relationships. Clearly these require time to be learnt. One Head reflected on the new climate of negotiation and how its development required changes in management culture:

It's led to a lot of difficulties in many areas. And I've heard ---- say at Secondary Heads Conference: "You talk about negotiation with children but then you don't apply

it when you do it among professionals". And of course he's quite right in many ways.

The case of one particular school illustrates the new capacities that had to be learnt by people at different levels in the school. The Head commented:

> I personally find it (negotiation) very difficult ... There's been a bigger change in management than in anything else ... And staff don't like it. They don't like the involvement of a senior management team, and you meet every week and you discuss all these problems ... There's a published agenda so the staff know what's being discussed ...
>
> And it's been said in the last week by a Head of Department, "Bloody Hell! Why couldn't I go into the Old Man and say 'Can I have this?' And all I get is, 'I'll raise it in the Senior Management Meeting'. Whereas I could have had an answer from him before"... (1/23)

This same Head reflected on the difficulties of his staff:

> But they can't get used to it. It doesn't suit their purpose. It's quite fascinating because I thought they would have welcomed it. The autonomy of the Head is gone. So they would have thought, "Great, it's exactly what we wanted".

He also related a significant incident which illustrates the need for "managing upwards" by teachers as well as "downwards" by administrators. In a spirit of light-hearted amusement he recalled:

> --- and I had a fight over trust because ---'d seen the Deputies and I talking - we had come in early. We joke about it now. If I see --- with other members of the Senior Management I say, "Is this a meeting?" He says, "Have we got a one or two tiered system?" And I say, "No ---, we're just trying to break the habit of years". They can now hold a meeting without me there at all ... And it's a much better atmosphere. There's less animosity ... They're genuinely looking at the school as a whole.

In a separately conducted interview, the staff member concerned commented spontaneously on the same set of issues without any prompting from the interviewer:

> Five years ago (a fellow teacher) and I could have decided how to spend 1000 quid fairly quickly. The Authority has produced a paper with guidelines to follow. Senior Management says we have to approach other people. This means another meeting. Now this never ending spiral. People need to go back to talk to their departments. While there is more support, the bureaucracy expands to such a degree that it's

259

difficult to know where the decision is going to be made, and indeed who is making the decision and how far up the tree you have to go. (1/51)

Some context needs to be provided to expand the significance of this data. The researcher has known both the head and the teacher since 1984. Both had been key participants since that time and had been interviewed several times. Data from those interviews and from other participants point to a strong mutual trust, loyalty and indeed admiration between them. If start-up difficulties with the new management structure were felt between people who enjoyed a positive relationship, then it is probable that it existed in other places, though it may not have been expressed so openly and light-heartedly.

This incident should not be taken as evidence of the general level of teacher morale in Enfield which, beyond TVEI, may have matched the accounts in the educational press and media. Rather, it typified the relationship between Heads and their (ex) school co-ordinators who had enjoyed considerable support in the early years of TVEI from their Heads who had looked to them for pedagogical innovation. Generally Enfield Heads were not remote administrators but took a close interest in curriculum and instruction and saw TVEI as an agent of change. Co-ordinators, therefore, had been selected often because they shared the Head's educational values. In turn, TVEI provided them with promotion, educational and other contacts outside the school, and considerable freedom to innovate. Over several years, Heads and those working in the Base Programmes were brought closer by common interests in educational change. This old TVEI network, then, would have helped to alleviate some of the friction in establishing the new structure, though many others, of course, beyond that network may have found the changes more difficult.

Overall the management structure in 1989 was better able to support school-based initiatives. The links between school and Authority had been strengthened, as indeed had links between the Authority and the Training Agency. The early experience of the isolated school co-ordinators, resisting a national agency perceived as attempting to impose narrow guidelines, had largely given way to dialogue between different levels. In this change the Authority had played a crucial mediating role. The widely felt satisfaction in this change can be best understood in the kind of framework that Malcolm Skilbeck describes for successful school-based curriculum development:

> ... neither the independent iniatives of the school nor those larger external forces in the curriculum are by themselves sufficient for achieving the systemwide kinds of changes that are needed. Imposed change from without does not work, because it is not adequately thought out, or it is not understood, or resources are not available to carry it through, or because it is actively resisted. Within-institution change is, by its nature, situation specific, often piecemeal, incomplete, of mediocre quality and so on. Each process requires the other, in a well worked out philosophy and programme of development.
>
> (Skilbeck, 1984, p. 5)

Section 6: New Directions for Technology

The definition of technology has been central to curriculum development in TVEI. In Enfield, too, debates and developments have frequently revolved around technology. One ambiguity, and issue, is the difference between technology per se and technology education. This was not addressed directly by the interviewees but it is inherent in some illuminating observations to be presented. More directly, as we noticed in the first phase of the research, one of the most marked differences between the Base Programme and the Tech/Voc Options was in their approaches to Technology. Put simply, the Base Programme had a broad view

261

of Technology that was not content specific; Tech/Voc Options focused on specific and specialist areas of knowledge and skill that collectively constituted Technology.[8]

By 1989 the Tech/Voc Options had changed to a broader "Technology for all". This had a much wider focus that gave schools very wide discretion as to what could count as technology. Different interpretations existed in different schools and practice varied. Projects were taken up in an opportunistic way. (An example will be provided presently.) Thus, Technology was less clearly demarcated than Science, as one interviewee pointed out. As we noticed above, many teachers and administrators adopted the concept of "small t" technology as something realized in many subjects. However, "big T" Technology also appeared on time-tables, suggesting a complex and diverse approach reflecting a broad policy with fluid application in different settings. There seemed to be no clear and uniform relationship between time-tabled "Technology" and the technological elements of other subjects.

These last observations, and other data provided in interviews, suggest that the debate was still on-going in 1989. Analysing the arguments of participants there seemed to be three broad positions on what Technology is:

i   artefact making - technology defined purely as the production of artefacts, or "naive technology";

ii   technology as techniques for solving any problem such as a management or emotional problem, without any necessary reference to artefacts - the all-inclusive view;

---

[8] In the case of the Tech/Voc Options it might have been more accurate to speak of a plurality of technologies defined by content areas rather than by a single inclusive area of Technology.

iii   the more moderate, flexible position of "artefact-related" activities, ie, incorporating artefacts into some overall process so that technology is not defined wholly in terms of artefacts nor as simply solving problems.[9]

These positions on technology have some similarities with the different possibilities that are found in the literature on the socio-philosophical foundations of technology (Scriven, 1985; MacDonald, 1983; Ihde, 1983; Heidegger, 1977; Lyotard, 1984; White, 1962; Rapp, 1981). Scriven's discussion of MacDonald's article is a case in point, in which Scriven denies that technology can be conceived as artefact-independent.[10]

Clearly there had been a considerable shift in thinking since 1986. In the first place, this was a shift in policy at the Authority and school level. Structural changes, facilitated by the departure of some key people and the recruitment of others, contributed to this. Several individuals claimed indeed to have maintained a consistent stance on technology, though this

---

[9] This position resembles that of Black and Harrison (1985) in so far as they represent a view of technology related to actual artefacts but within wider realms of meaning. They particularly regret those approaches to Technology Education which are partial, either in ignoring the physical aspects of existence or never going beyond them. They comment: "Some teachers have concentrated their effort on practical capability, to the neglect of other aspects. Others have emphasized the resources (of knowledge and intellectual and physical skills) and given little attention to their use. Emphasis on its many harmful effects has called in question the value-free promotion of technology ..." (p 4)

[10] The NC report, <u>Design and Technology for Ages 5 to 16</u>, (June 1989), refers to artefacts, systems and environments as three "realms of technology" which is a complex identification of what might be thought of as artefact. Of greater significance is its statement of the Profile Component for Design and Technology (p 8) which identifies four "Attainment Targets": AT1, identifying needs and opportunities; AT2, generating a design proposal; AT3, planning and making; AT4, appraising. Only the third AT is directly concerned with "making". The NC schema corresponds roughly to the third process-orientated position of the Enfield interviewees, being neither exclusively focused on simply "making artefacts", or, so inclusive as to accept any activity as "technology".

kind of self assessment cannot be always taken at face value. But clearly it was changes in

key people in key positions that made the difference. Ideas previously blocked had broken

through by 1989. One senior administrator recalled:

> Interesting thing is that we debated technology at that point in time. We came up
> with some very useful models at that time but we couldn't get them in and that was
> partly because of --- --- and some of the advisers at that stage. You must remember
> that the old advisory team had its particular views ... They're all gone now. The
> whole lot cleared out ... The notion of technology has moved on ... I remember we
> disagreed and I lost. (4/17)

The previous commitment to technology as occurring only in special purpose workshops were

now changed radically. In 1989 another adviser explained:

> TVEI started out using a model of technology defined in terms of hard technology,
> CDT oriented. The Adviser for Technology has changed within the Borough and
> there's been a different philosophy between the previous adviser and the new adviser.
> That maps the curriculum understanding that's changing nationally as well as locally.
> TVEI is now very much contributing to technology as a process that can be delivered
> in a range of subjects areas. And we've had a fair few conferences on staff
> development on that issue of staff development through process. (3/17)

The difference made by a change in key people could be equally decisive at the school level.

A teacher echoed a parallel development there:

> THe new Head of Technology appreciates that there are many areas of technology
> that have to be looked at very carefully. At one level there may be an erosion of
> skills teaching but we have to get away from the traditional view of woodwork and
> metalwork. He also appreciates many areas have opportunities for integrating with
> Science and Maths, although he, like the rest of us, doesn't know how best we might
> achieve that. That has major ramifications for management. (1/91)

While there had been a considerable change in the approach to technology the search for its

identity continued. Data indicating participants' definition of technology can be subsumed

under the three broad categories described on pp 242-3 above.

The first category, very much the early CDT orientation[11], had clearly been superceded by 1989. The second category represents a very open definition, one described as "extreme" even by one of its proponents:

> I think I would take a more extreme view than many. You see you create an environment and the creation of that environment is not just a physical environment, it's the structures by which we live. It's the practices and procedures. You are constructing a way of relating. You are constructing certain kinds of rules ... I don't operate (my) role ... by activating a set of artefacts. An engineer does. He has a technology for building a bridge. I have a technology for developing the work of the schools. And I think they're both a technology. That's my definition. It may be extreme. But we both must have an understanding about designing something, evaluating it, making it happen, setting up the appropriate arrangements and so on ... It uses exactly the same processes as the technologist. (4/27-9)

This passage illustrates two points. Firstly, it represents a view of technology that is not artefact-dependent or related, in any sense: technology is the process of designing and applying solutions for any human problem. Secondly, an inherent difficulty in maintaining this broad concept is shown in the "slide" in the last sentence, whereby the tighter concept of technology is invoked: discourse about technology seems to demand a tighter concept than simply "problem solver at large" if it is to be a useful concept in our discourse.

A view approximating to the third position was represented by the following comment by one of the younger recruits to the advisory service. Clearly in this view technology is artefact dependent, though it doesn't assume that the making of artefacts is the always prime purpose of technology:

> In one case[12] this school discovered a derelict site ... got in touch with the parks

---

[11] This is not meant as a categorisation of CDT at large but of the direction some individual CDT teachers were perceived as adopting.

[12] A group of students, with the support of their school, were given the opportunity by the local Council to develop a derelict site for community use. The project involved a mixture

department at the Civic Centre. They had an advisory teacher to support them - wasn't really an advisory teacher but what we call a peripatetic teacher, a supply teacher. And because we hadn't any vacancy we were able to use him to support schools. He was in there supporting them. He's a CDT teacher. (At first) none of the people involved in this programme were CDT teachers, which gave them a problem. They could explore needs, they could formulate needs, they could evaluate solutions. But what they couldn't do was make things - a major obstacle to them, to the whole technological activity. (4/105)

This account of the project was supported by data from independently conducted interviews with two other participants from the school concerned. This initiative represents a good example of how theoretical developments (in this case an attempt to define technology) can grow out of experiment. The two other interviewees were very positive about the school's involvement in urban renewal and the range of skills developed by the students. Activities, such as the conduct of social surveys were an echo of the old Base Programme but now they enjoyed greater support from artefact-dependent expertise.[13]

Another newcomer to the advisory service supported the previous interviewee in defining technology as artefact-dependent in the broad sense:

> Technology's got to be integrated across the curriculum in one sense but there needs to be time given specifically to technological activity, defined as "identifying the problem, design, making and then realising the solution to it". There is a lack of clarity over which context we can identify that technology process. At one school in Enfield they would say that students do it in Music when they're performimg a musical piece. I doubt if this is going to fall within the definitions nationally. I suspect they're going to offer some sort of artefact outcome on one level, or on the other hand you may define technology as understanding of systems, some systems process that is very accessible to students ... There are many definitions of

of physical design and work as well as social research.

[13] The Adviser who had described the project had actually spoken about utilising the skills developed in the Base Programme.

technology, as you'd find nationally as well. Different schools want different things out of this report. (ie, the Final Report on Technology)[14]. (3/21-23)

The views of these two younger members of the advisory service represented a strongly emerging position of a more flexible approach to technology. Clearly some interaction with artefacts is required for technological activity, according to this view. Interestingly, the second interviewee went on to say that simply using an instrument, as a musician might do, does not in itself constitute technological learning - which is what must occur if technology is part of the curriculum. This is not to deny that if a musician were to reveal previously unknown possibilities of the artefact, ie, the instrument, then s/he has extended the known range of technique - a somewhat wider notion than technology. It represents an engagement with technology which is unavoidable for many of the arts.[15]

We must be fair to this interviewee in that these post hoc reflections were not considered in the interview. His main point remains: using a musical instrument much as the writer is using a key board does not make either of us a technologist. Nor are we technologists by virtue of using our vocal chords to communicate. Of course we can always stipulate a very wide definition of technology but the result would be to erode whole conceptual structures which would weaken the power of our discourse.

---

[14] This interview took place on 23rd June 1989, the same week as the publication of the Technology Report

[15] Of course there are clearer examples of the marriage of art and technology, as in the work of William Morris or such artefacts as the Concorde. The musical example is in the context of an interviewee's comment on how technology might apply to another area of the curriculum.

Clearly then an influential middle ranking group of administrators do not regard technology as sufficiently defined purely in terms of problem solving alone. (Technology is just one strategy for solving problems.) Again, one of those interviewees supposed that it could be defined in terms of meeting human needs but his own very illuminating example itself suggests the insufficiency of this. This example illustrates the complexity of technology in an educational setting:

> Problem solving is important but it's not how you define technology. Technology is meeting human needs ... Let's take (an example): the kids could look at the needs of old people and hypothermia ... I could knit some woolie socks and a jumper for Granny. I could take the need for that artefact and have it as a problem to be solved ... But the kid could solve it by washing cars and get the money to buy them. That's one of the dangers in that approach. And it's perfectly legitimate. No one's going to make an artefact if he can buy it off the shelf. (5/9)

His further comment on this example (below) reflects a sophisticated approach to technology in a modern society in which so much of the environment is humanly constructed. The example emphasizes the central feature of design under which the elements of "making" must be subsumed and related to the higher goal of relating artefacts to a higher order purpose:

> It's ludicrous in our technology departments there's some kind of macho merit in making everything from raw materials. Bloody Hell! Nobody does that ... We always look for components first of all ... And you only make the components if you can't buy the bloody thing complete. (5/11)

This interviewee had the advantage of speaking from the vantage point of a previous career in industry. The contrast with education was illustrated in the use of computers:

> Take computers. One of the things that is short sighted in education is that we don't buy computers to do a job, which we do in industry, eg. to make a plant more flexible ... In schools we don't have that degree of sophistication. We buy a computer and then find out what to do with it. (5/13)

These data raise directly the differences between industry and education. We mustn't assume that the approach to technology in the "real world" of industry can, or should, be replicated in education. The context of education is, in one crucial aspect, quite different from

industry, namely, that the primary aim is learning, not the most efficient design and production of artefacts or systems based on artefacts. This was inherent, indeed, in the comments of this same interviewee on the pedagogy of technology education. In his experience it is important to

> make sure that those kids are making things because it's fundamental that the kids can interact with that artefact, that system. They must be able to do that otherwise they're always looking at it in abstract terms and your average person can't cope with that level of abstraction. (4/107)

> I'm saying that in order for children to learn the Design and Technology processes it's much more convenient if they can interact directly with something. Let's take a traffic problem. The solution has political dimensions, but also major implications in terms of technological solutions, like organising traffic systems, organising road building programmes, siting these programmes. Some people might call these a geographical solution. But whatever it is, I would call that a Design and Technology problem. But because it's such a big problem it's got other dimensions. A problem like that is very, very difficult for children to get to grips with and interact with unless they can have something on the desk, on the table they can poke at and they can feel it and squeeze it. They need the ability to interact. They can engage in action and interaction. The interaction between the affective and cognitive domains. They need that. Now that's where artefacts are incredibly useful. (4/111)

This dwells on the need to understand the educational context in which technology is being considered. Definitions of technology per se do not on their own determine policy for its implementation in the curriculum. Different needs, current knowledge and experience, and perhaps the developmental stage of the students (not to mention the resources available) will distinguish industrial training approach from technological education. And one possible irony to emerge here is that in some respects technological education might be more artefact-dependent than are many industrial processes.

In interpreting technology in terms of an attitude to artefacts, it must not be assumed that the concept of an "artefact" is fixed. Changes in technology not only give rise to new artefacts per se but to the way human agents relate to them. While, "software", in the sense of

intelligent instructions, is not an artefact, in another sense of its being embodied in hardware such as computer disks,[16] it certainly is. Such artefacts, in the form of plans and programs, are much more integrated into the other realms of technology, "systems" and "environments", as identified in the NC report, Technology and Design. Agents, from within their own human systems and environments, interact in quite intimate ways with such "artefacts" which cannot be identified purely in terms of physicality and do not allow neat hierarchical taxonomies with systems and environments. Indeed the meaning that such artefacts have for those who "use" them depend on the agents' understanding of the systems and environments in which they are interpreted. This gives rise to a more wholistic concept of technology in which a concept like "artefact" is understood in combination with other concepts.[17] Several Enfield interviewees reflected this flexible integrated orientation, as indeed, does the NC report. Some interviewees were clearly aware of the distinctions in the Interim NC report. (The Final Report came out as I was interviewing these particular officers and advisers.)

In summary, the data on the development of technology suggested three broad positions. Firstly, there was the view that technology necessarily consisted in the production of artefacts in special purpose workshops. This was referred to as the CDT orientation by more than one interviewee. Secondly, technology was regarded as an open ended approach to problem

---

[16] There may be some analogy here to Popper's notion of the objective knowledge of the 'third world' - "the contents of books, libraries, computer memories, and such like world '3'". (Popper, 1972, 74)

[17] Heidegger (1977, 296) refers to "mutual dependence" in Science and Technology in which entities help to define each other. Donald Pears (1975, 111) similarly refers to concepts which partly help to define each other (eg, force, mass and momentum) without becoming a closed definitional circle.

finding and solving. This borrowed a great deal from some of the spirit of the Base Programme, though the latter, as we noticed in earlier chapters, displayed great variability. Thirdly, a more balanced and subtle position was emerging strongly in 1989, in which technology had a looser relationship with artefacts, an involvement through making, or through using artefacts in novel ways, or through a more generalized intelligent co-habitation with artefacts. Furthermore, any making of artefacts was to be seen in the context of higher order purposes to which technology was subordinate.

Finally, there was also some focus on the relationship between education and the world in which technology has its primary existence. Data from the third position suggest that that relationship is also a subtle one. Technological education does not simply replicate industrial technology; learning, not efficient production, is its primary aim. On the other hand the data from this third position recognizes that there should not be a dichotomy between the two worlds. If learners are to understand technology then they must also understand the context in which it operates.

Section 7: Interpretations of the Vocational

TVEI was intended by its originators to be in some sense vocational. This was perhaps its most controversial aspect and the one about which there could be the greatest diversity in interpretation. Within Enfield, "vocational" was interpreted fairly broadly as we saw in Chapter Three. Indeed, some saw a liberal education as the best means of optimising a student's career opportunities. This view continued to be expressed in 1989:

> I don't have a vision of education which has at its heart the word "training". (The purpose of) TVEI is give students the abilities to recognize the opportunities available to them.

That comment by a teacher was echoed by a school administrator:

> While the Authority does have a vision to make school a more interesting and relevant place, TVEI is managed pragmatically. It's now a vehicle for encouraging good educational practice in secondary schools. It's not particularly technical and only vocational in so far as you offer kids a good education and they're more likely to go out and get a good job.

So far this was not new. A note being struck in some quarters, however, did suggest new thinking about the vocational aspects of TVEI. One of the schools visited was in the processes of developing close links with a large private firm to provide mutual benefits for both sides. The intentions went beyond the student work experience to include the accessing of each other's staff and resources, development of mutual understanding between education and industry, and opportunities for "shadowing" between staff from the two organisations. The scheme was in its planning stages in July 1989, but the aspirations of the school were significant in themselves, as was the support this initiative was receiving from the Authority.

What is strikingly new about this is the willingness to regard industry as a source of experience, as a legitimate learning environment. This was in some contrast with the traditional response to vocational educational from an administrator from another school:

> If you provide youngsters with a more stimulating environment you will provide them with a better preparation for life. In that sense TVEI is vocational. But we're not giving youngsters job-specific skills so that they can go out and be brick-layers or car mechanics.

In the traditional dichotomy, this is very much the "educator's" response and not the "trainer's". It contrasts with the newer, more relaxed approach. In the same way that the approach to technology had begun to develop a more flexible, "middle way" in its

relationship with artefacts, the approach to vocational education was showing signs of legitimating as educational an expanding range of experiences beyond the school. Indeed, it was an extension of the practical and applied learning that marked many of the exciting student experiences of the old Base Programme, described by one interviewee, in the early phase of the research, as "maturing with adults outside the school". Like much else in 1989 it differed from those early individual experiments in the level of planned supporting structure. It also differed in deliberately reaching out to large scale business and industry; whereas previously the focus was on occupations such as the professions, Local Government, health and retailing.

Another new note was struck by one of the recruits to the advisory service. This was the linking of concepts of technology and vocational education through deep personal experience of how approaches to technology impact on human working conditions.

> I had a personal relationship with it because my father was a boiler maker and worked in the shipyards. The shipyards closed down and he went to work in a car factory. And he bloody detested working in the car factory, couldn't stand it. It was so horrendous. You were working really hard. You don't think about what you were doing - Breaks are an inconvenience - tension, strife - it was a horrendous atmosphere. Eventually someone put a spanner in the works - sabotage and stuff. And then there was a horrendous kind of activity that went on there. People who operate in that kind of environment are obviously not operating in a Design and Technology kind of way. Times are changing ...

Here was reality. The speaker's passion and compassion is partly conveyed on the printed page through the strong language and tense syntax. Deep feeling and the hard edge of experience had eroded philosophical niceties about education and training. Moreover, commitment to an expanded concept of Technology impacted on education:

> Technology ... gives kids access to learning processes or educational processes. So it's a superb vehicle for delivering a liberal education.

This was an educational philosophy, growing out of personal experience, that working environments must ultimately be learning environments, both from the point of view of personal fulfilment and productivity. The significance of this statement is not about the restructuring of British industry, but rather that within the Enfield Advisory Team a person, who enjoyed widespread popularity and who had a central, influential role in the development of technology, did not hold industry at arms length but wanted to bring it within the focus of educational concerns.

Both of these examples (the school reaching out to industry and the Adviser seeking new creative possibilities through a technology informed by democratic design) were examples of a new kind of educational realism, attempting to transcend political labels. The same adviser comments:

> Another problem I have ... TVEI is a dirty word. Many teachers in Enfield are dubious about this right wing government, especially when I come in with notions of commerce and industry, turning the kids into little Thatcherites. Nothing to do with that. I'm dyed in the wool socialist. But as a socialist, you have to learn to live by the product of your labour. If you are unemployed on the West coast of Scotland you have to know why you are unemployed, not because someone has been bad to you but why no-one wants your products any more.

Here again is the note of reality, this time of the market place, which, in the view of the interviewee, imposes its own discipline in the long run, irrespective of the political system.

There are clearly tensions here and opportunity for future debate on educational values. Ultimately this debate will be played out through the practices adopted and the structures supporting them, in much the same way that debates originating in the Base Programme have been played out in the present Enfield TVEI Programme. In other words the debate will be

decided, and a practical consensus achieved, through the acceptability or unacceptability of practices to the generality of Enfield teachers and administrators.

Of course, the National Curriculum imposes a new dimension on any future TVEI developments. While there are constraints post-1988 - in particular the very interventionist testing programme - interviewees were generally confident about their ability to maintain TVEI as an educationally meaningful programme. Their perceptions have to be seen within the context of their having been somewhat marginalized in the early phase. They pointed with some satisfaction to the educationally meaningful contribution TVEI was making to Integrated Science, Integrated Humanities and a broad Technology within the NC. It remains to be seen whether their confidence will be justified in the long run or is a temporary Fidelio Effect.[18]

The vocational dimension of TVEI was an important one. However, it was not obtrusive and for that reason interviewees did not offer as much comment on vocationalism as its importance might have warranted. Another reason for this relative reticence is the somewhat confused and sometimes hostile discourse that generally characterizes discussion about vocational education. In the next chapter, I will analyse these more general issues of vocational education and relate them to TVEI. This chapter marks the end of the Enfield narrative; the perspective will now be very much wider and will no longer be that of the participants, although reference will be made to Enfield for example, support and illustration.

---

[18] Janet Harland compares the liberating experience of TVEI for some teachers with the singing of the liberated prisoners in Fidelio.

CHAPTER SEVEN - VOCATIONALISM IN TVEI

Section 1: TVEI - a Technical and Vocational Orientation

TVEI is committed, as its title suggests, to developing the technical and vocational implications of education. These implications are wide open to interpretation. From the outset MSC documents failed to provide either anything resembling a proper theoretical basis or an account of curriculum content and processes which might have provided practical insights into how the technical and vocational aspects of human experience could be treated in an educationally meaningful way. The original published aims of TVEI assumed that the concepts of technology and vocation were unproblematic. Ambiguities were inherent in the intentions of the TVEI document, "Aims and Criteria", particularly in regard to the meaning and educational implication of "technical" and "vocational". As already noted, at the local level there were widely different interpretations of these terms.

"Technical" and "vocational" each have their own set of connotations, though there is a large degree of overlap. Each concept is concerned with the the application of knowledge and the relationship of theory to practice. In this chapter we will concentrate on the dimension of vocationalism in TVEI, and will refer to the "technical" dimension only in so far as it relates to this. At this point we can simply observe that technology has been central to TVEI, both politically as part of the economic motivation for the programme, and philosophically as part of developing an entrepreneurial culture. Originally the MSC was driven by a vision of a curriculum transformed by a new orientation to technology. This emerged, for instance, in its early preference for expenditure on "high-tech" equipment rather than on people and staff

development. It is also evident in the importance given to such curriculum areas as Information Technology.

In this chapter, then, I want to focus on the vocational dimension of TVEI and how it advances our understanding of the scheme and, perhaps more importantly, how it advances our understanding of education in general. The meaning of "vocation" and "vocational" in an educational context will be an important focus. Difficulties in treating issues surrounding TVEI stem in no small part from the confused conceptual standing of these terms, and the wide range of related terms such as "practical", "applied", "work orientated", etc. The concept of work and its relationship to education will be a part of this focus; in particular we will look at Hannah Arendt's distinction between labour and work. I will also summarize the findings of a study I conducted in Technical and Vocational Education (TAFE) in one of the Australian states as a means of clarifying the variety of links that may be said to exist between work and study. Finally, in order to provide a wider perspective for understanding TVEI in Enfield, I will, firstly, examine some Aristotelian distinctions that are fundamental to much of our thinking about education and vocation, and, secondly, outline a philosophical perspective more sympathetic to vocational educational than the analytical school and the philosophical tradition from which it springs.

Section 2: TVEI and the New Vocationalism

The "new vocationalism" has received enormous attention in recent educational debate. Whole collections of articles have been devoted to it. (Dale, 1985; Walker and Barton, 1986; Holt, 1987; Pollard, Purvis and Walford, 1988) In many of these writings TVEI has in

varying degrees been associated with it. Let us first look at the phenomemon itself and then at its alleged association with TVEI. Perhaps Roger Dale (1985, 7), in identifying four of its major characteristics, has provided the most succinct statement. First, it is aimed at the 14-18 year old group, and particularly at the lower two thirds of the ability range. Second, it prepares young people for coping with the general employment climate and not simply for specific jobs. Dale comments: "The objectives of the new vocationalism are as much occupational versatility and personal adjustment as anything that would formerly have been recognized as education". (Ibid.) This means youngsters learning to adjust to lower employment expectations, which he sees as a major reason for the emphasis on personal and social education within the new vocationalism. Third, Dale believes that the new vocationalism has done little to overcome ethnic and gender inequalities, and that new vocational courses and structures only serve to legitimate further inequalities. Pollard, Purvis and Walford (1988, p 5) interpret this as reflecting the traditional social divide between "education" and "training". Fourth, Dale contends that, though the new vocationalism has enjoyed powerful sponsorship, it has been widely contested by a great variety of people including students themselves.

In the Enfield case study, however, these characteristics were not reflected to any great extent.[1] The scheme was certainly aimed at the 14-18 age group but nearly all the students (and no doubt their families) showed their independence, as we saw in Chapter Five, by leaving the programme after two years, even though the level of satisfaction was very high. Nor was the programme skewed particularly towards the lower two thirds. It did happen in

---

[1] Nor does Dale directly suggest this of TVEI. I am merely considering TVEI against his formulation of the characteristics of the new vocationalism.

the 1983 intake - "They were the only ones we could get" - was the revealing comment of one school administrator. From that point onwards, however, this pattern was resisted, as indeed the terms of the TVEI contract required.

As regards preparing youngsters for "personal adjustment" to the harsh economic climate, the data in Chapter Six showed that some students were going against their school councillors by accepting job offers from work experience and not coming back after the end of Form Five. In more general terms, comments by students and teachers consistently showed that, far from lowering expectations, the whole thrust was in fact the opposite. Of course, as one Head pointed out in 1989, they were fortunate in living in a region marked by high employment.

On Dale's point of institutionalising gender and ethnic inequalities, the picture is less clear. Administrators were conscious of these issues. In both the schools and the LEA, administrators claimed that the ethnic balance within TVEI reflected the larger school population. While I was not aware of any figures that supported these claims, in my own extensive contacts with Enfield students I was never aware of ethnic bias within TVEI, nor if it being an educational ethnic ghetto. Indeed the black students I encountered in TVEI were above average performers. There was gender bias in TVEI Options, a matter we discussed in Chapter Five. However, this was a reflection of the wider educational culture, not something driven by any "new vocational" bias within TVEI. Indeed the intentions of the national "Aims and Criteria" was to oppose gender bias and, as we saw, the Girls School swam against the current in the area of technology.

The claim that the new vocationalism continued the divide between training and education may perhaps have been exemplified in such programmes as the Unified Vocational Programme (UVP), Youth Opportunities Programme (YOP), Certificate of Pre-Vocational Education (CPVE) and Youth Training Scheme (YTS).[2] These did involve separating academic from vocational streams. To an extent they may have continued the socially divisive role of the old apprenticeship system which was no longer seen as an appropriate induction for "flexible" employability. Combining this (Dale's third) aspect of the new vocationalism with Dale's first aspect, namely, its focus on the 14 to 18 age group, suggests that we should examine TVEI as a possible vehicle for setting up a very early education/training divide . (Some of the other schemes mentioned also came to show an increasing interest in the 14-16 age group.[3]) The data from the Enfield study, however, does not really support the existence there of such a divide. TVEI students continued to remain within the mainstream for most of their school programme. (There was in Enfield TVEI, as already noted, a schools/FE divide but that cannot be equated with an education/training divide. In any case it was pronounced only in the early phase.) The separation of students that did occur was only partial, as we noticed in previous chapters. The original intention of the MSC had been, indeed, that TVEI would constitute the whole of a student's curriculum, but this policy did not prevail.

---

[2] Australian readers may consult Farley (1985) for a description of these schemes and their political context.

[3] The CGLI "vocational preparation" course, aimed at the 16+, did influence the 14-16 curriculum (Holt and Reid, 1988, p 20). Pring also notes the downward percolation of BTEC courses as well. (1987, 27)

This is not to deny that TVEI was potentially divisive and represented a threat to the comprehensive curriculum. However, this threat was contained in Enfield. This was due in no small measure to Dale's fourth observation, namely, that the narrowness of the new vocationalism was widely contested by teachers, administrators and students. From the outset an important element in this resistance in Enfield was the desire of TVEI students to maintain contact with mainstream education. In meeting MSC requirements for a truly mixed ability intake, "ambitious", high achieving students were persuaded to undertake TVEI only when they were guaranteed full access to the academic stream. In other TVEI schemes this does not seem to have always been the case. Of the schemes they studied, Evans and Davies (1988, 37) comment: "'High-ability' children were carefully and subtly channelled away from TVEI into high-status subjects, as management 'felt' the pressures of falling roles and the 'need' to sustain or attract a 'better' middle class intake." This "channelling", of course, ensures some kind of divide, but there was no evidence of it in Enfield. That the Enfield commitment to a broad general education was shared even by students was further evidenced by a general suspicion among them regarding low level "vocational" skill training, as we noticed in some of the RSA profiles. Student comment on "phone skills" ("Who would want to show these to an employer?") revealed their understanding of the true currency of such profile statements.

Enfield teachers and administrators also opposed vocationalizing the curriculum in ways which narrowed learning, and, indeed, the concept of the vocational itself. An influential member of the school co-ordinators made a typical comment: "I cannot support any curriculum that has the idea of training at its heart". This must be balanced against teachers' adoption of much of the FEU rhetoric. Some may have adopted a simplistic understanding

of "practical" and "experiential" learning, "problem-solving" and a cross curricular approach that was suspicious of "academic subjects", but certainly many did not.[4] This rhetoric also included reference to "maturing in the world of adults outside the school", often simply a euphemism for work experience. However, work experience was usually integrated into study themes that promoted reflection on work, context and self. Interestingly, some teachers adopted the business expressions of "briefing" and "de-briefing" to describe study activities before and after work experience. But their picking up this rhetoric did not constitute "vocationalizing" the curriculum in any pejorative sense. In this case the phenomenon of "the rhetoric not matching the reality" could be cited as evidence for attributing praise rather than the usual blame. Those Fifth Year exercises aimed to transcend the mere description of particular work settings. When they succeeded, work experience simply provided an empirical input that assisted understanding of key conceptual constructs. They may not have always succeeded, but students were seriously encouraged to reflect on perspectives that gave significance to work experience beyond the particular setting.[5] Little of this breadth would have been manifested had not school administrators, as we saw in the last chapter, perceived TVEI as an opportunity ultimately to enrich the whole curriculum.

Holt and Reid (1988) make the serious allegation that TVEI promoted the aims of the new vocationalism. In their view the distinction between education and training was fudged by

---

[4] The Enfield policy of deliberately recruiting high achievers, to ensure true mixed-ability TVEI cohorts, turned out to be a kind of insurance against TVEI going down the "training" road.

[5] To a casual observer the surface rhetoric of some interviewees may have grated and sounded divisively "industrial". However, the strength of the methodology was demonstrated in being able get behind the surface semantics, not to mention an interviewer's initial reactions.

"some educationists" to whom "the TVEI offered a convenient way of having one's cake and eating it". (p 21) They invoke Dearden's comment on the convenient fashion of much prevocational discourse "trading on wider and narrower interpretations of some key terms". (Ibid) I agree that much of TVEI discourse dealt in ambiguities, and some people may have exploited these in a self-serving way. However, the original distinction between education and training is not in itself, I shall be arguing, an absolute one. Many different kinds of learning may easily partake of both. Learners may be inducted into broad perspectives that range across the human condition while being "trained" to observe, understand and act from these perspectives in specific contexts. Education and training are not necessarliy different processes but often aspects of the same process, indeed, mutually supportive aspects, as are technique, understanding and feeling in learning to teach. Richard Pring (1987, 31) is one who questions the "crude dichotomy" of the liberal and vocational curriculum, a conception which lies at the heart of the education and training divide. Malcolm Skilbeck (1984, pp 209-213) argues analogously with regard to the usual overemphasis of the difference between the process and the objectives curriculum. His phrase, "an illogical polarization", (p 210) may be applied also to the distinction between education and training.

That is not to deny that writers such as Dearden, Holt and Reid are right to draw our attention to the educationally crippling effects of barbarous forms of training based on crude conceptions of "skill". As I will later relate, I have observed these too closely in some technical education contexts in Victoria not to be shocked by "unrestrained" training which is, in a simple and deep sense, inhuman: there is no place for the learner's understanding and appreciation of the human condition, nor for the learner's empowerment to act across the

broad contexts of life. However, TVEI - certainly as I observed it in Enfield - does not perpetrate this kind of barbarism.

The "cross-curricular" is at once a feature of TVEI and another element in the vocational rhetoric. Now, on their own, cross-curricular structures do not constitute a vocational intention, as for example, in good primary school practice. However, "cross-curricular" also evoked the notion of "foundation courses" as promoted by the City and Guilds of London Institute (CGLI). This concept turned on a contrast between "courses" and "subjects". (Holt and Reid, p 16) The idea is to loosen the control exerted by traditional subjects and to allow learning to be organized around either work-defined "problems" to be solved, or work-related "skills" to be acquired. In reality the "skills learning" promoted by some courses, often lacks a broad conceptual perspective, and have indeed a much narrower scope than the subjects they are meant to replace. In such cases, far from possessing a cross-curricular perspective, "skills learning" often has no perspective at all with which to counteract and civilize its (often) high degree of specialization. In contrast, the cross-curricularity of Enfield TVEI aimed at an integrated understanding of the context in which skills were practised. "Skills learning" did not decontextualize and specialize, but aimed at skillful and reflective action.

It was largely in terms of its specialization that Peters (1973, p 19) contrasts vocational and general education. Interpreting this as pejorative to vocational education, the specialization that Peters has in mind is the narrow application of manual or mental routines with little or no cognitive perspective. In this there is little beyond the concrete here and now, and the significance of buzz-words like "applied", "practical" and "relevant" is fairly impoverished.

These are among the FEU terms which were incorporated into TVEI discourse. However, these terms per se should not attract a negative response: they were semantic shells which depended for their content and significance on particular contexts and agents. Their wide use in Enfield TVEI could not be said to indicate a vocational specialization in Peters' pejorative sense. Teachers' work cannot be judged by the rhetoric they have picked up. Generally Enfield teachers and students were suspicious of narrow skills, even though talk of skills was common - as it is now in Australia. Their notion of being "practical" and "applied" referred more often to students being empowered to act in the social interest and to "make informed choices" (to quote a favourite Enfield expression), than to acquisition of mere routine skills. The exercise of skills was seen as having to be meaningful to students. The aim to empower students was behind most of the push to participatory learning with its development of social skills. This was spoken of in cognitive terms by some teachers and administrators as a redressing of the balance between "knowing how" and "knowing that".

Holt and Reid (1988) perceived TVEI as the vehicle for vocationalizing the 14 to 18 curriculum in particular. In their view this occurred to the extent that TVEI denied the philosophy of liberal education which they describe as "a way of equipping students to link thought and action by their engaging in a practice" (23). Their notion of "practice" they take from Alasdair McIntyre's formulation which turns out to be critical to their whole argument. McIntyre's notion of a practice (1985, 186) is an Aristotelian one in that there are goods "internal to" and "partially definitive of" a practice. In other words what an agent wants from a particular practice at least partly defines its essence: it cannot be understood wholly in terms of goods external to the activity. Holt and Reid, however, have made too much of

this. We should note that McIntyre speaks of the internal relation being a partial definition.[6]

Education, Holt and Reid claim, is such an activity with its own kind of internal goods. They identify these goods as "empowering (students) to feel and act as fully accredited members of the polity". The authors do not explain why these are internal to education (a utilitarian would argue they are good consequences), but we may assume that it is because the "polity" embodies practices which are in some way continuous with education. On the other hand, they contend that "training, which relates to occupations" is meaningful only externally for "future followers" of occupations.[7] This would imply either that occupations do not merit the status of a practice or, if they do, they cannot be continuous with education, at least to the extent of sharing any of the same internal goods. There is no reason for accepting any of this. The authors have appropriated MacIntyre inappropriately, whose account of a practice is, indeed, useful in describing the formal qualities of education. (I adopt it throughout this chapter.)

Practices, be they based in education or in occupations, are not quarantined from each other, and they have their place within a wider social and historical context, what MacIntyre calls a "tradition". His definition of a practice is part of an account of the virtues which themselves have "a complex, historical, multi-layered character". (Ibid, 186) Practices, similarly, "have a history: games, sciences and arts all have histories". (1985, p 190)

---

[6] The alternative would be a semantic black hole, cut off from any external semantic anchors. Understanding of the practice by those outside it, and, indeed, induction into the practice, would become problematic.

[7] This extreme characterisation of training creates the opposite kind of semantic puzzle in which the meaning of action is always specified in terms of consequences, leading to an endless motivational regress.

Moreover, the exercise of the virtues is also against the background of both the agent's whole-life "narrative" and a "moral tradition", and needs to be understood in this way (MacIntyre, pp 204 ff). Thus, the moral agent indeed acts out of concern for goods internal to certain practices, but the multi-layered contexts of real life require a kind of Aristotelian deliberation (MacIntyre, 1985; Lobkovizc, 1967; Bernstein, 1983), which does not rule out extrinsic reasons for acting, ie, weighing goods external to a practice. These goods, external to a particular practice, may or may not be internal to some other practice, and thus may or may not lead to the kind of clash of principles that Isaiah Berlin has explicated. (Berlin, 1959) The main point is that practices are not necessarily undermined or eroded by the existence of motives external to the practice. Whether they are or not, depends very much on what the external motives are. The Aristotelian position requires that a practice be supported by agents acting out of a central core of internal goods, but this does not exclude a collateral concern for extrinsic, consequential issues. A.N. Whitehead, commenting on his experience on a Prime Minister's education committee, accepts the Aristotelian position as including extrinsic as well as intrinsic motivation: "It was my misfortune to listen to much ineffectual wailing from witnesses on the mercenary tendencies of modern parents.... I wonder how Aristotle, as a parent, would have struck a headmaster of one of our great public schools.... I suspect there would have been an argument, and that Aristotle would have had the best of it." (Whitehead, 1932, 94-5) (Further analysis of the Aristotelian perspective will be provided in a separate section.)

These arguments all point to the dangers inherent in educational practice being constrained and distorted by narrow conceptual frameworks. In this regard Richard Pring (1985) saw TVEI as an opportunity to escape the narrowness of the liberal curriculum and a catalyst for

"an imaginative re-appraisal of the curriculum". (Pring, 1985, 15) Maurice Holt, however, opposes this assessment of TVEI and comments on Pring's position:

> He concludes by stating that "TVEI whatever the social function it might eventually serve, has forced us to reconceptualize processes through which we educate young people". (Holt's emphasis) The means, in other words, justifies the end: we need not worry too much about the social functions of TVEI, as long as it makes us respond to the "increasing technological base of industry" and all the other transient, empirical factors which appear to constitute the sole "educational purposes" of TVEI". (Holt, 1987, 72)

This is to misunderstand what Pring is saying. He had had some experience of both the political and educational dimensions of TVEI (Pring, 1987) and was well aware that the former did not determine the latter. Quite clearly, the economic motives (in so far as they can be attributed) for establishing TVEI did not drive the educational culture at the level of implementation. Enfield teachers and administrators, at the point of action, did not "think of England" but of the fulfillment of individual lives. It is also a well documented phenomenon in educational change theory that intentions located at the centre are transformed by local educational cultures. (Fullan, 1982 and 1989).

Holt (ibid) suggests that the effects of TVEI will peter out when the funding is withdrawn. This very much depends on the kind of curriculum structures that have been established and the degree to which changed teaching and learning styles have taken root. This is what seeding means. Data, especially from Chapter Six, quite strongly suggest that in Enfield the changes brought about by TVEI are deep and structural. Key interviewees claimed that critical changes could not have happened without TVEI and commended these changes in strongly educational, not industrial or national economic, terms. Whatever the larger political motives that led to the establishing of TVEI, in the Enfield setting the emerging conceptions of the vocational had much in common with "liberal" conceptions of education.

Section 3: Concepts of Vocation and Vocational

Notions of vocational education were centrally located in the education debate that marked the break down in the consensus originally established in 1944. TVEI was largely a response to that debate. The historical dimension was briefly described as part of the national background in Chapter One. In the next two sections I am going to look more closely at some fundamental philosophical distinctions in vocational education and their implications for TVEI. This will be an analysis of terms, less in a vacuum, than in their usage in the TVEI debate.

Some occupations were traditionally seen as a "vocation" a term literally that meant a calling (from the Latin "vocare", to call). Originally this had a religious significance but over time the term has been extended to occupations that were based on high ideals of community service such as teaching, nursing and medicine. (Pring, 1987) It is also applied to individual careers that might grow out of a sense of mission as might be possessed by some artists, scholars, scientists or even politicians.

Interestingly something happens to "vocation" when we turn it into an adjective because "vocational" does not seem to have the same high moral status. Occupations under the latter category are, by and large, seen as having lower social status even though they frequently demand considerable knowledge, skill and dedication and in some cases attract significant material rewards. Vocational education, serving this sense of vocation, is generally understood to denote the development of manual skill used in a context of some theoretical

understanding. Quite frequently in this context "manual" and "practical" are used interchangeably. In more recent times, with the decline in the manufacturing sector and the expansion in the service area, vocational "skills" have been stretched to include "people skills" (sic). The term "practical" has also been extended into this context. "She's very good in practical situations with people", is how a young person might be commended to an employer, who might reply, "Good, I could really use that kind of person".

However, "practical" can also be attributed to actions which are in some sense prudent, or are likely to have satisfactory outcomes, as in the actions of a teacher handling a difficult class. Thus, "vocational" education, in the common narrow sense (or even, perhaps, in its broader sense) is not the only kind of education that may be described as "practical". Broadly, studies that contribute to personal and social maturity can be said to be, in this broader sense, "practical". It is in this sense that the "capability" movement stresses a "practical" education, ie, one that assists students develop maturity, judgement and a sense of independence that allows them to be "practical" across the broader contexts of life. It is not unlike the classical virtue of prudence, though perhaps without the degree of moral emphasis which characterized that notion.

Closely allied to the notion of "practical" is that of "applying knowledge". This has become a catchcry of many of the vocational, or what have come to be called the "pre-vocational", schemes, such as TVEI, CPVE and the CGLI courses. It has also become a slogan for mainstream education. This rhetoric often invokes "relevance" to illuminate notions of theory and practice whose relationship is often not clearly spelled out. Bernard Barker

draws our attention to the circle of synonymy in much of this discourse linking "practical" and "applied":

> Relevance is a fundamental pre-vocational concept but conveys no precise meaning or intention. Instead it is used as a vague term of approval implying that direct and and immediate economic applications justify some forms of knowledge but not others.... The DES summary of better schools, Better Schools, provides a tautological definition of relevance which illustrates how empty such criteria can become: "subjects should be taught so as to bring out their applications to the pupils' own experience and to adult life, and to give due emphasis to practical aspects". (Barker, 1987, p 7)

But this has always been part of good teaching practice as Barker point outs. Familiar pedagogical maxims as "Teach a little, apply a little" or "Learn by doing" have been urged on teachers for generations.

Clearly, then, much of the vocational debate revolves around a number of fairly loosely defined issues which arguably turn out to be not specifically "vocational" but fundamental educational issues. This is similar to the discovery/argument that non-sexist or anti-racist pedagogy is simply good educational practice.

Section 4: Vocationalism and Prevocationalism

The debate about vocational education often invokes the concept of "pre-vocational education". In fact, "pre-vocational" is a term that is often used interchangeably with "vocational". When used with a differentiating intent, "prevocational education" denotes a broad preparation for work without any particular occupation in mind, whereas "vocational education" focuses its content and processes on a specific occupation, trade or profession. Pre-vocational education is typically aimed at the 16-19 age-group, although its influences

may push further down into the curriculum. In much of the literature "pre-vocationalism" and the "new vocationalism" have a more or less common denotation.

Prevocationalism sometimes thinks of its relationship to work in terms of "occupational families", eg manufacturing, hospitality, etc. At other times it envisages a much broader and looser relationship between the school and work, involving the reflective study of work as a central feature of the human condition. This can integrate historical, social, scientific, and philosophical perspectives. It is exemplified in such student activities as a social survey of work patterns in the local area, or a study of the role of unions in a particular industry. This was how some Enfield teachers and administrators consciously referred to "pre-vocationalism", specifically contrasting, for example, this interest in work from what they took to be the spirit of the 1982 proposal to establish separate Technical Schools in Enfield. Clearly then prevocationalism is an elastic idea. This is largely due to the complexity and indeterminacy in the relationship between work and education generally. As Golby points out, education cannot be unrelated to work, "Education has always been intimately connected with the world of work". (Golby, 1987, p 12) However, Golby's other point also needs stressing, namely, that "'education' and 'preparation for work', however broadly either or both may be defined, are not synonymous terms". This has the implication that we need to examine particular kinds of work and their moral dimensions in order to reflect adequately on any form of education which consciously supports those kinds of work. (This will be done more specifically in the next two sections.)

Despite the generous, humanistic interpretation of the concept that Enfield interviewees adopted, pre-vocational programmes generally have more than an incidental focus on work,

292

such as might be attributed to mainstream comprehensive curriculum. They aimed to simulate some of the broader aspects of work, often of a socio-emotional kind, such as "working in teams", "working with adults", and so on. This was true of CPVE, the CGLI programmes and some aspects of TVEI in some schemes. This orientation differs from a full blown vocationalism, as we said, in claiming to be a philosophy of learning which is not occupation specific in the way a fully vocational programme might be. It is concerned with attitude change, "responsibility", "maturity", focusing on "the practical rather than the theoretical", and "being able to apply knowledge". This is very much the rhetoric of the "new vocationalism" in its emphasis on personal and social development.

Prevocational programmes are frequently identified by an instrumentalist motivation clearly seen in the context from which much of the support for these initiatives comes, ie the political, industrial and commercial interests from outside education that supported such schemes as TVEI. However, to pack such instrumentalism into the very definition of "prevocational" is to commit the fallacy of characterizing the essence of a practice in terms of some of its initiating influences ("causes" may be philosophically too strong). The practice itself must be distinguished from the conditions that made it possible, even though some of these may exert some influence on the practice. Enfield TVEI was a very good example of a programme expressing a human "telos" quite distinct from some of the initating forces that made it possible. It was driven by a vision of human empowerment in a just, co-operative, as well as productive society. The national economic concerns that helped to initiate TVEI were not transplanted to the local setting, and certainly did not supplant the philosophical, in some cases religious, commitment to youngsters' individual development and life choices.

However, programmes cannot be entirely quarantined from their initiating and enabling background conditions. These are often visible in curriculum and organisational structures as exemplified in TVEI's separation from the mainstream secondary curriculum. This structural feature was imposed through the early insistence on the "voluntary" requirement whereby TVEI could not be offered to the whole age group. Despite Enfield's best efforts some elements of divisiveness and differentiation developed in the early phase. Certainly some teachers perceived prevocational elements as hostile to the "academic" curriculum, and the promotion of "practical" knowledge as having the effect, intended or unintended, of a differentiated curriculum. Moreover, in the early phase some Enfield schools with a high social and/or academic profile ignored TVEI, assuming it to be inappropriate for academic students. Bernard Barker makes a general observation on this attitude:

> Vocationalism[8] has attracted few able students; GCSE is the guarantee of worth ambitious families pursue.... Parents and able children calculate that worthwhile jobs are not available by this route. "Practical" training is not a realistic preparation for leadership in British society.[9] (Barker, 1987, p 8)

However, in those Enfield schools that did take TVEI (and it must be remembered that a large number adopted it, including some with a high academic profile), administrators made special efforts to recruit high achievers to provide a balanced intake. While prevocational programmes possess considerable potential for curriculum differentiation, in Enfield the

---

[8] In this context Barker does not distinguish between vocational and prevocational.

[9] I have another concern with this quote, namely, that Barker legitimates the rejection of vocational education by current and/or aspiring elites because it does not lead to social advancement. In effect, the argument depends on smuggling in vocational motives to reject certain kinds of vocational courses because they not lead to elite careers. This runs counter to his stated opposition to vocational motives in education.

commitment to a comprehensive curriculum over time softened the divisive elements and minimized the discontinuities in overall LEA planning caused by TVEI.

Barker also points to the tempting emblandishments of prevocational rhetoric:

> An attractive liberal sounding vocabulary has been borrowed to describe the aims, objectives and techniques of the movement, emphasising the personal qualities and attitudes it is intended to develop. (Barker, 1987, p 6)

Prevocational education can often be ambiguous about its orientation: it can be read as instrumental by some, as liberal by others, and as humanist by still others. Far from seeing this as a form of eclecticism, Bernard Barker judges "prevocational schemes" as "an unsatisfactory admixture of progressive ideas and behavioural objectives". It is worth remembering that the opposition among the Enfield school co-ordinators to a more distinct LEA planning role, in the Spring and Summer of 1985, was expressed in terms of an alleged "objectives-based curriculum". This was a period in Enfield when the ambiguities and tensions within pre-vocationalism broke out and confronted each other. On the one hand, the co-ordinators, distrustful of academic structures, had been attracted by the "progressive" flourishes of pre-vocationalism and the perception that they shared with it a common enemy, the "academic" curriculum. On the other hand, they rejected what they perceived as less progressive elements.

The philosophical ambiguity inherent in prevocational rhetoric is also expressed in the structures of its programmes. Their operations are frequently across schools and FE colleges, blurring philosophical focus and administrative control. Again, the Enfield situation offered some exemplification of this. TVEI was a programme that was conducted in both schools and colleges, though chiefly in schools. The position of Borough Co-ordinator, even

295

as late as July 1989, was administratively located in the FE Section, though most of the scheme was conducted in schools. As described in Chapter Three, the originators had a strong FE focus which caused some tension with many of those in schools, giving rise to the so called "F.E./School divide". All this exemplifies the way that prevocational programmes often meet on the fault lines of education and training, crossing institutions with different purposes and philosophies. It should be pointed out that Enfield worked through these problems, achieving a broadly based and flexible management structure.

It is almost impossible to wrestle seriously with prevocationalism because it is a virtual conceptual octupus. The rhetoric lacks sharpness and opposing positions are simply appropriated into an expanding mass of aims. Thus, prevocational programmes focus on attitude change that will orientate learners positively towards future work, but are also described as embodying a broad educational philosophy. Lord Young, head of the MSC at the time, expresses this mixture:

> First our general objective is to widen and enrich the curriculum in a way which will help our young people prepare for the world of work and to develop skills and interests, including creative abilities, which will help them lead a fuller life and be able to contribute more to the life of the community. Secondly, we are in the business of helping students "learn to learn". In a time of rapid technological change the extent to which particular occupational skills are required will change. (Lord Young quoted in Cattell, 1985, p 90)

Like the original TVEI "Aims and Criteria", there is something there for everybody and different commentators are drawn to different emphases. Cattell (1985, pp 89-90) shrewdly comments that there are optimists and pessimists among the MSC watchers. Both were observable in Enfield though the former were more influential and, ultimately, more numerous.

With such rubbery eclecticism, prevocationalism of the Lord Young kind is inherently unstable, except in a heavy solution of money. At the level of policy, meaning can be so inclusive that it remains for the programme implementers to interpret that meaning, as occurred in Enfield TVEI. There is no better example of this than the concept of "relevance" that has been an important selling point in schools for not only TVEI but CPVE, CGLI courses and other pre-vocational initiatives. Bernard Barker, as already noted, finds the concept quite meaningless. (1987, p 7) Perhaps it may be fairer to say that while policy statements may be semantically vague or tautologous, they invite practitioners to act (particularly when backed by resources) and, in so doing, to create the practical conditions for interpretation, improved understanding and growth in meaning.

Prevocationalism in the final analysis lacks a clear focus. It has not provided a philosphy but simply an arena for various contending philosophies. If the human condition abhors a semantic vacuum, then in practice prevocational initiatives are forced into either a more openly committed vocationalism or into broad educational practice. This happened in the case of Enfield TVEI where TVEI, as a form of prevocationalism, vanished into the general educational structure.

Section 5: A Comparative Case in Vocational Education

In 1987 after I returned to Australia I conducted a study on the significance of vocationalism in Technical and Further Education (TAFE) in Victoria. This involved conducting interviews with some key policy makers in the TAFE system in order to discover what they meant by "vocationalism", a term that had begun to appear in some TAFE documents. I had thought

297

to include this study as a comparative chapter in the dissertation but space prevented this in the end. However, a short summary of its analysis of different views on the perceived relationship between work and study may serve to sharpen our focus on the diverse links between work and study. In the TAFE study, these seemed to differentiate concepts of "vocationalism". This section also serves as a useful introduction to the next section on the nature of work itself.

Analysis of the data tentatively identified four approaches to the link between work and study. The first of these was what may be termed the "direct link" between work and study, the simplest and crudest formulation. It favours the closest possible fit between a particular job and a particular course of study through a "job analysis" itemising the required work skills which then constitute the content of the syllabus in the form of various kinds of "objectives". The methodology relies on the creation of a check-list of required skills drawing on input from employers, and occasionally workers,[10] within a particular field of work. Generally work is conceived in terms of small units of "skill" performed in so called "standard conditions". In many respects it relies on the methodology first brought to prominence by the work of Frederick Taylor (1911). Other interviewees, typically from areas such as Community Services, the hospitality industry, the retail industry, and General Studies, opposed this approach for reasons of (i) its inflexibility, (ii) its lack of a cognitive perspective, (iii) its inability to handle change, (iv) its depersonalized conception of work,

---

[10] Data from one interviewee who focused on workers showed that "skill needs" were significantly different from those indicated by employers. They were broader and promoted choice in the workers' own lives, even to moving beyond their particular industry.

and (v) the hidden political agenda in regard to the role of educational institutions. This first approach (and the second) is premised on part-time students already in employment.

The second of the four approaches was what may be termed the "extended direct link". This approach avoided focusing study on specific tasks currently engaged in by the student; rather the aim was to prepare students for a smaller number of broad occupational areas each involving a wider range of skills. It was loudly proclaimed by some as the "multi-skilling" of Australia, a prominent policy of the national government aimed at economic growth.[11] This was basically an add-on solution to the need for breadth and flexibility, involving mere accumulation of "skills" and addressing none of the objections already noted.

A third group of interviewees adopted what may be broadly categorized as the "broad link" between work and study. This approach continued to emphasize the importance of experiential input from the work place and to attend to the short term and immediate problems encountered by the young worker. However, broader scientific, technological and social understandings became part of the study aims. What distinguished this approach most clearly from the previous approach was its attitude to theory. Adherents of the two previous approaches saw theory purely supporting practice, typically constituted by discrete "skills". This inhibited the wholistic nature of theory with its central focus on generalisation, principles, and extrapolation to novel situations through the power of its "generational grammar". By contrast, in this third approach, theory supports practice but is no longer limited by it. Theory and practice no longer have an expicit relationship at every turn of the

---

[11] Like Britain, Australia is experiencing relative economic decline in relation to its (Asian) continental neighbours.

curriculum. The curriculum does not map theory onto practice point by point. Theory has its own kind of integrity, requiring its own sequencing and understandings (as, indeed, does practice). Theoretical learnings draw on as much experiential practice as possible, but may not always follow the sequence of acquiring practical skill. Indeed, given the tacit dimension of practical skill (Cotter, 1982; Polanyi, 1958; Schwab, 1978; Walsh 1978) and the rational emphasis of theoretical knowledge, mutual interaction must not be allowed to erode the distinct integrity of each.

This third approach also acknowledges that practice is not simply a list of practical tasks and skills but a structured body of skill, usually embedded in a tradition. Practice has implications that go beyond the concrete and transcend the immediate. These are the invisible, tangible, indeed transcendent, implications of practice: scientific, technological, social, political and ethical. This approach to practice is essentially sensitive to the presence of principles, drawing on the experiential reality of practice. It must not be thought, however, that this approach is basically oriented towards theory. On the contrary, study is still primarily directed to identified work areas and necessarily aims to provide the aspiring worker with economically viable work skills. In addition, however, perspectives are put before students which transcend the here and now and provide an orientation for future and novel situations. Unlike the "extended direct link", the "broad link" does not create breadth through a simple accumulation of skills, but through enlarging cognitive perspectives.

A fourth group of interviewees developed what I have called the "open link". This approach does not pre-ordain the extent to which study is focused on pre-specified areas of work. Study is not driven by acquiring entry qualifications or bureaucratic licensing for specific

occupations. It therefore lacks an industrial context in the political sense, ie, professional, craft and trade organisations have little or no input to these courses. A student may take up work related to study but it is very much on the student's own initative and interest. An example given by one interviewee was a so called "hobby course" on guitar making. One student began making instruments for his friends which eventually led to a full time occupation. Equally, many Arts graduates are engaged by employers for their sophistication in language. This may be an outcome of their studies but these studies were not initially undertaken for the work they later supported.

The most important point made by the advocates of this approach was that it was the "intention of the learner" which makes a course vocational. What may be of general interest for some, is for others part of their strategy for entering upon new work. Several interviewees, supporting the open link between work and study, emphasized the individual nature of many clients' vocational needs and aspirations. In particular, they drew attention to the role of individuals' perceptions of how they could utilize new skills in the work place. Others pointed to students' attitude formation during courses, leading to important exploration of vocational niches and their own personal preferences. Vocational motivation and choice cannot always be assumed before a student embarks on a course. (Many courses, however, from Law to Electronics, may be none the worse for being chosen on prior vocational commitments.)

To the extent that TVEI is vocational it comes closest to this open link. Chapter Five showed that students explored their vocational options with considerable change in their aspirations in the course of the programme. Sometimes they discovered in their work

experience what occupations they <u>did not</u> want to enter. Students' confirmation or modification of vocational aspirations were typically in terms of their expressive needs, not in terms of "external goods" such as money.

Section 6: The Concept of Work

In pursuing the nature of vocational education, the nature of work itself is logically prior to the relationship between work and study. Perhaps it would be more accurate to speak of the nature of different kinds of work. My argument in this section is that the same kind of intrinsic and extrinsic value distinctions apply to work practices as educational practices. Furthermore there is no <u>a priori</u> reasons why intrinsic values may not be shared between practices in education and work.

Vocational education is sometimes taken, incorrectly, to be a contradiction in terms. This is based on the supposed opposition between intrinsic value inherent in education and the extrinsic value that characterizes vocational "training". Philosophers from Plato and Aristotle to Dewey and Peters distinguish "intrinsic" value in the education process from "extrinsic" value attached to mere "products" or outcomes of the educational process. Such a product could be valued, for example, purely for economic reasons. That does not mean, however, that intrinsic value lies only in the process and cannot be attached also to product. Rather, we attribute value to both because our understandings of them may be <u>under descriptions that share common value concepts</u>.[12] In others words the product and the process may be

---

[12] The logic of practice does not separate process and product, a point made strongly by Malcolm Skilbeck. See Section 8 below.

necessarily related through some shared criteria for judging both the practice and its outcomes. Let us say, for example, that management students take courses in Ethics or study Macbeth in order to become better managers. Then the "product", or managerial outcomes, of such an education may be judged by the same values of self reflection and moral awareness inherent in the study process. (This is a very different point from the one commonly made by "naive progressives" that process and product cannot be separated.)

The central question seems to be: can a vocational programme be educational? This can now be re-conceptualised in terms of shared value concepts: can vocational aspirations be valued under the same concepts that describe goods internal to an associated educational programme? That depends very much on the nature of the work and the degree to which a resonance obtains between a form of work's own process and product. Indeed, a distinction is made by Peter Herbst, following Hannah Arendt[13], between work and labour: "Work is non-contingently related to its product. The description of the process and the description of the product are part of a single conceptual scheme."[14] (Herbst, 1973, p 58) In contrast, labour is carried out for ends other than those which define the practice itself. Arendt's point is that work, as distinct from labour, is not driven by necessity, allows choice and, therefore, may express value. Arendt comments on the classical position "... all ancient estimates of human activities ... rest on the conviction that the labour of our body which is necessitated by its needs is slavish". (Arendt, 1958, p 82-3)[15] According to this, human beings engage

---

[13] The Human Condition, Chapters 3 and 4

[14] This supports the formulation, "descriptions that share common value concepts", in the previous paragraph.

[15] Two additional issues are raised by this quote. First, it describes the limitations of the ancient view with its possibilities of dualism. Perhaps, an argument is needed that

in labour merely for the sake of its products. In the extreme or limiting case, as in the Arendt quote, the products are "necessitated by need" in a peremptory or driven way, and, therefore, impinge on the freedom of the individual. In contrast, work accommodates the possibility of human expressiveness because degrees of discretion, choice and freedom are involved.

Of course internal goods which define certain kinds of work may not be those which define a particular educational practice. The latter typically depends on a telos envisaged for human beings. Education and work may contradict or reinforce each other in the light of an envisaged human telos. Nevertheless there is nothing in the nature of work that must of necessity oppose it to education when the latter is seen or even chosen as a preparation for some form of work. Indeed, a student committed to certain internal goods may want to know what work such study will make possible because of those study commitments. Even when a student may switch from one discipline to another (say, from Philosophy to Education) because of work opportunities, there may still be a large degree of intrinsic value involved (and not simply careerism) through a broader, encompassing desire to participate in the life of ideas.

Objections to vocational education are usually pursued by thinkers educated within the humanities. Careers in engineering, for example, are not always accorded the kind of intrinsic personal value that they might. However, a philosopher as eminent as Dewey made

---

distinguishes "reasonable" bodily needs, which may be honourably satisfied "within reason", from those that may be considered "slavish". Second, Arendt considered that the Greek attitude to the physical and the manual was corrupted by the practice of slavery. While this complicates the picture of the ancient world, the work/labour distinction remains a useful one for us.

the point as long ago as 1916: "Industry has ceased to be essentially a rule of thumb or procedure, handed down by custom ... As a consequence, industrial occupations have infinitely greater intellectual content and infinitely larger cultural possibilities than they used to possess". (Dewey, 1916, p 314) Dewey points to work that offers the kind of life which Aristotle saw as worthy of the "free man", ie, there is choice, discretion and one is not enslaved by routine. In other words it opens up the life of praxis which we will examine below in the next section.

Views of vocational education as providing factory fodder for the less able and less academic, to the extent they are justified, arise from the nature of the work for which people are being "prepared", rather than any general connections between work and study.[16] Indeed the notion of a vocation needs to be expanded beyond what are often intellectual prejudices that reach right back to Aristotle. Dewey has a more tolerant and flexible notion when he states:

> ... it is necessary to define a vocation with some fullness in order to avoid the impression that an education which centres about it is narrowly practical, if not merely pecuniary. A vocation means nothing but such a direction of life activities as renders them perceptibly significant to a person, because of the consequences they accomplish, and also useful to his associates. The opposite of a career is neither leisure nor culture, but aimlesssness, capriciousness, the absence of cumulative achievement in experience, on the personal side, and idle display, parasitic dependence upon others, on the social side. Occupation is a concrete term for continuity. It includes the development of artistic capacity of any kind, of special scientific ability, of effective citezenship, as well as professional and business occupations, to say nothing of mechanical labour or engagement in gainful pursuits. (Dewey, 1916, p 307)

---

[16] The reform of vocational education is, therefore, intimately connected with the reform of work.

Data gathered from Enfield TVEI students showed positive feed back from work experience and that they returned to studies with renewed, and sometimes, redirected interest. There was at least a partial demonstration of value congruence between work and study for those TVEI students. This did not apply quite so much to the high achievers who had their sights set on professional careers. Bernard Barker admits that TVEI did a great deal for the less academic. I believe a large part of this was their being able to make value connections between different parts of their lives, the different practices linking their present and their envisaged lives. It is important to remember that MacIntyre's notion of a practice has its context within what he calls a "life narrative" and TVEI offered many Enfield students the opportunity to begin the essentially imaginative task of constructing such narratives. They may have been tentative and faltering but they owned them and felt a genuine "eros" in their imagining.

Work, through goods internal to it, can help or hinder the potentialities of our human nature. Through goods external to it, work may also define social standing, not to mention its effect on our material condition. However, our post-Freudian perspective recognizes the complexity of separating goods internal and external to a practice. Evolving, changing social cultures affect the degree to which either external or internal goods are emphasized and give status to an occupation. The decade of greed that we have witnessed in the 1980's seemed to stress goods external to work. Now that the English speaking world, and Australia in particular, has been sent into spiralling debt by lionized entrepreneurs, the self actualizing aspects of work may perhaps be rediscovered.

Section 7: An Aristotelian Perspective

A more generous notion of the practical, in which meaning and action are interrelated, is often central in efforts to establish a comprehensive philosophy of education. It also characterizes the rhetoric of the FEU whose literature struck a chord with so many teachers searching for an educational philosophy that links theoretical and practical pursuits in a comprehensive curriculum whole. Of course, the idea of the practical can be trivialized to the level of manual dexterity or social strategy. However, the search for a broad notion of the practical is a persistent feature of much current educational writing. The figure frequently looked to in this connection is Aristotle. In this section we will examine some key Aristotelian notions surrounding the concept of the practical which has had an increasingly important influence in recent educational thought.

Aristotle opposes praxis and poiesis which, respectively, can be broadly taken to mean "doing" and "making". (Lobkovicz, 1967, 9) "Making" typically involves "producing" an artefact which constitutes the end of such activity; in contrast, "doing" has its end internal to the activity itself. For example, industrial management is a form of praxis whereas making the products of that industry is a form of poiesis. Lobkovicz comments: "We do sports or business or politics, and we make ships or houses or statues". (Ibid) However, the distinction is not as clear as it may first appear. While "making" necessarily focuses on an artefact, the process of making may have excellences internal to itself. Strict division between "doing" and "making" is not tenable for reasons already discussed in relation to the concept of a practice, in which we argued that a practice may be defined by both internal and external goods. Moreover, the simple empirical fact that production is usually intimately

connected with the praxis of human organisation is a further factor that links doing and making. The denial of the co-existence of internal and external goods within a practice and the dichotomy between "doing" and "making" has had a negative influence on vocational education. These assumptions, as much as any, have been responsible for the lower status traditionally accorded to "practical subjects" by the liberal curriculum theorists.

In another direction praxis is contrasted with theoria. Lobkovicz (1967, 7) points out the linguistic and cultural links for the Greeks between theoria and Theos (God). Our modern translation of "theoria" as "theory" may be somewhat inadequate; perhaps "contemplation" adds a necessary element, although, as Lobkovicz points out "the object of Greek contemplation was not God but his manifestations in the visible world". (Ibid, 8) This included what we would today call scientific enquiry but pursued for the sake of its awe-inspiring regularity. This has some modern echoes in the study of modern science from Newton to Einstein. It has echoes in Ray Elliot's call for the recognition of the importance of Eros in learning. If governments complain that not enough young people are studying science it may be because this is lacking.

Aristotle distinguishes praxis from theoria by its being embedded in a human and social context and by the fact that agents have to deal with "variability". Modern theorists also distinguish between the generality of theory and the variability of particulars. In the practical domain (real) problems are cross categorial and are not contained within any one set of theoretical abstractions. There are clear implications here for cross curricular initiatives that engage an Aristotelian notion of the practical. Schwab sees the need for correcting "tunnel vision" (p 333) through teaching what he calls the "arts of the eclectic". This means

developing capacities for "practical deliberation". Work, studied through its variety of frameworks, can offer ideal opportunities for this.

Thus, Aristotle distinguishes three fundamentally different modes of human activity and being:

> ... since it is impossible to deliberate about things that are of necessity, practical wisdom cannot be scientific knowledge nor art; not science because that which can be done is capable of being otherwise, not art because action and making are different kinds of thing. The remaining alternative, then, is that it is a true and reasoned state of capacity to act with regard to the things that are good or bad for man. For while making has an end other than itself, action cannot; for good action itself is its end. (Ethics, VI 5, 1140b, in McKeon, 1941, p 1026)

Aristotle understands praxis as practical wisdom about "things which are variable", upon which agents must "deliberate". This differs in one direction from the understanding of universal, "demonstrable", scientific principles, and in the other, from the "art" of making. In deliberative action, which contains its own ends, the wise person is:

> able to deliberate well about what is good and expedient about himself, not in some particular respect, e.g. about what sorts of thing conduce to health or to strength, but about what sorts of thing conduce to the good life in general. (Ibid)

Practical deliberation differs from scientific demonstration in that while an understanding of (first) principles may be involved, these do not by themselves provide unproblematic answers. This is not simply because of contextual complexity or the clash of incommensurable principles but also, and indeed primarily, because prior ontological questions of the nature of "the good life" are involved which, in their turn, require some ontological conception of human nature itself, raising questions of self knowledge and reflexive definition.

This Aristotelian notion of the practical has a moral and intellectual dimension that has frequently been lost. Gadamer, (in Bernstein, 1983, 39) comments:

> In my own eyes the great merit of Aristotle was that he anticipated the impasse of our scientific culture by his description of the structure of practical reason as distinct from theoretical knowledge and technical skill.... the problem of our society is that the longing of the citizenry for orientation and normative patterns invests the expert with an exaggerated authority. Modern society expects him to provide a substitute for past moral and political orientations. Consequently the concept of praxis which was developed in the last two centuries is an awful deformation of what practice really is. In all the debates of the last two centuries practice was understood as application of science to technical tasks....It degrades practical reason to technical control. (Gadamer, 1975, 312)

Essentially, praxis, denuded of its social and institutional setting, is no longer praxis. MacIntyre makes a similar point on what he refers to as "the failure of the enlightenment project" in moral thought: "The individual moral agent, freed from hierarchy and teleology, conceives of himself and is conceived by moral philosophers as sovereign in his moral authority". (1985, 62) Both MacIntyre and Gadamer are referring to attempts in the last two centuries to devise frameworks freed from socio-historical constraints. For MacIntyre it leads to philosophical delusions and for Gadamer to an impoverished notion of practice. Both philosophers point to the dangers of applying "pure reason" to human settings and eliminating Aristotelian phronesis or "practical reasoning".[17] Phronesis is the kind of reasoning that supports praxis and has "the ability to do justice to situations in their particularity" (Bernstein, loc. cit., 219). However, we must not mystify phronesis by creating an autonomous realm of being separated from theoria and techne. Bernstein, in discussing Gadamer's interpretation of phronesis, comments: "We can appeal to the Greeks in order to point out that both for them and for us techne without phronesis is blind, while

---

[17] Gadamer's response is the "hermeneutical circle" which restores the dialectic between history and philosophy; MacIntyre advocates an ontological dimension both in terms of particular human settings and human nature itself.

310

phronesis without techne is empty". (Loc. Cit., 161) This has an important bearing on vocational education in so far as it overlaps with the technical, as indeed it typically does in life and work.

A western culture, which has largely collapsed Aristotle's three modes of human activity into a simple duality of theory and technique, has hurt the fortunes of vocational education. It has meant that we do not have a coherent language to describe the complexity of those "things which are variable" and intimately connected with human living. Of course, the dimension is not lost to human experience; it exists in the tacit understandings of those engaged in work (Cotter, 1982, Polanyi, 1958). Such tacit understandings of agents engaged in practical, including manual, activities, are typically in terms of values internal to the process. It was exemplified by many Enfield TVEI students whose vocational aspirations could not be separated from practices centrally defined by concepts of "internal goods". Generally, this understanding remains tacit in the agent's consciousness because of the lack of a coherent discourse that operates with a sufficiently rich concept of the practical. While philosophical discourse may have been deformed in the way Gadamer indicates, praxis is preserved unwittingly in human action. This is what makes the agent's point of view all the more critical, and TVEI students' experience all the more important. For them, as for us now, vocational links were generally life-enhancing and encouraged a kind of practical, reflexive deliberation that was clearly lacking in what they called "lessons".

Section 8: A Modern Perspective for Vocational Education

In this section I want to explore briefly a modern philosophical perspective that creates a more sympathetic climate for understanding vocational education. This perspective is most easily identifed in negative terms, what Richard Rorty calls the end of the "Cartesian-Lockean-Kantian Tradition". (1979, Ch. 1) Rorty shares with such writers as Thomas Kuhn and Thomas Nagel the view that the Kantian ideal of "unifying the manifold of experience" is a misconceived "foundationalism", a vain search for an Archimedian epistemological point. I will examine how the liberal educational tradition devalues vocational education, tracing the reasons for this to the philosophical tradition that Rorty sees as coming to an end.

Cultural attitudes to notions of the "practical" fundamentally affect the status of vocational education, not to mention different kinds of work. Deep seated preferences for either "theoretical" or "practical" pursuits are embedded in different sub-cultures. This is peculiar not only to modern social "classes" but has a long history. (Dewey, 1916, 250) A. N. Whitehead draws a historical comparison between the archetypal figures of Plato and St. Benedict as "symbolic figures typical of antithetical notions". (1932, 70) They each represent a vision of what it means to live a fully human existence. For the former the world as experienced was one of "appearances" or shadows and the developed human being focused on the ideal world of the forms; for the latter, human existence was multi-layered and human development required elements of practical achievement, even some manual work.

Despite the importance of Aristotle's insights discussed in the last section, he also shared

Plato's adulation for the life of pure contemplation (Nicomachean Ethics, Book X). Richard

Bernstein comments:

> There is deep irony in the tradition that Aristotle helped to initiate. Aristotle is at
> once one the noblest defenders of the autonomy and integrity of praxis and phronesis
> and also the philosopher who sowed the seeds for the denigration of practical
> philosophy".[18] (Bernstein, 1983, 47)

The dichotomy between theory and practice that developed from the time of the Greeks was

based on an impoverished notion of practice as, at best, an exemplification of theory, rather

than a mode of being in its own right.

This view of the practical has informed much of our traditional epistemology. Its influence

is clearly evident in the analytical school of philosophy which has contributed a great deal

to educational thinking. Some narrow conceptions of vocational education have resulted from

philosophical programmes aiming to define education in transcendent, content-free, context-

free terms. This framework has a wider philosophical currency than the contemporary

Analytical School. Durkeim identifies a broad philosophical root system:

> For Kant as for Mill, for Herbart as for Spencer, the object of education would be
> above all to realize, in each individual, carrying them to their highest point of
> perfection, the attributes of the human species in general. They stated as a truism
> that there is one education and one alone, which, to the exclusion of any other, is
> suitable for all men indiscriminately, whatever may be the historical and social
> conditions on which they depend - and that it is this abstract and unique ideal that the
> theorists of education propose to determine. (Durkeim, 1956, 115, cited in
> Enthwistle, 1978, 180-1)

This framework discourages linking education to vocation, with its focus on "historical and

social conditions" and has led to the overemphasis on the education/training divide. The

following comment is representative of this position:

---

[18] This ignores, of course, the role of Plato.

> We use the phrases "trained in" and "trained for" when we wish to talk about vocational, utilitarian or specialized pursuits. We do not speak of a person being educated "in" or "for" or "at" anything in particular. (Peters, 1973, 19)

This is the search for the context-free conception of education. To be fair to Peters, I doubt that he is offering this as a definition, nor am I denying that there are certain universal, cognitive and moral categories which should not be ignored in the theory and practice of education. However, the Peters' quote is representative of the kind of discourse that has discouraged looking at an "empirical" or "historical" dimension in formulating educational policy.[19] This discourse has also buttressed what used to be called the "new liberal curriculum" (Cotter, 1982, 17). In the end it contributed little to creating a climate in which might have emerged a publicly shared educational consensus that could have seen off attempts by the Conservative government to impose their highly prescriptive, divisive National Curriculum, and indeed a TVEI based on highly confused and divisive policy statements.

In the tradition of analytical philosophy it has been the practice to discover the meaning of education by conceptual analysis, ignoring what purposes education might serve in particular circumstances. Certain universal categories (eg, "rationality", "morality"), derived from pure reflection, are held to be a sufficient analysis of the meaning of education, irrespective of the context. Educational meanings, however, are not independent of social, economic, and industrial circumstances. "Any (conceptual) analysis", as Pring points out, "is itself within a particular social tradition that colours how one sees it". (1987, 31) My purpose is not to deny the important function of the analytical tradition which has admirably explored

---

[19] I would still be unfair to Peters if I did not point out that his later work transcends the early analytical framework.

the "categorical imperatives" of the meaning of education, distinguishing these from the merely hypothetical. Generally, however, the contextual contingencies that are inseparable from particularized educational practice are given insufficient attention. The important "necessary" truths crowd out consideration of the merely "contingent". The wedge driven between the two impoverish both and give rise to all those damaging dichotomies - theory and practice, education and training, liberal and vocational. In so doing Aristotelian phronesis is lost. The tradition of treating conceptual and contingent truths in separate domains is shared by both rationalists and empiricists (Aune, 1970). However, this tradition has been thoroughly criticized by a number of influential philosophers in recent years (Quine, Bernstein, MacIntyre, Rorty, Nagel). Indeed, it was challenged in the last generation by Winch, and by Collingwood in the generation before that. Going even further back, the pragmatic tradition, from which Dewey sprung, has been immune from this overemphasis on defining key concepts by focusing on timeless, context-free, universal categories. (Aune, 1970; Quine, 1953)

The effect of treating necessary and contingent truths in a discontinuous way has been to create different discourses for educational philosophers and sociologists. There have been some important exceptions. In Curriculum Studies, for example, conceptual and empirical issues have been inextricably linked in the task of solving real educational problems. Philosophical and sociological viewpoints are not collapsed but engage nevertheless in a common dialogue. Schwab contends that the problems in curriculum stem largely from an inability to exploit multiple perspectives in refining our perception and understanding of educational practice. Far from alleviating this, the analytic tradition has fissured the study

of education by restraining its scope to a "purer" conceptual analysis. This state of affairs

has drawn this comment from Harold Ent wistle:

> ... the philosophical perspective in education seemingly stands in conflict with the sociological. The former is essentially humanist in conceptualising education without reference to limiting social categories like nationality, religion, race, and, especially, class. (Ent wistle, 1978, 180)

It would be incorrect, however to assume that the Analytical School is the only, or even

dominant, tradition in the broad sweep of Western Philosophy. Within contemporary British

philosophy, for example, there have been those who have resisted the almost pathological

fear of committing the "naturalistic fallacy". G. J. Warnock, for example, has described

much of this century's moral theory as "empty", arguing against quarantining ethics from the

world in which they are enacted or invoked, resisting specifically "the content-less

characterisation of 'morality'" (1971, viii). A somewhat different tradition, Pragmatism,

whatever else may be said about it, at least recognizes the need to ground philosophical

categories in a cultural context. Furthermore, as we have been emphasizing, a tradition that

goes back to Aristotle assumes that rationality and morality, while aiming at universality, are

understood, developed and refined within a context. The Aristotelian concept of "phronesis"

and the tradition of "practical reasoning" on which it is based, has always had its

practitioners in widely different times and places. Aquinas, Montesquieu, Vico and the

educational philosopher J.J. Schwab are diverse in very many respects but all attest to the

continued influence of Aristotelian practical reasoning.

Clearly, not all modern perspectives are wedded to a dichotomous divide between education

and training, based as it often is, on an a priori definition of education, which itself rests on

certain assumptions about definition, and what Rorty identifies as the philosophical anxiety

"that all contributions to a given discourse are commensurable" (1979, 316). In contrast,

316

Dewey did not have the same exaggerated respect for not crossing some "philosopher's line" between necessary and contingent truths. He also had a great deal less trouble in dealing with vocational education. For Dewey, education had to be firmly rooted in the social dimension of the human condition; this is not dissimilar to the central role that the Greeks attached to the city state in the life of the autonomous individual. Dewey identifies three ways in which vocational aims impinge on education (1916, 308-11). Firstly, an occupation is "the only thing which balances the distinctive capacity of an individual with his social service". We may not accept that an occupation is the "only thing" but, it must surely be a major avenue for an individual's expression of "social service". Dewey places geat emphasis on individual's discovering a "right occupation" that ensures that "the aptitudes of a person are in adequate play". Secondly, because an occupation is a continuous, purposive activity, he comments: "Education through occupations consequently combines within itself more of the factors conducive to learning than any other method". (For the same reason it is also conducive to creating MacIntyre's "life narratives".) Thirdly, Dewey contends that the only adequate training for occupations is training through occupations.

A balance between universal and contextual factors is also found in some models of curriculum planning. Denis Lawton (Lawton, 1983, 30) emphasizes the importance of a dialogue between "cultural invariants" and "cultural variables" in establishing principles for educational planning. Malcolm Skilbeck speaks of the need for "clear and strong organising ideas" as well as "the need to be open to the diversity, variety and ordinariness of practice ... in specific situations". (1984, 1) These approaches to curriculum planning are compatible with those broader notions of rationality, already referred to, adopted by those philosophers attempting to lessen the discontinuities inherent in the objectivism/relativism divide.

(Bernstein, 1983; MacIntyre, 1985; Rorty, 1979) This philosophical climate is more sympathetic than the analytical tradition to allowing vocational considerations to be included as central elements in educational planning. In particular, because of the perceived importance of linking ideals to human communities, it is sympathetic to an organic relationship between education and the vocational aspirations of learners.

This organic relationship can be expressed in those kinds of practice embedded in moral communities, as defined by MacIntyre. Clearly, some occupations are ranked, without any objections, as constituted by such practices. The status is not so easily granted to other occupations such as carpentry and plumbing. The liberal curriculum theorists devalue practical pursuits (in the Aristotelian sense of "making") because they serve a utilitarian purpose and, therefore, lack "intrinsic" value. However, they clearly can satisfy the criteria that the liberal curriculum theorists require of those areas of knowledge that are seen as intrinsically worthwhile. (Cotter, 1982, pp 15 ff; Walsh, 1978, pp 60-62) A writer such as Hirst defines intrinsic educational worth in terms similar to the notion of internal goods that identify MacIntyre's practice. For the purpose of my argument it is not necessary that all practical occupations attain the status of a MacIntyrean practice. There is simply nothing in practical pursuits per se that would exclude them.

I am not arguing against the need for universal values in education. Nor am I suggesting that the culture of a single setting, such as a particular occupation, should be the sole ground for deriving the kind of universal moral categories that provide the essential framework of practices such as education. The issue is related to Peter Winch's (1962 and 1972) central concern that while our central principles derive from particular cultures (or practices), cross

cultural awareness offers a kind of dialectic that allows us to become more critically aware of our own values and raise the grounds of our belief and action beyond pure convention or even personal taste. Bernstein quotes Winch (1972) on this point, "...the concept of learning from which is involved the study of other cultures is closely linked with the concept of wisdom. We are confronted not just with different techniques, but with new possibilities of good and evil in relation to which men may come to terms with life". (Bernstein, 1983, p 29) Curriculum planning, with its tensions between philosophical, sociological and psychological perspectives, not to mention different cultures and sub-cultures, is a paradigm case of this aspect of the human condition. Considerations of vocation cannot be excluded in this multi-layered educational perspective.

In the Enfield study, TVEI students demonstrated that their vocational interests did not violate those universal aspects of "education" as demanded by the liberal theorists. In the classic statement of the liberal position, Richard Peters distinguishes education from other kinds of instruction by three criteria, first, its worthwhileness, second, its cognitive perspectives "that are not inert", and third, the adoption of learning processes that promote "wittingness and voluntariness on the part of the learner". (1966, p 19) Dearden (1984) echoes this position in terms of autonomous critical judgement and the development of understanding that has breadth and depth. Dearden also admits that vocational education is possible but that it must have a dimension that allows reflection on the work itself; in other words, education for an occupation should be critical and reflexive like any other form of education.

Much of the practice in Enfield would have satisfied the liberal position as well as Dewey's ideal. Indeed there is a great deal of overlap between the kinds of practice that the two positions might denote. However, it is also important to see the different connotations: Dewey saw educational practice as reinforcing the social forces of democracy, not simply something for its own sake, with universal ideals grounded in human community. The difference between the two positions is perhaps most obviously expressed in the liberal sense of outrage and panic when the vocational connection is proposed. Rarely is there the same response from the liberal theorists when the traditional subject curriculum endangers reflexive praxis, though, perhaps, they might if the full implications of the learner's "wittingness and voluntariness" were taken seriously. This is not to deny that the claims of political manipulation of education in the name of vocation, are not justified, or that some forms of vocational education are not pernicious. However, Enfield students discriminated between genuine vocational education and any travesty of it. They showed a clear awareness of the intellectual emptiness and even shame attached to some low level "skills learning". Generally, the vocational dimension, grounded in contexts towards which they felt some identity, provided students with opportunities to cooperate with others, inside and outside the school, to advance their own conceptual and social development.

CONCLUSIONS

The fieldwork and the reflections it stimulated support a number of broad conclusions. First, Enfield provides an example of an LEA that functioned as a positive reference-point for schools and individuals in a time of vast educational change. Second, educational management structures, in order to handle this interactive, "post-modern" curriculum scene, need to be more flexible, integrated, and focused on the whole curriculum. As a corollary to this, the aspiration to deep change in educational processes stands little chance of success if pursued within an isolated curriculum initiative, unless allies and partners are found in the main-stream curriculum. Thus vocational values, in particular, are more likely to be efficacious (in part because they are more meaningful) if they are related to the curriculum as a whole. Third, Technology Education cannot be contained within neat subject boundaries. Fourth, a vocational dimension in education can positively enrich education if it is conceived within the larger, cognitive and moral perspectives of general education. A "vocationalism", that is narrowly and wholly focused on occupational tasks, is impoverishing. This broader view is notably facilitated by an understanding of the vocational which is informed by such basic concepts as Aristotle's "practical reasoning" and Alasdair MacIntyre's notion of a practice.

The conclusions have been based on close observation and some degree of participation in Enfield TVEI. A narrative, stretching over a period of seven years, provides a longitudinal perspective with insights into directions and patterns of developments. The large amount of data - while not quantified - provide strong support for these conclusions.

A caveat remains. The work is very much a case study rather than the case study, in any definitive sense, of TVEI. In this study TVEI is exemplified through one case, which has no central or privileged position over any other.

The Educational Community of Enfield

As an LEA, Enfield functioned very well, and in the main benignly, as an educational community that was a source of identity, encouragement and leadership. Enfield LEA exemplified a collaborative culture with which teachers, school administrators, officers and advisers identified strongly and positively. In the early stages the intervention of TVEI created some tension. This proved a stimulus for creating new structures which facilitated curriculum change and resolved those early tensions in favour of the local culture. In the end, though TVEI was a national project, it actively contributed to teachers' and administrators' sense of themselves as Enfield people.

Management and Change Issues

When TVEI commenced, Enfield management structures were still largely subject-based, at both LEA and school levels, though there were strong aspirations for a more integrated curriculum. TVEI, firstly in the Base Programme, and later in the main-stream curriculum, was at the forefront of experiments in integration. The tensions between cross-curricular and subject-based orientations were progressively resolved as LEA and school managements developed a team structure with a whole curriculum focus, which included TVEI.

This supports the view that significant change is never along a single dimension but occurs on a wide front. Changes, such as occurred in Enfield TVEI, cannot be understood or

effected in terms of isolated programmes, as is sometimes attempted in vocational education. Within Enfield, broad educational policy was towards more flexible and experientially-based forms of teaching and learning. Within this framework TVEI became a potent focus for change, not least in the lives of teachers and students who experienced a new sense of hope, energy and educational direction.

Technology Issues

From the start, differences existed within the authority regarding the nature of Technology, with implications for Technology Education. For some, Technology was whol ly related to the designing and making of artefacts; for others, Technology was simply a way of solving problems, even those that had no relationship with artefacts. By 1989 Enfield TVEI had begun to forge a flexible and balanced working definition of technology as both artefact-related and based in human and social contexts.

In curriculum terms, a broad Technology prevailed against the narrow and specialist pursuit of Technology Studies, either as Science- or Craft-based. New management structures facilitated this cross curricular approach. While some specialist study continued in Technology, resources were mainly devoted to a broader provision involving a variety of subject teachers.

Vocational Issues

Never envisaged as a preparation for a particular occupation, TVEI was initially seen by influential backers, however, as a discrete pre-vocational programme for particular kinds of pupils. But it did not remain discrete for long. Nationally and within Enfield it came to be

more and more integrated into mainstream secondary curriculum. It influenced the mainstream curriculum towards more experiential, active and cross-curricular styles of teaching and learning. "Vocational" emphases on practical learning, and on experiencing some of the reality behind classroom discourse, came to be shared by mainstream teachers. In such a context it becomes progressively clearer that vocational education and general education cannot be quarantined from each other. If vocational education retains an importance of its own through the links it establishes with the world of work, it is because the powerful educational dynamic that can result from these links may be expected to enhance the learner's cognitive and social development generally. In broad terms, that is to rediscover that education does not take place in a social vacuum. Thus the case study suggests that vocational initiatives can beneficially open up the school and its curriculum to the local community. It is only when vocational education lacks broad, cognitive, social and moral perspectives, when it focuses exclusively on narrow tasks, that it impoverishes education - but then it has begun to impoverish itself.

Such a reduction is to surrender the human dignity embodied in the rich concept of a practice, historically embedded and understood in terms of Aristotelian phronesis or "practical reasoning". Work is reduced to labour, understood just as decontextualized technical skills and tradable commodities. Such impoverishment means the denial of goods internal to a practice as elaborated by Alasdair MacIntyre, with the consequent loss of the Aristotelian insight into the moral and intellectual dimensions of the practical. As Richard Bernstein puts it: "... techne without phronesis is blind, while phronesis without techne is empty". Enfield TVEI developed a range of professional practice that embodied the dialectical embrace of both.

APPENDIX

Background to the Australian study reported in Ch 7, Sect 5

In 1987 The Hawthorn Institute of Education invited me to conduct a study of TAFE's policy of "vocationalism". A member of the TAFE Board was on the Institute Council and felt that a study that clarified TAFE rhetoric would have benefits for TAFE and Hawthorn.

At that time the term "vocational" was featured in many TAFE documents and was frequently invoked in public statements. Tensions within the TAFE Board and in the TAFE teaching system often revolved around this concept. My task was to review and elaborate its meaning in TAFE policy.

I soon discovered that TAFE documents which featured the term were of little use. No elaboration was attempted. It was simply assumed that everyone knew what vocationalism meant. As a consequence, I turned to interviewing key people on the TAFE Board and in the TAFE Colleges. It was from these quite diverse group of interviewees that I conceptualized the four different links between work and study. These categories were not used by the interviewees; rather they constituted a framework I imposed which help me to order the range of responses.

A fuller report exists which has not been published. About the time the report was completed the TAFE Board was abolished and the system has been through several subsequent restructures. As I write it is experiencing a national 24 hour strike.

GLOSSARY

<u>Base Programme</u> - An integrated "core" in Enfield TVEI schools under the responsibility of each school co-ordinator

<u>Baseroom</u> - a room in each school for the exclusive use of the early TVEI cohorts

<u>CIG</u> - Curriculum Initiatives Group which comprised a number of small development teams, one of which developed Option C

<u>CTC</u> - Central Training Council in Dept of Labour (abolished in favour of MSC)

<u>CDT</u> - Craft Design Technology, a (former) school subject

<u>CGLI</u> - City and Guilds of London Institute, a programme development and assessment agency, specializing in technical areas

<u>CSCS</u> - Centre for the Study of Comprehensive Schools

<u>CSG</u> - Central Support Group, an Enfield LEA group of advisory teachers directly supporting TVEI course and staff development

<u>ERA</u> - Educational Reform Act (1988), establishing the NC

<u>FE</u> - Further Education, roughly paralleling Australian TAFE

<u>Features Co-ordinators</u> - Appointed in Enfield to co-ordinate areas such as profiling, industry links, teaching and learning styles

<u>FEU</u> - Further Education Unit, a prolific publisher

<u>GCSE</u> - General Certificate of Secondary Education, a common 17+ exam replacing multiplicity of exams; has some points in common with VCE

<u>ITBs</u> - Industrial Training Boards, in different industries, under the CTC

<u>LEA</u> - Local Education Authority, administers education in local regions

<u>LMS</u> - Local Management of Schools, a feature of ERA (1988), devolving authority to individuals schools with repercussions for LEA management

OECD - Organisation for Economic and Cultural Development

Option C - was a central part of Enfield's first TVEI submission

MSC - Manpower Services Commission within Dept of Labour which funded TVEI

NC National Curriculum, the major outcome of ERA (1988)

RSA - Royal Society of Arts, a course development and examining agency

SC - Schools Council (now abolished) sponsored curriculum projects and publications

School Co-ordinators - initially responsible in each school for TVEI which was in effect the

Base Programme and to which they more or less restricted themselves

TA - Training Agency, renamed or modified from the MSC in 1987

TAFE - Technical and Further Education, broadly Australian counterpart of FE

Tech/Voc Options (or TVOs) - Technical/Vocational Options, Enfield TVEI electives which

commenced in September 1984, the second year of the scheme

TGAT - Task Group on Assessment and Testing, whose report in late 1987 provided

guidelines for the ERA legislation

TUC - Trade Union Congress, the British counterpart to the Australian ACTU

TVEI - Technical and Vocational Education Initiative

TVEI Development Team (Enf LEA) - helped develop a broader TVEI from Sept 1985

TVEI Management Team (School) - a broadly-based team set up in each school from Sept

1985, responsible for a broader TVEI across the whole school

TVEI Steering Group (Enfield LEA) - another broadly-based group responsible for

developing an overview of the scheme across the Authority

VCE - Victorian Certificate of Education, a common course and examination for the final

Years 11 and 12, which, like GCSE, replaces a multiple system

YTS - Youth Training Scheme, two year training course, funded by MSC

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aldrich, Richard (1988) "The National Curriculum: an historical perspective" in Lawton, Denis and Chitty, Clyde The National Curriculum Institute of Education University of London

Apple, Michael (1982) Cultural and Economic Reproduction in Education RKP London

Archer, Margaret S. (1988) Culture and Agency:The Place of Culture in Social Theory Cambridge, CUP

Arendt, Hannah (1958) The Human Condition, Chicago, University of Chicago Press

Aristotle Nichamachean Ethics in McKeon, Richard, (Ed) (1941) The Basic Works of Aristotle New York, Random House

Aune, Bruce (1970) Rationalism, Empiricism and Pragmatism: An Introduction New York, Random House

Barker, Bernard (1987) "Prevocationalism and schooling" in Maurice Holt (Ed) Skills and Vocationalism: The Easy Answer, Milton Keynes, Open Univ Press

Barnes, Douglas (1987a) "A first impression: TVEI in six schools" in Gleeson, Denis TVEI and Secondary Education: A Critical Appraisal Milton Keynes, Open University Press

Barnes, Douglas et al (1987b) The TVEI Curriculum 14-16: An Interim Report Based on Case Studies in Twelve Schools University of Leeds School of Education

Barnett, Corelli (1986) The Audit of War: The Illusion of a Great Nation London, Macmillan

Barraclough, Geoffrey (1964) An Introduction to Contemporary History London, Penguin

Bernstein, Richard J. (1983) Beyond Objectivism and Relativism Basil Blackwell Oxford

Bernstein, Richard J. (1986) Philosophical Profiles Cambridge Polity Press

Black, Paul and Harrison, Geoffrey (1985) In Place of Confusion: Technology and Science in the School Curriculum London, Nuffield-Chelsea Curriculum Trust

Bridgewood, Ann (1987) "Technical and vocational education: a comparison between initiatives in Britain and abroad" in Educational Research Vol 29 No. 3, pp. 163-172

Bristow, Adrian (1970) Inside the Colleges of Further Education London, HMSO

Burgess, Robert G. (1984) In The Field London Allen and Unwin

Burgess, Robert G. (1985) Strategies of Educational Research London Falmer Press

Burke, Edmund (1790) <u>Reflections on the Revolution in France</u>, (current edition edited by Conor Cruise O'Brien, Penguin, 1982)

Cantor, Leonard M and Roberts, I F (1972) <u>Further Education in England and Wales</u> London RKP

Cantor, Leonard M. and Roberts I.F. (1979) <u>Further Education Today</u> London RKP

Cattell, David (1985) "New Vocationalism - the relevance of the 1890's" in <u>Vocational Aspects of Education</u> Vol 37, No 98, Dec 1985

Chitty, Clyde (1989) <u>Towards a New Education System: the Victory of the New Right?</u> Lewes, Essex, Falmer Press

CGLI (July 1981) <u>365 - Course in Vocational Preparation (General)</u> London, CGLI

Cohen, Louis and Manion, Lawrence (1980) <u>Research Methods in Education</u> London, Croom Helm

Collingwood, R.G. (1956) <u>The Idea of History</u> New York, Oxford University Press

Cooley, M. (1980) <u>Architect or Bee?: The Human\Technology Relationship</u> Sydney, TransNational Co-operative

Cornall (1989) "The dear little deadly question of how to do it" <u>Forum</u> Autumn 1989, Vol. 32, No. 1

Cotter, Richard (1982) <u>An Investigation of Some Issues Concerned with the Relationship between Theoretical and Practical Activities in Vocational Education</u> Unpublished MA Dissertation, University of London Institute of Education

Cotter, Richard <u>The Elusive Curriculum: Looking for TVEI</u> University of London Institute of Education

       Interim Report (1): <u>An Early History of Enfield TVEI</u>, September, 1985
       Interim Report (2): <u>Curriculum Development in Enfield TVEI</u>, December, 1985
       Interim Report (3): <u>The Students' Experience of TVEI</u>, April 1986
       <u>Summary Report of Enfield TVEI</u>, May 1986

Cotter, Richard (1987) <u>Vocationalism in TAFE</u> Hawthorn, Australia, Hawthorn Institute of Education

Cross, Anita and McCormick, Bob (1989) <u>Technology in Schools</u> Milton Keynes, Open University Press

C.S.C.S. (1989) <u>TVEI in Extension</u> York & London

Dale, Roger (1985) <u>Employment, Training and Education: Towards a New Vocationalism?</u>

Oxford, Open University/Pergamon Press

Dale, Roger (1986) "Examining the gift-horse's teeth: a tentative analysis of TVEI" in Walker, Stephen and Barton Len (1986) Youth, Employment and Schooling Milton Keynes, Open University

Dancy, John (1984) TVEI: Perspectives 14 School of Education University of Exeter

Danto, Arthur (1971) What Philosophy Is London, Penguin

Dearden "Education and Training" in Westminister Studies of Education, 1984

DES (1977) Curriculum 11-16, London, HMSO

DES (1981) Curriculum 11-16: A Review of Progress London HMSO

DES (1985) The Curriculum from 5 to 16 London HMSO

Dewey, John (1916) Democracy and Education New York, Macmillan

Durkheim, E (1956) Education and Sociology London, Collier-Macmillan

Elton, G.R. (1974) England under the Tudors London, Methuen

Eisner, Elliot (1979) The Educational Imagination: On the Design and Evaluation of School Programs New York, Macmillan

Elliot, R.K. (1974) "Education, love of one's subject, and the love of truth" in Proceedings of the the Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain, Vol 8, No 1, pp 135-153

Ent'wistle, Harold (1978) Class, Culture and Education London, Methuen

Evans, John and Davies, Brian (1988) "The rise and fall of vocational educational" in Pollard, Purvis and Walford

Evans, Karen (1980) Day Release - A Desk Study London FEU

Farley, Michael (1985) "Trends and structural changes in English vocational eduation" in Dale (1985)

FEU (1979a) A Basis of Choice London

FEU (1979b) Active Learning - A Register (Parts 1 and 2) London

FEU (1980) Beyond Coping - Some Approaches to Social Education London

FEU (1982) Profiles London

FEU (1984) <u>Profiles in Action</u> London

FEU (1985) <u>Progressing to College - A 14-16 Core</u> London

Fiddy Rob and Stronach Ian (1987) "Fables and futures: cases in the management of innovation" in Gleeson, Denis (Ed) <u>TVEI and Secondary Education</u> Milton Keynes, Open University Press

Flude, Michael and Hammer, Merril (1990) <u>The Education Reform Act: its Origins and Implications</u> Lewes, East Sussex, Falmer Press

Fullan, Michael (1982) <u>The Meaning of Educational Change</u> Toronto, OISE Press

Fullan, Michael (1989) "Managing educational change" in Preedy, Margaret (1989) <u>Approaches to Curriculum Management</u> Milton Keynes, Open University Press

Fullan, Michael (1991) <u>The New Meaning of Educational Change</u> (2nd Ed.) New York, Teachers' College Press

Frankfurt Harry G. (1988) "Freedom of the will and the concept of a person" in <u>The Importance of What We Care About</u> Cambridge, CUP

Gadamer Hans-Georg (1979) <u>Truth and Method</u> London, Sheed and Ward

Gadamer, Hans-Georg (1975) "Hermeneutics and Social Science" <u>Cultural Hermeneutics</u> Vol 2

Gipps, Caroline (1988a) "What exams would mean for primary education" in Lawton, Denis and Chitty, Clyde <u>The National Curriculum</u> Institute of Education University of London

Gipps, Caroline (1988b) "The TGAT Report" trick or treat", <u>Forum</u> Autumn 1988. Vol 31, No 1

Gipps, Caroline (1989) "National assessment and the evaluation of schools", <u>Forum</u> Autumn 1989, Vol 32, No 1

Gipps, Caroline and Goldstein, Harvey (1989) "A curriculum for teachers assessment" <u>Journal of Curriculum Studies</u> Vol 21, No 6

Gleeson, Denis and Mardle, George (1980) <u>Further Education or Training?</u> London, RKP

Gleeson, Denis (Ed) (1987) <u>TVEI and Secondary Education</u> Milton Keynes Open University Pres

Godfrey, Ian L. (1987) "Setting up a TVEI French course at Sixth Form level" <u>British Journal of Language Teaching</u> Vol 25, No 1

Goodall, Joe (1982) unpublished MA dissertation, Univ of London Institute of Education

Golby, Michael (1987) "Vocationalism and education" in Holt, Maurice (Ed) (1987) <u>Skills and Vocationalism: the Easy Answer</u> Milton Keynes, Open University Press

Gold, R (1958) "Roles in Sociological field observations" <u>Social Forces</u> Vol 36, No 3, pp 217-23

Grosch, Paul (1987) "The New Sophists: the work and assumptions of the FEU" in Holt, Maurice (Ed) (1987) <u>Skills and Vocationalism: the Easy Answer</u> Milton Keynes, Open University Press

Guba, Egon and Lincoln Yvonne (1981) <u>Effective Evaluation</u> San Francisco, Jossey Bass

Handy, Charles (1978) <u>Understanding Organisations</u>, 2nd Ed., London Penguin

Handy, Charles (1984) <u>Taken For Granted? Looking at Schools as Organisations</u> London, Longmans

Handy Charles and Robert Aitken (1986) <u>Understanding Schools as Organisations</u> London Penguin

Harrison, Geoffrey (1980) "Response II" to Walker (See Walker)

Harland, Janet (1986) "The view from Croydon" in McCabe, Colin (Ed) <u>TVEI: The Organisation of the Early Years of the Technical and Vocational Education Initiative</u> Clevedon, Avon, Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Harland, Janet (1987) "The TVEI experience: issues of control, response and the professional role of teachers" in Gleeson, Denis <u>TVEI and Secondary Education</u> Milton Keynes, Open University Press

Haviland, Julian (1988) (Ed) <u>Take Care, Mr Baker!</u> London, Fourth Estate

Heidegger, Martin (1977) "The question concerning technology" in <u>Basic Writings</u> (trans. David Krell) New York, Harper and Row

Herbst, Peter, (1973) "Work, labour and university education" in R.S. Peters (Ed) <u>The Philosophy of Education</u> Oxford, OUP

Hill Stephen (1988) <u>The Tragedy of Technology</u> London, Pluto Press

Hinckley, Susan M. (1987) <u>The TVEI Experience: Views from Teachers and Students</u> Moorfoot, Sheffield, MSC/NFER

Holt, Maurice (1987) "Vocationalism on the hoof" in Holt, Maurice (Ed) <u>Skills and Vocationalism: The easy answer</u> Milton Keynes, Open University

Honneth, Axel and Joas, Hans (translated by Raymond Meyer) (1988) <u>Social Action and Human Nature</u> Cambridge, C.U.P.

Hopkins, David (Ed) (1990) <u>TVEI at the Change of Life</u> Clevedon, Multilingual Matters

House, E.R. (1980) <u>Evaluating with Validity</u> Beverly Hills, Calif., Sage

Ihde, Don (1983) <u>Existential Technics</u> Albany, State Universtity of New York Press

Johnson, Paul (1972) <u>The Off-shore Islanders: From Roman Occupation to European Entry</u> London, Weidenfeld and Nicolson

Jones, Ann (1983) "Door need not close when Young comes in" in <u>The Times Educational Supplement</u> 7th January

Kogan M. (1978) <u>The Politics of Curriculum Change</u> London, Fontana

Kouzes James and Mico Paul (1979) "Domain theory: an introduction to organisational behaviour in human service organisations" in <u>Journal of Applied Behavioural Sciences</u> Vol 15, No 4, 1979, pp 446-69

Kuhn, Thomas (1970) <u>The Structure of Scientific Revolutions</u> 2nd Ed. Chicago, University of Chicago Press

Lakatos, Imre (1970) "Falsification and the methodology of scientific research programmes" in Lakatos and Musgrave <u>Criticism and the Growth of Scientific Knowledge</u> Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Langford, Glen (1987) "Appeals to relevance and the utilitarian attitude in education" in School of Education, Exeter <u>Philosophy and Education</u> Exeter

Laudan, Larry (1977) <u>Progress and its Problems: Towards a Theory of Scientific Growth</u> London, Routledge and Kegan Paul

Lawton, Denis (1980) <u>The Politics of the School Curriculum</u> London RKP

Lawton, Denis (1983) <u>Curriculum Studies and Curriculum Planning</u> London, Hodder and Stoughton

Lawton, Denis (1986) "The Department of Education and Science; policy making at the centre" in Hartnett, Anthony and Naish, Michael (Eds.) (1986) <u>Education and Society Today</u> Lewes, East Sussex, Falmer Press

Lawton, Denis and Chitty, Clyde (1988) <u>The National Curriculum</u> University of London Institute of Education

Le Grand, H. E. (1989) <u>Drifting Continents and Shifting Theories</u> Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Le Roy-Ladurie, Emmanuel (1979) <u>Montaillou: The Promised Land of Error</u>, New York, Random House

Levitt, Barbara and Nass, Clifford (1989) "The lid on the garbage can" in <u>Administrative Science Quarterly</u> v. 34, no. 2, pp 190-207, June 1989

Lewin, Kurt (1951) <u>Field Theory in Social Science</u>, New York, Harper
Lobkovicz, Nicholas (1967) <u>Theory and Practice: History of a Concept from Aristotle to Marx</u> Notre Dame, Illinois, University of Notre Dame Press

Lyotard Jean-Francois (1984) <u>The Post Modern Condition: A Report on Knowledge</u> Manchester, Manchester University Press

MacDonald, Stuart et al (ed) (1983) <u>The Trouble with Technology</u> Frances Pinter, London

MacIntyre, Alasdair (1985) <u>After Virtue</u> (2nd Edition) Duckworth London

Maclure, Stuart (1988a) <u>Education Reformed: a guide to the Education Reform Act 1988</u> London, Hodder and Stoughton

Maclure, Stuart (1988b) "Introduction" to Haviland, Julian (1988) (Ed) <u>Take Care, Mr Baker!</u> London, Fourth Estate

McCulloch, Gary (1987) "History and Policy: The politics of the TVEI" in Gleeson, Denis (Ed) (1987) <u>TVEI and Secondary Education: a critical appraisal</u> Milton Keynes, Open University

McNeil, John D. (1985) <u>Curriculum: A Comprehensive Introduction to the Field</u> Boston, Little Brown and Co.

Mathias, Peter (1983) "The machine: icon of economic growth" in Stuart MacDonald et al (1983)

Maw, J., 1985 "Curriculum control and cultural norms: change and conflict in a British context", <u>New Era</u>, Vol 66, No 4

Ministry of Education, Victoria (1988) <u>The School Curriculum and Organisational Frameworks</u> Melbourne

Morris, Robert (1980) "Response I" to Walker (See Walker)

MSC (July 1980) <u>Outlook on Training</u> London

MSC (1984) <u>TVEI Review 1984</u> London

O'Connor, Maureen (1984) "Give us the cash and we might get on with the job" <u>Education Guardian</u> 30th October

Owens Robert G. (1987) <u>Organisational Behaviour In Education</u> (Third Edition) Englewood Cliffs New Jersey, Prentice Hall

Patton, Michael Quinn (1980) Qualitative Evaluation Methods   Beverley Hills, Sage Publications

Pears, Donald (1975) "Sketch for a causal theory of wanting and doing" in Questions in the Philosophy of Mind   London   Duckworth

Peters, R.S. (1966) Ethics and Education   London, Allen and Unwin

Peters, R.S. (1973) "Aims of education - an educational enquiry" in R.S. Peters (1973) The Philosophy of Education   Oxford, OUP

Polanyi, Michael (1958) Personal Knowledge   Chicago, University of Chicago Press

Pollard, Andrew and Purvis, June and Walford, Geoffrey (Eds) (1988) Education Training and the New Vocationalism   Milton Keynes, Open University Press

Popper, Karl P. (1972) Objective Knowledge   Oxford University Press

Pring, Richard (1985) "In defence of TVEI" Forum   Vol 28 No 1, Autumn 1985

Pring, Richard (1985a) Theodore Fink Memorial Lecture 1985: curriculum for ages 14-18 - "the new vocationalism"?   University of Melbourne

Pring Richard (1987) "Vocational education: A philosophical appraisal" in   School of Education, University of Exeter   Philosophy and Education: Perspectives 28   Exeter

Quine, W. V. O. (1953) From a Logical Point of View   Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press

Quine, Willard Van Orman (1961) "Two dogmas of empiricism" in From a Logical Point of View, 2nd Edition, New York, Harper and Row

Rabinow, Paul, and Sullivan, William, M., eds. (1979) Interpretive Social Science: A Reader   Berkeley, University of California Press

Rae, John (1986) "Why the Second World War was not our finest hour", The Listener   6/3/86, p 23-4

Rapp, Friedrich (1981) Analytical Philosophy of Technology   Dordrecht, Holland, Reidel

Rawls, John (1972) A Theory of Justice   Oxford, Clarendon Press

Rorty, Richard (1979) Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature   Princeton, Princeton University Press

Schon, Donald A. (1971) Beyond the Stable State   New York, W.W. Norton & Co

Schools Council (1981) The Practical Curriculum   London, Methuen

Seckington, Roger (1985) "TVEI - defending the indefensible" Forum Vol 28 No 1

Scriven, M. (June 1985) 'Appendix I: the concept of technology and of education for technology' and 'Appendix II: the definition of technology' in Western Australian Science, Industry and Technology Council Report on Education and Technology in Western Australia Perth, WA, State Government Printing Office

Simon, Brian (1988) Bending the Rules London, Lawrence and Wishart

Simons, Helen (1980) The Science of the Singular Norwich, Centre for Applied Educational Research, Univ. Of East Anglia

Simons Helen (1987) Getting to Know Schools in a Democracy Lewes, East Sussex, Falmer Press

Simons, Helen (1988) "Teacher professionalism and the national curriculum", in Lawton, Denis and Chitty, Clyde The National Curriculum Institute of Education University of London

Skilbeck, Malcolm (1982) A Core Curriculum for the Common School University of London Institute of Education

Skilbeck, Malcolm (1984) School-based Curriculum Development London, Harper and Row

Smith, Peter (1990) "Resource management and TVEI: implications for schools and colleges" in Hopkins, David TVEI: At the Change of Life Clevedon, Avon, Multilingual Matters Ltd

Stoney, S.M. (1987) Consumer Reactions Two Years On: Fifth Years' Perceptions of TVEI, Sheffield, Manpower Services Commission

Stoney, S.M., Hinckley S.M., Pole C.J. and Sims D. (1987) The TVEI Experience: Views from Teachers and Students Sheffield, Manpower Services Commission

Stretton, Hugh (1987) Political Essays Melbourne, Georgian House

Schwab, Joseph, J. (1978) (Eds. Ian Westbury and Neil J. Wilkof) Science, Curriculum and Liberal Education: Selected Essays Chicago, University of Chicago Press

Taylor, Charles (1979) "Interpretation and the sciences of man" in Rabinow and Sullivan Interpretive Social Science: A Reader

Taylor, Frederick W. (1911) The Principles of Scientific Management New York, Harper and Row

Tenne, R (1986) "TVEI students and the subjects studied: the first two years", Department of Employment Gazette, 94, 7, 306-10

Thomas, Norman (1988) "Will the tools help the teacher help the child?" in Haviland, Julian

(Ed) <u>Take Care, Mr Baker</u> London, Fourth Estate

Venables, Ethel (1975) "The local tech: an agent of social mobility?" in W. Van Der Eyken and S.M. Kaneti-Barry (Eds.) <u>Learning and Earning: Aspects of Day Release in Further Education</u> Windsor, NFER

Waismann, Friedrich (1953) "Verifiability" in Flew, Antony (Ed.) (1953) <u>Logic and Language</u>, First Series, Oxford, Blackwell

Walker, Rob (1980) "Project Technology" in Stenhouse, Lawrence <u>Curriculum Research and Development in Action</u> London, Heinemann

Walker, Stephen and Barton Len (Eds) (1986) <u>Youth, Unemployment and Schooling</u> Milton Keynes, Open University Press

Walsh, Patrick D. (1978) "Upgrading practical pursuits", <u>Journal of Further and Higher Education</u> Autumn 1978

Warnock, G.J. (1971) <u>The Object of Morality</u> London, Methuen

Watkins, Peter (1985) <u>Technology, the Economy and Education</u> Deakin University Press Geelong, Australia

Weick, Karl E (1982) "Administering education in loosely coupled schools" <u>Phi Delta Cappan</u> June 1982

White, Lynn (Jr.), (1962) <u>Medieval Technology and Social Change</u> Oxford University Press, Oxford

White, Lynn (Jr.) (1971) "Cultural climates and technological Advance in the Middle Ages" <u>Viator</u> 2 (1971), 171

White, Stephen K (1988) <u>The Recent Work of Jurgen Habermas</u> Cambridge CUP

Whitehead, Alfred North (1932) <u>The Aims of Education and Other Essays</u> London, Ernest Benn

Wiener, Martin J. (1981) "Technology, education and industrial and economic strength" in <u>Journal of the RSA</u> February, No 127

Wiener, Martin J. (1985) <u>English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit</u> London, Penguin

Winch, Peter (1962) <u>The Idea of a Social Science and Its Relation to Philosophy</u> London, RKP

Winch Peter (1972) <u>Ethics and Action</u> London, RKP

Woods, Peter (1986) <u>Inside Schools</u> London, RKP

Young, David, (1983) "Letter to directors of education in England and Wales", (quoted by Cattell from a document of the Borough of Sandwell entitled, "The Technical and Vocational Education Initiative")

MacDonald, Barry et al (1974) <u>Innovation, Evaluation, Research and the Problem of Control</u> (SAFARI PROJECT) Norwich, University of East Anglia.

Nagel, Thomas (1986) <u>The View From Nowhere</u> New York, Oxford University Press Inc.

338