

THE CHANGING SOCIAL DEFINITION OF YOUTH IN SCHOOLS:

ENGLAND AND WALES AND THE USA 1945-1990

Submitted for the award of PhD

Institute of Education, London University

By

Catherine Macdonald

1992

ABSTRACT

The Changing Social Definition of Youth in Schools: England and Wales
and the USA 1945-1990

The thesis is an analysis of the changing social definition of youth and the pattern of transition from youth to adulthood in the context of the schooling systems and educational policies of England and Wales, and the USA since the Second World War. The period under study, 1945-1992 can be divided into two parts. The first is the period of the dominance of the welfare state. The second is the period typified by an attempt by the state to withdraw as a major provider of welfare.

In Part One of the thesis a general analysis is undertaken of the position of youth under welfare capitalism within liberal democracy. The study focuses particularly on the educational provision for the fourteen to nineteen year group. A comparison is made between the welfare capitalist model of youth and that of two totalitarian states in which comprehensive national youth policies were developed.

In Part Two, a study of the educational provision for youth in the USA, England and Wales during the period 1945 to 1972 is undertaken. It focuses upon the successes and failures of the policies of each state. In particular the tension between educational and state ideologies in the construction of youth is explored.

In Part Three there is a study of youth in the period from 1972-1992. For both countries this is a time of concern with economic decline. In the USA and England and Wales governments attempted to withdraw from the extensive provision of education and welfare. The study analyses the effect of the new policies on the definition of youth.

CONTENTS

<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	6
<u>PART 1: YOUTH AND THE STATE</u>	
A. Youth and the State	23
B. The Capitalist Welfare State	45
i) The State	47
ii) Liberal Democracy	50
iii) Welfare	53
iv) Capitalism, the Economy, Labour and the Welfare State.	56
C. The Capitalist Industrial State and Youth	72
i) Pre1945 USA. and England and Wales	73
ii) England and Wales	78
iii) USA.	85
iv) Conclusion	91
<u>PART 2: THE POLICY CONSTRUCTION OF YOUTH 1945-72</u>	
The Policy construction of Youth 1945-72	105
A. England and Wales	
i) Integration and Generalisation	108
ii) Consensus and Socialisation	121
a) Distribution of knowledge	123
b) Socialisation	131
iii) School and Work	137
a) The explicit agenda	138
b) The informal agenda	146
iv) Conclusion	150
B. USA.	169
i) Integration and Generalisation	171
ii) Consensus and Socialisation	178
a) Distribution of Knowledge	180
b) Socialisation	187
iii) School and Work	195
a) The explicit agenda	195
b) The informal agenda	200
iv) Conclusion	204

PART 3: THE POLICY CONSTRUCTION OF YOUTH 1973-1992

The Policy construction of Youth 1973-92	217
A. England and Wales	
i) Integration and Generalisation	219
ii) Consensus and Socialisation	232
a) Distribution of Knowledge	233
b) Socialisation	240
iii) School and Work	247
a) The explicit agenda	248
b) The informal agenda	256
iv) Conclusion	259
B. USA.	268
i) Integration and Generalisation	269
ii) Consensus	280
a) Distribution of Knowledge	283
b) Socialisation	289
iii) School and Work	294
a) The explicit agenda	295
b) The informal agenda	300
iv) Conclusion	304
CONCLUSION	314
APPENDIX 1.	
The Theory of Labour	329
BIBLIOGRAPHY	339

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis has been a long time in the making and I would like to acknowledge the help given on the way.

In particular I should like to thank my supervisor, Dr R. Cowen, for his encouragement, extensive and detailed help, without which I would not have completed this thesis.

In addition, I wish to express my gratitude to friends and colleagues for their help and encouragement. Also I would like to thank members of the Department of Comparative and International Education, staff and students, past and present. Especial thanks are due to Erica and Leslie Stratta for their considerable support and advice.

Needless to say, none of the above bear responsibility for errors and weaknesses, these remain my own.

INTRODUCTION

The Political and Economic Context.

During the late nineteen seventies there was widespread criticism of schooling. This criticism focused around a mismatch, perceived by politicians, between the outcomes of schooling, and the 'needs of the economy'. This critique coincided with a change in the economic fortunes of Britain and, later, with a change in the political economy of the state.

The criticism of schools was that the pupils left, after a minimum of eleven years attendance, ill-prepared for work.¹ At the same time the major political concern was youth unemployment, a concern which coincided with complaints by industrialists about the level of literacy and basic skills of the new school leaver.² Other concerns were expressed about the technical competence and knowledge of a population which had to compete in world markets.³

As a consequence a variety of issues were raised. Firstly, there were the capabilities of the potential unskilled worker, and the expectations of employers that the state would provide workers with minimum levels of competence. Secondly, there was a broader concern with the nature of the British economy and the supply of skilled manpower. As an outcome, the explicit political agenda around schooling, and the transition from child to employable adult, focused on a debate about how to improve the relationship between the school, the employer and the economy.

This thesis is concerned to analyse and to locate these issues within a theory of youth transition in contemporary industrial states. It will be argued that the proposed reforms are indicative of a profound change in terms of the relationship between youth and the state.

The analysis of change, both of the dominant model of youth and the process of transition, is based on a comparison of the state policies of two countries, England and Wales, and the USA, from 1945 to 1990. Both countries share similar political economies as members of the capitalist industrialised nations and share a commitment to a liberal democratic ideology. In broad terms, both countries have had a similar history of the development of schooling as the major state provision for youth. However, the relationship between school work and the labour market has been constructed in different ways. For example 'schooling' in England excluded vocational subjects, while in the USA vocational subjects had been included. Thus, it is proposed to illuminate, by comparison, the effects of these differences.

Another comparison is based in time. The period under study is divided into two parts. The earlier 1945-72, focuses on the post-war reconstruction, which was informed, in different degrees, by the ideals of welfarism.⁴ This period is characterised by the American dominance of the world economy. In Britain there was an optimism that the British economy would regain status.⁵ The later period, from 1972-1992, and the subsequent recession, is typified initially by a switch to monetarist economic policies.⁶ This was the foundation of a challenge to the values of the welfare state. It is argued that these changes were crucial in the development of the debate about the purposes and effectiveness of schooling as an agency of the state.

The literature on which the thesis is based.

The thesis is developed from literature with three different perspectives on the issue of youth and the outcomes of schooling. The first perspective focuses on the social construction of youth, which is derived from the study of sociological accounts of youth and from the theoretical accounts of the contemporary state and its agencies. The second perspective is derived from the literature about the relationship between school and work. The third perspective is based on government and national reports on the philosophy, purpose and reforms for the sixteen to nineteen age group.

The first perspective.

The framework for analysis of the social construction of youth is based in the work of Eisenstadt. Eisenstadt, in his work *From "Generation to Generation"*, develops a theory about the importance of "age sets" in the analysis of transition from childhood to adulthood.⁷ He argues that the "age set" is important in modern industrial societies where youth must make a transition from the family to a society's universalistic values.⁸ Thus, Eisenstadt argues, analysis of the role and status given to the "age set", and the identification with it by the young, are important in considering the cohesiveness of the society.⁹ In his discussion of the framework with which an analysis of modern societies could be made, Eisenstadt suggests that there are three types of "age set" for youth. These are school based, adult dominated and the youths' own grouping.¹⁰ This theory provides a provisional basis for the analysis of youth in

this thesis. The central concern is the definition of youth in transition to adulthood and the status allocated to the group through a society's provision of institutions, either in schools or college.

However, it is argued that Eisenstadt's work is not adequate to the analysis of modern industrial states. While he argues that modern is a 'synonym' for highly differentiated societies,¹¹ his theory continues to refer to central, universalistic values.¹² More recent writings on the state suggest that a key element of contemporary capitalism is the relative autonomy of the various agencies of the state.¹³ The political economy of these states combine both welfare and economic functions.¹⁴ Thus, it is argued, the significance of the agencies of the state, such as schooling, has grown since 1945 as part of the consolidation of the liberal welfare state. It is through the policies about school, or alternative agencies, that the state's construction of the transition from school to work can be identified.

From the writings about the relationship between schooling and the state, it is argued that the particular state should be taken into account when analysing the socially constructed nature of youth as an "age set."¹⁵ Thus in this thesis the analysis of youth, in the USA and England and Wales, begins with theories of the state and an analysis of the development of the country specific political and economic ideologies which underpinned the policies on youth from fourteen to nineteen. It is argued that the relative autonomy of the different agencies of the state results in a tension between the differing demands, on and requirements of, youth.

The second perspective.

As stated at the beginning of this section, a major area of interest is the anticipated relationship between the economy and the school. As Reeder comments, the relationship between school and industry is a "Recurrent Debate."¹⁶ During the early part of the period covered by the thesis, ways of understanding the relationship between school and the economy were dominated, in the literature, by the assumption that this was a technical relationship. This is clearly illustrated in the introduction to the volume "Education Economy and Society."¹⁷ In this the authors argue that modern industrial societies are distinguished in their structure and development by the institutionalisation of innovation.¹⁸ In their view, the system of education takes on increasing importance. It should be both the source and disseminator of technical change and, as such, should be able to institutionalise rapid change.¹⁹ Various chapters of the book argue the case "that the major link of education to social structure is through the economy."²⁰ In the view of the authors, the school relates directly to the state of technology and to the labour market in a linear way.

In this thesis, it is argued that this perspective provides an inadequate account of the relationship between education, economy and society. For example, changes in the educational qualifications of the labour force do not correspond to the change in occupations.²¹ Hussain argues that while education and its content clearly do have significance for occupations, the significance and role of education is broader than the technical role of replacing the family as the source of skills and knowledge for work.²² At issue then is the significance of the processes

of schooling and the way in which these have been formulated under differing political and economic ideologies.

A major contribution to the theory about the relationship between school and particular societies was the correspondence theory developed by Bowles and Gintis.²³ They argued that schooling was important in terms of its form; not its content. Thus schooling did not reflect technological change but reproduced the social relations of the American labour force. Their work focused on the differentiation produced by schooling and the importance of the hierarchical relationship of control. It also drew attention to the inadequacy of a discussion about the effects of school, based only on the content of schooling. They argued that both the particular form, and the experience of schooling, are crucial to an understanding of its effects. However, the correspondence principle, as described by Bowles and Gintis, was the only structural link between education and the economy which, by implication, was a harmonious link.²⁴

The argument of this thesis is that the Bowles and Gintis theory fails to account adequately for the contradictions in the articulation of the education system with the labour market or economy and the wider society. While it is argued that the form of provision is an important element in constructing an account of youth transition, the thesis goes on to argue that the competing and conflicting elements of the modern state need to be included. For example, the account of youth should include the political and ideological functions of the specific state, as well as that of the subsystem in which youth is being studied.

The third perspective

The third perspective is that of the reports and academic literature which contained recommendations to the state about youth. These provide the information from which the theory of youth as an "age set" is developed.

In the case of England and Wales the material was drawn from the reports to government by the Department of Education and Science and, while it existed, the Advisory Council on Education, as well as legislation and government papers. Also included in the literature are research reports and commentaries which contributed to the discussion on some aspect of youth as an "age set". For example, Leipmann's work on Apprenticeship is drawn upon since it gave an account of the adequacy of apprenticeship in the fifties and provided information which contributed to later recommendations.²⁵

The literature on the USA reflects the different government structure and the generation of reports on youth and education at a federal level: since this thesis is concerned with the development of state policy toward the "age set" of youth, the literature referred to has been that produced for national consumption, rather than reports made to individual states. The reports commissioned by the Federal government are included as are those from the National Task Force on Youth and Carnegie Commission. Also referred to are the works of individual authors which had an impact on the national discussion, such as Krug's study of the High School.²⁶

In addition, for both countries, material has been used from the contemporary commentaries on education to provide a context for the reports and to identify the issues around which change to the youth "age set" was occurring.

This literature has been analysed for the account given of youth as an "age set" in relation to the state and the way in which transition to adulthood is socially constructed. It is divided by time and country. This facilitates the comparison of the difference between youth as an "age set" in the two countries. It also makes possible the comparison of youth as an "age set" in relation to different political and economic ideologies, that of the welfare period 1945-1972 and the later period of 1972-1990, during which both states were committed to the reduction of the welfare state.

The thesis

The work is divided into three parts. The first part, Youth as a Category, sets out the theoretical framework in relation to youth and the state. In section 1A, the theories about youth as a category are explored. It is argued that the organisation of transition from childhood to adulthood is important for the stability of the state. This point is made comparatively, by reference to the model of youth, which operated in two countries during a period of social reconstruction: the USSR and pre-war Germany. It is argued that the creation, by the state, of youth movements which were located both within and beyond the school presented an idealisation of youth as a group. This contrasted sharply with the model which emerged under the ideology of the liberal welfare state. Youth, during a period of state reconstruction, although not

completely a unitary category, was constructed by state policy as both active and responsible participants in creation of the new societies.

For both the USA and England and Wales, the increasing importance of the state is noted in terms of the extension of childhood and the creation of adulthood. Unlike the USSR and Germany, both countries under discussion were and still are committed to political ideologies which give the various agencies of the state a relative degree of autonomy. Thus the needs of the state, identified as the maintenance of integration, consensus and the creation of conditions for production are implemented in differing ways.²⁷ In contrast with the situation in Germany and the USSR, there are different demands on, and requirements of, youth from the state. The way in which the differing demands are discussed in policy and reports about youth forms the basis for analysing the construction of the youth "age set" in transition.

Despite the diversity within the USA and England and Wales, there has been a continuing discussion of youth as a distinctive "age set." The thesis argues that the continued focus on youth as a group, with identifiable common interest, serves to obscure issues of differentiation and also to hide the effects of change.²⁸ In both countries the political ideal of liberal democracy contributed to the incorporation of a specific model of youth as adolescence, which was universalised, thus hiding the differences between youth.

In section 1B, theories about the industrial state are developed and discussed in relation to the way in which the nature of the state constrains the potential model of youth. Following from this literature, it is argued that the state needs, for its continuance, to provide a

means of integration, consensus and production or reproduction.²⁹ It is argued that the way in which the individual state achieves its aims varies according to its ideology and economic organisation. The political and economic ideologies of liberal democracy and welfare capitalism are discussed in relation to the two countries.

In this thesis it will be suggested that a key element in the social construction of youth in liberal democracies is the absence of state organised youth beyond the provision of educational establishments. Thus one of the sites identified by Eisenstadt, adult dominated youth organisations, is not as relevant to these societies as it was in Germany and the USSR. Consequently, it is argued, that identification of the policies and beliefs about youth need to be focused on the underpinning of political and economic ideologies of the state. It is argued that in the case of USA, and England and Wales the particular values of liberal democracy, in addition to those of the capitalist economy, are important in defining policies and belief about youth.

The principal site of the state construction of youth is the state provision of education. It is argued that an effective "age set" would accommodate the needs of the state for integration, consensus and production.³⁰ Following from the analysis of the state presented in part 1B, it is further argued that these needs, of integration, consensus and production, are achieved in relation to an "age set", which is both preparatory and transitional.

So far as integration is concerned the thesis goes on to argue that this is achieved by the state appearing to provide for all groups, in particular the subordinate classes, but this is not carried out in

practice. Integration has been presented as citizenship 'rights', although the extent of these rights has frequently been the basis of conflict. It is argued that in the earlier period covered in this thesis integration occurred around the value of welfare which, in relation to education, was apparent in terms of the policy of extending the 'good' of schooling to all youth. Thus, with the withdrawal from welfare values as a political goal, there was an attempt to create integration around a technological or work ethic, while retaining the dependent and preparatory model of youth.

With regard to consensus, it will be argued that the state creation of this around the values of order and security is established in educational terms around the definition of what constitutes 'education' and 'success'. Consequently, curriculum and socialisation policies will be analysed to establish criteria of 'education' and 'success' in operation. Changes in these provide an indication of the desirable model of youth in society.

Finally, so far as conditions of production are concerned these can be defined as the relationship between the state institutions for youth and the economy. The argument of this thesis is that this relationship, between institutions for youth and the economy, is mediated by the prevailing ideological account of the labour market, not by technological innovation.³¹ When the welfare ideology was dominant the relationship between school and the economy was accounted for in terms of meritocracy and technical change. This account of the relationship was heavily criticised and became the focus of extensive reform in the post welfare period. The analysis of these changes, in parts two and three, draws from the terms of the explicit provision of vocational

education and the implied relationship between school certification and the labour market.

In section 1C. an outline is given of the socially constructed model of youth which, it is argued, is specific to industrial capitalism during the period in which the ideology of welfare was dominant. The ideals underpinning the development of provision for youth prior to 1944 are analysed. It is argued that the emerging socially constructed model for youth was that of "adolescence". This construction of youth as "adolescence" is one which allowed the ideals of opportunity and merit to dominate and, at the same time, obscured the issues of selection and training.

In part 2, The Policy Construction of Youth 1945-72, there is an account of the values through which youth was constructed by the state between these dates. In order to identify clearly the construction of youth during this period, the policy recommendations and reports are analysed in terms of the identified functions of the welfare state, integration, consensus and production.³² This is the period during which state policy was underpinned by a commitment to the ideology of welfare. It is the argument that this welfare ideology was important in sustaining the model of youth as "adolescent". The political ideals of the time accommodated this essentially psychological account, which effectively served both the consensual and integrative functions of the state. However, welfare ideology also produced a model of youth which less effectively served the state need for production and reproduction for the economy.

In part 3, The Construction of Youth 1972-1990, it is argued that the

change in political economy that occurred around 1972 had the effect of creating a partial reformulation of the state construction of youth. The new economic and political theory of the state challenged and replaced the theories of the welfare state and of manpower planning. These challenges were then focused on the apparent inadequacies of the model of youth. In neither country under discussion did the state make a radical alteration to the model of youth. The state continued to restrict youth participation in paid work and maintained compulsory attendance at school or college, as the minimum basis of the state provision for youth. In both countries there were policies which proposed to realign the relationship between education, economy and society through the creation of a tighter relationship between the labour market and the product of schooling. This change was, however, only a partial reconstruction of the role and status of youth as a result of the changes in political economy. The model of youth in transition from 1972 to 1990 is analysed against the state functions of integration, consensus, and production, as in part 2. Furthermore, it is argued that the new policies toward youth create a new set of problems, many of which cluster around the changed account of the manpower needs of the economy. Thus, it is argued, the reformed account of youth may appear to meet better the requirements of production and reproduction. However, the continuing needs of the state for integration and consensus have an impact which constrain the reforms targeted at changing the relationship between education and production.

Themes and approach.

The thesis draws together several themes in its focus on youth in transition. Through the comparison of two states with similar political

and economic ideologies, it is argued that the creation of a youth transition in accord with these dominant ideals is problematic. The commitment to liberal democracy creates a context in which the treatment of youth becomes subject to a range of demands and outcomes, and these have been considered in relation to the state and not in relation to youth itself. Thus the changing nature of the state's expectations of youth has been discussed, but the issue of youth culture and the subjective experience of youth in schools is not addressed.

The major institutional provision for youth since 1944 has been educational, either through school or college. There are differences between the two countries both in terminology and provision. These reflect the differences in policy ideals and in institutional structure. These differences in names and purposes are reflected in the way in which information could be collected and compared. In the USA a vocational element exists in the High School. In England and Wales the definition of the secondary curriculum excluded subjects which were designated 'vocational' and these were offered separately in Colleges of Further Education. Since Colleges of Further Education are, in effect, a state provision for youth in transition, they have been included in the account of the English system.³³ Their distinction as providers of 'vocational' education is an important element of the structure for youth in England and Wales. Direct comparison of vocational courses has not been attempted. Within the American High School there has been a number of estimates of the students taking vocational courses but since these may be taken in association with a college course, it is not easy to separate programmes. In relation to the English material, the information on Colleges of Further Education does not make it feasible to identify by age the students on courses, particularly those of a

part-time nature.

The thesis draws on these sources to illustrate the argument that there is a conflict in the "age set" of youth in liberal democratic societies. In the period under study both countries changed their political economy and introduced measures to alter the ideals and provisions for youth. Despite these reforms, there are still discontinuities in the state construction of the youth "age set."

It is argued that the state has been unable to withdraw from involvement in the way it desired. In addition, neither state has managed to provide an easy articulation between youth in transition and the demand for labour while meeting the needs for values to create consensus and integration. The continued attempt to create policies for "age set" of youth is ideological and obscures the differentiation that is ultimately required of the youth "age set."

References and Footnotes: Introduction

1. Finn D., Training Without Jobs, London: Macmillan, 1987, Chap 5.
2. Callaghan J., "Ruskin Speech," in Wellington J., "Vocational Education and New Technology," in Holt M., ed., Skills and Vocationalism, Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1987
3. DES., Education in Schools: A Consultative Document, Cmnd. 6869, London: HMSO, 1977
4. Mishra R., The Welfare State in Crisis, London: Harvester, 1984
5. Pollard S., The Wasting of the British Economy, London: Croom Helm, 1982
6. King J. S., "The State and Social Structures of Welfare in Advanced Industrial Democracies," Theory and Society, vol.16, no. 6, Nov.87, pp. 841-868
7. Eisenstadt S.N., From Generation to Generation, London: Free Press Glencoe & Collier Macmillan, 1956
8. *ibid.*, p. 54
9. *ibid.*, p. 46
10. *ibid.*, p. 162
11. *ibid.*, p. 159
12. *ibid.*, p. 142
13. Clark G., Dear M., State Apparatus, London: Allen and Unwin, 1984
14. King, "The State and Social Structures of Welfare in Advanced Industrial Democracies," *op. cit.*
15. Taper T., Salter B., Education Politics and the State, London: Grant McIntyre, 1981
16. Reeder D., "A Recurring Debate: education and industry," in Dale R., et al. Schooling and the National Interest, Barcombe: Falmer Press, 1981, pp. 177-205
17. Halsey A., Floud J., Anderson C., (eds.), Education Economy and Society, New York: Free Press, 1961
18. *ibid.*, p. 2
19. *ibid.*, p. 3
20. *ibid.*, p. 12
21. Hussain A., "The Economy and the Educational System in Capitalist Societies." in Dale R., et al., Schooling and the National Interest, *op. cit.*, pp. 159-177

References and Footnotes: Introduction

22. *ibid.*

23. Bowles S., Gintis H., Schooling in Capitalist America, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1976

24. Gintis H., Bowles S., "Contradictions and Reproduction in Educational Theory" in Dale R. et al., Schooling and the National Interest, *op. cit.*, pp. 45-61

25. Leipmann K., Apprenticeship, An Enquiry into its Adequacy Under Modern Conditions, London: RKP., 1960

26. Krug E.A., The Shaping of the American High School (Vols. 1&2,) Milwaukee and London: University of Wisconsin Press, 1972

27. Clark, G.L., Dear M., State Apparatus, Boston: Allen and Unwin, 1984, p. 43 Clark and Dear argue that a key element to understanding contemporary capitalist states is the expansion and relative autonomy of these functions. In a review of many of the theories of the state, they argue that the operational objective of the state can be identified as the securing of consensus, integration and maintaining and creating conditions of production. However, they argue that modern liberal democracies are not concerned with the socio-economic structure of society but with a theory of correct methods for the reduction of social conflict. Their main thesis is that there is a crisis of the state since there is no coherent and dominant ideology at present.

28. For example, the Introduction to Hall S., Jefferson T., (eds.), Resistance Through Ritual, London: Hutchinson, 1977

29. Clark, Dear, State Apparatus, *op. cit.*

30. *ibid.*

31. See Appendix 1

32. *ibid.*

33. Hussain A., "The Economy and the Educational System in Capitalist Countries". in Dale R., (ed.), Schooling and the National Interest, *op. cit.* p. 171. The Colleges of Further Education are included as part of the education system since they are an outcome of the way that secondary schooling developed in England and Wales. The colleges provided vocational courses but were firmly in the local education authority remit. Many of the students attending them were in the same age group as those attending Sixth Form and High School. The changes in curriculum and policies were part of the state policy for that age group and are thus included.

PART 1.

YOUTH AND THE STATE.

SECTION A: YOUTH AND THE STATE.

Introduction

The starting point for the theoretical account of youth is the work of Eisenstadt in which he identifies youth "age sets" as a significant category both for the analysis of youth and as an indicator of social stability.

It will be argued, in Section A, that while Eisenstadt's cross cultural comparison illuminates small and preindustrial societies, his criteria become problematic when applied to large industrial societies. There are two major linked problems. His theory is based in a structural, functional model which is concerned with identifying the central value system in society and the maintenance of that society. Eisenstadt's theory holds validity in analysing small societies where there is a strong set of central values, and in societies which have a singular purpose of social reconstruction. Thus, his theory is illuminative when applied to agricultural societies where change is limited. It is also illuminative in societies, such as the USSR and Germany, during periods of social reconstruction and where a single political value system is dominant. However in liberal democratic states, such as the USA and England and Wales, where there is a strong state in economic and ideological terms, Eisenstadt's theory does not adequately give an account of the effects of stratification and the need for change.

In Part 1 section B of the thesis, the particular structure of these societies is analysed and the incorporation of the ideology¹ of welfare is examined as the basis for considering the social construction of youth in the welfare state. There is a focus on the adoption in both countries of the psychological model of youth, as "adolescence". It is argued that this particular cultural account of youth while facilitating the social integration of youth as an "age set", left as problematic the way in which youth was to be integrated into the economic production and reproduction functions of the state. The welfare ideology informed the specific policies and ideals that formed the basis for the state's relations to youth.

In Part 1, section C, the model of the state and that of youth as an "age set" is applied to the analysis of a specific youth "age set" established in the USA and England and Wales prior to 1944.

A. Youth as a category.

Any discussion of the term youth denotes a complex set of relationships. It is a descriptive category, relative to the society in which it is located and to other age groups in that society. Youth is a group in transition between childhood, defined by dependency and limited membership of the society, and adulthood, which allows full societal membership. The major premiss of the analysis of youth as a social category is that youth is in some significant way different from the rest of the society and that difference is based on age.² Youth is not however simply defined by chronological age.

In a major study of age grades Eisenstadt raises a number of questions about their function.³ He argues that the division of societies into age grades is a universal characteristic but that the definition of the age grade, its potential and its obligations is unique in a time and to a society. Drawing attention to the relational status of the age grades, Eisenstadt argues that the transition from childhood to adulthood is problematic in societies that have universalistic values. The transition requires a change from the particular values of the family to the universal values of society.⁴ He argues that, in this case, there is a structural need for the existence of age homogeneous groups to bridge the transition from the kinship system to the whole social system. These groups, or youth age grades, are significant where the family and kin values are not directly compatible with those of the wider social structure.⁵ Youth age groups can be integrative or potentially disintegrative depending on how they are located and on their relationship to the parent culture. Eisenstadt argues that this disintegrative potential of youth "age sets" is a distinctive feature of industrial nation states.⁶

A number of questions are raised by Eisenstadt's argument about the cultural value and the structural positions of age groups. For a group to remain integrated with the society, a balance needs to be struck between the gratification and status that it can provide for the individual, and the community orientation of the group itself.

Eisenstadt argues that this balance is related to three major features.

These are:

1. The internal allocation of roles within the age group and whether these are based on universal and achievement criteria;
2. The extent to which the age group confers full social status and

sexual identity;

3. The extent to which the institutional roles, economic, political, and symbolic, allocated to age groups, are adequately performed by them.⁷

Eisenstadt also argues that in modern society there is a strong emphasis on youth as a special category, not just in structural but also symbolic terms. Few youth age grades emphasise values which are not found in the adult society.⁸ Segregation is important because it provides a structure which diverts frustration from the relatively limited role of youth, while allowing the personality to mature. This results in the emergence of a secondary function, segregation as a consequence of membership.

Eisenstadt is suggesting that youth occupies a complex structural position in industrial societies. The youth age group is preparatory and not fully integrated into the society, in comparison to the position of youth age groups in preindustrial societies. By identifying aspects of the social structure which may contribute to tension and potential deviancy for youth groups, Eisenstadt marks the issue of social control as one of significance in discussion of youth. He distinguishes between examples in which the youth group may conflict with the family, where the family is not committed to national goals, or where the effects of stratification are such as to produce limited commitment to the society. These, he suggests, contribute to four possible types of deviancy.⁹

The major premise of Eisenstadt's work, that "age sets" are a primary consideration for the study of stable relations between generations in society, is a concern found in the extensive writings of the mid twentieth century on youth problems.¹⁰ While Eisenstadt's structural and functional analysis has highlighted the significance of youth, and

the potential for conflict, it does not readily allow for an analysis of change in the social structure or for different cultural responses, both of which are key elements in most western industrial societies.

The basis of Eisenstadt's analysis is a concern with the continuation of society rather than change; continuity is sustained by the existence of a singular normative value system in which Eisenstadt accepts an asymmetry of authority.¹¹ While acknowledging that the relationship between the individual and the society is mediated by other factors in the social structure, Eisenstadt argues that this does not generally alter the relationship of the youth age set to the central values. Eisenstadt argues that in industrial society these are the values of achievement and specificity.¹² Thus, in his theory the effects of stratification, and state power, are marginalised in relation to the category of age.

Subsequent work on youth, following from critiques of Eisenstadt's analysis, identify the importance of stratification as a substantive element in the understanding of youth as a category. This was evident in studies of subculture.¹³ However, subcultural analysis was still located in structural theory and identified middle class values as normative. Ultimately much of the analysis focused on the middle class norms and the restricted means available to particular youth groups to achieve them. While there was a recognition of class based culture, the subcultural analysis still presented a problem in relation to the theoretical understanding of the state. In particular this was a criticism of the theory that achievement could be identified as central value for all youth, and that merit, measured by the school system was a legitimate criteria of achievement. In effect, subcultural analysis

remained within the boundaries of a single normative value structure and did not account fully for class or power.¹⁴

In contrast to many of the preindustrial societies studied and cited by Eisenstadt, the existence of a welfare state has led to the increasing involvement of the state in the process of transition. The state both regulates the family and decides on the provision of social institutions to which the young are attached; for example schools and youth groups. Unlike many of the societies analysed by Eisenstadt, the modern welfare state is characterised by the extension of legitimate powers to the state as executor of social values. This is combined with a particular characteristic of industrial society, namely that the existence of change is a prerequisite to continuation. The complexity of transition is therefore increased. A process of incorporation must be flexible enough to allow change as well as reproduction.¹⁵ Thus, any analysis of youth in industrial society should include not only an adequate account of the processes of transition but also of the effects of stratification and the requirement to respond to change. Eisenstadt's analysis is effective in highlighting the significant position of age grades, and focusing on the category of youth in industrial society. However the value position of the analysis does not sustain an adequate exploration of the relationship between age grades and the state, or the potential for stratification of the age grading of youth.

In this thesis it is argued that the creation of the age category of youth is a fundamental process within industrial society. An associated process, and facilitator, has been the appearance of the state provision of schooling. The adoption and creation of state sponsored schooling, its growth absorbing more and more of the years of youth, and an

increasing proportion of the state expenditure, is a key feature of the social construction of youth.

The style and length of schooling is one of the indicators of the degree to which the state has become involved economically, and culturally, in the process of transition. It is also an indicator of the model of youth transition that is being promoted by the policy makers. The structure or absence of school and college provision, and the process of schooling, are important. Schools are effective both at the level of the formal institutional provision, and also in the construction and distribution of content. For example, the curriculum as a "selection from the culture"¹⁶ is a signal of the anticipated relationship between the young and the old and of the valid process of transition. As such, the provision for youth through schools and other organisations is a problematic to be resolved by each society.

Every society has its own specific definition of full citizenship. This is differentially composed by definitions of legal adulthood, or maturity, under which headings there might be constraints relating to political and economic participation and the achievement of social status.

The social definition of youth is created by the structures and processes of that society. The degree of integration of the "youth age" set is signalled by the way in which these definitions purposefully facilitate the enfranchisement of the young. One of the characteristics of industrial society has been the lengthening of the period of transition, and in some societies the lack of a clear and balanced definition of what is required to achieve adulthood.¹⁷

Both in the USA and England and Wales, since the early part of the twentieth century, the term "adolescent" has been used to identify certain characteristics of youth as a category. This is significant, as its usage is associated with a particular construction of youth in terms of immaturity and disenfranchisement from the political and economic spheres of society.¹⁸ It has also been used to justify a lengthening of dependency. Nevertheless, despite the complexity of both societies, there has remained an identifiable discussion of "youth as an age set". Gintis argues that the emphasis on youth has served to obscure both the issue of class and that of change. The relations to capital, of the age set, were subsumed when the focus of analysis is one of young versus old.¹⁹ In this thesis it is argued that youth, and in particular adolescence, is an ideological construction which should be analysed in the context of a specific time and policies.

The construction of the youth as a cultural process is one which no two countries have managed in an entirely similar way.²⁰ Youth as a separate category between childhood and adulthood is associated with industrialisation, urbanisation and the emergence of the strong state.

During the nineteenth century a redefinition of the relationship between parents and the state emerged, with the state acquiring an increasing responsibility. Initially state intervention was only accepted in situations where the family had failed and the need was defined as pathological in terms of family competence.²¹ Over time the relative autonomy of youth, described by Gillis²², was circumscribed by cultural and institutional control. The parental concern for the morality of the child was in part transferred to the state and the child carers. Youth

was created in limited roles: their rights to employment and to enfranchisement were restricted. In material and social terms youth was a relatively deprived category, with a daily experience of submission to adult authority. Youth almost became, in Marxist terms, a class in itself.²³ In both USA and England and Wales the emergence of state dominated youth has been associated with state education policies and the creation of national school and college systems.

From its emergence, mass schooling has been a major source not only of knowledge and skills but of values and attitudes.²⁴ Similarly, the presence or absence of state facilities for youth outside schooling, for recreational, cultural, political or economic purposes, is important. When present these institutions have a manifest role in the social construction of youth transition. When absent, there are other effects, not pursued in this thesis, such as the development of autonomous youth cultures.

The Experience in Nazi Germany and the USSR.

Societies that are undergoing a major process of change under one party control provide a good example of the way that a state can redefine the category of the youth "age set." Examples of two societies which have undergone such change in the twentieth century are the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany. Both of these states were proposing to become more industrially efficient, but under entirely different political ideologies. In both countries the model of citizenship underwent substantial change, and it is in that context that the young were the vehicle for promotion and sustenance of the new ideologies. While the faith in youth, both as the agents and maintainers of social change, is

evident, there is also distrust, often expressed as a fear of a threat to the social order.²⁵ Within these societies there is an explicit statement of the role and position of the young; one in which their position and status is high.

Despite radically different ideologies, the establishment of a new and clearly defined role for youth emerged in both states. Although the outcomes were different, both the National Socialists and the Marxist Leninists were concerned about the identity of the individual in mass society. Within National Socialism this was to be resolved by reforming society in a way which meant that identity and purpose were located in the nature, instinct and will of the individual, not suppressed by the intellectuals or the middle class.²⁶ Realisation of the desirable citizen came through the development of character and the subordination of individual qualities to the service of the state as the epitome of community.²⁷

Similarly Marxist Leninism promised a more satisfactory self-identity for the majority through the medium of community. Participating citizenship was to be available to all, although the ideology was less dismissive of intellectual endeavour than that of the National Socialists. On the contrary, the acquisition of skill and knowledge was demanded for the benefit of society. The acquisition of skill and knowledge did, however, require a reinterpretation of knowledge in terms of a socialist world view. There was an anticipation of the "heroic" in the youth, achieved through their service to the new society.²⁸ In both countries the relationship of youth to the state was direct and clearly defined. It was an explicit policy intention that youth, as a generalised category, be unmediated by stratification, unlike previous

youth movements.²⁹ However, in Germany youth was differentiated, as both ethnicity and gender were the basis of determining role for youth and as future adults.

During the phase of social reconstruction both nations experienced economic recession. In the case of the Nazis their acquisition of power has been viewed as a result of the recession in Germany in which the young had been most vulnerable.³⁰ In the Soviet Union the turmoil in the economy was, in part, the effect of the previous regime but also of the reforms undertaken by the Party.³¹ Since it was part of the ideology of National Socialism that race was the foundation of the German culture, it was through the state control of youth that this could best be preserved and perpetuated. The role of the state and its leader were to make the people aware of their membership of community and, as such, the leaders were portrayed as devoted and responsible custodians.

To facilitate this process of change, the Party set about the reorganisation of education despite the difficulties created by the federal structure of Germany. There was an attack on the traditional curriculum. The accepted consensus about high status classical subject knowledge was challenged through the establishment and promotion of schools with science curricula. The new curricula involved a comprehensive training in racial biology, German history and literature, which meant less time was available for ancient literature, languages and traditional science. The knowledge transmitted in school was scrutinised by a process of book selection and staff surveillance. A major change was that a considerable proportion of the day, up to five hours, was spent in physical activities which was in line with the ideal that youth should be fit and able to take the practical initiatives.

This was also a reflection of the view that male youth could be bound together in the 'fellowship of the battle' and that this did not require intellectual activity or comprehension. Instinct and will were to be as important, if not more important, than book knowledge. From the mid thirties, service given to the youth movements was included in school reports.

The curriculum changes, introduced by the National Socialists, were viewed by middle class professionals as a major devaluation of education, and its examination by the Abitur. They were critical of the idea that political reliability should become an element of university entrance.³²

Youth was not treated entirely as a homogeneous group. The state planned divisions between youth, in preparation for planned future adult roles. There existed a major distinction between the position of the females and males. It was expected that a girl's future was within the family and as such she would be excluded from courses which were preparatory to the university. As the regime became more established, there emerged a separate tier of schools for those who were to become the elite leadership of the Party. These were to be selected at the age of twelve and were to be given the opportunity to study at an intensive level both physical skills and Nazi ideology.³³

It was not, however, through the public schooling system that the National Socialist movement expected to build the new society, but through the auspices of the youth movement. Youth organisations had existed in a substantial sense from the early twentieth century and were connected to the state. For example the Prussian government had funded

youth organisations from 1911. As will be discussed in section Ci, this contrasts with England and the USA during the same period, where youth organisations were voluntary and without state sponsorship.

In the first thirty years of the century, German youth was subject to a high degree of regulation. The dominant values were those of a social moratorium, a role entirely viewed as preparatory. Prior to 1914, this was informed by a sense of spontaneity, sensitivity and antimilitarism.³⁴ During the twenties, the youth movements were used to create community, but in the process the focus of the youth workers moved away from youth development in itself as the centre of the work, and to a more conservative commitment to the state. The effect of this was to make the youth movements socially exclusive and authoritarian. As exclusive groups they reinforced the immaturity of their members and segregated them from the experience of working class youth.³⁵

The rise of the National Socialist movement led to a new, more political purpose, for the youth movements. After a short period of experimentation, they retained middle class adult domination, and an insistence that the status of youth was clearly distinguished from that of enfranchised responsible adulthood.³⁶ The values of the earlier youth movements were politicised to incorporate the principal purpose of youth as that of "service to great leaders." The ideology brought together strands of anti-intellectualism and an acceptance of violence, through idealisation of these values. The heroic was achieved through collective, often violent action, and through expressing a form of political indifference to previous moral values.³⁷

The youth movements, initially voluntary, were made compulsory in 1938

with a procedure for drafting in members, much as they were drafted into the army. Within the youth movement, prominence was given to those aspects of the ideology which supported physical activity and manual labour. The identification of youth success with sport, the competitive instinct and the world dominance of the Nazis is captured in the Riefenstahl film of the 1936 Olympics.³⁸ Youth organisations recruited at the age of six and continued to eighteen, at which point individuals were conscripted either to the army or to the labour service. During the pre-adolescent years youth was organised by tests of athleticism, outdoor living and knowledge of history, while the fourteen to eighteen sector consisted mainly of the preparation for soldiering, with an emphasis on health and service.

Although separate from other age groups, the youth movement was important for the economic and social policy of the Third Reich. The Nazi Party was highly successful in capturing the youth vote in the early thirties, the point at which youth unemployment was very high, both for the working class and the university graduate. Despite an uncertain economic programme, by the mid thirties the Party succeeded in providing both public works and vocational training, along with the sport, cultural and welfare programmes, all of which were strategies designed to sustain the loyalty of youth while giving them neither autonomy nor adult status. Youth was treated as a universal "age set" in so far as the policies contained no overt class distinction but, as already suggested, the effect were intentionally divisive along racial and gender lines.³⁹ National Socialism contained a coherent social construction of youth, for example a strong link was made between service to the state and educational achievement on the new curriculum. There was a role, in which self development both physical and mental had

some immediate rewards but also promised future status.

The other political theory which incorporated a view of the young, as the agents of change, was Marxist Leninism.⁴⁰ The ambivalence between using the young as agents of change and the ability to trust them as autonomous agents is evident in this model, as it was in that of the National Socialists. Schools were used by the Party as a means to alter the world view of the future citizens. As such, both the content and activities of schools were closely scrutinised. The schooling provision was radically altered with the development of the common school and policies of open access. A common curriculum was also a major mechanism in the establishment of the socialist ideology.

The new curriculum was encyclopaedic as had been the old. Its scope reflected the Leninist epistemology that all knowledge was valid, but that it required reinterpretation in terms of a materialist world view.⁴¹ Central to the Marxist Leninist ideal of schooling was the concept of polytechnical education: the interrelationship of theory and practice, with the emphasis on knowledge only being fully understood through practice. This informed both the youth movement and schooling processes, giving emphasis to labour and service. The practice of polytechnical education was a major part of the strategy to abolish the class stratification associated with the low status of manual labour, and with the relative high status of traditional academic subjects. This element of pedagogical theory, it was hoped, would provide the basis for challenging the traditional stratification of knowledge, and bring the new schooling system closer to the service of the new technological state.

The education of teachers was part of the process, and membership of the Party was high in this profession, as was also true in Germany.

Similarly, entrance to higher education was mediated by performance at a political as well as an intellectual level, thus attacking the middle class hold on the education system.

As with National Socialism, the integration of schooling with the youth movement was one of the substantive features of the practice of Marxist Leninism. The child of the Soviet Society would experience a continuity of values between the home and the state. While there was a formal distinction between the school and the youth movement, membership of the youth groups was used as the basis for the moral education of youth and discipline procedures in the school.⁴² The basis for moral decisions was that of the collective good. In the very early years of the revolution, this was identified by the collective, but later responsibility moved to adults from the Party.⁴³

The Communist Party has never been considered a mass membership organisation, but the first two stages of the youth organisations did have mass participation; at this stage youth was a universal category. It is at point of entry to the Komsomol that the more serious political purposes predominated and the elitist nature of Leninism was evident. In the mass membership groups, the ideals of patriotism and service to the community were mediated by the state or Party, these two being closely intertwined.⁴⁴

In the early period of Soviet Society, unlike the Third Reich, there was no youth unemployment problem. Full employment was part of the policy of the Party and, after the adoption of Makarenko's thinking, the

constructive use of youth labour played a major role in the reconstruction of Soviet communities.⁴⁵ While the young were disenfranchised from full membership of the adult community, both in a political and economic sense, they had a distinctive status which entitled their activities to recognition as significant in the construction of Soviet socialism. However, all youth had a clearly allocated position from which to achieve an effective place in the social arena.

In both societies the role of the young was clearly identified with the process of innovation and change. The young were idealised as the group most responsive to the new ideas, and most likely to learn to live their lives in accordance with the new principles. However, they were not self governing. Youth movements and the schools were strongly controlled by adult leadership from within the ruling elite. Youth was involved neither in the selection of goals, nor substantively in the processes of achievement. The definition of youth was participatory within a prescribed adult directed environment to which there was no legitimate alternative. In both societies, the young were held in some esteem as the real hope for the future, persuaded to participate by the promise of a new and better future in which they were portrayed as having a substantial claim.

The nature of the youth movements, and in particular their specific inclusion of lower middle and working class youth, meant that they were perceived as having greatly redistributed opportunity. The Nazi Party appealed directly to the youth who had suffered not only through the economic problems of the country but also in relation to the German intellectual middle class. The Leninist state similarly offered enhanced

opportunity to groups who had not previously had access to schooling or social mobility. Both states offered reward for effort in an apparently open and justly meritocratic manner.

The role allocated to youth movements was not merely of anticipatory preparation. The targeting of activity, in practical rather than intellectual and abstract terms, meant that the youth movements were taken seriously as part of social reconstruction. The model of youth that emerged was a unified one, representing an attempt to create a coherent policy congruent with the reforms of the Party. The central state developed a model for the youth in which identity with the national purpose meant that the demands of the community overruled that of the individual's rights. Identification with the purposes of the reconstructing state gave a singular set of objectives, which subsumed differences of stratification. In the case of the USSR, the intent was the eventual abolition of stratification; in Germany the destruction of the middle class intelligentsia.

Thus the model of social change adopted by both states was one where the formal goals aimed to create youth who were fully incorporated into the new society. Youth were allocated a route to adult status, while, in the transition were in a position to participate in a manner which was recognised as effective by the adult dominated political structure. The denial of autonomy in political terms was balanced by an ideology which contained a high certainty of deferred achievement and status.

This is in contrast to the position of youth in liberal capitalist states, will be examined in detail the next section. While in the countries discussed so far there was a clearly identified state purpose,

and they were involved in a focused process of change, the liberal capitalist state is committed to an ideal of pluralism. As a consequence there is potential for conflict and tension in the objectives of the state and the individual, which can be examined by identifying the status and transitional processes created for youth.⁴⁶

References and Footnotes: Part 1 Section A

1. The use of the term ideology in this thesis draws upon the use established by Tapper and Salter in their study of educational change. Salter B., and Tapper T., Education, Politics and the State, London: Grant McIntyre, 1981, Chap.3 (Ideology and Change.)
2. Hall S., Jefferson T., (eds.), Resistance through Rituals, London: Hutchinson, 1977
3. Eisenstadt S.N., From Generation to Generation, London: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1956.
4. Ibid., p. 274
5. Ibid., p. 298
6. Ibid., p. 288
7. Ibid., p. 276
8. Ibid., p. 305
9. Ibid., p. 307
10. Hall S., Jefferson T., (eds.), Resistance through Rituals, op. cit.
11. Eisenstadt, From Generation to Generation, op. cit. p. 25
12. ibid., p. 299
13. Hall S., Jefferson T., (eds.), Resistance through Rituals, op. cit.
14. For example, Milson argues for the recognition of anti-culture and subculture but does not recognise class or stratification as a basis for these categories. Milson F., Youth in a Changing Society, London: RKP. 1972. Similarly Reisman, in a major study of the child in American society, analyses the influence of the external structure of capitalism but sustains a singular notion of outer directed childhood, not directed to class. Riesman D., The Lonely Crowd, London: Free Press, 1967 and, "From Inner-Directed to Other-Directed," in Etzioni A. & E., Social Change, New York: Basic Books, 1964, pp. 379-390
15. Spring J., Educating the Worker Citizen, New York and London: Longman, 1980.
16. Lawton D., Class, Culture and the Curriculum, London: Routledge, 1975
17. Shipman M.D., Childhood, Slough: NFER, 1972
18. This argument will be expanded in the section on the capitalist industrial state and youth. It is outlined in Murray C., Youth in Contemporary Society, Slough: NFER., 1978
19. Bowles S., "Unequal Education and the Reproduction of the Social Division of Labour," in Carnoy M., Schooling in a Corporate State, New York: McKay,

References and Footnotes: Part 1 Section A

1972, pp. 38-68

20. Kett J.F., Rites of Passage, New York: Basic Books, 1977

21. Shipman M.D., Childhood, op. cit.

22. Gillis J., Youth and History, London: Academic Press 1974. (Chap 3) Gillis describes the relative autonomy of male youth, both middle class and working class, as substantially lost by the end of the nineteenth century. He suggests that rural male youth had a great deal of autonomy and as a group were regulators of matters such as sexual morality. He also argues that, whereas in the nineteenth century educators such as Arnold were concerned to advance as quickly as feasible the achievement of adult responsibility, this had changed by the beginning of the twentieth century.

23. Parkin F., "Adolescent Status and Student Politics," Journal of Contemporary History vol, 5, no. 1, 1970, pp.144-155

24. Etzioni-Halevy E., Social Change, London: RKP. 1981

25. Musgrove F., Youth and the Social Order, London: RKP. 1964. Musgrove argues in the chapter on youth and society that, "the hatred with which the mature of Western society regard the young is a testimony to the latter's importance, and to their power potential and actual." p. 10

26. Mosse G.L., Nazi Culture, London: W.H.Allen, 1966

27. *ibid.*

28. In a study of children's literature O'Dell argues than the criterion of the heroic has always been a major part of the socialisation of Soviet citizens. O'Dell F., Socialisation Through Childrens' Literature, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978

29 Gillis J.R., Youth and History, op. cit., chap. 4. He gives an account of the effect of the compulsory admission of working class youth to previously exclusive school based middle class organisations. This failed and the Nazis returned the organisations to middle class adult domination.

30. Craig G.A., Germany 1866-1947, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978

31. Carr E.H., The Bolshevik Revolution 1917-1923, vol 2, Middlesex: Penguin, 1966

32. Craig G., op. cit.

33. Shirer W.L., The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich, London: Secker and Warburg, 1960

34. Gillis J., Youth and History, op. cit.

35. Gillis J., Youth and History, op. cit. Chap.4.

36. Gillis J., Youth and History, op. cit. p. 166. Gillis, using as a source the Conferences of the Hitler Youth at the beginning of the war, notes the use

References and Footnotes: Part 1 Section A

of the address 'Du" to remind the youth that they have no grounds for considering themselves adult.

37. Lowenberg P., "The Appeal to Youth," in Smell J.L., Hitler's Dictatorship and the German Nation, Lexington, Massachusetts: Heath & Co., 1973, p.93.

Lowenberg describes this as a "mystical union of blood soil and volk."

38. Craig G., Germany 1866-1947, op. cit. p. 645

39. *ibid.* The state was able from a very early stage to begin to dispense with the labour of the Jewish group, something which had a profound effect on educational institutions. In 1933/4 there was a campaign to enforce the withdrawal of the labour of married women from the labour force, a policy which was not revoked even during the labour shortage of the war years.

40. Lenin V.I., On Youth, Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1977

41. *ibid.*, p. 218

42. Lenin V.I., The Tasks of the Youth Leagues, in Lenin, On Socialist Ideology and Culture, Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1974

43. O'Dell describes the use of the legend with Lenin as the heroic character in childrens' stories for school. These justified the patriarchal leadership intervening in the collective decisions for the betterment of the society. O'Dell F., Socialisation Through Childrens' Literature, op. cit.

44. Carr E.H., The Bolshevik Revolution, vol 1, Part 11, note A, Lenin's Theory of the State, Middlesex, Penguin, 1966

45. Lilge F., "Anton Semyonovitch Makarenko, An analysis of his Educational ideas in the context of Soviet Society," University of California Publications in Education, vol 13, no. 1, pp. 1-52, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1958

46. Gottlieb D., ed., The Emergence of Youth Societies, New York, Free Press, 1966

PART 1

YOUTH AND THE STATE.

SECTION B: THE CAPITALIST WELFARE STATE.

The stratification of the society into "age sets" remains an important focus of this thesis. However, it was argued in the last section that an account of age stratification is a necessary element in any analysis of youth, and this has to be located in an understanding of the complex nature of the modern industrial state, as the two countries to be compared are capitalist industrial democracies. It is the purpose of the section to give a brief theoretical account of the nature and purpose of the industrial state and to argue that a theory of the state is necessary to an analysis of the construction of youth.

The late twentieth century industrial state is a subtle and complex organisation in which a key characteristic has been the growth of the state agencies as an means of internal control.¹ In addition, the agencies of the state have developed a degree of autonomy from the centre. In this section, it will be argued that within the industrial states, that are both capitalist and welfare, there are a number of tensions created by the autonomy of state agencies. The autonomy of the state agencies make simple correspondence between state functions and social institutions unlikely.

Important to an understanding of the state has been analysis of the power relationships required to maintain its existence.² The democratic state is dependent on legitimacy and active consent through these

agencies.³ In particular the post-war welfare states are characterised by their extensive social and economic roles, which have won them legitimacy. However these extended spheres of influence have been gained through a process of challenge within the ideological framework of democracy and capitalism, and through these processes the consent of those governed.⁴ In relation to youth, this has meant that the state has become increasingly important in the construction of the boundaries of the "age set," with a relative decline in the private family agenda.

States can be analysed by their major social forms, that is, in terms of the economy, the cultural and political formations and ideologies. These institutions and values all contribute to the formation and maintenance of a particular framework, which creates and supports the social positioning of the population.⁵

Both the USA and England are capitalist welfare states and share common theories of the youth, in comparison to those of societies of different economic and ideological commitment. Both have, however, distinct political structures and different histories, which generate differing understanding of, and provision for youth, which will be analysed in section C.

In this section the theory of the state will be considered as a base for understanding the way which the youth is located and socially constructed as an "age set", specifically in industrial capitalist democracies. The different economic and political aspects of the state contribute to the specific configuration of youth, and the way in which the transition process to adulthood is presented.

i) The State

The complexity of defining the state is evident from the many writings on the subject.⁶ In developing an understanding of the location of any particular group, such as youth, it will be argued that it is crucial to have an understanding of power and inequality in the capitalist welfare state, and to recognise that the state has an interest in maintaining these. Within current writings the state is frequently viewed not as a set of institutions which regulate but as a set of relational process through which power is exercised.⁷ From a variety of sources there emerges an agreement that a key characteristic of the social structure of capitalist states is stratification associated with economic inequality.⁸ These accounts, of the characteristics of the industrial state, differ from those offered by the ideology of democracy, which suggests that the state is embodied in a set of institutions, separate from society and associated with abstract notions of equality and rights. Corrigan argues that it is this ideology which obscures the state regulation of stratification and class interest.⁹

In the twentieth century capitalist industrial society the state is a key to mediating social relations, and it does so in the interest of its own continuation.¹⁰ However, this is not a static condition, since capitalist industrial states are also required to create conditions for the processes of change. In this, they differ greatly from the agricultural societies examined by Eisenstadt, where the economic, technological, and social structural elements of society were relatively stable.

Important among the functions of the contemporary state are the creation

of conditions for accumulation, and the reproduction of the social formation. However, the economic functions are not in themselves an adequate explanation of the functioning of the contemporary state, since its structures have extended well beyond reproduction of labour, and have also developed a degree of autonomy.¹¹ Apart from production, the state is concerned to retain social order; both in support of its own interest and that of the economy. Clark and Dear argue that this can be further analysed in terms of the three objectives of the contemporary state.¹² These objectives are social integration, consensus, and the continuation of production. The way in which these objectives are pursued is framed by the political and cultural ideals.

Clark and Dear argue that the first objective, social integration, is strongly related to the other functions. By its nature the capitalist state must "buy social integration" through ensuring the welfare of all groups but especially the subordinate classes.¹³ The second objective, the achievement of consensus, requires that the rules of ownership are legitimated and class relationships defined. It is through consensus that order, security and stability are provided.¹⁴ The third objective, continuation of production, is achieved through the regulation of social investment, the creation of wealth and the maintenance of the conditions for the reproduction of labour.¹⁵ In his analysis of the state, Offe uses a similar threefold classification to analyse the functions of the welfare state.¹⁶ He argues that there is a contradiction between functions, a contradiction which constitutes the major incompatibility in the welfare state. Thus while the welfare state, as a capitalist state, is based in the continuation of the free market, it has also to regulate the market in favour of the decommmodified, non-market activities of welfare and citizenship rights.

In the two countries under study, the ideology of welfare capitalism has emerged as an integrative force for the capitalist state, providing an ideological basis for legislation. However, following from the analysis of the state, and from Offe, it will be argued in this thesis that, in the USA and England and Wales, the provision of welfare, particularly for the subordinate class, has produced conflict in relation to the achievement of the other functions of the state.¹⁷

Since all three functions, while analytically distinct, are interdependent in practice they can be identified in one social institution, such as the school.¹⁸ It is these functions of the state, and the conflict between them, which provides the framework for the analysis of the social construction of youth as an "age set", which is the purpose of this thesis. The two countries under discussion are, in economic terms, capitalist welfare states. In addition, they both operate within the political framework of the liberal democracy. Thus, the operation and institutions of the state contrast with those of the examples of the USSR and Germany discussed in Section A.

In the following sections there is an account of the features of democracy, welfare and capitalism and an outline of the theoretical underpinnings of the two states to be compared. Then, in part C, these are applied in a brief account of how "youth" was constructed as a social category prior to 1945 in both USA and England and Wales.

ii) Liberal democracy

The political theories that have been evident in both the USA and Britain have been based on liberal democracy.¹⁹ Liberalism is itself a diffuse term which does not represent a coherent political ideology although identifiable among its key concepts are individualism and rights.²⁰ It has taken distinctive forms in each country, the American structure being that of a federal state informed by a written constitution, in which individual rights have played a key part. In contrast, the British have a unitary parliamentary system with a monarch as head of state. Limited powers, compared to the USA, are devolved to regional authorities. The democratic ideology has been interpreted, over time, in different ways, in particular the rights to eligibility for citizenship. Those who become citizens have full membership of the community, with equal political status, rights and duties.²¹ While the principles of democracy are the right of majority rule, the structure of citizenship has evolved during this century. By 1945 the right to political enfranchisement had been granted to adults in both countries, although not all were encouraged to participate.²² Thus the 1945 consensus which created the welfare state has been viewed as "democracy scrutinising capital."²³ In effect democracy was defined in social and legal terms but did not include either economic rights or obligations.

Democratic ideology creates a distinction between political society and the economy.²⁴ Thus enfranchisement in the polity confers formal equal political and civil rights but does not include economic participation. This is evident in the continuing debate between the interpretation of rights, as opposed to needs and moral obligation, as the basis of welfare provision.²⁵ Participation in the economy, through ownership or work, is thus a desirable but not a necessary component of citizenship.

Importantly, categories of the population have been eligible for citizenship, while also being defined not as potential producers but as consumers. The family, for example, and by association women, have been defined essentially in terms of consumption, and thus constitute a bridge between production of things and the reproduction of people.²⁶

The development of political rights as an element of modern democracy has been accompanied by a concern for order, and a belief that if citizenship was to be exercised in an intelligent and responsible manner the citizen had to be educated.²⁷ This is based on a narrow definition of participation envisaged by Mill and Bentham. Citizens had the right to select government but the relationship between the people and the governors was paternalistic not mandatory.²⁸ Equally, participation is built on the notion of social contract developed by Rousseau, which, like utilitarian theory, was concerned with a continuation of the state and the protection of property ownership.²⁹

"Democracy" is better understood in two parts. The first is the ideal of democratic participation, which legitimates the idea of the responsibility and the rights of citizenry. The second is the reality of practice in which citizenship is circumscribed by the will and ability to participate. The political division of labour thus distinguishes political and administrative hierarchies; and the understood inequality of citizenry.³⁰

In the two countries under study the distinction between the political and the economic allows the right to be divided. There is no right to participation in the economy in terms of ownership or employment for all, although individual civil rights under the law are protected.

Achieving adult status means that individuals gain civil and political rights, although it is not anticipated that they will necessarily participate as producers or employees in the economy.

The political theory of liberal democracy relates to youth in terms of their future as citizens. The belief that education, which was equated with school attendance, would improve citizens and increase personal mobility has a long history in both the USA and England and Wales. The development of education, within the liberal theory, has contained the argument that if education were to be compulsory it should also be free. This, put into practice, meant a right to access to school, but not to equal expenditure, achievement or outcome. Education was also considered, mainly by its practitioners, to have the objective of developing individual qualities, particularly of mind. Since the establishment of the post war welfare state, there has been a tension between the individual right to receive and consume education, and the constraint on individual rights created by the state as the guarantor of community benefit.³¹ At the same time, youth, created a dependent category by the state, and controlled by legislation variously defining adulthood, had their rights to participate constrained in political, economic and cultural terms.

iii) Welfare

The origin of welfarism is diffuse. P. Gooby Taylor and J. Dale suggest that it arose with the adoption of Keynes and the policies of maintaining employment.³² Its emergence is associated also with industrialisation, liberal values and demands from the working class.³³ In a different account of welfare, Gough argues that welfarism is accounted for in the process of the struggle by the working class to advance their demands for improved economic and social conditions. Thus, the welfare state has inherent contradictions created by conflict and compromise.³⁴ Substantively the welfare state embodies non-market criteria in its decisions about production allocation and consumption of goods. Important in the underpinnings to the welfare state is the value of community as a means to meet certain needs both individual and collective.³⁵

While the name "welfare" clearly denotes an element of caring, the welfare states under discussion are both capitalist and based in the nation state as compared with that of the socialist state. Thus the element of welfare exists in relation to both economic and political demands in the liberal democracies of the USA and Britain.

The formal establishment of the welfare state occurred at the end of the second world war. Both England and Wales and the USA incorporated a version of welfare into the government, although in rather different style. King argues that the postwar acceptance of welfare and associated social and citizenship rights has fundamentally changed the state and

economy relationship, both in structural and ideological terms. For example, he argues that the incorporation of non-market criteria into the state, and the expansion of state employment, have created some situations in which the use of the term capitalism is problematic.³⁶ In contrast to the early demand for citizenship participation and legal rights, which had little direct impact on the economy, the establishment of the welfare state has meant that the distinction between polity and economy is not clear. The commitment to welfare as an ideology has been legitimated to a large extent by the belief that the way to reform and redistribution is through state rather than individual action.³⁷

While there are some common characteristics to the idea of capitalist welfare, the structure and values are country specific.³⁸ Significant in each of the capitalist welfare states has been the establishment of national state agencies for the provision of welfare functions, among which has been schooling, health, defence and welfare.³⁹ Distinguishing the capitalist welfare state provision for youth from that of the socialist states, and also militarist states, has been the lack of development of a national state youth policy which provides other common resources for youth beyond schools.⁴⁰

Since 1945 the role of the state has increased both in Britain and the USA. Both have created, in different ways, a welfare state. However, the two countries do have very distinctive political practice, which has contributed to a different response to the ideals of welfare. In the case of Britain there has been a strong institutional commitment.⁴¹ In the USA there has been a marginal commitment coexisting with the ideology that the state exists principally as a guarantor to protect an individual's right to go about his and her business freely, which has

acted as a constraint on state growth.

The values of welfare have been put into practice in a variety of ways in different countries,⁴² for example in the USA and England. The political ideology of each country has determined the model of action by the state.⁴³ Thus, while in both countries there is legislation about minimal provisions of health, education, income and a right to work, the delivery of these varies.⁴⁴ The adoption of state welfare policy as a the best collective solution to social issues has presented more political tension in the USA than in England.⁴⁵ There has been a system of welfare in the USA since the recession of the thirties where the New Deal set a precedent in terms of the relationship between federal and state governments. The principle of public action, once established, was sustained, and in the post war era shifted from the regulation of economic activity to more wide ranging strategies.⁴⁶ Ultimately the balance of power changed, as the proportion of finance generated by state and local communities lessened in relation to federal finance. In the USA the welfare system has been underpinned by two competing rationalities, that of welfare and collective state action, which has been in competition with an ideology of economic individualism. The tension between the two ideals is demonstrated by the two types of benefit paid. One type of benefit helped groups to function more effectively within the liberal market economy, that is, to operate self sufficiency, a dominant value in the USA. The second type, has been a benefit of right. This is based on 'welfare' understood as society as mutual dependence. It has had a limited distribution and very low status.⁴⁷

In contrast, the system adopted in Britain is based on an idea of

minimum welfare rights and a wider range of universal benefits.⁴⁸ The ideas both of Keynes and Beveridge complemented the market economy and intended a right to insurance against its worst hazards.⁴⁹ This meant that a substantially larger proportion of GNP in post war Britain has been involved in the state provision.

The ideology of welfare is the key in understanding the integrative function of the state after 1946. From that time the identification of the state as the reliable provider of citizens' minimal rights has produced a powerful means to achieve integration. At the same time it has had the effect of redefining the balance of the state's political and economic functions. While the state was not redefined either as a primary producer or owner, as occurred in socialist states, it became the guarantor of minimal political rights.

The outcome of welfare legislation for youth, as a group, was that they were guaranteed certain welfare rights, principal among which was universal access to schooling. From the perspective of the state, however, the purposes of schooling were several. Schools retained the role of educating citizens. These citizens were to become members of the contemporary capitalist welfare state, and needed to accept the legitimacy of the state.

iv) Capitalism, the Economy, Labour and the Welfare State

Both the USA and Britain have economies that are organised along capitalist lines. In its organisational form capitalism is not stable.

It is to be argued in this thesis that there is no direct correspondence between technological and industrial development and the schools. The relationship is mediated both by the nature of capitalist economies, and the two interdependent elements of welfare and liberal democracy. Significant in this relationship is the identification of the theory of labour, which contributes to an understanding of training, certification and skill as terms with an ideological meaning rather than a substantive one when applied to policy in schools. In terms of youth, this has been through the regulation of labour. Schools, since their establishment, have related to the economy through certification for employment, acquisition of skill directly for employment, or by removing youth from a saturated labour market.⁵⁰

The term capitalism refers to a principle of economic organisation, in which there is private ownership of property, sale of commodities and a market controlled by the pursuit of profit.⁵¹ Capitalism is not static, and one of the key characteristics of modern capitalism is the domination of large companies, "Monopoly Capitalism." At its extreme the size of a company's assets can be greater than the GNP of the smaller developing nations. Although this is not the case with the larger industrialised nations, the power of large companies and the influence that they exert on government are significant. The belief in and need for long term planning, both for government and companies, that was prevalent in the establishment of the welfare state assumed that the government could provide a stable market. Heilbroner estimates that in 1968 in the USA 200 firms controlled as large a proportion of corporate assets as the top 1,000 in 1941.⁵² In Britain the top 100 companies had 15% of manufacturing output in 1909, 20% in 1950, and 50% in 1970. By 1958 there were 2,000 businesses with 500 or more employees and these

represented 64% of manufacturing employment.⁵³

The size of companies, and the commodification of labour,⁵⁴ has implications both for management style and the notion of worker control and participation. When capitalism takes on the form of "Monopoly Capitalism" there is a divorce of ownership from control and the economy is dominated not by the small owner and entrepreneur, as during much of the nineteenth century, but by the large multi-national companies in which a strata of managers and a large bureaucracy are the main agents of control.⁵⁵ The formal organisation becomes much stronger in the large company with the stratification of employment and distinctions between work made more clearly. Thus "Monopoly Capitalism" is characterised, in part, by management specialists, whose job is to organise the elaborate relationships with financial institutions, experts and governments.⁵⁶ To a large extent the labour market, and perhaps more importantly government policy, is influenced by the needs of these companies.

The growth of bureaucracy and of professional skills has not been confined to the industrial sector but has occurred in the organisations of the welfare state.⁵⁷ With the emergence of the welfare state these developed further, the state adopting management and organisational styles which had grown with the emergence of "Monopoly Capitalism" as a form of ownership.⁵⁸ The political and economic organisation that has been evident in England and the USA since the thirties has been described as corporatism.⁵⁹ The analysis of corporatism draws together an understanding of the interdependence of the political and economic sphere. Corporate capitalism is partially defined by a necessary interaction with a strong state, and it is this that is important in the

analysis of the agencies of the corporate welfare state. Neither the economy, nor the state, is autonomous, and the state is limited in its action by economy, politics and notions of morality, since in the case of the USA., and Britain, it is operating within the ideology of both welfare and democracy.⁶⁰

For example, since the nineteen thirties, both in Britain and the USA, there has been a realignment of the political and economic sphere with the incorporation of welfare ideals.⁶¹ Industrial capitalism changes constantly in the search for new markets and the processes of production are constantly being renegotiated. Apart from the introduction of new methods of production, and new products, the deployment of labour is also changing. Industrial capitalism, in its corporate form, creates organisations that are characterised by the development of a professional bureaucracy and hierarchy. Control is operated, with rationality as the informing ideology, through a selective distribution of knowledge and the division of labour.⁶² While change of production is explicitly related to the development of new technologies the precise form of the change in production and labour is not a direct correspondence. The relationship between technology, institutional and ideological change is not clear. Social structure, and the need to deploy labour, play a part in determining the patterns and speed of incorporation of new technology.⁶³

As suggested, the relationship between the ideals and practices of capitalism and the structure and organisation of work is problematic. At issue is the way in which ownership and the needs of the state effect the organisation of labour. As a consequence of the ideology that technologically determined change is a major element in the continued

prosperity of industrialised nations, economics, as a discipline, has not traditionally concerned itself much with the theory of labour.⁶⁴ This has meant that the assumption that labour skills will become increasingly complex as the technological and industrial base of society grows has not been fully analysed. The technologically driven version of change discussed human labour in the same manner as that of machine labour. Thus the commodification of labour remained unproblematic.⁶⁵ In the study of the labour process it is the commodification of labour that is the problematic. In Nichols' terms there is nothing natural or eternal about the process and the way it is structured.⁶⁶

Braverman, whose work focused on labour as part of economic organisations, argued that an understanding of the approach to labour as a category was crucial in developing an understanding of the pattern of work in welfare capitalist states.⁶⁷ He criticises the accepted theory of modernisation, that change is technically driven and that the development of technology will necessarily require the growth of skill. While a technical determinist position would suggest that the forces of production are the sole determinants of the social relations of production, Braverman's argument, derived from Marxism, is that technology is not free in its creation of social relations since it is controlled by the social relations of capital. The critical relationship, ignored by theories of technical determinism, is the property relationship of capital;⁶⁸ and an understanding of labour and employment is gained not as a direct outcome of technological requirements, but by an understanding of the social relations of production and the negotiated relationships of power and legitimacy.

Braverman's argument is that skilled work is becoming degraded. This is

important, because in the industrialised nations the status of an individual in social terms is substantially defined by their employment, or lack of it. Thus the power position of labour is substantially altered by a decline in skill and control over the conditions of employment.

The commodification of human labour, along with the other resources of production, is a key characteristic of capitalism, which was retained during the establishment of welfare capitalism. The unique feature of human labour, the ability to conceive of and plan a task creates a problem for the owner or manager of capital. The problem, for the owner or manager, is that in deploying human labour they are not simply making a choice on grounds of efficiency to maximise profit, but are also resolving how to control the labour and achieve legitimate recognition of the procedures.

Control, within the capitalist industries in the twentieth century, has been achieved by the use of the principles of scientific management. Effectively, this stratifies by separating those who control knowledge and define tasks, that is management, from those who execute the tasks.⁶⁹ Although the distinction often coincides with the division between mental and manual labour, it is not always the same. The effect of these processes is that there has been centralisation of knowledge in the hands of management. Managers have increasingly exercised control by allowing access to only small sections of knowledge while retaining exclusive understanding of the whole task themselves. This approach to labour⁷⁰ gives priority to an understanding of the access to, and distribution of knowledge, and problematises the assumption that there will be a need for a growth in knowledge in the population as whole.⁷¹

As argued earlier, this is the basis of human capital theory which was dominant in the legitimation of extended schooling.

Labour theory has also challenged the idea that a growth in skill within the general population is necessary to technological advance. Labour theories ignore the traditional blue collar, white collar distinction of mental and manual labour, and focus instead on autonomy and control at work.⁷² By addressing the process of change in capitalist industrial states in this way, the reclassification shows that, within the population as a whole, there is no change in terms of distribution of skill or status. Braverman argues that there is a stronger division between those who control and operate power and those who labour.⁷³ If one accepts this argument it can be seen that it is through the continuation of the bifurcation of labour, between power and control, that modernisation and the use of technology becomes oppressive, and not the development of technology itself.⁷⁴

While providing a new account the labour process of capitalism, Braverman's work has been challenged by empirical studies of work in monopoly capitalist companies operating in the welfare state. These studies found operating processes of cooperation, consent and legitimacy.⁷⁵ In particular Braverman is criticised for not discussing the part of ideology, or state welfare capitalism, in the reproduction and production of the labour force.⁷⁶ Furthermore, Braverman's account of skill tends to romanticise the notion of past craft skills. By defining skill as the creative use of brain power, he suggests that there is an objective reality of skill recognised in a previous age.

More useful is the modification of Beechy.⁷⁷ Beechy argues that skill

is socially constructed from three components; objectively defined competencies, control over conception and execution, and socially defined occupational status, which may largely be independent of objectively defined competency, thus making clear the need to locate skill in a specified social context. As a consequence, understanding of the relationship between the school, skill development and the economy must necessarily take into account the socially defined context of labour and expectations. This replaces the simple idea of content based knowledge and objectively defined skills.

The distinction between the technical relations of production, the status of, and the control over, the execution of work, makes any simple correlation between school and work complex. It problematises the idea that government policy aimed at improving skill levels of school leavers will necessarily have a direct relation to the labour market. Any policy designed to alter the relation between school and the labour market must take account of the socially defined context of labour and the status ascribed to work. Thus the ideological construction of technology, as the principal organiser of new work structures, and the legitimating of reform of education and training becomes problematic.⁷⁸

Conclusion

In this section there has been an analysis of the principal theories of the capitalist welfare state. These have been addressed as important constraints on the way in which the state creates the social location of youth. In transition from dependent childhood to a stable enfranchised citizenship, youth should, in Eisenstadt's terms, have been integrated into these dominant values of the state. Unlike the preindustrial

countries, which form the major part of Eisenstadt's study, theoretical accounts of contemporary capitalist welfare states suggest that there is a conflict of values within the operation of the state.

The objectives of the state were identified as securing social integration, social consensus and the conditions of production. Youth, as an "age set" in transition, is constructed by the policies of the state. In both countries the major provision by the state for youth has been the system of schooling. Thus, it is proposed, in this thesis, to show that the "social construction of youth as an age set" is related to the integrative needs of the contemporary capitalist state, rather than to the specific needs of the economy.

An outline has been given of the economic and political theories of the capitalist welfare state. It has been suggested that the ideology of welfare can be viewed as acting as the principal integrative force for the state in post war capitalist states.

The state objective of creating consensus, in relation to the youth "age set," has focused upon the content and process of schooling. Thus the requirements of access to institutions and to differentiated curricula knowledge have legitimated mobility and regulated ambition.

The state objective of securing conditions of production is framed not only by the processes of current production, but also by change in the social relations of production. It has been argued that the relation between the process of production and the state is not one of direct correspondence, as suggested by theories of technical determinism, but that this relationship can be understood as mediated by the labour

market.⁷⁹ The relationship between schooling and the labour market has taken a variety of forms. These have included socialisation, certification, the teaching of specific skills and knowledge and the withdrawal of youth labour from the market.⁸⁰

In the next section, 1C of part one, there is brief exploration of the way in which these theories of the state illuminate practice in the USA and England and Wales. and there is an identification of the social construction of youth specific to each of the countries at the beginning of the welfare state.

References and Footnotes: Part 1 Section B

1. Wilensky H.L., The Welfare State and Equality, Berkley: University of California Press, 1975. Wilensky argues that the welfare state is a major structural tendency in modern societies. However different countries vary considerably in the proportion of GNP spent on welfare.
2. Urry J., Anatomy of Capitalist Societies, London: Macmillan, 1981. Urry argues that the capitalist state is best understood in terms of the needs of order and cohesion. These needs are not driven by purely economic criteria but also by the political and ideological values of the state. Clark and Dear outline several theories of the state. They argue that key components of the various theories are the need to protect and reproduce the social structure and the need to legitimate power. Clark G. Dear M., State Apparatus, London: Allen and Unwin, 1984
3. Corrigan P., Capitalism, State Formation and Marxist Theory, London: Quartet Books, 1980
4. Carnoy M., The State and Political Theory, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1984 Chap 8. Carnoy notes that within recent American political theory the need for the state to sustain material benefits is tied to the recognised legitimacy of the state.
5. Taylor-Gooby P., Dale J., Social Theory and Social Welfare, London: Arnold, 1981, Chap. 5, Gough I., The Political Economy of the Welfare State, London: Macmillan, 1979
6. For example Clark and Dear identify six different approaches to the state from within the Marxist tradition. Clark G., and Dear M., State Apparatus, op. cit., chap. 1
7. Taylor-Gooby P., Dale J., Social Theory and Social Welfare, op. cit. Chap 5. and Corrigan P., Capitalism, State Formation and Marxist Theory, op. cit. The ideology of democratic capitalism would suggest that the state is an autonomous structure separate from the mode of production For example in Milliband's work the state is posited as relatively autonomous and separate from class interest. However, this view is rejected by Corrigan and Taylor-Gooby in favour of the argument that the state is not external to the mode of production. The view that the capitalism, welfare or otherwise is dependent on the state for the conditions of its existence is problematised. The state legitimates and creates the forms of property ownership, the division of social and technical labour.
8. Giddens A. The Class structure of the Advanced Societies, London: Hutchinson, 1973 Giddens points out that there is little agreement about the nature of these classes. Marxist tradition emphasises the economic nature of the classes, while Weberians are concerned with status and symbolic nature. More recent writings have tended to narrow these distinctions. Clark and Dear, State Apparatus, op. cit. There is still a problem of transforming Marxist economic classes into social form, as this would lead to the designation of large numbers of the working population as middle class. This is unsatisfactory, as it means that a number of jobs formerly middle class do not give their incumbents access to power. One approach to this is to argue that the common language of class disguises the real meaning of class, the concentration of power and property in the hands of a very small number. This

References and Footnotes: Part 1 Section B

is also the view adopted in Braverman's theory of labour. Westergaard J., Resler H., Class in a Capitalist Society, Harmondsworth: Penguin 1976

9. Corrigan P., Capitalism, State Formation and Marxist Theory, op. cit. Corrigan, in his analysis of the state, argues that the state is not outside society. Its appearance as outside is ideological. The state as an agent permeates all aspects of society.

10. *ibid.*

11. Clark G., and Dear M., State Apparatus, op. cit.

12. Clark G., and Dear M., State Apparatus, op. cit.

13. *ibid.*, p. 44

14. *ibid.*, p. 43

15. *ibid.*, pp. 43 & 44

16. Keane J., (edit) Contradictions in the Welfare State by C Offe London Hutchinson 1984 Offe broadly defines the welfare state as crisis management in which there are regular boundary disputes between the systems of the economy, social life and the administrative and political system. Offe discusses three subsystems which together form the political and administrative institutions of the state. These are firstly socialisation, household and normative rules. Secondly commodity production and exchange in the economy and finally the mechanisms of political and administrative powers of coercion. These are similar to those identified by Clark and Dear. However Offe carries the analysis further by focusing on the incompatibility between the features of the market and the ideology of welfare.

17. Clark G., and Dear M., State Apparatus, op. cit., Chap 3.

18. Salaman G., Work Organisations Resistance and Control, London: Longman, 1979. Salaman makes the point that power within state organisations needs to be analysed. With reference to Etzioni, he uses the classification of coercion remuneration and norms in relation to the legitimation of power. Thus, in school the operation of coercive power can be found in terms of the legislative and punitive powers of the state. Normative power is exerted within the social construction of childhood and adolescence and the demands for specific models of success. Power can also be identified in relation to the internal experience of belonging to the school and in terms of the organisation of work, the experience of the hierarchy and control and the exposure to ideas values and knowledge of schooling.

19. King D., "The State and the Social Structure of Welfare in Advanced Industrial Democracies," Theory and Society 16: 1987, pp. 841-868. He argues that there are a number of factors unevenly contributing to the makeup of specific liberal democracies. Thus, in the USA the diffusion of liberal values has been supportive of the emergence of a welfare capitalist model. King argues that the ideas of liberalism were more important in the emergence of the ideology of welfarism than in its maintenance.

20. Hall S., "Variants of Liberalism," in Donald J. and Hall S., eds.,

References and Footnotes: Part 1 Section B

Politics and Ideology, Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1986, Chap 3., pp. 34-70

21. Marshall T.H., The Right To Welfare, London: Heinemann Books, London, 1981

22. The existence of democracy is not defined in terms of participation. Thus, Schumpeter accepted that participation could be circumscribed by other attributes such as race gender and religion. Schumpeter J. "Capitalism, Socialism, Democracy," London, 1952, in Pateman C., Participation and Democratic Theory, London: Cambridge University Press, 1976

23. Bowles S. Gintis H., Democracy and Capitalism, London: RKP. 1986

24. Gough I., The Political Economy of the Welfare State, op. cit.

25. Plant R. Lessor H. Taylor-Gooby P., Political Philosophy and Social Welfare, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1980

26. Beechey V., "The Sexual Division of Labour and the Labour Process", in Wood S. The Degradation of Work, London: Hutchinson, 1982 pp. 54-74

27. Room G., The Sociology of Welfare, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1979

28. Pateman C., Participation and Democratic Theory, op. cit.

29. *ibid* p.19. Pateman discusses the notion of social contact and the definition of freedom in Rousseau. She argues that for Rousseau participation was both an advantage and a burden. The citizen might be forced to participate and through this process come to understand social responsibility and eventually freedom.

30. Lively J., Democracy, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1975

31. Marshall T.H., "Social Selection and the Welfare State," in Halsey A.H. Floud J. Anderson C. Education Economy and Society, London: Collier Macmillan, 1961, Chap 14 pp. 148-164

32. Taylor Gooby P, Dale J., Social Theory and Social Welfare, op. cit.

33. King, D., "The State and the Social Structure of Welfare in Advanced Industrial Democracies," op. cit.

34. Gough I., The Political Economy of the Welfare State, op. cit.

35. King, D., "The State and the Social Structure of Welfare in Advanced Industrial Democracies," op. cit., p. 842

36. King I., "The State and the Social Structure of Welfare in Advanced Industrial Democracies," op. cit. Also Marshall T.H. The Right to Welfare, London: Heinemann, 1981

37. Taylor-Gooby P. and Dale J., Social Theory and Social Welfare, op. cit.

38. Wilensky H.L., The Welfare State and Equality, Berkley: University of California Press, 1975. Wilensky describes the welfare state as a major

References and Footnotes: Part 1 Section B

structural tendency in modern societies but argues that the USA is more reluctant than other rich countries to make a welfare effort appropriate to its affluence because of the strong ideology of economic individualism.

39. Wilensky H.L., The New Corporatism, Centralization and the Welfare State, Sage Professional Papers in Contemporary Political Sociology, London: Sage Publications Ltd., 1976

40. Davies B., Threatening Youth, Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1986
Davies explores the absence of a "national" youth policy which he argues would have provided a clear and coherent structure for youth in a welfare state.

41. King D., "The State and Social Structures of Welfare in Advanced Industrial Democracies," op.cit

42. Wilensky H., The Welfare State and Equality, op. cit.

43. King D., The Welfare State and Equality, op. cit., p.842. King argues that, " Substantively the welfare state embodies non-market criteria (that is, criteria about the social usefulness of certain goods, the need for minimum standards of health and education) in its decisions about production, allocation and consumption of goods; this erodes the pervasiveness of market criteria in these advanced industrial democracies." However he notes that "compelling generalisations" cannot be made about the group of industrialised nations because of the variety of ways in which the welfare state has developed.

King argues that " Substantively the welfare state embodies non-market criteria (that is, criteria about the social usefulness of certain goods, the need for minimum standards of health and education) in its decisions about production, allocation and consumption of goods; this erodes the pervasiveness of market criteria in these advanced industrial democracies." However he notes that "compelling generalisations" cannot be made about the group of industrialised nations because of the variety of ways in which the welfare state has developed.

44. Wilensky H., 1976, The New Corporatism, Centralization and the Welfare State, op. cit.

45. Schonfield A., Modern Capitalism, London: Oxford University Press, 1965.
Schonfield's principal concern is to analyse the success of post war capitalism in the developed economies of the world and to suggest that this is being achieved at the cost of a changing balance of power between the public and private sector, which he argues will produce a mismatch between the professionals of the state and the traditional ideas of democracy and popular consent.

46. Reagan M. D., Sanzone J.G., The New Federalism, London: Oxford University Press, 1981

47. Mishra R., The Welfare State In Crisis, Brighton: Wheatsheaf, 1984

48. The term "British" is used to describe the characteristics of the welfare state in general since the legislation applies to the whole country. However, the more detailed discussion of education is applied to England and Wales since the Scottish system is separately administered.

References and Footnotes: Part 1 Section B

49. Mishra R., The Welfare State In Crisis, op. cit.
50. Watts A.G., Education, Unemployment and the Future of Work, Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1983
51. Taylor Gooby P., and Dale J., Social Theory and Social Welfare, op. cit.
52. Heilbroner R.L., "Business Civilisation in Decline," Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1977 pp 57, quoted in Nichols T., Capital and Labour London: Fontana, 1980, p.29
53. Labour Research Department, "The Menace of the Multinationals," in Nichols T., Capital and Labour p.29
54. Appendix 1," Commodification of human labour, the treatment of individuals as far as possible as the same as other tools of production." Braverman H., Labour and Monopoly Capital, London: Monthly Review Press, 1974 pp. 85-121
55. Giddens A., The Structure of Advanced Societies, London: Hutchinson, 1975
56. Thompson E., Work, Employment and Unemployment, Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1984
57. Wilensky H., The New Corporatism, Centralization and the Welfare State, op. cit.
58. Clark G., and Dear M., State Apparatus, op. cit.
59. Clark G., and Dear M., State Apparatus, op. cit., pp. 31-41 Corporatism is identified by:
- i) an increased intervention in and the restructuring of productive relations;
 - ii) increased centralisation of state functions; iii) widening of the representation of labour and the institutionalisation of conflict; iv) a corresponding expansion of state apparatus.
60. Corrigan P., Capitalism, State Formation and Marxist Theory, op. cit.
61. In Britain this was marked by the adoption of Keynesian economics, while in the USA the adoption of supply side economics was slower and probably only clearly identified in L.B. Johnsons "war on poverty" budget. Wilensky, The New Corporatism, Centralization and the Welfare State, op. cit.
62. Ellul J., Technological Society, New York: Vintage Books, Random House, 1964. See also Mishra R., The Welfare State in Crisis, Brighton: Wheatsheaf, 1984, and Wilensky H. R., The Welfare State and Equality, Berkley: University of California Press, 1975.
63. Giddens A., Capitalism and Modern Social Theory, London : Hutchinson, 1971. Giddens argues that a weakness in Marxism is that although the growth of technology is viewed as an overall good, there is insufficient discussion of the way in which change will occur in its accommodation into organisations and labour. Among other writers however the problem is described in different terms. While allowing that change occurs around new technologies they argue that technology is used to legitimate a new set of social relationships which

References and Footnotes: Part 1 Section B

are not the necessary outcome of new technology but are the outcome of capitalist relations. Thus Habermas and Marcuse regard the technological model as ideological. In Salaman G. and Thompson K., Control and Ideology in Organisations, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980

64. Wood S., The Degradation of Work, London: Hutchinson, 1982
65. Bottomore T., Theories of Modern Capitalism, London: George Allen and Unwin, 1985
66. Nichols T., Capital and Labour, Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1980. Economic theory has been concerned with the development of large companies in terms of rationality and efficiency for capital and marginalised the theory of labour.
67. Braverman H., Labour and Monopoly Capital, New York: Monthly Review Press, 1974
68. Gorz A., "The Tyranny of the Factory," in Gorz A., The Division of Labour, Falmer: Harvester Press, 1976
69. Wood S., The Degradation of Work, London: Hutchinson, 1987
70. Wood S., The Degradation of Work, op. cit.
71. Halsey A., Education Economy and Society, op. cit.
72. For example Wood, Braverman, Nichols
73. Hill S., Competition and Control at Work, London: Heinemann, 1981
74. Levidow L. Young B., Science, Technology and the Labour Process, vol 2, London: Free Association Books, 1985
75. Hill S., Competition and Control at Work, op. cit.
76. Wood S., The Degradation of Work, op. cit.
77. Beechy V., "The Sexual Division of Labour and the Labour Process," in Wood S., The Degradation of Work, London: Hutchinson, pp 54-74
78. Levidow L., Science Technology and the Labour Process, op. cit.
79. See Appendix 1
80. Watts A., "School, Youth and Work," Educational Analysis, vol.3, no.2, 1981, pp. 1-7. Watts argues that the school has three functions in relation to the world of work. These are selection, orientation and preparation. As he points out even selection is not a process which directly corresponds to the labour market. Selection, at the various stages of schooling has several functions, some relate to access to higher levels of schooling rather than to accreditation for work. Thus, many processes of selection are taken as indicative of capacities rather than the acquisition of specific skills.

PART 1

YOUTH AND THE STATE.

SECTION C: THE CAPITALIST INDUSTRIAL STATE AND YOUTH

As argued in part one, section A, the categorisation of youth as an age set is important for social integration. However the particular designation of youth is related to the social structure in which that group is located. The accounts of youth as a significant social category which developed both in USA and England and Wales can be viewed as a process of middle class domination. That is, state policies attempted to create a normative consensus around a model of youth based in a set of ideals and practices which had developed in the middle class.¹ The focus of this section will be the way in which this occurred. In addition, there will be an account of the more general historical influences on the creation of youth as an "age set" within each country.

It has been argued in the previous section that the contemporary capitalist state lacks a coherent conception of the "age set" of youth. In this section it will be argued that the definition which emerged as dominant, in the early part of the twentieth century, was based in a psychological notion of adolescence, which failed to create a complete account of the transition to a fully independent adulthood. In particular, as an outcome of liberal democratic ideology, the socially constructed model of youth did not contain a strong definition of either economic or political rights for youth.

Youth as dependent members of families, was at the margins of welfare

policy or was defined as a problem because of the lack of family. It is argued in this thesis, that the emergence of this particular psychological account of youth, incorporated into the welfare state, of both England and Wales was at the heart of the marginalisation of youth. It also allowed the state, when formulating policy, to sustain an ideology which ignored the class division of youth. This contrasts with those states where youth is given a coherent role and status through a nationalised youth policy. It will be argued that the outcome of this representation of youth was that they became viewed as a potential threat to the society of adults.

i) Pre 1945: USA and England and Wales

The theory of adolescence although originally American was incorporated into the thinking of policy makers both in the USA and England and Wales. An extended childhood emerged in both societies at the same time as urbanisation and industrial stratification. Initially, in the mid-nineteenth century, it was the urban middle-class who began to use schooling mainly to provide their children with skills required for entry to the growing bureaucracies. This had the effect of extending the period of age separation into the late teens, and identifying school and credentials with a particular set of occupations. The importance of schooling was in terms of preparation for membership of particular social and economic groups. This was, at least in part, already guaranteed by birth, so that individual achievement or skill acquisition was not the sole criteria of success.² The separation of all the youth, and their effective disenfranchisement from adult society, both through the provision of schooling and industrial legislation, contributed to their recognition by adults as a distinctive cultural group. A youth

culture emerged, the nature of which was interpreted as reflecting a shared understanding of their position in society.³

During this period, there were already in existence organised youth groups. These were both adult and youth dominated and were separate from adult society as represented by the parental control evident in earlier times.⁴ The youth dominated groups tended to legitimate social and emotional aspects of maturation, peer group learning and sex roles, while the adult dominated groups were seen as preparatory in terms of leadership training.⁵ These changed, as did schools, when the idea of "adolescence" began to be accepted.

The emergence of the theory of adolescence occurred during a period of instability and uncertainty for the state in both countries. The English middle class felt menaced by socialism, and by Germany prior to 1914.⁶ In the USA there were fears of "bolshevism, crime and radicalism" as well as of the unemployed.⁷

The terminology of adolescence was in particular associated with Stanley Hall. Hall's ideas were not unique, but his work is of great importance as it provided a formal justification for the work of youth workers and educationalists.⁸ Hall provided an account of "adolescence" which explained the nature of youth culture and provided a rationale for the growing educational profession to argue for an extension of schooling.⁹ In theory schooling was portrayed as the appropriate socialising experience for youth, and also, as a means through which society would achieve social stability.¹⁰

Hall's account of "adolescence" was based in a theory of recapitulation

and included a model of fixed stages of development.¹¹ These stages were not only sequential but also necessary to the development of adult personality. In his work, Hall addresses the educational establishment on the need for more inspirational teaching in school. At the same time he attacked the industrial education movement for "ruthless subordination" of youth.¹² His publication coincided, in particular in the USA, with the period in which there was a move to extend secondary education. The argument, put forward by Hall, legitimated the idea that extended schooling was a suitable protective environment for the emotional experiences of the adolescent. Adolescence was viewed as helpful as it excluded the effects of industry and work, two elements of adult life which were considered damaging.

"Adolescence" as a category was thus initially a construct of psychology and was concerned with the development of a particular type of healthy personality. Hall had argued that the stormy emotional and psychological development of the age group was both significant and essential to the eventual achievement of healthy adulthood. This was very different from the social learning previously stressed by schools, who were training leaders. While drawing attention to the transitory nature of "adolescence", Hall stressed its essential, formative, importance. Thus the care of the adolescent age group had to be distinguished and separated from adult society. Youth was categorised as emotionally immature and as such their experience and opportunity had to be carefully constructed by the adult society. Ideally adolescence would be experienced in an environment which could tolerate the emotional nature of the adolescent and could offer support to enable the development of the sound adult personality. In Hall's account the environment was controlled by an authoritarian adult, who used the intrinsic good of the

rural life for toughening moral and physical attributes.¹³ While Hall claimed that a protected "adolescence" was a universal need, his ideas were essentially those that might appeal to the parents of comfortable urban middle class adolescents. Those who were not required to contribute to the family income and were expected to be socially mobile¹⁴ could afford to become serious adolescents, for example, the adult dominated youth groups such as the Scouts, both in England and the USA.¹⁵

Although educationalists were not totally committed to adopting these ideas as the central purpose of education, on the grounds that the school was concerned to develop knowledge based skills, there was a widespread acceptance of Hall's views. Hall widely influenced those groups involved with youth and philanthropic groups such as the urban playgrounds movement in New York.¹⁶ The ideas were also influential in the careers service where support for the ideas of individual responsibility had initially been important. Acceptance and use of these views is indicated by Counts, who equated High School education with that of the education of adolescents.¹⁷ Also in England there was explicit institutionalisation of adolescence in both schools and youth work.¹⁸

Perhaps most importantly, this essentially psychological categorisation of the "age set" gave both social and educational professionals a rationale for creating a protective environment for the adolescent. The effect was to reinforce the model of the adolescent as not yet ready to be a fully enfranchised adult, as someone still in need of the leadership of a moral or paternalistic figure. Thus educators could protect all children and develop their intellectual social and emotional

skills. The child savers identified the adolescent as someone who was to be protected, if necessary, even from the family.¹⁹ Within the framework, the urban environment was also considered disadvantageous, and industrialisation and work were considered as exploitative of youth. Adolescents were to be separate from the adult social and emotional world as well as from the world of employment. Those working class adolescents who did not conform to the pattern of dependency were thus defined as at least precocious by the middle class and more likely as dangerous.²⁰ In analytical terms the child had been divided into parts, the social, the physical, the emotional and the intellectual, each requiring protection to permit development. By the nineteen forties the scope and aspirations of school policy makers had extended to dealing with all aspects of the child and adolescent. "Adolescence", as a period of maturation, had become congruent with the definition of an entire age group and was substantially defined as coterminus with the provision of schooling.²¹

It is in this period that the hostility of the adult community to the young is clearly established. As a consequence Musgrave suggests that the four popular tenets of youth culture emerged. These are firstly, youth improve if excluded from economic life; secondly, that the segregation of "adolescence" was necessary; thirdly that youth are potential innovators, and finally that the majority of the young feel discarded and failures.²²

The social construction of youth had thus altered significantly in the first half of the twentieth century. The model, basically psychological, had an impact on the development of policy at the establishment of the welfare state. However there were some cultural differences between the

USA and England in the adoption of "adolescence" and it is these differences that are examined in the next two sections.

ii) England and Wales.

The socially constructed location of youth in nineteenth and early twentieth century England and Wales was distinguished along class lines. However with the growth of the state, and in particular the extension of the dependency of youth, the creation of integration around youth as an age set became important for the state.²³

During the nineteenth century, middle class English youth had become regarded as a potentially regenerative force if they were disciplined under the appropriate moral authority.²⁴ This thinking was clearly identified within the public school movement.²⁵ The originator of the reformed public school movement, Mathew Arnold, was concerned to bring order to the experience of schooling and to achieve it through spiritual autonomy and intellectual maturity, while also achieving as rapid maturity as was reasonable. Later to the development of physical power and intellectual prowess were added and combined with a delayed achievement of maturity.²⁶

The public school was an exclusive organisation separated from society by its nature as a boarding institution. The model of socialisation was one that praised conformity to the institution, self denial and, within the society, a reliance on ones peers. The late nineteenth century public school encouraged preparation for leadership achieved by creating dependency on the peer group and delaying, for an increasing period of time, the emergence of the adult. An interest in social and political

ideas was acceptable.²⁷ However, this interest in the society outside the school was filtered through the barrier of intellectual exercises.²⁸ The youth who attended these schools had both a status and purpose during their attendance at school, if only by comparison to other youth. In addition they were able to anticipate future success.²⁹

Another aspect of the creation of a separated youth was evident in the youth movements, the most notable of which in England was the Boy Scouts. This movement subscribed to the idea of youth as a potentially revitalising force for society. Predominantly a male middle class group, the Scouts were adult dominated, and made a virtue out of the postponement of maturity.³⁰ An important element of the ideology of scouting was the assumption that the urban environment would produce alienation and that this could be compensated for by learning the skills of rural survival, which would improve both physical and psychological development of the adolescent.³¹ The movement subscribed to the view, dominant at the time and also promoted by Hall, that the experience of "adolescence" was one that was potentially troubled. The explicit objective of the Scouts was the preparation of good citizens for tomorrow through constructive activity, in "adolescence". This was a mixture of the traditional public school ideology, (that militarism and national efficiency were useful foci for this purpose) and the Hall view of "adolescence" that there was a need to channel constructively the turbulent emotions of the "age set".

There was some resistance to the Scout movement by the working class, which they demonstrated by their absence. In England, however, the Scouts as the major youth group were never successfully challenged by a group representing a different class or ideology. The nearest exception

was the Boys Brigade, which had Scottish working class origins and was tied to a notion of "muscular Christianity."³² The Brigade had a base in Social Darwinist ideas, thus assuming that boys needed training and discipline and, like the Scout movement, was patriotic and militarised. Both groups sponsored essentially conservative and conformist attitudes which were resistant to change. There were a number of other organisations which challenged these values from a more left wing political position. However they were never fully sponsored by either the trade union movement or the Labour Party and failed to recruit in the same numbers as the two major organisations.³³

In practical terms, working class membership of such organisations was unlikely. The recreational activities and the youth movements were expensive both in terms of finance and time, given the greater probability that the youth would be employed.³⁴ It is perhaps not surprising that in the twenties, with the emergence of youth in England as a political and cultural category, youth was middle class and conservative, exemplified by those who worked to break the General Strike.³⁵

A further element in the development of an ideology of "adolescence" was that of 'child saving' or protection from the moral corruption of society. The 'child saving' movement was not fully incorporated into the state and remained as a series of voluntary organisations.³⁶ Child savers were concerned to extend childhood and supported the prolongation of "adolescence" to protect the young from adult society. In particular, they were concerned with the effects of industrialisation and urbanisation. Their impact is reflected most strongly in the push to continue raising of school leaving age, in 1918 to 14, and to 15 in

1947. Their views were also evident in the extension of extra curricula activities. These activities were again establishing the middle class school norm that separate adolescent recreational activity were a part of good and normal development. The youth movements and the child protection movements were both patriotic and social Darwinist in their views, thus their welfare and philanthropic ideas were framed in an acceptance of stratification and meritocracy.³⁷

The push to lengthen schooling was accompanied by a classification of working class youth, who did not conform to the newly created category of dependent youth, as a potential problem for social and moral order.³⁸ The practices of the working class family were portrayed as individualised and the result of poor care rather than a response to the economic and social context. There was a major and continuing clash between the state and the families of the workers over the age at which children could work.³⁹ The marginalisation of the family of the working class, where youth entered the labour market as soon as possible and were quickly absorbed into the world of the adult, was treated as poor, if not bad, practice by the dominance at legislative level of the new version of "adolescence". This ideal that 'youth' was a stage of life which did not include participation in economic activity was clearly established by the time that the welfare legislation was put in place.

The divide between the working class valuation of work and the ideal of adolescence is reflected in the arguments about the place of vocational education in state provision. The theoretical distinction between education and work or vocational training was underlined by a practical division in responsibility between the educationalists and the Department of Science and Art. Despite the fact that vocational

education might have increased the apparent relevance and validity of schooling to the working class the question of vocational education was not dealt with as a whole in the framework of education policy.⁴⁰

From 1889 onwards, the Instruction Act had made it legal for local authorities to levy a penny rate for technical instruction, but this had not led to much development in schools, despite the awareness of the failure to introduce technical education in comparison with both Europe and America.⁴¹ The Samuelson Commission of 1882-4 had recommended, for the elementary curriculum, the introduction of drawing in addition to writing. It had also suggested that the skills for working with wood and iron should be introduced, but these were to be taught, as far as possible, out of school time. These ideas were accompanied by a suggestion that in some schools Greek and Latin could usefully be replaced by natural science, drawing and maths.⁴² This idea was not, however, implemented, thus establishing the distinction that excluded a curriculum containing vocational and practical elements being seen as educational.⁴³

The lack of development of secondary technical education can be considered a direct result of the 1902 decision which protected the university preparation courses.⁴⁴ This ruling created a clear distinction between elementary and secondary schools. The elementary curriculum which, at the time of Haddow in 1926, was followed by 83% of eleven to fourteen year olds, was defined as an entity separate from higher level subjects, which gave access to the university.⁴⁵

A particular characteristic of English schooling is that the secondary curriculum, which developed within the traditional parameters of grammar

school knowledge, did not incorporate the idea of technical knowledge.⁴⁶ There were a few trade schools established in 1905. They were recognised as technical schools in 1913 for the education of artisans and industrial employment. These schools remained narrowly vocational, and were not considered as within the educational system. Thus both Hadow in 1926 and Spens in 1938 noted the lack of education to fit youth for industrial and commercial life. The pattern of further education that emerged was part time evening instruction and industrial experience or employment. Much of further education was at an introductory level, although some notion of continuity and progress was developed with the establishment of the National Diploma and Certificate system in 1918.⁴⁷ Attendance at these schools was clearly divided along class aspiration lines. The academic grammar school curriculum represented the knowledge required for preparation for the higher education sector and reflected the content of the public and grammar school sector. Vocational and technical studies were developed in colleges, which provided courses at post compulsory schooling level, below higher education.

The university sector in England was comparatively slow to incorporate technical education. This is one of the factors which allowed the continuing absence of technical knowledge at school.⁴⁸ It is also of note that there was no clear demand from employers. On the contrary, in 1926, the Malcolm Committee found that they were asking for intelligence and adaptability rather than specific vocational and practical skills.⁴⁹

The failure of the secondary school to develop along technical and scientific route can be accounted for in many ways. It can be viewed in part as the result of the status of the traditional subjects and the desire of the English to remain either urban middle class or

aristocratically attached to the land.⁵⁰ Also the retention of the grammar school curriculum can be associated with social mobility. The expansion of trade and commerce in the early twentieth century, as opposed to industrial production, meant that successful employment was in the professions and white collar sector, rather than engineering.⁵¹ For those entering commerce at a lower level, there was an expansion of junior commercial schools, helped by the grants of the Arts and Science Board for banking, finance and bookkeeping.⁵² However, like other aspects of technical education, there was no link through to higher education which remained a separate sector accessible only to those who attended secondary school and succeeded on the grammar curriculum.

Social mobility was identified with attendance at secondary schooling, and a lengthy youth dominated by middle class norms. This replaced an ideal of mobility through the wage earning sector. However, the ideal of "adolescence" as a dependent category was undermined in practice by the stratification of economic opportunity.

Middle class youth, and those who aspired to high status, could participate easily in the leisured and expensive pattern of "adolescence". This pattern had emerged as a result of the guarantee of status afforded by attendance at grammar and public school. The curricula of which, although not formally vocational and certainly not practical, offered through the route of certification access to higher education and employment. The majority, while pressured to remain in schooling, had less motivation and opportunity. The schools did not offer courses which were appropriate to their anticipated futures and failed as such to offer potential status and achievement. At the same time, the cultural affect of "adolescence" was to degrade the strategy

of survival, which involved employment and early entry to adult cultural activity, which was the working class pattern. This contrasts both at a policy and theoretical level with the USA, where the vocational tracks had a place in the High School and work remained a more acceptable ambition.

iii) USA

In the USA the fee paying, or private school model, was less influential in the provision for youth than in England. The American common school, which was less exclusive and more often co-educational, was the dominant pattern of school. During the nineteenth century there was an expansion in schooling: at the High School and also in college courses, and the growth of professional schools, all of which prolonged the experience of school based dependency for youth. This development was a dramatic change from the expectation of youth in the early part of the century; when to be successful was to strike out on one's own.⁵³

In the USA, aspects of the progressive movements were important if not solely responsible for creating institutions and values which separated the young from the society. These can be accounted for under two major themes in American policy, each with distinct phases. The first, in the period 1890-1915, involved the theme of childsaving through the use of public policy.⁵⁴ The second period to 1930, was the era of child study based on the developmental model of the, "normal child."⁵⁵

Thus post 1918 was dominated by a custodial model of the school. Public education was viewed as a wise investment to fit the individual to the

state and, in particular, to Americanize the new immigrant child.⁵⁶ The emergence of vocational schooling under the auspices of the Smith Hughes Act was thus viewed by some as socially divisive and there was pressure on the High School to be less academically orientated.⁵⁷ The move from the principally intellectual education, prescribed by Elliot, came with the Cardinal Principles in 1918. These were a combination of the ideals of social efficiency, life adjustment and progressive education. Though diverging in many ways, these educational movements had a common belief that education was concerned with a preparation for life in society. Both valued schooling for adolescents and advocated a model of conformity to the school spirit, or team, while distrusting purely intellectual activity. Also a passivity or repression of aggressive responses was encouraged. Cremin, argues that the ideas of the progressives were evident in the practice and thinking of most High Schools by the end of the thirties, in terms of a range of extra-curricula activities, varied and flexible grouping, and a recognition of individual differences. Similarly Krug argues that the custodial function of the High School had been generally accepted.⁵⁸

Outside school the main youth movement in the USA became the Scout movement.⁵⁹ This was not initially the case. The Woodcraft Movement based on Indian folklore was a competitor with the Scouts, called the first outdoor out of school movement for boys. However, after visiting England, the Woodcraft Movements founder Seton Watson incorporated his own movement into the Scouts thus losing its distinctive orientation. Later, in 1914, when Seton Watson withdrew from the scouts over the issue of patriotism, he was not able to resuscitate his own organisation to compete with the large scale organisation of the Scouts.⁶⁰

The legislation of the thirties and forties, in the USA, was more concerned with removing children from the labour market, where they were not required than with philanthropic motivation. Despite the legislation, the agricultural areas were still effectively unregulated and it was common for youth to be employed. At a legislative level, the struggles over the definitions of good motherhood, homes and poverty were dominated by the view that self reliance was a major ideal, even if, during the worst of the recession, this view was strained both in theory and practice.⁶¹

Overall, however, the USA was constructing, in effect, social unity through the school. This unity was not directly related to the ownership of, or participation in, the economy.⁶² The "problems" of the immigrant and city young were to be resolved not by early employment but by "schooling to order."⁶³ There was a minimal definition of welfare and care of the adolescent, but as Norton Grubb points out this was frequently justified in terms of economic benefit to the community.⁶⁴

The economic efficiency definition of the adolescent had emerged as the result of a long struggle over the economic and vocational purposes of schooling.⁶⁵ From the time of the Morrill Act there had been a relationship between the agricultural economy and education. However the High School curriculum had been untouched by this, and remained the preparatory route for college in the nineteenth century. This pattern was changed during the first thirty years of the twentieth century. There are a number of factors associated with this change and it is not easy to identify which was the most significant.⁶⁶ The dominance of business in terms of city and school management was important in giving space to the demands of the ideology of social efficiency. The

nineteenth century vision that "everyone could make it," with the common school offering opportunity to self made entrepreneurs, gave way to an urban society where business managers were concerned to reduce expenditure and were unwilling, for example, to pay for schooling for immigrants who did not require skills to work in the factories.⁶⁷

At the same time there were a number of pressure groups, with a variety of aims, all of whom advocated vocational education as a solution. The National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education suggested that efficiency could be achieved by the better adjustment of individuals to the industrial state. They advocated vocational education in the High School as a suitable means of achieving this. Prosser and Snedden, both senior members of the movement, were convinced that better adjustment would lead to better service both for themselves and their fellows. Their arguments were based on notions of the technical imperative and a belief that this was a neutral question devoid of political or ideological questions. Dewey and Adams also advocated vocational education as the means for reviving notions of community and collectivism which, they believed, had disappeared during the urbanisation of the late nineteenth century.⁶⁸ Underpinning the views of both groups was a common concern with possible instability of the society. Not only were there large numbers of new migrants to the USA, but the urban youth were changing jobs frequently and aimlessly. There was an apparently increasing gulf between the various sectors of American society; neither group, however, challenged the overall ideas of class or capitalism. Instead, they argued for a role to be taken by the state in providing a more efficient and or meaningful method of education to promote stability and a sense of purpose.

The Smith Hughes legislation, which emerged as the result of a series of alliances and compromises, was the basis of Federal involvement in vocational education.⁶⁹ The choice lay with the States as to whether vocational education should be in a separate institution or within the High School. The categories of vocational education were for specific trade training with the exception of the out of school training for the fourteen to eighteen year olds, who could receive civic or vocational education.⁷⁰ While the shift was away from direct manual skills, it progressively ignored the change in the economy that required a high level of white collar employment. This was, in part, because the Act was also designed as a social control mechanism, to retain and remotivate urban youth and in particular urban males.⁷¹ Although the development of commerce and white collar employment was essentially for females, this was not catered for in the Smith Hughes legislation. Instead the outcome of the debate about the training of young women for work or home duties was that the domestic interpretation dominated, with home economics as a category in the legislation.⁷² Smith Hughes, with its provision for courses below college level, represented the creation of stratification of opportunity in the common school.⁷³

Throughout the twenties and thirties there was a strong uptake of vocational courses. Kantor estimates that in California the majority of High School students took a vocational or manual training course, although for most students this was not as important to them as the commerce or general academic course.⁷⁴

During this period the vocational guidance movement became important in school. Initially, it developed with strong industrial links but it changed to a perspective internal to the High School. The form this took

was the emergence of intelligence and aptitude testing as the norm.⁷⁵ The premiss of the service was that it was possible to predict the vocational futures of youth and that some youth were more suited to certain occupations than others. These attributes were deemed to be identifiable out of context and independent of class, gender and culture, by means of psychological testing. While the ideological basis of the test was not greatly disputed, there was a recognised tension about the way in which the service should operate. Debate existed around the issue of whether the young were to be tested and directed to appropriate careers, or whether guidance aimed to diagnose the skills and competencies of individuals and then to provide them with information on which to base their own career decision. In the event the service became one which helped students to make choices between courses within the High School.⁷⁶

While the vocationalisation of education was an important feature of the state and federal purposes by the thirties, this is not the only reason for the increased attendance and use of schooling. All occupations were increasingly subject to credentialism; thus students with ambition were likely to remain in school for longer.⁷⁷ During the first twenty years of the twentieth century there was a change in the expectation of the purposes of college. Initially, access to the curriculum was in itself seen as the purpose for continuation. However, a number of processes served to change the significance of college. There was a development of extra curricula activities and the acceptance by the business community of college graduates as suitable for employment in preference to those who had hands-on experience. The argument that the curriculum was most valuable when it was least specialised gained credence.⁷⁸ That is, it was not the specific skill or knowledge that the education gave but the

invisible qualities that it instilled. Thus the process of attending an educational institution provided compensation for the alienating processes of urbanisation and the disintegration of relationships, by providing an alternative community.

In the thirties there was increasing doubt about the effectiveness of the High School. The Committee on the study of adolescents found that 40% of youth were unemployed and the usefulness of vocational education came under scrutiny.⁷⁹ Throughout the decade there was a competition between the National Youth Association and that of the educators about which was the best provider. The Youth Association lost only at the advent of war. At this time, high on the agenda, were arguments about reconciling the physical and moral apathy of youth, with other views which suggested that the youth were the source of radicalism and subversion.⁸⁰

The American model of the adolescent was characterised by the patterns of the common school and with this a strong commitment to mobility and self reliance for all. The schooling system had long been dominated by the middle class. This leadership had a dual purpose: to Americanize and to socialise.⁸¹ The creation of the vocational element in schooling, under the Smith Hughes legislation, was to create a divisive schooling structure, with provision created to motivate the majority rather than to give better access to social mobility.

iv) Conclusion: Youth in the pre welfare states of USA and England.

By the end of the thirties the definition of youth which was operating in both countries was one which was profoundly influenced by the

psychological definition of "adolescence". It was perhaps so readily accepted because Hall provided a basis for definition of youth as an "age set" that did not challenge the ideas already in existence. Thus the prescription that youth should be an "age set" because it was not reliable enough to take on fully adult roles, fitted with the nineteenth and early century growth of schooling. This growth had a basis both in socialisation and knowledge objectives, although, as discussed, they were differently constructed in the USA and England and Wales.

With increased access to school, selection and allocation had become major issues for the state as legislator and provider of schools. Since state legislation determined that all adolescents were to be compulsorily in school until the age of 14-16, the school had to take on the role of selection which had previously occurred outside the schools. For the state an effective way of relating the rights of access and mobility in a society increasingly orientated to credentialism had thus to emerge, while also retaining legitimacy in the belief that the state was the best representative of individual interest. Writing about American youth, but equally applicable in England, Kenniston argues that an important feature of the structural relationship of the youth group was the expectation of the parents that the youth would do better than they had, and that the youth would have access to a lifestyle in some way significantly different to the parents. The idea of youth success was premised, in the aspiration of parents, on intellectual, academic success and certification. Those who remained in school or college experienced longer "adolescence" and later had greater access to status within adult society.⁸²

The changes which brought about the establishment of a welfare state

both in the USA and England and Wales has been important in producing a new set of expectations of the state.⁸³ The state became of increasing significance, both in the legitimation of extensive policies related to the welfare ideology and as a agent of expenditure. The welfare state, it has been argued is a continuation of the liberal state, within a framework of capitalism. Both in the USA and England this has included the ideology of individual rights, rights to the protection of property and a belief in the merit of social mobility. Both states have a polity which is, in differing form, a representative democracy with a commitment to equality defined in political but not economic terms.⁸⁴

Unlike the socialist states, there was no right to employment. Welfare capitalism was based on old priorities but also a new belief that the cycles of the market could be controlled by the intervention of the state. The Keynesian, or demand economics model, had given the focus for the creation of employment by the state but had not provided a focus for a right to employment. However the state was also conceived of as the appropriate site for the maintenance of the general welfare of the population, in terms of income, nutrition, health, housing and education, as a matter of political right.

The structure of the transition of youth became more heavily identified with the measures taken by the welfare state to regulate and provide for citizens. However, the social construction of youth and the transition from childhood to adult were not identified as a an important feature of social processes. Youth was not a significant category with status and purpose in the state. Youth was an "age set" in transition.

Youth, along with children, was in the category of dependent, included

with family benefits, until deemed adult. The welfare benefit was negotiated by the state which defined both the levels of poverty and need. Those who became clients of the state were defined as deficit, in terms of the prevailing definition of poverty or social practice, such as child rearing. Although a rights ideology existed, it was principally interpreted as the protection of freedoms, and the minimal benefits of the state were framed by beliefs about the deserving poor.⁸⁵

Welfarism retained capitalism as its base, while taking on board the assumption that the market could be controlled by state intervention. The benefits of the welfare state were based on distributive justice or universal rights. There was a public commitment to the welfare state as an agency of redistribution. In the case of youth, this was principally interpreted as equality of access to free secondary education in school or college.⁸⁶

Authors such as Wilensky frequently separate schooling analytically from the structures of welfare such as health and housing, because of the age restricted nature of the population affected, its universal nature, and the less tangible nature of its service.⁸⁷ Since, however, along with defence and health, education is one of the main items of state expenditure, it is problematic to separate education entirely from the analysis. This is because within the corporatist welfare state, the legitimation of the state was dependent upon the recognition both of state bureaucracy, and the notion of the expert or professional, a socialisation process which was reproduced within the schools.⁸⁸ Thus while overtly schooling is not a service in the same manner as health and housing the state uses the schooling system as an agency of social policy.

In this thesis it is argued that it is more useful to consider schools as a form of welfare agency. Its service is the control and containment of the young, and in periods of high unemployment the removal of youth from the labour market. Both in the USA and England and Wales as a welfare objective, there was the provision of mass universal education to which was uneasily added that of elite selection. As secondary schooling was expanded to provide for the masses, its initial purpose of creation and certification of the ruling group was retained.

In the earlier account of the state it was argued that the three principal functions of the state in maintaining its existence were integration, consensus and production and reproduction.⁸⁹ It was also argued that these need to be evident in the social construction of the youth age set, if the processes of transition from childhood to adulthood are to be achieved in a coherent manner.

As suggested in the earlier section, during the nineteenth century, the socialisation of the young into an integrative set of values and behaviour developed from the middle class notion of "adolescence". Schooling took on part of the familial role of socialisation and the learning of normative rules. The state, took on more involvement in the relationship between the family and the child as, for example, in the extension of compulsory schooling and the definition of failing and inadequate parenting.⁹⁰

Another dimension to the policy which created integration was that of extending education to achieve containment. The overt reasons for this were dual.⁹¹ In part the reasons were accommodated to the theory that

changing technology necessarily required higher educational qualifications in the population. Other reasons however were concerned with the potential for disruption of the unemployed young during periods of high unemployment.⁹² The integrative elements were evident in the terms of power and legal definitions. In both countries adolescence was, in large part, identified with the extension of compulsory schooling. This was also achieved in the definition of juvenile delinquency, and the labelling of youth subculture as deviant as it challenged the dependent and depoliticised model of "adolescence".⁹³

Socialisation and consensus was achieved around competition for certification based on merit achieved within the school on an agreed curriculum. The curriculum knowledge which was the basis for success in the USA and England and Wales differed markedly.

Early in this century in the USA there was a closer relationship established in the construction of the "age set" of youth to the needs of the industrial society. This was identifiable in the citizenship and vocational orientation of the High School curriculum. Thus the American construction of youth was one in which success was related to the industrial state. In addition, this was also linked to the use of the High School as a mechanism for socialisation into community. However, as discussed earlier, the vocational element of the High School curriculum was not changed and thus did not function as an entry level course for work. By providing courses that were only apparently relevant, it was effectively creating stratification of youth.

The English curriculum was less clearly associated with the industrial nature of the state than that of the USA. There had been a retention of

the classical curricula forms of knowledge which were defined as secondary education. However, the effect of selection to, and success or failure in, different types of school provided a strong model of socialisation to the traditional education model of the grammar and public school.

The link to the state functions of creating the conditions of production and reproduction are complex and weak in the ideology of the welfare model. Certainly neither the USA nor England and Wales attempted to implement policies to bring the relationship between the school and the labour market to the point created by an extensive planning policy, as had been attempted in the Soviet Union. Secondary schooling in England and Wales did not offer a work related curriculum and the vocational courses that existed were excluded from school. In the USA there were work related courses. However, these were not changed in parallel with the changes in the labour market. The institutions constructed for youth reflected the weak account of labour and employment within the model of youth.

However, there were less explicit links between the labour market and the schooling system. These were the certification of pupils for higher or further educational qualifications. The lengthening of schooling, usually understood as representing the protective element of state provision, also reflected the political battle over access and redistribution. This was also associated with the increasing need for certification.⁹⁴ The aspect of schooling which was the most direct agent of the economy was that involved in selecting and sorting the pupils on credential criteria. The socialisation of adolescents, and the specific development of skills were subsumed under the policies designed to

develop access and equality in terms of the development of individual potential.⁹⁵

Within these functions there is a contradiction which, Offe argues, constitutes the major incompatibility of the welfare state.⁹⁶ While the welfare state is based on the continuation of the free market, it has continued to regulate it in favour of the activities of welfare, and citizenship rights.

In contrast to those countries with a strong central policy of reconstruction, which generated a coherent transition for youth, the welfare state in USA and England and Wales did not identify a comprehensive position or role for youth. Instead the psychological model of youth, "adolescence," dominated, focusing policy around separation, care and limited participation; and hiding the issues of stratification and selection for the labour market. However the consensus achieved around merit and selection on the basis of school achievement meant that some sections of youth had little to gain from extended schooling. In this thesis it is argued that this absence constitutes the weakness in the construction of youth adopted into the welfare states of Britain and USA in 1944.

In the next two parts of this thesis the changing policies of the state toward youth will be examined in terms of the three functions of the state. It will be the main argument of the thesis that while the welfare form of industrial capitalism was dominant the social construction of youth as "adolescent" was sustained despite the tension around the way in which the state also maintained the conditions of production and consensus. With the change in the economic climate in the early

seventies, welfare was no longer a politically acceptable definition of the state. It will be argued that while this made the ideology of "adolescence" unsuitable it has not been easy for the state to withdraw from its commitment to the ideology of "adolescence" because of its power as a focus for integration of the age set.

References and Footnotes: Part 1 Section C

1. Kett J.F., Rites of Passage, New York: Basic Books, 1977
2. *ibid.*, pp. 215-244 "The Invention of the Adolescent "
3. Tapper T., Young People and Society, London: Faber and Faber, 1971
4. Shipman M.D., Childhood: a Sociological Perspective, Slough: NFER, 1972
5. Milson F., Youth in a Changing Society, London: RKP., 1972
6. Springhall J., Youth Empire and Society, London: Croom Helm, 1970
7. Krug. E.A., The Shaping of the American High School, vol 2, Milwaukee and London: University of Wisconsin Press, 1972
8. Kett J., Rites of Passage, *op. cit.*
9. Kett J., Rites of Passage, *op. cit.*
10. Murray C., Youth in Contemporary Society, Slough: NFER Publications, 1978
11. Hall G.S., "Childhood and Adolescence" quoted in Spring "Youth Culture in the United States" in Karrier C et al., Roots of the Crisis, Chicago, Rand McNally, 1973, pp. 198-214
12. Kett J., Rites of Passage, *op. cit.* p. 219
13. Kett J., Rites of Passage, *op. cit.* pp. 221-228
14. Kett J., Rites of Passage, *op. cit.*
15. Morris B., "Earnest Thompson and the Origins of the Woodcraft Movement," Journal of Contemporary History vol. 5 no 2 1970 pp. 183-194
16. Kett J., Rites of Passage, *op. cit.*
17. Counts G., The Social Foundations of Education, New York: Basic Books, 1934
18. Davies B. and Gibson A., The Social Education of the Adolescent, London: University of London Press, 1967
19. Pinchbeck I. and Hewitt M., Children in English Society, London: RKP, 1973. Pinchbeck argues that in England during the twenties and thirties there was an overlap between the old poor law extension and the new school welfare function as educationalists began to develop wider spheres of influence.
20. Musgrove F., Youth and the Social Order, London: RKP., 1964
21. Kett J., Rites of Passage, *op. cit.*
22. Musgrove F., Youth and the Social Order, *op. cit.*
23. Murray C., Youth In Contemporary Society, Slough: NFER., 1978

References and Footnotes: Part 1 Section C

24. Gillis J.R., Youth and History, London: Academic Press, 1974
25. Shipman M., Childhood: a Sociological Perspective, op. cit.
26. Gillis J., Youth and History, op. cit.
27. Gillis J., Youth and History, op. cit. Gillis notes that the public school was designed to create social exclusivity at the same time as the male pupils were expected to show an intellectual interest in the social and political world to which they were denied direct access.
28. Musgrove F., Youth and the Social Order, op. cit.
29. Musgrove F., Youth and the Social Order, op. cit.
30. Gillis J., Youth and History, op. cit., p. 148 Gillis comments on the failure of other youth movements with alternative ideologies to develop in the context.
31. Kett J., Rites of Passage, op. cit.
32. Springhall J., op. cit.
33. Wilkinson P., "English Youth Movements 1908-1930", Journal of Contemporary History vol 4, no 2, 1969, pp. 3-23
34. Gillis J., Youth and History, op. cit.
35. Marwick A., Youth in Britain 1920-60, Journal of Contemporary History vol.5, no. 1, 1970, pp. 37-51. Marwick argues that, in analysing this period it is necessary to separate and distinguish the student youth; those who worked against the general strike, from the working or unemployed youth.
36. Pinchbeck I. Hewitt M., Children in English Society, London: RKP.,1973.
37. Gillis J., Youth and History, op. cit., p.146
38. Musgrove F., Youth and the Social Order, op. cit.
39. Gillis J., Youth and History, op. cit.
40. Argles M., South Kensington to Robbins, London: Longman, 1964
41. Gordon P. and Lawton D., Curriculum Change in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1978
42. *ibid.*
43. Reeder D., "A Recurring Debate: Education and Industry," in Bernbaum G., Schooling in Decline, London: Macmillan, 1979 pp. 115-147
44. Banks O. Parity and Prestige in English Secondary Education, London: Routledge Kegan Paul, 1955

References and Footnotes: Part 1 Section C

45. Argles M., South Kensington to Robbins, op. cit.
46. Banks suggests that there is not enough evidence about actual curriculum up to 1918. However she points out that the new examinations in 1918 "had little scope for manual arts of any type." Banks O., op. cit.
47. Argles M., South Kensington to Robbins, op. cit.
48. Argles M., South Kensington to Robbins, op. cit., p 76
49. Report of the Committee on Education and Industry, H.M.S.O., London, 1926-28
50. Weiner M.J., English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit, Cambridge and London: Cambridge University Press, 1981
51. Gordon P., & Lawton D., Curriculum Change in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries, op. cit.
52. Argles M., South Kensington to Robbins, op. cit.
53. Kett J., Rites of Passage, op. cit., p. 172
54. Craven H., "Child Saving in the Age of Professionalism," in Hawes J.M., American Childhood, Westport Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1985, pp. 415-488
55. Hawes J.M., American Childhood, Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1985.
56. Nasaw D., Schooled to Order, New York: Oxford University Press, 1979 (Chap 66). Nasaw argues that by 1920 every major city school system was centralised and run by the reformers, professionals and businessmen, rather than the community.
57. Nasaw D., Schooled to Order, op. cit., (Chap 6). Nasaw argues that the development of the manual and vocational schooling led very rapidly to the stratification of pupils as it was possible for schooling to be extended without the possibility of continuation to college.
58. Cremin L.A., Public Education, New York: Basic Books, 1976 and Krug, The Shaping of the American High School,. op. cit.
59. Hollingshead in his study of Elmstown noted the growth of the adult sponsored scout movement. Hollingshead A.B., Elmstown's Youth, and Elmstown Revisited, New York: Wiley, 1975
60. Morris B., Ernest Thomas Seton and the Origins of the Woodcraft Movement, Journal of Contemporary History, vol 5, no 2, 1970, pp. 184-194
61. Hawes J., American Childhood, Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1985
62. Spring J., Educating the Worker Citizen, New York: Longman, 1980
63. Nasaw D., Schooled to Order, op. cit.

References and Footnotes: Part 1 Section C

64. Norton Grubb W. and Lazerson M., Broken Promises, New York: Basic Books, 1982
65. Kantor H.A., Learning to Earn, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988. Kantor suggests that the emergence of vocational education had a profound effect on the ideology of the American High School, in so far as by the thirties the idea that there was a link between work and the purpose of schooling was undisputed.
66. *ibid.*
67. Nasaw D., Schooled to Order, *op. cit.*
68. Venn G., Man Education and Work, Washington: American Council of Education, 1964
69. Thompson J.F., Foundations of Vocational Education, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1973
70. Cohen S., Education in the United States, vols. 3&4., New York, Random House 1974
71. Violas P., The Training of the Urban Working Class, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1978
72. Kantor D., Learning to Earn, *op. cit.*
73. Cohen S., Education in the United States, *op. cit.*
74. Kantor D., Learning to Earn, *op. cit.*
75. Nasaw D., Schooled to Order, *op. cit.*
76. Kantor D., Learning to Earn, *op. cit.*
77. Norton Grubb W., Lazerson N., Broken Promises, New York: Basic Books, 1982
78. Spring J. "Education and the Rise of the Corporate State" cited in Kett J. Rites of Passage, *op. cit.*
79. Krug E. A., The Shaping of the American High School, vol.2, Milwaukee and London: University of Wisconsin Press, 1972
80. Krug E., The Shaping of the American High School *op. cit.* Krug notes that Mrs Roosevelt, who sponsored the youth administration, was in favour of physical exercise and compulsory camps. The youth themselves were asking for more individuality and autonomy.
81. Tyack D., The One Best System, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1974
82. Keniston K. "Youth Culture as Enforced Alienation," in Rapson R., The Cult of Youth in Middle Class America, New York: D.C. Heath, 1971.
83. King D., "The State and the Social Structure of Welfare in Advanced

References and Footnotes: Part 1 Section C

Industrial Democracies," Theory and Society 16, 1987: pp. 841-868,

84. Carnoy M., The State and Political Theory, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.

85. See Part 1 section 3 Welfare

86. Eisenstadt S.M., "The Welfare State and the Transformation of the Modern Social Order", in Eisenstadt S.M., The Welfare State and its Aftermath, Beckenham Kent: Croom Helm, 1985 pp309-316

87. Wilensky H.L., The Welfare State and Equality, Berkley, University of California Press, 1975

88. Corrigan P., Capitalism, State Formation and Marxist Theory, London: Quartet Books, 1980

89. See Part 1 Section B i)

90. Keane J., (ed.) Contradictions in the Welfare State, by C. Offe, London: Hutchinson, 1984

91. Norton Grubb W. Lazerson M., Broken Promises, New York: Basic Books 1982 (Part 2 Chap 5) Lazerson and Grubb argue that in the USA, in particular, there was a tension between the desire for the state to take over from inadequate parents for moral reasons and for economic reasons. Thus the state could act in the case of pathologically inadequate parents. However there was another strand of thinking which legitimated the same action on the grounds that it would pay off in economic terms.

92. Rees G. & Rees T.L., "Juvenile Unemployment and the State Between the Wars," in Rees T.L. & Atkinson P. Youth Unemployment and State Intervention, London: RKP, 1982.pp13-29

93. Davies B., Threatening Youth, Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1986

94. Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies Education Group, Unpopular Education, London: Hutchinson, 1981

95. Hall G., Childhood and Adolescence op. cit.

96. Keane J., (ed.), Contradictions in the Welfare State, by C. Offe op. cit.

PART 2THE POLICY CONSTRUCTION OF YOUTH 1945-72SECTION A: ENGLAND AND WALES

As argued in part 1, "adolescence" as normalised through the acceptance of Stanley Hall's ideas was essentially a middle class phenomena associated with state legislation. The post-war establishment of a political order informed by a welfare ideology, both in the USA and England, meant that youth as an "age set" were constructed as both dependent on the state and the object of welfare policies. In the case of youth, this was a situation influenced by the state, principally by the legislation controlling youth employment and by that requiring compulsory school attendance. Youth was marginal, rather than central to policy. Thus in certain cases youth was covered by family, employment and education policies. In relation to youth as a group, the most important elements were the universal compulsion of families to send children to school and the legislation which controlled youth employment. The process of transition from dependent to adult was weakly defined in the industrial capitalist state. The advent of the ideology of welfare meant that it was the policies of the state, rather than the family or community, which defined the experience of youth. Thus the nature and distinctions of that experience are indicative of the social construction of "adolescence" during the post war period to 1972.

It was argued, in part one, that within the two countries, integration of youth as an "age set" had been achieved through the generalisation of a psychologically based model of youth. This construction of youth normalised a dependent and depoliticised "age set". Integration was also

achieved around the state policy which contained youth away from the labour market. The way in which the state continues to achieve integration around this value during the welfare period of 1945 to 1972 will be analysed. This value was balanced by the commitment to a "right to opportunity" through access to school, which in 1944 had been differentially achieved.

It was also argued that the state needed to create order and security. In part one this was identified as being achieved through the creation of consensus and socialisation around the value of merit signalled by certification. It was argued that in the early part of the century this had been implemented in a different form in the USA and England and Wales. The American High School offered a more broadly based curriculum on which to succeed. Thus, at the point of establishing the welfare state, the American construction of the youth "age set" was one which created a more open model of success for youth through the offering of a greater range of subjects on which to achieve. The issues to be examined in the section, Aii), on consensus relate to the nature and availability of the curriculum and the social learning of the school during the period of welfare capitalism.

The third identified function of the state was that of creating conditions for production and reproduction, which it was argued, were evident in the demand for labour. In the tradition of schools in England and Wales, the explicit provision of vocational courses had been determined as inappropriate to secondary schooling. Thus in 1945 vocational courses were provided in institutions separate from secondary schools. In contrast in the USA, there existed distinct state sponsored vocational courses within the High School.

The Keynesian economic model dominated welfare planning. It was one in which maintenance of high employment figured as an important element. The state was operating policies which it was hoped would lead to a full employment situation. Dominant during the early part of the welfare state was human capital theory, which stressed expenditure on education not as consumption but as investment.¹ The theory was based in a series of assumptions about technological change. These supported the view that technology would require an increasing level of skill. The policies and objectives that were generated tended to ignore distribution of skill and knowledge in educational provision.

Education, in a generalised form, that is not specifically vocational was advocated as an important contribution to economic growth.² The theory that industrial society required an increasingly well educated labour force and the reflection of this in policies about youth is a problematic to be explored. Open to question is the effectiveness of this strategy in fulfilling the state functions of production and reproduction.

In the USA and England a major state expenditure was on the education system through the provision of the schooling and college system. The provision was developed in accord with the overall commitment to an ideology of right of access to some form of secondary education.³ Schooling provision has been one of the items which has incurred a high level of growth and cost, thus the investment of the state in this interpretation of welfare cannot be taken lightly. Rather it is indicative of a construction of youth as appropriately within the public domain, substantially schooled and regulated by the state. Absence of

participation or success thus creates a definition of problem or failure.

In the following sections the country specific model of "adolescence" in transition, in the period 1944 to 1972, will be analysed. As argued in part one, the state is continuously renegotiating its position in relation to its objectives of creating consensus and integration, and facilitating the processes of production. Part 2 is divided into two sections each referring to a different country. Following from the argument, presented in the first part of the thesis, the state functions of maintaining integration, consensus and production can be identified and analysed in relation to the construction of youth as an "age set". In each subsection the effectiveness of the state in achieving its identified functions is examined.

A. England and Wales

i) Integration and Generalisation of Youth.

As already outlined in part one, integration was achieved in 1944 through the adoption of welfare as a political commitment. In relation to youth and the redistribution of benefits, it was principally achieved through the expansion of the schooling system.⁴ In educational terms this was marked by the passage of the 1944 Education Act. This Act represented one dimension of a broad political settlement, which for education lasted until the early nineteen seventies.⁵ This version of welfare was one in which there was an emphasis on the redistribution of social rights. However, in many ways the 1944 Act was not a break with

the traditions of English education, principally because it did not alter the high status of Grammar schooling. Both the institution and the social construction of knowledge as reflected in the curriculum were retained. There was, however, no commitment to making this a universal experience.

The 1944 Act administratively altered the school system, by the abolition of the Elementary Code. This created continuity of access from primary to secondary school, which was compulsory for all until the age of fifteen.⁶ Prior to the 1944 Act, the education that had taken place in the Grammar school was the only curriculum labelled as secondary. In its initial form, secondary school was not necessarily linked by age or right to attendance at elementary school. These were separate institutions, although increasingly practice had been that continuity was possible for those who passed a selective examination. Secondary education had been a privilege for those youth who were selected at the age of eleven, and were likely to continue until the age of eighteen. There was a very limited number of alternative schools which catered for the age range and were outside the elementary system.⁷ These were the junior technical, commercial and art schools. In 1938 secondary schools provided for less than one in eight and the other schools for less than one in two hundred of those aged eleven to fourteen.⁸

Thus the 1944 Act, by giving education as a right to age fifteen, was also legally extending the period of compulsory dependency, further limiting the power of the parents over the adolescent and altering the rights of the adolescent, particularly access to waged labour.⁹ In exchange the age group was offered an extension of dependency and an experience of secondary schooling. Whether the protected environment of

schooling offered any improvement for those compelled to remain was problematic, since prior to 1944 they would have been employed.

The early stages of the period "adolescence" were thus firmly located within formal schooling. Both compulsory attendance laws and the obligation on parents to make the child attend, or to provide an inspected adequate alternative, meant that nearly all fourteen and fifteen year olds were in school. The local authorities were charged with providing efficient education throughout the levels, in order to meet the needs of the population, which meant primary and secondary for all.¹⁰ The right to secondary schooling did not however mean the right of access to the same institution or curriculum. Thus state integration was achieved around the theme of access, but not of similarity of treatment.

While secondary schooling became an integral part of the experience of youth to the minimum leaving age, the state provision for the post compulsory sector was much more uneven. For those not selected for the Grammar school, access to post compulsory was not so rationalised. In the 1944 Act the Further Education system was described as the third tier, not as parallel to schools. Further Education colleges provided courses for the same age group of youth who were in the Grammar School. Those youth who remained in the Grammar school course, beyond the compulsory period, went into the sixth form which was guarded by highly controlled access. The sixth form was the epitome of grammar education, and it was in reality a preparatory and selection course for Higher Education.¹¹ On the other hand Further Education was administratively outside the school system and lacked continuity of courses and examinations. Although the 1944 Act proposed, at some future date, to

provide part-time and other opportunities for the fifteen year old leaver to the age of seventeen years and eight months, this was not a substantively reflected in the policy of the following two decades.¹² Thus at the level of post compulsory provision the state provided a highly divisive experience. For the academic youth, commitment to the youth "age set" of "adolescence" was long term and promised status and success. For the others, the majority, the identification with the "age set" youth was more problematic as it promised little mobility, success or status.

Up to 1963 educational reports all embodied the notion of a tripartite system of provision. The allocation of places lay principally with the professional educationalists, legitimated by a selection procedure which claimed to predict future academic potential in three broad categories. Thus the experience of youth was of selection at eleven on the basis of testing which purported to predict future competence and performance. The 1944 Act made limited provision for parental choice, in so far as that did not require unreasonable public expenditure, an option rarely used. As might be anticipated, in this form of welfare state there was no right of choice offered to youth.

The acceptance of a tripartite division continued for some time after the establishment of the welfare state. This was evident in Spens,¹³ and Norwood,¹⁴ at an explicit level; and implicitly in Crowther and Newsom.¹⁵ Of the three types of school which provided the compulsory secondary education, the Grammar school was the only type in which it was expected to find substantial numbers of post compulsory pupils. The target of fifteen percent of the cohort as eligible and suitable for post compulsory schooling was originally set by Spens¹⁶ in 1938. Grammar

school pupils were given access to sixth form education on the basis of ability. The alternative, for those not selected to Grammar school, lay outside of the direct remit of schools in Further Education provision. Although the criteria for success was attendance until the sixth form, it was not assumed that all Grammar school pupils would take a seven year course. The schools provided a five and two year structure with selection taking place after the public examination.¹⁷ It had been envisaged in Norwood that some pupils aged sixteen might prove capable of remaining in the Secondary Modern School. However the curriculum and examination constraints did not encourage this.¹⁸ The Secondary Modern School was "protected" by HMI from the effect of examinations and had a long struggle to establish any set of formal credentials.¹⁹ This version of school purposes tended to restrict any utilitarian use of the Secondary Modern School by denying access to certification and designating practical and vocational work as low status and non-educational. This issue is one which illustrates the inherent contradictions created by the differentiated provision, which would appear for the majority as one of containment rather than opportunity. For the Grammar school pupil certification was the important criterion for access to Higher Education or as a terminal qualification at sixteen. However the rejection of vocational education or access to school certification, prior to the minimum compulsory school leaving age, meant that appropriate certification and access to status did not exist for the majority of youth in the early part of the welfare state.

The third type of school, the Technical Secondary School, was to give its pupils a curriculum experience distinguished by its relationship to industry and occupations. This was not expected to be narrowly vocational, but it was expected to be of comparable level to the Grammar

school. The courses were typically expected to cover the age range eleven to sixteen with a possibility of extension. This would not however include continuity of access to the traditional route to university. The expectation was that the majority of pupils would either go directly to industry or to higher qualifications in the technical sector.²⁰

In effect the majority of pupils experienced a bipartite choice. There were approximately twenty five percent in Grammar schools, the Technical High School number never grew beyond the 292 established in 1951. Although the government had constructed a policy which legitimated the division of youth along clearly defined criteria, in practice neither the criteria nor the resources were available. The distinction between Grammar school and Technical School pupils was not clear and those able to attend the Grammar school chose the established prestigious route.²¹ For a number of reasons there was also a lack of new buildings and a confusion about the location of sixth form work.²² Thus, although the 1944 Act contained some potential for change, the restatement of the distinction between education in school and vocational education constrained the actual changes that occurred. The changes were modifications rather than a restructuring of the purpose of the school. The 1944 Act created a separate but theoretically equal provision of secondary school. In 1944 however the benefits to the majority who found themselves in extended schooling were not clear.

There was a general consensus in government reports that attendance at school was a good to be extended to all youth. How far this was to extend and how easy this was to achieve was a discussed at length by the Early Leaving Report²³. The Report argues for a differentiated system of

compulsory education, extended to the age of sixteen. The high numbers of early leavers were considered a waste, both to the individual in terms of lost development of talent, but also as a loss to national efficiency. The Report suggested that the state provide allowances for children over fifteen if they were still at school. Post-sixteen education however was not envisaged as a right, but was to be based on the character and ability of the pupil. The extension of a year would provide for the greater intellectual and social maturity of the adolescent and benefit employers. The benefit to employers was not a direct one in terms of specific skill acquisition but of a better, more generally educated, worker. The task of the educational institution was thus to persuade more pupils to stay on to age sixteen until such time as this became compulsory.

These themes were echoed by a report on the fifteen to eighteen age group, the Crowther Report in 1959.²⁴ Crowther focused on the youth they described as the second quartile of the population, out of which only 12% were remaining in full time education to the age of seventeen. In Crowther's view this group should be encouraged, if not compelled, to receive more education, at least in compulsory form to age sixteen, and as part time until eighteen. This was justified on grounds of general moral and social control benefits to the community, and to the individual youth. Youth was considered not mature enough to make their own judgments. In addition, economic investment was cited as a justification, both for general education and specific technical training.²⁵ Four years, later the Newsom report,²⁶ concerned with pupils of below average ability, also supported a move to generalised education for all to the age of sixteen while acknowledging that the pupils were most interested in vocational subjects.²⁷ In the event the school

leaving age was finally raised to sixteen in 1973 and the schemes for part time Further Education to eighteen were not implemented.

The lack of voluntary attendance post fifteen was defined as problematic by the Reports which all recommended further state provision for the 15 to 18 year age group. Administratively the Further Education system was not integrated into the structure of schooling or Higher Education.²⁸

The development of this sector had historically been located outside schools, mainly because of the 1902 decision. Further Education had developed with a variety of qualifications and examining bodies which were not recognised in the secondary school sector and, importantly, had little purchase on the university sector of Higher Education. The 1944 Act had required a regional plan for Further Education, but this was imprecise and not mandatory so very little planning or building had occurred immediately upon the ratification of the Act. However over the following decade there were some moves towards a rationalisation under the auspices of the National Advisory Council for Industry and Commerce set up 1947 and followed, later by Regional Advisory Councils.

Attendance doubled between 1944 and 1956 but Crowther, reporting in 1959, was still able to describe Further Education as, "neglected educational territory,"²⁹ despite the fact that there had been some reorganisation in 1956, when ten regional colleges were designated CATS, and began providing advanced courses.³⁰ The youth who attended, mainly part time courses, were disadvantaged in not receiving support from the state unlike their peers who had been selected to go through the Grammar school sixth form route.

The Further Education students were therefore in a different position to the Grammar school pupil in relation to the ideal of youth. Attendance

in Further Education effectively denied access to the university and thus to the system of state funding for Higher Education. The majority of courses were low level and the employers and unions were reluctant to accept educationally based courses instead of apprenticeships for skilled work.³¹ However, at the same time, Further Education did not cater for the most educationally needy, nor had it developed courses suitable for female entrants to work.³²

The assumption, embodied in the settlement of 1944, that it was efficient to select at age eleven and to base future educational opportunity on this selection, was made problematic. Increasingly evidence, that the pool of talent of the upper age range of youth was larger than anticipated, and that there was widespread demand for formal certification, began to influence the Reports to government.³³ This was particularly important, since the planned tripartite system had effectively become a bipartite system, with the failure to establish the proposed technical schools. By the early fifties, it was known that the selection criteria were functioning on a class basis in the case of boys, and presumably girls.³⁴ Working class boys had fewer chances of grammar selection than those middle class boys with equal examination results. This bias was reinforced within the schooling system where the chances of academic success were also class based.³⁵ There was pressure on the system in two ways. The first was the number of secondary schools which began to enter their pupils for the GCE. The second was the failure to develop a post compulsory sector as a coherent entity. Crowther noted that the greatest growth in education was the part-time day course in Further Education, showing that there was a demand both from adolescents and employers.³⁶ The provision was, however, incomplete since it was not integrated with the compulsory sector and it made

considerable demands on the individual in terms of part-time study modes. Thus voluntary study demanded more of this student than those who were in full time schooling. Crowther neatly describes this as a penalty both to the individual and the country.³⁷

This debate, about the organisation of schooling and the procedures of selection, was dominant from the late fifties through to the early seventies. As suggested, there were two major elements in the debate. Firstly, the increasing evidence that the prediction of talent at eleven was not sufficiently accurate: secondly, the notion of parity of esteem between the different schools no longer had political credibility.³⁸ The policy answer to both of these problems appeared to be the Comprehensive school. These had existed since 1952 in experimental form in London. The reason for the emergence of the Comprehensive School in urban development areas was that there was resistance from both political parties to the changing of traditional Grammar schools and it was easier to designate newly funded schools.³⁹ By 1965 the aim of reforming the whole structure of schooling to one based on Comprehensive Secondary schools had been accepted by the government of the time. Only 8.5% of the relevant population attended Comprehensive schools, and the definition of comprehensive was far from clear.⁴⁰ The change was not embodied in the force of law but in an administrative circular. However this did effect change, as by 1972 there were an estimated 41% of secondary pupils in schools which were labelled Comprehensive. This label did not guarantee either that the school had a representative population, without competition from selective schools in the area, or that the internal organisation of the school had been revised in any way.⁴¹

Welfare rights for youth in terms of education embodied in the 1944 Act and the subsequent reports were defined purely in terms of access to free secondary schooling. During the first part of the period the right of access was to a system which segregated the youth. They were separated into different schools which had neither parity of status, nor for that matter expenditure. The tension between selection and equality was not directly confronted at the level of government, principally because there was no clear political will, or for that matter, electoral demand to abolish the Grammar school.⁴² Youth was thus offered a highly differentiated experience, with unequal outcomes in terms of certification and life chances. At the same time this was politically portrayed as an advantage to all. Thus encouragement was given to extend compulsory schooling and, for those not accepted to or wishing for sixth form education, to use the post compulsory sector.⁴³ There was, however, a failure to integrate the Further Education sector with the certification taken in schools. The disadvantage of those who used this route, with limited access to higher education, and was not modified.

Youth was defined by these processes as dependent to the age of fifteen or sixteen, and having little choice over their schooling. The choices were made by the educationalists with, in some cases, parental involvement. This was the result of a conception of equality, which narrowly focused on the individual right of access to personal social mobility, aptly described by Turner as sponsored mobility.⁴⁴ The failure to create an efficient structure for mobility was the principal focus around which the reforms of the welfare period were focused.

Youth were expected to be individually socially mobile on the basis of talent, and to demonstrate this through the schooling system. In the

context of human capital theory, meritocracy was described as good both for the individual and the state. For those youth who were ambitious, educational certification provided success, and a way to achieve greater control over their lifestyle ⁴⁵ At the same time, the provision of social mobility was, in the terms of the welfare ideology, evidence of the state's efficient use of talent.

The concern about talent was, however, responded to selectively and reflected the unequal status hierarchy of the various routes. Thus the opportunities for the youth who, although ambitious, went on to Further Education were more restricted and certainly did not retain them within the adolescent "age set" since it had a strong orientation to the adult world of work. Despite concern expressed in Reports, the youth with employment ambitions and the vocational talents were neither a political force, nor a strong enough threat to the state, to effect a policy change in their favour. Ironically the group who were successful in creating a political dilemma for the state were the increasing number of adolescents with advanced level qualification who wanted access to university level education. Their rights were asserted in 1963 in the Report on Higher Education, which supported the right of all qualified to attend Higher Education. ⁴⁶ Clearly this demonstrated that the state was more concerned to sponsor those with traditionally defined academic talent within the grammar system than those in the vocational and practical courses. These youth were appropriately personally ambitious, and willing to remain in the formal organisation of schooling which offered extended dependency, in all probability to age twenty-one.

In England, the practice of the welfare state, at the level of post compulsory schooling, did not demonstrate much concern for

redistribution of opportunity to all youth as an "age set". Opportunity was limited to the right to compete for access to secondary schooling. The schooling system was, however, divided at the age of eleven in a way which restricted choice and opportunity in the future, legitimated by selection procedures. When the evidence became available that the competition was biased according to social class origin, and later gender and race, there was a slow move to the provision of a form of common school, whose nature however was not clearly defined at national level. The issue of equality of outcome was not substantially addressed. Instead policy, targeted at younger children, was developed with the idea that this would create greater opportunity to participate and compete effectively.⁴⁷

It has been argued that the domination of the ideology of welfare had the effect of integrating youth as an "age set" around "adolescence". The state provision used the ideal of adolescence in policy to legitimate the extension of compulsory schooling. However, in the context of the policies pursued in England and Wales, the experience was a differentiated one. The original interpretation of welfare in the English context was that of access to mobility through secondary schooling. However, the 1944 legislation recognised three types of school as providers of secondary schooling. Thus the continuation of past prestige plus failure to create alternative routes meant that the 1944 Act had a limited effect in generalising the category of "adolescence" and in making it an integrative experience across the "age set." "Adolescence" was legally created as dependent in terms of compulsory schooling to age fifteen and later sixteen. However, the nature of the schooling provided did not create equal social status for all nor did it create equal opportunity to succeed or even equal

resource provision. Thus, the essentially middle class version of "adolescence", which was imposed on all youth to the school leaving age, did not offer the same certification opportunities to all youth.

In creating "adolescence" as a universal ideal for youth there was a withdrawal of opportunity to continue with independence through earning. This withdrawal had little compensation since it did not offer, in exchange for deferred entry, any real prospect of improvement in status in the adult world.⁴⁸ The ideal of a dependent and depoliticised "adolescence" was, in practice, only a reality for a small elite group. The majority of youth were adolescents only until the end of compulsory schooling. At that point, employment or the pursuit of a practical or vocational qualification, separated these youth from the dependant and psychologically immature construction of youth as "adolescent." In other words the argument here is that the selective distribution of certification, and the different status of school and college clearly signalled the limited state interest in creating a opportunity for all youth to be "adolescent".

ii) Consensus and socialisation.

In part one it was argued that the state function of providing order and security would be achieved through the establishment of procedures and processes which are recognised as the legitimate regulators of ownership and stratification. In relation to youth in school, these were identified as the procedures and processes which legitimated and controlled the access to knowledge, socialisation and regulated ambition. Also it was argued that there was tension between the

representation of youth as an integrated "age set" for whom state policy could be devised and youth as a group within stratified society.

In this section, the way in which policy evolved between 1945 and 1972 will be analysed in terms of the model of success made available to the fourteen to nineteen group. This model is found both in the pressures exerted on schools through government reports. and is also available in evidence about the practice of the schools themselves.

It is argued that consensus and socialisation can be achieved not only through the provision of different types of schools but also in terms of a different internal experience of curriculum. Thus, the principles of social and cultural control were clearly indicated by the forms of knowledge available, the status given to them, and their availability to different groups of pupils.⁴⁹ It was through this differentiated provision of knowledge just as much as differential schooling, that the tripartite distinction was sustained. In particular a clear distinction was made between the types of knowledge available and the rationale that sustained them.

There were two main features of the English curriculum experience. The first was that knowledge was distributed differentially between institutions, legitimated by assumptions about the ability range of the pupils. The second was that the curricula were socially distinguished in different ways, by the use of external accreditation. This reflected the relative status of the subjects taught and, by association, the institutions.

Schools are also transmitters of messages about the nature of

citizenship and those characteristics, abilities, and achievements which will lead to success. These characteristics are not explicitly defined as necessary to success in the formal curriculum, but are transmitted both within and around the curriculum. The demonstrated acquisition of knowledge is important but so are the socialisation processes in ensuring consensus. Unlike the reconstructing states of the USSR and Germany, this was generally an unacknowledged process in the English system.

It will be argued that not only was the need to create consensus explicit in some Reports, but also recognition that there was no single coherent model of youth socialisation. This, it is argued, allowed the retention of the traditional high status model to remain unchallenged.

a) The distribution of knowledge: England and Wales.

In the 1944 Act there was little reference to the curriculum, except for the inclusion of religious activities. The 1944 Education Act did not redistribute access to knowledge and thus offered no radical challenge to the already existing division of youth. However, the earlier Reports of Spens and Hadow contained clear discussions of appropriate knowledge for the secondary school.⁵⁰ Both Reports accepted the legitimacy of the tripartite division of youth on the basis of innate ability. From this a corresponding division of knowledge was inferred, which constituted a suitable basis for constructing a curriculum for the different types of pupil expected to attend different types of school.

Even within the Labour Party, the Grammar school curriculum retained its place as the paradigm of excellence.⁵¹ The curriculum was based on

nineteenth century tradition despite modification in the twentieth century of the examination system. While the Grammar school held a clear position, with a recognized tradition of educationally valued knowledge, the curricula of the Secondary Moderns, Technical Schools and the Further Education sector were less clearly defined. Further Education was distinct since it specialised in vocational knowledge, which in the English tradition was excluded from education. This was shown in practice by the lack of continuity between schooling and Further Education at the entrance level, and, in terms of outcomes, the mismatch between the qualifications achieved and the requirements of the Higher Education sector.⁵²

The classification of youth into groups which would receive different curriculum knowledge, was validated by a commitment to a psychological account of intelligence which suggested that there were three broad bands of ability and aptitude. These abilities practical, academic and those who dealt more easily with concrete things were to be matched by differentiated curricula. Thus although this divided youth, it also provided a legitimate account in terms of individual development. In the event, the practical identification of these pupils did not turn out to be so easy to make as the Reports had suggested it would be. The selection was, in practice, made on the basis of three criteria, culture, motivation and relevance to likely future occupation.⁵³ Despite the difficulties, in practice, this theory was sustained for some time.

The Grammar school was established as the prestigious institution. This had a historical continuity and credibility, confirmed in the earlier part of the century.⁵⁴ The restructuring of the public examinations meant that there was a broad curriculum, balanced to some extent between

science and arts to the age at which GCE was taken. Later this was modified to make it possible to take single subjects, but the requirements of university entrance dictated the inclusion of a specified range of subjects.⁵⁵ The Advanced Level course was narrowly defined and involved a clear choice between the science and arts subjects. The approach to the subjects, particularly in terms of science, was abstract thus contributing, or perhaps sustaining, the view that technology, taught in other institutions, was "failed science."⁵⁶ The abstract knowledge of the Grammar school, based in subject disciplines, retained a very high cultural status, as the only knowledge form accepted by the university sector.⁵⁷ The Grammar school curriculum was used to certify the elite, principally destined for administrative work. There was no pressure on the school to prepare pupils directly for employment since the majority were expected to continue on to Higher Education. For those that left the school, the acquisition of school certification was taken by employers as a sign of intelligence.

During this period there was a clear distinction made between the practical nature of a subject and the idea that it was vocational. Thus both the Technical Schools and the Secondary Modern schools were practical in orientation, but neither was viewed as vocational. Pupils of the Technical School were to experience a curriculum of good intellectual discipline apart from its technical value in relation to a group of occupations.⁵⁸ In the event the curriculum of the Technical Schools proved problematic and they tended to evolve towards the Grammar school model, with an allowance of time for practical subjects.

Inclusion of practical subjects in the curriculum of the Secondary Modern had a different purpose. Here the value of practical orientation

was not for cognitive purposes but motivational ones. Experimentation with pupil centred learning was considered an advantage of the Secondary Modern, made possible because of a lack of external examination pressure. This was again justified in terms of the pupil's development, viewed separately from the acquisition or control over a particular form of knowledge.⁵⁹ Haddow had suggested that for the Secondary Modern school the subjects should be similar to the Grammar school, but restricted in scope and approached through practice. Handwork was overall to take a higher profile especially during the last two years of the course. Although not fully vocational, the course was to be orientated to the outside world. This was an orientation based not in social mobility or aspiration but; "with the interest arising from the social and industrial environment of the pupils."⁶⁰

The curriculum of the English school was substantially evaluated by the use of a public examination system and it had been the intention of HMI that the Secondary Modern schools were not to be part of the General Certificate system. This was justified on the grounds that it would allow for a protective policy to facilitate the development of a more interesting and innovative curriculum and pedagogy. There was evidence that in some schools this occurred, with the combining of subjects and the use of child centred teaching. It is interesting to note that while concern was expressed about motivation and quality of teaching for those unable to take the public examination, the same issues were not raised in relation to those in the Grammar school. It would seem that, the explanation for this distinction, given in Reports was limited to the psychological account of ability and neglected the significance of these examinations within the English system.

Parents judged school status on examination passes, and for those pupils not allowed to take examinations there was a clear restriction of access to other educational routes and certification. This was never accepted by a number of secondary schools and the practice of entering pupils for the examination grew rapidly.⁶¹ While the rate of entrance and success was not equal to that of the Grammar school examination entrance did provide evidence that the distinctions, made at eleven, were perhaps not as accurate as claimed and that there was a injustice in the limitation on examination entrance.

The issue of credentials, for what was in effect a majority of the population, revolved around the desire to mitigate the effects of the division at eleven. By 1963 this had become a nationally recognised issue, when the Beloe Report recommended the establishment of a new examination. This was still to leave the majority uncertified, and did not in any way challenge the status inherent in the original system; GCE was for the top 20%, the CSE would cover the next 20%, still leaving the largest group without a formal leaving qualification. Although extending the certification process, the Report did not tackle in any substantial way the distinct division of youth on the basis of access to curriculum knowledge through an examination which offered different knowledge and status.

The problems of diversity and continuity are best illustrated in the provision of Further Education which also provided courses for the sixteen to eighteen sector. During the fifties there was neither a standard entrance age, nor a coherence in style, length or type of course. This was not necessarily a disadvantage, since the courses developed at a local level were often more in tune with employment

needs. However, the lack of integration with the schooling sector had implications for students, since the route into Further Education meant that there was no substantial opportunity of access to university. The majority of students entering the colleges were unlikely to have any formal qualifications for entry. Attendance was voluntary and for many, even in the situation where day release was involved, the incentive to succeed was not very strong.⁶²

Increasingly the colleges took part in the training of the youth, with a curriculum orientation which was towards the development of skills for employment. In the early sixties there was a move to bring the technical colleges closer to schooling by developing direct recruitment from schools.⁶³ This was not the only solution to the location of these courses. Earlier Reports on technical colleges had decried the emphasis on narrow vocationalism and, while asking for a more liberal curriculum, had also implied that the sector ought rightly to be funded by the employers. The knowledge transmitted tended to target specific competencies, with little time for the social skills and relations of employment. The bias in the fifties to engineering courses rather than commerce and business altered in the sixties, when the courses were remodelled with foundation courses and the opportunity for a diagnostic period to assess pupil capabilities.⁶⁴ However, for the majority of those who entered the Further Education sector, the available meritocratic achievement was shorter and led to lower status employment than the Grammar school system.

During this period there was tension between differing views of the appropriate knowledge forms. As suggested, the Grammar school was the inheritor of the secondary schooling system which had high status. The

status was associated with a number of factors, some with concepts of knowledge and academic qualities, others with the social processes of the school and its outcomes. Through the Grammar school, the English system sustained a specialist knowledge system, based in subjects, which was structurally supported by the external examination system, itself linked to the university sector.⁶⁵ This curriculum was supported within conservative education circles as high culture and was successfully established both in Grammar schools and the public school sector.⁶⁶ Knowledge thus acquired was principally for its own sake; the subjects were not justified in terms of utility and application. However, there were claims that the process of mastering this abstract and academic curriculum would contribute to the development of high level transferable skills. Thus, although not vocational, the Arts degree or A level was taken by employers as a indicative of ability and provided a clear link to white collar work, often in some kind of management.⁶⁷

While there was confidence about the boundaries of the curriculum material for the Grammar school, there was confusion about the curriculum for both the technical and Secondary Modern schools. The Technical School curriculum never came to fruition. In part this was the result of confusion about and competition for potential pupils. The entrance to many of the Technical Schools was at age twelve, when those students who were to be of Grammar school potential, if they had achieved a place would have been on the first year of a five year course. This was accompanied by indifference on behalf of local authority providers.⁶⁸ The curriculum of the secondary Technical School did not develop a distinctive identity instead it divided between the two traditions.⁶⁹ It was also unlikely, on social grounds, that those deemed capable of Grammar school entrance would prefer Technical School,

given the uncertain status of their curriculum.

As discussed, the Secondary Modern school was excluded from the examination system. In addition the innovative subjects and the treatment of material were considered not only by the educational establishment, but also by the pupils, to be of low status.⁷⁰ The pupils themselves perceived that the courses did not have status within the system and were not of utilitarian value.⁷¹ This failure illustrates the issue of social stratification of knowledge which was based on the potential to achieve social status rather than skilled application to employment. The abstract knowledge taught in the Grammar school was the basis of certification to middle class occupations while not providing a specific knowledge base for these occupations. Similarly practical work was set as a motivational task by the teacher and was taught to those who were expected to take unskilled work. It did not presume to be training for that work. In the light of this dichotomous form of thinking, the suggestion that there was some intermediate form of knowledge, technological and high status, could not be easily incorporated into the English education system.

There had been a clear distinction made in the Early Leaving Report between knowledge for its own sake, acquired in the period of compulsory schooling and knowledge of another kind which applied to the world outside.⁷² There was no comment on the relative status of the different types of knowledge, and the term vocational was used in a variety of ways. There also seemed to be uncertainty within the policy agencies for youth about the advantages of different knowledge. While the Education Department was planning, in 1961, that there should be broad study as part of the craft training, the Ministry of Labour was more concerned

with specific skill requirements and was not concerned with the wider context of skill.⁷³

Thus was confusion in the policies between a number of elements. The idea that there was a right to education for its own sake, for the individuals' personal development, was appropriate to the compulsory schooling period.⁷⁴ Personal intellectual development, however, was highly differentiated. In the Grammar school the pupils were initiated into abstract academic thinking through subject based knowledge, with the objective of improving the quality of their minds. The statements about practical knowledge appeared only in discussion about the technical and modern schools. Clearly the genesis of this thinking was the description given in the Spens Report which outlined the different abilities of the groups.⁷⁵ Rather than offering a rigorous theory of knowledge, or the idea of a right of equal opportunity for access to differing forms of knowledge, the theory underpinning school knowledge in England suggested that it was appropriate to give the three types of child three different types of knowledge. As Banks wrote this failed to achieve "parity and prestige".⁷⁶

b) Socialisation

The manifest concern of the schooling sector was with the cognitive learning of the individual. However there was also a concern with the social and personal development of the individual. The effects of the process of selection at age eleven, and the differential social status of the secondary schools, were the result of external structure and social pressure.⁷⁷ In addition, the 1944 legislation also imposed on the local education authorities an obligation to contribute to the moral,

spiritual and physical development of the child. This was catered for in a range of ways, both through the formal organisation of schooling, the roles and rules which were learnt by being a member of the school, and in some cases as an explicit part of the timetable, with an allocation of the time for a subject covering social or moral education.

Socialisation of the pupils in schools was in many ways a covert agenda created by the aims and objectives of the teachers, and the way in which the schools tackled the opportunities and restrictions placed on them by government.

The Grammar school, as the inheritor of the traditional curriculum, created a highly organised pattern of schooling with status acquired through age, and the expectation of long "adolescence".⁷⁸ Pupils were separated from adult society and from the world of employment, with a later benefit being advantage in terms of high status certification.⁷⁹ The separation was also based on the need to protect the adolescent, or at least filter the experience of adult life while the process of learning was covered. Learning was thus from books and teachers and not from life outside the school. It was, however, accompanied by the expectation that pupils would be part of the school culture.

The basis of the Grammar school was the fostering of an intellectual culture, in its essence a separate and elitist objective.⁸⁰ There was some theoretical confusion about the source of motivation of the Grammar school pupils. This was unlike the Secondary Modern pupil for whom it was assumed there would be a need for external motivation.⁸¹ The definition of the Grammar school pupil was that of a pupil who was motivated by abstract ideas and interested in causes. The pupils were described as needing to be "fond of books and readily drawn to abstract

ideas."⁸² However, teachers in the schools in the post war era felt that it was necessary to teach the social codes that were part of the Grammar schools.⁸³ These included intellectual perception, skills and knowledge and also the maintenance of moral and cultural standards. For some this included the ideas of social loyalty and service. As one teacher described it, it was the purpose of the Grammar school to produce a "thoughtful governing class."⁸⁴

This form of socialisation had an effect on pupils, who viewed themselves as being required to defer rewards and postpone adult status in return for achieving an intellectually superior education.⁸⁵ The pupils had, however, absorbed the dual view of their suitability for such a position, both defining themselves as having the appropriate intellectual qualities and also needing the spirit of hard work and achievement that the Grammar school provided.

Pupils in the Secondary Modern school were not to be so carefully segregated from the world of adults. In particular the final years were to have a specific orientation to the world outside.⁸⁶ The Ministry of Education argued that by 1949 the Secondary Modern School was a human and civilising place but as yet was failing to meet intellectual and motivational requirements.⁸⁷ In the first fifteen years of their existence, the Secondary Modern pupils, and the aims of the school, were very much defined in terms of the absence of characteristics usually present in the Grammar school pupil.⁸⁸

This is exemplified in the Crowther Report, which specifically discussed youth. The Report presents a strong case for the view that there was a changing set of social needs for secondary education. In the Report, the

phrase used to describe the area of educational concern was, "it is not the living they will earn but the life they will live"⁸⁹ The issues, addressed by Crowther, were about adolescents finding their way in the adult world: a concern with moral standards, recreational activities and continuing educational needs. Crowther's major premiss was that the fifteen year old leaver was immature and could not to be expected to make wise decisions. Youth was still in need of protection from the adult community until they had become more aware, and acquired the skills required to become competent adults. However the areas of study suggested by the Report were not ones destined to provide specific skills for employment or high status certification. In the fifties and sixties, it was hoped that the Secondary Modern School would encourage the pupils to mature and leave school with interests that would accompany them into adult life.⁹⁰ These interests, however, were not defined by the entry into paid work, a future which the majority of pupils leaving Secondary Modern schools faced without the benefit of public certification of competence or achievement.

A similar view can be found in a Report on the Youth Service.⁹¹ Albermale accepts the separate world of "adolescence" and argues for the greater understanding of it by adults. The Report argues that the desire expressed by the young for premature adulthood is not to be taken seriously. It continues with an argument for setting up separate organisations to prevent too early transition. Similarly, Newsom also incorporated these ideas of "adolescence". In a discussion of the way in which the school might respond to the moral and spiritual needs of the adolescent, both religion and the corporate spirit of the school are referred to as suitable sources.⁹²

The models of socialisation within the two schools are in sharp contrast. The Grammar school adolescent was expected to leave and to take on a position of responsibility and status, which would probably also be well paid.⁹³ To this end the internal organisation of the school created socialisation around ideas of moral and cultural standards combined with hard work. These, when achieved, led to a well defined social status, motivation in itself. The Secondary Modern pupil, it would appear, was only to be socialised into gaining some of the characteristics of motivation and interest that the grammar pupil already held on entry. At its most extreme, it was anticipated that the Secondary Modern pupils might not turn out to be a good workmen, but they would be good citizens.⁹⁴

In so far as there was consensus achieved around the goal of socialisation for youth it was restricted to school attendance to the age 16. This was legitimated in two main ways. The first was the incorporation into the welfare state of the psychological account of "adolescence". This was further reinforced by the account of learning used in Spens, which formed the theoretical basis for tripartite schooling. The protective and character forming element of the upper secondary school was, in the English context, divided by the separate objectives of the different types of schools. The Reports on the less academically successful contained an explicit model of citizenship and suggested clear objectives for the school in terms of preparation for adult life. In the case of those pupils who were expected to continue to Higher Education, there was less concern with social objectives, and an implicit assumption about elite status and employment. There were also no reports prepared on these pupils.

In addition legitimation for extending the years of youth based in schools was found in the claim of rights: in the case of schooling the right to compete in the meritocracy. In the English version of welfare, the equality amounted to access to secondary school, but not to outcomes. In the case of England the continuance of a liberal conception of knowledge meant that there was limited development of high status technical alternatives, particularly since all political parties were committed to the maintenance of the Grammar school tradition.

All youth was subject to this model of success. Failure was accounted for in terms of individual lack of intelligence. Even as this began to be challenged by the success of Secondary Modern pupils in examinations designed for the Grammar School pupil, the reform of the examination system reaffirmed the tripartite division.

Thus state policy was built around the extension of dependence in youth in school on the grounds that this added up to increased opportunity. Youth was expected to accept the selecting and sorting of the school as a legitimate way of allocating opportunities. In so far as the welfare society with increased opportunity was sustained as an effective political model, youth as a group made an investment in their future by remaining in school. During the sixties it became clear that all youth did not have the same opportunity. The policy adopted by the state, positive discrimination, targeted at the young rather than youth, was in essence still a welfare policy. There was no evident challenge to the view that extending the period of compulsory schooling was a good thing, however there was little action on the recommendations.

During the period in which the ideology of welfare dominated English

policy toward youth, there was a continued failure to reconcile the elitist selection process with the provision of universal secondary schooling. There was a model of school based merit which was separate from the labour market. The retention of the distinction between school knowledge and the content of Further Education illustrates the resistance of the system to provide a more market and vocationally orientated school system. The processes of selection, and the continued lack of state provision for the majority of post compulsory pupils, indicates that the consensus around a narrowly defined meritocracy was sustained during the welfare period.

iii) School and Work:

As argued earlier in the thesis, there are two strands to the analysis of the relationship between school and work. In part one it was argued that the relationship between school and work is best analysed in terms of the theory of labour: that is, skill and or knowledge need be located in the social context of the status of work, and the degree of control held by the worker. Consequently the state policies are analysed, in this thesis, in terms of their commitment to an increase in skill not the model of technical development. Furthermore the policies are explored in terms of their effectiveness in maintaining the welfare model of youth, which as discussed in the earlier section, excluded work and industry from the "age set" of youth as adolescents.

Certification has been the principal mechanism through which schools relate to the labour market. It has acted both as a measure of explicit skill but also a means by which employers have imputed candidates'

abilities.⁹⁵ Even at the level of numeracy and literacy, the English school system had not provided a certification of competency. The public examination system, which certified only a minority of pupils, was normatively based and not criterion referenced.

Within the English system there has been a reluctance to include vocational courses, with practical and applied knowledge, into the secondary schooling sector. There has been little development of those courses labelled "vocational" within schools. Instead Further Education Colleges, which are parallel to schools, rather than higher education,⁹⁶ provided courses for the same age group as that which took school qualifications. This was also reflected in the lack of development of examinations for the vocational courses which were compatible with those in schools. Within the English system the certification and training of those not destined for Higher Education had traditionally taken place outside the compulsory schooling sector and was not nearly so effectively sponsored by the state. The interest of this group of adolescents had not been structured or protected by the state as much as that of the able, potential grammar school pupil.

a) The explicit agenda.

There was, from 1944 onwards, a continuing restatement in Reports of the need for more technical and qualified staff in the labour force⁹⁷, the desirability of extending education to the fifteen to eighteen group⁹⁸, and, at times, the dire consequences of failing to do so.⁹⁹ It is significant that this aspect of state policy was never given priority, favour being given to the sponsorship of the elite in arts and science.¹⁰⁰ At the explicit level, the social construction of the

adolescent as a worker is to be found in the provision, or lack of provision, in the technical and Further Education sector, defined in the English context as outside schooling.

In the forties the majority of youth left school to join employment without formal educational qualifications. Post compulsory attendance at school was not an option for the majority of adolescents and the provision of Further Education was used by a restricted number of industries to provide qualifications. In 1944 the definition of Further Education was new, distinguishing it clearly both from secondary schooling and also from the Higher Education sector. All the courses in the system were administratively labelled as vocational. Provision varied across the country, with certification by a wide range of Examining Bodies. Further Education had emerged mainly as a part-time mode of education and was closely related to industry on a regional basis. The courses which gained employer sponsorship were those provided for the more skilled worker. The status was that of a privilege given by an employer to attend rather than a right of an employee.¹⁰¹

The other route to qualification was through the apprenticeship system which was outside the control of the state. This had limited effectiveness for a number of trades. The increase in school attendance had changed the availability of the more able candidates who were increasingly inclined to stay at school. In addition the changing patterns of employment meant that the five year apprenticeship was not the most suitable method of training.¹⁰² By the forties there had been some blurring of the levels and patterns of training. In some cases technicians and technologists had been drawn into the apprenticeship system, but it was not clear at which level a holder of a college

granted certificate would be employed. Thus the student, who completed evening class to national certificate level, was not guaranteed a particular status. Along with this, the failure rate in evening and block release courses was very high and related poorly to the completion of apprenticeships and school based qualifications.

National policy was informed by a commitment to the view that technological advance in industry would necessarily require the development of more skilled workers. For example, national economic interest was evident in the Percy Report of 1945.¹⁰³ The Report was concerned with the supply of higher level technological qualifications and identified a failing in the application of science to industry. To bridge the gap they recommended selection of colleges that were able to deliver a university level of teaching for day students, and adoption of policies to widen the access to higher level courses. It is perhaps illustrative of the status problems that surrounded the issue of technical qualifications that the Report contained a dispute about the name and status of the qualification to be awarded.¹⁰⁴ There was also a concern in the Report about impinging on the role of the university sector. This dispute about the names, and more importantly the relation between Further Education and Higher Education, was not resolved for many decades. The lack of resolution of this debate is reflected in its restatement, in much the same form, eleven years later in the White Paper on Technical Education.¹⁰⁵ Again it was not resolved by any clear policy action by the central state. Instead Further Education provision was devolved to the local authorities in 1952. It was decided that Local Authorities should take on 75% of the funding of Further Education; the issue of continuity and provision of high level technical skills was thus side stepped. Further Education, although often administered by the

same department as schools, was kept as a separate entity.

In 1956, the White Paper on Technical Education made a statement of criteria for differing awards within the technical sector.¹⁰⁶ The declared government policy was to double the output of scientists and technicians in the following five years and to develop funding through the local authority and also through a system of tax relief to employers. Thus although policy recommendations began to move toward a state interest in the provision, there was still a commitment to the view that this form of education should be provided by employers. It was clear that the Committee felt that the system of apprenticeship, which had evolved under the idiosyncrasies of the industrial employers, was unsatisfactory. In the view of the Committee, it was both out of date and had only worked satisfactorily in a limited range of industries.¹⁰⁷

The demand for higher level technological courses is part of the pattern of development that took place under the early evolution of the welfare state. What also became important during the sixties, was the generation of courses which were legitimated by the broadly based incorporation of human capital theory. It is this view that legitimated the greater national expenditure on education in most industrialised nations.¹⁰⁸

These courses were not as tightly related to entry level skills in employment. This is most sharply visible outside the compulsory sector, because the employers were more instrumentally orientated, and were reluctant to take on wider training and educative functions.

Consequently the demand in Reports that there should be a continuation of the education, as opposed to the training of those adolescents who left school at the minimum school leaving age, was poorly met since both employers and the state disagreed about this provision. The concern of

the Education Department, as it were by definition, non-vocational. This is distinguished from the courses which were set up to provide specific training levels of technical or commercial competence which were run by the Further Education sector. In practice this was a false divide, demonstrated by the history of apprenticeship, where status as well as competence were involved in the certification.¹⁰⁹

Despite considerable changes in Further Education, the Crowther Report in 1958 stated that there was still a lack of coherence inside Further Education and a failure to integrate with the school system. The apprenticeship system was picked out for particular criticism and it was suggested that it needed monitoring through a National Council.¹¹⁰

During the sixties, reform of the system continued towards providing a national-state led structure.¹¹¹ A strong theme was the need to broaden and make flexible the pattern of curriculum and to reduce the wastage from part-time courses. The length and admission criteria for courses were altered, with the intention that all courses should become more broadly based and flexible. The Crowther Report had recommended 16 as the age of transfer to technical college, where possible as a direct transfer, rather than an employer based and sponsored relationship. These reforms were broadening state responsibility for the youth and narrowing both the employers responsibility and the specific vocational work orientation of the courses for youth. While also modifying the access route to Further Education, the content of courses was to be altered. Craft courses were to be developed to cater for more than the requirements of a specific firm as they had done in the past. Further expansions plans strongly embodied the idea that general social education could not be complete at the age of sixteen. It was agreed that pupils had a right to access to further general education as well

as vocational training. However, this was strongly legitimated in terms of the needs of industry and of the country to keep pace with changing technology. The interests of the adolescents were not apparent except for the statement that for the individual the age of 16 was too young to be narrowly vocational.

Government industrial training proposals were couched in much the same terminology, though the emphasis was toward pushing the industrialists into taking a greater share of the training package through the establishment of the Industrial Training Boards.¹¹² Again the need for flexibility in relation to industrial demand and the reduction of wastage were cited, as were the needs of industry. Wastage was defined as the wastage of talent to the country. The overall push was for government to take a greater role than before; through central direction to encourage industry to upgrade the qualifications of its workers. There were, for example, further innovations during the sixties particularly at the technician level.¹¹³ Pressure for vocational education for the more able few, in direct response to meet the demands of industry for skilled labour, tended to lead to the neglect of complete courses for the majority of students.¹¹⁴

An attempt was made in the Industrial Training Act to provide more even funding across the industries. The intention was to bring a much wider range of activities into the sphere of regular training, and also to develop a coherence within government policy. This is the first time that government had been formally involved in what had been known up to then as industrial training. However, because of the way the Act was written, the employers were able to involve only those of the youth for whom training was considered to last a year or more, thus excluding

themselves from the responsibility for the training of those with poor school qualifications. As a consequence it failed in one of its principal intents: to develop the general training of all young employees.¹¹⁵ However the Act did succeed at one level, by altering the relationship between Further Education and the industrialists. This was not always a harmonious relationship; the Technical Colleges arguing that industry was much too dominant and that educational concerns were being suppressed; industry complaining that the colleges were slow in responding to their needs. The courses that evolved in this period were modular in structure with a larger part of the "skill training" taking place in the colleges than had previously been the case. The development again tended to affect the most able. Not all the boards were successful and, the tensions between the role of industry and that of the technical education interest were apparent. Industry was reluctant to train except narrowly, and the educational and government sectors were pushing for more broadly based courses. In Cantor's view the recommendations of Crowther and Newsom were not implemented but by-passed on the grounds that there were more immediate and prominent needs in industry for higher levels of skill.¹¹⁶ Thus, in the late sixties up to 40% of the 15-17 age group were still receiving little or no education beyond compulsory schooling.

Within Further Education, apart from the large increase in attendance, there was little change in the nature of the curriculum. The Haselgrave Committee had looked at the structure of examinations and at the structure of technician courses, and again suggested that a national structure was required. This led in the early 1970s to the establishment of the Business and Technical Education Councils. Prior to this there had been, in the 1960s, a number of reorganisations of certificates and

diplomas, with clarification of levels and different types of employment. There had been growth particularly in the middle level, of ONC. and OND work. By the end of the decade these changes were considered to be ineffective and two Councils were established to identify structures of education within the fields of technology and commerce.

Further Education was in a period of transition from employer led to government manpower policies. However it was not the subject of major government policy change. Tension between employer concerns and the provision of a clear national structure and certification still existed. The level and structure of craft training had always been in the hands of the employers and apprenticeships were varied both in the level of achievement and the length of practical service required.

Failure to raise the school leaving age to 16 immediately, meant that entrance to technical college was not made uniform. Nevertheless routes through to Higher Education became clearer, if not always very effectively distributed.¹¹⁷ The relationship between the Further Education structure and the Higher Education sector was limited, because Further Education recruited different students and there was little acceptance by the university sector of the qualifications of Further Education students.

In addition, there had been a slow evolution of science and technology in the university sector in the prewar years. However, post war competition for high level technical work developed.¹¹⁸ With the emergence of a concern about the technological society and the shortage of technologically trained people, the training and education of technologists and technicians became of more interest to central

government. While the status and of the Higher Education sector was viewed as essentially unproblematic, there remained the difficulty of including practical and applied subjects.¹¹⁹ Traditional Higher Education institutions were not controlled by the same mechanism as local authority provision. While there was a expectation that the courses in science be expanded, this was not to be at the expense of the development of the humanities. The university continued to influence the school sixth form, but had little relationship with the Further Education sector. Students in Further Education were on shorter and less prestigious courses and despite the apparent government commitment to sponsoring technology, they received less support than school pupils.

b) The informal agenda

The explicit agenda of the relationship between school and work is in the structure and organisation of those courses labelled vocational. While these do represent a major part of the relationship, the relationship is more complex and varied than this. Thus, although there is a clear correlation between the emergence of the industrialised economies and the development of nationalised schooling, it is not a direct correspondence.¹²⁰ The statements of government Reports represent the dominant view of the time. These have to be viewed in the context of the values of schooling and the context of both industry and government services; that is, the organisations which would provide employment. Yet there was no commitment to a planned relationship between the outcome and certification of schooling and the labour market.

There are several aspects to the school, employment, economy relationship. Schooling can be viewed as principally pursuing the functions of selection, orientation and preparation.¹²¹ These objectives of the school are framed by the social context, in particular the knowledge and understanding of employment held by the policy makers.

As already argued, the model of youth was based on a dualism. This was the development of individual potential but also control by limiting participation in politics, and in particular from labour.¹²² This was achieved in the universalisation of "adolescence" as part of the structure of the welfare state. The role of the state and schooling was to socialise to membership of adult society, to protect from adult society until maturity, while at the same time to develop the potential and talent of the individual.

The manpower planning ideology provided a justification for the greater investment in schooling and an expansion of general education as well as sponsoring specifically science and technology. It is in this way that the informal agenda of school/work relations was most popularly understood, in England, during the period of welfare policies. Such an interpretation of the relationship between schooling and labour meant that it did not come into direct conflict with the view that compulsory schooling should be about the development of individual potential. While this was not necessarily congruent with the technical or industrial demands of the economy, it did fulfil the ideals of "adolescence", as a period of development separate from maturity.¹²³

In England the sharpness of the debate about the relationship between technology and schooling had been diffused earlier in the century by the

1902 decision and the emergence of the public examination system. As a consequence the schooling system had taken on the job of stratifying pupils through a curriculum based on academic subjects.¹²⁴ Youth were stratified on the basis of their competence in traditionally orientated subjects, and the nature of certification became a major divide in future opportunity.

The first clear statement, in Haddow, of the need for more practical and vocational courses was modified both by policy, and the cultural practices of the English schooling system. These modifications produced the initial curriculum for Secondary Modern schooling. A fully technically orientated curriculum was in the English context not easily implemented, because of the status hierarchy of the examination system and the dominance of the arts curriculum in the Grammar school.¹²⁵ Technical and practical subjects were outside the mainstream of the curriculum and were described in Reports as a means to motivate, rather than educate, those not selected for access to Higher Education.

Although the general tenor of government policy was that there was an increase in the level of knowledge required of the whole population, this view was not strongly enough supported to allow for the development of either the secondary Technical Schools, or to genuinely integrate science or technology to the Secondary Modern curriculum. The ideology of meritocracy, and the opportunity for mobility served the state purpose of production for education and were the dominant themes of reform. Those youth not selected for Higher Education opportunity were given instead a curriculum experience which offered a very broad based conception of skill, which, as both Crowther and Newsom noted, failed to motivate the target groups. The other components of the curriculum were

differentially structured for boys and girls and were targeted at their future as citizens, potential consumers, leisure participants and parents. The status of these subjects was low, uncertified by the public examination system of the schools. Allocation to one of these courses was a clear statement to the participants that opportunity had been restricted.

Despite the apparent generalisation, across the youth age set of access to secondary school, this was based on the Grammar school curriculum. Certification for this curriculum was thus the basis for the relationship between schools and the labour market. For those who were certified to gain access to the university based Higher Education sector, the route to middle and higher status employment was clear. A notable lack was the failure to provide either academic certification or certification of competence of skill based in vocational schooling for the majority of the population.¹²⁶

The preparation of youth for a role in production, in the context of England and Wales, was not made explicit during the period of the welfare ideology. The dominant theme was one of educative practices and rights. Implicit within this was the recognition that the stratification of the school curriculum and different institutions reproduced broadly the entry level of employment. Consequently the working class boy who entered Grammar school was considered a failure if he left before taking the Ordinary Level examination.

There was in the English system a resistance to technical and vocational style education. This resistance extended to both as forms of applied knowledge. The Technical Schools, which could have provided a high level

education failed, losing out to the established status of the Grammar school. The purpose of applied subject, loosely vocational, was described in government documentation as motivation for the less able pupil, not skill development. While government Reports from the forties onward argued for the development of skilled technologists, neither the school nor the employers responded adequately. The formal distinction made between Further Education and the schools was a major feature of this failure. Since the qualifications achieved in Further Education were of limited use in access to Higher Education, the ladder of merit was narrowly defined mainly by sixth form studies. Although Further Education and employer training schemes offered an alternative for some of the more able there was a notable lack of state intervention to provide post sixteen opportunity for the majority. So the English system of schools stayed predominantly with a form which more clearly accommodated the welfare adolescent, dependent and depoliticised. In combination with the dominance of the curriculum knowledge of the Grammar school, this served to sustain a selection process for high status employment. However, it failed to expand provision of the mid range science and technology skill required for the labour market.

iv) Conclusion

It was argued in part one that recognition of youth as an "age set" was important to any analysis of youth. It should also be related in theoretical terms to the state as provider for, and creator of, the conditions of youth as a socially constructed category. It was thus argued that the functions of integration, consensus and production were critical to continuation of the state in industrial society.

It is evident from the policies outlined in the previous section that an "age set" of youth existed as the subject for policy. The integrative function served by the extension of secondary schooling and college should have produced in the case of England a universal category of youth committed to the meritocracy, and to the notion of exploiting the opportunities offered by these access provisions. However, the actual state provision of school opportunity was restricted, offering a highly selective experience with narrow access to Higher Education. This was underwritten by the technique and theory of selection which had emerged in the thirties, and which was still evident when Crowther Reported.

In this initial construction of youth there was a dualism between the potential challenge to the social order which youth presented, and the idea that youth were the future members of society. In the post war period the consensus model of youth dominated, with a focus on the extended period of dependence created by the welfare state, and to some extent an anticipation of the resistance that youth might offer, as a necessary part of the experience of "adolescence". "Adolescence" was, however, only appropriate to youth in school. After the compulsory minimum school leaving age was achieved, those youth who remained in school retained the dependency that was characteristic of "adolescence".

Much of the literature on class of the period focused around the three themes of embourgeoisement, affluence and consensus.¹²⁷ Adolescent culture was accounted for as a direct result of extended schooling providing both time and opportunity for distinct cultural development. Adolescents had adopted cultural values other than those of the adult society and were thus a cause for concern. The increased affluence of

the group was problematic. There is evidence of the reality of this account in terms both of increased affluence and the post war consensus.¹²⁸ Embourgeoisement was less easy to identify. It was a cultural process which, it was anticipated, would result from a reduction of class cultural distinction through meritocracy. This, however, was not the case, either within education or in the out of school experience of youth. Instead, there was a continuing reproduction of the relationship between class and achievement.¹²⁹ Consequently the generalisation and allocation to the "age set" of youth of the role of adolescent was modified by the apparent reluctance of working class youth to be identified as dependent, either on economic or cultural terms. This was paralleled by a limitation on state policy, which meant that the containment function of the school was generalised, and consensus was achieved; but through creating an essentially middle-class "adolescent."

The lack of a clear achievement model for the majority continued to be a feature of state provision throughout the length of the welfare state. Both the Crowther and Newsom Reports promoted longer schooling, and argued that motivation could be achieved through relevant courses. However, the lack of appropriate examinations was being discussed by another Committee which was not related to the purpose of these groups.¹³⁰

Up to one third of the Secondary Modern curriculum could be identified as orientated to social control, as many of the courses were without the certification of public examination, so important to progress in the English system. These subjects, taught to the lower ability groups, often did not contain the same subject knowledge as that of the

examination stream pupils.¹³¹ The pupils on these courses were identified by the schools as having a poor social image, and not participating in the school community. While the Government Reports were suggesting that the secondary curriculum for the average and below average child should be more relevant, the reality of the youth's home experience, and the reality of part-time or weekend work, were not incorporated into this thinking. The state was operating on a model of "adolescence" formed in the light of the normalisation of middle-class aspiration and ignoring the social experience the working-class. It was operating efficient social control and retention of status rather than the promotion of meritocracy. For Eisenstadt this would constitute a system of potential instability since it offered such restricted status to the majority of youth.

The absence of post-compulsory provision is not in itself a sufficient reason for the lack of widespread participation, although it must be seen as a contributing factor. Both the Crowther Report and the study made by Douglas¹³² indicate that ability was not the main factor in determining the intention to remain within the schooling system. Yet there was little serious attempt on the part of the state to deal with disadvantage as it was manifested at the leaving age. Instead the policy of positive discrimination was being targeted at the early years of schooling.¹³³ The youth who left, unqualified at the minimum leaving age, were from the lower strata of the class structure, and were distinguished by other characteristics, such as belonging to an ethnic minority group. It would seem that despite the liberal philosophy of equality, and the view expressed by Reports such as Crowther, that schooling could contribute to national efficiency, these youth were not identifying with the overall consensus of policy, and resisted remaining

in schools. The specific reasons for this pattern of leaving is not entirely clear.¹³⁴ Although associated with social class background, there was also evidence of association with the labelling processes of school. The closure of meritocratic opportunity to many, and the weakness of Further Education, did little to suggest that there was any real personal gain in remaining in school. There is evidence, for instance, that girls subscribed in high numbers to more directly vocational courses, (both part-time evening and full-time) in Further Education, although they were not sponsored by the state or industry. The state provision for this age group was in the higher level academic courses, which in effect produced a second chance for the middle class male, and further reduced opportunity for working-class youth in general.

This is exemplified by the debates surrounding the examination system and whether there was a need for a school leaving certificate, as opposed to the GCE, which was a part of the pre-selection process for the elite group going into higher education. It has already been noted that there was no qualification, either academic or vocational, for the majority of youth. The Beloe Committee recognized that a leaving examination was useful both socially and as an incentive. The recommended reform, however, only included a further twenty percent of the population despite the apparent demand for certification.¹³⁵ This new examination was achieved by pressure from parents, teachers and employers and opposed both by the Ministry and the Inspectorate.¹³⁶

The slowness of reform for this category of youth has to be contrasted with the experience of the youth selected for the academic curriculum. For example, the speed with which the recommendation of the Robbins

Report were put into operation, to provide access for those with the requisite A Level qualification, contrast with the thirty years taken to raise the school leaving age. While Robbins clearly challenged views of the restricted pool of talent, the interpretation by successive governments meant that access to Higher Education was restricted effectively to traditional qualifications.¹³⁷ The expenditure on the sixth form increased by 60% in the nineteen sixties, while that on the sector where most working class youth of fifteen to eighteen were located, the part-time non-advanced Further Education sector grew very little.¹³⁸ While the ideology of access and equality was the overt agenda for education, this contrasted with policy implementation and the experience of the majority of youth, outside of the designated academic 15%.

Socialisation was not fully effective within the school. While both Newsom and Crowther identified youth culture within the school, and its effects on the achievement of pupils, both were optimistic that this could be contained and reformed within the school.¹³⁹ This view, however, was not supported by studies of the social processes in both Grammar and Secondary Modern schools.¹⁴⁰ Studies of male adolescents provided evidence that a strong anti-school culture existed, and that this was related both to the streaming processes within the school but to the social class origin of the pupils. Lacey suggests that the resources, cultural and economic, of the working-class family were major features of the identified failure. Thus, it was neither motivation nor the failure to aspire to mobility, but limitations in terms of finance and knowledge which restricted the access of the working class youth.¹⁴¹ Hargreaves' work illustrates the process within schools that brought this about. In particular, he identifies streaming as a major element of

the pattern of failure. Hargreaves argued that the socialisation of the peer group, and the cultural pattern of role expectation, contributed more than the culture of the school to the pattern of failure.

While the schooling system was designated by the state as the means to educate and socialise youth to the new and increasingly technological society, groups of youth were rejecting the role given to them as dependent and too immature to work. Youth culture, particularly that of male working class, used the adult world and its activities as a reference, on which to model success and reject school values.¹⁴² These youth groups were modelled on the culture surrounding work in traditional manual skills and were not incorporated into the more technical society or that of the value of the school meritocracy. It is difficult to gauge how extensive the commitment to this male youth culture was, since, as Hargreaves and Lacey show, there was an anti-school culture both within the selective and Secondary Modern sector. The second aspect of youth culture was that it was based in consumption of goods, symbolising an alternative cultural style to that of the adults.

In relation to the need for the state to create conditions of production and reproduction, there were a number of failures. The labour market which received the young workers was changing, but not at the pace and direction that had been anticipated by the theory of technological growth. Thus while there was an increasing change in technology, the labour market changed in a different pattern. There was a continuation of the move to the service industries and growth in the government sector. As Finn notes, there was a dual labour market, part requiring specific skills and training, and part requiring very little skill at

all.¹⁴³ Thus over half of the female, and just under half of the male leavers, were going into work, which offered and required no further training. In the fifties and through most of the sixties, there was access to work for those who wished it. It would seem that many did. Girls went directly into work, where possible, although they were also major participants in part-time and evening Further Education. Adolescent girls defined themselves in terms of cultural consumption, rather than employment.¹⁴⁴ The Secondary Modern curriculum clearly failed realistically to relate to the labour market or orientate to a new society. Instead, it was a conservative version of the past, which failed, under the constraints of state policy, to motivate the young to the new technological society.

There is some recognition in the Reports that the work situation did not reflect the growth of skill anticipated. For example, the 1947 Report, "School and Life" recognised limited skill requirements and argued for extended school, in terms of social skills as members of youth culture and consumers of leisure.¹⁴⁵ However Crowther, in 1959, appeared at, one level at least, to believe in the need for an introduction to the technological society to reach all levels of schooling.¹⁴⁶ This was combined with a concern for the adolescent life style. And so the argument for the county colleges was in terms more heavily concerned with negotiating adulthood than with specific acquisition of science and technology skills.¹⁴⁷ It would seem that the Report was at least equally concerned about social control issues as with egalitarian access to skilled work.

This is in contrast with what appears to have been a real demand for vocationally relevant education. Female participation in voluntary

Further Education increased. This demand was not, however, being adequately met by the state, and certainly did not represent the upgrading of work that had been forecast. Thus, the industrial sector as a whole was weak in providing opportunity, even in the sixties when there was a clear skill shortage.¹⁴⁸ While there was recognition of this lack at the level of state policy making, both in Crowther and in the Henniker Heaton Report, neither contained any powerful means for achieving better provision.

The construction of the youth "age set" which emerged from the welfare state in England and Wales remained remarkably stable in its retention of "adolescence" as a major characteristic. The dominance of the values associated with "adolescence", in particular the extension of dependency rather than a clear allocation of status and opportunity for all, resulted in the creation of a youth "age set" which was effective for a minority. In addition, the continued acceptance of the ideology of "adolescence" sustained a pattern of schooling which did not reform the relationship between schooling and the labour market. The schools continued to certify some pupils, but not the majority. This had the effect firstly of failing to provide the skills recommended in government Reports; and secondly, it failed to offer any real improvement to those youth who in previous generations would have been at work, and who were now forced to remain at school.

References and Footnotes: Part 2 Section A

1. Schultz T.W., "Investment in Education," in Halsey A.H., Floud J., and Anderson C.A., (eds.), Education Economy and Society, London: Collier Macmillan, 1961 pp. 50-55
2. Halsey A.H. Floud J. and Anderson C.A., (eds.), Education Economy and Society, New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961 4th reprint, Parts 1&2
3. Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, Education Group, Unpopular Education, London: Hutchinson, 1981. The argument of this book is that there is dispute as to whether right of access was popularly won or imposed by the state.
4. For example Banks O., Parity and Prestige in English Secondary Education, London: RKP, 1975, Chap 9. Banks analyses the progress of "secondary education for all," as a slogan from the 1890 Trade Union Conference through to its acceptance in 1944. She argues that its adoption marks a change towards consensus in the social structure.
5. Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, Unpopular Education, op. cit.
6. Maclure S., Educational Documents, London: Chapman and Hall, 1965
7. Ministry of Education, Pamphlet No. 9., The New Secondary Education, London: HMSO, 1947
8. Report of the Consultative Committee of the Board of Education in Secondary Education with Special Reference to Grammar Schools and Technical High Schools, London: HMSO, 1938 (Spens Report) in Maclure op. cit., pp.193-199
9. The parent's duty was to cause his child to receive efficient full-time education, suitable to his age aptitude and ability either by regular attendance at schools or otherwise. Maclure S., Educational Documents, op. cit., pp. 225
10. Education Act 1944, Part 11.7., Maclure S., Educational Documents, op. cit., p.224
11. Pedley R., Comprehensive Education: A New Approach, London: Gollancz, 1956
12. Banks O., Parity and Prestige in English Secondary Education, op. cit.
13. The Spens Report set the appropriate level for grammar intake at fifteen per cent of the population. Maclure S., Educational Documents, op. cit.
14. The Norwood Report had a brief to consider changes in the secondary curriculum and the school examinations. The Committee accepted the need for three broad types of education and that the secondary school should have an internal examination system. Report of the Committee of the Secondary Schools Examination Council on Curriculum and Examinations in Secondary Schools, London: HMSO, 1944
15. Crowther did not accept the earlier view of the pool of ability and challenged some of the categories that had been put in to practice on the

References and Footnotes: Part 2 Section A

basis of data collected on the social class background of Grammar school pupils. It made a very strong case for the raising of the school leaving age both in terms of national efficiency and individual development. Ministry of Education London, 15 to 18, Vol 1, London: Her Majesty's stationary Office, 1959 (The Crowther Report)

16. Spens, Report of the Committee of the Secondary Schools Examination Council on Curriculum and Examinations in Secondary Schools, Maclure S., Educational Documents, op. cit.

17. Ministry of Education, pamphlet no, 9, The New Secondary Education, London: HMSO, 1947

18. ibid. It was generally thought that the focus of child development, and the wide range of aptitude and ability, would mitigate the inclusion of Secondary Modern in the public examination system.

19. Gosden P., The Education System Since 1944, Oxford: Martin Robertson & Co., 1983

20. Spens Report, Report of the Committee of the Secondary Schools Examination Council on Curriculum and Examinations in Secondary Schools, op. cit. chapter 8

21. Banks O., Parity and Prestige in English Secondary Education, op. cit.

22. Lodge P. Blackstone T., Educational Policy and Educational Inequality, Oxford: Martin Robertson, 1982 Chap 5. Lodge and Blackstone comment on the Newsom Report that 79% of buildings were seriously inadequate and that the concern, in creating the tripartite system, had been reforming rather than radical.

23. Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education, Early Leaving, London: HMSO 1954

24. Ministry of Education, 15 to 18, op. cit.

25. Report of the Central Advisory Council op. cit., pp. 449 to 454.

26. Department of Education and Science, Report of the Minister of Education's Central Advisory Council, Half Our Future, London, HMSO, 1963 (The Newsom Report)

27. ibid., p.114

28. Lodge P., Blackstone T., Educational Policy and Educational Inequality, op. cit.

29. Report of the Central Advisory Council to Education 1959, op. cit., Chap 28

30. Ministry for Education, White Paper on Technical Education HMSO, 1956

31. Leipmann K., Apprenticeship, An Enquiry in to Its Adequacy under Modern Conditions, London: RKP, 1960

References and Footnotes: Part 2 Section A

32. Lodge P., Blackstone T., Educational Policy and Educational Inequality, op. cit.

33. Report of the Central Advisory Council pp.76-101. Crowther, for example, suggest that there is a changing place for the GCE in modern schools. Crowther also discussed Further Education as filling a gap in providing courses that were not available at school.

34. The analysis of class used in the fifties and sixties was based on the normalisation of the male worker, usually between the ages of twenty to sixty-five. This led to other categories within the population not being adequately accounted for, in particular the experience of women. Wolpe A.M., Feminism, Materialism, Women and the Modes of Production, London: RKP, 1978

35. Glass D.V., Social Mobility in Britain, London: RKP., 1954

36. Crowther op. cit., pp. 322

37. Crowther op. cit., pp. 367 The Report notes the number of voluntary Ordinary and Advanced Level students who were compensating for bad teaching and unavailable of subjects in the compulsory sector.

38. Banks O., Parity and Prestige in English Secondary Education, op. cit.

39. Contemporary Cultural Studies, Unpopular Education, op. cit.

40. Benn C. Simon B., Half Way There, London: Penguin, 1970

41. The 1968 survey by the National Foundation For Educational Research found that 4.5% of their sample had mixed ability first years. In Richmond W.K., Education in Britain since 1944, London: Methuen, 1978

42. Contemporary Cultural Studies, Unpopular Education, op. cit.

43. Lodge P., Blackstone T., Educational Policy and Educational Inequality, op. cit. They point out that 44% of ROSLA pupils wished to leave.

44. Turner R., "Modes of Social Ascent through Education: Sponsored and Contest Mobility," in Halsey, floud and Anderson Education Economy and Society, op. cit., pp.121-140

45. Poulzantas, cited in Contemporary Cultural Studies, Unpopular Education, op. cit., p.113

46. Report of a Commission Appointed by the Prime Minister, Higher Education, London: HMSO, 1963 (The Robbins Report)

47. Lodge P., Blackstone T., Educational Policy and Educational Inequality op. cit.

48. O'Keefe D.J., "Market Capitalism and Nationalised Schooling," Educational Analysis, Vol. 3, No.1, 1981 pp.23-37

49. Apple M., Education and Power, London: RKP, 1982. Apple argues that the

References and Footnotes: Part 2 Section A

structure of knowledge has legitimated the economic system by through the dominance of teaching humanities and science as unproblematic and conflict free. Apple argued for an analysis of the school in a specific social context with particular knowledge forms and social relations. Giroux raises similar issues in relation to the importance of knowledge and culture. Thus he argues for clear identification of legitimate culture, the categories available to classify knowledge hierarchies, distribution and access and the ways in which these relate to class hierarchies. Giroux H., Ideology Culture and the Process of Schooling, Brighton: Falmer Press, 1981

50. Spens, Report of the Committee of the Secondary Schools Examination Council on Curriculum and Examinations in Secondary Schools, op. cit., and, Report of the Consultative Committee of the Board of Education, The Education of the Adolescent, London: HMSO, 1927 (The Haddow Report)

51. Barker R., Education and Politics, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972

52. Argles M., South Kensington to Robbins, London: Longman, 1964, p.91. Argles points out that in the fifties there was a difference of view about the development of higher technical education in which the government favoured the university sector.

53. Taylor W., The Secondary Modern School, London: Faber and Faber, 1963

54. Hewitson J.N., The Grammar School Tradition in a Comprehensive World, London: RKP., 1969. Hewitson points out that much of the defence of the Grammar school that occurred in the sixties was about schools established after the 1902 Act.

55. Ministry of Education, The Road to the Sixth Form, 1951 in Spoltan L., The Upper Secondary School, London: Pergammon, 1967 pp. 23

56. Hutchings D.W., Technology and the Sixth Form Boy, Oxford: Oxford University Department of Education, 1963

57. Taylor W., The Secondary Modern School, op. cit.

58. Report of the Consultative Committee, op. cit.

59. Taylor W., The Secondary Modern School, op. cit., p.90. Taylor discusses the distinction contained in Haddow between practical and vocational approaches to the curriculum. He argues that the Report distinguishes between the social implications of practical work and the motivational aspects. He argues there are three elements to the practical: 1.motivation: the enlisting of enthusiasm 2.cultural: practical as a means to the acquisition of habits of mind which communicate the cultural heritage 3.relevance: relationship to future occupation. He suggests that within Haddow the first is the dominant and that the sociological association of status and class was not fully developed.

60. Haddow chap 2. in Maclure S., Educational Documents, op. cit., pp. 173-9

61. Dent H.C., Education in England and Wales, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1982

References and Footnotes: Part 2 Section A

62. Gosden P., The Education System Since 1944, London: Martin Robertson, 1983
63. Better Opportunities in Technical Education, London, HMSO, 1961, (White Paper)
64. Argles M., South Kensington to Robbins, London: Longman, 1964
65. Hewitson J.N., The Grammar School Tradition in a Comprehensive World, London: R.K.P. 1969. The history of this lies with the Cockerton judgment of 1900-01. The curriculum of the higher elementary schools became clearly defined as distinct from that of the secondary school for purposes of finance. While the Act of 1902 seemed to clarify the position and to provide potential for secondary education development, it is worth noting that the State was not prepared to finance really practical instruction. Hewitson argues that the basis of the decision was that the elementary schools were an offshoot of the Poor Law and, as such, extravagance in terms of providing higher level tuition was inappropriate.
66. Richmond W., Education in Britain since 1944, op. cit.
67. Banks O., Parity and Prestige in English Secondary Education op. cit., p.171. Banks notes that the numbers entering black-coated occupations had fluctuated between 42% in 1909 and 40.7% in 1938.
68. Richmond W., Education in Britain since 1944, op. cit., p.87
69. Argles M., South Kensington to Robbins, op. cit., p.106 [footnote]. Argles notes that of 5,400 secondary schools 340 were technical and many of these were effectively old junior Technical Schools which had specific trade functions. He suggests that they did not develop and took their pupils from the lower end of the 'selected' pupils with no regard for apparent technical aptitude.
70. Burgess R.G., "It's not a Proper Subject: It's just Newsom," in Goodson I.F., Defining the Curriculum, London: Falmer Press, 1984, pp. 181-201
71. O'Keefe argues that one of the factors contributing to working class failure in schools is the instrumental nature of their approach. Thus, the tendency to place non-academic pupils on course which did not have academic or direct employment potential meant that they were unlikely to take the course seriously. O'Keefe D.J., Market Capitalism and Nationalised Schooling, op. cit., pp. 23-37
72. A Report of the Central Advisory Council, Early Leaving, London, HMSO, 1954
73. Better Opportunities in Technical Education *ibid.*, and Ministry of Labour. Industrial Training, Government Proposals, London HMSO 1964
74. Report of the Central Advisory Council, Early Leaving, op. cit.
75. Report of the Consultative Committee of the Board of Education on Secondary Education with special reference to Grammar Schools and Technical High Schools, London: HMSO, 1943

References and Footnotes: Part 2 Section A

76. Banks O., Parity and Prestige in English Secondary Education, op. cit.
77. Hewitson J., The Grammar School Tradition in a Comprehensive World, op. cit., argues that the separation of the Grammar school was along class lines and contributed to its creation of an intellectual elite.
78. Musgrove F., Youth and the Social Order, London, RKP, 1964
79. Jackson and Marsden in their study of working-class boys in Huddersfield note how this was more effective for some of these pupils than others and that there was a tension between the Grammar school boys and their homes and peers group which was presumably less of a problem for the middle-class boy. Jackson B. & Marsden D., Education and the Working Class, London: Penguin, 1963
80. Davies R., The Grammar School, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1967
81. Taylor W., The Secondary Modern School, op. cit. (see note 59)
82. HMSO, "The New Secondary Education," in Banks O., Parity and Prestige in English Secondary Education, op. cit., p.198
83. Stevens F., The Living Tradition, London: Hutchinson 1960
84. *ibid.*, p.106
85. *ibid.*, p.184
86. Taylor W., The Secondary Modern School, op. cit.
87. Taylor W., The Secondary Modern School, op. cit., p.97
88. Taylor W., The Secondary Modern School op. cit. In the introduction Taylor lists the features of the Secondary Modern in such terms. ie the pupils were not selected were not exam orientated etc.
89. Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education, Half Our Future, op. cit., p.53
90. Taylor W., op. cit., The Secondary Modern School, p. 135
91. Report of the Departmental Committee on the Youth Service in England and Wales, London, HMSO, 1963
92. A Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education, (England) Half our Future, London, HMSO, 1963
93. Stevens F., The Living Tradition, op. cit., p. 106
94. Wadeson N.K., "The Secondary Modern School," in Taylor W., The Secondary Modern School, op. cit., p.111
95. Berg I., Education and Jobs, The Great Training Robbery, Boston: Beacon Press, 1971
96. Hussain A., "The Economy and the Educational System in Capitalist

References and Footnotes: Part 2 Section A

Societies," in Dale R., et.al., Schooling and the National Interest, Lewes: Falmer Press, 1981, pp.171

97. For example, Report of the Special Committee on Higher Technological Education, and Report of a Committee appointed by the Lord President of the Council, Entitled Scientific Manpower, 1946 in McLure J., Educational Documents, London, Methuen 1965

98. Dent notes that the aim of providing for the post compulsory sector in a substantive way had been on the public agenda since 1918. It continued to be unfulfilled despite the repeated statement of need through to the raising of the school leaving age to sixteen in 1972. Dent H.C., Education in England and Wales, London: Hodder and Stoughton 1982

99. White Paper on Technical Education, London: HMSO, 1956

100. Cantor I., Roberts I., Further Education Today, London: RKP, 1983

101. Leipmann K., Apprenticeship An Enquiry into its Adequacy under Modern Conditions, London: RKP., 1960

102. *ibid.*

103. Report of the Special Committee of Higher Technological Education, (The Percy Report) and Report of a Committee appointed by the Lord President of the Council, entitled Scientific Manpower, (Barlow Report) 1946 cited in Maclure S., Educational Documents, *op. cit.*, pp.226-233

104. Maclure S., Educational Documents, *op. cit.*, p.228

105. The level of technologist, technician and craftsmen were defined; the range and level of courses was designated: university degree, technical college award, national diplomas and certificates, and the City and Guild certificates. Maclure S. citing the White Paper, Educational Documents, *op. cit.*, pp. 239-245

106. *ibid.*, pp. 239-245

107 Leipmann K., Apprenticeship An Enquiry into its Adequacy under Modern Conditions, *op. cit.*

108. For example the articles in Halsey A., Floud J., Anderson C.A., (eds) Education, Economy, and Society, London, Collier Macmillan, 1961

109. Leipmann argued that apprenticeship was a mixture of status, the firms tradition and craft skills, which she argued were changing rapidly. Leipmann K., Apprenticeship An Enquiry into its Adequacy under Modern Conditions, *op. cit.*

110. Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education *op. cit.*

111. For example, 1961 the proposals in "Better Opportunities in Technical Education," were for a major reconstruction of the 'technician craft and operative' courses. Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education (Wales) on 'Technical Education in Wales', HMSO, 1961

References and Footnotes: Part 2 Section A

112. Industrial Training Act, London, HMSO, 1964 This act created a range of training boards These were to extend the notion that training and education were appropriate to more industries than had been traditionally involved in apprenticeships and technical education.
113. Better Opportunities in Technical Education (White Paper) Cmd.1254, London, HMSO, 1961
114. Lodge P., Blackstone T., Educational Policy and Educational Inequality, op. cit.
115. For example, in 1964-5 19% young employees were receiving day release, in 1970 24% young employees were receiving day release. This constituted 38.8% of the boys in the age group and only 10.1% of the girls. Lodge and Blackstone, Educational Policy and Educational Inequality, op. cit., p.193 argue that equal opportunities was not on the agenda.
116. Cantor I. Roberts I., Further Education Today England, op. cit.
117. Industries such as engineering gained recognition for their diploma as an A Level equivalent. However at other levels, such as technician, the course status was less clear as were entry and final qualification. Haselgrave focused on the need to develop end on qualifications and recommended the establishment of a Business and Technicians Education Council to develop unified patterns of courses, since in particular at the business level there was still problems about the role of technician. National Advisory Council for Industry and Commerce, Technicians Courses and Examinations, 1969
- 118 Argles M., South Kensington to Robbins, op. cit.
119. Weiner M.J., English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit, London: Cambridge University Press, 1981, Chaps 4&5
120. Bowles S., Gintis H., Schooling in Capitalist America, London: RKP, 1976 The theory of correspondence is also discussed at length in Whitty G., Sociology and School Knowledge, London: Methuen, 1985, Chap 2
121. Watts A.G., "School Youth and Work," Educational Analysis vol.3, no.2, 1981, pp.1-7
122. Musgrove F., Youth and the Social Order, (Chap. 2), London: RKP, 1964
123. Finn D., Training Without Jobs, London: Macmillan, 1987
124. Reeder D. "A Recurring Debate: Education and Industry," in Dale R., Esland G., Ferguson R., McDonald M., (eds) Education and the State, Barcombe, Falmer Press, 1981, pp.177-205
125. Taylor W., The Secondary Modern School, op. cit.
126. Crowther for instance argued that only a proportion of the population was suited for Higher Education. The Report however did note the importance of qualifications in creating the division of labour. The Report suggested that there were three needs:
1. a generality of educated men and women who comprehend the impact of

References and Footnotes: Part 2 Section A

technology:

2. all citizens should be able to use the fruits of technology:
3. given the speed of change there should be adaptability in the curriculum.
Ministry of Education, 15 to 18, London : H.M.S.O. 1959, pp. 51, 52 para.
77,78

127. Hall S., Jefferson T., Resistance Through Ritual, London: Hutchinson, 1977

128. Hall S., Jefferson T., Resistance Through Ritual, op. cit., p. 23

129. Banks O., Parity and Prestige in English Secondary Education, op. cit., and "Early Leaving Report"(Crowther) op. cit.

130 Gosden P., The Education System since 1944, Oxford: Martin Robertson and Co., 1983

131. Burgess R., "It's not a Proper Subject: It's just Newsom," op.cit.

132. Douglas J.W.B., et.al., All Our Future, a longitudinal study of secondary education, London: Peter Davies, 1968

133. Lodge P., Blackstone T., Educational Policy and Educational Inequality, op. cit.

134. In 1968 only a third of the parents whose children were expected to stay at school for an extra year were in favour, and that 44% of the pupils themselves wished to leave. Lodge P., Blackstone T., Educational Policy and Educational Inequality, op. cit.,p.167

135. By 1961 it was apparent that the majority of pupils who remained voluntarily for a fifth year in school were being entered for examinations. Gosden P., The Education System since 1944, Oxford: Martin Robertson and Co., 1983

136. Gosden P., The Education System since 1944, op. cit.,p.112

137. Corbett A., Much to Do About Education, Basingstoke: MacMillan, 1968

138. Lodge P., Blackstone T., Educational Policy and Educational Inequality, op. cit., Chap.8

139. Maclure S., Educational Documents, op. cit.,pp. 253 and 285

140. Hargreaves D., Social Relations in the Secondary School and Lacey C., Hightown Grammar, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1970

141. Lacey C., Hightown Grammar, op. cit., chap.9

142. Hargreaves D., Social Relations in the Secondary School, op. cit.

143. Finn D., Training Without Jobs, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1987

144. Griffin C., Typical Girls, London: RKP., 1985

References and Footnotes: Part 2 Section A

145. Finn D., Training Without Jobs, op. cit., p.39

146. Report of the Central Advisory Council, op. cit., p.124

147. Crowther, Early Leaving op. cit., p.189 However Lodge and Blackstone argue that the aggregate figures hide a picture which is highly differentiated and complex. While women did participate, it tended to be in non-advanced courses and during this period there was a decline in attendance by males. Also important was the high dropout rate. Lodge P., and Blackstone T., Educational Policy and Educational Inequality op. cit.

148. The government intervened with setting up of the Industrial Training Boards but these were not strongly supported by the industrialists. The traditional manufacturing industrial base was more inclined to grant release but the growth service sector were much less likely to grant release for their under eighteen employees. Lodge P., and Blackstone T., Educational Policy and Educational Inequality op. cit., Chap 8.

PART 2THE POLICY CONSTRUCTION OF YOUTH 1945-72SECTION B: USA 1945-72

The particular history, development and politics surrounding the creation of the USA had a direct effect on the style and uses of public schooling. The USA, as a federal state, was dominated by an ideology of minimal government. In the nineteenth century as a newly settled country, the USA, had an expanding immigrant population, and a longer term settled group. The period of major European immigration of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century coincided with the growth of state schooling. This produced a schooling structure which reflected both the values of minimal federalism and nationalism. There was a strong attachment to the High School as a community school. While the emergence of the common school signifies an early public responsibility for intervention in childhood, this concern coexisted with a strong commitment to individualism.¹

Under the Constitution, the provision of schooling was the responsibility of the individual states. However, during the twentieth century, but most particularly during the recession of the thirties, there was a change in the level of federal intervention which affected schools and briefly created a federally sponsored youth organisation.² Although the consensus, which created and accepted the New Deal legislation, lasted only a short time it set a precedent for future federal intervention.³ The extension of government facilities, and perhaps more importantly, the idea that federal government legislation

was a legitimate solution to economic and social crises was established as a policy for economic recovery. The Constitution of USA was based on an ideal of minimal government and little federal intervention in internal state policies. However, the New Deal strategy gave the experience of heavily centralised funding.⁴ In addition the national policy structure in the years following the second world war had a new focus, as the Roosevelt policies had realigned the political system towards a recognition of the urban areas in which there was an apparent pattern of affluence.⁵

In the context of schooling the Cardinal Principles of 1918 and the Smith Hughes legislation provided the substantive guide-lines to the curriculum of the High School through to 1944. So while there was change it was evolutionary: the major change being one of volume, an increase in the number of adolescents who attended and remained in High School. This was in itself the outcome of economic problems which put a premium on schooling and certification, rather than an explicit education policy. Consequently writers on the High School find continuity in the variety of objectives and values from 1918 to 1944.⁶ The High School had gained legitimacy as the custodian of youth by the twenties. The earlier use of the High School as an agency to Americanise the immigrant children set a precedent for the pattern of use as an agent of social reconstruction.

Thus while the use of school as an agent of reconstruction was not a new phenomena, it became increasingly significant in the post war era.⁷ By 1945 the American High School was already established as an integrative agency, both as a community and as a national institution. Although not as heavily committed to the ideals of the welfare state as England and

Wales, American post war policies were influenced by welfare ideals. In this section the way in which these ideals impacted on the social construction of youth from 1942 to 1972 is explored.

i) Integration and Generalisation of Youth.

During the period immediately after the second world war the High School was under pressure from a number of groups, all of which supported extended attendance. At national level each group made distinctive demands for precedence of a different objective for schooling. In the terms of the supporters of the social efficiency movement, schooling was a means for the creation of individuals who could learn to live more effectively within the status quo of the capitalist democratic state. This group wished the High School to be the vehicle for creating the 'well adjusted' American youth. Their concerns were twofold. Firstly to ensure that all youth participated in High School and secondly, that the needs of the individual were met by the educators.⁸ The interests of the progressive educational movement were more concerned that wise investment by the state would ensure that the young became integrated American citizens, who perpetuated and improved the democratic state. The progressive ideal involved a greater active participation in society than that the social efficiency movement.⁹ Both groups, however, shared a commitment to the use of a national schooling system as the appropriate location for the preparation of the youth of America.

There were two major national Reports in the immediate post war period, which reveal something about the attitude of the policy makers to adolescence. In 1944 in the Report on Education for All American Youth,

it was taken for granted that all youth should be in High School.¹⁰ The terms of the Report suggest that this was a major element in a national efficiency drive. Concern is expressed for the effectiveness of the schooling, and the Report recommends the development of a common core curriculum to ensure greater effectiveness. There is little discussion of the suitability of universal High School graduation for all individuals, but much concern about the way in which this could be implemented in a cost-effective way.¹¹ Overall, the Report recommended the long term attendance of all youth at the High School. However, while it was argued that all youth should attend until graduation and that there should be some common core to the experience, the school was not expected to interfere with the socially determined destiny of the pupils, except in the minimal terms of increasing access. The role of the High School was to smoothly facilitate the achievement of this destiny by giving youth extra skills and strategies.¹² Essentially this Report was paternalistic. The report argued that this objective for schooling could best be achieved by the use of the already defined curricula, which would develop skills, and with the addition of a few new vocational courses make marginal improvement to the lifestyle for the students.¹³

A more revolutionary change to assumptions about rights to education was signalled in the 1944 legislation which gave comprehensive access to higher education to returning servicemen and women. While the group initially catered for by this legislation were not youth, the legislation was radical in its effect on youth over the next few years. The principal motivation, on the part of the federal government, was one of maintaining social order, as the strategy avoided a crisis over the reabsorption of these individuals into the economy. The higher education

institutions were ambivalent, and in some cases resistant, to providing for non-traditional students but, by the time that the aid for the discharged soldiers was finished, the colleges had become accustomed to growth, and turned to the traditional youth market for an enlarged recruitment cohort. Colleges were an attractive option to both of these groups of potential students because of the clear identification of a college course with social mobility. Consequently it was not a problem to recruit to the expanded sector.¹⁴ This continued to be the case as the earnings advantage to students increased immensely in the immediate post war period.¹⁵

From the beginning, there was a concern in the higher education sector about quality. It was presumed, by some, that there would be a fall in quality in the circumstances of increased quantity.¹⁶ The GI Bill plus the 1946 Report, which stressed the importance of college level science and technology education, had a major impact on the expectations of American youth and their parents. These two Reports, although they did not produce legislation, or long term financial aid, changed the normal expectation for youth. The extension to graduation from High School for the majority had hardly been achieved before a major increase in access to college was predicted and promised. This democratisation of access to college did not greatly alter the internal processes of selection and from the forties onwards there were processes at work which meant that the opportunity for elite education was restricted. In particular the Presidents Commission, reporting in 1947, made it clear that the open access to state colleges was for the education of those intending to enter semi-professional and technical jobs, thus lowering the traditional target occupations associated with college graduation.¹⁷ The private colleges remained separate from the open access model. In

addition, a further change brought about by the forties legislation was that the state system evolved in a highly stratified way. This occurred with the two year course in the community college operating as an initial selection process. The pattern of community colleges, initially developed in California, became common throughout the country during the fifties. The estimates of the Presidents Committee in 1946 were accurate; there was a move to much greater attendance in some form of college or higher education. However, by the time, this was achieved it was not entry to a unified but a but to a highly stratified sector of provision.¹⁸

The broad consensus of the late forties and early fifties disappeared under new pressures from the economy and nationalism in the middle fifties. The quality versus quantity debate, which had emerged initially during the democratisation of the college sector, began to affect the High School. These pressures did not result in a challenge to the idea that all should attend High School. On the contrary, there was a reaffirmation of the basic social desirability of the High School; however this was accompanied by the view that there should be a differentiated experience for youth. Conant's Report on the American High School suggested that there were three major objectives to be achieved by the state provision of schooling.¹⁹ These were: vocational education, the challenging of the able students, common education in democratic values for all youth. Conant was concerned with social and intellectual objectives and thought these best achieved through the attendance at a common school whose purpose was to reflect community. His Report was published prematurely in the light of the perceived challenge to America's technological supremacy, and was thus concerned with responding to criticism of youth and national achievements. Conant

set out to consider youth as a whole and to ignore the differentiation of the youth in social and economic terms. The nineteen fifties had brought a wave of internal black immigration to the cities which was viewed by some policy makers as a potential threat to security. Despite this, in 1959 Conant paid little attention to equal rights either on the basis of gender or race. Although this view was changed by the time he produced his Report on Slums and Suburbs in 1961 the 1958 account is a Report which asserted the consensus view of policy makers of the fifties.²⁰

At the end of the fifties Conant was principally concerned with the ability of the educationists to produce efficient testing mechanisms so that the meritocracy could operate more effectively.²¹ Conant identifies the barriers to an efficient process of socialisation and selection. Apart from the testing service, he focused on the existence of special schools, separate vocational schools and the pressure of the middle-class for exclusiveness. He argued that it is inefficiency in these minor terms that accounts for the pattern of outcomes of the High School. Conant was thus reassuring America about the basic foundations of the High School as an integrative agent through which the education of the future citizen should occur. He suggested that with minor reform, all adolescents should attend High School for a longer period. This he suggested, along with this proposed reforms, would result in an improvement in national efficiency.

The growing demonstration of divisions in the society was reflected, however, in two further pieces of federal legislation in the sixties. By this time the effects of the federal government interest in civil rights can be identified.²² The Vocational Education Amendments and the

Elementary and Secondary Education Acts were both targeted at groups that had been identified as failing to attend, or utilise, the opportunity offered by attendance at the High School. While at the explicit level the legislation was targeted at the improvement of quality and opportunity in American education, the fact that there was federal finance available for the programme had its roots in the panic about standards in the late fifties.²³ There was some ambivalence of purpose in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. While the Act set out to target the extension of opportunity its funding was on the basis that it was protecting the nation. The act provided a complex system of categorical aid to support schooling for those who were underprivileged. Consequently while legitimating extra support to the groups within the school system, there was no challenge to the nature of the schools or the curriculum offered.²⁴ The Act sustained the consensus view that there were merely inefficiencies rather than major problems with the school.

The policies of the immediate post war period confirmed the generalisation of adolescence and the national need to extend education. Both the 1944 Report and those by Conant affirmed that the High School was a universally acceptable institution, despite the need for some internal reorganisation. Principal among the ascribed objectives of the High School was the integration or creation of the American community. The existence of a school based adolescence was regarded as unproblematic. On the contrary all adolescents could be improved as potential citizens by an extended attendance in High School. Although citizenship was not clearly defined, the curriculum included skills for living and frequently included some skills specifically relating to employment. Thus, an element of common social training was offered to

all adolescents.

The change from this consensus was quite dramatic, as suggested by the alteration in Conant's view between the publications of 1958 and 1961. The change occurred in the early sixties as an outcome of the emergence of urban problems and an increased awareness of the unequal distribution of opportunity within society. Both the Kennedy and Johnson presidencies were concerned with reform in what became known as the "Great Society" programme. This did produce a clear interest in the achievements of the lower 20% of youth and an optimism that greater opportunity for these youth could be created.²⁵ Also during this post war period the highly differentiated provision of the college sector became obvious. While the ideology of access, sponsored by the post war legislation, was retained and developed, there was no public resolution of the tensions between access, quantity and quality. There were demands for the technological achievements apparently required of the modern industrial state, particularly one whose supremacy was challenged. This was not achieved through access at all levels. Instead, there was confirmation of a stratified higher education system which was legitimated by the policy of open competition for access. Thus, the overt ideology of access was sustained both by High Schools and colleges, while the stratification on the basis of class race and gender was retained in the outcomes of High School and college selection.²⁶

Social integration of the state had long existed in the USA around attendance at High School. Access to secondary school was not the issue in 1944 that it was in England and Wales. On the contrary, access was extended to higher education but at the same time this became a highly differentiated experience. In the weak model of the welfare ideology

adopted in America, the creation of a dependent adolescent youth was greater than that in England. However the goals of school achievement were less narrowly defined. Thus, in the USA the outcome of a strong commitment to rights of access and opportunity under the "Great Society" label began to show a concern with equality of outcome as a problem for a mass schooled society. As will be discussed in the next section, this did not mean equal treatment. However it did create a view that the state should provide for children and save them from bad parents, so that they could participate in the American dream of mobility and success. Thus the welfare ideals, as adopted, sustained an ideology of childhood as classless.²⁷

As argued in part one, this ideology of adolescence as dependent and depoliticised existed in the USA alongside a more utilitarian view of the purpose of the High School. However, during the period between 1945 and 1972, the vocational courses were not developed and "adolescence" was promoted. For example the concerns of Conant, and later Kennedy and Johnson, were for unity through effective community which did not make vocational knowledge central to the policy. Instead the High School was a key agent in creating this community, as a symbol of opportunity to all with reforms that highlighted opportunity and success within the existing framework of the High School.

ii) Consensus and Socialisation.

Adolescence had been generalised, in part, by legislative means through compulsory attendance laws, and, in part, through the economic climate which put a premium on the certification of students. The adolescents in High School were in transition into a society around whose values

consensus had to be created.

The socialisation pattern of the American High School was achieved both through the organisation and expectations of schooling. The roots of the socialisation delivered by the school had been established long before 1944. The comprehensive High School had been the focus of a socialisation policy for much of its institutional existence, with its origins in rural and small communities, and in its more recent past in, the Americanisation of the immigrant population. Perhaps, more importantly, the urbanisation of America and its rise to dominance in the industrial world had been accompanied by the emergence of an urban bureaucracy. The planners of the various school systems had been motivated to plan for common values. These were to produce a rationally operated institution with an explicit agenda of social engineering. Schooling was constructed as a process of conditioning in which appropriate behaviour and attitudes were learnt.²⁸ It was these values which continued, to exist into the postwar period, through the administration of the system.²⁹

While the form of knowledge to be transmitted, and type of access given through the curriculum, had been the subject of much debate early in the century, these issues had not been fully resolved and modifications around the Cardinal Principles continued. In 1944, at the beginning of the period of this thesis, the national efficiency movement appeared to have some dominance in major Reports on the content and purposes of schooling. Federal participation in educational matters was still restricted by individual state policies. In addition there was a lively national education agenda, based on the perceived needs for the state to promote the scientific and technological leadership of the country, and

to ensure that the provision of schooling and college was operating in an effective and efficient manner. To this end a number of bodies produced statements on curriculum.³⁰ Thus there emerged an education agenda which was not being fulfilled by the states.

a) The distribution of knowledge: USA.

The growth in attendance at High School in the early twentieth century was accompanied by the controversial emergence of curriculum as field of study in itself. This was at least in part a response to changes in industrial management.³¹ The development of curriculum as a field of study in the USA was marked by the production of two Reports on the High School curriculum, the Committee of Ten in 1893 and the Committee on the Reorganisation of Secondary Education in 1918. These two Reports illustrate the distinctions and continuities of thinking about the curriculum, and the way in which the minds of the pupils should be fostered and educated for the twentieth century society.³² The Reports also signal that the state had used a national agenda of schooling as one of the agents of social engineering available to it.

As discussed in part one, there were two opposing strands in American curriculum thinking. These are exemplified in the two Reports. The Committee of Ten Report advocated that the High School curriculum should prepare for the duties of life through systematic study. This came to be understood by many as an attempt to impose on all youth, regardless of motivation or talent, an academic curriculum.³³ This focus on the academic capacities of the mind contrasted with the 1918 Report, which outlined seven categories of human activity as the basis for the High

School curriculum. The development, in each student, of knowledge, interests and habits would occur around these seven categories.³⁴ The value of the curriculum was no longer to be found in its effect on the development of mind, but in relevance to life. The school curriculum was to reflect and reproduce the life outside the school. In effect this ruled out involvement in a process of social engineering to facilitate mobility.³⁵ The policy aimed to make youth more efficient and effective within contemporary social structure, but not one in which mobility played much part.

The two themes of purpose and content are still evident in the post-war struggles over the curriculum. Also evident is a third strand, associated with Dewey and the progressive movement. This was concerned with the development of children's minds through practice and experience. This view challenged both of the other perspectives in so far as it was assumed that the child should be in control of the process of learning, and that the central concern was the experience of the child and the achievement of individual competence.³⁶

The curriculum was the subject of a highly politicised debate. Under scrutiny was not only the content of curriculum, but also the style of pedagogy, particularly since the development of the project method in the twenties.³⁷ Implied in these views, but not always made explicit, were differing views of both childhood and society. The subject centred approach was associated most strongly with the group that took as a given the need to select for the elite of society.³⁸ This view was based on an assumption that intelligence and ability to develop knowledge in abstract subjects was a limited capacity among the youth of society.³⁹ Those concerned with the maintenance of subjects were arguing that the

dominance of subjects in the curriculum was the best way to develop rational minds. Similar assumptions about the distribution of ability were made by those involved in the social efficiency movement. The ideas of psychologists and of practitioners, such as Bobbit, underpinned the views of the social efficiency movement and the view that the average and below average child would most efficiently be dealt with by a training in manual skills.

The distinction between the views of knowledge and the approach to youth are clearly exemplified in the Reports and legislation in the late forties. The 1945 Harvard Report, "General Education in a Free Society,"⁴⁰ was in favour of the development of mind through the acquisition of academic subjects as associated with the essential knowledge for an industrial society. However, the Report on "Education for All American Youth"⁴¹ more strongly reflected the views of the social efficiency movement with its suggestions that the role of the school was to be congruent with the already socially determined future of the American youth.⁴² Thus, class and a geographical location of the child's home were predictive of the appropriate school curriculum.⁴³ The production of good citizens for the local community and for the state was the major element of the Report. The academic curricula was targeted to the development of a limited elite. The processes of selection and acquisition of competent skills and knowledge were ill-defined in the writings of the social efficiency movement, and it was this aspect of the movement's values that led to the criticism of them in the late fifties. It is perhaps worthy of note that the SAT assessment, introduced in 1947, claimed to be content free. This was based on the presumption that it was qualities of mind rather than specific subject knowledge that was required by the higher education sector, and perhaps

also employers. ⁴⁴

Also contained in the debate about the content of curriculum were issues directly relating to control and to models of social structure. Thus, there was a strong relationship between the arguments for the content of the curriculum and those of appropriate socialisation. The emergence of the vocational schools and the vocational subjects within the High School illustrated a struggle over purposes in schooling, which ran parallel to the arguments about the mainstream curriculum. In 1917 the success of the Smith Hughes legislation demonstrated that the vocational educators had made their case sufficiently well, resulting in the federal government being prepared to provide long term funding.⁴⁵

This is an important feature of the American schooling system since despite the changes that have occurred both in schooling and the economy, the vocational element has been consistently sustained. Its effects have been important both in ideological and practical terms. The faith in vocational education has been retained on the political agenda and the development of curricula has been in the context of the longevity of federal funding for the Smith Hughes categories.

In the ten years following the two Reports, the life adjustment movement came, and fell, from power within the educational establishment. It was strongly supported by the school managers who wanted to reform the youth through schooling, and who believed that life adjustment curricula would prove a force for social and economic change.⁴⁶ This movement took elements of practice both from the social efficiency lobby and the progressive educationists.⁴⁷ As a result it is difficult to give a specific content base of a life adjustment curricula. The Report,

Education for All American Youth, which was influenced by the movement, updated the Cardinal Principles and suggested that the emphasis should be on the needs of youth in terms of vocationalism, citizenship, consumption, family duties and economic functions.⁴⁸ Accounts given of the curriculum describe outcomes rather than process or content.⁴⁹ The theory clearly accepted that youth were stratified in terms of social and economic futures. It was the task of the school to help adolescents accommodate to these differences through appropriate curriculum study and the formation of social attitudes.

The dominance of life adjustment education was short lived. The first major attack came in 1953 with the publication of the "Educational Wastelands"⁵⁰. Further challenges to the life adjustment philosophy came from outside the schools. In particular the change was created by the international world which challenged the USA as the dominant nation, and as the leader in economic and scientific terms. The external interest of the state with technical supremacy were translated into a criticism of schooling. Initially the fifties were a period during which education had a high political profile in a context of expansion and affluence during which the proportion of blue collar employment dropped below 50%. This confirmed the view that schooling and certification led to success,⁵¹ although expansion was based on political rather than educational factors, and the nation could afford to sponsor a levelling up of educational access.⁵²

In contrast, the National Defense and Education Act in 1958, with Federal funding, signalled the return to the agenda of subject based study. As the title of the Act suggests, the funding was based in nationally defined interests and was a response to external pressure.

This was to meet the apparent shortfall of properly trained, technically competent, youth required to sustain economic and political superiority. That the USA was no longer superior in space technology was laid at the door of the High School which had allowed adolescents to laugh at their own incompetence and clumsiness and had failed to sponsor excellence.⁵³ Funding for science, maths and language was to be found from the federal budget. It was this thinking that also created pressure for the early publication of Conant's study of the High School. In the event this Report was not highly critical but was a popular reassertion of the importance of the social rather than the intellectual values of the High School.⁵⁴ Conant does discuss the academic failure of High Schools in terms of the access of girls to science, of language teaching in general, and of the need to stretch the able. While he suggested that in all but a few schools the brightest were not working hard enough, the Report did not voice a major condemnation of the High School. Conant recommended that there should be improvement through the development of a core of subjects. These were English, Social Studies, Maths and Science, all of which were to have the effect of moderating and improving standards while leaving the institutional structure to continue its socialisation effects. The outcome was to be a programme for the talented, estimated to be 15% which was academically orientated. Other students were assigned to different course by their abilities, in effect widening division in the High School. This was accompanied, however, by the rhetoric of socialisation and community. In his 1966 Report there is a similar defence of the social function, although the tone is perhaps more critical of the lack of offering of the full curriculum, than of specific standards achieved in subject areas.⁵⁵

There were a number of different external pressures on the curriculum in

the sixties. While the subject orientated approach continued, the pedagogy suggested by a number of science projects was that of student exploration. The progressive notions of experience and child centredness, combined with a distrust of teacher competence, informed the development of teaching projects in these subjects. While the principal focus was on the earlier age groups there was a move to spread more open learning across the age range.⁵⁶ These changes were accompanied by the growth of testing in the curriculum which led to the separation of students by aptitude and the use of achievement testing as a major feature of High School.⁵⁷

The development of the "Great Society" under Johnson, and the establishment of the 'war on poverty' in the early sixties, moved the public agenda to the underachievement of the ethnic minorities and the poor. Again much of the discussion was about the failure by the young to acquire basic skills. There was also a thrust to give access to higher education which led to development of the community colleges.⁵⁸

President Johnson's policy was developed around ideas of national unity and continuity.⁵⁹ However, this did not produce a radical change to the content and organisation of the curriculum in High School, although it did contribute to the further stratification of the university and college sector.⁶⁰ The development of the community college while apparently offering access to the four year course was in effect a diversion for the majority of students. It was a further division of the schooling structure, since the majority of community college students failed to continue to the four year course.⁶¹

The sixties policy of growth was informed not so much by the advantages of specific subject competency as by the views of the manpower planning

economists, who supported a more generalised investment in the youth.⁶² Importantly, although the focus on schooling as an appropriate structure for investment was a continuation of social policy, the federal funding of the sixties carried with it a requirement for evaluation. The system of title funding sets out more clearly the criteria for success and failure, and marks a move away from the funding of education as good in its own right. Later, this gave support to the critique of the schooling system as an efficient mechanism for social change.⁶³ Thus the investment in education which took place in the sixties was motivated by a consensus that all youth should be educated as a national resource. This contrasts with the earlier policy of learning to earn.⁶⁴

While the curriculum debate continued in the High School the federally funded vocational education category of courses continued to run. (As the Smith Hughes categories were viewed as vocational they will be more fully referred to in the section of this thesis that discusses production and work.) However, it is important to note that the American High School did, in the majority of states, contain a vocational strand. Students who participated in this part of the curriculum found it was difficult to gain access to the higher education strand. Thus the schools offered a differentiated access to knowledge and to opportunity.

b) Socialisation

The American High School had, as discussed, a history of being involved in explicit socialisation policies. These had been focused on community, as an agency of Americanisation for immigrants in the early twentieth century, and in the thirties, as a means of containment during the

recession. This final purpose occurred with the segregation of youth and children from the world of full-time work, which was established by legislation on interstate commerce in 1938.⁶⁵ However, there was a diversity of opinion about the goals and priorities in the High School, since attendance at school was a response to controlling the adult labour market. Although for practical purposes the adolescents were in High School, there was a dilemma about whether, in better economic times, the majority of youth should be at work or in school. There were also different views about the balance between socialisation into community and the values of individualism and social mobility. While attendance at High School increased in the thirties, this was the outcome of individual choice about the importance of certification, rather than a national policy. Increased attendance up to graduation from High School however did not extend further and college attendance was still not the norm in 1940.⁶⁶

As was already argued the extension of youth as a dependent "age set" had its legitimacy in the psychological ideas of the early twentieth century. In the USA both Stanley Hall's ideas, and the urban movement of the twenties, gave an acceptance of the view that there was a need to accommodate the "natural" process of adolescence. This included a belief that the urban environment was not a good environment for youth in the process of transition.⁶⁷ So, in a society fast becoming urbanised, a component of American thinking about youth was that the urban environment was one of potential disorder and immorality.⁶⁸

However, as Hollingshead found, in the rural community he studied, this view of adolescence was held mainly by the middle class. Among the majority of adolescents and their parents the value of work was still

retained in a class cultural pattern.⁶⁹ Consequently there was another ambivalence in American thinking about the socialisation of youth. The middle class ideal that extension of the protected lifestyle of youth should include all youth did not give a clear set of objectives for the schooling period, and gave no clue to the status of work preparation in that process. While the psychological definition of adolescence was accepted by some in the liberal policy making group, there were other very strong tensions evident in the model of socialisation for youth. There were varying theories of knowledge underpinning the debate about American curricula. The dominant view of the desirability of achievement was maintained alongside the life adjustment and progressive movements. American culture was ambivalent about the relative merits of intellectual achievement as against practical abilities and "a nice personality."⁷⁰

These different approaches to socialisation were all evident in the post war legislation. In 1944 the Report, Education for all American Youth, advocated a pattern of socialisation for youth which constituted an enriched fulfilment of the life style inherited at birth. The various needs of 'All' youth were viewed in terms of citizenship, consumption, family, vocation and economy.⁷¹ There was confusion in the Report between ideas about individualism and the construction of the community through the school.⁷² It was argued that the school was the institution to teach ethical sensibility, patriotism and self-awareness. These were to be taught on the basis of assumed adolescent interest and motivation. During the fifties, the belief was that those adolescents who were not so motivated were to be referred to school psychological and testing services.⁷³

However, the Harvard Committee Report, also produced in the forties, was more concerned with the use of the humanities in the curriculum, both for teaching traditional academic skills and to give a training in responsibility as citizens.⁷⁴ It was hoped that success in such a curriculum would give social mobility. The educated were those students who were able to develop the powers of reason through access to the tradition of subject knowledge. This confusion, between the society centred and youth centred approaches to socialisation, continued through the fifties and into the sixties.

The idea that youth was an inevitable period of emotional trouble had been validated through the writings of Hall and his associates. It was this view that led to the Hollingshead study in the thirties.⁷⁵ and it is still evident in Conant's work in the late fifties and early sixties.⁷⁶ On the basis of this psychological account in both studies, youth is addressed as a coherent grouping, although both Reports contain a clear awareness of the importance of stratification. Thus, Hollingshead notes that even the clothes pegs in Elmstown had social class implications.⁷⁷

Hollingshead argued, in the original study, that there were three major features, money, power and moral principles through which class stratification were sustained. He argued that the top two social classes from the community ran the school and that a prerequisite to being involved was that the individuals had to be male, Protestant, Republican and property owners. In the forties the policy of the High School had the effect of extending the schooling of the children from the three upper class groups. The culture described in Elmstown is reflected in the ambivalence in the policy statements of the later forties; that

there was a high value on having money and on work which did not necessarily mean an emphasis on intellectual success. The work expectations and commitment to part time work of the other class pupils was acceptable in the community but did not qualify them for success in the High School. In the early seventies revisit to Elmstown, this stratification was not so evident, but Hollingshead argues that the structure had been highly resistant to change. Success was associated with ability, hard work and the ideology of free enterprise.⁷⁸

Conant in his comments on the High School in the fifties also considered youth as an "age set". While Conant wanted to retain the selectivities of the traditional universities, he also wished to use the High School as an agent for the creation of community.⁷⁹ In effect, Conant is suggesting that the strength of the national idea of youth is greater than the divisions represented by status and economic stratification. He prescribes a mixture of society centred and student centred solutions for the High School. However, the student centred view is instrumental in terms of social control and stability, since he assumes that there will be a positive response to reforms which encourage participation.

The issue of youth as a potential control problem became much more prominent in Conant's work after the sixties.⁸⁰ While he continues to advocate the strong tracking of able students he also stressed the importance of the comprehensive High School in terms of the social skills of the students.⁸¹ Conant's ideal adolescent was tough, competitive and ambitious. Those who were not able, or willing, to develop such a set of characteristics were to be offered counselling and guidance, but also ultimately encouraged to develop marketable skills. The state was to be encouraged to help these youth by the continuing

provision of courses both vocational and general. Conant viewed these courses as useful for motivational purposes rather than for the acquisition of job entry qualifications.⁸²

The focus on youth as a problem at national policy level became more diverse in the sixties.⁸³ While a youth centred approach was still evident in the ideas and ambitions of the white middle class, there was a different approach to the inner cities and in particular to black youth in the schools. The issue of urban collapse was high on the political agenda; with a focus on the difficulties that teachers encountered in working in the city schools.⁸⁴

Initially the restructuring of opportunity was targeted particularly at the elementary age group, but by the late sixties the urban riots and the campus unrest put youth in the centre of the agenda. The youth who had continued to college, was, in the majority, white and middle-class. Ironically they were the group who became politically prominent during the sixties as a protest group. For this group, mass education created visibility for them as partially disenfranchised from adult life, with their own culture and style. This culture was one viewed as problematic for adult society,⁸⁵ consequently they were viewed as a challenge by the policy makers.⁸⁶

While this group was viewed with concern, black American youth, many of whom were in the inner city areas and not at college constituted a threat.⁸⁷ The problem of youth unemployment was significant in the USA during the sixties and the legislation of the period demonstrates the degree to which a fear of social unrest was taken seriously. The civil rights movement had been pursuing the goals of access and mobility

within High School for the black community. This concern with black youth, however, absorbed under the state concern for order. Within schools the desire for mobility and achievement was incorporated by a range of employment legislation and the Vocational Education Amendments of 1963 and 1968.⁸⁸

By the end of the sixties, it was increasingly difficult to argue that youth could be treated as a unified 'age set'. There was an increasing consciousness of diversity and limited opportunity available for particular sections of the population. Reform, however, continued to be targeted at the High School and youth as a whole. Silberman, for example, argued that the High School curriculum had failed adolescents because it had not given them the opportunity to understand the 'authority' of the culture. He suggested a curricula which, while retaining diversity and choice, would also give real meaning and direction to the experience of adolescence.⁸⁹ The idea of adolescence as a unified whole still had a meaning for the writers on education at the end of the seventies. The category "adolescence" was still attractive to those with a wish to produce reforms to create more effective participation for all youth. This interest in participation became conformist to the state by the late seventies as government became more concerned about the disruptive impact of youth.⁹⁰

There was a steady development of youth attendance at High School through the 25 years of welfare policies, which led to an increase in the number of youth who remained to graduate. As discussed earlier at the beginning of the welfare society there were two models of the curriculum. Firstly, the social efficiency model, which suggested High School for all, to help the youth better accommodate to the society

around them. The second emerged from a more academic context and promoted a meritocracy based in achievement in a subject form of knowledge. The tension between the two models continued during the welfare period. The differences were effected by external pressures such as the appeal to national security and technical success in the fifties which led to an increased demand for the academic curricula.⁹¹

The belief that there was a need for an academic curricula was challenged by Conant's reassuring Report on the High School and later by the concerns for the "Great Society." These political and state pressures favoured a broader interpretation of the curriculum, rather than the subject curriculum which was regarded as potentially divisive. The principal concern for both Conant and Johnson was that the ideal of equal opportunity was no longer a value around which state dominance and consensus could be created.⁹² It was clear that a large number of youth was failing to experience the ideal of "adolescence."

In 1944 American youth was a separate "age set", in preparation for adulthood. The period of transition through High School had been extended. The cultural commitment to mobility and the focus on the High School as community, were the two themes which dominated the socialisation pattern of the period. During the late fifties there was an expression of concern about the level of knowledge and achievement of the High School pupils. This was however deflected by the educationists such as Conant and the government reforms of the sixties which used the school system as a means of social engineering.

In addition the state school system was not as clearly dominated by an exclusive academic tradition as that found in England, and the pressures

of the social concern for unity in the sixties submerged the challenge from those who advocated a more academic curriculum. The celebration of diversity was part of the means to the creation of a more equitable distribution of opportunity. This was accompanied by a focus on the community and social aspects of the High School rather than the academic. This was, in part, a reflection of the success of mobility as a common goal, compatible with the middle class ideal of individual personal development. The concerns with the future of the inner city youth and the discontent of the middle class college student, led to the view that equal opportunity was no longer a credible political value around which to achieve consensus.

iii) School and Work

It has already been argued that the normative relationship between school and work was one which was not simply defined. During the development of the common school, those students who remained to graduation were those who were expected to go to college. Increasingly, however certification became a prerequisite for employment. Thus the relationship between achieving school certification and obtaining work became more important for the majority of the adolescent population.⁹³

a) The explicit agenda.

The explicit agenda for vocational education was established in the USA in 1917 by the Smith Hughes legislation. This legislation was the outcome of a varied debate among educators, industrialists and politicians about responsibility and appropriate training.⁹⁴ The

acceptance of this legislation shows the dominance of the views held by the manufacturing industrialists in 1917, that there should be a useful vocational purpose to the High School curriculum.

In the early decades of the century, the role of schooling, and more crucially that of certification, was being extended. Thus those youth, who had previously been able to find employment without qualifications, were finding themselves in an increasingly disadvantaged situation.⁹⁵ Within the settlement represented by the Smith Hughes legislation, there was an evident distinction between the industrialist's view that there was a role to be played by the state in the modernisation of skills, and the educational arguments about the nature and purposes of schooling. This is evident in the discussion about the introduction of vocational elements into the High School, which were about the acquisition of the work ethic as much as a specific skill.⁹⁶ The Smith Hughes legislation created categories for funding. These were agriculture, home economics, trade and industrial education. These were expanded in 1937 to include education in the distributive trades. However, there was no legislation to cover the funding of vocational advice. In addition, the skills to be learned were at work entry level, and below college grade and, as such, heavily reflected the cultural concern with work and employment for youth.⁹⁷ It would therefore appear that the consensus (which accepted the Smith Hughes legislation) was one which reflected the view that the ambition of the working child in urban and rural areas needed to be focused and channelled toward industry.⁹⁸

This pattern of provision continued to be the basis for vocational schooling within the American system, the majority of states providing the federally funded vocational courses alongside the other courses in

the High School. This continuity of categories from 1917 to the early 1960s raises a number of questions about the purposes of vocational education. The original legislation was argued for in terms of vocationally orientated skills, but also contained a measure of social control. The continuity in the types of vocational courses on offer, despite the changes in the employment structure of the American economy, and the lack of evaluation of any of the vocational education programmes suggest that the continued use of vocational solutions was a piece of social legislation rather than an industry orientated policy.⁹⁹ This is also demonstrated by the lack of substantial evidence about the use of vocational courses in the future choices of the students. The same thinking is evident in the emergence of the vocational programmes introduced during both the thirties and seventies, which were more vigorous in their removal of youth from the labour market into courses than in the creation of work entry skills.¹⁰⁰

The argument of the industrialists, as given in 1917, that the High School curriculum should be directly related to employment became less evident with time and practice. Essentially vocational education remained categorised as it had been in 1917 until 1963, although some flexibility was given to the funding under the George Barden legislation in 1946.¹⁰¹ While there was an awareness of the change in skill and employment requirements, the basic categories of Smith Hughes remained, although there were schemes focused on the High School and the post secondary sector to upgrade skill of the underemployed and unemployed.¹⁰²

Thus it can be argued that some of the thinking behind these vocational course was not tightly related to skill acquisition. Continuity of these

courses was sustained in the belief that blue collar workers were better trained on vocational education courses. It was assumed, by the advocates, that literacy would be more adequately acquired if pupils were enrolled on apparently vocational courses. These assumptions, however, were never made explicit nor were they substantiated by thorough evaluation.¹⁰³

The reforms of the early sixties were based on the liberal criticism of the vocational provision on the grounds that it restricted choice, rather than its lack of relevance to work and the employment market. In particular, there was criticism of its effects on progress to college.¹⁰⁴ However, vocational education continued to be a popular federal policy solution and it was infused with the ideology of manpower planning. There was an even closer relationship envisaged between school and work. The Kennedy Commission of 1961, which led to the Vocational Education Amendments in 1963, was evidently driven more specifically by economic considerations. This emerged in the discussion of skill requirements. The Commission classified the then current provision of technical education as basically sound but requiring reorientation to the future. This reform was to be achieved by new amendments: a widening the definition of vocational education and allowing for the virement of some parts of the categorical aid. Whether this constituted a substantive change or was merely manpower planning terminology attached to Smith Hughes categories is debatable.¹⁰⁵ The changes were also relatively short lived, as in 1968 the definition of the categories were narrowed while provision was broadened.¹⁰⁶ However manpower arguments were again evident in the development of the Jobs Corps which was targeted at providing for High School dropouts outside the education system.¹⁰⁷ Thus, although the reforms were as before termed vocational,

the purpose was not really one of preparation for work, or for understanding technological society. In the sixties, the policies were part of a solution to unequal opportunity. By providing courses with apparent vocational relevance it was hoped to increase the age participation rate of those youth, who had previously dropped out of High School.

Thus vocational education was regarded, by the policy makers, in terms of a generalised preparation for jobs, rather than a specific training for employment. Although it was argued by the reformers that the 1963 Amendments were a response to the new technological unemployment of youth they were also targeted at disadvantaged youth. In the event the reforms were not successful in providing specific job skills for this group.¹⁰⁸ This was acknowledged in 1968 when there was a redesignation of the target population.¹⁰⁹ This 1968 legislation ended the tight categorical aid and led to the development of a National Advisory Council on Vocational Education. However this reform was also short lived and was followed by the emergence of Career Education in the early 1970s. Career education signalled a move away from vocational orientation and entry level skills in designated courses to the view that the whole of schooling should be more carefully related to the needs of the economy and the labour market.

There was, however, a long established ambivalence between the school as a protector, a custodian and a preparer. As the length of schooling extended, this became more of an issue. Grubb and Lazerson point out that, in the nineteenth century, schooling had been useful for those hoping for white collar and book based employment. As the numbers attending school increased, it became more difficult for those who were

looking for employment to ignore the effects of school and certification.¹¹⁰ The Smith Hughes categories were the result of pressure by industrialists and were significant in terms of establishing vocational education, rather than industrial training as the categories to receive funding.¹¹¹ Over time, the effect of Smith Hughes was to provide low status streams, some within the High School, others in special vocational schools. The categories of vocational education did not lend themselves to development; nor even to the arguments that there was a growth in science and technology, which would produce a need for a more skilled workforce. The development of vocational education became distorted by the status of traditional, and non-manual subjects in the USA, as had happened in England.¹¹² Despite the appearance of a closer integration of vocational objectives in the schooling system, in practice the effect of these courses was much the same as the practical courses in England: the segregation of youth whose future was in lower status blue collar and manual work. It is also the case that these courses failed to provide a more effective link with the demands of changing technology, since this tended to be associated with higher order abstract learning despite the broader base of curriculum subjects through which to achieve High School graduation.

b) The informal agenda.

Neither the Smith Hughes legislation, nor the Report, "Education for all American Youth", incorporated a formal advisory or careers dimension to their recommendations. The link to employment was not one of direct correspondence, since it did not match either school curriculum, or certification, with employer's specification of qualifications.

In 1947 there was a recognition of the use of schooling, or in this case Higher Education, as a mechanism for preventing the flooding of the employment market. A campaign was targeted at bringing back into school youth who had been pushed out of work by returning servicemen and women.¹¹³ The Report, "Higher Education For American Democracy," in 1948 brought together expectations about the advancing of industrialisation, technology and science to meet the expected higher future demand of students for access to college. The Commission recommended a vastly extended network of post secondary institutions as a solution to a range of problems, such as international understanding, occupational development and democratic living.¹¹⁴

The school, rather than vocational education, remained at the centre of the solution for improving the useful life of the adolescent. Writers, such as Rugg and Counts, argued that High School could be used to build a new social order. Principal among the strategies of this group of Life Adjustment educators were curricula to attract those students who stayed away from school. It was agreed that the school was failing the majority in terms of life adjustment and that "functional experiences in the areas of practical arts, home and family life, health and physical fitness and civic competence " were fundamental to a programme for youth."¹¹⁵

Conant, in his Report on the American High School, gave a clear prescription of the core curriculum which favoured ability grouping and individual programmes, rather than tracking, on the grounds that it would be less divisive. A similar social purpose lay behind the suggestion that all students should have a record of achievement to

supplement the High School leaving diploma. Although the High School was a place to prepare adolescents for future life there was no intention to provide them with specific job skills. The curriculum was permeated with an orientation to work which presumed, particularly in Conant's work, that there was a useful collective identity for youth in terms of the state which over-rode the divisions created by certification and selection.

Prior to the war, the High School was predominantly considered an institution for college preparation for a minority, but by the fifties it was evident that there were students in school who were not destined for college.¹¹⁶ The Life Adjustment Movement and some of the progressives wanted the High School to provide a generalised background to the world of work, rather than vocational skills. Conant envisaged a tighter relationship between the school and society, but not through what he thought of as a narrow focus on work. He wished students to have marketable skills as well as continual access to guidance and counselling. This was to be delivered through the provision of vocational education within the High School, as a method of encouraging a common identity and motivation.

The High School was being pressured in different ways. While vocational education was being modernised to bring it into line with manpower planning requirements, there were two other major thrusts to educational policy. One was the incorporation of disadvantaged groups into the mainstream success of the education system, the other was the education of experts.¹¹⁷ While these continued to be a major competing tensions in the education system, the policy of Careers Education, outlined in 1971, signalled an attempt to abandon the old category of vocational education

in the High School.¹¹⁸ Career Education was based on a permeation model of curriculum. A work orientation would inform the teaching of all subjects, and High School students would leave with job focused skills.

Thus, the intent of the 1968 Report, "A Bridge Between a Man and his Work," was in the process of becoming a policy.¹¹⁹ This incorporated the notion that education was a critical element in the construction of the working life of any citizen and that it should be used to demonstrate those capacities that were valued by employers: consistency, persistence and self discipline. Marland's reform incorporated the view that only the successfully employable are the successfully educated.¹²⁰ Throughout the welfare period the American High School contained an explicit vocational orientation. Significantly, as noted earlier, the federally funded elements were unchanged since their selection in 1918, until 1963. In the sixties, the revival of vocational education attempted to associate attainment on vocational education courses with the improvement of poor academic performance. As college access requirements allowed some of the vocationally tracked subjects some of the vocational students were, in fact, socially mobile. However, the identification of success with hard work and ability remained.¹²¹ Thus failure, which was still overwritten in terms of class, gender and ethnicity implied laziness and lack of ability.¹²²

The American definition of school was one which apparently incorporated work more readily than that of England and Wales. Thus youth as an "age set" had a more pragmatic orientation. However, in practice vocational orientation became identified as low status and vocation education failed to change with the changes in labour market and economy. This suggests that the provision of the work force at this time was not a

priority for the state in the context of schooling.

iv) Conclusion

The generalisation of the youth role as a national basis for policy was established well before the end of the second world war. It has been the argument of this thesis that the model of youth dominant in the USA was based in the psychological dimension of Stanley Hall's work, and implied effective disenfranchisement from adult life on the basis of emotional immaturity. Participation in adult life was thus restricted and the ideal of "youth" was a protected process of transition to full citizenship status. It was also argued that the role of youth as a universal "age set" was incomplete, since it did not contain an adequate account of the means of transition to work or the means for acquiring the skills needed for social mobility and change for all youth. There was in effect, an idealisation of 'youth' who were committed to education, for its own sake, which implied that school certification was an advantage, but not specific job skills.

The formation of a new nation, and the concerns about immigration and community, which had dominated late nineteenth century thinking had supported an extension of the comprehensive High School tradition in a way not found in English secondary education. Although the studies by Hollingshead and the Lloyds would suggest that the advantage of schooling was related to class, a normative model of the comprehensive high school was dominant. This included the assumption that it was desirable to remain at school and to participate in the formal curriculum and in the community and recreational elements of the High School. Although the fourteen to sixteen age group was able to leave

school, if it could find employment, this was after attendance in a secondary schooling structure. Increasingly urban employers were unwilling to offer employment without qualification, and the stratification of those who had not achieved High School qualifications became more acute.¹²³

There was evidence, however, of the early emergence of youth as a cultural problem. While the American dream supported a notion of cohesiveness built through the legitimacy of social mobility, it was evident that the reality did not correspond.¹²⁴ The lack of distinction between individual and community, which characterised much of the thinking of progressive and social efficiency reformers, was an outcome of the overriding concern with social control as an element of education. Schooling as an agent of the state had to socialise and control, whilst also presenting itself as the structure of opportunity. School boards, however, were consistently male Protestant and Republican and were less concerned with the community wide version of opportunity than with creating a means of control of the disadvantaged.¹²⁵

Similarly, the 1944 Report had not treated all adolescents as a group. While referring to the role of education in relation to all aspects of youth citizenship, vocationalism, consumption, familial and economic, the Report was very weak in terms of offering a structure of opportunity to all youth. Both this Report, and the life adjustment movement, were substantially concerned with adjustment to community and were noticeably lacking in reference to the acquisition of technical skill and competencies. Consequently, the conclusion can be offered that the concern was with facilitating a peaceful transition to an ascribed adulthood. In terms of Eisenstadt's analysis, stability and continuity for youth as the "age set", it is evident in the context of the USA that

the role was not completely adopted by all youth. The state only offered limited participation, through High School attendance, which was not accepted by all youth, since it was accompanied by an unequal distribution of rewards, and did not incorporate work orientation.

Success in the schooling system was equated with advancement to white collar, professional work, achieved through college attendance. The GI Bill had opened access to higher education and, as already noted, this was followed by the development of access to a wider group of youth. This was aided by the underlying intent to keep down the unemployment of the young in the fifties and sixties.¹²⁶ The national orientation was to promote schooling as the agent of mobility. This was made possible by the presentation of the state college sector as the route to the semi-professions as well as the academic elite. The adoption of the California state plan across many other states fed the assumption that youth could be a coherent group up the point of employment, which for many was at the age of late teens or early twenties. In reality however class, race and gender stratification were a major element of the pattern of recruitment. The proportion of students on four year courses declined between 1958 and 1968. While the rhetoric suggested that there was and should be an increase in opportunity, there was a clear bias in recruitment and thus in subsequent status and earnings.¹²⁷

A further national concern was the youth rebellion in the sixties. The rebellion focused around a youth culture which in the eyes of many commentators constituted a substantive cultural critique of the mainstream American ideology.¹²⁸

A quieter resistance to the generalisation of adolescence did occur in

the schooling sector. This, however, was identified at government level as a problematic for the state given the potential for disorder. It was evident that 50% of black youth were dropping out of High School. These young were increasingly associated with a hostile youth culture.¹²⁹ The sixties were then typified by legislation with a focus on positive discrimination.¹³⁰ While in part this was targeted at the incorporation of urban and black youth into the mainstream of schooling, other reforms to the vocational sector were less concerned with universalisation than with pacification.¹³¹

As already discussed, the integration of all adolescents within the ideology of meritocracy was not entirely successful. There was a continuing tension between adolescence as a period in which emphasis was given to the development of cognitive skills as against an appropriate orientation to the world of work. The Americans were unsure whether adolescents should be at work or in school.¹³² Models of citizenship were unclear. The emphasis on employment and conformity to the state was evident both in the life adjustment policies but also in the views of Conant. He anticipated that education would be at the centre of the continuing development of America as a liberal, scientific, and industrial nation.¹³³ While the democratic ideal advocated the expansion of opportunity and rights, the reality of the earnings advantage to those who achieved college graduation meant that the system continued to discriminate against groups on the grounds of gender, race and class. The dominance of human capital theory, in the sixties, had justified investment in education. Human capital theory brought together the notion of the ideal citizen portrayed by Conant, hardworking earnest and patriotic, and it enabled a large section of the population to be labelled as deviant for failing to be employed or successful. Thus, in

the sixties the revival of vocational programmes had a double agenda. Firstly, to establish control through the work ethic and secondly to classify those unlikely to succeed in the higher education market. Thus the programmes used during this period emphasised training rather than employment as an end.

The main identification of youth culture was with that of affluence and a liberal critique of the failures of American society. The successful youth were beginning to define their own social role. However, they were also defined as separate from those who were unemployed and poor.¹³⁴ As the Presidents Panel described them, youth was simultaneously both the most indulged and the most oppressed part of the population.¹³⁵

References and Footnotes: Part 2 Section B

1. Violas P., The Training of the Urban Working Class, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1978
2. Ekirch A.A., Ideologies and Utopias; the Impact of the New Deal on American Thought, Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1962
3. Miller D., The New American Radicalism, New York: Kennikat Press, 1979
4. Ekirch A., Ideologies and Utopias; the Impact of the New Deal on American Thought, op. cit.
5. Grantham D. W., Recent America, Arlington Heights, Illinois: Harlan Davidson, 1987
6. Tyack D., Public Schools in Hard Times, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1984, (Chap 5)
7. Grisson T., "Education and the Cold War, the role of James Conant" in Karrier C., Violas P., and Spring J., (eds.) The Roots of the Crisis, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973 pp. 177-197
8. United States Office of Education: "A Look Ahead in Secondary Education; Report of the Second Commission on Life Adjustment Education for Youth," in Cremin L., The Transformation of the School, New York: A.A. Knopf, 1964, p. 337
9. Krug E.A., The Shaping of the American High School, vol 2, London: University of Wisconsin Press, 1972
10. Harvard University Committee on Secondary Education, "The Objectives of General Education in a Free Society." in Cohen S., (ed.), Education in the United States, vols. 3 and 4, New York: Random House, 1974
11. Ravitch D., The Troubled Crusade, New York: Basic Books, 1983
12. NEA, Education Policies Commission, "Education for All American Youth," in Bremner R.H., Children and Youth in America, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1974, vol 111, pt. 5-7, pp. 1661-1663
13. Hampel R., The Last Citadel, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1986
14. Ravitch D., The Troubled Crusade, op. cit.
15. Grubb N., Lazerson M., Broken Promises, New York: Basic Books, 1982 The earning advantage of college graduates over non-college trained employees changed from 10% in 1954 to 25% in 1966.
16. Nasaw D., Schooled to Order, New York: Oxford University Press, 1979
17. *ibid.*
18. Nasaw estimates that open admission meant that between 1958 and 1968 the number of students on open admission courses of four years declined from 47% to 18%. In effect it became almost impossible for certain categories of

References and Footnotes: Part 2 Section B

student to be recruited directly to a four year course. *ibid.*, p.224

19. Conant J.B., The American High School Today, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959

20. Conant also published a second account of the Comprehensive High School, in 1968. In it he acknowledged the improvement of teaching of some subjects. However he was still concerned with issues of access and the continuation of the comprehensive nature of the High School.

21. Hampel R., The Last Citadel, *op. cit.*

22. Grantham D., Recent America, *op. cit.* Grantham argues that Eisenhower was not very enthusiastic in his support for the potential of the 1954 decision, Brown versus the Board of Education, Topeka. While he supported moderate civil rights legislation over voting rights, it was not until the election of Kennedy that there was any federal support for social and educational legislation.

23. Perkinson H.J., The Imperfect Panacea, New York: Random House, 1968

24. Spring J., American Education, New York: Longman, 1982

25. Graham H.D., The Uncertain Triumph, Chapel Hill, University of California Press, 1984

26. Norton Grubb W., Lazerson M., Broken Promises, New York: Basic Books, 1982

27. Norton Grubb W., Lazerson M., Broken Promises, *op.cit.*

28. Hummel R. Nagle J., Urban Education in America, New York: Oxford University Press, 1974

29. See Tyack D., The One Best System, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1974 and Callahan R., Education and the Cult of Efficiency, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964

30. Kliebard H.M., "The Drive For Curriculum Change in the United States," Journal of Curriculum Studies, 1979, vol 11, no 3, pp. 191-202

31. Cremin L.A., "Curriculum Making in the USA.," Journal of Curriculum Studies, 1979, vol 11, no 3, pp.191-202.

32. *ibid.*

33. Kliebard H., "The Drive For Curriculum Change in the United States," *op. cit.*

34. The seven aims were also categories. These were 1. Health, 2. Command of fundamental processes, 3. Worthy Home Membership, 4. Vocation, 5. Citizenship, 6. Worthy Use of Leisure 7. Ethical Character. Kliebard, *op. cit.*, p.199

35. Grissom T., "Education and the Cold War," in Karrier C., violas P., Spring J., Roots of the Crisis, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973, pp177-198

36. Dewey J., Experience and Education, New York: Macmillan, 1938

References and Footnotes: Part 2 Section B

37. Kliebard H., "The Drive For Curriculum Change in the United States," op. cit.
38. For example Bestor, "Educational Wastelands," in Vassar R.L., Social History of American Education, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965 pp.370-393 , and Conant's work. Both were concerned with the failure of America to be predominant in the technological society.
39. Karrier C., "Testing in a Corporate Liberal State," in Karrier, Violas, Spring, (eds)The Roots of the Crisis, op. cit., Chap 6.
40. Harvard Committee on Secondary Education, (1945) "General Education in a Free Society," in Cohen S., Education in the United States, vol 3&4, New York, Random House, 1974
41. Education Policies Commission, "Education for All American Youth", Washington D.C., National Education Association, 1944
42. See Kliebard H., "The Drive For Curriculum Change in the United States, 1890-1958. II, " in Journal of Curriculum Studies, vol.,11, no., 4 1979, pp 272-286 and Cremin L., "Curriculum-Making in the United States," Teachers College Record, Vol.73,No.2, 1971, pp 207-220 for further discussion of these points.
43. Hampel R., The Last Citadel, op. cit.
44. Brown B.F., Crisis in Secondary Education, New York: Prentice Hall, 1984
45. Kantor H., "Vocationalism in America," in Kantor H. Tyack D., (eds.) Work Youth and Schooling, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1982, pp. 14-45
46. Kliebard H., "The Drive For Curriculum Change in the United States," op. cit.
47. Ravitch argues that the life adjustment literature was written with continuous reference to the progressive ideology. She suggests that by 1944 the two strands were confused, and that the distinctions made by Dewey were obscured. Ravitch D., The Troubled Crusade, op. cit., Chap. 2
48. National Educational Association Educational Policies Commission, "Education for All American Youth," in Bremner, R.H., Children and Youth In America, Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1984
49. Prosser (1945) at a meeting of the Vocational Education Association defined life adjustment as "that which equips American Youth to live democratically with satisfaction to themselves and profit to society as home members, workers and citizens." He estimated the target group to be 60% of the High School youth. Bremner, Children and Youth In America op. cit., p.1663
50. Bestor A.E., "Educational Wastelands, The Retreat from Learning in Our Public Schools," in Vassar R.L., (ed) Social History of American Education, Chicago: Rand MacNally & Company, 1965, pp. 370-393
51. Grantham D., Recent America, op. cit.

References and Footnotes: Part 2 Section B

52. Grantham D., Recent America op. cit., Chap 1.
53. Hampel R., The Last Citadel, op. cit., p.58
54. Conant J., The American High School Today, 1959 op. cit.
For a discussion of Conant's part see, Kliebard H. "The Drive For Curriculum Change in the United States," op. cit. pp 282,283, and Grissom T., "Education and the Cold War," in Karrier C., Violas P., Spring J., Roots of the Crisis, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973, pp 177-198
55. Conant J.S., The Comprehensive High School, New York: McGraw Hill, 1966
56. Silberman C., Crisis in the Classroom, New York: Vintage Books, 1970
57. Karrier C, "Testing in a Corporate Liberal State," in Karrier, Violas, Spring, The Roots of the Crisis, op. cit., pp. 108
58. Hampel R., The Last Citadel, op. cit.
59. Graham H.D., The Uncertain Triumph, Chapel Hill: University of California Press, 1984
60. Perkinson H.J., The Imperfect Panacea, New York: Random House, 1968
61. Karabel J., "Community Colleges and Social Stratification," in Karabel J. Halsey A. H., (eds.) Power and Ideology in Education, New York, Oxford University Press, 1977, pp.232-254
62. Ginzberg E., "Education and National Efficiency in the U.S.A.," in Halsey A., Floud J., and Anderson C., Education Economy and Society, New York: Free Press, 1961, chap 8
63. Graham H., The Uncertain Triumph, op. cit.
64. Grubb W. Lazerson M., Broken Promises, op. cit.
65. Report of the Panel on Youth to the Presidents Science Advisory Committee, Youth Transition to Adulthood, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974
66. Hampel R., The Last Citadel, op. cit., p.12 Hampel notes that in 1940 more boys attended the civilian conservation corps, part of the Roosevelt New Deal scheme, than went on to college.
67. This view was still evident in the sixties when projects such as the Jobs corps, targeted at youth with special needs, were established. The conception of the project clearly incorporated the restorative view of the rural and was a continuity from the legislation of the New Deal. See Levitan S., Johnston B., The Jobs Corps, Baltimore, John Hopkins, 1975
68. Violas P., "Jane Adams and the New Liberalism," in Karrier C., Violas P., Spring J., (eds.), The Roots of the Crisis, op. cit., pp. 66-84
69. Hollingshead A.B., Elmstown's Youth and Elmstown, New York: Joseph Wiley, 1975

References and Footnotes: Part 2 Section B

70. Hampel R., The Last Citadel, op. cit., p. 12
71. Ravitch D., The Troubled Crusade, op. cit.
72. Gumbert E. & Spring J., The Superschool and the Super State, New York: Joseph Wiley, 1974
73. Hampel R., The Last Citadel, op. cit.
74. Harvard University Committee on Secondary Education, "The Objectives of General Education in a Free Society." in Cohen S., (ed.), Education in the United States, op. cit.
75. Hollingshead A., Elmstown's Youth and Elmstown, op. cit. Hollingshead states in his introduction that the initial interest in adolescents in American High schools was focused on the idea of problem as attributed to Stanley Hall.
76. Conant J., The American High School Today, New York: McGraw Hill 1959. and The Comprehensive High School, New York: Mc Graw Hill, 1966
77. Hollingshead A., Elmstown's Youth and Elmstown, op. cit.
78. Hollingshead A., Elmstown's Youth and Elmstown, op. cit.
79. Conant's Report was initially seen as less critical of the academic achievements of the High School than had been anticipated. However, he was evidently very critical of the High School and in particular of its failure to stretch the academically able adolescents. This is much more evident in his practical support for ability grouping and testing than in the text of the Report on the High School. Hampel R., The Last Citadel, op. cit., p. 70 and Grissom T, "Education in the Cold War" in Karrier C., Violas P., Spring J., The Roots of the Crisis, op. cit., pp.177-198
80. Shor I., Culture Wars, London: RKP, 1986
81. Conant J., The Comprehensive High School, op. cit.
82. Conant J., The Comprehensive High School, op. cit.
83. Gumbert E., Spring J., The Super School and the Super State, New York: John Wiley 1974 Chap.4
84. Hunter E., "The Blackboard Jungle" in Hampel R., The Last Citadel, op. cit. and Silberman, Crisis in the Classroom, op. cit.
85. Report of the Panel On Youth of the Presidents Science Advisory Committee, Youth Transition to Adulthood, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974
86. Shor I., Culture Wars, Boston: RKP., 1976, Chapter 1.
87. Carlson R.A., The Quest for Conformity, New York: John Wiley, 1975, Chap 9

References and Footnotes: Part 2 Section B

88. Grubb W. Lazerson M., Broken Promises, New York, Basic Books, 1982 and Venn G., Man, Education and Work, Washington: American Council of Education, 1964. Both sources suggest that the changes in vocational Education legislation was an attempt to integrate the poor and unemployed into the economic system. Similarly the Jobs Corps, which was also unsuccessful, was targeted at all High School drop outs. Thompson J.F., Foundations of Vocational Education, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1973
89. Silberman C., Crisis in the Classroom, op. cit., p.334
90. Carlson D., The Quest for Conformity, op. cit.
91. Silberman C., Crisis in the Classroom, op. cit. Bestor, "Educational Wastelands, The Retreat from Learning in Our Public Schools," op. cit.
92. Hampel R., The Last Citadel, op.cit. Hampel argues that during this period there was a change in the sixties from the psychological view of adolescence as innocence. Hampel remarks that Conant, while prepared to support the High School as a representative of American community in his published work, was privately more concerned with streaming and the provision of two year colleges to avoid the dilution of standards.
93. In 1940 less than 40% of 25-29 year olds had completed High School, in 1960 60% had completed. Weitzel J.R., American Youth, A Statistical Snapshot, Washington: The William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Work Family and Citizenship, June 1987
94. Cohen, Education in the United States, (vol 3+4) op. cit.
95. Kantor H. Tyack D., (eds.) Work Youth and Schooling, Stanford: California: Stanford University Press, 1982
96. Grubb W., Lazerson M., Broken Promises, op. cit.
97. Cohen S., Education in the United States, op. cit., Volume 4,
98. Grubb W., Lazerson M., Broken Promises, op. cit., p.134 & Kliebard H., "The Drive For Curriculum Change in the United States," op. cit.
99. Cohen S., Education in the United States, op. cit.
100. McClure A.F. Chrisman J.R. & Mock P., (eds.), Education for Work, London: Associated University Press, 1985
101. McClure A.F. Chrisman J.R. & Mock P., (eds.), Education for Work, op. cit., p. 101
102. Cuban L., "Enduring Resiliency: Enacting Federal Vocational Education Legislation," in Kantor, and Tyack, (eds) Work Youth and Schooling, op. cit., pp. 47-79
103. National Research Council Committee on Vocational Education Research and Development, Assessing Vocational Education Research and Development, Washington D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1976

References and Footnotes: Part 2 Section B

104. National Manpower Council, Education and Manpower, New York: Columbia University Press, 1960 (edit David H.)
105. Bailey L. J., "Implications of the Current Interest in Education Work Concepts," Journal of Industrial Teacher Education vol 15, no 3, 1978, pp.55-68
106. Thompson J.F., Foundations of Vocational Education, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1973
107. Spring J., American Education, (2nd edition), New York Longman, 1982
108. Grubb W., Lazerson M., Broken Promises, op. cit.
109. United States, National Commission for Employment Policy, The Federal Role in Vocational Education, Report No 12, Washington D.C.: September 1981. This Report although about the courses designated vocational clearly indicated a move away from specific skill course to the idea that the general schooling and a core curriculum might be equally acceptable to employers. p.20.
110. Grubb W., Lazerson M., (eds.), Broken Promises, op. cit.
111. Thompson J., Foundations of Vocational Education op. cit.
112. Kantor H., Tyack D., (eds.) Work Youth and Schooling, op. cit.
113. Gumbert E., Spring J., The Super School and the Super State, op. cit.
114. Ravitch D., The Troubled Crusade, op. cit.
115. Cremin L., "Curriculum Making in the USA.", op. cit., p. 335
116. Cremin L., "Curriculum Making in the USA.", op. cit.
117. Clark Burton L., Educating the Expert Society, New York: Chandler Publications, 1962
118. Grubb W., Lazerson M., Broken Promises, op. cit.
119. "A Bridge Between a Man and His Work," Advisory Council on Vocational Education, Document 20 1968 in Lazerson, Grubb, (eds.) American Education and Vocationalism, 1870-1970, Columbia: Teachers College Press, 1970
120. *ibid.*
121. Hollingshead A., op. cit.
122. Nasaw D., Schooled to Order, New York: Oxford University Press, 1979
123. Violas P., The Training of the Urban Working Class, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1978
124. Hollingshead A., op. cit., chap 7
125. Ravitch D., The Troubled Crusade, op. cit.

References and Footnotes: Part 2 Section B

126. Nasaw D., Schooled to Order, New York: Oxford University Press, 1979
127. *ibid.*
128. The President's Panel on Youth characterised the culture as:
 a) inwardlookingness, that is relying on their own age for values styles and entertainment,
 b) psychic attachment to their own peer group,
 c) a drive for autonomy, which is focused on a rebellion against a lack of identity
 d) a concern for the underdog
 e) an interest in developing change
 Report of the Panel on Youth to the Presidents Science Advisory Committee, Youth Transition to Adulthood, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974, pp. 113-125
129. Hampel R., The Last Citadel, *op. cit.*
130. For example, the Economic Opportunities Act 1964.
131. The vocational reforms of 1963 and 1968 were designed to bring the vocational education element into line with the current economic position. They were not, however, concerned to evaluate the effectiveness of such a strategy in terms of the enhanced opportunity of the group but with the control and removal of the group from a situation of mass unemployment. Gumbert E. and Spring J., The Superschool and the Superstate, New York: John Wiley, 1974
132. Grubb W., Lazerson M., Broken Promises, *op. cit.*
133. Grisson T., "Education and the Cold War, the role of James Conant," *op. cit.*
134. Grubb W., Lazerson M., Broken Promises, *op. cit.*
135. President's Panel *op. cit.*

PART 3THE POLICY CONSTRUCTION OF YOUTH 1973-92SECTION A: ENGLAND AND WALES

It was argued in parts one and two that the welfare state construction of youth was "adolescence." Although this model of youth applied in slightly different forms in both England and Wales and USA, "adolescence" dominated as the preferred model of youth in preparation for adulthood. "Adolescence" was underpinned by psychological and educational theories which normalised dependent and depoliticised lifestyle.

The English model of adolescence was essentially middle-class, and remained so until 1972. The English school system supported a small group of youth moving into higher education. These youth were able to fulfil the pattern of adolescence, a lengthy period of protection or separation from the demands of society, in which to develop personal skills. The curricula of the English school was traditional, and these pupils did not encounter practical or applied subject study.

In practice the majority of English youth did not share this experience in full; they were "adolescents" only until the age of fifteen, at which point they might continue in the Further Education sector, or more likely, go into employment. Adolescence for them did not include such a great separation from the adult world. The curricula on offer to fourteen to nineteen year olds, who were not in a traditional sixth form, were likely to include social, vocational and practical skills.

In the USA, through the High School, there was a more generalised model of "adolescence." While there was less of a commitment to the welfare state there was strong commitment in socialisation into community through the school. Youth, as a group, remained in High School for longer than in the English system. In addition the curriculum of the High School was more diversified than the one experienced in England and Wales as it contained vocational courses as part of the credit structure. The vocational strands, in comparison to the curricula in England, were more flexible and many of the youth, including those who were to continue to higher education, took some of these courses. The "High School adolescent" was more strongly linked to the creation of opportunity and mobility for the majority than the English "Grammar School Adolescent" during the period of dominance of the welfare state ideology, 1944-1972.

In part three, it will be argued that 1973 was a point of change in state policy for liberal democratic states. The change was associated with economic recession which, during the seventies, brought to power governments who considered that the welfare state was too extensive and needed to be "rolled back."¹ It will be argued that while the state policies necessitated the rejection of the welfare model of youth, both states found it difficult to replace this model in totality. The value of a dependent and depoliticised youth had been that it provided, for the state, the focus of integration and consensus within the policies of the welfare period. However, as argued in part 2, the welfare adolescent had been uneasily related to the needs of production and reproduction, which from 1972, in both the USA and England and Wales, had become defined as the dominant needs. It is argued, the change in 1972 this

left as problematic, for the state, the values and policies which would create integration and consensus.

i) Integration and Generalisation of Youth

During the period in which the welfare philosophy dominated generalisation of the ideals of adolescence to the whole of youth was a clear state objective. There was a coherent commitment to continuity and extension of youth attendance in schools as a desirable goal. At the level of ideology, psychological theory and associated social theories legitimated the notion of adolescence as a period of dependency. Thus adolescence as a broad social category was integrative. All youth was compelled by law to attend school. The welfare state extension of compulsory schooling offered a universal and compulsory role to the youth. In practice, as outlined in part one, the differential opportunities and status within the group were sustained by a range of institutions and curricula.

During the fifties and sixties, the English education system had been characterised by growth and a sense of achievement.² From 1944 until 1964 there had been substantial real growth in expenditure and a continuity of purpose. In 1964 there was a change in emphasis, away from a simple account of human capital development to a commitment to growth, underpinned by redistribution.³ This policy was still based on the welfare model of youth. Redistributive policies were concerned with the extension of access to a school based adolescence but targeted at a specific sections of the population for a broader section of the population than had been participating in the meritocratic structure offered by the 1944 reorganisation. The broadening of the basis for

success was, in England, targeted at younger children in the belief that encouraging the young would create a greater commitment to the meritocracy and would encourage them as youth to remain in school, away from the labour market.

This policy orientation was still evident in the government White Paper, Education a Framework for Expansion, published in 1972.⁴ Although there is little detail about the means of implementation to achieve this, the White Paper makes it clear that the government retained its commitment to the continuation of the ROSLA objectives. There was also a commitment to the need to develop Higher Education along the Robbins principle. This was that Higher Education should be available to those qualified by ability and attainment, but on dual tracks.

This short document is the last government policy statement to be committed to growth and to the unproblematic assumption that youth was best served by an extension of the institution of school. In common with the other policies of the earlier welfare period, the White Paper contains little reference to the curricula content of schooling. Instead it concentrated on the nature and structure of institutional provision. The paper retained the common objective that the majority of youth should attend school. However there was no change in the assumptions about the post compulsory sector. University attendance was still assumed to be for a minority, those suitably qualified by success in a narrow meritocracy whose summit was A level examination. The policy for the other youth was limited to a reference to the government wish to involve employers in the provision of Further Education. However, there is little indication of a commitment to the target of choice and coherence in the system of post compulsory education, which had been

recommended in the Crowther report. Ironically, despite the title, the White Paper contains the first indications that the agenda for education might be more closely scrutinised and restrained.⁵ Both the issues of equity and access are still evident but were framed in a different context, one which problematised the value of education as a right in itself.⁶

Despite the limited changes signalled by the White Paper the issues of coherence in post compulsory provision, and of choice and breadth, become prominent during the seventies. It will be noted that the subsequent changes in education policy were driven by external pressures on the schooling system. These pressures were economic and related to the change in the position of the major trading nations with the realignment of the oil producing nations. The lack of economic growth was reflected throughout the political sector both in England and the USA, by the election of governments which had policies targeted at reducing the welfare state.⁷ It is this change that creates a new policy about youth and make the 1972 White Paper a final document in the welfare construction of youth.

During the sixties, the major focus of attention had been the conversion of English secondary schooling to a comprehensive system. This change had been fought for in terms of access and equity for all youth. However, while there had been a great increase in the number of schools calling themselves comprehensive, there had not been a parallel decline in the grammar sector.⁸ This issue of reorganisation, limited as it was to attendance at a common institution, tended to overshadow all other reforms until the mid seventies.⁹ Consequently, the ideal of extending youth was retained, more or less by default, as a desired but an

unachieved objective. Comprehensive reorganisation focused substantially on the reforming of school entrance at eleven and did not produce a new or reorganised policy for the fourteen to nineteen group. The term 'comprehensive' was in the English context highly problematic and did not have a single meaning. There was a wide range of institutions and no specific central objectives for the schools.¹⁰

Although the issue of the fourteen to nineteen provision of schooling had been a problem which Crowther identified, this had been submerged in the powerful political issue of comprehensive school reform.¹¹ Crowther had argued that the failure to provide an alternative to the academic sixth form was a major weakness in the education system. Not only was there inadequate provision for the non-academic fifteen year old but, at the age of sixteen 40% of those classified as capable of taking academic work did not remain for sixth form study. Twenty one years later, in 1980, the McFarlane Report notes that the suggestions and ideas of Crowther had virtually no impact on this aspect of schooling.¹²

Another aspect on which there is substantial agreement was the need to blur the very strong distinction in the English system between the Further Education and the schooling sector which had been established in 1944. This legal divide, since it was supported not just in policy terms but in financial legislation, was a major characteristic of the provision for youth. The post compulsory sector of English education both catered for smaller numbers than that of the USA, but also divided them very clearly between the school and the vocational Further Education sector. Despite the fact that between the publication of Crowther and McFarlane there had been, in practice, some overlap and share in functions between the two, by the mid eighties this was still

not a formal part of the role of either institution. There was a lack of strong policy commitment and competition in practice between sixth forms and Further Education Colleges. Instead there was a move toward bipartite post-sixteen education.¹³

The formal division of youth at the end of the compulsory schooling period, or at the completion of the first round of public examinations, is important in signalling the retention within state educational provision of a narrowly defined elite. There was a majority for whom formal school qualifications were not deemed significant. Despite an increase in the non-traditional sixth form there was a failure to create, for this group, a rationale for their course of study. This indicates the remaining strength and superior status of the ideal of the sixth form. The sixth form, based on A level study, was retained as much in the interest and status of schools and teachers as in the interest of the pupils. It had echoes of the pre-welfare model of youth, and its history in the grammar and public schooling sector tradition.¹⁴ Its retention was, in many ways based on a myth rather than a reality. The sixth form of the traditional grammar schools had often been narrow with a small range of subjects and students who studied courses not specifically suited to their needs.¹⁵ Despite the increase in numbers and the change in course during the seventies, educators continued to view the sixth form as essentially about a selective route to even more selective institutions. Schools were concerned that any broadening of the curricula away from 'A' level studies would reduce the standard of academic achievement. During the seventies the 'A' level course, with schools' and employers' acceptance, gained in credibility as a multipurpose qualification. This was despite the McFarlane finding that many employers used A level results as evidence of educationally created

skills, or as a signal of persistence and ambition, and not necessarily as a signal about knowledge for specific employment. The Macfarlane finding could have created a potential basis for change if there had been a substantial wish to create technical or other vocational courses.¹⁶

McFarlane builds directly on the Crowther report, but with a clear term of reference to recognise the divide between school and Further Education provision as a problem.¹⁷ It is, however, altogether different in its approach to the issue of provision. McFarlane is notable for its response to the crisis of falling numbers in terms of rationalisation, and issues of cost effectiveness. The Report is worded to create a blend of interest between the needs and ability of the youth, who are dealt with in seven categories, and needs that are to be conditioned by "realistic aspiration."¹⁸ A further constraint is the amount that the nation wishes to pay. The McFarlane Report is principally driven by concerns for rationalisation and economy which are identified as congruent with the needs of youth. The argument, that more young people should have access to coherent provision of education between the ages of sixteen and nineteen, is justified in terms of an analysis of the age participation rates of the industrial competitors of Britain. The Report proposed that the age participation rate rather than moral ideas of equity and rights, or individual development, should be the reason for requiring a review of the post-compulsory provision in each local authority. With this stress on the industrial and employment, Macfarlane suggests that there should be greater evenness and parity of esteem between the courses and qualifications at post sixteen level. The Report contains a clear commitment to the idea that the courses should have criteria of content relevance as well as that of certification. There is

also some acknowledgement that this would require not only a change in the perception of the selective value of post sixteen education, but also a belief in standards in, and the value of, vocational courses.

Perhaps most importantly the MacFarlane recommendations gave a push to legislation, which made it possible to create comprehensive post sixteen local provision with the potential to integrate Further Education and the sixth form. Although Mcfarlane argued that a comprehensive structure would be potentially more equitable they also expressed the view that the old system was no longer cost effective. Thus, change did not come through the adoption of a new educational ideology, nor was there an educational or welfare debate; instead there was an extension of economic and political strategy.¹⁹

In the early seventies, there emerged a new government organisation which began to influence the provision for sixteen to eighteen year olds. Within government there was a concern about the relationship between education, training and the economic performance of England. The issue of youth employment had found some expression in a consultative document published in 1971, itself the basis for the 1973 Employment Training Act and the development of the Manpower Services Commission.²⁰ It is not clear what the government's response to the Mcfarlane Report would have been if the economic circumstances had been different. In the event the creation of the Manpower Services Commission created the potential for a change in the relationship between that part of government concerned with employment and that concerned with education.

This new body, the Manpower Services Commission, had a profound effect on the provision for the postcompulsory sector and the policy around

youth. It was located in a government agency outside the Department of Education and Science. Perhaps even more significantly it was the first involvement of the central government in industrial training. It is around this issue that the major impetus for reform occurred. Up to this point there had been little state concern or involvement in the transition from school to work, for the majority of youth. It had been assumed that the youth who were going directly into work or through to vocational course in Further Education could make the transition smoothly (minimally aided, if employers were involved, by the industrial training boards). However, as the seventies began, it was argued at national level that this pattern was no longer a legitimate or efficient manner of allowing the transition;²¹ although the policy statements express concern about lack of technical and vocational knowledge. This was because of the issue of youth unemployment rather than educational ideology, or a clear rejection of the welfare ideals for youth.²²

The initial remit of the Manpower Services Commission was to improve training, principally for those who left school with limited qualifications, and who, on the basis of past practice, were not likely to receive employer based training. In addition, the policy was created in response to the failure of the Industrial Training Boards. It was with this purpose that the previously distinct services of the DES, and the Department of Employment, became jointly involved in the creation of courses for those young people who were not receiving either education, training or employment. This was achieved by cooperation between the Local Education Authorities, and the training services division of the Manpower Services Commission. The scheme that emerged was the Unified Vocational Preparation scheme. It linked together the three elements but significantly was state sponsored and not industrially based.²³ It was

a scheme which opened access to continuing education for those youth already in employment who had been unlikely to receive any Further Education, principally because they had been recruited with a low level of skill. It is probable that the UVP model would have been the pattern for future schemes, if the level of youth unemployment had not risen so dramatically.²⁴

Instead the Holland Report moved to the recommendation that there should be a comprehensive national scheme for the jobless school leavers.²⁵ This Report, along with the subsequent modifications, aimed toward a policy which would increasingly attempt to keep responsibility for the sixteen year old leaver with industry and the community, and restrict state intervention. At the same time, it radically altered the role of the Further Education college from training, based in industry, toward provision for the young unemployed which gave a much wider skill and knowledge base. Although not made explicit at the time, these changes constituted a move away from the ideals of extended comprehensive schooling, based in the liberal welfare notion of youth. The model of the adolescent dependent in social and psychological terms was abandoned in favour of a transition, stressing the acquisition of skills for employment. Thus "youth" as a category which experienced a period of time protected from the world of employment, was under challenge.

The nature of this change was remarkable in that it was achieved without the usual process of consultation within the organisation, the DES, which provided schooling. As discussed earlier the DES publication, "Education a Framework for Expansion",²⁶ did not include detail either of post compulsory provision or a discussion of the adequacy of the traditional sixth form. Although the Schools Council had produced

documents on the subject of transition, the dominance of concern about the comprehensive reform meant that they received little attention.²⁷ When the changes occurred, in the absence of consultation with representatives of educational interest, the group that could have been the target of extended comprehensive schooling up to the age of eighteen instead became the target for Department of Employment initiatives. Thus, by the mid seventies, it is clear that the hopes of the Crowther Report, that a much larger proportion of this group would be in educationally based institutions, was no longer a policy objective for the government.

This change was finally confirmed by the generation of the "Great Debate" and, the "Education in Schools Report" of 1977.²⁸ These were the clear public markers that there was to be a change in the state objectives of schooling. By the mid seventies there was a widespread belief that educational development did not necessarily produce greater social equality and also some concern that the standards of education were slipping. This was despite the fact that by 1976 80% of school leavers did have some form of qualification.²⁹ The substance of the argument was that the schools were not producing young people adequately educated for employment or who could fill the vacant places in science and technology course in Higher Education.

Much of this was not new; it had been evident in both the Crowther and Newsom Reports, but there was a new element to the debate. This was the argument that in some way the failure of the schools to provide this type of education was linked to the decline of the economic performance of the country. In effect the schools were failing the nation rather than failing individual pupils.³⁰ By implication the new policy rejected

the ideals of Human Capital Theory which had advocated a general increase in the level of education in the population as an adequate basis for maintaining industrial and technical progress.

This controversy and reform coincided with the change in focus on the transition from compulsory schooling to work, and away from ideals of equality and access. While the rhetoric of the policies suggested that the framework should be altered for all the youth, in the following years the traditional sixth form and A level candidates were left remarkably untouched. The Manpower Services Commission was given the power to purchase up to a quarter of the public sector provision of non-advanced Further Education, thus changing the nature of the colleges. While the MSC moved substantially towards short term courses, the effect on the elite selection process within schools was minimal. Schools, however, were involved, but at a level different to that of the traditional sixth form. The DES document "Schools and Working Life" cited examples of good practice, which focused on the need for schools to promote an orientation to the world of industry and commerce outside schools, and, to increase the specific skills of pupils.³¹

However there was some convergence of reforms in both Further Education and schooling. The DES announced an examination targeted both at schools and Further Education institutions for 17 year olds.³² This examination was not for all seventeen year olds, but for those not qualified either to enter a certified technical college course or the traditional sixth form A level course. It was proposed as a course for young people who intended to go into work rather than continuing in education and, as such, had no formal status in terms of admission to higher certificate courses.

A further radical innovation was the development of the TVEI scheme. It was radical on two counts. It was funded by the MSC, that is from outside the agencies that traditionally funded schooling. In addition, it was targeted initially at group which covered both compulsory and post compulsory age groups. This scheme was intended for all ages and abilities and specifically incorporated objectives of equality of opportunity irrespective of ability and gender. Its major focus was the development of a more technically appropriate curricula for the upper end of the schooling system. In practice it has tended to cater for those who were not participating in the high status academic curricula.³³ Despite the explicit policy objectives the capacity of English Education to separate the elite from the others, through the formal provision of schooling, was thus continued throughout the eighties. Those who took routes other than the A level found themselves in an educational cul de sac.³⁴

In the later part of the eighties, major reform was concentrated on the whole curriculum for the compulsory schooling period. Despite the concern expressed both by the MSC and others involved with the post sixteen provision, there was little in the reforms about the institutions or content for this age group. The effect of reforms on the provision of schooling, such as the choice to become grant maintained, were likely to divide the institutional and curriculum provision further.³⁵

There was, however, a number of features which had an impact on the overall structuring of the experience of youth. A principal feature of the new legislation was the increasing centralisation of educational

policy and, with this a tendency to more uniform national provision. At government level this was described in terms of greater diversity and choice through the creation of institutions, such as the city technology colleges and grant maintained schools. The effect of the changes was, in the view of many, aimed at creating a more stratified experience for youth.³⁶ The changes seemed to signal a return to the divisions of the eleven plus era but delayed to the age of fourteen.

Thus the integrative value of schooling had changed. At the beginning of the seventies, the commitment, in the White Paper, had still been to an extended period of schooling, during which youth would have an increased opportunity to develop intellectually and socially. In the following eighteen years there was a redefinition of the purpose and shape of schooling.

Initially this was achieved through criticism about the competence at work of the new leavers. The state created an expectation that the school ought to produce employable youth. The extension of state power was no longer a universal good but conditional on the use value of the product. At the same time the influence of the state in direct terms became more distant and was voiced through control of the governing bodies.³⁷ The ideal of youth as a unity, which required protection in which to develop, was no longer accepted. At the same time the state extended its interest to include control of provision for youth who had previously been the concern of the labour market or Further Education. While there was a withdrawal from adolescence as the model for the "age set", there was a growth in state responsibility for the "age set" of youth.

ii) Consensus and socialisation.

It was argued, in Part One, that one of the purposes of the industrialised states is to maintain a consensus among the population, through the establishment of rules of order and security. In the case of schooling, consensus and socialisation was identified as the agreed knowledge of the curricula and the model of socialisation. The welfare policy of extending the period spent in school had produced a level of integration around the concept of adolescence, principally based on chronological age. The transition from child to adult was, in state terms, framed clearly in terms of the provision of schooling and compulsory attendance. It was argued, in Part One, that the state maintained consensus in the early stage of the welfare policy around a pattern of knowledge distribution and socialisation essentially inherited from the pre-war grammar and elementary schooling system, legitimated by the idea of merit. The framework of educational legislation had not substantially amended or challenged this. During the sixties there were challenges embodied in Reports such as Crowther and Plowden. However, these were acted upon in such a way as to constitute no real policy change. Instead they were incorporated into the system as modifications required to make marginally more effective the objective of achieving access. The failure to extend access to achievement was, during this period, explained on a deficit model, which assigned the problem to the pupil or parents rather than to the schooling system itself.

As suggested in the introduction to this part of the thesis the election of a government with a strong critique of the welfare state, plus the

economic crisis of the early seventies, provided a changed context for the development of schooling. The focus of concern for the fourteen to nineteen age group became the rising levels of unemployment. The impact of the altered model of the state, and in particular the move away from the ideology of state welfare, provided the basis for redefining youth as an "age set".

This redefinition is analysed in the following section. It is argued that the state needed to create consensus around both a new definition of knowledge in the curriculum and also to challenge the socialisation patterns of school for youth, accepted under the welfare regime.

a) The Distribution of Knowledge

Up to 1972, the experience of remaining in school beyond the compulsory period had continued to be a minority experience. The lack of interest in curricula change and development for this age group can, in part, be accounted for by this fact. However, another factor was the maintenance of the Advanced Level, sixth form tradition, as the principal route to Higher Education, a route which is still unchallenged.³⁸ The curricula theory that informed the knowledge transmitted post sixteen, in school, was that of the old grammar and public school tradition, an elitist and academically defined experience. Apart from this there was no overarching theory of curriculum for this age group.

It is significant that the issue of the structure of, and access to, knowledge for this age group through the school curriculum was not acted upon earlier. There were evident problems both for the majority of youth who left school with no terminal qualifications and curriculum problems

in the further education sector. This was the result of the reform of the English schooling system which had focused so strongly on the issues of schools as organisations and had ignored the question of the internal school processes.³⁹ Those new courses that were available at the end of the sixties had been developed on a technical and Further Education basis and, as such, were associated with the low status of applied vocational knowledge, which did not carry adequate certification for access to Higher Education. Although there had been a recognition by educational Reports of the need to change, there had been a failure to implement fully the recommendations of either Crowther or Newsom that the fourteen to eighteen sector of provision required radical revision.

The dominant concern of the early part of the seventies was still with raising of the school leaving age. The range of new curricula offerings to meet the demands of the ROSLA was pupils were piecemeal and did not constitute coherent curriculum development. The students in comprehensive schools tended to be split three ways on the basis of perceived academic potential. The minority of adolescents were in the academic paths and were likely to remain in school for two years of the sixth form. The larger middle group was entered for CSE and some GCE, while the third group, which in some schools constituted 40% of the cohort, was uncertified at the age of sixteen.⁴⁰ One of the dominant themes of the comprehensive school reform programme was equality, which in the English context was limited to a change in the school intake and did not produce real change in the theory of knowledge or the practice of curriculum.⁴¹ At the time of the Crowther Report there had been nine major subjects studied by the sixth form intake; by the time of the McFarlane the choice had widened, but the take up of the wider range was very limited.⁴²

A change in both curriculum theory and content was signalled in 1977 in a debate which was about the unemployability of youth. It was publicly initiated by the then Prime Minister, James Callaghan.⁴³ His Ruskin speech, and the subsequent Inspectorate Reports were the first part of a profound process of change, leading eventually to the most major reform since the 1944 Education Act. This reform focused much more clearly on the knowledge transmitted through the process of schooling. It also generated new criteria for successful schooling, which were more closely allied to the economic policy of the government than to the ideals of welfare state and liberal education.⁴⁴ In effect, the model of success for the adolescent was being modified by changes in the political and economic environment.

In 1977 the DES was still concerned with the completion of comprehensive organisation. However, unlike previous Reports, the Consultative Document also contained a substantial review of the curriculum.⁴⁵ In particular, the curriculum was now to be scrutinised in terms of the contribution it made to the needs of a modern industrial state. The recommendations for a common curricula experience, and for the creation of a non-academic curriculum in the sixth form, began the move toward establishing totally new criteria of provision for the upper secondary school. This was accompanied by proposals for criterion-referenced examinations, which were intended to establish common standards of attainment. A Report, two years later, referred to troubling inequalities in the curriculum.⁴⁶ This Report suggested that variation in curricula within a school and between schools did not give the same opportunity to all students. The highlighting of curricula variation, as unsatisfactory, marked a clear change toward a tighter scrutiny of the

content of schooling itself. The Report refers to four basic areas of the curriculum and suggests that the education system had not been successful in meeting the requirements of provision for differences in age, aptitude or ability, as required in the 1944 Act, in these areas of the curriculum.⁴⁷ In particular there was concern about the curriculum that was offered to the average child. This critique reflected the absence of an adequate curriculum theory for this group at the beginning of the welfare state. Until the seventies a theory of knowledge which had been dominant from the early part of the century still held credence. Elite knowledge was structured around an essentialist theory inherited from the aristocratic classics tradition which produced depth if not breadth.⁴⁸ However, there had been a failure to establish criteria for suitable knowledge for the majority of youth, who had been encouraged to remain in school. There was a tradition of curriculum developed within the Further Education sector, based in vocational courses, but much of the secondary modern curriculum were a thin version of the grammar school, carrying with it inferior status through the absence of subjects considered too complex for the average child.⁴⁹

By 1983 the Department of Education and Science were referring to an entitlement curriculum which should be characterised by "distinctive breadth and depth."⁵⁰ It was through the delivery of this common curriculum for eighty per cent of the timetable that the common purpose of schooling to the age of sixteen would be realised. Thus the new model of the education of the adolescent was based on the idea that there was a distinctive body of knowledge to which all pupils should have access, and from which certain skills should develop. These requirements were justified in terms of relating the curriculum to the demands of society and the world of work.

The pressure behind this reform was not a new theory of education, or the child, nor was it new theory of curriculum knowledge. It was pressure from government and industry to relate the learning of youth to the demands of society and, in particular, the potential labour market. The emerging curriculum was not based therefore in the notion of developing specific individual potential, but in matching the schooling system more to the requirements of an industrialised society. At the beginning of the eighties this was legitimated in terms of a populist attack on the 'extremes' of the earlier liberal welfare schooling policies targeted at equality and the anti-discrimination policies.⁵¹

The curriculum criteria of relevance to industry and the labour market, set out in the early eighties, were those that eventually informed the Education Act in 1988. There were modifications during the eighties, and discussion about the knowledge which was most valid.⁵² It also became evident that those subjects not in the curriculum were unlikely to be on offer for the compulsory period of schooling. In effect the state had developed a centrally defined and controlled curricula. The abolition during this decade of the Schools Council and the Central Advisory Council on Education confirmed that curricula were no longer being defined by educationalists. Overall policy formulation moved to an ill defined group, a bureaucracy which represented the managerial sector of society, and which defined the elements of the new curricula at national level. The traditions that had devolved to the teachers many of the choices about curriculum, and also the educational theory which had suggested that the demands of pupils should form a component of the curriculum, were now deemed illegitimate.⁵³ The knowledge and skills of the curriculum were based in areas of study rather than subjects

although, in combination with the testing criteria, they lent themselves to the construction of a traditional subject based curriculum.

While these changes were taking place in the compulsory sector, there was confusion in the post sixteen sector. Much of the reform taking place in this sector was based on the changes in Further Education sector. Since the Macfarlane Report and the establishment of the Manpower Services Commission, the two sectors of Further Education and schooling were no longer distinct for the purpose of the planning of courses.

A number of the reforms had an overall effect on the post-sixteen provision in school and Further Education. A major source of finance for the new developments in this age group came from agencies concerned with manpower planning and training rather than education. For example, the acceptance in 1981 of the seventeen plus examination cut across both the new sixth in schools and the Further Education sector.⁵⁴ It also legitimated the modular structure of curriculum. This had been piloted by the Further Education Unit, and was quite different in conception to the subject based certificate of extended education which had been supported in the Keohane Report.⁵⁵ The policy within Further Education was one which focused on the creation of a flexible pattern of skill acquisition which, the MSC argued, suited both adolescent choice and employers.

Youth was thus not educated, in the liberal sense, through a balanced course designed by educationists to develop intellect. Instead, there was a demand led curricula, designed by a new government created unit, outside the traditional curriculum development machinery, which took as

its focus the needs of employers.⁵⁶

These reforms were not in accordance with those proposed for the compulsory sector of education which, although sharing the new aims, was based increasingly in subject knowledge. This was possible in the English system, because the majority of the increased intake in the post compulsory sector located in Further Education was assumed to be taking courses that would not lead to the Higher Education sector. There is no evidence that there was considered to be a need to have a coherent pedagogy, body of knowledge, or certification, across the two types of institution. This is quite different to the thinking of both Robbins and Crowther, in so far as both had recommended a more open system, where courses could be cumulative to allow access to Further and Higher Education for those able to take advantage of the structure. Instead, the creation of agencies outside schooling with different objectives produced an alternative transition for youth, following a selective rather than comprehensive model. In effect the tripartite division, for so long a feature of English education, was still evident but now at the age of sixteen.

The national curriculum proposal was targeted at producing coherence and greater equity of experience in the early part of the schooling system. However, the lack of coherence in the post compulsory sector, plus modifications of the sixteen plus examinations, meant that coherence and equal opportunity stopped at sixteen for the majority of youth. Youth were then confronted with choice. However, this choice was constrained by their achievement at that point. For those not qualified to take the academic route there was a range of intermediate qualifications. Some of these were vocationally orientated with industrially recognised

qualifications, but there were also the government manpower schemes, few of which were formally certified.⁵⁷ The only groups which were on the route of access to Higher Education were those in the advanced level courses. While the rhetoric of the reform in the comprehensive school was of 'standards for all',⁵⁸ the failure to consider the reforms in terms of outcomes and opportunities at sixteen was problematic.⁵⁹ Although the sixteen age group examination structure had been reformed, the mismatch of the GCSE with the criterion testing requirements of the national curriculum made it unlikely that the stratification of knowledge and access would be substantially modified for those in transition from school.⁶⁰ The change that was occurring was both piecemeal and lacking in coherence. The approach was one which was based in a pragmatic approach to cost effectiveness rather than a drive to increase access and equality in post sixteen education.⁶¹

b) Socialisation

As argued in part two, the socialisation toward citizenship which was transmitted through the English education system was not explicit. The reforms of the later welfare period of the sixties had been targeted at the less academic pupil and contained citizenship models and work expectations, but only for that group. The grammar school remained as the high status model of academic success and as a preparation for potential white collar employment throughout the period from 1946 to 1972. This track, principally taught in the sixth form, embraced the 'liberal' model of education which included broad intellectual skills but not practical ones.

From 1973 there was a change in the socialisation demands. It has been

argued that in the early 1970s equality and social justice ceased to be state objectives for schooling. Schooling was targeted as a culprit in national economic failure and as a result these goals were replaced by the belief that education, if reformed, should and could be linked to growth and modernisation.⁶² During the eighties, the emphasis changed so that educational policy was subject to a range of differing ideals.⁶³ The policies of the new right, which dominated, were not entirely internally consistent and policy developed through the eighties around a series of different foci.

These were accountability, effectiveness and efficiency within the context of the market; each with a different emphasis but all moving toward a system which was radically different in context to that prior to the late seventies. The values of the new governments of the seventies and eighties were essentially in support of market capitalism. Market advantage, competition and novelty were to be pursued. Clearly these values did not fit easily with those of the welfare state such as the values of extended adolescence for all and an education based on individual development, in an 'education context,' rather than adult society.

The challenge to educational welfare values was based in a broad critique of the education system and its lack of accountability.⁶⁴ The ideas of education and welfare in the late sixties had sponsored the ideals of individual choice, and teacher autonomy, within a semi-autonomous profession. Government pressure during the seventies was towards accountability, particularly to the tax payer. This was clear, for example, in the terms of the Taylor Report, which was about local participation in school governance.⁶⁵ The representation of community in

the governing of the school was viewed by Taylor to be an important element in the focusing of the school goals and curricula. The incorporation of parents into school governance, which had been viewed in the sixties to be a radical move, was in the seventies and eighties part of move to take education out of the hands of the professionals and to constrain the autonomy of education by making it more relevant to the demands of the parents, and later to the demands of the business community.⁶⁶ The extreme critics of the education system in the early eighties used the language of crisis to suggest that the teachers and local authority educational professionals were no longer fit to guide the objectives of schooling.⁶⁷ The model of state provision for the adolescent was slipping from that of professional welfare control, in the interest of clients, toward one of control by parents and local business. With this change in control came a changed set of socialisation objectives. Teachers supported by an educational theory based on the psychological model of adolescence had stressed the development of the individual. The new group in charge of schools was concerned to change socialisation towards the government account of the needs of society, and the labour market.

By the turn of the decade it was clear that among the skills to be learnt as a future citizen were those considered central to the experience of work. The Ruskin speech, sponsored by the Labour government, had referred strongly to the nature of the industrial state, and the importance of schools including in the curriculum an account of processes leading to wealth creation. At a later stage, in the discussion on curriculum change, this was developed into the need to understand the interdependence of the industrial nations and the nature of political democracy.⁶⁸

Arguably in 1977 the reforms were targeted at a broadening of the quality of experience and knowledge of all youth. However by the mid-eighties, a division was evident between the social ideology of education for those participating in different types of the curricula.⁶⁹ The elitist model, with its implication that the citizenship model was about competition for leadership, was clearly in place in the schooling sector.⁷⁰ Merit and status were earned through achievement in the defined curriculum rather than in terms of the egalitarian and participatory principles of the sixties. The pluralist dimension of the curriculum became increasingly unimportant. This is particularly evident in the discussion about the role of the sixth form, which had been the preserve of the narrow leadership ethic.⁷¹ Post sixteen education was still dominated by the A level courses, although access had slowly increased. The power of A levels accepted by employers and universities as measures of skills such as persistence and ambition made the possibility of equal status for other courses less likely.⁷²

The rationale for the Reform Act was the raising of standards and personal competence in terms of the needs of the industrial state. However, the elements of centralisation, which denied access to the consultative process, suggest that there was also an agenda concerned with processes of social control. The rhetoric of the reform was that the school curriculum should have increased 'relevance'. Although relevance was apparently a central value, it was an abstract idea which lent itself to interpretation in different ways. The objective, which had been sustained by the ideology of welfare, that pupils should be encouraged to work toward effective personal development was replaced by a school curriculum and ethos which focused around a hierarchy of

personal and social skills.⁷³

In addition the requirements of testing, and the core curriculum, markedly changed the model of citizenship available to youth. Rather than access, the focus was on labelling and sorting. While at one level the overall effect of the national curriculum was to create a common experience, the subjects and experience were based on a curriculum defined by the state. Both the subjects in the national curriculum and the associated pedagogy are a reflection of traditional and absolutist ideas of knowledge rather than within the modern and experimental tradition. These constraints, along with the criterion referenced testing, suggest that the reforms, theoretically about standards and modernisation, were also concerned with social control, through a closing down of aspirations and choice.⁷⁴

The 1988 Reform Act refers very briefly to the objectives of schooling. The outcomes are in terms of responsible citizenship and an ability to meet the challenges of employment in tomorrow's world. The 1985 White Paper referred to the need to develop lively and enquiring minds and knowledge relevant to adult life. However the details of the curriculum and the processes of implementation leave little scope for the development of these skills, except as they are delivered through the subjects.⁷⁵ The major part of school time was to be occupied by the core curriculum. This is in contrast to the moral welfare remit of the 1944 Act. The curriculum document refers to cross curricula themes among which are personal and social education. This is the potential agenda for explicit socialisation. However if, as curriculum theory suggests, the status and methods of a subject are as important as the content, the emergence of Personal and Social Education as a theme, rather than a

fixed curricula subject, suggests its insignificance.⁷⁶

Mitigating against the notion of a broad and balanced curriculum for the adolescent is the agenda that demonstrated a lack of faith in teacher and pupil autonomy. While the explicit socialisation effects of the Educational Reform Act of 1988 are yet to be fully established, the framework suggests that youth socialisation should be one in which responses to society, as represented by parents and the immediate commercial community, are important. The successful adolescent is to be competitive and, ideally, attends a school which socialises into the values and standards of industrial society. These policies would appear to broaden the divisions between the youth and to make the universal category of adolescent more problematic, by reducing access and emphasising performance.

In the early seventies the view that extended schooling was a desirable goal was still evident in public policy. Both Crowther and Newsom accepted that late adolescence was both difficult and formative. Both Reports argued that adolescence was best accommodated in the extended school structure, not in individual self determination in the world of adults and employment. From the custody of the school, youth who were not destined for academic excellence, were to learn coping skills for their future roles as citizens.

It was not until the mid seventies that this consensual view of youth was challenged at the level of state policy. The challenge had two main foci, the issue of standards and the issue of efficiency, both relating to British economic performance. During the early eighties a third focus that of entitlement, was briefly added by HMI, a model which retained

the idea of minimal rights.

With this restatement of objectives, there was a major shift in the model of merit set by the state school system. While the welfare model had offered opportunity which included both self development and the chance to succeed within a broadening academic curriculum, the new model was one of achievement in a reformed subject curriculum. This particular model emerged in the late eighties after a series of Reports.⁷⁷ The emergence of the national curriculum, with its accompanying remit to raise standards through a testing process, marks the move away from pupil's self-development to a curriculum based on societal needs. It also marks a move away from the relative autonomy of educationists to set and to moderate achievement, in favour of the state. Thus the welfare state sponsorship of self development is replaced by a state policy orientated to economic and social needs.

The new curriculum created both greater common experience and restated the division of youth in social as well as academic terms. In particular post-compulsory provision was clearly differentiated, with limited potential for changed routes. The legitimation for such change was underwritten by themes of national industrial efficiency and the technological society. The voice of manufacturers and employers was given priority in demanding that schools raise standards and the achievements of youth. Schools were held to blame, not only for the academic failure of the pupils, but also for the lack of social skills required by the employer.

The rules of order and security, which dominated the post seventies, focused on national economic survival. This model included the

assumption that technical change required an increasing level of skill.⁷⁸ While the dominant political ideology contained a policy commitment to reduce state involvement and create self reliance, the process of change was state led⁷⁹ and the new values were imposed on the education institutions. The consensus values around which the youth "age set" was to be defined were ones which accepted the need to have youth very clearly differentiated by achievement and employability.⁸⁰ However the way in which this relationship was to be understood was socially mediated, as discussed in the following section.

iii) School and Work

It was argued, in part one and two of this thesis, that the state function of providing production and reproduction of the labour force, through the relationship between school and work, was the least consistent with the ideal of "adolescence". The success of "adolescence" as an ideology was that it provided the state with an account of youth around which integration and consensus could be achieved. The relationship between school and work was broadly interpreted through the manpower planning account which suggested that increased educational certification would benefit the state and the economy as a whole. After 1972 this account was rejected by the governments of both the USA and Britain. In its place there developed an ideology which argued for an industry led model of youth.

a) The Explicit Agenda

As argued in the preceding part, the ideology of efficiency and national well being, which developed during the late seventies and early eighties, did not originate in the educational sector.⁸¹ Rather, the changes which occurred were imposed by the political sector of the state on the educationists.⁸² In addition, the changes were driven by political and economic interests which disenfranchised the ideas of educationists. This is particularly evident in the field of curriculum development where the teaching profession lost control of the Schools Council.⁸³ At the same time the dominance of the political and economic elements of the state, in the formulation of policy, meant that the agenda for youth was set in quite different terms to those of the liberal welfare era. The major change was in the ideal model of the relationship between schooling and work, in particular industry. It is in the post sixteen provision, both in terms of curriculum and institutions, that the major change in policy occurs; although these changes also become evident in the upper end of the compulsory sector. The 1988 Education Act had major impact on schools. However this was predated by a number of changes in the transition from school to work which had occurred earlier in the decade.⁸⁴ The changes were all focused around a new state populist ideology of the relationship between schooling and work, which was built on a critique of the inefficiencies of state intervention.⁸⁵ This ideology contained both a critique of schooling outcomes and a new statement of the process of transition from school to work.

In the early seventies, the main curriculum concern of the Further Education sector was the impact of the Haselgrave Report.⁸⁶ This Report

had examined the issue of training at technician level and the operation of the various training boards. The intention of the review was to move the sector toward a more rational and coherent structure, with the implication that this might lead to a greater status for these courses. The problem that had been identified for Haselgrave was a lack of coherence and opportunity which was accompanied, if not caused by, the low status of the courses in both educational and employment terms. The focus of the recommendations of the Haselgrave Report and the continuing reforms resulted in the Business and Technicians Examining boards. The Boards were intended to develop unified national patterns of courses, creating greater coherence between the demands of industry and the educational institutions. This was to fill the gap that had not satisfactorily been filled by the Industrial Training Boards. In practice, however, the Haselgrave Report was pre-empted by the movement of the central government into the Industrial Training sector. The Government White Paper expressed concern at the failure of the Industrial Training Boards either to provide an adequate pattern of training for the industries they represented, or to provide adequate national coordination of training. This resulted in the creation of a new national agency, the Manpower Services Commission.⁸⁷

It is difficult to identify the effects that the Manpower Training Agency might have had on the problems of adequate training as these were identified at the beginning of the seventies. The initial brief to the Agency was to deal with manpower skill issues in general. However, a major increase in unemployment, and in particular youth unemployment, during the seventies changed that agenda. In its initial structure the MSC was only partially concerned with the training sector. However, this aspect of its work grew. The government response to youth unemployment

was formulated outside the school structure and the MSC became the focus for developing the new policy. Other aspects of the MSC were concerned with the traditional framework for apprenticeship and the location of training for skilled workers. In particular the MSC explored the definition of skill and the construction of courses of industrial based certification. These two elements were drawn together in the seventies to create a new policy approach to the provision of transition for youth. The transition was thus substantially moved from the welfare ideal of extended liberal education to one in which policy and finance came from an agency located initially with a concern for labour.⁸⁸

The first training model developed was the Unified Vocational Preparation course.⁸⁹ UVP was targeted at those youth who were employed but with very low levels of skill or education. This was the sector of the population that industrialists had been unwilling to release for further training and for which the education system had no curriculum. The UVP curriculum was framed within the liberal education tradition, and involved the release to Further Education colleges of the participants for college based courses.⁹⁰ UVP was conceived of in educational terms rather than on industrial or economic model. This might well have been the extent of the Manpower Services Commission involvement in the Further Education structure but for the unemployment crisis.

However, in 1977 the Holland Report produced by the MSC set a totally new agenda for the government in terms of youth unemployment.⁶⁷ This signalled a clear change in the assumptions behind policy. Holland argued that the unemployed were unlikely to be helped directly by employers, and in effect the state would have to intervene. It

recommended that the government, through the agency of the MSC, create new courses and agencies to deal with the unemployed youth. This was a clear choice against locating the resources within the existing framework of school and Further Education courses, as might have occurred within the recommendations of Crowther. The policies and schemes that emerged prioritised the response of the courses to the economy over those of individual needs. Holland argued that the main reason for youth unemployment was that the young were leaving school without appropriate qualifications. Concern was also expressed about the attitudes and expectations of the young as potential employees. This was contrasted with the employers' needs which were for flexibility and relevance in courses. School curriculum was typified as having long term and less flexible provision and thus as lacking relevance to the young school leaver.⁹¹

The first scheme, the Youth Opportunities Scheme, was intended to be a comprehensive scheme for those of the youth who were unemployable. By developing such a scheme, there was an implied assumption that the purposes of schooling had been unfulfilled if the outcome was unemployment. Thus there is a coincidence of emphasis with the content of the Ruskin speech and the subsequent Great Debate, all of which were focused on changing the purpose of schooling towards a more pragmatic and measurable outcome: performance in society, particularly employability.

During the seventies and throughout the eighties, there were three institutional bases for the sixteen to nineteen group apart from employment. These were the sixth form, Further Education and MSC schemes. Modifications in the operation of these institutions occurred,

particularly in the case of Further Education, when the schemes generated by the MSC gave increasing power to the organisation to purchase and formulate courses. These modifications were developed to provide a more flexible orientation to work and vocation.⁹² This was paralleled by changes in the legislative basis for Further Education and schooling which allowed for an overlap in students and funding between these two sectors.

There was also a fundamental change in the funded provision for youth during these twenty years. The provision for the majority of youth became a vocationally orientated programme, separate from the school as an institution and ideology, and separate from the qualifications required to gain access to the Higher Education sector. Despite government attempts to move the costs towards employers there was an increase in state intervention and funding. The model for youth had been changed to one of economic orientation, where the changing requirements of the employment market were prioritised over personal development. The need to make the school, or the training agency, respond to the market was resolved by the construction of short term courses and schemes.

One of the characteristics of the liberal reforms following the 1944 Act was a push for reform in the institutions of schooling rather than the curriculum.⁹³ While this remained the case in schools until 1977, the reform began earlier within the Further Education sector and by 1977 there was in place, for the first time, a centrally based and funded curriculum agency, the Further Education Unit.

The traditional pattern of Further Education curricula had been changed in response to new demands in the early seventies. There had been an

accommodation to the needs of the less qualified youth in terms of the Certificate of Extended Education Course.⁹⁴ This course, conceived in educational terms and developed from within the educational establishment was a response to the failure of employers to expand training and education for the least qualified. However, this experiment in prevocational education, which contained a component of liberal schooling and was linked to the school examinations board structure, was rejected by the Government at the end of the decade.⁹⁵ Instead there was sponsorship for the curricula developed within the Further Education Unit. The Report, "A Basis for Choice," was technically not a curriculum but a framework into which existing subjects could be fitted.⁹⁶ This policy choice, to support "A Basis For Choice," as against the Certificate of Extended Education, signalled rejection of both of the idea that developments in the post sixteen sector should be based in the patterns of formal education, and that these courses would widen the opportunity of access to Higher Education.

The "A Basis for Choice" framework was designed to fulfil the requirements of the Ruskin and Holland agenda, that the education system should respond to the requirements of the employers. For the Further Education Unit which developed it, this meant that the curriculum should be both modular, variable and driven by process not content. It was a change for the Further Education sector, where the usual pattern of courses had been directly vocational, most frequently related to specific industrial requirements. Through this means the central government had now created a new form of vocationalism, prescribed by the government and orientated to the requirements of the industrial state rather than the specific requirements of the various industries. This 'new vocational' or pre-vocational curriculum, as it was called,

had several features which were new in the context of educational certification. The first was that the core would combine academic and experiential learning. The second was a compulsory component of counselling and guidance. The third was that an element of vocationalism provided motivation for the candidates, who were also required to acquire job-related skills.⁹⁷ The course was to run, albeit in slightly different forms, in both schools and institutions of Further Education after 1982. It was sufficiently problematic in its curriculum to cause an internal dispute about how closely tied to specific vocational skills it should be, and how it related to an educational approach.⁹⁸

The emergence of the seventeen plus curriculum, which became the Certificate of Prevocational Education, can be viewed as a direct result of state pressure on these institutions. It was based in the same ideology as the TVEI scheme, which was piloted in 1983. The Technical and Vocational Educational initiative was revolutionary, in that it brought curriculum reform and control into the compulsory sector of schooling from an outside agency. It also represented a very well funded curriculum innovation based on criteria not recognised as traditionally educational. That there was some confusion in the objectives and implementation of both these schemes is shown by the terminology. The Technical and Vocational Education course was for fourteen to eighteen year olds either in school, or Further Education in its later stages. The seventeen plus examination, also available in the same two institutions, was known as the Certificate of Prevocational Education. This illustrates clearly the confusion in the use of the term 'vocational.'⁹⁹

Perhaps the most radical curriculum was being developed within a tight

framework of government agency control for the unemployed youth. From the Holland Report onwards, the MSC developed a clear model of youth provision based on the ideal of a trainee being prepared for work.¹⁰⁰ The MSC, which became the training agency and subsequently the TEC's moved in as a major source of training for the young with a series of schemes, modified in a relatively short time to suit the prevailing unemployment situation and the government requirement that the source of finance be moved increasingly towards the employers.¹⁰¹ The curriculum theory of these schemes was based not in education but in the transmission of transferable core skills. These skills were work related and underpinned the concept of skill transfer. It was intended that these skills should form the basis of the school to work processes.¹⁰² Also on the agenda was the acquisition of competent skills rather than the idea of time serving for skill acquisition which the government considered to be embedded in the old apprenticeship schemes. The core skills were combined with a social skills training element, which are intended to raise the personal effectiveness level of trainees in the environment of work and during the process of searching for work. 103

It is this aspect of the training programmes that is clearly distinguished from the welfare state conception of education. A liberal education framework, which valued personal autonomy and breadth of choice, was no longer valued. The courses and programmes on offer to this group of youth fell clearly within the remit of training rather than education. Since the group recruited to the YOP and YTS course was those who were unemployed, and with limited formal educational certification, the fact that the MSC courses did not carry educational certification made it clear that there was no policy towards broadening opportunity in the academic sense. The programmes are more readily

understood in terms of industry. However, when they are matched against employment, they are clearly designed to effect a measure of social control over a potentially disenfranchised youth group.¹⁰⁴

If Beechey's classification of skill is applied to the Further Education Unit documents, it is evident that the reforms amount to deskilling.¹⁰⁵ The control over conception and execution was centrally defined, so that the students and colleges were given fewer rights in the development of curricula content and orientation. Since few of the courses were associated with either recognised craft skills or gave access to Higher Education, they were destined to remain relatively low status.

b) The Informal Agenda.

It is within the upper secondary school and the post compulsory sector that the rejection of the welfare consensus is most evident. This change was brought about through continuous pressure on the schooling system from a political level. This included the public debate about the failures of schooling and the reduction in financing. The major policy change was generated by a Department not traditionally associated with education but with industry and employment. In itself this constituted a change in the balance of power within the state. It also constituted a rejection of the welfare education model of youth transition. By placing the planning and resources for some youth with an agency concerned with labour supply and industrial training, there was a clear change to a social construction of youth in which the public world of work played a major part. This model was not however applied universally to youth as an "age set". It left intact the welfare orientation for the academic

child, insofar as personal development rather than utilitarian skills were still the objectives of schooling for them. The Manpower Services Commission was one which did not operate at all through the traditional channels of the Central Advisory Committee, and thus rejected the policy which had been based both in consultation with professionals and on the previous criteria of education Reports. The relation of schooling to the state had changed and the control of the professionals, who had been concerned to implement the welfare policy, had been reduced.

The Reform Act of 1988 was framed in terms of continuity of commitment to equality and opportunity, but contextualised in an argument about standards and modernisation. The Act gave dominance to the voice of employer organisations. The attack on the previous curriculum was fuelled by an ideology which was both designed to reduce the central state but, at the same time, demanded that the schooling system was society centred.¹⁰⁶ In addition, the Act contained a traditional educational appeal to standards.

Thus there was a discrepancy in central government policy between the earlier non-educationally based reforms of the Manpower Services Commission and that of the Education Reform Act of 1988. The new core, as framed in the Education Reform Act, was to be areas of study which were in effect, traditional subjects. This was modified to some extent by the creation of cross curricula themes which reflected issues.¹⁰⁷

There were a number of discontinuities in the reforms. For example, there was no clear relation between the assumptions of the National Curriculum and that of the MSC schemes, (which stated that the important element in all learning should be that of transferable skills) and those

of testing in the 1988 Act. Among the objectives of the National Curriculum was that of providing youth with insights into the economic foundations of the society and the nature of the political system, as well as the introduction to the curriculum subjects. The contradiction is particularly evident in the emphasis in the TVE project which was school based and aimed to ensure that all pupils, not just the academically less able, should have employment skills which were evaluated in practice and through a multidisciplinary curriculum.¹⁰⁸ However, practice had demonstrated a reluctance to extend this curriculum toward the academic stream of pupils. After 1988 the economic insights were substantially academic and it was difficult to fulfil the curriculum requirements for the TVE project. This orientation was far removed from the priorities for curriculum reform which were being advocated during the seventies.¹⁰⁹

Thus there was a model of success, which clearly divided youth at the age of sixteen. In the National Curriculum, which applied up to the age of sixteen, success was defined in terms of achievement in subjects. Post-sixteen there was a diversity. This included applied knowledge and skills, the certification of which did not make students eligible for access to Higher Education but also included a traditional sixth form Advanced Level.

The welfare state curriculum was premised on the professional choice and ideas of the teachers and, for the academic youth, ultimately the University Examination Boards. Within this a new pedagogy emerged which focused on the pupils as learners and decision makers.¹¹⁰ However, the selective education system was retained with the GCE boards directly linked to university entrance requirements; leaving in place the grammar

school theory of knowledge.

The rhetoric of the new reform only partially challenged these assumptions. While the demands of the industrial trainers, with their version of the requirements of an industrial society, were evident in one sector, those of the traditional grammar school were evident elsewhere.¹¹¹ In the post fourteen sector of education, the outcomes of the reform are the maintenance of differentiation.

Thus the existence of two parallel structures with entirely differing outcomes resulted in the state provision for youth continuing to distinguish as sharply as ever between the academic and the non-academic in the English school system. While there had been widespread revision of the courses available to the post school group and a major change in the institutional arrangements, the courses remain distinct in their orientation, so much so, that there is a clear suggestion that there is no intention to provide the coherence of a comprehensive curriculum policy at the post sixteen level. On the contrary, this is equated with loss of standards,¹¹² so that at the beginning of the nineties the Advanced Level route had remained substantially unreformed and elitist.

iv) Conclusion

The reconstruction of youth occurred most radically in relation to the way in which youth was expected to relate to the world of work. At the beginning of the seventies, the welfare state model of youth still held legitimacy for the policy makers. However, the effects of the economic recession and the change in government produced a challenge to the

accepted model of youth. There was a substantial challenge to the idea of continued and extended support from state agencies, which meant that the ideals which had been sustained from 1944 through to Crowther, of continuing educational contact to eighteen, were finally abandoned. In their place there was an attempt to normalise a model of youth which was work orientated.

Integration was still achieved around a core of compulsory schooling and consensus was to be formed around the new National Curriculum. Success, which was related to greater central concern with outcomes and efficiency, was no longer defined by self development but employability. This was accompanied by a diminishing of pupil and teacher autonomy.

While the ideology required a move to more utilitarian objectives for youth, the actual policy fell short of this. The policies worked within the existing framework and served to maintain the distinction between academic and 'other' pupils. Thus, for the non-academic youth the advantages of schooling were restricted, and the route to work mediated by a government scheme. These schemes did not carry either academic qualifications or technological entry level skills for work, and as such represented a reduction in opportunity and control for these pupils. The ideology which argued for skill upgrading and greater technological awareness was, in effect, a deskilling around the work ethic. The state was offering a transitional scheme because of a critical level of unemployment which made it politically difficult not to intervene. At the same time, for the able there was a different route of school based achievement. Virtually unchanged and unchallenged, this route to the sixth form and academic success continued to lead directly to high status white collar work.

References and Footnotes: Part 3 Section A

1. Reagan M.D., The New Federalism, London: OUP., 1981 and Cross R., Economic Theory and Policy in the UK., London: Martin Robertson, 1982
2. Hewton E., Education in Recession, London: Allen & Unwin, 1986
3. Kogan M., "Education Policy Making," in Hewton, Education in Recession, op. cit., p. 148
4. DES, Education a Framework for Expansion, London: HMSO, 1972
5. Bernbaum G., (ed.), Schooling in Decline, London: Macmillan Press, 1979
6. ibid.
7. King D., "The State and the Social Structure of Welfare in Advanced Industrial Democracies", in Theory and Society vol 16, Nov 1987 pp. 841-868
8. Benn C., Simon B., Halfway There, London: Penguin, 1970
9. Hopkins A., The School Debate, Harmondsworth, Penguin 1978
10. Ball S., Beachside Comprehensive, Cambridge: CUP, 1981
11. Crowther had argued that the English education system was best suited to the education of the elite. Underpinning this was an analysis which highlighted the narrow selective process of the secondary school. Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education, 15 to 18, London: HMSO, 1959
12. Review Undertaken for Her Majesty's Government and the Local Authority Association, Education for the 16-19 year Olds, London: HMSO, 1980 (The Macfarlane Report)
13. Barrow P., "The Nature of Tertiary Colleges and Education Reform Act 1988" in Journal of Further and Higher Education, 14(1), 1990, pp. 51-67
14. Edwards A.D., " An Elite Transformed: Continuity and Change in 16-19 Educational Policy," in Ahier J.& Flude M., (ed.), Contemporary Educational Policy, London, Croom Helm, 1983
15. ibid. p. 63
16. Macfarlane Report, op. cit.
17. Macfarlane Report, op. cit.
18. MacFarlane Report op. cit.
19. Reid W. & Filby J., The Sixth, Falmer: Falmer Press, 1986
20. Training for the Future, a consultative document. London: HMSO 1972 and Employment Training Act 1973
21. Roberts K., School Leavers and their Prospects, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984

References and Footnotes: Part 3 Section A

22. During the 1970s, unemployment of young people trebled while total unemployment doubled. The number of apprentices employed in manufacturing fell as did the overall number of industrial trainees. By the end of the seventies, there was a rise not only in the proportion of school leavers who were unemployed, but also in graduates, principally from arts subjects, although in the long term this group was unlikely to remain unemployed. Lindley R., "Education, Training and Labour Market in Britain," European Journal of Education, vol.16, No1, 1981, pp. 7-27
23. It is interesting to note that employers in England had always been reluctant to develop training for those with restricted skills. Apprenticeship has always been for a limited number of industries and for an elite. This had been one of the principal reasons for the failure of industrial training boards which led to the publication of the 1971 White Paper. Gosden P., The Education System Since 1944, Oxford: Martin Robertson Co., 1983
24. Moos M., Government Youth Training Policy and its Impact of Further Education, Stencilled Occasional Paper no 57, Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, University of Birmingham, 1977
25. Special Programmes Division, Manpower Services Commission, Young People and Work, (Holland Report) London, HMSO., 1977
26. DES., Education a Framework for Expansion, HMSO., 1972
27. Schools Council, Choosing Curriculum for the Young School Leaver, Working Paper no 33, London: Evans Methuen, 1971
28. "Speech of the Prime Minister at Ruskin College," 18 October, Times Educational Supplement, no 3202,22, October, pp.1-3, 1976 and DES., Education in Schools: A Consultative Document, London: HMSO, (Cmnd6869) 1977
29. Fowler G., "The Politics of Education" in Bernbaum G., Schooling in Decline, London: Macmillan Press, 1979, pp. 47-91
30. *ibid.*
31. DES., Schools and Working Life, some initiatives. London: HMSO., 1981
32. DES., 17+ A New Qualification, London: HMSO., 1982
33. TVEI was announced in 1982 and the first pilots were in place in 1983. The intention was to produce a curriculum that was attractive across the ability range. It would orientate the participants to qualifications that were of direct value to them at work. MSC., TVEI Review, Annex A; Aims of the Technical and Vocational Education Initiative, London: MSC TVEI Unit, 1984
34. Farley M., "Examination post 16, the need for radical reform," in, Ranson, S., The Revolution in Education and Training, Harlow: Longman, 1986
35. Levell P. " There Must Be a Better Way," Education, 13 September, 1991, pp. 210-211
36. Simon B., Bending the Rules, London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1988

References and Footnotes: Part 3 Section A

37. Editorial comment, Education 27 May, 1992 p.245. The estimate for schools opting out of Local Authority Control by 1994 is 2,000. Although this moves them into a new position in relation to the local authority it is arguable that they will ultimately be more under state control.
38. "Not so Comprehensive," in Hopkins A., The School Debate, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1978, pp. 13-37. Hopkins argues that the model of circular 10/65, that "reorganisation on comprehensive lines, "will preserve all that is valuable in grammar school education for those children who now receive it and make it available to more children". was still the policy in 1977
39. Lawton D., The Politics of the School Curriculum, London: RKP, 1980 p.22
40. Hopkins A., The School Debate, op. cit.
41. Edwards, " An Elite Transformed: Continuity and Change in 16-19 Educational Policy," op. cit.
42. *ibid.*
43. "Speech of the Prime Minister at Ruskin College" TES op. cit.
44. A high ranking treasury official said:
- "We took a strong view that education could play a much better role in improving industrial performance. The service is inefficient, rather unproductive and does not concentrate scarce resources in the areas that matter most. The economic climate and imperatives are clear: the task is to adjust education to them."
- in University of Exeter School of Education, (ed. Golby M.) Ruskin Plus Ten, Perspectives 26, 1986, p.27
45. DES., Education in Schools, a Consultative Document, London: HMSO., 1977 (Cmnd 6869)
46. DES., Aspects of Secondary Education, London: HMSO, 1979
47. op. cit., Aspects of the Secondary Curricula. The four areas of study were language, mathematical understanding, scientific skills and understanding, and personal and social development. The 10% sample of secondary schools demonstrated that the raising of the school leaving age had not led to any radical reshaping of the curriculum, and the outcome of this had been a failure to cater adequately particularly for the third quartile of pupils.
48. Whitty G., Sociology and School Knowledge, London, Methuen, 1985, Chap. 7
49. *ibid.*
50. DES., Curricula 11-16, Toward a Statement of Entitlement, London: HMSO, 1983
51. Simon B., Bending the Rules, op. cit.
52. Chitty C., "Two Models of the National Curriculum," and Aldrich R., "The

References and Footnotes: Part 3 Section A

National Curriculum, a Historical Perspective", in Lawton D., Chitty C., The National Curriculum, London: Bedford Way Papers, Institute of Education, 1988, pp.21-33.

53. Eraut M., "Accountability and Evaluation," in Simon B., & Taylor W., Education in the Eighties, London: Batsford, 1981

54. Cantor I., Roberts I., Further Education Today, London: RKP., 1988

55. Proposals for a Certificate of Extended Education, London: HMSO, 1979 (Cmnd 7755) (Keohane Report)

56. Cantor I., Roberts I., Further Education Today, London: RKP., 1983, pp. 205-208

57. Gorbutt D., "Education and Industry: A changing Pattern of Response," in Ruskin Plus 10, op. cit., pp. 48-60

58. The National Curriculum Consultative Document said,

"imaginative application of professional skills at all levels of the education service, within a statutory framework which sets clear objectives, will raise standards"

quoted in, University of Exeter, Perspectives on the National Curriculum, Exeter: School of Education, 1987

59. Sutcliffe J., "A GNVG by any other name...." TES, March 13, 1992 p.12

60. Whitty G., Sociology and School Knowledge, op. cit.

61. Reid W., & Filby J., The Sixth: an Essay in Education and Democracy, Lewes: Falmer Press, 1982

62. Johnson R., "Thatcherism and English Education," History of Education, vol 18, no. 2, 1989, pp. 91-121

63. *ibid.*

Johnson suggests that these can be identified as:

1979-81 parental choice and educational standards;

1981-3 attack on professionals and on resourcing;

plus the establishment of other agencies such as MSC

1983 vouchers and loans;

1987 search for politically more acceptable [*sic*] version of privatization than loans such as opting out;

1988 ERA with a central curricula and a framework for the reduction of the LEA.

64. Eraut M., "Accountability and Education," in Simon B., and Taylor I, Education in the Eighties, London: Batsford 1981.

65. DES., and Welsh Office, A New Partnership for Our Schools, London:HMSO, 1977 (Taylor Report)

66. Hall S., "Education in Crisis," in Wolpe A.M., Donald J., Is There Anyone here from Education?, London: Pluto Press, 1983, pp. 2-10

References and Footnotes: Part 3 Section A

67. The Hillgate Group, (C.Cox, L.Norcross, R. Scruton, C. Cox, J. Marks. J. Douglas-Home) Whose Schools, London, The Hillgate Group 1986. This group, which constituted the right wing of the Conservative party found a solution in the devolution of power to parents and the extension of parent choice. They assumed that this would result in the kind of curriculum that they themselves sponsored, academic and selective.
68. DES, Education in Schools, A Consultative Document, London, HMSO 1977
69. White argues that there were two distinct ideologies operating within the government policy. One group was based around Roger Scruton which was traditional essentialist and selective in nature. This contrasted with the policy articulated by Sir Keith Joseph and Young at the MSC which was orientated to the industrial curricula and the needs of the economy. J White, "Two National Curricula", British Journal of Educational Studies, xxxvi, no. 3, October 89 pp. 218-231
70. White P., "Political Education and School Organisation," in Simon B. Taylor, Education in the Eighties, op. cit.
71. Reid W., Filby J., The Sixth: an Essay in Education and Democracy, op. cit.
72. Flude M., Ahier J., Contemporary Education Policy, London: Croom Helm, 1983
73. Pring R., "Preparing future Generations for Life," in School of Education, Exeter, Perspectives on the National Curriculum, op. cit., pp.25-37. Pring lists these as basic skills, industrial spirit, prevocationalism, technological knowledge, reexamination of gender roles, and life skills,
74. Simon B., Bending the Rules, op. cit.
75. White P., "Political Education and School Organisation," op. cit.
76. Hargreaves A., Curriculum and Assessment Reform, Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1989
77. Chitty C., The National Curriculum, op. cit.
78. Holt M., "Ten Mean Years," in School of Education, Exeter, Ruskin Plus Ten op. cit., p. 16
79. King argues that it is difficult to dismantle or roll back welfare states even when the government has an ideological persuasion to do so, as in the case of M. Thatcher, and R. Reagan. "The State and Social Structure of Welfare in Advanced Industrial Democracies," Theory and Society, 16, no. 6., Nov 1987. pp.841-846
80. Lawton D., Chitty C., "Two Concepts of a National Curriculum," in Preece P., School of Education, University of Exeter, Perspectives on the National Curriculum, op. cit. p.10-12
81. Cathcart H., Esland G., "Schooling and Industry: Some Recent

References and Footnotes: Part 3 Section A

- Contributions," British Journal of Sociology, Vol 4, no 3, 1983, pp. 275-283; Bates I., et al., Schooling for the Dole, London: Macmillan, 1984; National Advisory Council for Industry and Commerce, Technicians Courses and Examinations, 1969; Training for the Future, a consultative document. London: HMSO 1972; Wray M.J., et al, Unified Vocational Preparation, Slough, NFER, 1980; Cathcart H., Esland G., Schooling and Industry: Some Recent Contributions, British Journal of Sociology, Vol 4, no 3, 1983 pp. 275-283
82. Benn C., Fairley J., Challenging the MSC, London: Pluto, 1986
83. Whitty G., Sociology and School Knowledge, op. cit.
84. Gorbutt D., "Education and Industry," in Ruskin Plus Ten Perspectives 26, University of Exeter, op. cit.
85. Bates I., Schooling for the Dole, op. cit.
86. National Advisory Council for Industry and Commerce, Report of the Committee on Technicians Courses and Examinations, 1969 (The Haselgrave Report)
87. Training for the Future, a consultative document. London: HMSO 1972
88. Moos M., Government Youth Training Policy and its Impact on Further Education, op. cit.
89. Wray M.J., et. al., Unified Vocational Preparation, Slough: NFER, 1980
90. *ibid.*
91. MSC, Special Programmes Division, op. cit.
92. Moos M., Government Youth Training Policy and its Impact of Further Education, op. cit.
93. Whitty G., Sociology and School Knowledge, op. cit.
94. This course ran on a pilot basis from 1972 to 1976 when a moratorium was placed on its development by the various boards. Cantor I.M., Further Education Today, London: RKP, 1983
95. Pring R., Ruskin Plus Ten op. cit., p. 34
96. Further Education and Curriculum Review and Development Unit, A Basis for Choice, London: DES, 1979
97. *ibid.*
98. Cantor I., op. cit.
99. Golby M., "Vocationalism and Education", in Holt M., Skills and Vocationalism, Milton Keynes, Open University, 1987 pp133-152
100. Moos M., Government Youth Training Policy and its Impact of Further Education, op. cit.

References and Footnotes: Part 3 Section A

101. Finn D., Training Without Jobs, London: Macmillan, 1987
102. Levy M., "Curriculum Development in the Youth Training Scheme," in Ranson S. et al., The Revolution in Education and Training, Harlow, Longman 1986
103. Nash I., "Training Load too Great for TECS," Times Education Supplement, May 15, 1992, p.1
104. Moore R., "Education, Employment, and Recruitment," in Cosin B., et al. School Work and Equality, Sevenoaks, Hodder and Stoughton, 1989, pp. 206-223
105. Following from the analyses of Braverman and Beechey it was argued, in Part 1 of this thesis, that technological growth will not necessarily result in the greater skill of all the population. On the contrary it may well create deskilling for a large group. Braverman H., Labour and Monopoly Capital, New York: Monthly Review Press, 1974. Beechey V., "The Sexual Division of Labour and the Labour Process," in Woods S., The Degradation of Work, London: Hutchinson, 1982, pp 54-74
106. Wragg E., "The slippery slope to State Think," Perspectives on the National Curriculum, Perspectives 32, 1978 pp23-29
107. Fowler W.S., Toward the National Curriculum, London: Kogan Page 1988
108. Saunders M., "TVEI and the National Curriculum, a Cautionary Tale," BJES, XXXVIII no 3 pp. 224-237
109. Hickox M., & Moore R., "TVEI, Vocationalism and the Crisis of Liberal Education," in Flude M., & Hammer M., The Education Reform Act, Falmer Press, London 1990, pp133-152
110. Whitty G., Sociology and School Knowledge op. cit. Chap 6.
111. Whitty G., Sociology and School Knowledge, op. cit.
112. Nash I., "Cracks in the Brickwork", Times Educational Supplement, April 13, 1992, p.9

PART 3

THE POLICY CONSTRUCTION OF YOUTH 1973-92

SECTION B: USA

As argued in Part Two, the generalisation of a school based adolescence was well established in the USA. The acceptance of a period of schooling, and substantial separation from the economic aspects of society, had long been the position of the majority of youth. As a consequence of this, the young had been the beneficiaries of a major financial investment by the state, and the growth of expenditure on education had been one of the significant features of educational policy in the sixties USA.

However by 1973 there was an acute political awareness of the failure of the economy in relation to the rest of the world.¹ The formation of OPEC, which had affected all industrialised nations, refocused national attention on problems of growth and efficiency. Under this scrutiny it seemed that the USA was no longer as effective and dominant as it had once been. Thus while the welfare policies of the fifties and sixties were underpinned by an increasing economic confidence and strength, the policies of the seventies were formed in the context of decreasing confidence in the economic and technical supremacy of the USA. The political response to this was the election of anti-welfare Presidents. Successive governments from 1970 onwards were determined to reduce the federal role in welfare provision. Presidents Nixon and Reagan were pledged to abolish the Federal Office of Education and to reduce greatly the Department of Labour Programmes which were targeted at the youth labour market.² This presidential policy objective continued for some

time, even after the Reports of the eighties, which were in favour continuing federal government involvement in education.³ This political and economic context was one of withdrawal from state assistance and an emphasis on the market place. At the same time the state and its economic health become the focus of policy. It will be argued that this led to a substantive change in the social construction of youth.

This period can be divided into two sections, on the basis of time but also on the basis that each part had a distinctive orientation to policy. Firstly, the seventies, saw a notable lack of substantive federal interest in education. The legislation which was produced was more concerned with labour and employment rather than education. Secondly, during the eighties, which education became once again the focus of state policy for youth, but in a much changed form and with a new emphasis.

i) Integration and Generalisation of Youth

In Tyack's terms, the seventies was typified by a lack of everything, but in particular he cites students, money and public confidence.⁴ In the case of students, there was a change in the demography of the adolescent population in comparison to the sixties, as adolescents became a proportionately smaller group in the population. The context in which rights to schooling was debated had changed considerably. It became clear that the idea of the "right" to a school and college based adolescence had substantially been fought on behalf of the white male middle class. By the mid seventies, it was evident that different groups in the population, for example, women and those of varied ethnic

backgrounds who still had to benefit from access and mobility. Thus there were contradictions hidden by the generalisation of 'adolescence' to youth as an "age set." There was an increase in the dropout rate from High School by some sections of youth, and an increase in the attendance rate by another.⁵ While the majority of youth attended High School, there was a decline in participation of those students, the economically disadvantaged, targeted by the federally funded Title One of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This was, in part, compensated for by an increase in the bilingual group catered for under Title Seven.⁶ This meant that, in effect, those who were finally claiming their rights to the extended period of dependence in formal schooling, and to equity of access and treatment, constituted a different, and much more heterogeneous group than that of the sixties.⁷ The arrival of this group was, in one way, a demonstration of the pervasiveness of the model of extended adolescence, which gave a high value to extending schooling to the ethnic minorities and to the female population. The move of this group into the group of 'adolescent' was accompanied by a remarkable absence of new federal legislation. Thus, for the first part of the seventies, there was a school based youth supported by apparent commitment from parents to the long term economic benefits of the process.⁸

Ironically, those who came new to college and High School graduation in the early seventies encountered a period during which the political faith in that provision was in decline at national level.⁹ By 1973 the agenda was set by politicians in terms of perceived failures. The indicators for this were a decline in performance quality, as measured by the falling SAT scores, and an apparent lack of discipline which was highlighted by popular press coverage and by Gallup poll responses.¹⁰

Educational failure was thus conceived both in terms of knowledge gained and also in terms of discipline and socialisation. In terms of the public agenda, schooling was, a failure. Both the apparent lowering of standards and the ill-discipline of youth, typified by campus unrest, and High School problems, led to a dislike of youth by sections of the American public. This was particularly so as the protests appeared to be based in an anti-American culture.¹¹ Thus the activities of the middle-class and privileged student group contributed to a national lack of certainty about the wisdom of extending adolescence to other sectors of youth. Changes in demography also contributed to a concern about the nature of the new community around which integration should occur.¹² The assumption that there was community to be created by High Schools had been more tenable when it was viewed as a substantially white and English speaking group than in the diversity of the seventies.¹³ Also evident was a decline in confidence in the public schooling system and in the ideal of the state as an effective agent of welfare. Change in the policy of schooling, in the eighties, to state dominance rather than dominance by the educators, was the outcome of distrust of the educationists and distrust of autonomy in public sector education.

A number of factors had contributed to declining confidence in the model of youth promoted through the High School. Publicity given to the changes of the poor performance and quality was crucial in challenging the assumptions that the welfare model of youth could be successful.¹⁴ In addition, the concern that schools produce young people with adequate skills for the industrial society meant that there was a shift in the demands being placed upon schools. It can be argued that the schools had in fact been relatively successful, and were in many ways further down the route of reform and change in social policy than the society as a

whole in terms of the creation of opportunity.¹⁵ However, there was considerable evidence of failure, which dominated the public perception of the school system.¹⁶ It included the campus unrest of the sixties but also the focus on the High School as the site of conflict, on racial, linguistic and class grounds. Schools had become the focus of political conflict and, at the same time, had failed to deliver in terms of the social policy promises of the sixties. The optimism that had led to the high profile programmes of remediation and access had been based in a belief that schools could deliver improved outcomes and advance the objective of equality and rights in the context of the liberal state.¹⁷

The welfare model of youth was not able to sustain legitimacy as it became extended to a more plural model. The assumption that the social engineering of the High School would lead youth to be committed to American democratic culture had been found wrong. Thus, in the early seventies, there was a widely publicised lack of support for schools. For example, the Report, "Reform of Secondary Education", argued that the school had lost its way and that there was a need for change.¹⁸ It is necessary, however, to distinguish between a lack of confidence in the then contemporary school system and an underlying commitment to schooling.¹⁹ It would appear that the commitment to schooling, as a focus of reform and change, had not dissipated despite disillusion as shown by the Reports of the following decade.

Interlinked with the failure of confidence was a crisis over funding. In the sixties, the legitimacy of the state endeavour to send to school and to gain equity for the majority of the population had meant that there was a willingness to allow school budgets to grow. This was not the case in the seventies. As with the other factors, the crisis over finance

came from different directions. There was an increasing accountability built into the delivery of the categorical funding.²⁰ This meant that the relatively generous financing of the earlier programmes was less accessible, while at the same time there were increasing demands being made on the schools.

Further financial pressure was exerted through the state structure. The decision by a number of states, beginning with California, to reduce and control the proportion of funding available to the schooling system was the most clear indication of decreasing tolerance of the financial demands of schooling. In effect, there was a move to change the relationship between the federal government, the state and the local district.²¹ Schools were expected to continue to provide a service and to be more precise about achievements, for example through minimum competency testing. At the same time there was a sharp demand for greater cost effectiveness which meant that these initiatives could be achieved on the basis of current funding. The question of equality was reframed in legal and economic terms.²² Instead of a principle of justice as the basis for school provision the argument moved to one about the income level of the parents.

At federal level there was an increasing pressure to have an effective economic policy, by which was meant having a policy which returned responsibility and fundraising to the individual States. While the publicly stated agenda was that the change was directed at moving responsibility, it was a covert cost cutting exercise.²³ There was considerable pressure being exerted on an already willing federal government to withdraw from the economic model which had supported the extension of the state welfare function.²⁴ Thus it was expected that

legislation, such as the Comprehensive Education and Training Act, should be based on a 'return to investment' calculation.²⁵ It was being claimed that the liberal policy solution of extra funding for specific targets had led to an uncontrollable, ineffective and ultimately unaffordable budget growth. It was argued that the professional had to be made more accountable as the growth in educational expenditure per pupil had risen by 500% between 1940 and 1976/77.²⁶ At local level, the battle to create greater equity in financing was both won and lost when the case for financial equalisation was revised.²⁷ New choices were to be made in the field of public policy on schooling and youth. These policies were to be chosen in the context of economic decline and failing confidence in public policies of reform. While the integrative idea of a youth based in schooling and training was not entirely abandoned, the focus of the policy was reorientated to the new version of the national agenda during the 1980s.²⁸

While the seventies, in contrast to the sixties, had been short of educational reform at federal level, the first few years of the eighties more than compensated. The "Great Debate" in American terms was the product of over a dozen Reports published between 1983 and 1985 on the subject of school and college practice.²⁹ There was great diversity in the Reports but there was also a common theme, that the process of schooling was inadequate to support national economic growth and that the solution to this was to create an agenda for excellence of achievement in the High School. The sources of the Reports was varied, some coming from political and corporate groups, not traditionally associated with education. However the most polemical, "A Nation at Risk," was commissioned by the Reagan Government.³⁰ This Report was vociferous in its criticism of the schooling system for failing to

produce the youth the nation required. The basic criticism was that schools were not succeeding in their contribution to economic growth. It was suggested that schools were allowing the development of poor moral standards. This report implied, at least in part, that the failure was a result of federal intervention. In contrast, the Report, "Action for Excellence," while sustaining a place for government intervention, also located responsibility at the level of the individual state.³¹

Overall there was an underlying suggestion in the Reports that there are agents other than the state that share the responsibility for producing an appropriately schooled youth. These are the teachers, parents and the community. The other feature, aspiration to excellence, which was variously defined, accompanies the critique of the earlier products of school. The implication was that the national goals of education should be redesigned toward societal needs to be defined by the federal State in terms of trade and defence. This implied that the guiding principles of welfare policy had not been successful. In particular it was suggested that this was the case with the reforms for the benefit of the underachievers. It was argued that the policy of spending money and time on these groups had been to the disadvantage of others and to the detriment of the attainment of high standards required to promote economic growth.³²

There is an ambivalence in the production of so many national Reports. While there is a move away from blaming the federal government for the problems in schooling and the skills knowledge and attitudes of American youth, the emergence of these Reports themselves, suggests that government and policy makers still viewed education as a national concern. In effect, at the national level, there had not been a

withdrawal from the commitment to a schooling, or its use as an agency of reform. However the new policy argued that education should be financed at the state and community level as part of the political ideal of accountable citizenship. In addition there had been a change in the objectives of schooling, toward the idea of youth who were required to regenerate the USA in economic and trade terms. Thus federal interest in education was sustained in the interest of promoting national economic well being.

In Boyer's view the production of these Reports suggests that the USA did indeed have a youth problem in the eighties. The problem was that there was no reference at all to the youth in the Report, *'A Nation at Risk'*.³³ Boyer draws attention to the lack of concern for youth evident, not only in this Report but, in the majority of those published in the eighties. He argues that the hostility to the demands of youth resulted in their disenfranchisement as a voice in the proposed reforms. The youth that the Reports are concerned with are those that are competent to perform at a level of excellence in cognitive tasks.³⁴

Thus these national Reports, as a group, represent a change from the issues of equity, choice and diversity for youth, to that of high performance. The concern for those who underachieve is no longer evident. Instead the able are defined in terms of marketable skills, and the corporate political elite are represented as the guardians of America.³⁵ *'A Nation at Risk'* in particular marks a substantial move toward the society-centred version of policy and the absence of a needs centred approach which had underpinned the welfare model.

Thus the production of these Reports indicates, at the level of

educational policy, the emergence of a new public philosophy. However this philosophy, remains hidden in so far as there was and is no public debate within education about the changing position of youth and the relation of schooling to the state. Instead, through a large number of detailed changes, the schooling system is represented as having a legitimacy only in relation to the economy and technology. Schools are identified with the economic well being of America and the country's ability to compete in the world market.³⁶ The absence of discussion about the cultural and integrative functions of schooling implies that these policy concerns, particularly as expressed for equity and opportunity, no longer have a legitimacy.

Neither was there any longer a public or government confidence in schools as agents of reconstruction directed by central policy. On the contrary, schools were viewed as a weak link in reform. There was a legitimacy crisis for schools as institutions and for teachers as professionals.³⁷ The schools are defined in the political sense as a problem, with teachers and the ruling bodies portrayed as having "given into" youth, rather than leading them. Instead of this group, the corporate leaders, who were behind the publishers of the excellence Reports, were set up as the model of success. The High School was deemed to have lost its way as an agent of policy under the previous liberal leadership and a new partnership between industry business and the schools was planned. Success was no longer explained in terms of the collective constraint of stratification, as in welfare capitalism, but in terms of the individual's effort to achieve regardless of their personal social circumstances.³⁸

In ideological terms the eighties provided a substantial change in the

way in which the state related to the youth. The change in the financial base was not so radical, as that undertaken in the seventies although finance was still a site of conflict. As suggested, the increase in federal support for schooling was the target of much criticism by those associated with the policies of both Presidents Reagan and Nixon.³⁹

Reagan was elected on a policy pledge to reduce expenditure and to abolish the Federal Office of Education. However these tasks were not as easily attained as had been anticipated. Although there appeared to be success in creating a consensus that was critical of the schools on the grounds of efficiency, it was less easy to reduce expenditure.⁴⁰

Throughout the sixties and seventies, increasingly complex financial formulae were evolved to target those who were deemed to be disadvantaged. The restrictions on the total levy that emerged in the seventies were congruent with the declining faith in education. There was also criticism of the belief that investment in education was necessarily good, and for the first time the courts became involved in financial cases. The formal procedures for giving finance to the schooling sector remained. President Reagan was unable to pull back from the centralised financing of youth as much as he would have wished. At the same time, within the financial arena, new norms were established which broke with the principle of equity. Variation in finance was ruled legitimate, and the State legislatures were not to be expected to raise finance from other sources to even out the funding. It was also regarded as legitimate to provide extra expenditure for exceptional talent.⁴¹

The period 1973-90 was clearly marked by a change in orientation to youth. While there was an integration of youth around the policy view that the state should provide schooling and that youth should attend, there were changes of purpose for schooling. The continued expansion of

the period of compulsory schooling, and the expectation of college attendance, came under severe pressure as the economics of that process were scrutinised by a new interest group. The "welfare" and "rights" purposes of the state were subsumed under a sharp focus on outcomes. There was a shift in emphasis from socialisation and individual self development to an ability to compete and contribute to the competitive market of technology.

However, there was an ambivalence around the roles of the federal government. During the eighties there had been proposals which had simultaneously developed greater and lesser government regulation.⁴² Many of these proposals did not become reforms.⁴³ This lack of direction was perhaps ended with the proposal 'America 2000'. This was a federal proposal which clearly set standards, radical reform and testing as the objectives for the following decade, but substantially devolved funding and implementation to the individual states.⁴⁴ There was also included a proposal for the '535+' schools which would tie Congress to the development, in each district, of flagship schools which demonstrated the 'best in teaching, learning and educational technologies.'⁴⁵ The omissions in this policy were poverty, and cultural and racial diversity in youth.⁴⁶

It was increasingly difficult for the federal state to create 'integration' of youth around a universal model of 'adolescence.' The middle class cultural values of adolescence sat uneasily with the concerns of the seventies. Thus, by the eighties a new model of youth was emerging. This suggested that there could be a common view of the successful youth around excellence in some aspect of performance. The High School, and the Community College remained as the bridges in the

opportunity gap providing openness and flexibility.⁴⁷ In contrast to the policies adopted in England there was no attack on the comprehensive school, although there were similar proposals for increasing parent power and competition.⁴⁸ Integration of federal policy for youth focused around a new form of competence which was tested achievement on the core subjects. Within these policies there was less concern for equity and opportunity than had been the case in the welfare model of 'adolescence'.

ii) Consensus

in part two it was argued that in the USA consensus had been achieved in schools around the ideal of the community High School which offered opportunity and mobility. During the sixties, public policy was targeted at enhancing the opportunity for more youth to achieve through the school system. Schools had worked both on a cultural and an economic level with the support of the state during the post war era.⁴⁹ The educational Reports of the sixties had focused around a basically conservative idea that the school was the best institution for the production of harmony between the various sectors of American society. Harmony had been increasingly created in the sixties by the recognition of diversity. This had resulted in the creation of a broad curriculum with the estimated number of courses doubled between 1960 and 1972.⁵⁰ Thus, although the breadth of the curriculum offering had extended, there had been no substantial reconsideration of the purposes and structure of the school curriculum.⁵¹

By the early seventies, there was a change in policy concerns towards

the purpose and the product of High School rather than the redistribution of access and opportunity. During the seventies and eighties the criteria of merit and achievement were discussed and reviewed in a highly political debate about the curriculum and the purposes of school and college.

This was evident in two Reports, the "Reform of Secondary Education", and "Career Education", which were the main focus for change in the early seventies.⁵² Clearly the "Career Education" Report had implications for the school work relationship and the traditional pattern of vocational education. However, much of its significance was that it was designed to have an effect on mainstream education. "Career Education" was an attempt to move all of schooling away from the emphasis on college access as the principal source of success to a situation where direct entry to industry and business were also considered desirable.⁵³ Marland promoted "Career Education" as a positive, motivating choice, as opposed to vocational education and to the non-academic High School courses, which were considered both shallow and uninteresting. The term "career" related not to a single career but to many careers in different fields of work. Within these Reports there was a strong critique of the traditional goals of schooling which Marland viewed as failing the majority. He argued that traditional college track schooling left students isolated in an academic environment, which he and they viewed as largely irrelevant to the future and the world of employment. In effect, Marland was restating the work ethic. In a reference to the Report "Youth Transition to Adulthood", which discussed the effects of the long period of transition, Marland argued that one of the effects of that long period of transition was the separation of youth from a clear awareness of the

place of work in society. He criticised schools for moving away from the compulsory curriculum, on the basis that it did not prepare youth with a moral commitment to work.

A similar view can be found in the Report The "Reform of Secondary Education".⁵⁴ This Report was particularly critical of teachers who, it argued, were out of touch with the aspirations of their pupils. It was suggested that the solution would be a reinstatement of the Cardinal Principles as educational goals and values because they were pragmatically orientated.⁵⁵ In the view of the Committee, this would be accompanied by performance-based objectives which were orientated to career. The Report was based in a belief that the school could have a direct link with the world of work, and that school credits could be created for experiential learning. The Reform Report wanted a further integration of vocational aims into the High School curriculum and the integration of outside learning, through credit, into the High School. This contrasts with Marland's approach, which advocated a revision of the purposes of curricula toward careers and work.

It could be argued that this movement to turn the High School toward work had some success, but not in the way advocated by the Reports. During the seventies there was a decline in the proportion of High School students in academic curricula, and an increase in vocational education courses.⁵⁶ In a continuing desire to be successful, many High School students moved out of academic curricula into courses which were apparently career orientated. They were, however, less well integrated with higher education opportunities. The emergence in the early eighties of the debate about the quality of High School curricula was thus a product of the changes of the seventies as well as the sixties, although

this is infrequently mentioned.⁵⁷

In the early eighties, in particular between 1983 and 1985, more than a dozen Reports on American schooling emerged. They were produced by a number of bodies, but, in general, they were not based on research or practical knowledge of schooling. The Reports thus represent a series of statements about the normative value of education rather than practical programmes for reform. In fact several of the major Reports are very limited in suggesting how the prescribed pattern of excellence can be achieved.⁵⁸

a) Distribution of knowledge.

In this section it will be argued that, in the USA, the eighties were a period in which there was contest, rather than consensus about the nature of the school and college curriculum. The 'new consensus' was achieved through a debate which was dominated by industrialists and corporate interest rather than those of the educators.

The early seventies were less controversial in terms of an attack on curriculum and distribution of knowledge. On the contrary, there was a slow development of concern about the failure of the High School to achieve the goals set in the sixties and increasing concern with standards and levels of pupil competency.⁵⁹ It was beginning to be suggested that the concern of policy, which had principally been about those who failed, had been too strong.⁶⁰ It was not until the early eighties that a clear debate began about the nature and distribution of knowledge for the High School. However, when it began it was a large scale debate, through a large number of national Reports.⁶¹

Within these Reports, identification of a single model of socialisation or knowledge is difficult, since the Reports vary considerably in their content and approach to youth. However, in all the major Reports there is a belief that there was a national crisis in education. In many Reports this is constructed as a link between the health of schooling, economic development and the American free society.⁶² However the nature of the link is not explicit. The authors of the Reports also believed that youth needed to be incorporated into America's economy and into the anticipated technological future.⁶³ There is also much use of the term "excellence," although this was variously interpreted to mean an interest in the development of elite education, or an upgrading of all schooling. Thus "Making the Grade", while arguing for the need to educate all youth more fully to enable them to participate in modern society, also went on to discuss the requirements of a complex technological society in which there would be a need for a highly educated group of technologists and scientists.⁶⁴ This prominence of the term "excellence" contrasted with the earlier basics movement which had presented an argument for a strong focus on literacy. As a consequence the Reports moved both the content and the objective of education towards a more skilled group.

The knowledge basis of several of the eighties Reports is defined in terms of core subjects, although these are, in some cases, defined by competencies rather than subjects. Thus Sizer, Goodlad and Paideia all suggest a radical restructuring of the curricula.⁶⁵ Both "Horace's Compromise" and "Paideia" suggest a subject based curricula. The Report, "A Nation at Risk", defines curriculum in terms of new basic academic areas.⁶⁶ Other Reports discuss a core area of learning and

suggest the proportion of time that should be spent on these. While often these are little different from those traditionally found within the main sections of the High School curriculum, there is a fairly consistent addition of technology and computing. The model of the future society that emerges from all of these Reports is one in which some form of technical literacy will be important. However, the Reports do not specify the level of literacy or make clear how it should be incorporated into the curriculum.⁶⁷ Important to the discussion is the idea that the basics or core should be common to all students. However, it is not clear whether the reformers consider that the economic crisis will be resolved by raising standards for all students or, by making schools more efficient in their selection processes.⁶⁸

This is a change from the previous decades in which curriculum knowledge was a reflection of diversity and difference. The assumption that achievement had to relate to the distinctive characteristics of the American population had disappeared in favour of a more singular view of achievement.

This is particularly evident in the "Nation at Risk" Report which refers to the minds of youth as if they were a national resource to be collectively focused on specific achievements and excellences.⁶⁹ In this Report there is no acknowledgement of the variety or motivation of the individual. Instead there is on offer a more clearly defined ladder of merit which is identified with the greater success of the national economy. The term "excellence" is identified with tying the outcomes of schooling to economic and market objectives. The Report is concerned that there are more young people emerging from High School ill-prepared either for work or college.⁷⁰ Thus, there is in the Report a demand that

schools should be rapidly responsive to the demands of society and should teach a curriculum which is flexible. There is in the Report an unacknowledged tension between prescribing the content of the curriculum and the desire to retain flexibility and change in ways that are compatible with the economy.

This tension is resolved to some extent in other Reports by the introduction of the idea of skills. Boyer for example, discusses the substance of learning and argues that variety leads to waste. "High School' prescribes a core of learning but identifies critical skills as a priority rather than identifying levels of competence.⁷¹ By contrast, the major government Reports tend to suggest that it is possible to identify a core and also to retain a potential for change in relation to national requirements. The curriculum base of these Reports is one in which there is a single testable basis for achievement. This is very clear in the Reports "Nation at Risk,' "Academic Preparation for College', "Making the Grade' and "Education for the Twenty First Century.' The tested outcomes of schooling are all important for the youth as these will determine access to successful employment.

Two of the major Reports differ in so far as they consider that the purpose of schooling is related to the whole individual. The "Paideia Proposal' advocates the educability of all youth in terms of "bringing up", a wider term which the Report bases in ideas of induction to knowledge. The concern is not simply to school in terms of the cognitive function but to begin to develop the individual child.⁷² The Report also contains recommendations for a strictly academic pedagogy, which would be delivered through didactic teaching which fits uneasily with the other objectives. Sizer's Report also concerns itself with adolescents

and their minds.⁷³ The recommendation of his Report is that all youth is given access to ten essential skills, integrated through the division of knowledge into four major areas in which writing forms a central skill.

In comparison with previous decades, the Reports make little concession to the idea of class, race and gender as determinants of achievement and motivation. Instead there is a move to the view that competition towards excellence will operate to open up opportunity for the unused talent of all American youth. In pursuit of this objective most of the Reports recommend that there is less tracking and more common curriculum. Thus the reports recommend making the same curriculum available to a wider variety of students, rather than the adjusting curriculum for the differences between students.

Concerns were also expressed about science and also about a version of basics. However the approach to the delivery of these subjects varied between reports. In some cases it is as extra to the curricula, but the Reports by Sizer, Goodlad and Adler suggest a total restructuring of the knowledge base, with less emphasis on the distinctions between knowledge and more on the interconnections.⁷⁴ Several of the other Reports were concerned to establish a centrally defined knowledge base for the curriculum. In some reports this is resolved by a clear commitment to a core of fairly traditionally defined subjects and a number of new technologically based ones.

However, there is no certainty about this as a definitive resolution of the education problems of the USA. There is a contrast here with the confidence that informed the basics movements in the late seventies. While there is reference to the choice between equity and excellence,

this does not emerge as an important dilemma. There is a fudging of the issue of college achievement, although there is an acknowledged need to raise SAT scores. The Report which focused on college entrance requirements suggests that there are subjects and competencies for college, but, by also advocating that they are equally useful for going directly into the world of work, avoids the issue of narrow selection.⁷⁵ While the publicised national agenda for schooling was one of excellence, it would seem that the recommendations fall short of a commitment to a more elitist system. Instead excellence is contextualised in a teacher based system with increased accountability and testing. In effect this may well represent a decrease in the use of inferential skills in favour of the reproduction of knowledge in unit packages, in effect a "dumbing down" of the curriculum.⁷⁶

The knowledge base of the curriculum that emerges after 1980 steadily becomes defined in core subjects. The attempts to reintroduce a subject base to the curriculum, made in the fifties, were also advocated on the basis of falling standards. The fifties proposals had fallen under the pressure of the sixties demands for equity and opportunity. However, by the eighties both the political and economic agenda had changed. The attempt to vocationalise the curriculum, as a response to economic failure, was itself a failure. After the "Excellence Reports" vocationalism was replaced by a widespread reassertion of subject based curricula, which was associated with measurable standards. While these reforms were being publicly debated, youth, either as developing individuals or as a voice in their own future, disappeared from the policy agenda. Youth was defined in a competitive school environment, where excellence was tied to technical and scientific employability.

b) Socialisation

The reforms of the sixties had focused on the plurality of American youth and the growing acknowledgement that there was validity in the variety of youth culture. The singular account of youth, evident in the immediate post-war period, had been expanded to incorporate the view that access was clearly constrained by race, gender and class. Federal policy had been designed to create a context which was sensitive to the needs of a variety of youth, although its ultimate aim was their incorporation into American democracy. These school reforms were based in the responsiveness of the system to principles based on need, stated either in individual or group terms. The policies and reforms of the seventies and eighties are in marked contrast to this.

The idea that the schools should build a new social order had been carried into the sixties from the reform movements of the thirties.⁷⁷ However as disillusion with schooling as a vehicle of change became evident, this ideology of the purpose of school was abandoned. For example, the Kettering Report on the "Reform of Secondary Education" argued that the goals of schooling had to be changed.⁷⁸ It argued that there was little public or professional faith in the grand social objectives of the earlier period. Its evidence suggested that there was a clear mismatch within school between the objectives of pupils, parents and teachers.⁷⁹ The parents and pupils were found to be more orientated to the extrinsic value of education than the teachers. Consequently the welfare objectives of schooling were not shared between the parents and teachers.

At national government level there is remarkably little attention to the idea that, in fact, schools had made some progress in terms of equity and participation, comparable to that in the society in general.⁸⁰

During the seventies, the ideology which gave validity to a generalised adolescence, which would benefit from extended schooling, was challenged. For example, in the Report "Youth Transition To Adulthood"⁸¹ youth was described as simultaneously the most indulged and the most oppressed part of the population. The extension of dependency on parents and the state was described as part of this oppression, which denied the youth a right to employment and to self sufficiency.

Five years later a Report was produced by the Carnegie Council, a group more usually concerned with Higher Education.⁸² The reason given for producing this Report on youth was the major concern over the inequalities between youth in college and in non-college institutions.⁸³ The Report identified several major problems with the position of youth. In particular, it focused on the creation of a permanent underclass who, by dropping out of High School, become unable to fit into the economy and social life of modern America. The concern about the failure of particular categories of youth was an issue which had been well documented before but still remain unsolved. Also identified were a number of problems that had not been so clearly identified before. Among these were the apparent failure of High Schools to stretch and to challenge youth and to appear relevant to life. These themes were clear in the Reports that followed in the eighties. However Carnegie's recommendations were much less radical than those of the next decade.⁸⁴ Carnegie suggested that alternatives to High School for the post-sixteen group be developed in which there would be a close relationship between

the work place and the educational environment. The basic concern however was to make the High School more attractive to the pre-sixteen age group and to enhance opportunity for those in the sixteen to eighteen group who were not going to college. The main theme was that there should be greater flexibility and coherence in the programmes on offer, both in the work based schemes, such as Comprehensive Education and Training Act⁸⁵, and in the school curriculum.⁸⁶

The target of the renewed schooling reform movement in the eighties was the state and its survival in economic and technological terms. With this requirement for schools, the issues of equity, participation and citizenship were changed radically. The overt focus was that of excellence. As a general goal this was not a source of dispute. However the particular meaning was not explicit, nor was there discussion of the meritocracy and its effects. Thus the change in the socialisation objectives was not made explicit. The Reports are themselves by no means unified in the approach to the socialisation processes and model of citizen that should be on offer to the youth.⁸⁷ However, in many there is an absence of such issues as the plurality of youth values and it is through these absences that the new model of socialisation becomes evident.

An underlying view, in all the Reports, is that success in the USA is identified with a high level of prosperity. This reward is attached to participation in a newly competitive, effective, economy based on technology. Worth for the individual has to be transformed into marketable value. However there is less unity about the way in which the participation should be distributed. The Reports by Boyer and Adler are distinctive in that both resurrect, albeit in differing form, Dewey's

idea that schooling should be about a whole person. Adler is quite clear in his belief that the way in which the schooling system should be able to respond to the required reform will have a direct effect on democratic society.⁸⁸ Boyer in his Report suggests that there is a conflict between the equity and quality dimension of schooling.⁸⁹ His Report recommends that High Schools should help all students take part in their social and civic obligations, through school based curricula and community service.⁹⁰ Like Adler, Boyer suggests that this will have a direct effect on the nature of American democracy.

Other Reports are not, however, as able or willing to resolve this dilemma. The Report, 'Action for Excellence', is based on a generalised notion that all youth can and will participate in the pursuit of excellence, defined as a singular goal. The new qualities that all youth are to achieve are based on a technological society, and defined for them by the leaders of the corporate world. 'Education for the Twenty-first Century,' and, 'Making the Grade,' both contain the suggestion that it is possible to incorporate all youth by achieving a level of scientific literacy that creates the competence to participate in democratic decision making. However, what remains problematic, as indicated earlier, is the level at which this literacy is obtainable, the level which groups can be realistically expected to achieve, and the legitimate level of participation in decision making.

The state is identified in many Reports as the appropriate agent for the creation of patterns of socialisation for citizenship. Few of the Reports argue this in terms of continuity of knowledge or experience from an earlier period of education. On the contrary, the newly defined field of national survival has the effect of submerging the past concern

for individual rights and for a citizenry who are able to accept a diversity of values. In the new reforms, this diversity has become identified with a falling of standards, reversing the earlier acceptance that achievement is undermined by stratification and privilege. The new state ideology is to deny this connection between wealth, power and excellence.⁹¹

The agenda of the public debate also ignores the problem of implementing the Reports,⁹² thus failing to draw attention to the strategies and costs that might be involved in achieving excellence for all youth as citizens. For example, there is an assumption in many Reports that competence in English is crucial.⁹³ This ignores the relative increase in the numbers of the youth from different linguistic minority groups and indicates a rejection of earlier views. There was considerable evidence from earlier Reports, such as Coleman, that school and youth culture are key features in mediating the outcomes of schooling.⁹⁴ Coleman argued that the pupil culture of the school had to be addressed if achievement patterns were to be altered. The Reports of the eighties argue that these differences are not a reason for providing a different curriculum content.

It has therefore been argued, that the concern of several of the eighties Reports is not for those groups but to re-establish the access of the white male middle class.⁹⁵ The issue of choice and mobility to students from other groups was not addressed.⁹⁶ Overall the effect of these Reports is to recommend a return to a normative model of socialisation for youth which was a state defined meritocracy. While the rhetoric of the reports was that the state requires an increasing number of technically competent and efficient individuals to restore the

economic health of the nation, the socialisation outcomes were not made clear. The reality of the new curriculum knowledge was that traditional subjects would dominate a pattern which is more likely to produce white male-middle class success. By the early nineties few of the recommendations had been put into practice but there had been an effective change in the public debate about the purposes of schooling.⁹⁷

In many ways the change to the model of youth is to make them, as an "age set", a single group for the purpose of policy. The reforms of the seventies and eighties are dominated in different ways by a centrally defined notion of the "needs of the state." This is not, however, balanced by a concern for the needs of those in a highly stratified society.

iii) Work

The issue of the relationship between the state provided schooling system and that of work and employment was one which changed in form and significance during the years from 1972 onwards. It was evident, as already argued, that the vocational education programmes were of uncertain value, and that they had needed modification in the sixties. The purpose of the American education system had always been more pragmatic than that of England. Human capital theory, which informed both systems in the sixties, related in the USA to an explicit vocational education programme that had been long established. This programme had, however, been static in its definition of vocational, and was not meeting the changing employment requirements of the American market. There had been an assumption, during the sixties, that the

transition of youth to employment should be one of increased college and school attendance on programmes created both by the school and the Labour Department. This had led to the reform of the Vocational Education legislation and to more specific targeting of groups. During the seventies, there was a far more critical analysis of the effects of vocational education on schools and pupils, and also of the effectiveness of traditional programmes in creating a useful school-to-work transition.⁹⁸ This was reflected in a series of Reports on youth and on work which highlighted a concern for adolescents as dependent and culturally marginalised.⁹⁹ The context of education was changing rapidly as was the economy and the work opportunities for youth. In response the vocational education of the eighties was characterised by a revival of distributive education programmes, although vocational education remained a separate lower status form of schooling.¹⁰⁰

a) Explicit agenda

The major programme of the early seventies was the "Career Education" package. The explicit objectives of "Career Education" were to reduce the distinction between explicit vocational programmes, which Marland considered to be identified with failure, and the objectives of the High School.¹⁰¹ The intention of "Career Education" was to change the whole pattern of schooling towards producing students orientated towards a work culture.

Marland's objectives were based on a substantial body of critical opinion.¹⁰² The traditional vocational education programmes were associated with low level skills, and the programmes of the sixties had been targeted at the low achieving groups in the schooling system. The

school based vocational programmes were targeted at the skills required of the blue collar worker. At the same time as revising vocational education, Marland was determined to recreate the work ethic in all of American youth.¹⁰³ Thus he was addressing two issues in his programme. The first, the question of how to incorporate equality of opportunity into education for those groups who had suffered from increased youth unemployment during the sixties. The second was to reclaim the more successful youth toward a work orientated culture and away from the critical values of the sixties youth culture. His response was to try to create a more positive work culture within the High School.

The Department of Health Education Welfare Report "Work in America" demonstrated a concern with a decline in the quality of available employment.¹⁰⁴ The suggestion was that the overall problem was more fundamental than a concern with entry level skills. It was, however, at the same time highly critical of vocational education, both in terms of the curriculum experience it gave students, and the effect it had in relation to the employment market. The Report argued that vocational education failed to give students useful skills or to place them in satisfying jobs.¹⁰⁵ However, the Report did not claim that this was entirely a result of the schooling, curricula and available credentials, although these did not match the demand within the economy. "Work in America" identified a mismatch between qualifications and potential employment but also in the aspiration of the youth, who hoped for college education after vocational schooling.

These points, while acknowledged in Marland's programme, were only taken into account in a minimal sense, thus the school remained an agent of reform of the pupils and the pupils' aspiration, rather than the labour

market. "Career Education" concentrated on the reorienting of schooling to work and tried to change vocational education and student ambition towards the realities of the labour market. Marland's programme, underwritten by the federal government, focused on the schooling part of the transition to work and did not challenge the transition process. On the contrary, the values of the "Career Education" programme were a reorienting of the students towards a new set of values and skills. The implication was that those who failed were in some sense responsible for their own failure.

The differences between the perspective of the federal government programme, which was to use schooling as a vehicle for an improved means of transition, and the studies of vocational and labour programmes, which criticised school based courses, continued throughout the seventies, almost in two parallel dialogues. There was a concern that the school based programmes were not in any way related to the labour market.¹⁰⁶ Despite this by 1977 about half of all High School students were in some form of vocational education programme. There had been a substantial movement toward the curricula of home economics, office, trade and industry programmes.¹⁰⁷ These students were still involved in the process of gaining certification and increasingly went on into the Community Colleges. These colleges changed their nature from a principally academic orientation to the provision of vocational courses in the decade between 1965 and 1975.¹⁰⁸ In two years the intake of the colleges doubled and by 1979 nearly a quarter of all vocational education took place in post school institutions.¹⁰⁹ While the change in use of the Community College can be viewed as the result of individual initiative and as a search for mobility¹¹⁰ it can also be viewed as a probable result of employer preference for older workers and

to patterns of increased school certification.¹¹¹ Youth were forced into aspiring to more certification before becoming employable. During this period there was also a review of the employment programmes.¹¹² The revision was designed to create cooperative school-work programmes for unemployed and disadvantaged youth. These included work and school based projects which carried High School accreditation, thus bringing them closer to the route to higher education. These projects were developed throughout the eighties but met with varied success.¹¹³

At the turn of the decade the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education recognised the importance of the issue of the poor status of vocational education in a special Report.¹¹⁴ The Report focused on the lack of equity and opportunity for those students on vocational education programmes, and the absence of this group from the national agenda for youth. The research demonstrated that those who attended vocational courses in High School were less likely to complete a year in college, and that the most likely beneficiaries of the vocational programme were black females. Overall the programmes had little effect on occupation or income.¹¹⁵ Carnegie argued that there was an incongruity in the federal distribution of funding, which put more finance into trying to get low income youth into college while it spent little on trying to help them while in High School. At the same time the transition from school to work was abrupt and unsuccessful for many. On grounds of equity, the Report argued both for the abolition of vocational programmes, and for the abolition of tracking in High School. Instead, it argued for a broad base of work orientation for all High School students and the need for the proper local planning of transition and for links with the community colleges. At much the same time the evaluation of the two labour programmes CETA and YEDPA were suggesting that they were poorly targeted

and had problems with their local coordination.¹¹⁶

By the early eighties the purpose and status of vocational education programmes was unclear. The required reforms, those of bringing schools closer to the market place and changing the status of vocationalism, had already been tried in different forms, most noticeably "Career Education", and had not succeeded. In effect there had been a problem in defining what might appropriately be called vocational education in the seventies. Strikingly, the national education Reports produced in the early eighties hardly dealt with the issue of vocational education. In the vocabulary of the National Commission, it was "The Unfinished Agenda."¹¹⁷ While the major national debate was framed in terms of pushing for excellence and competitive merit, the concerns of this Report on vocational education are with the issues of motivation and diversity. There is the suggestion that the field of vocational education should provide an alternative for those who dropped out of school. The major Reports of the eighties had not referred to this group who were ill catered for by the increasing emphasis on academic work.¹¹⁸ There had been no suggestion of an alternative model for youth. The Report, "Unfinished Agenda", implied that there could be a new status for those youth on vocational education courses and maintained that there was also evidence that vocational education was still considered popular and viable solution.¹¹⁹ However, there was still a clear equation of curricula subject with standards and vocational education, either as motivation or as a poorer route, leading to low status employment. Thus the Reagan Commission on the federal role in Vocational Education argued that only national interest programmes should receive federal funding.¹²⁰

In effect there was a withdrawal from vocational education during the eighties. During this period 90% of High School graduates earned at least one credit in vocational education, although this was of a general rather than an occupationally specific type.¹²¹ However overall there was a decline in recruitment as students began to spend more time on the "competency" based subjects. Vocational education continued to suffer from low status, and a failure to reform its curriculum in terms of issues such as sex role stereotyping.¹²² Recruitment to the courses still tended to be from the black and Hispanic groups and there was a continuing debate about the effect of the courses on labour market success.¹²³

b) The informal agenda

During the seventies the premiss underlying the policies was still that the issues of transition, employment and school were all part of the same problem.¹²⁴ While the overt agenda of the process of transition changed after 1972 to one in which the pursuit of specifically vocational curricula was less popular, the implications of the new reforms suggested another agenda. Transition became the focus of many Reports and programmes throughout the seventies and in the early eighties. There was some diversity in the approaches, some taking as given the continuance of the vocational education programmes, others suggesting that the continuance of vocational education in the High School was detrimental.¹²⁵

Among the concerns expressed was the failure of the High School and its teachers to relate to the aspirations of pupils and parents;¹²⁶ the need to give those students on vocational programmes a broader based

education, and to give them access to further and higher education. In 1979 Carnegie suggested that the continuing of tracking in High School would produce a permanent underclass.¹²⁷ However, by the end of the seventies there was concern with all transition and access from schooling to work even for the college graduate.¹²⁸ It was suggested that the expectation that the school would provide transition was no longer adequate and that the responsibility needed to be spread more widely.¹²⁹ The Report, "National Commission on Youth", also signalled the end to the open idea that the continued extension of schooling was a good in itself. The need to assess the value of the course and qualifications in relation to the labour market was very important. This new concern is also reflected in the national education reforms of the early eighties.

At federal level, the issue of education was framed in terms of the excellence Reports. These, as discussed, moved the agenda radically to a notion of a youth, who would be designated as successful by achieving on a curriculum based around a concern of a modern technical society. Youth was addressed as a unity in terms of success and the issue of transition to employment was based on the crude assumption that the labour market would require the products of the new curriculum. Few of the Reports were based in a specific concern for the detail of the transition between schooling and work, although there were concerns about the transition to college and the raising of standards at that level.

The interest was a more general view of changed objectives of education which related to excellence and standards. The origins of that debate were located in the reassessment of American economic performance during the seventies. This debate, which had led to the establishment of the

new right government, was located in the recognition of the decline of American competitiveness and in the changing form of the economy.¹³⁰ The policy response, as it related to education, was in two parts. The competitiveness of the economy had to be restored by raising education standards, and it was argued that this was done by responding to business demands for better delivery of the new basics of literacy. This is the new core curriculum as recommended by several of the Reports.¹³¹ The changing form of the economy was represented in the assumption that growth would come through the new technology. This, it was argued, would create demand for more highly skilled personnel.¹³² Thus there was a move in many of the Reports away from the traditional vocational tracks towards a new agreed basic curriculum, which would serve as the basis for the new knowledge. The explicit discussion of stratification and equity, so visible in the preceding decades, was submerged in the crisis over national economic recovery.

However these reforms were also taking place in an era where it was doubtful that there was still a belief in the school as an agent of social mobility. Evaluations of the welfare reforms had an impact as well as the continued awareness of the inequalities of American society. The question of which groups were most likely to gain from the reforms was not addressed. Rather, it was suggested in the Reports that there was a restatement of opportunity through the creation of a more genuinely competitive schooling system.¹³³ The creation of a technologically based meritocracy became the main objective of the New Federalist reforms of schooling. The rationale was that it would provide the required skills for the large industrialists who, it was argued, would be the basis of American economic recovery. Also unacknowledged was that the realities of employment in the eighties, which were that

service industries, such as fast food, were much more likely to be the providers of employment than a high skill industry. This absence meant that the reformers did not have to discuss the strategies for coping with those pupils who were destined to fail. Such pupils would have no access to the rewards of achievement in a society in which it was presumed that technological knowledge and skilled employment were desirable. This group was being catered for by the expansion of retail courses. However, continuing federal government support was problematic and the existence of these courses and the needs of these youth were not part of the popular agenda.

From 1970 onwards American school policy moved rapidly away from the tradition of vocational schooling. There was a steady critique of the effectiveness of the vocational tracks and a return to a version of the basics. These basics were tied to the idea that US economy needed technological efficiency. Thus it is a state centred account of youth that emerges in the eighties, one in which the youth is expected to match ambition with the needs of the industrial state. While there was considerable discussion of raising standards, it was difficult to identify the way in which the state proposed to implement this objective.

It would seem that in the USA, unlike England, the idea that vocational education was a policy solution no longer had any legitimacy. The vocational education system had become normalised as part of the High School, but not linked to the changing labour market. Despite the various attempted reforms, it remained identified with low levels of achievement. The reforms failed to deal with the problems that had been identified in the early eighties. While the courses were often

expensive, students were not any better placed to enter the labour market.¹³⁴ Also the bridge between Higher education and the vocational track was not improved. On the contrary, the changes in curriculum in the High School gave priority to non-vocational subjects.

Perhaps more importantly this evaluation of vocational education occurred at a time when there was a strong impetus to make school more society centred and economically responsible. As there already existed a mass higher education system, the reforms were less concerned with division and segregation at sixteen and eighteen than those of England. The Americans thus retained a commitment to a lengthy adolescence and targeted their reforms at increasing standards and certification. The policy concern with work was less dominant and not through separate courses, as in England. Achievement in basic subjects was to be the means of demonstrating merit. Thus, as with the formal socialisation process, the model of youth was not "adolescence" as a general category. The informal agenda of the reforms was the withdrawal of interest from those routes which had made access and mobility a possibility, if not a reality.¹³⁵

Conclusion.

In the USA the reconstruction of youth began, in the seventies, with reforms designed to make them more responsive to concerns outside of education and school, such as careers and the work ethic. Although these ideas constituted a challenge to the welfare model of adolescence, Marland's initiative did not substantially alter the model of youth as dependent adolescents. At the same time there were substantial

criticisms that the available work did not relate to the statements of government prophesying increased skill requirements, or to the certified outcomes of school. None of these Reports however had much effect on youth policy in the seventies in comparison to the Reports of the eighties.

The eighties Reports were not consistent, however, either in the criticism or recommendations as they affected youth. They were critical of federal welfare intervention, but also recommended extensive remediation. The remediation was to reflect the need of the state for a more technically and scientifically educated population. In the eighties, youth was to be more responsive to the needs of the economy and the labour market. This was not, however, the then current labour market but one which would emerge with the recreation of American technical dominance. Yet there were fewer consensus values as reflected in the eighties Reports. The needs of the state dominated over the needs of individuals and there was little reference to the effect of this in terms of a coherent youth group. The meritocracy was established without consideration of the problems and issues of the sixties. Unlike England, the USA model of youth was not one which was orientated to vocational schooling. Instead, terms such as "competency" and "excellence" were used to motivate youth to be successful.

References and Footnotes: Part 3 Section B

1. Fellner W.J., Contemporary Economic Problems, Washington: American Enterprise Institute, 1977 Fellner argues that the economic crisis of 1972-4 was about high inflation and unemployment. He also suggests that it is about the level of government spending on welfare. O'Connor J., The Fiscal Crisis of the State, London: Macmillan, 1973 O'Connor argues that much of the problem was about maintaining the high consumption standards within the country.
2. Reagan M.D. Sanzone J.G. The New Federalism, London: OUP, 1981
Snider R.C., "The Rhetoric and Reality of Reagan's School Reform", Secondary Education Journal Vol. 16, No.2, Sept. 1986, pp.3-4
3. Brademas J., The Politics of Education, Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1987, p. 80 Brademas cites the example of the members of the National Commission of Excellence being flabbergasted when Reagan stated that the Report had supported an end to federal intrusion in the national schooling system. op. cit.
4. Tyack D., Lowe R, Hansot E., Public Schools in Hard Times, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1984
5. Eckstrom B, Goertz E., Rock D., Education and American Youth, Lewes, Sussex: Falmer Press, 1988
6. *ibid.*
7. Vitteretti J.P., Across the River, New York: Holmes and Meir, 1983. The ethnic minority enrollment in New York grew from 28% to 68% between 1955 and 1975.
8. Eckstrom B., Education and American Youth, op. cit..
9. Graham H.D., The Uncertain Triumph, Chapel Hill: University of California Press, 1984, Chapter 9. Graham argues that there was disillusion in the early seventies with education and schooling. The blame is located in badly constructed financial categories which meant that the title funding did not reach the target audiences; and also in the failure of the Great Society and a consequent disillusion with compensatory education as an effective reconstruction policy. This was in spite of the fact that there were successes such as the increase between 1955 and 1974 from 17.8 to 33.5% of the 18-14 age group in university.
10. Marland S.P., Career Education, Washington: McGraw Hill, 1974 Introduction
11. Henry D.D., Challenges Past Challenges Present, London: Jossey-Bass, 1975
12. Tyack D., Public Schools in Hard Times, op. cit.
13. Hampel R., The Last Citadel, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1986. Hampel argues that in the early seventies there was a change in the relationship between youth culture and the adult community. The contrast between youth culture and the educators' commitment to conformity, became apparent.
14. Tyack D., Hansot E., The Managers of Virtue, New York: Basic Books, 1982

References and Footnotes: Part 3 Section B

15. Graham H.D., The Uncertain Triumph, Chapel Hill: University of California, 1984
16. Ravitch D., The Troubled Crusade, New York: Basic Books, 1984
17. Tyack D., The Managers of Virtue, op. cit.
18. National Commission on the Reform of Secondary Education, The Reform of Secondary Education, New York: Charles F Kettering Foundation, 1973
19. Tyack D., Public Schools in Hard Times, op. cit.
20. Graham H., The Uncertain Triumph, op. cit.
21. Reagan M.D., The New Federalism, London: Oxford University Press, 1981
22. Morphet E.L., Johns R.L., Reller T.L., Educational Organisation and Administration, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1982
23. Greenstein F., The Reagan Presidency, An Early Assessment. New York: John Hopkins University Press, 1983
24. For example Friedman M. & R., The Tyranny of the Status Quo, London: Seeker and Warburg 1984
25. Pechman J.A., Setting National Priorities, Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institute, 1983
26. Williams M.F., Government in the Classroom, New York: Praeger, 1979
27. Burrup P.E. Brimley V., Financing Education in a Climate of Change, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1982. Burrup gives an account of the Serrano v Priest decision which challenged the basis of tax provision for schooling and, the reversal of the decision, in the higher court decision of Rodriguez.
28. Morphet E., et. al., Educational Organisation and Administration, op. cit.. Morphet points out that in 1980 the Office of Education found itself with 114 programmes to administer. It was felt that the provision of education at the federal level was becoming a battleground for testing principles of law and theories of government, rather than an effective means of improving the provision.
29. Altbach P., Excellence in Education, Buffalo, USA: Prometheus Books, 1985
30. National Commission on Excellence in Education, A "Nation at Risk", The Imperative for Educational Reform, Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983
31. Education Commission of the States, Task Force for Economic Growth, Action for Excellence, Denver, Colorado: Education Commission of the States, 1983
32. Tyack D., Public Schools in Hard Times, op. cit.
33. Boyer E., "Reflections on the Great Debate," Phi Delta Kapan 86, April

References and Footnotes: Part 3 Section B

1984, pp. 525-530

34. Cross K.P., "The Rising Tide of School Reform Reports," Phi Delta Kappan 66, Nov., 1984, pp.167-530
35. Spring J., Political and Economic Analysis in Altbach P., Excellence in Education, Buffalo, New York, Prometheus Books, 1985
36. Giroux H., "Public Philosophy and the Crisis in Education," Harvard Education Review, 54, 1984 pp.186-194
37. Shor I., Culture Wars, London: RKP, 1986
38. Carnoy M. Schooling Work and the Democratic State, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1985
39. Clark D., et.al., "The Changed Structure of Federal Education Policy in the Eighties", Phi Delta Kappan, 65, Nov. 83, vol. 65, pp.188-193
40. Reagan M.D., The New Federalism, London: Oxford University Press, 1981
41. Burrup P., Financing Education in a Climate of Change, op. cit.
42. Cibulka J., "American Educational Reform and Government Powers," Educational Review, 42, no.2, 1990, pp.97-108
43. Furtrell M., "Mission Not Accomplished," Phi Delta Kappan, vol.71, no.1, Sept 1989 pp. 8-15
44. Doyle E., "America 2000," Phi Delta Kappan, vol.73, no 3, Nov.91, pp. 185-191.
45. Howell H., "A Bumbly Ride," Phi Delta Kappan, vol.73, no 3, Nov.91, pp.192-203
46. ibid
47. Judge H., "Images and Reflection : the USA," Comparative Education, vol.25, no.3, 1989, pp. 333-339
48. Cooper B., "Local School Reform Great Britain and United States," Education Review, 42, no 2, 1990, pp. 133-149
49. Everhart R.B., The Public School Monopoly, Cambridge Massachusetts: Ballinger Publishers, 1982
50. Eckstrom B., Education and American Youth, op. cit.
51. Rudolph F., Curriculum, New York: Josey Bass, 1978
52. Charles F. Kettering Foundation, The Reform of Secondary Education, National Commission on the Reform of Secondary Education, Washington, 1973
Marland S.P., Career Education, op. cit.
53. The programme was established in HEW in 1972 but the major statement of

References and Footnotes: Part 3 Section B

the objectives and programme are contained in Marland S.P. Career Education, op. cit.

54. C.F. Kettering Foundation, The Reform of Secondary Education, op. cit..

55. Kliebard H.M., " The Drive for Curriculum Change in the United States," Journal of Curriculum Studies, 1979, vol 11, no.3, pp. 191-202. The Report produced seven categories of human activity which were also aims in the curriculum.

56. Ekstrom B., Education and American Youth, op. cit.

57. Shor I., Culture Wars, op. cit.

58. Presseisen B.Z., Unlearned Lessons, Lewes: Falmer Press, 1985

59. Hynes F., Sutherland D., Educating America, Skokie National Textbook Company, 1981

60. Tyack D., Lowe R., Hansott E., Public Schools in Hard Times, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984

61. Altbach P., Excellence in Education, Buffalo: Prometheus Books 1985. Altbach identifies the period 1983-1985 as the focus of the debate which was generated by national agencies and not grassroots school interests.

62. Altbach P., op. cit., "Introduction, The Great Education Crisis" pp.13-31

63. Cross K.P., "The Rising Tide of School Reform Reports," Phi Delta Kappan, vol 66, Nov 1984, pp.167-173

64. Report of the Twentieth Century Task Force on Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Policy, Making the Grade, New York: The Twentieth Century Fund, 1983

65. Sizer T.R., Horace's Compromise, The Dilemma of the American High School, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1984. Goodlad J. A Place Called School : Prospects for the Future, New York: McGraw Hill, 1983. Adler M.J., The Paideia Proposal, New York: Macmillan, 1982

66. National Commission on Excellence in Education, A Nation at Risk, The Imperative for Educational Reform, Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1983. These are English, mathematics science, social studies computer science.

67. Cross, K., "The Rising Tide of School Reform Reports," op. cit.

68. Husen T., "The School in the Achievement Orientated Society: Crisis and Reform", Phi Delta Kappan, vol 86, Feb. 1985

69. National Commission on Excellence in Education, A Nation At Risk, The Imperative for Educational Reform, National Commission on Excellence in Education, Washington, U.S. Department of Education, 1983

70. A "Nation at Risk" op. cit., Introduction

References and Footnotes: Part 3 Section B

71. Boyer E.L., High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America, New York: Harper Row, 1983
72. Adler M., op. cit.
73. Sizer T., op. cit.
74. Kelly G.P., "Setting the boundaries of the Debate about Education," in Altbach P., Excellence in Education, Buffalo: Prometheus Books, 1985 pp.31-41
75. The College Board, "Academic Preparation for College, New York," 1983 in Presseissen B.Z. Unlearned Lessons, Lewes: Falmer Press, 1985, pp.68-70
76. Carlson D., "Curriculum and the School Work Culture," in Altbach P., Excellence in Education, op. cit., pp.171-182. Carlson use this phrase to summarise his argument that the curriculum reform will lead to a decrease in the use of inferential skills. In his view this is a lowering not an increase in excellence.
77. Tyack D., Public Schools in Hard Times, op. cit.
78. C.F. Kettering Foundation, The Reform of Secondary Education, op. cit.
79. C.F. Kettering Foundation, The Reform of Secondary Education, op. cit.
80. Ravitch D., op. cit. and Carnoy M. and Levin H.M., Schooling Work and the Democratic State, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1985
81. Report of the Panel on Youth of the Presidents Science Advisory Committee, Youth, Transition to Adulthood, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974
82. A Report with Recommendations of the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, Giving Youth a Better Chance, San Fransisco, Josey Bass, 1979
83. Carnegie, Giving Youth a Better Chance, op. cit., Summary and Conclusions
84. Carnegie, Giving Youth a Better Chance, op. cit.
85. This scheme, with a mandate to give training to the economically disadvantaged, was one of the outcomes of the reforms in the sixties. Various schemes were run under the Manpower Development and Training Act. (MDTA) These schemes were originally targeted at adults and specifically to exclude youth . However there were many modifications and they continued to run, to expand and to include youth. However they were located outside the remit of education budgets. Although there was some suggestion that funding was redirected to maintain existing vocational programmes rather than starting new ones. See Ginzberg E., The School/Work Nexus, New York: PHi Delta Kappan Education, 1980 and National Commission on Youth, The Transition of Youth to Adulthood, Charles F. Kettering Foundation, 1980
86. Carnegie Giving Youth a Better Chance, op. cit., Chap 5
87. Altbach P., Excellence in Education, op. cit.

References and Footnotes: Part 3 Section B

88. Pressiesen B., Unlearned Lessons, op. cit.
89. Boyer E.L., High School, New York: Harper Row, 1983
90. Boyer E., High School, op. cit., pp.66-7
91. Pink W., "The New Equity, Compelling Visions" in Shea C., The New Servants of Power, Westport: Greenwood Press, 1989, pp.123-126
92. Wayson W., Up From Excellence, Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappan Educational Foundation, 1988. Wayson describes the excellence movement as a "top down quick fix strategy." p.12.
93. Presseissen B., Unlearned Lessons, op. cit.
94. Altbach P., Excellence in Education op. cit.
95. Martin D., "A Critique of the Concept of Work and Education in the School reform Reports." in Shea C., The New Servants of Power, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1989 pp.39-56
96. Carnoy M., Schooling Work and the Democratic State, op. cit.
97. Furturell M., "Mission Not Accomplished' Phi Delta Kappan, vol.71, nol, pp.8-15, 1989
98. For example: Youth Transition to Adulthood, Report of the Panel on Youth of the Presidents Science Advisory Committee, Washington, University of Chicago Press, 1974. Work and the Quality of Life, O'Toole J., MIT Press, 1976. Giving Youth a Better Chance, A Report with Recommendations, Carnegie Council On Policy Studies in Higher Education, San Fransisco: Jossey Bass 1979, Education for Employment: Knowledge for Action, National Academy of Education, Task Force on Education and Employment, Washington: March 1979
99. Holloway W. B., "Youth Employment/Education Programs," in Education and Urban Society, vol. 14, no. 12, Nov. 1981, pp. 33-54
100. McClure C., Education For Work, London: Associated University Press, 1985
101. Marland S., Career Education, Washington: McGraw Hill, 1974
102. National Research Council Committee on Vocational Education Research and Development, Assessing Vocational Education Research and Development, National Academy of Sciences, Washington D.C., 1976
103. Marland discusses the ethic of work at length and denies that he is returning to the earlier idea of compulsion. At the same time he feels the need to discuss the relationship between the real world of work as discussed in the "Work In America" Report in which the experience of work is described by many as alienating. He argues that although work may not require full development of the intellectual capacities, there was a need to reecognise what he describes as the dignity of work. This he believes is the purpose of "Career Education'. Marland S., Career Education, op. cit., pp. 134-152

References and Footnotes: Part 3 Section B

104. Report of a Special Task Forces to the Secretary of Health Education and Welfare, Work in America, Cambridge: MIT Printing, 1973

105. *ibid.*

106. Task Force on Education and Employment, Education for Employment: Knowledge for Action, National Academy of Education, Washington: 1979

107. Wilms W., "The Nonsystem of Education and Training," in Doeringer P.B., Vermeulen B., Jobs and Training in the 1980's, Boston, Martinus Nijhoff, 1981, pp. 19-50

108. Grubb W. Norton, "Occupational Demand and the Rise of Post Secondary Vocational Education," Project Report No. 83-89, Institute for Research in Educational Finance and Governance, School of Education, Stanford: Standford University Press, May, 1983

109. *ibid.*

110. Deegan W., "Continuing education and the Young Adult: the Community College Experience in the United States of America," in Evans K., Education for Young Adults, London: Routledge, 1991

111. Wilms W., "The Nonsystem of Education and Training," *op. cit.*

112. Youth Employment Act 1977. This is reviewed in Spring J., American Education, 2nd Edition, New York: Longman, 1982 Also Rist R.C., "Walking Through a House of Mirrors," Journal of Education and Urban Society, vol 14, no.1, Nov. 1981, pp.3-13

113. Unwin L., "Meeting the Needs of the Global Society", in Raggat P., Unwin L., Change and Intervention, London: Falmer Press, 1991, pp.81-94

114. The Reports were: The Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, A Summary of Reports and Recommendations, San Fransisco: Josey Bass, 1980. Grasso J.T., Shea J.R., Technical Report for the Carnegie Commission, Vocational Education and Training, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Berkeley California: 1979

115. *ibid.*

116. Mann D., "Chasing the American Dream," Teachers College Record, vol. 83, no.3, 1982, pp.341-375

117. The National Commission on Secondary Vocational Education, The Unfinished Agenda: The Role of Vocational Education in the High School, Sponsored by the National Centre for Research into vocational education, The Ohio State University, Funded by the U.S. Department of Education Office of Vocational and Adult Education, Columbus Ohio: 1984

118. These are the excellence Reports discussed earlier.

119. The National Commission on Secondary Vocational Education, *op. cit.*

120. United States, National Commission for Employment Policy, The Federal Role

References and Footnotes: Part 3 Section B

in Vocational Education, Report no 12, Washington D.C.: Sept. 1981

121. Cantor L., "Re-visioning of vocational Education in the American High School", Comparative Education, vol.25, no.2, 1989, pp.123-133

122. *ibid.*

123. Claus J., "Opportunity and Inequality in Vocational Education," Curriculum Inquiry, vol 20, no 1, 1990

124. Martin D., "A Critique of the Concept of Work and Education in The School Reform Reports," in Shea C.M., The New Servants of Power, New York, Greenwood Press, 1989, pp.39-57

125. Both Reports by Boyer and Goodlad are critical of tracking in the High Schools and advocated differing forms of the central curriculum. However Reports, such as Horaces Compromise and Adlers' Report The Paideia Proposal, imply some form of streaming or tracking.

126. C.F. Kettering, The Reform of Secondary Education, *op. cit.* Martin distinguishes between the seventies Reports which, he argues, are still in a liberal tradition in their analysis of youth, and the Reagan era Reports of the early eighties, which he suggests are influenced by a business view of the state.

127. Carnegie Council, Giving Youth a Better Chance, *op. cit.*

128. Freeman R.B., The Over Educated American, London: The Academic Press, 1976 and Rist R., *op. cit.*

129. National Commission on Youth, *op. cit.*

130. Reagan M.D. Sanzone J.G., The New Federalism, *op. cit.*

131. National Commission for Excellence and Academic Preparation for College. *op. cit.*

132. Shea C., "Pentagon v. Multi-National Capitalism, The Political Economy of the 1980's Reform Movement," in Shea C.M., The New Servants of Power, New York, Greenwood Press, 1989, pp. 3-38

133. For example both the Paideia Proposal and the Making the Grade Report contain criticism of affirmative action.

134. Cantor L., "Re-visioning of vocational Education in the American High School", *op. cit.*

135. Claus J., "Opportunity and Inequality in Vocational Education," *op. cit.* Claus argues that vocational education was enjoyed by those who took the courses and that it was effective in many of the personal objectives. However this did not produce further opportunity and as a result tended to reinforce class-related inequalities.

Conclusion

The Changing Social Definition of Youth as an "Age Set."

It has been argued that the policies which emerged in the late seventies, both in the USA and England and Wales, should be understood in the context of an analysis of the socially constructed account of youth as an "age set." These policies, intended to reform the relationship between school and the economy, created a realignment of the state institutions which were concerned with the provision for youth, and, at the same time, created a new rhetoric about youth. The central government policies attempted to create a correspondence between schools and colleges as the major state provision for youth, and the economy. It has been argued that these policies were only partially successful in challenging the welfare state definition of the "age set" of youth.

Themes and approach.

With reference to recent theories of the state, it has been argued that for its continuation the state needs to create integration, consensus and production or reproduction.¹ With the development of the state these needs are achieved relatively autonomously, where its operation is reflected in the construction of the youth "age set", which is the transition between childhood and adulthood.

In order to identify the particular ideological construction of youth as an "age set", two similar societies have been compared over time. Both countries are capitalist and liberal democracies. For these two nations,

the post war period has been divided into two distinctive periods of time, marked by a change in political ideology.

The immediate post-war age was one of reconstruction, broadly typified by the label welfare capitalism. This lasted until the early seventies, when the creation of a cooperative power group in the oil producing nations led to economic recession. The potential for a change in the balance of trade to the detriment of both nations produced, in the USA and England, a change in the political ideology of government. In both countries governments were elected with a commitment to the reduction of the welfare state. Thus, the second period, post welfare, is typified by the need of the state to reconstruct its economic well being.

During the early part of the century, there has been a similarity in social and economic policy.² For example, neither of the countries has constructed a nationalised youth policy. This contrasts with policies in Germany during the Nazi period or during the post revolutionary period of Soviet history when strong national youth policies existed. It has been argued that the absence of a single national youth policy reflects the tensions between the various functions of the liberal capitalist state, that of providing order and security and that of regulating investment and the reproduction of labour.

In the absence of a national youth policy, the substantial state provision for youth was the school and college structure.³ The status of the "age set" is thus subject to the demands created by the state agencies in their construction of the youth "age set", rather than to the demands of a single central value system, as suggested by Eisenstadt.

It was argued, in the first part of the study, that in 1945, at the establishment of the welfare state, the social construction of youth was dominated by the ideology of adolescence. Adolescence was principally a psychologically defined category, based in a developmental model.⁴ It emphasised the emotional immaturity and dependent nature of the fourteen to eighteen year old and argued that a formal acceptance of the stormy and unreliable nature of adolescence was necessary to the creation of psychologically healthy and independent adults. Adolescence was incorporated into other aspects of the welfare state through the professionalisation of care and education as functions of the state. Thus, the political ideology of rights in democracy in the case of youth was interpreted as the right to secondary schooling and the opportunity to compete for social mobility, while being essentially disenfranchised from the political and economic activities of the state. Youth was a marginal category in welfare ideology. The ideal of protection and exclusion from responsibility meant that youth and their activities were preparatory for adult societies. Those who were most anxious to work and to emulate adult society were labelled as precocious, failures or as a threat.⁵

The social construction of the youth "age set" as adolescent was challenged after 1972, at the point at which a new political ideology emerged. In the second part of this study there was an analysis of the policies, designed to reform the provision for youth, to fit more coherently with the new political and economic ideals of the state.

It has been a principle argument of this study that the needs of the relatively autonomous agencies of the state create a definition of the

youth "age set" through policies and reports. As the state sponsored site of preparation for adulthood, schools and colleges were the object of the new policies and the site at which the tensions in the state definition of the youth "age set" could be identified. In the thesis the functions of the state, the creation of integration, consensus and conditions of production, have been used as the framework in which the analysis of youth as an "age set" has been undertaken.

Integration

The incorporation of adolescence allowed for the state to establish integration around the extension of schooling both as a protective and as an educative environment. In both countries youth was idealised as depoliticised and dependent.

In England and Wales the extension of secondary schooling was highly differentiated and the compulsory sector excluded provision of vocational and technical education.⁶ The American provision was based on the High School which was built around the ideal of community.⁷

In both countries the ideal of extended educational provision held until 1972. There were, however, different patterns. In England and Wales the end of compulsory schooling was, for the majority, the end of contact with state provision. Although there had been a steady development toward a more common pattern of schooling, this pattern was still, comparatively, a highly differentiated experience. In the USA the dependent category of youth was more generalised, with a larger proportion of youth in school and college. The curriculum was differently defined, including a form of vocational education, and increasingly extending adolescence to college level.

However, in both countries a similar pattern of failure emerged, one which suggested that adolescence was indeed a class based ideal, which favoured the success of the white male middle and upper class population.⁸ Despite reforms during the period of welfare, this pattern of failure was continued.

Identification with the extended and dependent "age set" of adolescence was inappropriate for the majority of youth since they went directly into work. Direct entry into work was, however, was considered as the least desirable route for youth to become citizens.

With the change in the political and economic strategy which began 1972, the ideal of youth as dependent adolescent was challenged.

In the USA there was a suggestion, in a number of reports, that the school leaving age should be clearly optional at sixteen, not eighteen as had become the practice.⁹ In England and Wales there was a move away from the policy recommendation of the sixties that eighteen rather than sixteen was the point at which schooling should end. Instead, the new developments took place in agencies not traditionally connected with school and education policy.¹⁰

The state could not create integration around the extension of dependency in youth. Instead the state argued that youth should be more responsive to its needs, which were broadly defined as those of industry and the economy. Youth, although dependent during the period of compulsory schooling, was defined as 'in preparation for work.' It has been argued that the policies, both in the USA, and England and Wales,

were concerned to establish a work ethic.

Thus, the "age set" in the post welfare period was preparatory and directed toward the purposes of the state, and not to the development of the individual, as had been the case during the welfare period. Youth was encouraged to be less dependent and to find success in terms of employability.

These strategies had a different impact. In England and Wales the division of youth at sixteen became more marked with an initial reform package which created differentiation in qualifications and failed to guarantee for many a route to broader opportunities. While these policies have been revised, there is still little coherence in post sixteen qualification and provision.¹¹ In the USA the High School and Community College retained their position as mass providers and were able to sustain the rights to provision for the whole of youth as an "age set." Although the practice produced differential outcomes, the ideals of the American institution were stronger and less vulnerable to the potential divisiveness of post-welfare reforms than those of England.

Consensus

The consensus values, those which legitimated order and security, were of merit and achievement. Neither country established consensus around a single body of curricula knowledge. The ideals of opportunity dominated the reforms between 1945 and 1972. Those reforms, which focused on the groups of youth who were not successful in the traditional academic curricula, tended to offer social skill learning in the context of

applied subject work. Increasingly the courses carried some form of certification, although this did not achieve parity of esteem with academic subjects.

The American curriculum in High School was in some senses more accessible to all youth than the strict division of knowledge in the Grammar and Secondary Modern Schools of England and Wales. However, the High School curriculum did contain a divide: the tracking system which separated designated vocational education and college preparation courses.¹² Despite the apparent acceptance of vocational curriculum as educational, as in England and Wales, vocational education and practical work were associated with low educational achievement.

As a consequence, secondary provision in both countries effectively sorted and selected youth across different curricula, but was able to do so only in so far as the criteria were deemed legitimate. In England and Wales, there were extensive reforms during the period 1945-72, which were intended to give greater opportunity to youth. While these reforms extended the opportunity of achieving credentials, the system remained unchanged, the route to Higher Education remaining elitist.¹³ The legitimate route remained a meritocracy of academic performance.

Socialisation patterns were weakly defined. In England they were residual to division between Grammar and Secondary Modern schools. When social skills were discussed it was in the context of Reports on the less able.¹⁴ In the USA socialisation into the community was a focus of the High School, and during this period there was little revision of the model of citizenship despite unequal success.¹⁵

In both countries, after 1972, decision making was removed from the pupils and the educationists, who under the ideology of welfare had been custodians. Policy making was more strongly located at the centre in terms of curriculum knowledge and appropriate socialisation, despite the rhetoric of devolving power to parents or states.¹⁶

In the USA there was an initial attempt to reform the status of vocational education under the term 'career education.' This, however, was abandoned in the late seventies. There followed a cluster of Reports which focused on excellence, and which subsumed the ideal of technical and career knowledge, and made vocational courses redundant.¹⁷ In contrast, the English reforms towards vocational and technical courses were often conflated in the schemes devised for the less academic pupil. The terminology of 'standards' and 'excellence' were attached to the Reports concerned with national curriculum and sixth form.

In both countries testing began to define categories of competence.¹⁸ There was much controversy about the tests since they constrained the curriculum, tending to be content driven and focusing on traditional subjects. Thus, there was uncertainty about which youth would benefit from the reforms, since they did not include the vocational and technical courses.

The pattern of socialisation, post 1972, was one which promoted merit and achievement over that of opportunity. The needs of the state in relation to youth were politically defined as a change in the supply to the labour market for all youth. However, this was not defined as an explicit correspondence between the content of courses and entry level

to the labour market. Instead, it was argued by government that certification and testing should become an increasingly important and valid mediator. The tension between the needs of the state thus defined, and those traditional within schools and colleges, became more obvious.

In the USA this was accommodated by a return to the basics, despite the difficulties of agreeing about what might constitute the basics for the eighties. In England and Wales the state imposed a national curriculum, which, as in the USA, was based in a traditional structure of knowledge and socialisation.

In effect, there was not a new consensus either of common knowledge or socialisation. The curriculum reforms referred to past criteria of merit and achievement and, despite the rhetoric that accompanied them, were uneasily associated with the commitment to economic and technologically required competence across the range of abilities.

Production and reproduction

With the welfare definition of youth, the relationship with the economy and the need of the state to provide production and reproduction was most unclear. Youth was located in the market as consumers with restricted access to the labour market. The liberal ideals of education argued that separation of education and work was important for personal development, and that schooling should not be utilitarian in nature.

In the USA there had been an attempt to bring the two closer together, with the acceptance of technological and vocational knowledge. However, the history of the vocational track is one of static categories and of

no effective evaluation, a pattern which meant that the structure of vocational education did not match the changing economy.¹⁹ The reforms of the American system involved a reappraisal of the vocational courses in High School.²⁰ These were modified to make them a more attractive option to those youth who had not been successful in the traditional curriculum. However, the reforms, principally concerned with establishing the work ethic and with skills training, were of limited success.

In England and Wales the divide between vocational education and schooling was sustained. Practical and vocational skills were used as motivational rather than as ends in themselves.²¹ The curriculum developments that accompanied the raising of the school leaving age were focused on social skill learning.

In neither state was there a clear production and reproduction model congruent with the skill or knowledge apparently required in the labour market. In schools there remained a body of high status knowledge, based on disciplines rather than application. The reforms of practical and vocational education were not those which would provide new and higher levels of technical knowledge.

The status and effectiveness of vocational education and of many technical courses was problematic throughout the period of welfare government. By the early seventies and eighties these courses were the focus of a number of reforms. Despite career education, technical and vocational reforms, neither state created a culture in which standards or excellence were associated with either technical or vocational studies.

In the USA there was a withdrawal from state provided vocational education, and a new policy was advocated to raise standards for all around a common curriculum of the "New Basics." Youth in England and Wales was subject to a policy which proposed a national curriculum, and a greater level of common experience than before. However, post fourteen, the proposed reforms also sustained division of courses. These courses had very different outcomes in terms of status and qualifications, and, in many cases, did not provide entrance to Higher Education.

The social construction of youth as an "age set."

In the welfare period, the definition of the "age set" of youth as 'adolescent' provided an ideal of youth as a category which was in the care of the state. "Adolescence" also suggested that the state would increase opportunity and provide mobility based on merit. While this was not achieved in either country, the reforms of the period were constructed to further that aim.

The autonomy of this definition of youth, sustained by the school, was challenged in the early seventies both in the USA and England and Wales. The challenge was created by forces outside the school.

This was as a result of both states responding to economic crises,²² resulting in a withdrawal from the welfare ideology of government. Instead it was expected that the schools and colleges, which had initially been created to protect youth from the adult world of employment, should develop closer links with this world. This led to the

requirement of a more direct and coherent response from schools as agents of production and reproduction.²³

To do this, policies at an explicit level attempted to make the culture and practice of schooling orientated to the creation of a more technical society. These policies had to accommodate to the other functions of the state. They were not designed to reform the construction of the "age set" of youth as a whole and, as a result, were not suited to achieving the needs of the state to create both integration and consensus for the "age set."

By 1990 'adolescence' as the social construction of youth as "age set" no longer existed either as an ideal or as a target of policy. With welfare politics there had been an incorporation of the model of "adolescence" into policies concerned with youth which provided integration around dependent, depoliticised youth for whom opportunity had to be created by the state. The welfare ideology had targeted all youth through provision of schools and colleges. In this way adolescence appeared to offer common values to youth as "age set". The ideals of adolescence, which were essentially middle class, had prioritised opportunity for all through schooling as the direction of policy. The new orientation, to the needs of the state, provided a different focus for consensus. It favoured achievement, sorting and selecting above the ideal of community and personal opportunity. Youth and adolescence disappeared as subjects from policy and were replaced by criteria for certification. The "age set" was clearly preparatory.

However the world of work, for which it prepared, was a highly differentiated one offering little common identity to the transitional

"age set" of youth. The reform rhetoric of achievement, excellence and technical competence was, in practice, related to a reassertion of subject knowledge, and also to a selection process, both of which were intended to provide better certification of the competent. Reform in both countries potentially offered wider access to the 'new basic' subjects.

However, neither set of reforms established the technical or vocational as significant subjects. The reforms tended to remove those curricula designed in the sixties to broaden the basis of choice and opportunity for the categories of youth not traditionally successful in the schooling system. Instead youth was offered a state defined meritocracy with employability as the basis of success rather than technical knowledge. Despite the radical promises of the seventies, schools had not been brought into a new relationship with the economy. Traditional certification was still the main form of relationship between education and the economy. In addition, in neither country had the state been able thus far, to reduce significantly its commitment to the continued provision for youth.

In neither country had youth become more skilled or directly prepared for a technical society. On the contrary in both countries, youth as an "age set" had become more divided. Thus, the social consequences of policies so energetically and confidently pursued are significantly unclear.

References and Footnotes: Conclusion

1. Clark G., and Dear M., State Apparatus, Boston: Allen and Unwin, 1984
2. Part 1, Section B. It has been argued that both the USA and England and Wales have similar developments in social and economic terms, as compared to countries with different political and economic systems. However, there is a variation between the two countries in pace, scale and the details of ideals and practice.
3. Davies B., Threatening Youth, Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1986
Davies analyses the absence of a national youth policy in Britain, and discusses the resistance in Britain to the models adopted in states of different political and economic ideologies. It has been argued in the study that these arguments are equally relevant to the USA.
4. Part 1, Section C 1.
5. Craven H., "Child Saving in the Age of Professionalism," in Hawes J.M. American Childhood, Westport Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1985, pp.415-489.
Musgrove F., Youth and the Social Order, London: RKP., 1964
6. Contrast the effects of the 1902 decision in English education and the subsequent examination regulations with the introduction of the Smith Hughes legislation. Banks O., Parity and Prestige in English Education, London: RKP, 1955. Kantor H., Learning to Earn, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988
7. Judge H., "Images and Reflections, the USA," Comparative Education, vol.25, no.3, 1989, pp. 333-339
8. Blackstone T. Lodge P., Educational Policy and Educational Inequality, Oxford: Martin Robertson, 1982. Nasaw D. Schooled to Order, New York: Oxford University Press, 1979
9. National Commission on Youth, The Transition of Youth to Adulthood, New York: Charles F Kettering Foundation, 1980. This report argues that the High School is ineffective and should be part of a network of institutions which provide for youth. Carnegie Council on Policy studies in Higher Education, Giving Youth a better Chance, San Fransisco: Jossey Bass, 1979. This report argues that there is no one category of youth and that there should be variety in the approach to the construction of opportunity for youth.
10. Cantor I.M., Roberts I. F., Further Education Today London: RKP, 1983
Cantor notes that during the seventies there was a major change in the role of the Manpower Services Commission as the issue of youth unemployment became poetically sensitive. (See Part 3 A iii)
11. Nash I., "Cracks in the Brickwork," TES, April 3, 1992, p.9
12. Conant J., The American High School Today, New York: McGraw Hill 1959.
13. Hewitson J.N., The Grammar School Tradition in a Comprehensive World, London: RKP, 1969
14. For example Ministry of Education, 15-18, London: HMSO, 1959 (Crowther

References and Footnotes: Conclusion

Report)

15. For example Conant J.B., The American High School Today, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.

16. Cross R., Economic Theory and Policy in the UK., London: Martin Robertson, 1982. Reagan M.D. Sanzone J.G., The New Federalism, London: Oxford University Press, 1981

17. Martin D., "A Critique of the Concept of Work and Education in the School Reform Reports," in Shea C., The New Servants of Power, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1989 pp.39-56

18. Hargreaves A., Curriculum Assessment Reform, Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1989

19. National Commission on Secondary Vocational Education, The Unfinished Agenda: The Role of Vocational Education in the High School, sponsor The National Centre for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, Funded by US Department of Education, Office of Vocational And Adult Education, Colombus Ohio: 1984

20. The Smith Hughes legislation was amended in 1963 to target disadvantaged youth. These amendments were revised in 1968 Bailey L. J., Implications of the Current Interest in Education Work Concepts, Journal of Industrial Teacher Education vol 15 no 3 1978 pp 55-68. Thompson J.F., Foundations of Vocational Education, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey : Prentice Hall, 1973

21. Blackstone T., Lodge P., Educational Policy and Educational Inequality op. cit., Chap 5

22. Cross R., Economic Theory and Policy in the UK., op.cit., and Reagan M.D. Sanzone J.G., The New Federalism, op. cit.

23. DES., Education in Schools, a Consultative Document, London: HMSO (Cmnd.6869), 1977. Marland S.P. Career Education, New York: McGraw Hill, 1974

APPENDIX 1.The Theory of Labour

Central to the debate about labour theory over the past fifteen years is the work of H. Braverman.¹ Braverman's stated purpose was to analyse the change occurring in the patterns of labour in an industrial economy, principally the USA, and to develop a general theory about the processes of labour under capitalism.² Since the publication of his work there has been considerable discussion and criticism of the issues and, in particular, his use of monopoly capitalism and the market, the ideas of skill, and the conception of class.³ The focus of Braverman's account of the division of labour under capitalism is the class of workers who do not own the means of production, in an economic system which is characterised by treating human labour as a commodity. His work is divided into five major themes. These are i) labour and management, ii) science and mechanisation iii) monopoly capital iv) the growing working class occupations v) the working class.⁴

Braverman argues that he has identified a serious conflict in previous discussions of the theory of labour and the expected change in patterns of employment. He is critical on two major issues. The first is the lack of problematisation of the relationship between technical change and development and theories about the level of skill labour required. In particular, he criticises the assumption that advances in the application of technology will necessarily result in the demand for more highly skilled labour. The second issue is the assumption that there is an inherent and unalterable law to the pattern of modernisation through technical development, the assumption that in modern industrialised

states change is driven by the technical knowledge available. This, the technological determinist position would suggest that the forces of production are the sole determinants of the relations of production.

By applying the Marxist distinction between the forces of production which are the materials of production, the power, and the tools available, including human labour power and the relations of production which are the determinants of the organisational structure Braverman identifies the issue of control of human labour as a major problematic for the owner or manager. It is this, the "commodification" of human labour, the treatment of individuals as far as possible as the same as other tools of production, which creates the conflict in capitalist modes of production.⁵

Braverman argues that the purpose of work is to provide for human requirements through the transformation of physical resources and to improve human control over the environment. Although a variety of power is available to achieve this end human power is distinct from mechanical or technical power, in so far as it is able to conceive of the task before it is executed and to organise the sequence of the work. The division of human labour into those who conceive of the task and those who execute it is a fundamental division, determining the possibility of power and inequality in the structure of work organisation. Those who have capital or power are able to purchase labour. With the power to purchase goes the need to control and organise the hired labour. The realisation of the potential of purchased labour is circumscribed by the technical aspects but also by the general and social conditions of the enterprise. In Braverman's view the development of management theory, initially in terms of Babage's ideas, but ultimately in Taylor's, has

meant a new level of control of labour, beyond that of ownership of capital.

The key procedures of Taylorism are the systematisation of work, knowledge and theory into rules and procedures which are expropriated from the worker. The conception of work is separated fully from the social organisation of the work place so that the employee is required to have very little involvement in the task. The managers use their monopoly of the knowledge to control each step of the labour process and its mode of execution.

The second important feature of Braverman's work is the challenge to the view that the present level of technological advance is the main and necessary source of change. Since those who work on the machines do not own them, workers are deployed in such a way as to maximise efficiency for the owners of the machine, which means it becomes necessary to maximise the labour power of the employee. Braverman argues that it is this process, of maximising human labour power, that makes technology oppressive rather than the technical requirements of the machine itself. This process is stressed by the innovations of Taylor's management theory. These involve the employment of 'scientific' professionals, who work in management, to innovate on behalf of the owners of capital, but not as independent scientists, or on behalf of employees such as machine operatives.⁶

Braverman challenges the idea that there will be a widespread growth of skills and knowledge as technology becomes more complex, the idea which is the basis of human capital theory. Instead, he argues that the complexity of organisations has produced a polarised distribution of

knowledge which has, been hidden at least in part, by the traditional analysis of work and education undertaken by social science. These analyses have used categories based on traditional divisions by status based on the division between mental and manual work, but have failed to analyse the changing nature of the employment and the actual skills required of the employee. In particular, the work studies ignored the nature of the involvement of the individual and the amount of initiative and control allowed of the worker. It is Braverman's thesis that the management revolution has attacked the nature of work so that much employment has been reduced to a series of routines which are so simple that minimal involvement or responsibility is required on the part of the worker. This has applied both to the factory and, through the processes of work study, to office and white collar work.

There are some industries, such as the service industry, that would appear not to be affected by these processes, since it is the useful effect of labour that is their saleable commodity. However, Braverman argues that the employees are equally vulnerable to the strategies of management and, although structurally in a different position than those workers in productive industry, the social relations of their employment will not necessarily be different.

Thus, according to Braverman, the working class can be seen to be a much broader class than is traditionally included in the category. If the division between mental and manual labour is abandoned and instead distinctions of status, and the degree of autonomy and control over work is measured, then a number of clerical and white collar occupations become classified as working class.

While Braverman's work has focused on an important element in the social relationships of capitalism it has attracted criticism. Principal among the criticisms of Braverman's work is his stress on Taylorism as the most important character of modern organisational theory.⁷

The first criticism is that there are many other forms of organisation and that he has misunderstood the complexities of the current organisation. The second, that Braverman has not treated Taylorism justly by failing, firstly, to recognize that Taylorism is not easy to implement and met heavy resistance, and secondly, that Taylor understood the need to gain cooperation, consent and legitimacy from the workers.⁸ Thus, Braverman argues that current organisational practice could be the result of consensus not coercion.

Braverman is also criticised for confusing deskilling with control.⁹ Principal among the alternatives to Taylorism are those analyses that are based on the human relations school. These argue that low productivity, low morale and poor social relations are remediable. This is done by processes of work study and analysis, which aim to optimise the needs of human labour within the constraints of the given form of technology. Thus Blauner argues that alienation is not specific to capitalism but to the conditions of employment and immediate work.¹⁰ However, this view of work does not emphasise the effects of ownership and ignores the social location of work organisation. Thus, the late human relationships school does not differ in principles from the ideas of Taylor, which Braverman is attacking.

A further criticism of Braverman is that he has over romanticised the idea of skill, particularly the old notion of craft skills. His

definition of skill is about the creative use of initiative and the use of brain power. It is difficult to ascertain the degree of deskilling, since the process of change in skills and the shift from high level to low level skill can alter dramatically several times, as Braverman himself notes in his discussion of the Teamsters union. Braverman discusses deskilling as if it were an objective reality and does not recognize that Taylorism may represent both an objective process and an ideology. As Littler suggests there are several dimensions to deskilling.¹¹ These are the loss of the right to design and plan the work, the fragmentation of work to meaningless segments, redistribution of a job among skilled and unskilled workers, and the transformation of a craft job. These processes can take place at various stages and thus make identification of deskilling a problematic. Woodward in his study notes that managers can often choose whether to move to personal or mechanical control.¹² In his view managers often use technology and machinery as the means by which they implement notions of control.

This draws attention to a major criticism of Braverman: the assumption that skill is an objective category independent of time and social relations. Skill definition is used by workers to bargain for pay and condition differentials, and it is used by management to define and segregate. Beechey lists three elements of skill:¹³ these are defined competencies, control over conception and execution, and socially defined occupational status: which may be largely independent of any objectively defined competency. This classification draws attention to the mix of the socially and objectively denoted components of skill which make a definition of skill problematic over time.

Also implicit in the discussion of the divorce of conception and

execution is the stratification of workers. The division of labour, and the designation of control of one group, is an important defining characteristic of the structure of capitalism. For the Marxist the fundamental class distinction is between those who own capital and those who sell their labour. This distinction has however been problematic for some time since the divorce of ownership and control. The reclassification of large numbers of workers as socially mobile, belonging to the middle classes in the growth areas of employment such as service industries, does not account for the context or experience of work.¹⁴ Braverman had tackled this issue by extending the definition of working class to control, thus including a large number of the new white collar employees in the working class

Braverman discussed class as a direct outcome of labour, which does not allow for the context and social processes of class to be recognized. Thus the stratification of labour influences profoundly the life chances and is associated with distribution of knowledge, understanding and patterns of cultural adaptation.¹⁵ However, the basis in labour does not account for other divisions of a class society, such as race, and gender. Although the social division of labour has created a situation where the apparent homogeneity of class in a strictly economic sense is not evident, Braverman's argument that class is a process of maintaining control is a useful, if not an adequate, account.¹⁶

In his writing Braverman treats the working class as a class in itself but by omission passive; while suggesting that the ruling group is much more organised and reflective about its objectives, a class for itself. This does not recognize any of the strategies of resistance developed by the employees.¹⁷ At the same time he is overestimating the cohesiveness

of the ruling class and those who manage for them.¹⁸ Equally problematic is the question of whether the social identification of the working class is altered by the restructuring of employment. In a review of the studies undertaken Hill suggests that occupational heterogeneity is not fundamental to the social stratification of the working class; there is much greater significance to other measures of class such as the market, work conditions and the relationship to capital. This applies not only to the working class, traditionally defined in terms of manual labour, but also to the intermediate categories of worker.

The theory of labour provides an account of the relationship between the owners and controllers of the means of production and the labour market, which challenges the theory that there is a simple and direct correspondence between changes in technology and the labour market. The theory of labour argues that both control and status are important elements in an analysis of labour.

In this thesis there is a discussion of the way in which the state constructs youth as an "age set". The transition to work became an important feature of reform after 1972. It is argued that the justification for change in that relationship, given by the state and employers as technical, is in fact ideological. The prioritisation, by government, of a need for change in the relationship between school and the labour market was based in a technologically determinist account of the labour market. In this thesis this view is not accepted. Following from labour theory, and in particular, Beechey's modification of Braverman, it is argued that, in addition to specified competence, both control and status are important elements in accounts of the labour market. Thus the attempts to technicalise¹⁹ and vocationalise the "age

set" of youth should be analysed as part of the ideology of technical determinism.

References and Footnotes: Appendix 1

1. Braverman H., Labour and Monopoly Capital, London: Monthly Review Press, 1974
2. *ibid.* Introduction
3. Wood S., The Degradation of Work, London: Hutchinson, 1982
4. *ibid.*, These are the titles to the five parts of the book.
5. *ibid.*, pp. 85-121
6. *ibid.*, Chap 8
7. For a discussion of Taylorism see Gorz A., "Technical Intelligence and Capitalist Division of Labour," in Young M. and Whitty G., Society State and Schooling, Lewes: Falmer Press, 1977
8. Wood S., Deem R., Salaman G., (eds.), Work Culture and Society, Milton Keynes: Open University, 1985
9. Thompson P., The Nature of Work, London: Macmillan, 1983
10. Hill S., Competition and Control at Work, London: Heinemann, 1981
11. Littler C., "Deskilling and the changing structure of control," in Wood S., The Degradation of Work, London: Hutchinson, 1982
12. Woodward quoted in Hill S., Competition and Control at Work, *op. cit.*
13. Beechey V., "The sexual division of labour and the labour process," in Wood S., The Degradation of Work, chap. 3, London: Hutchinson, 1982
14. Esland G., The Politics of Work and Occupations, 1980
15. Esland G., The Politics of Work and Occupations, *op. cit.*
16. Beechey V., "The sexual division of labour and the labour process" *op. cit.*
17. Wood S., The Degradation of Work, *op. cit.*
18. Wood S., The Degradation of Work, *op. cit.*
19. Grignon argues that reforms in France have transmitted a technical morality to give students an implicit functionalist and individualist explanatory framework for social life. The morality is that of technical progress and technical culture. He argue that the advantage of such an ideology is that it distances the new courses from the manual and practical discourse but at the same time is more certain and constructive than the theoretical Dickinson H., Erben M., "The Technicalisation of Morality and Culture," in Gleeson D., Youth Training and the Search for Work.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adler M.J., The Paideia Proposal, New York: Macmillan, 1982
- Advisory Council on Vocational Education, A Bridge Between a Man and His Work, Document 20, 1968, in Lazerson M. Grubbb N., American Education and Vocationalism, 1870-1970, New York and London: Teachers College Press, 1970, pp. 163-174
- Ahier P., Flude M., Contemporary Educational Policy, London: Croom Helm, 1983
- Altbach P., Excellence in Education, Buffalo: New York, Prometheus Books, 1985
- Anderson C.A., Halsey A.H., Floud J., (eds.), Education, Economy and Society, London: Collier Macmillan, 1961
- Apple M., Education and Power, London: RKP, 1982
- Argles M., South Kensington to Robbins, London: Longman, 1964
- Atkinson P. Rees T., Youth Unemployment and State Intervention, London: RKP, 1982
- Bailey L. J., "Implications of the Current Interest in Education Work Concepts", Journal of Industrial Teacher Education, vol. 15, no. 3, 1978, pp 55-68
- Ball S., Beachside Comprehensive, Cambridge: CUP, 1981
- Banks O., Parity and Prestige in English Education, London: RKP, 1955
- Barker R., Education and Politics, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972
- Barrow P., "The Nature of Tertiary Colleges and Education Reform Act 1988" in Journal of Further and Higher Education, 14 (1), 1990, pp. 51-67
- Bates I., et al. Schooling for the Dole, London, Macmillan, 1984
- Beechey V., "The Sexual Division of Labour and the Labour Process", in Wood S. The Degradation of Work, London: Hutchinson, 1982, pp.54-74
- Benn C, and Simon B., Half Way There, London: Penguin, 1970
- Benn C., Fairley J., Challenging the MSC, London: Pluto, 1986
- Berg I., Education and Jobs: The Great Training Robbery, Boston, Beacon Press, 1971
- Bernbaum G., Schooling in Decline, London: Macmillan Press, 1979
- Bestor A.E., "Educational Wastelands, The Retreat from Learning in Our Public Schools", in Vassar R.L.ed. Social History of American Education, Chicago: Rand MacNally & Company, 1965

- Better Opportunities in Technical Education (White Paper) Cmnd.1254, London: HMSO, 1961
- Blackstone T. Lodge P., Educational Policy and Educational Inequality, Oxford: Martin Robertson, 1982
- Board of Education, Curricula and Examinations in Secondary Schools, London: HMSO, 1943
- Boggs C., Gramsci's Marxism, London: Pluto Press, 1976
- Bottomore T., Theories of Modern Capitalism, London: George Allen and Unwin, 1985
- Bowles S. Gintis H., Schooling in Capitalist America, London: RKP, 1976
- Bowles S. Gintis H., Democracy and Capitalism, London: RKP, 1986
- Boyer E.L., High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America, New York: Harper Row, 1983
- Boyer E.L., "Reflections on the Great Debate", Phi Delta Kapan 86, April 1984, pp.525-530
- Brademas J., The Politics of Education, Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1987
- Braverman H., Labour and Monopoly Capital, New York: Monthly Review Press, 1974
- Bremner R.H., Children and Youth in America, vol 3, parts 5-7, Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1974
- Brighouse T. Ranson S. Taylor B. (eds.), The Revolution in Education and Training, Harlow: Longman, 1986
- Brown F., Crisis in Secondary Education, New York: Prentice Hall, 1984
- Burgess R.G., "It's not a Proper Subject: It's just Newsom," in Goodson I.F., Defining the Curriculum, London: Falmer Press, 1984 pp.181-201
- Burrap P.E. Brimley V., Financing Education in a Climate of Change, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1982
- Callahan R., Education and the Cult of Efficiency, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1964
- Cantor I.M. Roberts I. F., Further Education Today, London: RKP, 1983
- Carlson D., "Curriculum and the School Work Culture", in Altbach, P. Excellence in Education, Buffalo: Prometheus Books, 1985, pp.171-183
- Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, Giving Youth a Better Chance, San Fransisco: Jossey Bass, 1979
- Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, A Summary of Reports and Recommendations, San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1980

- Carnoy M., Schooling in a Corporate State, New York: McKay, 1972
- Carnoy M., The State and Political Theory, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1984.
- Carnoy M., Levin H.M., Schooling Work and the Democratic State, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1985
- Carr E.H., The Bolshevik Revolution, vol 1, part 11 note A, Lenin's Theory of the State, Middlesex: Penguin, 1966
- Carr E.H., The Bolshevik Revolution 1917-1923, vol 2, Middlesex England, 1966
- Cathcart H., Esland G., "Schooling and Industry: Some Recent Contributions," British Journal of Sociology, Vol. 4, no 3, 1983 pp.275-283
- Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies Education Group, Unpopular Education, London: Hutchinson, 1981
- Cibulka J., "American Educational Reform and Government Powers," Educational Review, 42, no.2, 1990, pp.97-108
- Clark Burton L. Educating the Expert Society, San Francisco: Chandler Publications, 1962
- Clark G., Dear M. State Apparatus, Boston: Allen and Unwin, 1984
- Cohen S., (ed.), Education in the United States, Volume 3&4, New York: Random House, 1974
- College Board, "Academic Preparation for College," in Presseissen B.Z. Unlearned Lessons, Lewes: Falmer Press, 1985 pp. 68-70
- Conant J., The American High School Today, New York: McGraw Hill 1959.
- Conanat J., Slums and Suburbs, New York: McGraw Hill, 1961
- Conant J., The Comprehensive High School, New York: McGraw Hill, 1966
- Cooper B., "Local School Reform Great Britain and United States," Education Review, 42, no 2, 1990, pp. 133-149
- Corbett A., Much to Do About Education, Basingstoke: MacMillan, 1968
- Corrigan P., Capitalism, State Formation and Marxist Theory, London, Quartet Books, 1980.
- Cosin B. Flude M. Hales M., (eds.), School Work and Equality, Milton Keynes: Stoughton and Open University, 1989
- Counts G., The Social Foundations of Education, New York: Basic Books, 1934
- Craig G.A., Germany 1866-1947, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978

- Craven H., "Child Saving in the Age of Professionalism," in Hawes J.M., (ed.), American Childhood, Westport Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1985, pp.415-489
- Cremin L.A., "Curriculum Making in the USA.", Journal of Curriculum Studies, 1979, vol 11, no 3, pp.191-202
- Cremin L.A., Public Education, New York: Basic Books, 1976
- Cremin L.A., The Transformation of the School, New York: A.A. Knopf, 1964
- Cross K.P., "The Rising Tide of School Reform Reports", Phi Delta Kappan 66, Nov 1984, pp.167-173
- Cross R., Economic Theory and Policy in the UK., London: Martin Robertson, 1982
- Cuban L., "Enduring Resiliency: Enacting Federal Vocational Education Legislation", in Kantor H., and Tyack D., (eds.), Work, Youth and Schooling, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1988, pp.45-79
- Dale R. Esland G. Macdonald M. Ferguson R., (eds.), Education and the State, Barcombe: Falmer Press, 1981
- Dale R., Esland G. Macdonald M. Ferguson R., (eds.), Schooling and the National Interest, Barcombe: Falmer Press, 1981
- Davies B., Gibson A., The Social Education of the Adolescent, London: University of London Press, 1967
- Davies B., Threatening Youth, Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1986
- Davies R., The Grammar School, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1967
- Deegan W., 'Continuing Education and the Young Adult: the Community College Experience in the United States of America,' in Evans K., Education for Young Adults, London: Routledge, 1991
- Dent H.C., Education in England and Wales, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1982
- Department of Education and Science (DES)., Report of the Minister of Education's Central Advisory Council, Half Our Future, London: HMSO, 1963 (Newsom)
- DES., "Training for the Future," a consultative document, 1971
- DES., Education a Framework for Expansion, London: HMSO, 1972
- DES., Education in Schools, a Consultative Document, London: HMSO (Cmnd6869,) 1977
- DES., & Welsh Office, A New Partnership for Our Schools, HMSO., (Taylor Report) 1977

- DES., Proposals for a Certificate of Extended Education, London: HMSO, 1979
- DES., Aspects of Secondary Education, London: HMSO, 1979
- DES., Curricula 11-16, Toward a Statement of Entitlement, London: HMSO, 1983
- Dewey J., Experience and Education, New York: Macmillan, 1938
- Doyle E., 'America 2000,' Phi Delta Kappan, vol.73, no 3, Nov.91, pp. 185-191.
- Doeringer P.B. Vermeulen B., Jobs and Training in the 1980's, Boston: Martinus Nijhoff, 1981
- Eckstrom B. Goertz E. Rock D., (eds.), Education and American Youth, Lewes, Sussex: Falmer Press, 1988
- Education Commission of the States, Task Force for Economic Growth, Action for Excellence, Denver, Colorado: Education Commission of the States, 1983
- Edwards A.D. "An Elite Transformed: Continuity and Change in 16-19 Educational Policy," in Ahier J. and Flude M., (eds.), Contemporary Educational Policy, London: Croom Helm, 1983, pp. 59-81
- Eisenstadt S.N., From Generation to Generation, The Free Press of Glencoe, London, 1956.
- Eisenstadt S.N., The Welfare State and its Aftermath, Beckenham Kent: Croom Helm and Jerusalem Institute, 1985
- Ekirch A.A., Ideologies and Utopias, The Impact of the New Deal on American Thought, Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1971
- Ellul J., Technological Society, New York: Vintage Books, Random House, 1964
- Eraut M., "Accountability and Education," in Simon B., (ed.), Education in the Eighties, Chap 8, London: Batsford, 1981.
- Esland G. Macdonald M. Dale R. Ferguson R., (eds) Education and the State, Barcombe: Falmer Press, 1981
- Esland G., Cathcart H., Schooling and Industry: Some Recent Contributions, British Journal of Sociology, Vol 4, no 3, 1983 pp.275-283
- Etzioni A., Etzioni E., Social Change, New York: Basic Books 1964.
- Etzioni-Halevy E., Social Change, London: RKP., 1981
- Evans K., Education for Young Adults, London: Routledge, 1991
- Everhart R., The Public School Monopoly, Cambridge Massachusetts: Ballinger Publications, 1982

- Farley M. "Examination post 16, the need for Radical Reform," in Ranson S., (ed.), The Revolution in Education and Training, Chap 12, Harlow: Longman, 1986
- Fellner W., Contemporary Economic Problems, Washington: American Enterprise Institute, 1977
- Ferguson R. Dale R. Esland G. Macdonald M., (eds.), Education and the State, Barcombe: Falmer Press, 1981
- Finn D., Training Without Jobs, London: Macmillan, 1987
- Flude M. Hales M., Cosin M., (eds.), School Work and Equality, Milton Keynes: Stoughton and Open University, 1989
- Fowler G., "The Politics of Education" in Bernabum G., (ed.), Schooling in Decline, London: Macmillan Press, 1979, pp.47-91
- Fowler W., Toward the National Curriculum, London: Kogan Page, 1988
- Freeman R.B., The Over Educated American, London: The Academic Press, 1976
- Friedman M. & R., The Tyranny of the Status Quo, London: Seeker and Warburg 1984
- Further Education Curriculum Review and Development Unit, A Basis For Choice, (second edition,) London: Department of Education and Science, 1983
- Furtrell M., "Mission Not Accomplished", Phi Delta Kappan, vol.71, no.1, Sept 1989 pp. 8-15
- Giddens A., Capitalism and Modern Social Theory, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971
- Giddens A., The Class structure of the Advanced Societies, London: Hutchinson, 1973
- Giddens A., The Structure of Advanced Societies, London: Hutchinson, 1975
- Gillis J., Youth and History, London: Academic Press: 1974
- Giroux H., Ideology Culture and the Process of Schooling, Brighton: Falmer Press, 1981
- Giroux H., Public Philosophy and the Crisis in Education, Harvard Education Review 54, 1984, pp.186-194
- Glass D.V., Social Mobility in Britain, London: RKP. 1954
- Gooby-Taylor P. and Dale J., Social Theory and Social Welfare, London: Edward Arnold, 1981
- Gordon P. and Lawton D., Curriculum Change in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1978

- Gorz A., The Division of Labour, Hassocks: Harvester Press, 1976
- Gosden P., The Education System Since 1944, Oxford: Martin Robertson Co., 1983
- Gottlieb D., The Emergence of Youth Societies, New York: Free Press, 1966
- Gough I., The Political Economy of the Welfare State, London: Macmillan, 1979
- Graham H.D., The Uncertain Triumph, Chapel Hill: University of California Press, 1984
- Grantham D. W., Recent America, Arlington Heights, Illinois: Harlan Davidson, 1987
- Grasso J.T. Shea J.R., Technical Report for the Carnegie Commission, Vocational Education and Training, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Berkley California: 1979
- Greenstein F., The Reagan Presidency, An Early Assessment. New York: John Hopkins University Press, 1983.
- Griffin C., Typical Girls, London: RKP., 1985
- Grisson T., "Education and the Cold War", in Karrier C. Violas P. and Spring J., (eds.), The Roots of the Crisis, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973 pp.177-198
- Grubb W. and Lazerson M., Broken Promises, New York: Basic Books, 1982
- Grubb W. Lazerson M., "Vocational Solutions to Youth Problems," Educational Analysis vol.3, no., 2, 1981, pp.91-105
- Grubb W.N., Occupational Demand and the Rise of Post Secondary Vocational Education, Project Report no 83-89, Institute for Research in Educational Finance and Governance, School of Education, Stanford: Standford University Press, May 1983
- Grasso J., Shea J., Technical Report for the Carnegie Commission, Vocational Education and Training, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Berkley: California: 1979
- Gumbert E.B., Spring J., The Superschool & the Superstate, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1974
- Hales M. Cosin M. Flude M., (eds.), School Work and Equality, Milton Keynes: Stoughton and Open University, 1989
- Hall G.S., "Childhood and Adolescence", in Spring J. "Youth Culture in the United States," in Karrier et al, Roots of the Crisis, Chicago: Rand McNally 1973, pp 198-215
- Hall S. Jefferson T., Resistance Through Ritual, London: Hutchinson, 1977

- Hall S., "Education in Crisis," in Wolpe A.M. and Donald J. (eds.), Is There Anyone here from Education?, London: Pluto Press, 1983 Chap 1, pp. 2-11
- Hall S. "Variants of Liberalism," in Donald J. and Hall S. Politics and Ideology, Milton Keynes, Open University Press, 1986 Chap 3, pp. 34-70
- Halsey A. Floud J. Anderson C.A. (eds.) Education, Economy, and Society, Toronto: Free Press of Glencoe, Fourth Print 1961
- Halsey A.H. Karabel J., (eds.), Power and Ideology in Education, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Hampel R. The Last Citadel, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1986
- Hansot E. Tyack D. Lowe R. Public Schools in Hard Times, Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard University Press 1984
- Hargreaves A., Curriculum Assessment Reform, Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1989
- Hargreaves D. Social Relations in the Secondary School, London: RKP, 1967
- Harvard University Committee on The Objective of General Education in a Free Society. in Bremner R.H. Children and Youth in America vol 3, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1974
- Hawes J.H., Hiner J.M., (eds.), American Childhood, Westport Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1985
- Hayes F. Sutherland S., Educating America, New York: Skokie National Textbook Company, 1981
- Heilbrunner R.L., "Business Civilisation in Decline," in Nichols T. Capital and Labour, London: Fontana, 1980, pp 29
- Henry D.D. Challenges Past Challenges Present, London: Jossey-Bass, 1975
- Her Majesty's Government and the Local Authority Association, Education for the 16-19 year Olds, London: HMSO, 1980 (The Macfarlane Report)
- Hewitson J.N., The Grammar School Tradition in a Comprehensive World, London: RKP, 1969
- Hewton E., Education in Recession, London: Allen & Unwin, 1986
- Hillgate Group, Whose Schools, London: The Hillgate Group 1986.
- Hindess B. "Class and Politics in Marxist Theory", in Littlejohn G. (ed.), Power and the State, London: Croom Helm, 1978, pp. 72-98
- Hollingshead A.B. Elmstown's Youth, and Elmstown Revisited, New York: Wiley, 1975
- Holloway W., "Youth Employment/Education Programmes," in Education and Urban Society, vol 14, no. 12, 1981, pp. 33-64

- Hopkins A., The School Debate, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1978
- Howell H., " A Bumbly Ride ", Phi Delta Kappan, vol.73, no 3, Nov.91, pp.192-203
- Hummel R., Nagle J., Urban Education in America, New York: Oxford University Press, 1974
- Hutchings D.W., Technology and the Sixth Form Boy, Oxford: Oxford University Department of Education, 1963
- Husen T., "The School in an Achievement Orientated Society", Phi Delta Kappan, Feb. 1985, no. 66, pp. 398-403
- Jackson B. & Marsden D., Education and the Working Class, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963
- Janowitz M., "Youth and the welfare state in the USA," in Eisenstadt S.M. The Welfare State, London: Croom Helm, 1985, pp 93-108
- Jefferson T. Hall S., (eds.), Resistance Through Ritual, London: Hutchinson, 1977
- Johnston B., Levitan S., The Jobs Corps, Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1975
- Johnson R., "Thatcherism and English Education", History of Education, vol 18, no. 2, 1989, pp. 91-121
- Judge H., "Images and Reflection:the USA," Comparative Education, vol.25, no.3, 1989, pp. 333-339
- Kantor H., Tyack D., Work Youth and Schooling, Stanford, California, Stanford University Press, 1982
- Kantor H., Learning to Earn, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988
- Karabel J. Halsey A.H., Power and Ideology in Education, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Karrier C.J. Violas P.C. Spring J., (eds.), The Roots of the Crisis, Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Corporation, 1973
- Keane J., Contradictions of the Welfare State by Klaus Offe, London, Hutchinson, 1984
- Kelly G.P., "Setting the boundaries of the Debate about Education," in Altbach P. (ed.), Excellence in Education, Buffalo, Prometheus Books, 1985, pp. 31-42
- Keniston K., Youth Culture as Enforced Alienation, in Rapson R., The Cult of Youth in Middle Class America, Massachusetts: D.C.Heath, 1971.
- Kett J.F., Rites of Passage, New York: Basic Books, 1977

Kettering C.F. Foundation, National Commission on the Reform of Secondary Education, The Reform of Secondary Education, (B Frank Brown chair) New York: McGraw Hill, 1973

King D.S., "The State and Social Structures of Welfare in Advanced Industrial Democracies", Theory and Society, vol 16, no 6, Nov. 1987, pp.841-868

Kliebard H.M., "The Drive for Curriculum Change in the United States", Journal of Curriculum Studies, 1979, vol 11, no 3, pp.191-202

Kogan M., Education Policy Making, London: Allen and Unwin 1975

Korpi W., The Democratic Class Struggle, London: Routledge Kegan Paul, 1983

Krug. E. A., The Shaping of the American High School vol. 2, Milwaukee and London: University of Wisconsin Press, 1972

Labour Research Department, "The Menace of the Multinationals," in Nichols T., Capital and Labour, London: Fontana, 1980, p. 39

Lacey C., Hightown Grammar, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1970

Lawton D., Class Culture and the Curriculum, London: Routledge, 1975

Lawton D., The Politics of the School Curriculum, London: RKP, 1980

Lawton D. Gordon P., Curriculum Change in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Century, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1978

Leipmann K., Apprenticeship An Enquiry into its Adequacy Under Modern Conditions, London: RKP. 1960

Lenin V.I., On Youth, Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1977

Lenin V.I., The Tasks of the Youth Leagues, in Lenin, On Socialist Ideology and Culture, Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1974

Levell P. " There Must Be a Better Way", Education 13 September, 1991, pp.210-211

Levin H.M., Carnoy M., (eds.), Schooling Work and the Democratic State, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1985

Levidow L. Young B., Science Technology and the Labour Process, vol 2, London: Free Association Books, 1985

Levitan S. Johnston B., The Jobs Corps, Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1975

Levy M., Curriculum Development in the Youth Training Scheme, in Ranson S., et al. The Revolution in Education and Training, Harlow: Longman, 1986, Chap. 5

- Lilge F., "Anton Semyonovitch Makarenko, An analysis of his educational ideas in the context of Soviet Society", University of California Publications in Education, vol 13, no 1, pp.1-52, California: University of California Press, 1958
- Lindley R., "Education, Training and Labour Market in Britain," European Journal of Education, vol16, No1, 1981, pp.7-27
- Littlejohn G., (ed.), Power and the State, London: Croom Helm, 1978
- Lively J., Democracy, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1975
- Lodge P., & Blackstone T., Educational Policy and Educational Inequality, Oxford: Martin Robertson, 1982
- Lowe R. Hansot E. Tyack D., Public Schools in Hard Times, Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1984
- Macdonald M. Dale R. Esland G. Ferguson R., (eds.), Education and the State, Barcombe, Falmer Press, 1981
- Maclure S., Educational Documents, London: Chapman and Hall, 1965
- Mann D., "Chasing the American Dream," Teachers College Record, vol. 83, no.3, 1983, pp. 341-375
- Manpower Services Commission, Special Programmes Division, Young People and Work, London: HMSO, May 1977 (The Holland Report)
- Marland S.P. Career Education, New York: McGraw Hill, 1974
- Marshall T.H., "Social Selection and the Welfare State," in Halsey A.H. Floud J., Anderson C., (eds.), Education Economy and Society, London: Collier Macmillan, 1961 pp.148-164
- Marshall T.H., The Right To Welfare, London: Heinemann Books, 1981
- Marshall T.H., "Value Problems of Welfare-Capitalism" in Marshall T.H., The Right To Welfare, London: Heinemann Books, London, 1981, pp.123-137
- Martin D., "A Critique of the Concept of Work and Education in the School Reform Reports," in Shea C., The New Servants of Power, (ed.), Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1989 pp.39-56
- Marwick A. "Youth in Britain 1920-60," Journal of Contemporary History vol 5, no 1, 1970 pp.37-51
- McLure J., Educational Documents, London: Methuen 1965
- Milson F., Youth in a Changing Society, London: RKP., 1972.
- Ministry of Education, Pamphlet no 9. The New Secondary Education, London, HMSO, 1947
- Ministry for Education, White Paper on Technical Education London: HMSO, 1956

- Ministry of Labour. Industrial Training, Government Proposals, London: HMSO 1964
- Mishra R., The Welfare State In Crisis, Lewes: Harvester, 1984
- Moore R., "Education, Employment, and Recruitment," in Cosin B. Flude M. Hales M., (eds.), School Work and Equality, Sevenoaks, Hodder and Stoughton, 1989, pp. 206-223
- Moos M., Government Youth Training Policy and its Impact of Further Education, Stencilled Occasional Paper no 57,, Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, University of Birmingham 1977
- Morphet E., Johns R., Reller T., Educational Organisation and Administration, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1982
- Morris, B., "Ernest Thomas Seton and the Origins of the Woodcraft Movement," Journal of Contemporary History, vol 5, no.2, 1970, pp.183-194
- Mosse G.L., Nazi Culture, London: W.H.Allen, 1966
- Musgrove F., Youth and the Social Order, London: RKP., 1964
- Nasaw D. Schooled to Order, New York: Oxford University Press, 1979
- National Advisory Council for Industry and Commerce, Technicians Courses and Examinations, London: HMSO, 1969
- National Commission on the Reform of Secondary Education, The Reform of Secondary Education, New York, Charles F Kettering Foundation, 1973
- National Commission on Youth, The Transition of Youth to Adulthood, New York: Charles F Kettering Foundation, 1980
- National Education Association, Educational Policies Commission, "Education For All American Youth", in Bremner R.H., Children and Youth in America, vol.3, parts 5-7 Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1974 pp. 1661-1663
- National Commission on Excellence in Education, A Nation at Risk, The Imperative for Educational Reform, Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1983
- National Commission on Secondary Vocational Education, The Unfinished Agenda: The Role of Vocational Education in the High School, sponsor The National Centre for Research in Vocational Education, The Ohio State University, Funded by US Department of Education, Office of Vocational And Adult Education, Colombus Ohio: 1984
- Nichols T., Capital and Labour, London: Fontana, 1980
- O'Dell F., Socialisation Through Children's Literature, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978
- O'Keefe D.J. "Market Capitalism and Nationalised Schooling," Educational Analysis vol 3, no. 1981 pp.23-37

- Parkin F., "Adolescent Status and Student Politics," Journal of Contemporary History, vol. 15, no. 1, 1970, pp.144-155
- Pateman C., Participation in Democratic Theory, London: Cambridge University Press, 1976
- Pechman J.A., Setting National Priorities, Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institute, 1983
- Perkinson H.J., The Imperfect Panacea, New York: Random House, 1968
- Pinchbeck I. Hewitt M., Children in English Society, vol 2, London : RKP., 1973.
- Plant R., Lessor H., Taylor-Gooby P., Political Philosophy and Social Welfare, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1980
- Presseisen B.Z., (ed.) Unlearned Lessons, Lewes, Falmer Press, 1985
- Raggat P., Unwin L., (eds.) Change and Intervention, London: Falmer Press, 1991
- Ranson S. Taylor B. Brighouse T., (eds.) The Revolution in Education and Training, Harlow: Longman, 1986
- Reagan M. D. Sanzone J.G., The New Federalism, London: Oxford University Press, 1981
- Ravitch D., The Troubled Crusade, New York: Basic Books, 1983
- Reagan M.D. Sanzone J.G., The New Federalism, London: Oxford University Press, 1981
- Reeder D., "A Recurring Debate: Education and Industry," in Dale R., Esland G., Ferguson R., McDonald M., (eds.), Education and the State, Barcombe, Falmer Press, 1981 pp. 177-205
- Rees G. Rees T.L., Youth Unemployment and State Intervention, London: RKP, 1982.
- Reid W., Filby J., The Sixth an Essay in Education and Democracy, Lewes: Falmer Press, 1982
- Report of the Consultative Committee of the Board of Education, The Education of the Adolescent, HMSO, 1926 (Hadow)
- Report of the Consultative Committee of the Board of Education on Secondary Education with Special Reference to Grammar Schools and Technical High Schools, London: HMSO 1943
- Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education, Early Leaving, London: HMSO., 1954
- Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education (Wales) on Technical Education in Wales, London: HMSO, 1961
- Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education, (England) Half our Future, London, HMSO, 1963

- Report of a Commission Appointed by the Prime Minister, Higher Education, London; HMSO, 1963
- Report of the Departmental Committee on the Youth Service in England and Wales, London: HMSO, 1963
- Report of a Special Task Forces to the Secretary of Health Education and Welfare, Work in America, Cambridge Massachusetts: MIT Printing, 1973
- Report of the Panel on Youth to the Presidents Science Advisory Committee, Youth Transition to Adulthood, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974
- Report of the Twentieth Century Task Force on Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Policy, Making the Grade, New York: The Twentieth Century Fund, 1983
- Resler H. Westergaard J., Class in a Capitalist Society, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971
- Richmond W.K., Education in Britain, London: Methuen, 1978
- Reid W., Filby J., The Sixth, Falmer: Falmer Press, 1986
- Riesman D., The Lonely Crowd, London: Free Press, 1967
- Roberts K., School Leavers and their Prospects, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984
- Room G., The Sociology of Welfare, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1979
- Rudolph F., Curriculum, New York: Josey Bass, 1978
- Salaman G., Work Organisations Resistance and Control, London: Longman, 1979
- Salaman G. and Thompson K., Control and Ideology in Organisations, London: Oxford University Press, 1980
- Salter B., Tapper T., Education, Politics and the State, London: Grant McIntyre 1981
- Schelsky H. "Technical Change and Educational Consequences," in Halsey A., et al. (eds.), Education, Economy and Society, Toronto: Free Press of Glencoe, 1961, pp. 31-37
- Schonfield A., Modern Capitalism, London: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- Schultz T.W., "Investment in Education" in Halsey A. et. al., (eds.), Education Economy and Society, London, Collier Macmillan, 1961, pp.50-55
- Schumpeter J., "Capitalism, Socialism, Democracy", in Pateman C., Participation and Democratic Theory, London: Cambridge University Press, 1976, pp.1-6
- Shea C., The New Servants of Power, Westport: Greenwood Press, 1989

- Shipman M.D., Childhood, Slough: NFER, 1972
- Shirer W.L., The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich, London: Secker and Warburg, 1960.
- Shor I., Culture Wars, London: RKP, 1986
- Silberman C., Crisis in the Classroom, New York: Vintage Books, 1970
- Simon B., and Taylor I., Education in the Eighties, London: Batsford, 1981.
- Simon B., Bending the Rules, London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1988
- Sizer T.R., Horace's Compromise, The Dilemma of the American High School, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1984
- Smell J.L., Hitler's Dictatorship and the German Nation, Lexington, Massachusetts: Heath & Co., 1973.
- Snider R.C., "The Rhetoric and Reality of Reagan's School Reform", Secondary Education Journal Vol. 16, No.2, Sept. 1986, pp. 3-4
- Spring J. Karrier C.J. Violas P.C., (eds.), The Roots of the Crisis, Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Corporation, 1973
- Spring J. Gumbert E., The Superschool and the Superstate, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1974
- Spring J., Educating the Worker Citizen, London: Longman, 1980.
- Spring J., American Education, 2nd edit, New York: Longman, 1982
- Spring J., "Political and Economic Analysis", in Altbach P. Excellence in Education, (ed.), Buffalo, New York: Prometheus Books, 1985
- Springhall J. Youth Empire and Society, London: Croom Helm, 1970
- Steven F., The Living Tradition, London: Hutchinson, 1960
- Tapper T., Young People and Society, London: Faber and Faber, 1971
- Task Force on Education and Employment, (Chair: C Kerr) Education for Employment: Knowledge for Action, National Academy of Education, Washington: Acropolis Books, 1979
- Taylor B. Brighouse T. Ranson S., (eds.), The Revolution in Education and Training, Harlow: Longman, 1986
- Taylor Gooby P. and Dale J., Social Theory and Social Welfare, London: Arnold, 1981
- Taylor Gooby P. Plant R. Lessor H., Political Philosophy and Social Welfare, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1980
- Taylor W., The Secondary Modern School, London: Faber and Faber, 1963

- Thompson E., Work Employment and Unemployment, Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1984
- Thompson J.F., Foundations of Vocational Education, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey : Prentice Hall, 1973
- Times Educational Supplement, (no 3202,22,) "Speech of the Prime Minister at Ruskin college, Oxford," 18th October 1976, pp.1-3
- Turner R., "Modes of Ascent Through Education," in Halsey et al. (eds.), pp. 121-140
- Tyack D. Lowe R. Hansot E. Public Schools in Hard Times, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1984
- Tyack D., The One Best System, Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1974
- University of Exeter School of Education, (edit Golby M.) Ruskin Plus Ten, Perspectives 26, 1986
- University of Exeter, Perspectives on the National Curriculum, Exeter: School of Education, 1987
- Urry J., The Anatomy of Capitalist Societies London: Macmillan 1981
- Venn G., Man, Education and Work, Washington: American Council of Education, 1964
- Violas P.C. Spring J. Karrier C.J., The Roots of the Crisis, Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Corporation, 1973
- Violas P., The Training of the Urban Working Class, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1978
- Vitteretti J.P., Across the River, New York: Holmes Meir, 1983
- Wallace C., Cross M., Youth in Transition, Basingstoke: Falmer Press, 1990
- Watts A.G., "School Youth and Work", Educational Analysis vol.3, no.2, 1981 pp.1-7
- Watts A.G., Education Unemployment and the Future of Work, Milton Keynes: Open University, 1983
- Weiner M.J., English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit, Cambridge and London, Cambridge University Press, 1981
- Weitzel J., American Youth, a Statistical Snapshot, Washington: The William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Work Family and Citizenship, June 1987
- Westergaard J., Resler H., Class in a Capitalist Society, Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1976
- White J., "Two National Curricula", British Journal of Educational Studies, vol. xxxvi, no 3, October 89, pp. 218-231

- White P. "Political Education and School Organisation", in Simon B., Bending the Rules, London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1988
- Whitty G., Sociology and School Knowledge, London: Methuen, 1985
- Wilensky H.L., The New Corporatism, Centralization and the Welfare State, Sage Professional Papers in Contemporary Political Sociology, London: Sage Publications Ltd., 1976
- Wilensky H.L., The Welfare State and Equality, Berkley, USA: University of California Press, 1975
- Wilkinson P., "English Youth Movements 1908-1930" Journal of Contemporary History vol 4, no 2, 1969, pp. 3-23
- Williams M.F., Government in the Classroom, New York: Praeger, 1979
- Wilms W., "The Nonsystem of Education and Training," in Doeringer P.B. Vermeulen B. Jobs and Training in the 1980's, Boston: Martinus Nijhoff, 1981, pp. 19-50
- Wolpe A.M., Feminism, Materialism, Women and the Modes of Production, London: RKP, 1978
- Wolpe A.M., Donald J., Is There Anyone here from Education?, London: Pluto Press, 1983
- Wood S., The Degradation of Work, London: Hutchinson, 1982
- Wray M.J. et al, (eds.) Unified Vocational Preparation, Slough: NFER, 1980
- Young B. Levidow L., Science Technology and the Labour Process, vol 2, London: Free Association Books, 1985