

A Content-Theoretical Model of Educational  
Change: the case of the new vocationalism

Peter John Hodgkinson

*Submitted to the Institute of Education,  
University of London, for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy.*

1990



## ABSTRACT

This thesis is concerned with theorising educational change. This involves the identification of a distinct theoretical object; the conceptualisation of a dynamic of educational change and the delimitation of the fundamental units of analysis. Together, these provide the basis for the development in Part One of the thesis of a content-theoretical model.

Working within a Marxist Reproduction problematic, power and domination are theorised in terms of Social Forms - wage, state and civil-forms - which are the product of the social relations of production within the Capitalist Mode of Production. The education system is taken to be the most public and formal site of their reproduction. Since social forms are a feature of the social structure, including the education system, a 'translation effect' can be identified between different levels of analysis. This approach therefore entails recognition of the fact that reproduction is contested and has a political aspect. The object of analysis has been to reveal this political aspect by delineating the relationship between the economic and the political (the wage and state-forms), thereby demonstrating how 'the political' makes possible the reproductive role of the education system.

In Part Two of the thesis, this content-theoretical model is employed in an analysis of the introduction of the 'new vocationalism' into Further Education. Focussing upon the FE teachers' trade union organisation NATFHE, this analysis reveals that, faced with the introduction of the new vocationalism in the shape of the Youth Training Scheme, a 'strategy of opportunism' has been the dominant logic informing their collective action. Such a strategy is shown to contribute to the proletarianisation of FE teachers, thereby rendering their opposition to the new vocationalism ineffective.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

*There are no words which can begin to express or measure the support - intellectual, emotional and physical - I have received from Ann Lahiff whilst working on this thesis. There is no doubt in my mind that, without her love, the work would never have come to fruition. Ann's strength, patience and understanding have been my inspiration and to her I owe everything.*

*I would also like to thank my supervisor Tony Green for all his help and advice. Given the nature of this particular student, I sometimes thought he had the more difficult task. I would also like to thank all those research students and staff in the Sociology Department who, over the years, have rekindled my fundamental faith in the 'collective' whilst engaged in this most individual of all enterprises. In particular, I would like to thank Anna. Finally, a special thanks to Barry Liddle - a friend indeed - and everyone else who has helped me along the way.*

*This thesis is dedicated to the memory of Michael Lahiff.*

## Contents

| <i>Section</i>              | <i>Page</i> |
|-----------------------------|-------------|
| Title Page                  | ...1        |
| Abstract                    | ...2        |
| Acknowledgements            | ...3        |
| Contents                    | ...4        |
| Abbreviations Used          | ...8        |
| <u>General Introduction</u> | ...10       |

### PART ONE

#### Chapter One - *The Sociology of Education & the Theorisation of Educational Change*

|        |  |       |
|--------|--|-------|
| 1.i    | Introduction                               | ...25 |
| 1.ii   | The Political-Arithmetic Tradition         | ...26 |
| 1.iii  | The New Sociology of Education             | ...31 |
| 1.iv   | Reproduction Theories                      | ...35 |
| 1.v    | Bowles & Gintis                            | ...36 |
| 1.vi   | Centre for Conetmporary Cultural Studies   | ...39 |
| 1.vii  | Michael Apple                              | ...44 |
| 1.viii | A Critique of the Correspondence Principle | ...48 |
| 1.ix   | Bourdieu & Bernstein                       | ...51 |
| 1.x    | Summary                                    | ...60 |

#### Chapter Two - *Political Models of Educational Change*

|       |                 |       |
|-------|-----------------|-------|
| 2.i   | Introduction    | ...63 |
| 2.ii  | M.S. Archer     | ...64 |
| 2.iii | Salter & Tapper | ...71 |
| 2.iv  | Gintis & Bowles | ...81 |
| 2.v   | Summary         | ...88 |

### Chapter Three - Class Analysis and the Specificity of the Political

|       |                                  |       |
|-------|----------------------------------|-------|
| 3.i   | Introduction                     | ...91 |
| 3.ii  | Marxist Class Analysis           | ...93 |
| 3.iii | The Specificity of the Political | ...97 |
| 3.iv  | Social Form Theory               | ...99 |
| 3.v   | The Social Formation             | ..105 |
| 3.vi  | Summary                          | ..114 |

### Chapter Four - The Class Location of Teachers

|       |  |       |
|-------|--|-------|
| 4.i   | Harris   | ..119 |
| 4.ii  | The Labour Process of Teachers                                     | ..122 |
| 4.iii | Teachers and Proletarianisation                                    | ..130 |
| 4.iv  | The FE Teacher   | ..132 |
| 4.v   | The Political & Ideological Aspects of<br>Teachers' Class Position | ..135 |
| 4.vi  | The Logic of Teachers' Collective Action                           | ..136 |
| 4.vii | Summary  | ..147 |

### Chapter Five - A Content-Theoretical Model of Educational Change

|        |  |       |
|--------|--|-------|
| 5.i    | Introduction   | ..150 |
| 5.ii   | A Content-Theoretical Model  | ..150 |
| 5.iii  | How is the ES delimited within this model  | ..156 |
| 5.iv   | How can educational change be defined  | ..159 |
| 5.v    | How autonomous are educational processes<br>vis-a-vis non-educational processes in<br>shaping educational change | ..161 |
| 5.vi   | How autonomous are political processes<br>vis-a-vis socio-economic processes<br>in shaping educational change    | ..162 |
| 5.vii  | Political projects   | ..173 |
| 5.viii | Summary  | ..175 |

## PART TWO

### Chapter Six - *Vocationalism Old and New*

|        |   |       |
|--------|---|-------|
| 6.i    | Introduction                                      | ..180 |
| 6.ii   | Strategies, Phases and Discourses                 | ..180 |
| 6.iii  | Vocational Preparation                            | ..181 |
| 6.iv   | The MSC 1973-78                                   | ..187 |
| 6.v    | The Sociology of the New Vocationalism            | ..192 |
| 6.vi   | Structural Approaches                             | ..193 |
| 6.vii  | Culturalist Approaches                            | ..203 |
| 6.viii | The Policy Studies Approach                       | ..209 |
| 6.ix   | Summary of the Sociology of the New Vocationalism | ..213 |
| 6.x    | The New Vocationalism                             | ..216 |

### Chapter Seven - *Vocational Preparation as a Strategy of Reproduction*

|       |                                    |       |
|-------|------------------------------------|-------|
| 7.i   | The MSC and Vocational Preparation | ..219 |
| 7.ii  | Central-Local Government relations | ..225 |
| 7.iii | The Holland Report (1977)          | ..229 |
| 7.iv  | NATFHE & Vocational Preparation    | ..232 |
| 7.v   | The Debate Within NATFHE           | ..243 |

### Chapter Eight - *The Youth Opportunities Programme*

|       |                                       |       |
|-------|---------------------------------------|-------|
| 8.i   | The Provision                         | ..251 |
| 8.ii  | A Basis For Choice                    | ..253 |
| 8.iii | The NATFHE Leadership                 | ..261 |
| 8.iv  | YOP in Practice                       | ..264 |
| 8.v   | Conclusions on Vocational Preparation | ..267 |

## Chapter Nine - *The New Vocationalism as a Strategy of Reproduction*

|       |                                    |       |
|-------|------------------------------------|-------|
| 9.i   | Introduction                       | ..272 |
| 9.ii  | The Youth Training Scheme          | ..273 |
| 9.iii | NATFHE and the NTI                 | ..282 |
| 9.iv  | The Youth Task Group Report        | ..284 |
| 9.v   | YTS and the Institutional Ensemble | ..287 |
| 9.vi  | Political Representation           | ..295 |
| 9.vii | Summary                            | ..296 |

## Chapter Ten - *The Youth Training Scheme*

|        |                                       |       |
|--------|---------------------------------------|-------|
| 10.i   | Introduction                          | ..299 |
| 10.ii  | YTS in Practice                       | ..299 |
| 10.iii | YTS & the FE Teachers' Labour Process | ..310 |
| 10.iv  | The Divisions within NATFHE over YTS  | ..316 |
| 10.v   | NATFHE Policy on YTS                  | ..320 |
| 10.vi  | Training For Jobs                     | ..324 |
| 10.vii | Summary                               | ..328 |

|                    |       |
|--------------------|-------|
| <u>Conclusions</u> | ..335 |
|--------------------|-------|

### Appendix 1

|  |       |
|--|-------|
| <i>From Urban Studies to the New Urban Sociology</i> | ..361 |
|--|-------|

### Appendix 2

|  |       |
|--|-------|
| <i>A History of Non-Advanced Further Education</i> | ..371 |
|--|-------|

### Appendix 3

|   |       |
|---|-------|
| <i>The National Association of Teachers in Further<br/>&amp; Higher Education</i> | ..380 |
|---|-------|

|                     |       |
|---------------------|-------|
| <u>Bibliography</u> | ..384 |
|---------------------|-------|

(Notes and References appear at the end of each chapter)

## ABBREVIATIONS USED

|          |   |
|----------|---|
| ACC      | Association of County Councils                    |
| ADC      | Association of District Councils                  |
| AFE      | Advanced Further Education                        |
| AMA      | Association of Metropolitan Authorities           |
| AMB      | Area Manpower Board                               |
| ATTI     | Association of Teachers in Technical Institutions |
| BTEC     | Business and Technician Education Council         |
| CBI      | Confederation of British Industry                 |
| CCCS     | Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies          |
| CMP      | Capitalist Mode of Production                     |
| DES      | Department of Education and Science               |
| DoE      | Department of Employment                          |
| DST      | Dual State Thesis                                 |
| ECY      | Extended College Year                             |
| ES       | Education System                                  |
| ESD      | Employment Services Agency                        |
| FE       | Further Education                                 |
| FEMIS    | Further Education Management Information System   |
| FESC     | Further Education Staff College                   |
| FEU      | Further Education Unit                            |
| GLC      | Greater London Council                            |
| GLTB     | Greater London Training Board                     |
| GOVT:APA | A Programme for Action (NTI White Paper)          |
| HMI      | Her Majesty's Inspectorate                        |
| ILEA     | Inner London Education Authority                  |
| IMF      | International Monetary Fund                       |
| IMS      | Institute of Manpower Studies                     |
| INSET    | In-Service Training                               |
| ISA      | Ideological State Apparatus                       |
| ITB      | Industrial Training Board                         |
| LEA      | Local Education Authority                         |
| MA       | Managing Agent                                    |
| MSC      | Manpower Services Commission                      |
| MSC:AA   | Agenda for Action (NTI document)                  |

|        |  |
|--------|--|
| NAFE   | Non-Advanced Further Education                                   |
| NATFHE | National Association of Teachers in Further and Higher Education |
| NEC    | National Executive Committee                                     |
| NFER   | National Foundation for Educational Research                     |
| NJ     | Natfhe Journal   |
| NPB    | New Petty Bourgeoisie  |
| NSE    | New Sociology of Education                                       |
| NSTO   | Non-Statutory Training Organisation                              |
| NTI    | New Training Initiative  |
| OTF    | Occupational Training Family                                     |
| OTJ    | Off The Job (training)   |
| PMC    | Professional-Managerial Class                                    |
| RETA   | Review of Education and Training Act                             |
| ROSLA  | Raising Of the School Leaving Age                                |
| RSG    | Rate Support Grant   |
| SLS    | Social and Life Skills   |
| SNV    | Sociology of the New Vocationalism                               |
| TFECG  | Training and Further Education Consultative Group                |
| TOPS   | Training Opportunities Scheme                                    |
| TPB    | Traditional Petty Bourgeoisie                                    |
| TSA    | Training Services Agency   |
| TUC    | Trades Union Congress  |
| TVEI   | Technical and Vocational Education Initiative                    |
| WEEP   | Work Experience on Employers Premises                            |
| WRNAFE | Work-Related Non-Advanced Further Education                      |
| YOP    | Youth Opportunities Programme                                    |
| YTG    | Youth Task Group   |
| YTS    | Youth Training Scheme  |

### *General Introduction*

This thesis is concerned with educational change. In recent years the education system in Britain has been subject to a number of radical changes in terms of both form and content. Indeed, educational change has become one of the most controversial and bitterly fought over items on the political agenda. Yet, the Sociology of Education can be said to have hardly featured in this controversy. As a result, it might be argued, we have witnessed a side-lining of Sociologists, a marginalisation, which has fuelled the chorus of those who believe that the discipline is becoming increasingly 'irrelevant' (and not all these critics are from the traditional political Right).

A major by-product of the present period has also been the revelation that there is a major absence in the repertoire of the Sociology of Education: an almost total neglect of theorising educational change (Salter and Tapper 1981). That is, Sociologists of Education are accused of having consistently failed to conceptualise both the nature of educational change and its relationship to wider economic, political and ideological transformation. No doubt many within the sub-discipline will find it difficult to acknowledge, let alone accept, this charge. After all, Sociologists have for many years been struggling to comprehend all manner of changes in terms of school organisation, curriculum, teacher training etc. However, when we begin to look closely at *how* educational change has been understood, rather than the descriptions of specific instances and their effects, we find that there is an almost total absence of theorisation. So, why is it that the theorisation of educational change within the Sociology of Education has become such a rarity? Before answering this question, it is necessary to briefly outline what exactly is meant here by the term 'the theorisation educational change'.

Firstly, the theorisation of educational change must be seen to involve the identification of a distinct theoretical object of analysis. Therefore it entails the delimitation or definition of what is meant by the term 'educational' change. Secondly, in order to theorise one must be able to identify, on the basis of a particular delimitation, the fundamental units of analysis involved in educational change. Thirdly, the theorisation of change must also involve an attempt to establish the degree of autonomy of educational processes vis-a-

vis non-educational processes (social, economic and political) in shaping educational change. That is, it must involve the identification of an underlying dynamic of change. Taking these as minimal criteria of what it means to 'theorise' educational change, one would have to agree with Salter and Tapper that, within the Sociology of Education, there are 'no systematic theories of educational change already in existence' (p.3). These authors have also suggested why this is the case.

Salter and Tapper identify two factors which they see as having prevented a 'thoroughgoing' theory of educational change developing within the Sociology of Education. These factors are (i) the division of academic labour and (ii) the degree of political commitment to social transformation found amongst Sociologists themselves. With regard to the first, they argue that professional self-interest and 'territorial jealousies' have acted to inhibit eclecticism, which they see as necessary for the development of a theory of educational change. With regard to the second, political commitment to social transformation, Salter and Tapper are far more strident in their view. They argue that those Sociologists who hold such a commitment:

*"...take the political means to these ends [social and educational transformation] to be self-evident...and structure their theories accordingly. Naturally this rather cramps their theoretical style, not to mention their capacity for theoretical development, because the focus of the theory is logically subordinated to the political ends and means preferred. Since these are, mostly, immutable, so is the theory." (1)*

Hargreaves (1982) has made much the same point, although, unlike Salter and Tapper's generalisation, he restricts his criticisms to Marxist accounts within the Sociology of Education.

As an explanation for the lack of a comprehensive theory of educational change, Salter and Tapper's view can be seen as having only a partial validity. That is, the two factors which they identify must be seen as a necessary but not sufficient condition for the situation. The reason we cannot accept their explanation as sufficient is due to the fact that they fail to fully explore the

range of possible effects these two factors may have had on the development of the sub-discipline. That is, instead of the rather simplistic equation -

division of academic labour + political commitment = lack of theory of educational change

- a far more substantive explanation needs to be given. Each of the major perspectives within the Sociology of Education - the Political-Arithmetic tradition, the 'New' Sociology of Education and the political-economy of education or Reproduction problematic - can be shown to have had a specific combination of these division of academic labour and political commitment effects. Therefore it is necessary to explicate these effects, in each of the major perspectives in turn, if we are to arrive at an adequate explanation of the absence of a theory of change. Such an explication is attempted in Chapter One.

The examination of the major perspectives undertaken in Chapter One reveals that there has been, and still is, an internal/external dichotomy at work within the Sociology of Education wherein change is seen as determined *either* wholly from within or wholly from without the education system itself. This dichotomy can be shown to be a legacy of the Sociology of Education's own theoretical development, which has acted to inhibit the specification of a mediating site between external and internal pressures for change. That site is what I shall refer to throughout as the 'political' ie. that dimension which concerns the origin, nature and distribution of power and domination. This absence of such a political dimension within the Sociology of Education has also been identified by Salter and Tapper (1981), Dale (1982) and Apple (1986).

Within the Sociology of Education, the articulation of academic division of labour and political commitment effects can be shown to correspond to a division between what will be termed '*intrinsic*' and '*extrinsic*' types of political analysis. An intrinsic political analysis is an analysis of the role of the 'political' *in* educational change. Whereas an extrinsic political analysis is an analyses *of* educational change which is simply informed by a political perspective. Thus the latter may exclude altogether an analysis of how change is determined politically. It will be argued that, until very recently, the intrinsic

political theorisation of educational change has been neglected within the Sociology of Education. Furthermore, political commitment has increasingly been substituted for any critical examination of the role of the 'political' in educational change.

Chapter One indicates that Sociologists of Education working within the political-arithmetic tradition often 'imported' their research projects, already defined by others, into the field and, as such, rarely questioned their origins or historical development. Thus, the question of change was taken for granted and was seldom seen as 'political'. On the other hand, there have been Sociologists - mostly working within what was the 'New' Sociology of Education - who took the view that educational change is something which can be understood as just that, 'educational'. Everything which goes on within education has its own particular history and dynamic and it was considered the task of the Sociologist to get 'inside' and uncover the inner secrets (preferably through ethnographic approaches) of how the system works. In order to do this one had to look no further than *'the school'*. The school was and, in some cases still is, taken to be a microcosm of the system at large. Finally, and just as limiting to any comprehensive theory of educational change, has been the Reproduction problematic within which 'external' agencies are often taken to 'determine' change. As such, these agencies have been considered outside the parameters of the sub-discipline. For example, changes in the economy are often cited by some Marxists as being 'behind' recent educational change.

It is interesting to note that many of the authors who have recently attempted to introduce a more intrinsic political analysis of educational change have come from outside the Sociology of Education. They have, in fact, been political scientists and/or political economists ( Salter and Tapper, Gintis and Bowles). In Chapter Two their attempts, along with the work of Archer, are shown to be flawed as a result of the 'liberal' conceptions of the political which they employ. Briefly, in the case of both Archer and Salter and Tapper, this involves 'politics' being reduced to an institutionalised form which is then left unrelated to social relations in general. Thus, their conceptions centre on the role of the state and its apparatuses in terms of policy-making and implementation. In particular, Salter and Tapper focus upon the recent history

of the Department of Education and Science. In contrast, Gintis and Bowles stress the role of the 'political' by highlighting its contradictory relation to the 'economic' under modern capitalism. This conception, which gives a prominent role to 'liberal discourse', entails a separation of the economic and political. Whilst this will be shown to mark a distinct advance over the conceptions of Archer and Salter and Tapper, Gintis and Bowles fail to establish the function of this separation. Thus, in all three models examined in Chapter Two, the origins of power and domination are left unexplicated and, as such, it is only their phenomenal forms - policies and educational outcomes - which are examined and taken as evidence of educational change. These models are therefore shown to lead to a very partial understanding of the role of the political in educational change. What is needed is a far more critical approach to the political, one which takes into account the nature of the relationship between power and domination and social relations in general. This, it is argued, can be achieved by developing an explicitly Marxist account of educational change. This thesis is therefore principally concerned to develop such an account.

A Marxist view of educational change is one which entails a particular recognition of historical development and class struggle. It will therefore have both a structural and dynamic character. As such, the education system is seen as a historical product which is related to a specific social formation, and, in particular, its social relations of production. Central to this conception is the 'reproduction' problematic. That is, the education system is seen as critically involved in the reproduction of the relations of production in so far as its principal function is the reproduction of labour capacities. Since reproduction is seen as being undertaken in the interests of a particular social class, this process produces conflict and a potential for class struggle. Therefore, within this perspective, it is in the nature and outcome of these struggles that educational change is to be explained. However, a major difficulty with this approach lies in the central concept of social class. In particular, it is the relationship between the class formation and class struggle - what are often seen as the economic and the political aspects of class - which is the subject of intense debate, both within and outside of Marxism (Hindess 1987). This difficulty, which concerns the relationship between the

'specificity of the political' and class analysis, is the subject of Chapter Three.

In Chapter Three class relations are shown to be derived from the mode of exploitation found in capitalist productive relations. This gives rise to the value form, a specifically capitalist form of association which involves the unique 'separation-in-unity' of the economic and political spheres. Utilising 'Social Form Theory' (Williams 1988), this separation can be shown to be a necessary yet contradictory condition which is specific to capitalism. In the realm of civil society the capital-labour relation is transmuted into a contractual relation between 'competition subjects' - employer and employee. Thus the incongruity of income sources between employer and employee is transmuted into an abstract equality. This constitutes the 'wage-form' of the capital-labour relation. Similarly, within the capitalist state, economic and social differences found in civil society are transmuted into formally equal legal and political relations, which find their clearest expression in the concept of 'citizenship'. This constitutes the 'state-form' of the capital-labour relation. Finally, in the 'private sphere' within capitalist society - the sphere of family and personal relations - what will be termed the 'civil form' of bourgeois domination is exercised. Urry (1981) has similarly identified three spheres of social relations within capitalist society - capitalist production, state authority and civil society. This delimitation corresponds with the forms of domination - wage and state forms - plus the core relations of family and gender found mainly in the private sphere. Overall, therefore, three forms of political domination can be conceptualised - the wage, state and civil forms. A major role for the state is to maintain a '*separation in unity*' of the economic and political realms and their corresponding forms of domination. This it attempts to accomplish through its policies and provision, especially in relation to the reproduction of labour capacities within the education system.

Chapter Three also discusses the social formation and the class location of the 'new' middle class in particular. Identifying their 'economic' role and/or function is shown to be an inadequate way of conceptualising their class location. Instead, on the basis of the value form, they can be located in the 'employee' class - the proletariat - on account of their exploitation by employers. However, differences (from those of the traditionally conceived

working class ) in their political mobilisation still need to be explained. This is achieved by viewing status differentials which arise from resistance to employers (Barbalet 1986. Meiksins 1986). That is, the new middle class are taken to possess certain 'rights' which are constructed in the course of their resistance. This places them in a different relation to their employer compared with workers who do not possess these rights. Rights are also seen to be conferred by the dominant class where it is in their strategic interests to do so.

The above examination of the new middle class is undertaken in order to bring the class location of teachers, seen as key political actors in the education system, into focus. Teachers will be shown to be part of the new middle class. They are seen as exploited in their relations of 'production' and subject to proletarianisation. That is, their industrial rights can be withdrawn, especially through changes in their labour process, with the result that their status differentials are undermined. It is suggested in Chapter Four that this process of proletarianisation can be linked to changes in the relationship between the wage and state-forms of bourgeois domination and is reflected in the teachers' modes of organisation - their collective political mobilisation - which, historically, have been 'professionalism' and/or 'trade unionism'. Changes in their status differentials, changes in the state-form, will therefore be shown to result in moves away from professionalism towards trade unionism and struggles over the wage form. These struggles can therefore be conceptualised and linked to the actual content of educational change, policy and provision.

In order to explicate this Marxist conception of educational change, a 'content-theoretical' model is developed in Chapter Five. The 'content' component of the model involves the specification of the 'educational' aspect of educational change. That is, the theoretical object of investigation - educational change - is delimited by first defining what is meant by 'education'. This is deemed to be necessary in order to avoid the adoption of a normative conception of education, one which would logically circumscribe what may constitute educational change by limiting both the scope and the level of analysis. Such limitations are shown to be the case with pluralist models discussed in Chapter Two. In this analysis, 'education' is taken to be the combination of three *moments* in the process of reproducing labour capacities

within the education system ( hereafter ES) - training, socialisation and selection (2).

Whilst it is true to say that educational change, as a phenomenon relating to the ES a whole, will be unobservable in its entirety ie. it must in one sense remain an abstraction, it does nevertheless need to be grounded by reference to some specific material objects and processes. In pluralist conceptions this is achieved by reference to particular institutional matrices. However, as shown in Chapter Two, these institutional approaches are devoid of anything which is specifically 'educational' ie. the content and nature of the processes involved in training, socialisation and selection. As a result, the educational component of educational change is left unidentified. Furthermore, these pluralist accounts exclude any concern for the relationship between 'education' and the social structure due to their methodological individualism ie. change is often seen as simply the aggregation of individual actions and there is no attempt to relate these actions to the system of social relations in general. Therefore, a model of change is required which identifies the educational content of educational change and how this content is conditioned by social relations.

The 'theoretical' aspect of the model involves the recognition of the distinction between the transitive nature of the model itself and the intransitive object of the analysis ie. the real entity, its relations and effects - in this case, educational change. It is therefore recognised here that our conceptions of the world are not independent of these social relations and structures. Indeed, our conceptions help to constitute them. In this way, education and educational change must also be considered as 'concept-dependent', theoretical phenomena. Therefore the content-theoretical model of educational change which is developed in Part One of the thesis is meant to generate hypotheses about recent changes, not, as in pluralist models, represent 'reality' as such.

In Chapter Five, such a content-theoretical model is developed by utilising Social Form Theory. Educational change is theorised in terms of contradictions between the 'education' and 'training' functions of the ES, as mediated by its 'selection' function. These contradictions are seen as structurally determined

within the process of reproducing labour capacities within the ES. The process of reproduction is seen as having three *moments*, which are identified as its 'production', 'consumption' and 'exchange' moments which correspond to the 'education', 'training' and 'selection' functions of the ES. Each moment is taken to be articulated with the other moments so as to reproduce the three forms of political domination found in capitalist social relations. In this way 'training', which is taken to involve the inculcation of 'skills', contributes to the reproduction of the 'wage-form'. 'Education', seen in terms of socialisation into the dominant ideology, helps reproduce the 'state-form'. Whilst 'selection', via processes of differential certification, is seen as mediating both the wage and state-forms, as well as contributing to the legitimisation of a 'civil-form' (including gender and ethnic relations) of political domination. Thus, within the ES there is 'structural selectivity' with respect to the forms of domination ie. the differentiation of the forms of domination is structured in accordance with the social formation as a whole.

Educational change is therefore being conceptualised within this model as 'form-determined'. That is to say, the structural determination of educational change is delimited by contradictions between the 'education', 'training' and 'selection' moments of the process of reproducing labour capacities. Yet these are, in turn, seen as overdetermined by political class struggles. Therefore the term 'form-determined' is being used here to denote a conception of change which is both structural and dynamic ie. determined and the outcome of political struggle. Attempts by the state to articulate the different forms of political domination involved in the reproduction of labour capacities can be seen to constitute a '*strategy of reproduction*'. The implementation of such strategies provides the dynamic for educational change. Within this model such strategies of reproduction are shown to be manifest in three 'aspects' of the ES : in the institutional ensemble of the state and the government of the system; in the content of policy and provision (the curriculum); and in the political mobilisation of teachers. In each of these aspects the contradictory nature of the relations between social forms is evidenced. For example, within the institutional ensemble of the state, it is manifested in the functions of the central and Local states with regard to government and expenditure on education; at the level of educational policy and provision, it is evident in attempts to vocationalise the curriculum; and in terms of the political

mobilisation of teachers, it is manifested in the 'logics of their collective action'. Educational change can therefore be theorised and examined in terms of the relation between the forms of domination found within and between these three aspects of the ES.

A major theme in this thesis is that the contradiction between the wage and state-forms of domination found within the modern capitalist social formation finds its clearest expression in the relationship between social class inequality and the notion of 'citizenship'. Thus:

*" The dynamic feature of capitalism is precisely the contradiction between politics and economics as fought out in the sphere of social citizenship." (3)*

Following Marshall (1950), the concept of citizenship is seen to involve the existence of social rights and social welfare provision, state education being an important example. It is therefore argued that changes in the nature of citizenship will affect educational provision. For example, certain changes in educational provision, especially the extension of provision to hitherto neglected groups, may be seen as indicative of changes in the nature of the social rights of citizenship. Indeed, this can be seen as a form of educational 'enfranchisement'. Such provision may, in turn, profoundly affect the relationship between social class and citizenship, not least in terms of 'politicising' the state's management of collective consumption. Indeed, the whole nature of the government of provision may change, particularly the role of the Local state. Changes in the institutional ensemble of the state can, in turn, be shown to affect the relationship between citizenship and professionalism. This obviously has a direct bearing on the collective organisation of state employees such as teachers. Thus the concept of professionalism can be related to the state formation itself (Johnson 1982). As such, all three aspects identified in this model of educational change - the institutional ensemble of the state, the nature of the policy and provision and the logic of teachers' collective action - are encompassed by this wider debate concerning the relationship between class and citizenship. Using this content-theoretical model, this relationship can therefore be used as an explanatory principle - a basic organising strategy - with respect to an examination of recent educational change.

In Part Two of the thesis an attempt is made to apply this content-theoretical model to the introduction of the 'new vocationalism' into Further Education (FE). One of the reasons for choosing this topic lies in the fact that the focus of much political and professional attention has been on the FE sector - it might even be said that FE has borne the brunt of the recent changes in education - and yet this is an area which has traditionally been poorly served by the Sociology of Education. In this respect, the thesis can be taken to be a critical case study of the absence of the theorisation of change. That is, FE has experienced radical change and yet this has been poorly understood and, in the opinion of this author, inadequately theorised within the Sociology of Education. Overall therefore, two objectives are sought. First, to use the content-theoretical model to examine educational change in FE and thereby enable change in a specific sector of the ES to be related to changes in social relations and the social structure in general. Secondly, to show how this theorisation of change provides a more meaningful explanation of the new vocationalism than those which already exist within the Sociology of Education.

Since the early 1980s there has developed a body of work which can now be seen to comprise a Sociology of the New Vocationalism (hereafter SNV)(Jordan 1986). However, behind the concern many Sociologists have recently shown for matters relating to FE and training, has been the spectre of mass youth unemployment. Unfortunately, this context of youth unemployment has expressed itself in analyses which are, for the most part, theoretically underdeveloped. That is, many of the SNV accounts simply find the measures taken to deal with youth unemployment politically objectionable (Bates *et al* 1984, Benn & Fairley 1986, Ainley 1988). Indeed, the polemical nature of much of the SNV has detracted from the very real problem of understanding *how* the new vocationalism came to pass. Thus, a weakness of many SNV accounts is that they have had a tendency to be descriptive rather than analytical. In this respect they share the more general disinclination within the Sociology of Education to theorise educational change. For this reason the review of the SNV in Chapter Six concentrates on the exceptions to this rule. That is, only those accounts which explicitly proffer an analysis of the new vocationalism, as distinct from description, are reviewed. These accounts are seen to fall into three categories:

- (i) 'structural' approaches - which focus on the 'economic';
- (ii) 'culturalist' approaches - which focus on the ideological; and
- (iii) a policy approach - which has a political focus.

This classification provides the framework for a discussion of the SNV literature in Chapter Six.

The review of the SNV literature in Chapter Six reveals that the 'political' aspects of the new vocationalism have been undertheorised. In none of the approaches is there any attempt to introduce an intrinsic political analysis ie. an account which examines the role of the political in educational change, including an analysis of the main political actors and the institutional context into which the new vocationalism has been introduced. Furthermore, a separation of the economic, political and ideological moments of the new vocationalism is maintained and reflected in these approaches, with the result that relations *between* these moments are left unaccounted for. Similarly, the historical background and the particularity of the institutional context ( the FE sector) has been neglected [Gleeson's work excepted]. Finally, the relationship between the introduction of the new vocationalism and wider political change (including other educational and non-educational policies) has also been left largely unexamined in the SNV literature. Thus, the new vocationalism has not been seen as part of a more unified political change, especially in relation to the nature and role of the state. The overall result of the SNV, as outlined above, is that a rare opportunity to study and understand an example of educational change, in the form of an extension of the 'educational franchise' ie. an extension of the inculcation of the state-form to a new population of 16-19 year olds, has been missed because the theoretical and conceptual tools required for the task have not been developed.

In Part Two, the three aspects of the ES which the content-theoretical model identifies - the institutional ensemble of the state, policy and provision and the political mobilisation of teachers - are examined in relation to vocational preparation and the new vocationalism, seen as strategies of reproduction. The historical context of FE provision in relation to vocational preparation is outlined, followed by an analysis of policy and provision in the period from 1975 to 1985. Using the content-theoretical model outlined above, the analysis proceeds to show that educational change, initially in the shape of

vocational preparation, was form-determined and represented a 'failed' strategy of reproduction ie. it failed to procure an extension of the educational franchise. Whereas the new vocationalism, in the guise of the Youth Training Scheme, represented an altogether different strategy, one which has been 'successfully' implemented as a result of a transformation of the state-form. This is evidenced in all three aspects identified in the model. That is, transformation in the institutional ensemble of the state, in terms of changes in central-Local state relations; changes in the nature of policy and provision - a move away from 'citizens-in-training' (vocational preparation) towards 'training-in-citizenship' (the new vocationalism). Finally, a transformation of the FE teachers' logic of collective action, away from a bifurcation between professionalism and trade unionism, towards one of a 'strategy of opportunism'.

The nature of the 'success' and 'failure' of these educational changes is revealed through an intrinsic political analysis. Such an analysis provides both a clearer conception of the general political processes of educational change, as well as accounting for the specificity of the politics of the new vocationalism. Above all else, it is intended through this *theorisation* of educational change to provide some coherence to what has been up until now a largely disparate body of research.

### Notes and References - General Introduction

1. Salter & Tapper (1981) pp.3-4
2. The delimitation of 'education' being used here is seen as applicable to Further Education (FE) ie. post compulsory (16) education. This does not, however, necessarily preclude its applicability to other sectors eg. secondary education in general. The utility of this theorisation can only be established by its application to these other sectors and this has not been attempted in this thesis.
3. Turner, B (1986) p.12

PART ONE

## CHAPTER ONE

### *The Sociology of Education and the Theorisation of Educational Change*

#### *1.1 Introduction*

In this Chapter the three dominant approaches within the Sociology of Education, the Political-Arithmetic tradition, the New Sociology of Education and the political-economy of education or Reproduction problematic, will be examined in terms of their theorisation of educational change. It is not intended here to provide a detailed examination of the development of these three approaches as such an examination is available elsewhere (Sarup 1978, Sharp 1980, Banks 1982). It will however be argued that the absence of an intrinsic political analysis in each of the approaches has inhibited the development of either a comprehensive theory or model of educational change which could provide the basis for empirical investigation. In particular, all three of the major approaches within the Sociology of Education will be shown to have been incapable of generating such a model of change because they have failed to develop even a 'politics of education' (Dale 1982). For Dale, this absence of a politics of education is evidenced by the marginalisation, even ignorance, within the Sociology of Education of the importance of understanding the role of the state in educational provision. Whilst making specific reference to those political scientists who have incorporated a political dimension in their work (see Chapter Two), the following comment by Dale has I believe much wider applicability with regard to conceptions of the 'political' within the Sociology of Education :

*" Those political scientists who have focussed on education have confined their studies very much to education politics rather than the politics of education. By this I mean that they have concentrated much more on studying the effectiveness of education systems and forms of education government in achieving goals presented to them, rather than on the relationship between the production of goals and the form of their achievement. To put it another way, political questions are bracketed out and replaced by questions about processes of decision-making; politics are reduced to administration. The focus is on the machinery, rather than on what powers it, or how and where it is directed." (1)*

This also corresponds to what is being seen here as the absence of an 'intrinsic' political analysis of educational change within the Sociology of Education. That is, an analysis of the role of the 'political' *in* bringing about educational change. It will be shown that, without such an intrinsic analysis the theorisation of change remains at best incomplete, at worst simply neglected.

### 1.ii *The Political-Arithmetic Tradition*

The earliest exponents of the Sociology of Education in Britain were strongly influenced by the 'political-arithmetic' tradition of social research. This meant that they were very much concerned (i) to ameliorate educational disadvantage and deprivation amongst 'the less fortunate classes' through (ii) the methodical reporting of their condition by (iii) influencing policy-makers. In this respect, a marked Fabian influence can be seen to have informed their whole project.

In the immediate post-war period, researchers involved in the Sociology of Education became closely associated with the work of Professor D.V.Glass and his social mobility inquiries. As a result, the fledgling sub-discipline came under the hegemony of the 'political-arithmetic' tradition with its central concern for the demographic character of disadvantage. Therefore, from the very beginning, the British Sociology of Education can be seen to have had a distinct political pedigree. Furthermore, its founders adopted a methodological stance which was specifically attuned to political interventions in the field of educational reform. It must be said, however, that this methodological stance did not arise entirely out of an act of concern or beneficence on the part of these Sociologists. It also served a far more instrumental purpose, in so far as their concern for inequality was tempered by the need to establish their own credentials as the practitioners of a legitimate discipline. Both the methodological character and the choice of subject-matter were therefore closely related to the institutionalisation of the Sociology of Education itself. As a result, this appears to have precluded the theorisation of educational change in terms other than those which contributed to this process of institutionalisation i.e. terms which were uncontroversial or 'apolitical'.

Bernstein has curtly described this early 'approach' within the Sociology of Education as bearing all "...the hallmarks of British applied sociology; atheoretical, pragmatic, descriptive and policy focused "(1977,p.162). The extent to which this approach can be said to have been 'atheoretical' is, however, debatable. Bernstein has argued that a careful reading of the two leading exponents of the approach, A.H.Halsey and Jean Floud, dispels the common assertion that they were operating within an imported structural-functionalist paradigm. Yet, it would be difficult to find a more explicit avowal of that paradigm than the following, which appeared in the now classic Halsey, Floud and Anderson reader *Education, Economy and Society* (1961):

*" Education attains unprecedented economic importance as a source of technological innovation, and the education system is bent increasingly to the service of the labor force, acting as a vast apparatus of occupational recruitment and training." (2)*

Although one could quibble over how far Halsey and Floud accepted the more rigorous consensual rendition of the structural-functionalist paradigm which made its way across the Atlantic, they certainly appear here to be in its grip. However, it might also be said in their defence that their account is more 'British' than structural-functionalist, not only in terms of a distinct nomenclature but also its Fabianism. That is, the reformist zeal of these early Sociologists of Education can be discerned in their espousal of a firm commitment to gradual administrative reform of the system. The political-arithmetic tradition was thus initially imbued with an egalitarian ethos which, nevertheless, conformed to the dominant economic imperatives of the day. As a result, the focus of the reforms consisted of a dual emphasis being placed on the twin goals of 'efficiency' and 'equality of opportunity'.

For the purposes of this thesis, what is most distinctive about the political-arithmetic approach is that it sought, wherever possible, to disengage the 'political' from the arithmetic. This can be seen in the concern with access to education which dominated the politics of these early practitioners. As a result, they adopted a methodology which they hoped would convince policy makers and administrators that the educational system was both inefficient and unfair. This meant that the actual processes of data collection had to be seen as 'objective' i.e. untainted by

the moral and political outlooks which impelled them. Statistical methods, above all others, were seen as one way to achieve this. In fact the type of research undertaken by the political-arithmetic approach coincided, in the 1960s, with a Labour administration which was willing to 'use' sociologists and sociological findings to shape (or legitimate?) education policy and, as a result, this did much to help establish the sub-discipline.

It is also true to say that the central problem of state schooling, working class underachievement, almost inevitably became *the* issue for sociologists. As mentioned earlier, this was seen in terms of a dual problem of inequality of access and economic efficiency. What this means is that the boundaries of the subject and the 'problems' with which it was dealing were being imported, already defined, into the sub-discipline. It could therefore be seen as a 'normative' discipline ie. one which accepted official definitions and parameters. However, this is a complex set of relationships, none of which should necessarily be seen as causal. As Bernstein has remarked:

*" Sociologists are creatures of their time, and the range of approaches to their subject is in part a realization of the political context and the Sociologists relation to it... Sociologists of Education are particularly sensitive to this political context, because the areas of cleavage, dilemma and contradiction in the wider society are particularly transparent and are most visible in the educational arrangements. Thus, there is a resonance between the value positions underlying the various approaches and the problems of educational arrangements, because those problems are the problems of society, which in turn calls out the sociological approaches." (3)*

Therefore it is perhaps too astringent to argue, as Sarup (1978) has, that the early Sociology of Education was '...a social science which spoke to administrators and policy makers who commissioned research on the underprivileged' (p.186). This is to confuse distinct levels of analysis. The methodology employed in the research was itself a political issue, in so far as it attempted to eliminate from investigation any notion of 'politics' ie. it often took for granted the institutional parameters of the system and dismissed or ignored these as important variables in themselves. For this reason we find an almost total silence on the role of the state in this work (Dale 1982). Similarly, there was an avoidance of concern for the political nature of inequality. This expressed itself in

the actual conceptualisation of inequality utilised within this approach and, in particular, the rather confused use of the concept 'class'. As the CCCS (1981) authors noted,

*" There is a sense in which the old sociology has never been concerned with a politics of class, but always with a politics of status " (4).*

In fact, three distinct conceptions of the relationship between 'class' and 'status' have been identified in this approach - 'status over class'; 'class as status'; and 'class alongside status' (CCCS, *op cit* p.83). The importance of these distinct conceptions lies in the fact that they correspond to three periods in the development of the political-arithmetic tradition within the Sociology of Education. In the first period, between the 1940s and mid/late 1950s, the demographic work of Glass and the social philosophy of T.H. Marshall are thought to have been important influences on the conceptions of 'class' and 'status' which were brought to the Sociology of Education. Status was conceived in terms of its associated concept 'citizenship' which was then promoted over class as *the* major category of social difference. Hence the concern with social mobility, which did not incorporate a more considered conception of class *relations*.

The relationship between the work of Marshall (1950) and the early Sociology of Education is especially relevant to this thesis. It bears witness to the notion that educational change is closely related to the concept of citizenship. In the political-arithmetic tradition it would appear that this relationship was overdrawn, in so far as it excluded altogether any consideration of the relationship *between* citizenship and class. As a result, the 'politics of education' was conceived wholly in institutional terms, to the extent that the origins and forms of political domination found within education went unseen. Even in the second period of development of the political-arithmetic approach, between the late 1950s and the early 1960s, the 'class over status' conception did not entail an investigation of the relationship between class and status (and citizenship). Class was simply redefined as status, with the result that it became seen as 'a form of distribution and social evaluation rather than a relation of power and exploitation' (CCCS, *op cit*p.84). This conception of class, based upon market rewards, excluded altogether the 'political' by emphasising the relationship between the education system and the economy.

Finally, in the latest period, from the 1970s onwards, the relationship between class and status has been conceived of as one in which class is seen 'alongside' status. That is, class is sharply differentiated from status within a neo-Weberian framework. The effect of which has once more been to institutionalise conceptions of the political and focus upon policy-making. Thus further insulating the economic from the political.

What these criticisms amount to is the fact that the political-arithmetic tradition did not begin to see power and political relations *within* education as intrinsically important to their analyses. This is a quite different criticism to that of both Sarup and indeed the CCCS authors, who have argued that the 'reformism' of the political-arithmetic tradition was somehow inadequate i.e. not socialist enough:

*" Its detailed findings remain valuable, but its explanatory frameworks and limitations of scope remain positively disabling for a more developed socialist politics " (5).*

This is an altogether different criticism because the 'elitist' and 'statist' prescriptions for change which accompanied the political-arithmetic approach, must be seen as *extrinsic* to their theorisation i.e. the prescriptions may follow on from the general approach, its methodology and focus, but they are not the product of their theorisation of the politics of education. This is because no such theorising took place.

To conclude, if we are to locate the factors within the political-arithmetic approach which inhibited the theorisation of educational change, we can see that they lie in the effects of the academic division of labour and the political commitment of its exponents. The political-arithmetic tradition, despite being imported into the study of education, acted to differentiate the sub-discipline and mark out the boundaries of its concerns. In this respect it bore the classic hallmarks of an infant discipline, especially its exaggerated claims regarding explanations of educational disadvantage. In need of establishing their credentials, the early exponents of the Sociology of Education took on board the pressing policy issues of the day, in particular the problem of working class underachievement. As such, the level and subject of analysis was largely circumscribed externally ( by educational administrators especially). This, coupled with a general subscription to structural-functionalism, meant that

the approach was infused with both a methodological and theoretical conservatism. Despite their reformist commitments and desire for social change, albeit gradual and top-down, the theorisation of educational change by these early Sociologists of Education was precluded by their particular methodological stance. Finally, it must also be noted that the political-arithmetic tradition was almost totally devoid of any discussion of what actually goes on in schools or colleges eg. changes in the curriculum, pedagogy and general processes of classroom interaction - the content of the education process (Halsey 1977, p.52). Without this concern for the specificity of the content of the education system, the 'Black Box' approach to educational accounting could not begin to describe, let alone explain *educational* change.

### 1.iii *The New Sociology of Education*

It is commonly agreed that the dawning of the 'New' Sociology of Education [hereafter NSE] occurred with the publication of 'Knowledge and Control' edited by M.F.D.Young (1971). It is useful to compare this new perspective with the traditional approach using Bernstein's aphorism, 'atheoretical, pragmatic, descriptive and policy focused', as a framework of analysis.

In contrast to the atheoretical *appearance* of the traditional Sociology of Education, the political-arithmetic approach, the new approach was, initially, explicitly grounded in what was basically a phenomenological perspective of the social actor. It must be stated here however that there was a certain ambivalence within the NSE regarding the 'analytic', apolitical nature of phenomenology and its relation to radical action:

*"Phenomenology provided certain key predispositional rules such as 'making rather than taking' problems, suspending taken-for-granted assumptions, etc., but these things did not help either the radical sociologist or the radical teacher in explicating, controlling and transforming the actual processes within the classroom..." (6).*

This ambivalence is important in so far as it indicates that the 'politics' of the NSE were, for many adherents, extrinsically related to their theorisation of educational processes.

One of the intentions of the new approach was to instil theory into what appeared to be the theoretically barren British political-arithmetic tradition. As mentioned earlier, the extent to which theory was in fact absent from the traditional approach is itself a matter of contention : it was certainly never very explicit. However, the lack of theoretical candour by the practitioners of the traditional approach should not be taken as an absence of theory; especially in the case of a theory such as structural-functionalism, which reinforces the taken-for-grantedness of social relations ie. one should not expect the overt questioning of the existence of consensual values in a theory which presumes the very existence of those values to be the basis of the 'social'. Therefore, the introduction of theory into the Sociology of Education by the NSE must be seen in fact as a strategy to expose and supersede the existence of a rival theory.

The NSE was similar to the political-arithmetic approach in so far as they were both 'pragmatic'. However, whereas the political-arithmetic tradition was characterised by its responsiveness to the exigencies of policy-makers, the new approach appeared more autonomous with respect to the formation and implementation of policy. The fact that the NSE's critique of the traditional approach should have incorporated an attack on that approach's pragmatism did not therefore necessarily mean the new approach was entirely devoid of that characteristic itself. It was a difference of degree rather than kind which appears to separate the two approaches on this score. For example, the new approach was particularly concerned with the training of teachers, which was not unrelated to the fact that it was largely centred within the University of London Institute of Education, the Open University and other Colleges and Departments of Education. Therefore it was a pragmatism which derived from what were seen as the needs of teachers themselves, as opposed to the needs of administrators, which appears to have informed the new perspective. Closer inspection reveals that the new approach was also pragmatic in so far as it responded to the prevailing concerns of both the educational and the political arenas of the late 1960s and early 1970s. It can also therefore be deemed to have been a 'normative' approach. For example, the failure of the structural reforms of secondary education to meet the demands of the 'white-heat of the technological revolution', plus the impending raising of the school leaving age, were the specific educational concerns which, along with the general upsurge in political radicalism, contributed to the

flowering of the NSE. It was however the *process* rather than structure of change which was the focus of concern and this manifested itself in a shift from the 'sociology of stratification' towards the 'sociology of knowledge' (Bernstein 1977,p.164)

Despite the radical assertions the changed focus gave rise to, the extent to which educational knowledge was made problematic was limited by the inability of Young and others to seriously examine the relationship between knowledge and power.( It is perhaps significant that the seminal collection of papers should have been entitled *Knowledge and Control* rather than *Knowledge and Power*.) As Sharp (1980) has argued,

*"Given Young's concern with power relationships and their implication for the stratification of knowledge in the curriculum, it is questionable to argue that the sociology of knowledge provides a central perspective, since the latter has not produced an adequate theory either of social stratification or of power relationships, both of which Young admits play a vitally important role. "* (7)

Unlike Sharp, I would argue that the new approach was not only inadequate at the level of an understanding of 'power', but that, more essentially, it lacked any conception of the specificity of the political ie. a specification of the origins and nature of power and domination.

The methodological imperatives of the new sociology meant that a distinct break with the empiricism of the traditional approach occurred. The use, in particular, of anthropological methods in the new approach was a distinct change of direction. These methods, largely based on participant-observation techniques, when brought into the classroom, were indeed a novel departure within the Sociology of Education. However, they also tended to result in analyses which were largely descriptive in character, albeit far more enriched than those which had come before. This development of an ethnography of the classroom was perhaps the single most productive aspect of the new methodology. However, the problem of relating the sociology of knowledge to power and the social structure was not resolved within these classroom studies.

The new approach was also not as removed from the 'policy focused' nature of its predecessor as it would appear. The central concern with the 'underachievement' of working class children was not forsaken and, if

anything, came to the fore once again as the principal cause for concern. The egalitarianism which had inspired the political-arithmetic sociologists was also entrenched within the new approach. However, the 'reformism' of the traditional approach had been overtaken by what can be described as a form of 'libertarianism'. Thus the notion of the 'free' individual who has the potential to redefine his/her social existence is inscribed in the writing of some of the early exponents of the new approach. This notion of the individual teacher as agent of change, what elsewhere has been termed 'possibilitarianism' (Whitty 1977), only served to marginalise the influence of social constraints and the social structure, which must be accounted for if an adequate conception of educational interaction and change is to be forthcoming (Sharp & Green 1975). Whilst not rejecting a concern with social structure, the NSE had no means to trace its effects on classroom practices.

It is also one of the most telling points of the new approach that its success in drawing attention to the content of education opened up possibilities for policy-makers which are thought to have far exceeded those of the traditional approach:

*" ... government administrators have recently developed a strong interest in the content of the educational process; for them, followers of the interpretative approach promise to deliver sociologically informed studies of the consequences of given types of curricula offerings ... If the sociology of education is ever to provide a basis for an applied sociology which effectively meets the needs of the Welfare State, it may come not from conflict theorists, but from the 'new' sociology of education." (8)*

It might be suggested that the principal reason for Halsey's optimism is the fact that the nature of the new sociology meant that the system's managers had no need to worry about a 'political' dimension *within* the approach. Once again, this is because the new sociology's political dimension, its radicalism, was largely *extrinsic* to its theorising.

In conclusion, we can account for the lack of a concern to theorise educational change by looking at the nature of the NSE itself. Two factors stand out. Firstly, the emphasis on micro studies of classroom interaction. Secondly, the pragmatism of the approach and, in particular, its concern with teacher training. Both of these appear to have limited the scope for

*theorising* educational change. These must therefore be seen as both the cause and the effect of the failure to develop an intrinsic political analysis of change. Moore (1988) has usefully summarised the problems which remained unresolved within the NSE:

- " (i) *how to achieve a non-positivistic conceptualization of social structure which preserved the radical humanism of the phenomenological critique but which did not entail its rejection of social structure ( and class in particular) as an ontologically effective category;*
- (ii) *how to construct a methodological procedure whereby the class form of social structural relationships could be revealed within the power relationships of the educational system and classroom interaction;*
- (iii) *how to retain the possibility of radical action and change, both within education and in society at large, within a theoretical framework in which the principle for analyzing social interaction was derived from an assumption of the determining power of social structure." (9)*

The root cause of these unresolved issues lies in the failure to *theorise* educational change. What we now know is that the limitations of this approach eventually led many of its adherents to broaden their horizons and contextualise their concerns within the social structure and economic and cultural reproduction.

#### 1.iv *Reproduction Theories*

*" Capitalist production, therefore, under its aspect of a continuous connected process, of a process of reproduction, produces not only commodities, not only surplus-value, but it also produces and reproduces the capitalist relations; on the one side the capitalist, on the other the wage-labourer." (10)*

Given the particularism of the various theories of reproduction i.e. their different theoretical and substantive points of departure, it is proposed that the work of Bowles and Gintis (1976), which is perhaps the mostly widely debated of the so-called 'correspondence theories', be taken as the focus of the first part of this discussion. The later work of these

theorists will be discussed in the next chapter as it constitutes a specific model of educational change, as well being an example of the reproduction problematic.

#### 1.v *Bowles and Gintis*

The early thesis of Bowles and Gintis found in *Schooling in Capitalist America* (1976) can be summarised as follows:

*" Education prepares students to be workers through a correspondence between the social relations of production and the social relations of education." (11)*

In their explication of the nature of the relationship or 'correspondence' between education and production, Bowles and Gintis took as their starting point a traditional liberal conception of what an 'adequate educational system' needs to achieve (Dewey 1966). This, they argue, entails the following three functions being performed: firstly, that schools should be *egalitarian*. That is, they should help alleviate and overcome the inequalities which 'naturally' arise in the present social system. Secondly, that schools should be *developmental* in so far as they nurture the 'cognitive, physical, emotional, critical and aesthetic' abilities of all pupils. Thirdly, schools should perform an *integrative* function i.e. socialise and allocate pupils to positions within the social structure as a whole. Bowles and Gintis went on to argue that it is only this latter function which is capable of being fulfilled within capitalist education systems.

Bowles and Gintis delimited the ES in terms of its functions in relation to the Capitalist Mode of Production (CMP). According to Bowles and Gintis, schools differentially transmit the skills necessary for production. However, more important than the actual nature of those skills i.e. their actual content, is the *form* of educational transmission:

*" ...the current relationship between education and the economy is ensured not through the content of education but its form: the social relations of the educational encounter." (12)*

The nature of these educational encounters is such that schools introduce pupils to discipline and general attitudinal learning which correspond to

the needs of the process of production under capitalism. Thus, there is an emphasis on rule-keeping and conformity.

Central to Bowles and Gintis's early perspective was their recognition of a major contradiction existing between reproduction and capital accumulation ie. the imperative of accumulation within capitalism was seen by the authors to threaten the process whereby social relations are reproduced. This is due to legitimation crises arising out of the constant need to restructure social relations in accordance with the accumulation imperative. These crises manifest themselves in the shape of a 'mismatch' between the educational system and the economy. Educational change was therefore seen by Bowles and Gintis as an attempt to rectify this mismatch. However, due to the failure to recognise the essential contradiction which lies behind this structural 'lack of harmony' (p.54) between education and the economy, they believed that educational 'reform' was inevitably inadequate to the task.

In *Schooling in Capitalist America* Bowles and Gintis located the central dynamic of educational change in the contradiction between the imperative of accumulation and the necessity of reproduction:

*" This disjunction between an economic dynamic which extends the wage-labor system and incessantly alters the organization of work and the class structure on the one hand, and the educational system which tends to stabilize it in a given form on the other, is, we believe, an essential aspect of the process of educational change."*  
(13)

How exactly this central contradiction is translated into the education system was however left unexplained. Bowles and Gintis are now the first to admit that their correspondence principle '...fails to elucidate the dynamics of change internal to the school system ' (1980,p.55). It is also fair to say that the theoretical and methodological position which Bowles and Gintis initially adopted led them to neglect the actual content of the curriculum. It was only by taking the functions outlined by the liberal educationalists as given, that Bowles and Gintis were able to locate the contradictory nature of reproduction within capitalism. They adopted the categories 'egalitarian', 'developmental' and 'integrative' without first interrogating them. Therefore they failed to go beyond what might be argued is their discursive form within the education system. Such an

interrogation may have in fact revealed the non-contradictory nature of these functions. However, since educational processes were deemed to be relatively unimportant in determining educational change, Bowles and Gintis saw no reason to undertake such an interrogation.

Bowles and Gintis's original formulation of the problem of reproduction has been widely criticised. They now admit that this simple conception was the result of finding themselves:

*" much impressed with the classical Marxian paradigm of base/superstructure, according to which the economic system forms a base of material relations defining the essence of social life, with respect to which such institutions as the family, the state, the educational system, the communications media, and cultural relations in general, appear a mere superstructural reflections." (14)*

This admission is also tantamount to saying that *Schooling in Capitalist America* was reductionist, which of course accounts for their structural-functional leanings with regard to role of the education system. Yet, they now signal where the mediation for a translation between change in the relations of production and educational change might be located:

*" ...no very simple or mechanistic relationship between economic structure and educational development is likely to fit the historical evidence... political factors have intervened between economic structures and educational outcomes in complex and sometimes, apparently, contradictory ways. " (15)[emphasis added]*

As a result, their recent work (Gintis and Bowles 1980,1988) has sought to explicate the 'political' in a far more intrinsic fashion. Since this an explicit attempt to theorise educational change, it will be dealt with in Chapter Two, along with other 'political' models of educational change. At this point it is necessary to review some developments in reproduction theory which have arisen since Bowles and Gintis' 'simple' correspondence theory. These developments will therefore act as a critique of *Schooling in Capitalist America*.

1.vi *Centre For Contemporary Cultural Studies - Unpopular Education*

*Unpopular Education* (1981) is, in many respects, a unique text within the Sociology of Education. It represents an attempt to locate a role for the 'political' in the constitution of educational change. It is therefore an original text, in so far as it can be considered an attempt to provide a political analysis of educational change. More succinctly, the purpose of the book was '...to understand the ways in which educational politics have been constructed in England ( and to some extent in Britain more generally) during the post-second world war period ' (p.8). The authors utilise a combination of Marxism and Cultural Studies to produce a 'critical history' of post-war educational politics. What this perspective entails is a prioritisation of the 'ideological' within a reformulated reproduction problematic. As such, the authors of *Unpopular Education* retain the basic tenets of the problematic, whilst rejecting those simplistic accounts which posit a straightforward 'correspondence' between the 'needs' of capital and the operation of capitalist 'schooling'. They accuse these formulations of being too 'abstract', 'unhistorical', 'grand' and 'pessimistic'. In particular, they note that it is the absence of any conception of the 'political' which undermines the value of these theories:

*" The problem with many such theories, despite the real deepening of knowledge which they represent, is that they are insufficiently alive to the contested nature of such processes and therefore to the centrality of political struggles." (16)[emphasis added]*

It is important to note here how the authors of *Unpopular Education* fail to differentiate between what are being seen in this thesis as the 'intrinsic' and 'extrinsic' political aspects of these analyses. As a result, is not surprising to find that throughout their own account there is often a conflation of analyses of politics *in* and politics *of* educational change. This can be seen in the following passages referring to reproduction theories. Firstly, the CCCS criticism of what can be interpreted as their intrinsic inadequacy:

*" The problem is now to draw on [their] insights in a way that gives a central place to struggle and to a conscious willed politics, to disorganized and diffuse resistances, but also to more organized political forces with their own theories and strategies." (17)*

Secondly, their extrinsic failing:

*" Politically ...this contribution is problematic: much of the knowledge has remained too abstract and too purely critical to help in the development of alternative practices." (18)*

The authors of *Unpopular Education* nowhere attempt to distinguish between these two levels of political analysis. With the result that there is a very strong case for both Salter and Tapper's (1981) and Hargreaves and Hammersley's (1982) criticisms that the political commitment of the authors intrudes upon and even distorts the CCCS account. However, I would argue that the distortion is not of the order of the above critics i.e. that the CCCS the account is basically 'unscientific'. The distortion is rather more complex than that. The distortion comes in the shape of mistaking what in fact an analysis of the politics of education *must* entail. For the authors of *Unpopular Education*, the politics of education must always entail social transformation and a notion of *praxis*. Therefore they write from the standpoint of 'committed socialists and feminists' (p.13). Unfortunately, a 'willed' socialist politics of education does not, in itself, necessarily explain capitalist schooling. This again can be illustrated by examining their critique of simple correspondence theories.

As shown above, one of the criticisms which the authors of *Unpopular Education* level at the correspondence theories is that they were politically 'pessimistic'. They were seen as denying the 'possibility of struggle'. This criticism leads the CCCS authors to argue for a formulation which combines an 'explanatory force with a more activist, less pessimistic employment of theory ' (p.9). The way the authors see this more activist theory arising is through the use of a 'popular histories' methodology. Taking the side of 'the people' is seen as one way of ensuring that their analysis does not become detached from active struggles. It also ensures that their analysis remains immune from any charges of reductionism. However, this approach, as Hargreaves and Hammersley point out,

*" ...arises not in response to the open and uncertain quest for knowledge about schooling, but as a corrective to the rather pessimistic cast of those theories of the relationship between schooling and capitalism which dominated Marxist sociology of education until recently." (19)*

Therefore the 'explanatory force' of such an approach is in no way

guaranteed. The authors of *Unpopular Education* recognise this, to some extent, and attempt to graft a 'logical' aspect onto the popular-historical.

The 'logical' part of the analysis concerns the authors in a search for a more 'complex Marxism'. This appears to entail a conception of the reproduction problematic wherein capital's 'needs' and 'requirements' are seen as multifarious and contradictory. For this reason, the 'political' assumes a new importance in the reproduction of capitalist social relations. This is because the various demands of capital(s) are seen as being 'condensed' in the state itself, which then has to act to resolve their contradictory nature. According to the CCCS account, this is then reflected in the contradictory nature of capitalist schooling. However, it is not made clear by the CCCS authors how the demands placed on the education system are in fact 'contradictory'. It is only suggested that, in certain conjunctures, they *become* contradictory. This is an important point since it relates to the lack of formal theoretical analysis found throughout the text.

Where a more formal theoretical approach is attempted, the analysis remains cursory. For example, the CCCS authors attempt to avoid class-reductionism by locating the reproduction of social relations in two 'sites' - in the economic (the 'factory') and in the family. The former is seen as the site for the reproduction of class relations, whereas the latter is the site for the reproduction of age and gender relations. In particular, the family is seen as having a relative autonomy in relation to the economic. Apart from the problematic use of the term 'the family', their interpretation of a 'feminist materialism' is simply left foot-noted. Thus, despite the fact that it is in the family-school relationship, within a 'family-school-wage labour complex', that the authors attempt to locate 'popular interests', the theorisation of that relationship is not attempted. This is manifest in the overall coherence of the account which, signally, is prefaced by the following health-warning to the reader, ' It is important that we are not misunderstood at this point ' (p.25). Thereafter, the attempt to explicate the relationship between the reproduction of gender and class relations is couched in so many imprecise, relational terms that the reader is left wondering what possible value can the notion of 'relative autonomy' still have. This can be seen in the following examples:

" Gender is intimately connected with class."

" Gender differences ...are partly constructed in relation to the class organisation of economic life."

" The family is not ...a merely dependent institution."

" It [the family] is not merely transformed by capitalism"

These terms tell us very little about the actual relationship between sites.

As a result of this lack of formal theorisation of the relationship between these sites of reproduction, the CCCS authors fail to avoid the dichotomisation of educational politics and in particular the 'internal/external' determination of educational change. This can be seen in the following summary:

" The salience of the child-adult relations means that there are always two levels of struggles in relation to schooling; there are struggles *within* the schools, in which children and teachers are the most active participants, and there are struggles *over* schooling from which children and adolescents are excluded and in which the figure of the parent carries the full weight of popular interests. It is parents who are directly addressed in debates about schooling; it is their consent, on behalf of 'their' children, which is won or lost." (20)

It is therefore not possible, according to the CCCS authors, to simply 'read-off' the needs of capital from the nature of the education system. Needs are always and everywhere mediated by political struggles. Throughout *Unpopular Education* these take the form of 'anti-capitalist' or 'popular' struggles over state schooling. The authors assert that '...how far education becomes capitalist schooling depends on the strength of resistances and the resultant balance of forces [ capital and anti-capitalist ]' (p.23). This conception sees schooling having a certain contingency or relative autonomy under capitalism. It also, rather ironically, has left the CCCS authors open to a charge of 'pluralism' ( Hargreaves & Hammersley 1982, p.141). This charge is interesting in a number of respects. Its basis lies in the rather vacillating usage within *Unpopular Education* of the term 'popular' coupled with the notion of a 'balance of forces'. However, it must be said that it is only a somewhat literal conception of the latter which enables Hargreaves and Hammersley to equate the CCCS account with pluralism. Of course, such an equation is unwarranted. The 'balance of forces' which the CCCS authors make reference to is firmly within the Marxist tradition and involves, in particular, the

concept of hegemony. There is, therefore, no question of 'consensus' or 'equality', 'negotiation' etc. as there would be in a pluralist conception. This can be seen in the important CCCS concept of an 'educational settlement':

*" If hegemony refers to the overall relations of force in society, we wish to use the term 'educational settlement' to refer to the balance of forces in and over schooling. Settlements entail, at this 'regional' rather than 'global' level, some more or less enduring set of solutions to capital's educational needs, the putting together of a dominant alliance of forces, and a more widespread recruitment of popular support or inducement of popular indifference." (21)*

Settlements are also seen as being 'highly unstable and deeply contradictory'. It is the history of these 'settlements' in the post-war period which is the substance of the CCCS account in *Unpopular Education*. It is not proposed that this history be reviewed here.

In defence of the CCCS account, it must be said that they had no intention to provide a formal theorisation of educational change in the post-war period. Therefore they can hardly be accused of failing to live up to this objective. However, what is abundantly clear from the above critique is the fact that it is just this lack of formal theorisation of educational change which undermines their own limited objectives. They cannot begin to explain the construction of the politics of educational change in the post-war period without locating the actual role of the 'political' *in* educational change. Their recourse to a 'complex' Marxism still leaves them open to the charge of reductionism. Thus, *'in the last instance'*, we are left with an account which falls between two stools. On the one hand, it makes space for the 'political' as a determinant of educational change. On the other hand, it cannot grasp the importance of the political because it has no formal model of how educational change actually comes about.

It has been left to others to take up the space which the CCCS account uncovered for a more *theoretical* treatment of an 'elaborate' reproduction theory. Drawing upon many of the original insights provided by the CCCS authors, Michael Apple's work is representative of recent attempts to build upon the 'complex' Marxism/ Cultural Studies synthesis.

Apple's work epitomises the dominant thinking in Marxian analysis within the Sociology of Education. In this respect, his work can be seen as a summation of the current 'trends' within the perspective. It also represents, in a rather exaggerated form, the problems which beset the approach. The maturation of the perspective which Apple now expounds is closely and frankly documented in two recent publications, *Education and Power* (1985) and *Teachers and Texts* (1986). Basically, Apple sees schooling as 'both a system of production and reproduction.' This conception, he feels, takes him beyond the 'simple reproduction' theories of Bowles and Gintis. The 'distributional' emphasis of the early Reproduction theorists is therefore rebuked and a conception of the production and accumulation of knowledge in schools is appended. As a result, Apple's emphasis falls upon both the 'economic' and the 'cultural' role of schools. Not content with this still rather 'functionalist' formulation, Apple introduces into his perspective the notions of 'contestation', 'resistance', 'conflict' and 'contradiction'. In particular, it is within the labour process that Apple seeks to demonstrate the contradictory and contested nature of reproduction.

Apple suggests that the 'function' of schools is twofold. Firstly, like both the Human Capital theorists and the 'allocation' theorists [his term for the simple reproduction theorists] he sees the schools as concerned with the reproduction of economic agents who are stratified in accordance with the needs of the economy (1985, p.44). Secondly, and in contradistinction with both these approaches, Apple sees schools as '... institutions that produce the cultural forms directly and indirectly needed by this same economic sector ' (ibid). It is here that Apple neglects to mention whether schools fulfil any 'political' function or role. The complex interplay between the two functions he identifies is then used to arrive at his 'elaborated' reproduction theory.

Apple argues that it is important to see schools as not only involved in the distribution of knowledge but also its production. He also recognizes that there may be something different about the nature of production within schools compared to that of factories and offices etc.:

*" ... schools, because of their internal history, are different in some very important ways from factories and offices, and teachers are still very different from other workers in terms of the conditions of their work. Products are not as visible ( except much later on in the rough reproduction of a labour force, in the production and reproduction of ideologies, and in the production of the technical/administrative knowledge 'required' by an economy) as in offices and factories...Furthermore, there are children who act back on the teachers in ways an automobile on the assembly line or a paper on a desk cannot. Finally, teaching does not take place on a line, but goes on in separate rooms more often than not." (22)*

However, he fails to distinguish the special nature or form of that production, especially the collective nature of its reproduction. It is this omission which eventually leads him to take a rather marginal view of the role of politics in educational change. Apple's recognition of the 'political' is confined to a rather brief analysis of the state, despite the fact that ' It seemed odd to me that we had so thoroughly ignored the state in education, except for some predominantly liberal research on the 'politics of education'...' (ibid, p. 29). Apple recognises that the state increasingly has a role which entails socialising the costs of production of technical /administrative knowledge. Thus the state is seen as having two basic functions: maintaining profitability and accumulation, and legitimating the system. In periods of crisis these functions can become even more contradictory. A strategy, which Apple argues the state can employ in times of crisis, is to 'export' the crisis out of the state itself. That is, return the problem/crisis to the market and 'deflect any criticism' - and thereby maintain its legitimacy. Importantly, Apple sees that:

*" The increasing role that the state plays, for instance, in the cultural and economic production process means that these interventions are in the political arena and can potentially become political conflicts, not merely technical ones." (23)*

In this regard, Apple is in agreement with the views of Carnoy and Levin (1985) who have argued that:

*" Educational institutions are not just producers of dominant class conceptions of what and how much schooling should be provided; public[state] schools also reflect social demands. Attempts by the capitalist State to reproduce the relations of production and the class division of labor confront social movements that demand more public resources for their needs and more say in how these resources are to be used. The capitalist State and its educational system are therefore more than just a means for co-opting social demands, or for simply manipulating them to satisfy dominant class needs. Social demands shape the State and education." (24)*

It is necessary at this point to examine in more detail the work of Carnoy and Levin since it appears to have informed Apple's conception of the politics of education.

Carnoy and Levin's model of education starts from the class struggle in the *base* : the inherent contradictions between the interests of capital and labour. These struggles are seen as being mediated through state education. They insist that contradictions in the base are dealt with largely within the base and that crises in production should not be 'down played' in the production of change. This leads them to suggest that the education system plays an 'economic-reproductive' role as well as a *repressive* role. That is, it indirectly contributes to accumulation by producing skills necessary for that process. In doing so it can have a direct impact on capital-labour relations in so far as the generation of a reserve army of labour and new skills will affect the balance of these relations. Education also acts as an important area of employment. In its reproductive role, education reproduces the distribution of skills and encourages inequalities through the ideology of individualistic mobility. It also functions, through compulsion, as a repressive apparatus. Carnoy and Levin see these functions as coterminous. Attempts by the state to mediate the contradictions of production are however contradictory.

Carnoy and Levin then go on to identify two *principal* contradictions. Firstly, the crisis of legitimation which arises from credential inflation. That is, the 'over-education' of workers for the kinds of jobs available undermines the ideology and motivation of young to succeed. Secondly, the inculcation, albeit at an abstract level, of democratic rights jeopardises the legitimation of economic inequalities within the relations of production. As a result of these contradictions, the mediating role of the

education system is itself undermined. In such a situation, there will be a restructuring of the education system to bring it 'back into line', according to Carnoy and Levin. On the basis of Carnoy and Levin's model, Apple has therefore suggested that:

*" ...since schools are part of the state, of the political sphere, and the state has been the site of conflict between property rights and person rights, we should expect that schools will be more democratic than these other institutions." (25)*

This is very much in keeping with the recent views of Gintis and Bowles (see Chapter Two).

Apple appears to have all the ingredients for a thoroughgoing theory of educational change. He is concerned with the *form* of the curriculum; he looks at the labour process of teachers; he has a conception of resistance; he is aware of patriarchy and racism as determinants; and he has a conception of the role of the state. However, on closer inspection it can be seen that Apple has done very little to rectify the shortcomings of his predecessors. He has failed to go beyond a notion that the curriculum is being 'commodified' and 'technicised'. That is, he has adopted a rather 'productivist' notion of curriculum development which, ultimately he sees as determined by the 'large publishing houses' i.e. 'in the last instance', the economy. This is a very weak and ethnocentric conception of determination ( in the sense of helping explain the complexity of change). Similarly, his notion of 'proletarianisation' is left indeterminate. This is due to the uncritical acceptance of Wright's (1978) conception of the 'contradictory class location' of the new middle classes (see Ch.3). We are not sure whether it is the nature of teachers' work which has brought about their proletarianisation or their failure to effectively organise themselves, or both, as we are presented with largely anecdotal evidence. As for feminisation determining proletarianisation of teachers, we are again left to work out whether the sexual division of labour is a cause or an effect. Finally, Apple's conception of the state and politics turns out to be similar to that of both Carnoy and Levin and, as will be shown in the next chapter, that of Gintis and Bowles. As such, it shares the same basic limitation. That is, their conception of the contradiction between person and property rights is an unsatisfactory explanation of the source of educational change since it entails an acceptance of a notion of 'formal' equality in the political sphere. It is basically a liberal

conception which, unlike a Marxist conception, only serves to mystify capitalist social relations (see *critique of Gintis and Bowles in Chapter Two*).

#### 1.viii *A Critique of the Correspondence Principle*

Moore (1988) has argued that the original formulation of Bowles and Gintis' 'simple correspondence' theory has not been supplanted by the theoretical advances made by Apple and others. Indeed, Moore argues that these developments in the reproduction problematic have 'simply increased the complexity of the model of the system of relationships within which the correspondence theory operates' (p.51). Thus, the introduction of concepts such as 'relative autonomy', 'resistance', 'transformation' and 'hegemony' within recent *critical* conceptions of reproduction, have not repaired what Moore sees as a fundamental error in the major domain assumption which currently informs the Marxist Sociology of Education. That 'error', according to Moore, lies in the mistaken identification of the social relations *of* production with the system of social relations *in* production:

*"...it is this which provides the dimension of continuity within the development from simple to complex correspondence models and why the various responses to and strategies for developing correspondence only develop the complexity of the model within which the principle operates rather than transform the theory." (26)*

Moore demonstrates his thesis by reference to the work of both Bowles and Gintis and Althusser and the particular way in which they both achieved this conflation of the social relations of production and the social relations in production. For example, in his *ISA* (Ideological State Apparatuses) paper (1971), Althusser argued that the forces of production are always set to work within a definite set of relations of production, both of which have to be reproduced. Althusser proceeded to analyse the reproduction of the forces of production. Here the distinction between the *means* and *forces* of production became his starting point, with labour power being conceived as part of the latter. It is well known that for

Althusser the reproduction of labour power entailed the reproduction of (a) its material existence (the basic means of subsistence etc) and (b) its 'competence' (skills, knowledge and submission to the ideology of the ruling class). According to Althusser, the role of the educational system, as an ISA, was to reproduce the necessary competences.

Moore argues that it is in Althusser's assignation of the ES as an ISA that the conflation of its role in reproducing competences with the much wider concept of the reproduction of the relations of production occurs. Moore contends that the key moment in this conflation is Althusser's misunderstanding of the nature of the conditions for the material existence of labour power. Basically, Althusser takes an essentialist view of these material conditions and neglects to posit them, as Marx did, within the mode of production. That is to say, Marx saw the material conditions as constitutive of labour power as a commodity. These material conditions therefore precede labour power and the reproduction of the social relations *in* production. Thus, according to Moore, Marx argued that :

*" What is distinctive about the existence of labour power under capitalism is that it acquires the form of a commodity with an exchange value. Hence the material conditions for the existence of labour power under capitalism are the general conditions which bestow this form and which construct wage labour as a category. It is these conditions which constitute capitalist social relations of production, and they are prior to and are the precondition for wage labour within the process of direct production. Capitalist relations of production are general conditions and prior to the system of social relationships in production." (27)[original emphasis]*

As a result, Moore suggests that the concerns of the correspondence theorists, and those that have since followed, have been with the system of social relations *in* production rather than with the social relations *of* production. The role of the ES has been seen as one which reproduces these social relations in production as *if* they were the social relations of production. Utilising the work of Boudon (1974) in particular, Moore's believes he has demonstrated that this 'error' confounds the very *possibility* of there being any correspondence between the ES and the reproduction of the social relations *of* production (Moore 1984).



Moore's critique of existing reproduction theories is an important contribution to our understanding of the limitation of the reproduction problematic as it is presently constituted. However, it does not follow that we should accept his solution. Indeed Moore's own thesis serves to highlight some of the inadequacies of the theorists to whom he is most indebted - Bourdieu and Bernstein in particular. Therefore it is possible, by way of Moore's own conceptualisation of the relative autonomy of the ES, to appraise some aspects of the work of these theorists, with regard to their contribution to the theorisation of educational change.

The essential presumption of Moore's conception of the ES is that it be seen as a 'field in its own right,' ie. the site of the social relations of the material production of knowledge' ( p.71). This conception of the 'educational field' enables Moore to argue that, as a productive site, the regulation of the practices of the agents of the field becomes a central concern, both in terms of relations within knowledge production and between the educational field and other sites in the social formation. As a result, Moore identifies four problems which arise concerning the relationship between the ES and occupational system (the concern of correspondence theorists):

- (i) the determination of their *forms*;
- (ii) the relationship between the two *systems* in society;
- (iii) the characteristics of the systems of relationships *within* each;
- (iv) the relationship *between* the two systems of relationships.

(p.74)

The most significant point to note here is that Moore does not attempt to deal with problem (i), despite the fact that he recognises that it is this problem which 'relates most directly to the concept of the relations of production'. Instead, he goes on to the ground of the correspondence theorists and proceeds to attend to the relationship between the ES and the occupational system, the system of relations *in* production. It is this omission which signifies the fact that Moore's conception does not in itself address the issue which he claims is at the heart of the present difficulties within the reproduction problematic.

The major claim which Moore attempts to demonstrate is that the educational and occupational systems are distinctive sites of production with 'their own intrinsic principles and possibilities'. However, there is a

caveat in the same sentence and that is ' (under the social relations of production)'. One would therefore have thought that it is the prior social relations of production which needed to be theorised before the relationship between the distinctive systems could be examined. However, this is not attempted. Instead, the class categories which Moore employs are left unexplicated. It is here that the legacy of both Bourdieu and Bernstein is most apparent. As will be argued below, their conception of class - the social relations of production - which underpins the whole classificatory framework and, in particular, the autonomy of the ES as a distinct site of production - can be shown to be inadequate. More than that, it is based upon a conceptualisation of class which, in Moore's own terms, is fundamentally in error since it takes as its datum line the occupational system - the social relations *in* production. In short, a Weberian conception of class relations. At this point the legacy of both Bourdieu and Bernstein needs to be examined in some detail.

#### 1.ix *Bourdieu and Bernstein*

Bourdieu's (1977) basic premise is that all social formations are constituted in power relations and, as such, give rise to 'dominant' and 'dominated' groups and classes. The maintenance of such social formations cannot however, be achieved on the basis of brute force alone: ' There is no power relation, however mechanical and ruthless, which does not additionally exert a symbolic effect ' (p.10). In fact, Bourdieu goes on to declare that it is 'symbolic force' which is the key mechanism in the reproduction of power relations in the present social formation. This symbolic force is manifested in the form of 'pedagogic action' which is, according to Bourdieu, 'symbolic violence'. Thus social class positions are reproduced by the dominant, in so far as they have the ability and power to impose their cultural ascendancy upon the dominated via the use of symbolic violence. In other words, the dominant reproduce their domination by 'legitimizing' their position symbolically, as well as by virtue of their possession of other sources of power e.g. economic ascendancy and the potential for physical repression. The education system has become a key apparatus in this process.

The ability of the education system to legitimate the domination of the dominant class is predicated upon the fact that Bourdieu sees a dislocation between the dominant in the 'economic' sphere and those

dominant in the 'symbolic' sphere (or '*intellectual field*' as he terms it). This dislocation represents the degree of 'relative autonomy' of the education system from the productive base. Thus there exists, for Bourdieu, an area of the social - the intellectual field - which is relatively independent of production and this enables those who occupy this space to appropriate an alternative source of power, 'symbolic power', with which they can dominate others. As such, Bourdieu sees the dominant in the present social formation as being constituted by those who own economic capital *and* those who have possession of 'cultural capital'. However, it is stressed by Bourdieu that the latter are '*always expressing the former*', and as such it is the former who are in fact the dominant fraction of the dominant class.

In detail, Bourdieu's theory sets out to provide a series of transformations from what might be termed the 'micro' to the 'macro' levels of analysis of the process of cultural reproduction. At the level of the individual child, it is within the family and primary socialisation that Bourdieu locates the process of reproduction being initiated. The child is inculcated into a '*habitus*' - ' a system of modes of perception, of thinking, of appreciation and of action' which is class-based (ibid). The habitus is not a fully articulated 'ideology', in the narrow sense of the concept i.e. a coherent set of ideas. Rather, the habitus is seen as a set of generative rules or dispositions which can be called upon to realise certain practices. It is therefore both 'structure' and 'structuring' according to Bourdieu. The habitus, in turn, informs the general attitudes of the child towards the knowledge that the education system transmits. Bourdieu therefore sees children from different class backgrounds coming to the education system differentially endowed with 'cultural capital'. And it is the relationship between this endowment and the 'cultural arbitrary', the culture of the dominant class which is transmitted in the education system, which determines the child's achievement within the system. Although the education system transmits the culture of the dominant class, it does so in such a way as to distance itself from any charge of indoctrination. It is able to do this by virtue of its 'relative autonomy', which gives it the appearance of neutrality and objectivity in relation to the class nature of the knowledge it transmits. According to Bourdieu, the dominant culture is 'misrecognised' by *all* parties within the education process and it is this misrecognition which enables the domination of the

dominant to be legitimated within the education system:

*" In any given social formation, legitimate culture, i.e. the culture endowed with the dominant legitimacy, is nothing other than the dominant cultural arbitrary in so far as it is misrecognised in its objective truth as a cultural arbitrary and as the dominant cultural arbitrary."*  
(28)

It can be seen from this that the notion of 'misrecognition' is central to Bourdieu's theory. As with Weber, the legitimation of domination is only made possible if, in some way, the dominated conspire in their own subordination. According to Bourdieu, in terms of the reproduction of class positions, the dominated consciously eliminate themselves from contesting the power relations which are *'behind'* the transmission of knowledge and the selection system which accompanies that process. The individualised nature of the selection process, and especially the use of competitive examinations, by being seen to be 'fair' and 'neutral', merely legitimates the differentials in cultural capital which are class-based. This process of self-elimination therefore helps reproduce class positions (Willis 1977). And those few from working class backgrounds who do not 'drop out' and go on instead to 'achieve' within the education system, only serve to further legitimate the fairness of that system.

Bourdieu's theory of cultural reproduction has been criticised on virtually every level of analysis - theoretical, methodological and substantive. At the heart of these criticisms is the question of his conceptualisation of the very object of his theory, namely social class relations and their reproduction. Underlying this objection to his work is the criticism that Bourdieu conflates ' Marxist terminology with Weberian epistemology' (Sharp 1980). For instance, Bourdieu's use of the basically Marxist notion of a 'dominant class', which is sub-divided into 'fractions', and a 'dominated class', does not correspond to the substantive realisations found in his work. Thus one finds in his supporting evidence that he includes in his 'dominant' class such diverse fractions as teachers, administrators and engineers, as well as the more traditional fractions such as employers and professionals (1980, pp.225-259). As Poulantzas (1975) points out:

*" despite the fact that he uses, instead of the term elite, that of class fraction ( a case of 'Marxism oblige'), these 'fractions' are found to coincide with the 'socio-professional categories' of the INSEE(Institut National des Statistiques et Etudes Nationales)..." (29)*

Similarly Sharp (1980) notes:

*" In the light of the criteria he uses for differentiating between different fractions of the dominant classes, it seems evident that he is really discussing occupational elites and not class fractions in the Marxist sense ..."(30)*

What this means in fact for Bourdieu's theory is that the reproduction of social relations is translated into the reproduction of aggregates of individuals, who either share a similar market position or who have a common cultural or educational identity - a similar place in the intellectual field. Hence his ability to equate the class position of teachers and business tycoons! This is not simply the result of the data which Bourdieu uses (which is, nevertheless, problematic), rather, it is the effect of utilising a basically Weberian conception of social stratification. Bourdieu's economically dominant fraction corresponds to the uppermost stratum in Weber's property and commercial classes, and his symbolically dominant fraction is the equivalent of those who occupy the top of a Weberian status hierarchy. Together, these can be seen to constitute a 'plurality of elites' rather than a recognisable 'dominant class'. Swartz (1977) for example, is able to argue that;

*" Status group competition rather than social-class conflict best characterizes the dynamics of his [Bourdieu's] model. This perspective testifies to Bourdieu's greater affinity to Weber than to Marx." (31)*

One of the major consequences of Bourdieu's adoption of a Weberian perspective on social class is that he is left no choice but to see power as 'institutionalised'. That is to say, power is seen to emanate from the occupation of leading positions within institutions; and it is these positions which are captured by the dominant and used for their own ends. In this view, institutions are perceived as being intrinsically 'neutral' instruments which can be appropriated. Therefore the education system can be 'used' by the dominant class in Bourdieu's theory. Just as Poulantzas was able to criticise Weber's conception of institutional power in relation

to religion - ' ...Weber was wrong in claiming that the Church creates and perpetuates religion: rather it is religion which creates and perpetuates the Church ' (1975, p.29) - one might reasonably argue that Bourdieu ' is wrong to say that the educational system creates and perpetuates social classes: rather it is social classes which create and perpetuate the educational system' .

A second major consequence of Bourdieu's implicit Weberianism is that it leads him to set up the problem of reproduction as simply one of 'legitimation'. Whilst it is undeniable that the cultural aspect of reproduction does involve a process whereby inequalities are 'naturalised' and 'legitimated', contestation, resistance and conflict are not thereby automatically subsumed or removed, as they appear to be in Bourdieu's theory. As with Weber, Bourdieu fails to distinguish between the problem of 'legitimation' and that of 'legitimacy':

*" legitimations are claims that the dominant groups make about themselves ...Legitimacy, on the other hand, refers to the condition in which such claims have in fact been accepted and endorsed by subordinate groups. Legitimations emanate from on high, but legitimacy is bestowed from below." (32)*

This distinction has profound implications for those who have adopted Weber's notion, or variants of it, as it means that they are forced to view the question of domination as a problem for the *dominated*. Hence the centrality of 'misrecognition' in Bourdieu's theory, and the problem this poses for him of having the dominated adopt an almost schizophrenic position in relation to the education system. Thus, they are supposedly rational enough to perceive their 'objective' chances ( or lack of them) within the system, yet irrational enough to misconceive the real class nature of the overall process.

Another major absence in Bourdieu's theory ( and one which is not really surprising given the above criticisms) is any role for the state in the reproduction of class relations. Bourdieu's few references to the state are entirely in keeping with his 'instrumentalism'. For example, speaking of the state in general:

*"...the refusal to recognise the relative autonomy of the State apparatus leads one to ignore some of the best-hidden services this apparatus renders to the dominant classes in accrediting, thanks to its autonomy, the representation of the State as an umpire ..."* (33)

Bourdieu appears to be saying here that the 'neutrality' of the state is brought about by its relative autonomy which, in turn, enables it to perform its functions for the dominant class more effectively. In this respect Bourdieu is merely repeating his conception of the education system, only writ large. There is no mention of internal contradiction or contestation within the state, and the relativity of its relative autonomy is nowhere seriously addressed. In fact, within his theory in general, the state has only a peripheral role in the key area of the intellectual field. This is due to the fact that he sees this field as largely self-regulating. According to Bourdieu, the 'agents' within the field of symbolic control are so well inculcated into its ethos, by virtue of their own positions being dependent upon the maintenance of the autonomy of the field itself, that 'outside' or state interference is usually uncalled for (1977, p.196-7). In Britain at least, from the introduction of compulsory education to the interventions of the Manpower Services Commission, the role of the State in shaping the education of the dominated has been anything but marginal. The 'autonomous history' of educational institutions which Bourdieu refers to can only really be said to be true in respect to private schools and, to a lesser extent perhaps, certain Universities. Although even here the state's role has been less than perfunctory.

One is left with the distinct impression that Bourdieu seriously underestimates the role of the 'political' in his analysis and, in particular, the role of the state in the reproduction of class relations. Despite his claim that relations of power permeate all social relations, his work is singularly devoid of any analysis of the origins and manifestations of power, other than in an institutional form. This, rather ironically one feels, places Bourdieu's work alongside that of the political-arithmetic tradition in its inadequate conception of social class relations.

Bourdieu's work can be seen in fact to have inspired a number of 'cultural' reproduction theories, amongst which, within the British context, the work of Bernstein (1977) is undoubtedly the most important. Bernstein's

work is difficult to classify, yet it has much in common with that of Bourdieu. Therefore I propose to concentrate, as with Bourdieu, on Bernstein's conception of social class relations. I will contend that his concept of social class undermines the possibility of his work being utilised in the theorisation of educational change.

Despite Atkinson's (1985) assertion that, within Bernstein's work power relations are ubiquitous, it is, if anything, even more apolitical than that of Bourdieu. It will be argued here that the principal reason for this can be seen to lie in his concept of class relations. Bernstein (1982) has defined class relations as follows:

*" Class relations will be taken to refer to inequalities in the distribution of power and in the principles of control between social groups which are realised in the creation, distribution, reproduction and legitimation of physical and symbolic values which have their source in the social division of labour." (34) [emphasis added]*

It is evident that, when deconstructed, this definition can be seen to contain the familiar Weberian triad of 'class, status and party' - the 'division of labour' (class), 'the principle of control' (non-economic authority - status), and 'distribution of power' ( party). It is hardly surprising then that classes are seen as 'categories', discrete entities, and their classification appears quite arbitrary. There is no place for 'class struggle' in this schema; at least, it can only occur *after* classes have already been formed. Thus classes are already determined rather than constituted in class relations; they are *distributed* rather than 'emergent' in practices. Furthermore, status and party (politics) are seen as separate dimensions of stratification. The economic and the political are therefore conceived as quite distinct spheres of domination - power and control are divorced in Bernstein's analysis.

This can be seen especially in Bernstein's discussion of the new middle class. Outwardly, the distinction which Bernstein makes between a 'ruling class' - ' that is, those who dominate production by deciding its means, contexts and possibilities ' - and a ' middle class', of whom a fraction appropriate the means of symbolic control, would appear to be more in the mould of current neo-Marxist theorising than Bourdieu's variety of Weberian analysis. In contrast to Bourdieu's notion that cultural capital merely 'expresses' economic capital, Bernstein appears to

be far more assertive in his contention that '... there is a division between dominating power (production) and dominating control (cultural production) and that the former limits the latter.' [original emphasis] (1977,p.191). From this it would appear that Bernstein's analysis is distinct from that of Bourdieu. However, at a more substantive level, Bernstein's conception is, like Bourdieu, seen to concern, almost exclusively, the 'middle class', or more specifically the 'new' middle class.

It is not difficult to understand Bernstein's concentration on the 'new' middle class. It is due to his acceptance of the thesis that, under the conditions of modern monopoly capitalism, there has been a 'divorce' between ownership and control of the means of production. Thus there has occurred a decomposition of the traditional ruling class and with this the possibility now exists that 'managerial control' provides an alternative basis for class structuration:

*"...with developed forms of capitalism, not only do management functions become divorced from ownership, but there is an expansion of social control positions which have their basis in specialized forms of communication - With this extension and differentiation of control functions, the basis of property becomes partly psychologized, and its basis is located in ownership of specialized forms of communication." (35)*

The reproduction of the 'new' middle class is seen as being largely the product of the control they exercise over the education system, which, according to Bernstein, represents an alternative basis for class formation. This conception is made possible by virtue of the fact that, in common with Bourdieu, Bernstein sees education as relatively autonomous of production under present capitalist conditions. It is important to note here that, in the absence of an analysis of the cultural reproduction of the 'ruling class', the limits production exerts over education are left unexamined. In Bernstein's account these limits appear in any case to be mainly 'technical', i.e. they are seen as being derived largely from changes in the technical division of labour. Thus Bernstein's account of cultural reproduction has been criticised for its determinism, '...the model needs to be enriched by taking into account factors, such as political and cultural struggles, that cannot be reduced to the division of labor alone' (Cherkaoui 1977,p.561)[emphasis added]. Of course, the underlying premise of the above criticism of Bernstein is that this distinction between the

'ruling' and 'middle' classes is maintained throughout his work. In practice however this is not the case.

A careful reading of Bernstein's work reveals a recurring conflation of his notion of the ruling class with the middle class and this finds expression in his conception of an 'old' middle class:

*" What we call here the old middle class ( essentially nineteenth century) based itself on the ideology of radical individualism ( a form of integration referred to as individualised organic solidarity), whether its functions were entrepreneurial or professional." (36)*

It is important to note that Bernstein sees that under '... individualised organic solidarity. property has an essentially physical nature...' (ibid,p.126). Thus Bernstein sees the reproduction of the old middle class as simple replication, which involved inheritance and the inculcation of an ideology transmitted principally through the family and the public school. One can see here that what Bernstein is describing applies equally to the ruling class proper in the nineteenth century. Therefore there is every reason to believe that this old middle class and the ruling class are one and the same for Bernstein. (This usage of the term 'middle class' is, however, quite common in reference to the 'rising' Bourgeoisie of the nineteenth century, the nouveau riche, who were seen *politically* in relation to the aristocracy and the working class as in the 'middle'. Therefore it is essentially a denotation of their citizenship, not their 'class'.) However, the term 'middle' class becomes confusing in Bernstein's work because it opens up the possibility that the 'new' middle class can also be equated with the ruling class as a result of its ownership of 'psychologised property':

*" ...although property in a physical sense remains crucial,it has been partly psychologized and appears in the form of ownership of valued skills made available in educational institutions. Thus, if the new middle class is to repeat its position in the class structure, then appropriate secondary socialisation into privileged education becomes crucial." (37)*

Additional evidence of Bernstein's conflation of the ruling class with the middle class lies in the fact that he sees the former maintaining their power by attempting to 'control the State' (ibid, p.191) Yet, in his analysis of the type of roles undertaken by the 'new' middle class, the

majority are seen as occupying positions of control within the State apparatuses (ibid, p.128). That is, unless he adopts a crude 'instrumentalist' view of the state and its apparatuses - which conflicts with his notion of there being some relative autonomy - the 'ruling class' would appear not to have direct control of the state. Instead, what we see is the 'new' middle class at the helm. In which case, does this make the new middle class a significant fraction of the current ruling class, or are they merely 'agents'/representatives for the ruling class?

What is important here, however, is to note the effect this type of formulation has on Bernstein's conception of reproduction. What actually occurs, as in the case of Bourdieu, is that the *origins* of the power of the dominant actually disappear from the analysis, save in the case of the 'new' middle class and their symbolically derived power. Power relations, other than those which are 'legitimate' and institutionalised, remain submerged in Bernstein's thesis. That is, they are everywhere and nowhere. For this reason, Atkinson's notion that power relations are ubiquitous in Bernstein's work does after all have some validity, though not in the way he suggests. Thus this type of analysis can itself be seen as contributing to the process of reproduction by failing to recognise ('misrecognising') the location and origins of class relations and their political manifestation. As such Bernstein's work does not provide the basis for an intrinsic political analysis of educational change.

#### 1.x *Summary*

In this chapter the three major approaches within the Sociology of Education have been examined in respect of their theorisation of educational change. It has been shown that the absence of an intrinsic political analysis within each approach has inhibited the theorisation of change. The reason for this absence has been located in the effects of the preferred methodologies and, perhaps more importantly, the political commitments of the theorists themselves. In each case a particular combination of these factors has prevented the theorisation of change.

Within each of these major approaches an inadequate conceptualisation of the social structure, and in particular the political aspects of the social relations of production, can be seen as the key to this failure to theorise educational change. Without this theoretical basis, an intrinsic political analysis of educational change is impossible because the nature of power and domination within the education system is delimited to either a simple reflection of relations outside the system or an autonomous domain with its 'own principles and possibilities'. The mediating site between the two, what here is being taken to be 'the political', is elided in such conceptualisations. An internal/external dichotomy with regard to the nature of change is maintained.

Whilst this chapter has been concerned exclusively with the Sociology of Education, a vast amount of literature exists elsewhere which deals with 'educational change' and 'educational innovation' (Nicholls 1983). For the purposes of this thesis it has therefore been necessary to delimit this survey of the literature. Broadly, this delimitation has been sociological rather than educational. That is, only models and theories which have explicitly attempted to examine the relationship between the education system and the social structure have been referenced or examined in relation to their theorisation of educational change.

In order to theorise educational change most authors have found it necessary to first construct a model of the ES. This exercise has by no means been the preserve of Sociologists. Indeed, of late, some of the most notable models have come from political economists eg. Carnoy and Levin, Gintis and Bowles. As a result, one of the features of these recent attempts to construct models of the ES has been the inclusion of a role for 'politics' in bringing about educational change. That is, 'intrinsic' political analyses of educational change have recently been attempted. Since it is the *absence* of such analyses which formed the basis of the critique of the Sociology of Education in this chapter, the following chapter is devoted to an examination of these recent 'political' models, which Shipman (1984) has usefully identified as falling into two distinct types - pluralist and social systems models. Examples of both types will now be examined in Chapter Two.

## Notes and References - Chapter One

1. Dale (1982) pp.128-9
2. Halsey, Floud & Anderson (1961) p.2
3. Bernstein (1977) pp.170-1
4. Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS) (1981) p.84. These authors are being taken here as an authoritative source since their 'political' analysis is exceptional in terms of its 'intrinsic' nature.
5. CCCS *op cit* p.88
6. Moore (1988) p.53
7. Sharp (1980) p.78
8. Halsey (1977) p.61
9. Moore (1988) p.54
10. Marx (1867) Capital, Vol.1,Ch.23 in Lawrence & Wishart ed. 1970
11. Gintis & Bowles (1980) p.52
12. *ibid*
13. Bowles & Gintis, quoted in Sarup (1978) p.181
14. Gintis & Bowles *op cit* p.55
15. Bowles & Gintis, in Sarup, *op cit*, p.180
16. CCCS (1981) p.9
17. *ibid* p.19
18. *ibid*
19. Hargreaves & Hammersley (1982) p.141
20. CCCS, *op cit*, p.20
21. *ibid* p.32
22. Apple (1985) pp.248-9
23. *ibid* p.61
24. Carnoy & Levin (1986) p.195
25. Apple (1986) p.194
26. Moore (1986) p.66
27. *ibid* p.68
28. Bourdieu (1977) p.23
29. Poulantzas (1975) p.177
30. Sharp (1980) p.71
31. Swartz (1977) p.554
32. Parkin (1982) pp.77-8
33. Bourdieu *op cit* p.165
34. Bernstein (1982) p.304
35. Bernstein *op cit* p.131
36. *ibid* p.127
37. *ibid*

## CHAPTER TWO

### *Political Models of Educational Change*

#### *2.i Introduction*

To facilitate this examination of recent political models of educational change I have adapted Dunleavy's (1980) methodology with respect to his analysis of perspectives in 'Urban Politics'. As a result five basic questions will be asked relating to these models:

- (i) How do they delimit/conceptualise the education system (ES) ?
- (ii) How do they define educational change ?
- (iii) How autonomous do they see educational processes vis-a-vis non-educational processes in shaping educational change ?
- (iv) How autonomous do they see political processes vis-a-vis socio-economic processes in shaping educational change ?
- (v) What are their fundamental units of analysis ?

The rationale behind the use of this methodology is that in each case it entails (a) identifying a theoretical object of analysis ie. the relationship between the ES and the wider social structure, (b) asking how 'educational change' is to be conceptualised, and (c) examining how change is seen to come about and in particular the role of 'politics' in this process. It is therefore a framework which will provide a coherence to this examination of the theorisation of educational change within each of the models. The actual models to be reviewed are, from the pluralist tradition, the work of Archer (1981) and Salter and Tapper (1981) and from the social systems tradition, the work of Gintis and Bowles (1980,1988).

As with the Sociology of Education in general, it will be shown in this chapter that the theorisation of educational change in these 'political' models is inadequate. It will be argued that this is due to the particular conceptions of both social relations and the 'political' which are employed in these accounts. As a result, these conceptions are shown to have prevented the development of a 'translation effect' between different levels of analysis of educational change. For this reason, a

conceptualisation of social relations and the 'specificity of the political' which enables such an effect to be realised will be the subject of Chapters Three and Four. This will then be used as a basis for the development of a 'content-theoretical' model of educational change presented in Chapter Five.

## 2.ii M.S. ARCHER

Archer's work represents an attempt to formulate a comprehensive model of how education systems change. Her thesis is firmly within the pluralist tradition. As such, it is primarily concerned with the *distribution* of power measured in terms of the distribution of resources ie. a perspective which sees power as dispersed. In fact Archer utilises a combination of resource dependency theory and general systems theory in her model. Resource dependency theory holds that power can be measured in terms of resource ownership and that the value of a resource can be gauged by its scarcity/demand. Compliance is achieved in exchanges or 'negotiations' between organisations for their respective scarce resources. Archer's model of educational change therefore consists of an elaborate systemisation of resource identification, distribution and exchange within the education system.

(i) *How does Archer delimit the education system in her model ?*

Archer delimits the ES by taking an institutional approach. She therefore defines the ES as:

*" ...a nationwide and differentiated collection of institutions devoted to formal education, whose overall control and supervision is at least partly governmental, and whose component parts and processes are related to one another." (1)*

What is noticeable about this delimitation is the unproblematic way she treats education or, to be more precise, 'formal education'. She adopts in fact a completely normative conception ie. one which sees the ES as an arena within which there is an unproblematic consensus as to its function - the provision of 'formal education'. This necessarily circumscribes her understanding of educational change in so far as social relations,

contestation and content are defined by the institutional boundaries and functions of the system.

(ii) *How does Archer define educational change within her model?*

At no point in the outline of her model does Archer specify exactly what she means by 'educational change'. This can be seen to derive directly from her taken-for-granted conception of 'education'. As a result, we are left with a number of possible interpretations of what might constitute 'educational change'. From the nature of her delimitation of the ES and the general pluralist orientation of the model, change appears to entail some redistribution of power and control within the matrix of institutions which comprise the system. Furthermore, change is measurable in terms of the relative bargaining strengths of the interest groups involved in the 'government' of the ES. It is apparent that Archer is not really concerned with the content of educational change at all. Archer's conception of educational change can in fact be seen to refer to the *processes* of change i.e. the means by which certain outcomes are arrived at ( in Archer's case the policies which result from negotiations and exchanges). Thus, the problem with Archer's model is that it excludes any reference to the actual nature of educational practices. However, within the outline of her model Archer does hint at the levels within the ES at which change may occur. In particular, she argues for analyses which capture change at the level ' of the school, the community and the nation'. Within these three levels she also hints at the form that change may take, although once again it is the process which is evident rather than the content.

(iii) *How autonomous are educational processes vis-a-vis non-educational processes in shaping educational change within Archer's model?*

Archer sees educational change as the product of three varieties of 'negotiation' which may take place between different groups within the ES. She states that all '... three processes are held to be universal in state systems although their relative importance varies greatly with the structure of the national educational system ' (p.32). These three types of negotiation are:

1. *'Internal initiation'* - whereby change is initiated within the system by educational personnel or their professional organisations.

Internal initiation is seen by Archer as the type of negotiation which involves the educational professionals exchanging their expertise, *'the specialist knowledge possessed by teachers', for financial resources and legal rights (p.34).*

2. *' External transaction'*, which involves the interaction between internal and external pressure groups. The internal groups, notably the professionals, negotiate with the external group following, usually, the latter's initiation of the exchange. Thus, what *'external transaction'* actually involves is the exchange of the interest groups' wealth for the expertise of the educational professionals.

3. *' Political manipulation'* which arises out of the fact that public funding and policy-making are sites of intervention for all manner of groups which are lacking in in terms of both wealth and expertise. Archer's model, because of its systemic nature, involves seeing these different types of negotiation as interwoven and interacting:

*" ...each form of negotiation and the changes to which it gives rise has repercussions on the others. This then is the complex network of interaction and change which must be unravelled in order to explain the transformation of educational systems." (2)*

Archer then draws upon both exchange theory and *'non-organic'* systems theory to help unravel the relationships outlined above. Exchange transactions and power are seen as *'linked'* to the extent that control and reciprocity are the outcomes of unequal relations between the interested parties.

According to Archer, the *'rates of exchange'* are normative and thus vary over time. The overall distribution of resources is seen as the context within which these exchanges take place. Again, because of its systemic nature, this context is integrated, to the extent that the repercussions of transactions in one sphere will find their way to other spheres. This entails the specification of those repercussions if we are to understand the nature of change within the system. If then we take educational change to be the changes in the resource bargaining strengths of interest groups i.e. changes in the *'balance of power'*, the relative

autonomy of *educational* processes in initiating change appears to be extremely limited within Archer's model - to 'internal initiation' in fact.

What is noticeable, and clearly stated by Archer, is that it is the *distribution* of resources which is the key to the whole process. Yet, she is unable to explain the momentum or dynamic of change within her model:

*" Resource distributions change over time, largely in response to non-educational factors, and thus while they are introduced here, they cannot themselves be explained within the framework of the present analysis." (3)(emphasis added)*

This raises a number of very serious issues. Firstly, how are we to trace the 'correspondence' between resource distribution and educational interaction when, by Archer's own admission,

*"...the social distribution of resources and the structure of educational interest groups can change independently of one another." (4)*

Secondly, given that this problem of 'correspondence' could be overcome, what are we to take as the measure of the outcome of educational interactions? Presumably the results of decision-making i.e. policy. If this is so, all the problems of pluralist analysis are brought to bear on this model and, in particular, the problem of gauging non-decision making ( Bachrach & Baratz 1971). Thirdly, Archer's reliance on exchange theory means that the problem of 'commensurability' or exchange rates between resource holders is mystified. Archer herself recognises this and notes that her model entails:

*"...problems of commensurability between the three hierarchies [ wealth, expertise and political power], in the absence of a common denominator to which all resources can be reduced. In view of this we are forced to work in rather gross terms, merely designating groups as having high or low access to particular resources, and are constrained to avoid detailed comparative statements about the relative availability of different resources to given groups." (5)*

Since the whole object of the exercise is to trace the relative power of the different groups within the processes of negotiation, the fact that one cannot assess their relative strengths with any degree of accuracy seems to undermine the utility of the model.

Archer's problem can be seen to stem from the fact that she cannot equate the resources available to the different parties to the negotiations. That is to say, wealth, expertise and political power are always seen as separate entities. This derives from Archer's rather 'slavish' interpretation of Weber's distinction between class, status and power. Thus Archer can be criticised for concerning herself almost exclusively with the distribution of resources and, as a result, neglects their production i.e. she looks at *how* power is used rather than its origins or nature. This is a particularly important criticism in relation to any understanding of education and *educational* change because 'expertise' is itself a resource which is *produced* within the system and it is one which has political effects. Archer fails to see the importance of this, despite her recognition of the fact that 'educational interaction itself will bring certain interest groups into a better position vis-a-vis resources...' (p.39). This failure highlights the need for a model of the ES which takes into account its productive nature (Apple, 1982).

(iv) *How autonomous are political processes vis-a-vis socio-economic processes in shaping educational change within Archer's model ?*

Archer's model of the ES is a 'political' model only in so far as she appears to adopt a rather undeveloped Weberian conception of the political. Unfortunately, this particular interpretation of the political has nothing to say about the nature of either power or domination. Furthermore, the whole question of the role of the state is treated rather summarily (unlike Weber himself). Therefore we find in Archer's model the state appearing as a neutral instrument which is particularly responsive to political demands, especially from those who lack alternative means of achieving their goals i.e. those groups which lack expertise or wealth. She gives no account of why or how this fully democratic process actually operates. For example, the representativeness of these interest groups and their organisational effectiveness are nowhere raised as issues. The state therefore appears bereft of power other than that which is 'legitimate' (thereby ignoring Weber's own conception of the state as the 'monopoly of physical violence'). Although Archer makes great play of the distinction between centralised and decentralised systems, she also fails to elaborate upon the role of the state other than as a repository of funds or administration i.e. it only appears to have an allocative role.

(v) *What are the fundamental units of analysis within Archer's model?*

The fundamental units of analysis within Archer's model are made explicit in her distinction between 'broad' and 'high' educational politics. Archer defines the former as:

*"... attempts ( conscious and organised to some degree) to influence the inputs, processes and outputs of education, whether by legislation, pressure group or union action, experimentation, private investment, local transactions, internal innovation or propaganda." (6)*

And 'high' educational politics as:

*" ...the analysis of interpersonal relations at government ( and in our decentralised system, local government) level(s)." (7)*

Archer suggests that there is a degree of relative autonomy between these two types of educational politics. Thus she sees some 'partial autonomy' for 'high' politics and, in particular, the ability of 'personalities' to modify policy outcomes. This she gives as a reason for the necessity of having different methodologies for the study of the two types of politics. However, on inspection, the different methodologies turn out to be variants of one, methodological individualism. Thus, Archer's call for different methodologies in relation to 'broad' and 'high' educational politics, can in fact be seen to correspond to Lukes'(1973) definition of the two strands of methodological individualism. That is, 'social institutions ... as founded and maintained by individuals to fulfil their ends, framed independently of the institutions' ( Archer's 'broad' politics) and 'every statement about social phenomena is either a statement about individual human beings or it is unintelligible' (Archer's 'high' politics)(Lukes 1973, pp. 116-18). Both of these positions are encompassed within the perspective of methodological individualism.

Archer's model is also predicated on a notion of interests which appear as wants ie. a conception which is equivalent to saying that ' ... a given course of action is in someone's interests... [if] the actor wants to carry out that course of action ' (Giddens 1979, p.188). This conception of interests raises the whole question of the recognition of these interests and the possibility that interests exist other than those expressed by the actors concerned. That is to say, the distinction between subjective and

objective interests is reduced in Archer's model to the examination of only those conflicts of interest which are expressed in the 'issues' or decision-making processes. As a result, change is delimited to the institutional level, and the possibility of investigating different levels of analysis, within the same model, is precluded.

To conclude, Archer's concern with the *processes* rather than the nature or content of educational change means that there is nothing particularly 'educational' about her model. It is therefore difficult to agree with Salter and Tapper when they argue that,

*"Archer..., in our opinion, has not proposed a theory of educational change but rather analysed the forms of educational change." (8)*

Archer has not even provided us with the 'forms' of educational change. Indeed, the systems approach she adopts makes it very difficult to discern where change comes from within her model. We have the rather vague prescription of 'internal', 'external' and 'political' negotiations acting as a change dynamic, but no account of what sets these negotiations in train. Similarly, the context of change appears to be a relatively self-stabilising environment which, in itself, also makes it difficult to identify where the impetus for change might be generated.

Since there is nothing specifically 'educational' about Archer's model i.e. in terms of both the content and processes relating to training, socialisation and selection within the ES, it must by definition preclude any possibility of it being used to carry out an intrinsic political analysis of recent educational change. That is to say, although the role of political processes in bringing about educational change is made apparent in the model, the relationship between education and politics is completely arbitrary. Archer's model must therefore be seen as a political/sociological/organisations model which just so happens to have some affinity with the particular configuration of institutions which have 'formal education' as their common denominator. There is no theoretical justification for any particular relationship i.e. Archer has failed to theorise the content of 'formal education' and how this is related to the politics of educational change.

### 2.iii *Salter and Tapper*

As indicated in the General Introduction to this thesis, Salter and Tapper contend that the Sociology of Education has neglected the theorisation of educational change. Furthermore, they argue that this neglect, which is so apparent in the current period, stems from a reluctance (or inability) of Sociologists of Education to seriously engage in analyses of educational change which incorporate a political dimension ( what I have referred to as 'intrinsic' political analyses of educational change). Salter and Tapper's project in *Education, Politics and the State (1981)* was therefore to develop a 'socio-political theory of educational change':

*" ...a theory which shows how the social and economic pressures for change have to be politically negotiated in the context of state institutions ."(9)[emphasis added]*

#### (i) *How do Salter and Tapper delimit the ES within their theory?*

Salter and Tapper argue for an eclectic approach to the study of educational change. This eclecticism, in practice, involves them in an attempt to combine a concern with the institutional matrix of the ES - an approach not too dissimilar to that of Archer - with a functional approach. That is, they see the ES in terms of a set of state apparatuses which have the specific function of reproducing social relations. However, in their actual analysis, this eclecticism soon dissolves into a paramount concern with the institutional arrangement of the ES. This can be seen to be the product of the particular conception of politics which they employ. Thus within Salter and Tapper's analysis, the ES comes to be delimited in purely institutional terms.

#### (ii) *How do they define educational change?*

Salter and Tapper take educational change to mean, '...change in the way all or part of the education system is organized and administered...' (p.2). More specifically, they see educational change as having two dimensions. First, change in the 'institutional character of schooling'. And secondly, change in the 'experience of schooling'. What is noticeable about

this conception is the failure to specify what actually constitutes change in either of these spheres. Furthermore, along the dimension of educational experience it is not clear whose experience they are referring to (presumably the pupils/students?). Without this type of specification 'change' remains, much like Archer's conception, a catch-all category.

Salter and Tapper develop the following typology based upon the above distinction between the institutional and experiential dimensions of educational change:

### TYPES OF EDUCATIONAL CHANGE

|   | <i>Total</i>  | <i>Restricted</i> |
|---|---------------|-------------------|
| <i>Impact upon the Institutional -<br/>Character of Schooling</i> | Revolutionary | Reformist         |
| <i>Impact upon the Experience<br/>of Schooling</i>                | Privatized    | Localized         |

( Salter and Tapper,p.46)

However, the utility of this typology is not really made apparent in their text. At one point Salter and Tapper argue that:

*" Change which is general in terms of institutional scope and which completely reshapes the character of schooling is rare and invariably occurs gradually..."(10)[emphasis added]*

Yet this would appear to fall outside their typology, which only allows for 'general' and 'total' change to be 'revolutionary' in character. For this reason Salter and Tapper are left to argue that, in the present conjuncture ' we may be witnessing something of a contradiction in terms - a state sponsored attempt at revolutionary change ' (p.49). This 'contradiction in terms' only appears to arise out of their own typology.

We are invited by Salter and Tapper to view change in three inter-related 'arenas'. Firstly, in the arena of the social ends of education and the experience of schooling. Secondly, in the allocation of resources related to those ends. Thirdly, in the distribution of power between institutions. Salter and Tapper hypothesize that:

*" Changes within the first two arenas have a bearing on changes in the third, but it is our contention that this may emerge as one of the more significant consequences of the contemporary struggle i.e. the location of educational power may shift more dramatically than either the goals of the educational system or the experience of schooling or the concomitant resource allocations." (11)*

This seems teleological and bears out the poverty of their 'institutional' approach. That is, one would expect a change in the distribution of power within education to precede any changes in the nature of schooling and/or resource allocation. And it is perhaps only by capturing or redistributing power that a redefinition of the goals of education and the redirection of resources to achieve those new goals can be accomplished.

(iii) *How autonomous are educational processes vis-a-vis non-educational processes in shaping educational change within Salter and Tapper's theory?*

Salter and Tapper argue that modern society has a 'general need' for rational modes of organizing social relations, and that state bureaucracies have also '...developed to the point where they are capable of generating and sustaining their own autonomous needs' (p.7). However, Salter and Tapper see the education system as operating somewhat differently from other, largely mono-functional, state apparatuses. This is because the education system operates on two planes. It not only services individual needs, it also has the wider social function of servicing the 'credentialling needs' of society. The interesting point here, and one which is very contentious, is that they see the state producing patterns of inequality in accordance with its own rationality ie. the state appears to be absolutely autonomous.

Salter and Tapper see the possibility, especially in times of economic crisis, of contradictory pressures arising from the education system's twin functions of providing both a trained labour force and social control.

Added to which are the bureaucratic pressures emanating from the internal 'needs' of the system:

*"...the educational bureaucracy itself and the demands for rational credentialling to which education may or may not respond, can together magnify the importance of the bureaucratic dynamic to the extent that it assumes a development logic of its own, independent of social and economic pressures."(12)[emphasis added]*

The difficulty with this position is that the rationality arising out of the 'needs' of the educational bureaucracy has to be shown to be autonomous or 'relatively autonomous' of 'social and economic pressures'. Nowhere, however, do they convincingly show it to be the case. One of the major reasons for this lies in the fact that they, like Archer, utilise a normative conception of 'education' which, because of its taken-for-grantedness, does not require the authors to identify the rationality which is specific to its administration. The nature and degree of relative autonomy of 'educational' processes in shaping educational change cannot therefore be gauged in Salter and Tapper's theory.

(iv) *How autonomous are political processes vis-a-vis socio-economic processes in shaping educational change within Salter and Tapper's theory?*

Salter and Tapper state:

*"...we believe that the dynamic for educational change is politically controlled...It is part of our thesis that schooling is constrained by the needs of capital but if these needs are to influence the process of educational change they must be expressed in effective political terms." (13)*

As a result, they identify three 'social determinants' of educational change:-

1. *The changing social ends of education.* Accepting the division between the social and technical relations of production, Salter and Tapper see the education system acting to produce both technically competent and 'disciplined' workers. The failure of the system to meet one or both of these objectives, or a harmonious compromise, calls into question the whole system. This questioning is more likely to occur in times of protracted economic crisis. As a result, Salter and Tapper see such a crisis

precipitating a restructuring of the education system and, in particular, attempts to bring the system 'back into line ' with the needs of the economy. Indeed, such a restructuring was thought to be in train at the time they were writing (1981). Salter and Tapper accept that the outcome of such moves are indeterminate. Interest groups are seen as negotiating a new 'consensus' which, in reality, amounts to compromises being made.

Apart from producing a technical and disciplined labour force, Salter and Tapper see the education system as charged with meeting the needs of individuals - as citizens - what they refer to as 'social demand'. What is interesting here is the fact that Salter and Tapper do not see that this commitment to citizenship is not only desirable but necessary to secure the legitimation of the system. Thus the 'democratic' element of the provision is an essential ingredient in its political role. Thus, in times of economic constraint, Salter and Tapper see 'social demand' as the first victim of cutbacks and restructuring. However, what they fail to see is the fact that in order to curtail this social demand, the institutional framework within which it has hitherto been articulated, principally the Local state, also needs to be dismantled or made impotent. The omission in Salter and Tapper's thesis of any serious discussion of this facet of educational change is not really surprising given their limited institutional focus.

2. *Demographic trends.* These are seen by Salter and Tapper as providing contexts suitable for restructuring and educational change. This of course has a significant bearing on both the nature of youth unemployment and the relationship between FE and the Schools in particular. However the translation of demographic trends into educational forms is not shown by Salter and Tapper to have a relatively autonomous role in instigating educational change.

3. *Political inputs.* Salter and Tapper's section on 'political inputs' as a determinant of educational change gives rise to a very serious problem - which is surprising given their emphasis on the 'political'. They seem to contradict themselves over the relative strength of political inputs in the process of educational change. On the one hand they argue that:

*"If the political commitment of a government to a particular policy is high then it is unlikely to be resisted even if it should run contrary to the logic suggested by demographic trends and/or the need to readjust the social goals of schooling." (14)*

Whilst on the other hand, they argue that:

*"If the political parties have defined policy positions these risk being squeezed out by more potent determinants of educational change, especially if they should run counter to the policy logic of those determinants." (15)*

If they are saying that, in practice, political inputs are marginal to educational change, it is difficult to reconcile this with their whole thesis unless we interpret the 'political' very narrowly to mean party politics. This narrow conception of the 'political' undermines their own general thesis which sees the dynamic of change as 'political'. A much broader conception of 'politics' is therefore required to sustain such a thesis.

Salter and Tapper see the 'dynamic of educational change' as arising out of 'tensions' between the economic base and the superstructure and within the superstructure itself ( cf. Carnoy and Levin, Ch.1). In particular, Salter and Tapper see 'bureaucratic' pressure as being vitally important in the production of change.

*" ...tensions are created not simply as a result of passive structural impediments to the economic and social pressures, impediments which alone can redirect that dynamic, but also as a result of a counter-pressure which is essentially bureaucratic. It is out of the interaction of these pressures that the dynamic for change is born." (16)*

Here Salter and Tapper move precariously onto the ground of 'relative autonomy' theory. However, they appear to be arguing for an emphasis on 'autonomy' rather than the 'relative'. Their proposition entails a notion that the 'rationale' which they see developing within the state apparatuses is [may be?] independent of the socio-economic context within which those institutions operate.

A neo-Marxist retort to Salter and Tapper might be that the 'rationale' which they identify is one which has been developed within a certain socio-economic context and as such bears all the hallmarks of that

context. Secondly, following Poulantzas, the notion that the state may operate, on occasions, against the direct interests of the dominant economic group is still compatible with the conception of the state as a capitalist state operating in the long-term interests of the system as a whole. 'In the final analysis', the bureaucracies of the state have to conform to the interests of capital because that is where they secure their funding and power.

Salter and Tapper argue that educational power is being re-located within the present conjuncture. The 'tripartite' system of educational government, wherein power was distributed between the three main agents involved in the system - the Department of Education and Science (DES) the Local Education Authorities (LEAs) and the teachers - is being superseded by a more centralised, DES controlled arrangement. They argue that the reason for this shift of power is the fact that the DES has better intelligence as to the nature of the shifting determinants of educational change, as well as being far more responsive to those changes (pp.42-3).

There are a number of possible objections which can be raised regarding this conception. Firstly, the notion that the three 'partners' in the government of education were '*more or less equal*' is itself highly debatable. Secondly, and on a more common-sense level, the notion that one form of bureaucracy is more responsive than another is highly questionable. In fact there are good grounds, some provided by Salter and Tapper themselves, for suggesting that it was the *inability* of the DES to respond to the problem of youth unemployment and training which lost it control over this area vis-a-vis the MSC. Thirdly, the fact that the DES interprets party programmes appears to be rather an odd reason for Salter and Tapper to argue that it was more responsive. In fact, it is probably the case that the LEAs would have been more responsive, albeit unevenly, and that the paucity of proposals for 'radical' change contained in the central party manifestos would have bred inertia rather than dynamism within the DES. What makes their proposition even more questionable is the fact that they cite as evidence the policies which emerge from the DES. Thus, Salter and Tapper's reasoning appears suspect on this point. The decision-making model which they adopt from pluralist conceptions of power-holding is unreconstructed:

*" What then is the dynamic of educational change? It is that policy which emerges from those increasingly bureaucratically controlled negotiations which are a response to the interaction between the developing goals of schooling, the changing pattern of demographic variables, and the nature of political ( primarily political party) inputs... Even those who may be excluded from the institutionalized negotiations by which policy emerges still have channels through which they can express their views. How effective these will be is another matter." (17)*

It appears here, that, in the final analysis, the 'dynamic' of educational change in Salter and Tapper's model is in fact the policy outcome. Yet, we have no means of knowing who or what exactly has had an effective say in its determination. This again represents little or no improvement on the model offered by Archer.

(v) *What are the fundamental units of analysis within Salter and Tapper's model?*

The fundamental units of analysis within Salter and Tapper's model are never made explicit in their theory. However, they can be identified from their discussion of the role of ideology in educational change. Salter and Tapper begin this discussion by drawing a distinction between 'legitimation' and 'ideology'. They then go on to discuss the far more important of the two concepts - for their theory - 'ideology'. However, they begin by providing a contentious interpretation of what they term the 'straightforward' Marxist conception of ideology. Thus we have the statement that:

*" The straightforward Marxist view of legitimation, ideology and hegemony is that ideas are inevitably class-based: they serve the function of legitimizing the economic and political power of the ruling class and depressing and regulating the aspirations of the subject class or classes... Through the manipulation of ideology the dominant class engenders a state of 'false consciousness' in the working class, disguising from the working class its real ( i.e. exploitative) relations with the economic substratum of society. Successful ideological resistance by the working class is therefore unlikely since it remains unaware that such resistance is either necessary or possible." (18)*

The manner in which Salter and Tapper conflate the concepts of 'legitimation', 'ideology' and 'hegemony', as if they referred to one and the same thing, is difficult to comprehend, let alone accept. It reveals an almost total disregard of the complexity of these concepts, especially as they have been employed and discussed by neo-Marxists. It does however illustrate the problem of their methodology.

Salter and Tapper's willingness to locate all Marxist conceptions of ideology under one umbrella, is a major limitation. This is evident from the way in which their 'critique' leads them to suggest the following:

*" The problem which neither Gramsci nor Althusser face up to squarely is that in our increasingly complex society, group interests, and ideologies supporting them, are expressed chiefly through highly bureaucratized institutions, such as those which make up the education system, which are quite capable of establishing their own logic of development in line with their own bureaucratic dynamic." (19)*

This distorts the conceptions of ideology employed by Althusser and Gramsci, which, in any case, are not strictly comparable and certainly should not be linked in this way. Furthermore, this concern with Gramsci and Althusser seems to be altogether too narrow and ignores totally developments in 'Critical Theory' which have taken up the issue of bureaucracy, the state and 'technocratic consciousness' (Offe, Habermas for example).

We are left with Salter and Tapper's own conception of ideology which entails the following:

*"... we view its function as the attempted legitimation of particular group interest, both to the members of that group and to outsiders, while bearing in mind that this group may be dominant or subordinate, aspiring or established..." (20)*

This conception is then counterposed to the Marxist view, which they see as entailing a 'monopoly of ideology by the dominant class'. Of course, no such Marxist view exists, especially in the case of Gramsci and his concept of hegemony. The very idea of Gramsci positing the existence of a single ideology is simply wrong. As for the basis for the dominance of a particular ideology, Salter and Tapper are forced to acknowledge that, even given their plurality of ideologies and the contestation this entails, this

' ... does not deny that in the long term an ideology's success will largely depend on the economic factors shaping the group's fortunes ' (ibid) [emphasis added]. It must be said that this conception seems to correspond, rather embarrassingly one feels, with their so-called 'straightforward Marxist' conception of ideology.

As a result, Salter and Tapper argue that:

*"... the satisfactory orchestration of economic, social and bureaucratic dynamics to produce educational change has to be consonant with the development in parallel of a suitable educational ideology. Without the protective cloak of ideology, the change is likely to be short-lived."*(21)

Once again, the notion of 'ideology' employed here is one which is similar to that credited to many 'naive' Marxists. Thus an educational ideology is seen as something which masks the 'reality' of the situation, and/or produces 'false consciousness'. One of their fundamental units of analysis must therefore be the 'ideology' which is 'consonant' with educational change. However, as shown above, Salter and Tapper's conception of ideology is itself problematic. They take it to be the surface appearance - 'ideas' or 'policy' - which 'legitimizes' educational change. This 'naive' conception accords with the empiricist, institutionalist approach they employ in their analysis of recent educational change.

Salter and Tapper also argue that their investigation concerns those structures which intervene between the 'macro' level of the 'superstructure' and the 'micro' level of the classroom. In doing this they seek a 'translation effect' between these levels. I believe it is important that we accept the notion of such an effect and that this requires us to have a number of levels of analysis. Unfortunately Salter and Tapper's institutional conception of the political, like Archer's, does not make this type of analysis possible. This is because such a 'translation effect' cannot be *identified* using the decisional-analysis approach which these pluralist authors favour. This effect needs to be *theorised* ie. normative, institutional conceptions of 'education' are inadequate to the task. An alternative approach has recently been developed by Gintis and Bowles (1988).

## 2.iv *Gintis and Bowles*

The early thesis of Bowles and Gintis found in *Schooling in Capitalist America* (1976) has already been discussed in Chapter One. In that discussion the way in which Bowles and Gintis delimited the ES was shown to be in terms of its function in relation to the CMP. Educational change was therefore seen as an attempt to rectify the 'mismatch' between the needs of the economy and the output of the ES. Within this process of change, Bowles and Gintis's early theorisation led them to neglect the actual content of the ES and as a result, educational processes were accorded little or no autonomy in shaping change. Bowles and Gintis have recently reformulated their early theorisation and have introduced a more pronounced 'political' element in the determination of change ( Gintis & Bowles, *Contradiction and Reproduction in Educational Theory 1980,1988 - hereafter - Gintis and Bowles*). It is this which provides the focus for the discussion that follows. The question which needs to be asked is therefore:

(i) *How autonomous are political processes vis-a-vis socio-economic processes in shaping educational change within Gintis and Bowles' model?*

In their recent work Gintis and Bowles ( 1980, 1988) have abandoned their naive interpretation of the base/superstructure couplet, and we are now presented with a view of the social formation as an '*ensemble of structurally articulated sites*'. These sites, which include, principally, the family, the state and the economy, together constitute a '*contradictory totality*', within which it is the contradictions which are seen to provide the dynamic for change.

Two 'dynamic principles' are identified by Gintis and Bowles: '*structural delimitation*' and the '*transportation of practices across sites*'. These are explained as follows:

" *By delimitation we refer to the constraints placed on the development of a site by the very nature of its articulation with envioning sites. By the transportation of practices we refer to the fact that groups, in their struggle and confrontations, do not always limit themselves to practices characteristic of the site in which these struggles occur but will, under specific circumstances, attempt to 'transport' practices characteristic of other sites.*" (22)

It might appear here that Gintis and Bowles are simply replacing economic determinism with total indeterminacy, in so far as their new conception allows for reciprocal determination between sites. They see sites as capable of 'undermining' reproduction as a whole by developing, *internally*, principles which are incompatible to those found in other sites. The extent to which they abandon the 'economic' as determinate 'in the last instance' might however appear to remain debatable, as can be seen from the following summation of their delimitation of educational change:

*" Demands for the democratisation of the social relations of education therefore are likely to be effective only in the context of workers' demands for the democratisation of the production process - in short, for the full development of workers' control." (23)[emphasis added]*

What remains of their economic reductionism is nevertheless confined to a conception of the 'economic' no longer defined as the mode of production but as 'the site of practices and struggles which have economic relations ( conditions of work, or wages)' (Hall 1980). That is, a concern with the *distributional* aspects of economic relations. In fact even this limited conception of 'the economic' is almost completely overshadowed in Gintis and Bowles' latest work by their new found concern for the 'political'.

According to Sharp (1988) 'politics is everywhere' in Gintis and Bowles' latest work. Yet, following their conception of the economic, 'politics' is also narrowly conceived. For Gintis and Bowles, politics consists of social practices which regulate, reproduce and transform the 'rules of the game' within and between the various sites of the social formation. Since there are no recognisable or defined structural limits to the various sites in terms of their relations, political practices must be seen as the principal determination of the totality. Each site has its own distinct set of political practices, its own political structure, and these are irreducible to those found in other sites. Nowhere is this autonomy of the political structure and practices of a site more apparent than in their conception of the state. According to Gintis and Bowles, the state is a '*distinct structure governed by distinct rules which are irreducible to the social relations of production or the imperatives of reproduction.*' (Bowles, 1985a, quoted in Sharp, p.198). More than this, in its liberal democratic form, the state;

*" whilst central to the reproduction of the conditions of domination and subordinancy in the family and the economy is not itself a site of domination." (24)*

This conception of the state is pluralist (Cole 1988). It bears no relation to any Marxist conception, and certainly underestimates the coercive character of the modern capitalist state.

In order to comprehend the full import of Gintis and Bowles' new thesis, it is necessary to outline their overall conception of the relationship between capitalism and liberal democracy. Gintis and Bowles are arguing that liberal democracy and capitalism are incompatible; in so far as it is possible for discourses to be 'transported' between sites or spheres, which effects contradictions between rights based on property ownership and rights based upon persons - citizenship.

According to Gintis and Bowles, social change comes about as a result of historically specific 'accords' being struck:

*" By an accord, we mean a mutually accepted joint redefinition and consequent reconstitution of political reality by antagonistic classes or class fragments. Through an accord, class interests are redefined. Class identities are respecified so as to produce a novel logic of social action." (25)*

An accord is seen to be the harbinger of social reorganisation on two levels: the institutional level and at the level of 'communicative tools of political discourse'. Whilst the first level is largely self-evident, the second level needs to be elaborated upon:

*" On the communicative level, the accord results in the creation of new communicative tools which (a) provide a common framework for political discourse across contending groups, (b) express the moral legitimacy of the newly created institutional nexuses,(c) are admitted by speakers and hearers as intelligible and worthy of affirmation, and (d) are affirmed in all the major formal institutions of daily life ( media, political speeches, educational institutions, churches law)." (26)*

It is difficult to see how this conception differs in any major respects to the concept of 'hegemony'. It has been noted before, in relation to *Schooling in Capitalist America*, that Bowles and Gintis appear to be unaware of this concept in their work (Sarup 1978, p.172). They still appear unaware of its existence in their latest work (Cole 1988). This

raises the issue of their general interpretation of Marxist theory. That is, they appear to take some Marxist concepts and disregard the existence of others. This undermines the possibility of any conceptual unity or coherence in their theorisation.

We can now see how Gintis and Bowles' conception of liberal democracy relates to the role of education and the problem of reproduction :

*" The central contradiction in the educational systems of advanced capitalist society derives from two aspects of its location in the social totality. First, it forms in general a subsystem of the state site, and therefore is directly subject to the principle of rights vested in persons. Second education plays a central role in reproducing the political structure of the capitalist production process, which in turn is legitimated in terms of rights vested in property. Thus, education is directly involved in the contradictory articulation of sites in advanced capitalism and is expressed in terms of the property/person dichotomy: education reproduces rights vested in property while itself organised in terms of rights vested in persons." (27)*

Gintis and Bowles argue that education is not to be seen as a site in its own right. This is because it is part of both the state and economic sites. This location of education has some very important implications for their new thesis. Although part of the state, a 'sub-site', education is seen as organised along '*radically different principles*' and has a different internal organisation and participation from that of the state in general. Whereas the state is seen by Gintis and Bowles as being '*... organised according to the principle of majority rule, the schools are organised according to that of top-down control*' (ibid, p.57). Quite apart from the slippage between the 'state' and 'government', it is the latter which Gintis and Bowles appear to be referring to for the most part. The notion of 'majority rule' is entirely formal in this account.

There also appears to be some confusion here with regard to the use of the terms 'education' and 'schools'. (This may be due to the American usage of the term 'schooling' to denote all forms of educational experience). It might well be argued that, formally, the education system is organised and administered democratically, whilst schools are undemocratic i.e. have 'top-down control'. However, Gintis and Bowles use the terms interchangeably. Thus, education, *despite* being a sub-site of the

state, is organised differently to the state itself. Therefore one would not expect there to be the same citizenship rights in education as there is, supposedly, in the state in general. If this is so, then the rights found in education may not necessarily be in contradiction with those found in production and their earlier thesis i.e. that 'there is a correspondence between the social relations of production and the social relations of education' need not be displaced. However, this is not the case if they are arguing that the education system is organised along the lines of the state and it is 'schools' which are differently organised. Then, the contradiction between 'education' with its person rights and the economy with its property rights would be valid. As indicated earlier, there is no reason for putting this interpretation on their work. The education system and schools are taken to be one and the same thing. Therefore it remains difficult to see where the contradiction between the undemocratically organised schools and the undemocratic production process arises other than in discourse. Indeed, it is only in 'discourse' that Gintis and Bowles locate the central contradiction between education and production.

Gintis and Bowles therefore extend their argument by stating that the central contradiction within education can be 'described in terms of its characteristic form of discourse...The form is that of the cultural structure of liberal discourse' (1980,p.62). It should be stressed here that Gintis and Bowles appear to hold a very idiosyncratic conception of liberal discourse. They view liberal discourse as follows:

*" Liberal discourse is not a coherent political philosophy or set of ideas. Nor was it the creation of the leading classes in society bent on the legitimation of the exploitation of labor. Liberal discourse is the structure of cultural practices in advanced capitalist social formations. As a real ensemble of social relations, it is no more capable of being 'false' or 'true' than is a political or appropriative structure. Rather than reflecting or embodying ideas, it is simply a medium of communication. Like other structures, it in no way determines the acts of communication which occur through it, though it may delimit the range of communicative forms capable of expression within it." (28)*

Without some specification of the 'form' the structural practices of liberal discourse take, and how these are translated into educational

practices, this conception precludes the possibility of delimiting educational change. In other words, their conception of liberal discourse lacks both 'content' and 'form'.

Gintis and Bowles also make a number of claims for the transformative effect of liberal discourse. They argue, for instance, that women 'having gained the status of full citizenship' in the state site, have extended their struggle and now seek to gain 'full equality' in the family. Similarly, workers have extended their demands for person rights into the economic sphere to the extent that they have often achieved 'the precedence of person rights over property rights' (1980,p.58). The formal nature of the 'equality' in the state sphere is treated unproblematically by Gintis and Bowles. It is therefore difficult to reconcile these claims with actual social relations in these sites within capitalism. They fail to utilise Marxist analysis to go beyond the discursive. Thus the 'equality' to which they refer is formal juridical and political equality, which helps sustain the *appearance* of equality. This again can be seen in their examples relating women, where they refer to them achieving full equality within education:

*"...the formally equal status of women as citizens, gained early in the Twentieth Century, virtually ensures that the state political mechanism will come to supply relatively equal education to men and women." (29)*

Patriarchal relations within the education system are not even considered in all this. Similarly, in relation to labour in general, the political 'rights' or 'equality' which Gintis and Bowles identify is the 'equality' of exchange relations under capitalism, rather than any form of substantive equality. This explains the idealism which has come to inhabit their account. Gintis and Bowles fail to recognise that capitalist social relations are inherently relations of 'unfreedom and domination' (Wood,1986 p.146) constituted in the very act of exchange between formally 'free' labour and capital. Thus the 'person rights' to which they refer have a price, and that is the recognition of the precedence of 'property rights'. Similarly, the power of liberal discourse to stifle resistance is nowhere mentioned by Gintis and Bowles. The individualising effect of person rights (citizenship), what Poulantzas referred to as the 'isolation effect', is itself an extremely important ideological weapon in class struggle.

Therefore, the central contradiction between liberal discourse and capitalism, the opposition of person rights and rights based on property, is inherited by the education system and this explains, according to Gintis and Bowles, its dual progressive/reproductive role. They fail to recognise the fact that the contradiction is at the level of 'principle', thought, and that change is not the product of discourse alone.

By according the political sphere a more central role in their thesis, Gintis and Bowles appear to reinforce a conception of a social totality within which the 'political' and the 'economic' are *in fact* separate spheres. Hence the importance of the distinction between property and person rights. This separation of politics and economics has a number of important implications. Firstly, it enables the development of a notion of 'equality' or 'rights' in one sphere to be seen as unrelated, even antithetical, to those in another sphere. As pointed out above, in Gintis and Bowles' work this entails a failure to recognise the purely formal character of 'equality' in the political and juridical spheres within capitalism. It is this *appearance* of equality in the juridical and political spheres which can be seen to delimit actual struggles, despite Gintis and Bowles' argument that struggles can be transported *in discourse*, and thereby contribute to capitalist hegemony. In particular, this separation enables the state to appear as a neutral or autonomous domain. Further, this separation also gives rise to a form of political analysis which abstracts and delimits the field. This tendency can be seen in Gintis and Bowles' treatment of the state. For instance, they neglect the coercive side of the capitalist state eg. in relation to education, its compulsory aspect is not mentioned. Secondly, they fail to recognise the interventionist role of the state in capitalist production, which is mirrored in their neglect of the content and productive nature of education. Thirdly, the actual *form* of state apparatuses is left unexamined by Gintis and Bowles. It will be argued later that the actual materiality of government and administration of education has a significant bearing on the overall 'politics' of reproduction. Gintis and Bowles appear to take no account of this, as witnessed, in part, by their confusing usage of the terms 'education system' and 'schools' i.e. the politics and administration of an individual school and that of an education 'system' may not be considered one and the same phenomenon. This may be evidence of a move towards methodological individualism.

Despite the above criticisms of Gintis and Bowles, their recent work can be seen as a major advance over their earlier formulation of reproduction in education. More generally, the introduction of the 'political', albeit in an undertheorised form, marks a considerable step forward in reproduction theories. Therefore they must be given the credit for at least placing it on the agenda. The task now is to take this forward by attempting to theorise the 'political' in a much more rigorous vein.

(ii) *What are the fundamental units of analysis within Gintis and Bowles' model?*

Gintis and Bowles have moved away from the holistic approach of *Schooling in Capitalist America*. However, the conception of the 'political' which they have adopted lends credence to the charge that there has always been a serious contradiction between their structuralist theorisation and methodological practice. That is, their embrace of an essentially 'liberal', institutional conception of the political may be a natural corollary of the positivist leanings found in their earlier work (Sarup 1978 p.173). In this respect, it must be seen to represent a move towards methodological individualism, albeit at the level of the institution (particularly in their conception of the state, the education system and the school).

## 2.v. *Summary*

The transition in the thought of Bowles and Gintis to that of Gintis and Bowles described above is symptomatic of the anti-reductionist current of what Sharp (1988) calls the 'new orthodoxy' within the Sociology of Education. That is, the desire to escape the legacy of Althusserian pessimism and the discovery of Gramsci and the autonomisation of the 'ideological', has recently found expression in 'culturalist' accounts of reproduction and educational change within which the transposition of 'material cultural practices' into political practices (contrary to Gramsci's own efforts) has, at best, been treated unproblematically, and at worst not at all (Apple 1985 - see Chapter One). Similarly, the discovery

of the heterogeneity and irreducibility of forms and sites of domination within Capitalism has seen a reversion to varieties of historicism and humanism in Marxist theorising. Whilst not immune to some of these tendencies, Gintis and Bowles have concerned themselves with the 'political' - the point of mediation between the external and internal pressures for educational change. However, as shown above, this 'politicisation' of their analysis has only been made possible by their rejection of what Hall has termed the 'cardinal principle' of Marxism - 'that without which it is theoretically indistinguishable from any other 'sociology'- the determination in the last instance by the mode of production (the economic) (Hall 1980 p.201). As a result, although there is a sense of relative autonomy within the latest work of Gintis and Bowles, the limits to and structural constraints on educational change have been left implicit in their current theorising. It will be argued in the next Chapter that it is by no means necessary to abandon this 'cardinal principal' of Marxism in the search for a political analysis of educational change.

Although Gintis and Bowles use the terminology and radical credentials of Marxism, they negate its conceptual unity: a case perhaps of Marxism *oblige*. Instead of seeking the 'specificity of the political' within a Marxist problematic, which would make possible an intrinsic 'political' analysis of educational change, Gintis and Bowles have succumbed to the embrace of liberalism and Pluralism. As such, their latest account can be seen to converge in some respects with those models of educational change, Archer and Salter and Tapper, already discussed in this Chapter. The task remains therefore of developing an 'intrinsic' political analysis of educational change *within* a Marxist problematic. In order to develop such an approach, it may in fact be useful to 'recover' Bowles and Gintis and avoid the liberal deviation of Gintis and Bowles.

## Notes and References - Chapter Two

1. Archer (1981) pp. 31-2
2. *ibid* p.33
3. *ibid* p.37
4. *ibid* p.39
5. *ibid*
6. *ibid* p.29
7. *ibid* p.30
8. Salter & Tapper (1981) p.31
9. *ibid* p.2
10. *ibid* p.46
11. *ibid* p.45
12. *ibid* p.8
13. *ibid* pp.30-1
14. *ibid* p.38
15. *ibid* p.39
16. *ibid* p.7
17. *ibid* pp.44-5
18. *ibid* p.52
19. *ibid* p.57
20. *ibid* p.53
21. *ibid* pp.8-9
22. Gintis & Bowles (1980) pp.56-7
23. *ibid* p.63
24. Gintis & Bowles (1988) p.21
25. Gintis & Bowles *op cit* p.62
26. *ibid*
27. *ibid* pp.61-2
28. *ibid* p.60
29. *ibid* p.58

## CHAPTER THREE

### *Class Analysis and the Specificity of the Political*

#### 3.i *Introduction*

In Chapter Two it was argued that, in order to develop a Marxist approach to educational change, it may be necessary to 'recover' Bowles and Gintis in order to avoid the liberal deviation of Gintis and Bowles. Sharp (1988) helps in this respect by identifying four 'critical themes' of the early Bowles and Gintis:

(i) The issue of causal primacy. In their early work there can be little question that Bowles and Gintis accepted the 'cardinal principle' of Marxism, namely that the,

*"...capitalist system of production and associated division of labour is causally prior and central to an understanding of the forms of educational provision and their role in constituting the typical forms of consciousness, interpersonal behaviour and personality attributes required by capitalist work relations." (1)*

(ii) Bowles and Gintis incorporated a notion of directionality in their analysis of educational change in so far as it corresponded to the periodisation of the restructuring of social, economic and political relations within capitalism.

(iii) Bowles and Gintis also subscribed to the view that reproduction was not to be seen as a linear process and that contradictions, inertia and indeterminacy were all apparent.

(iv) Finally, Bowles and Gintis identified a specific mechanism of educational change in the form of 'pluralist accommodation. This acted to unify educational and economic change by mediating the class struggle.

These four critical themes can be taken as the starting point for a Marxist approach to educational change. As such we are indebted to Bowles and Gintis for their delimitation. However, in order to develop an intrinsic political analysis of educational change the objective should now be to shift the emphasis to point (iii) without negating point (i) and invoking too much of point (iv). That is, a Marxist approach to educational change should be based upon a particular conception of historical development and class struggle. It will therefore have both a structural and dynamic

character. The education system has to be seen as a historical product related to a specific social formation and, in particular, its social relations of production. Central to this conception is the 'reproduction' problematic. That is, the education system is seen as critically involved in the reproduction of the relations of production, in so far as its principal function is the reproduction of labour capacities.

Since reproduction is seen as being undertaken in the interests of a particular class, this process produces conflict and a potential for class struggle. Therefore it is in the nature and outcome of these struggles that educational change is to be explained. This approach entails a recognition of the fact that reproduction is a *social* phenomenon: it is contested and has a political aspect. The objective of analysis should therefore be to reveal this political aspect by delineating the relationship between the economic and political, in order to show how 'the political' makes possible the reproductive role of the education system. This will involve tracing the continuities between the economic and political aspects of reproduction; continuities which lie in the fact that they are both constituted by specific *forms* of social relations. In this way, a base/superstructure conception is not simply replaced by superstructure/base, but by an organic conception, one which suggests that political 'forms' are attributes of the reproduction process itself. That is, political contestation and organisation can be shown to be constitutive of the reproduction process and are not simply epiphenomenal. It is for this reason that an understanding educational change requires an 'intrinsic' political analysis. However, such an analysis is predicated on the specification of the 'political'.

The 'specificity of the political' will be examined in this Chapter. It will be argued that the political does indeed have its own specificity ie. 'its own efficacy, its own forms, its specific conditions of existence, its own momentum, tempo and direction, its own contradictions internal to it, its 'peculiar' outcomes and results' (Hall 1980,p.227). It will also be argued that the political has to be seen as articulated with the economic. That is, political class struggles mediate the economic relations of production through a set of irreducible concepts, forms and processes. As a result,

*" ...once the class forces appear as political class forces, they have consequent political results; they generate 'solutions' - results, outcomes, consequences - which cannot be translated back into their original terms." (2)*

Again, for this reason an intrinsic political analysis of reproduction becomes indispensable to the explication of educational change. That is, the economic 'need' for reproduction, is seen to provide the 'raw material' and the 'outer limits' of the political class struggle within the education system, but this struggle reacts back into the mode of reproduction in terms of having pertinent effects on the forces and relations of reproduction. Furthermore,

*" ...the precise direction and tendency of that reaction is not given exclusively by the forces and relations of the base: it is also given by the forces and relations of the political and the ideological struggle, and by all that is specific - relatively autonomous - to them." (3)*

In the case of reproduction within the education system, specific concepts which enable us to 'think' the political class struggle have to be developed. These concepts form part of the 'content-theoretical' model of educational change developed in Chapter Five. However, before this model and these concepts are developed, it has to be recognised that the political forms and relations within the reproduction process are constituted in and by the wider class relations of the capitalist mode of production ie. they constitute 'the concrete objects of the practices of class struggle' (Hall, p.230). Political analysis therefore requires a theory of the class formation in all its complexity. For this reason, this chapter examines the vexed issue of social class analysis. It necessarily deals with class relations at a high level of abstraction. In particular, it is based upon an approach which has been termed 'Political Marxism' (Wood 1981), as well as incorporating 'Social Form Theory' (Williams 1988).

### 3.ii *Marxist Class Analysis*

Marxist class analysis is predicated on the identification of the social formation which, in turn, is accomplished through an analysis of its dominant mode of production. The central organizing principle of capitalism, as a mode of production, and the basis of class relations is the mode of exploitation. That is, the defining feature of the capitalist

mode of production (CMP) is the form in which surplus products and surplus labour are appropriated *within* production:

*" The essential difference between the various economic forms of society, between for instance, a society based on slave labour, and one based on wage labour, lies only in the form in which ... surplus labour is in each case extracted from the actual producer, the labourer. (4)*

Class relations are therefore seen as a correlate of productive relations within the CMP, in so far as the latter structure social collectivities of actors into oppositional interest groups:

*" Exploitative relations of production create a clear and eradicable conflict of interest between the producers and appropriators of surplus-labour which stimulates the formation of groups we call classes, as human beings react to and organize around their experience of exploitation."*  
(5)

Productive relations are therefore the central dynamic in both the process of capital accumulation and social class formation.

The unique character of the CMP is manifested in the differentiation between the 'economic' and the 'political' spheres, with the result that exploitation is seen as taking a completely economic form. However, this economic form of appropriation does not entail the absence of political or juridical dimensions to the relations of production. On the contrary, productive activity has both political and juridical 'moments' which ensure the overall context for accumulation. For example, the organisation and control of means of production, including the labour process, involves a political moment in productive relations. Similarly, production involves the 'rights' of private appropriation and property, a juridical moment. Therefore, the appropriation of surplus labour must be seen to involve both political and juridical dimensions.

The identification of exploitation within production raises the issue of class reductionism ie. is it possible to reduce the dynamic of all social relations to those of class? If it is not, then the utility of class analysis itself becomes an issue:

*" The logic of capital is presumed to delimit the actual forms of domination in civil society - as class domination. But simply because capitalism rests on the domination of the working class (among others) it does not follow that domination must exist exclusively as the power of one socio-economic class over another." (6)*

It is obviously the case that forms of domination other than that constituted in class relations exist in the CMP. The most important of these are the forms of domination based upon gender, ethnicity and the nation state, none of which are seen by most contemporary Marxists as being reducible to class relations. However, few Marxists would accept that these forms of domination are comparable to, or even more intrinsic than, class relations in terms of understanding the dynamic of the CMP. Even non-Marxists, such as Giddens (1982), who disavow historical materialism, accept that class relations are the basic structural principle organizing the CMP (7):

*" Only in capitalism are class relations established as intrinsic to the process of labour. The fact that 'capitalism' can serve to indicate both a set of economic mechanisms and a type of society as a whole is expressive of this." (8)*

According to Wright (1983), there are three kinds of argument which have been used to defend the *'primacy of class'* - existential, structural and developmental. Existential arguments concern the way in which class relations are seen to permeate all aspects of social life within the CMP and act as the most important influence on people's consciousness. However, this argument can easily be refuted, since it may also legitimately be argued that both gender and ethnicity are equally, if not more, pervasive. Structural arguments on the other hand are based on the notion that class relations structure or limit the group capacities of social actors. This is a 'chicken and egg' type argument. That is, class relations and class struggles can also be seen to be delimited by relations of domination based upon gender and ethnicity. As a result, Wright argues that it is '... arbitrary to assign one of these 'necessary conditions' a privileged position, and thus to accord class a general primacy over other relations' (p.24). Finally, developmental arguments are based upon a conception of social change within which class relations are paramount. This argument is

summarised by Wright as follows:

*" ...only class relations have an internal logic of development, a logic which generates systematic tendencies for a trajectory of transformations of the class structure. This trajectory has a general directionality, it is argued, because of the way class relations and class struggles are articulated to the development of the forces of production. The apparent symmetry in the relationship between class and gender or class and race, therefore, is disrupted by the developmental tendencies of class relations. No such developmental trajectory has been persuasively argued for other forms of domination. " (9)*

This conception of social change, as having a *directionality*, is derived from the basic Marxist contention that the political and economic spheres are structurally linked within the CMP, with the economic being determinate. Even where the political can be seen to have primacy, the *explanation* for this must be seen in the nature of economic development. Central to this is the interconnectedness of the relations of production and the development of the forces of production:

*" Two pivotal claims are made: (1) That for a given level of the forces of production, only certain types of production relations are possible...(2) Within a given form of production relations, there is a limit to the possible development of the forces of production. Thus there is a relationship of reciprocal limitation between the forces and relations of production. However...there is at least a weak impulse for the forces of production to develop, and this creates a dynamic asymmetry in their interconnection. Eventually the forces of production will reach a point at which they are 'fettered'. that is, a point at which further development is impossible in the absence of transformations of the relations of production." (10)*

Wright also contends that is by no means the case that such transformations are inevitable. The actors concerned in social change not only have to articulate their interests, they also have to translate these into outcomes. However, the nature of the development of the forces of production does limit the direction or trajectory of change, if and when it comes about. This is due to the fact that the forces of production can be seen as being '*sticky downward*'. There are four reasons for this :

- (i) it is in no group's interest to reduce the productivity of labour *per se*;
- (ii) knowledge of productive techniques tends to be retained rather than lost;
- (iii) developments in the forces of production creates strong interests in their retention; and
- (iv) persuasive arguments can be made for enhancing rather than reducing labour productivity. (Wright, pp 27-8)

This conception of social change, whilst involving the relationship between the 'forces' and 'relations' of production, rejects the traditional conception of 'base' determining 'superstructure'. However, Wright's notion of the forces of production appears to be based solely in terms of their materiality, the nature of technology, which he juxtaposes to the 'social' relations of production. As a result, his overall conception of the relationship between the forces and social relations of production appears as a form of technological determinism. As such, this position is rejected here. According to Sayer (1979), what is required instead is to see that,

*" the relevant contradiction lies not between technology and social relations simpliciter but between one set of emergent production relations, which both constitute a productive force in their own right and are capable of sustaining a superior technology, and another, ' within the framework of which they have operated hitherto' [ Marx] (1859a)" (11)*

Such an approach is similar to that which forms the basis of what has been termed 'Political Marxism' (Wood 1981). This again takes as its starting point the unique character of the CMP, namely the separation of the economic and the political.

### 3.iii *The Specificity of the Political*

According to Wood (1981) ' for Marx, the ultimate secret of capitalist production is a political one (p.68). That is, Marx's achievement was to reveal the nature of social and political relations *in* production, and to show how these relations were based upon the political configuration of capitalist society as a whole. In particular, it was the balance of class forces and the power of the state which provided the context for the exploitation of the worker by legitimating the right to and control over

private property. In this way, Marx, in direct opposition to bourgeois political-economy, was able to trace the continuities between the economic and the political, in so far as both were seen as constituted in and by social forms. In this sense there is no separation of the 'levels' or 'spheres' in Marx's mature work ( Hall 1980). Such conceptions of a separation between base and superstructure - 'vulgar economism' - in later Marxist theorising therefore render invisible the 'organic' relation between the economic and the political.

Political Marxism is based upon Marx's central tenet that ' capital is a *social relation* of production'. As such, it seeks to provide a theoretical alternative to economism in so far as it,

*"...attempts both to preserve the integrity of 'production' and to work out the implications of the fact that the productive 'base' exists in the shape of specific social processes and relations and particular juridical and political forms." (12) [emphasis added]*

Above all else, this approach insists that the mode of production be seen as a social phenomenon, within which the relations of production have a political aspect ie. they are contested as relations of domination and control. As a result,

*" 'Political Marxism' ...does not present the relation between base and superstructure as an opposition, a 'regional' separation between a basic objective' economic structure, on the one hand, and social, juridical, and political forms on the other, but rather as a continuous structure of immediate processes of production and appropriation, beginning with those relations and forms that constitute the system of production itself. The connections between 'base' and 'superstructure' can thus be traced without great conceptual leaps because they do not represent two essentially different and discontinuous orders of reality." (13)*

Within this approach, forms of social interaction - social relations - are themselves taken to be 'material forces' which contribute to the definition and delimitation of the mode of productive activity. These forms are seen as 'integral parts of the material base', although they may be designated as juridical and/or political. This of course poses the problem of distinguishing between these political and economic forms. According to Wood,

*" There are certainly legal and political institutions that cannot be usefully regarded as constituents of productive relations even if they help to sustain the system of production and to reproduce its essential relations; and perhaps the term 'superstructure' should be reserved for those. However, not all legal and political principles can be relegated to superstructure, since the material base itself is articulated through juridical-political forms. The 'sphere' of production is dominant not in the sense that it stands apart from or precedes these political-juridical forms, but rather in the sense that these forms are precisely forms of production, the attributes of a particular productive system." (14)*

The task is therefore to specify which forms are actually 'attributes' of the productive system. In order to accomplish this, 'Social Form Theory' (Williams 1988) will be utilised in this analysis.

In Chapter One, it was argued that a major problem with correspondence theories has been their misrecognition of the social relations *in* production with the social relations *of* production. The incorporation of Social Form Theory in this thesis will help avoid this problem. In order to delineate the social relations of production, the social *forms* of those relations, which emanate from the unique separation of the 'economic' from the 'political' within the CMP, need to be identified. Social Form Theory is seen here as a means to achieve this. That is, it should help delineate the 'specificity of the political' whilst avoiding both economism and reductionism.

#### 3.iv Social Form Theory

The central objective of social form theory is to accomplish what Williams (1988) refers to as ' the greatest unfulfilled aspiration of Marxist intellectual activity', namely,

*" ...to theorise aspects of bourgeois society other than the economy on the basis of a coherent account of that economy..."(15).*

This theorisation involves a specification of the 'political' which, as a result of conceptualising the basis of the division between the economic and the political *dialectically*, is thought to avoid economic reductionism and instrumentalism. Thus, the starting point for this theorisation is an abstract notion of the 'pure' capitalist economy, which is followed by the

conceptualisation of its negation - the specific grounds for its non-realisation. These abstractions give rise to a contradiction which, when articulated, result in the *doubling* of the original abstract notion of the pure capitalist economy into 'civil society' and the state - the economic and the political. Therefore it is a resolution in theory of the contradiction which is the critical objective of this approach, since this enables us to comprehend the totality.

Social form theory is an attempt to explain how the forms of consciousness of bourgeois subjects come to express class relations. It therefore recovers and builds upon Marx's insight that, whilst 'individuals' do not constitute the basis for a theory of classes, the *forms* of consciousness of individuals in bourgeois society must be seen as the product of the antagonistic relations within which they are constituted. That is, '... this prior constitution ... produces, under specific conditions, as its results, a specific type of individuality...' (Hall, P.203). The task of Marxist analysis is therefore to identify the forms of consciousness and account for them. The starting point for such an account must be with a conceptualisation of the conditions of existence of these forms of consciousness ie. the nature of the society itself. In social form theory, this is conceived at the most abstract level as 'competitive society'.

At the level of the capitalist economy in abstraction, individuals appear only as 'character masks' (Marx, 1867, quoted in Williams, p.97), bearers of social relations, without subjectivity. This is due to the fact that the value-form, a specifically bourgeois form of association which overcomes, in social reproduction, the inability to self-reproduce, is a structurally determined relation (Reuten 1988). That is, the value-form is reproduced independent of the will of the individuals concerned, it is simply a product of their activities. Furthermore, the value-form is indifferent to their particular existence as individuals and, taken in conjunction with the tendencies of capitalist accumulation, actually threatens the reproduction of the conditions of existence of particular economic agents.

Within capitalist production, value exists in the form of income (profit, interest, rent and wages) derived from an income source, which

takes either a property ( industrial capital, money capital and landed capital) or non-property form (labour power). Income, is concretised in 'competition subjects' whose subjectivity arises from an abstracted free will' which is necessary for their pursuit of income. That is, competition subjects must have freedom to deploy their particular income source in order to reproduce themselves at the individual level. Such freedom is grounded in a *right* to property and the income derived from that property. This right transcends the incongruity which exists between property and non-property income sources ie. the fact that, unlike property *per se*, labour power is inseparable from the labourer and has a unique role in the valorisation process. Therefore this right to property forms the basis for an abstracted free-will which, in turn, makes the deployment of income sources possible. However, this free-will is 'abstract' since ' ... competition subjects can exercise free will only within the constraints of the opportunities provided by the value-form determined economy...' (Williams,p.98). Thus competition subjects have a limited, 'form-determined' subjectivity which informs their immediate class interests. The distinction between property and non-property income sources is manifested in the antagonistic relations between classes of competition subjects arising out of the capital-labour relation. Labour-power, by virtue of being an income source of the last resort, as well as having a unique role in the valorisation process, is therefore set apart from and in opposition to capital.

The subjectivity which arises out of the right to deploy income sources, must also be predicated on a *right* to existence. As Williams suggests, ' subjectivity without existence is contradictory '(p.101). This being the case, a disparity between the right to property and the right to existence arises, especially in the case of those who possess nothing but their capacity to labour. This is due to the fact that, within the capitalist economy, no *right* to employment of one's labour capacity exists. Therefore the capitalist economy cannot guarantee the reproduction of one of the conditions of its own existence, namely labour-power. This contradiction is only resolved by the 'doubling' of competitive society into civil society and the state. The *right* to property is upheld by the state by separating it from the right to existence, thereby ensuring the valorisation process. Thus, ' civil society is the reappearance of competitive society vis-a-vis the state ...[and] the bourgeois person is the

reappearance of the competition subject with the additional determination of citizenship ' (ibid,p.102).

Within social form theory the state is seen as a universal social subject which ensures the right to existence by standing outside the value-form processes of civil society. In this way, the legitimation of the state can be seen to lie in its willed existence, as a universal social subject, enforcing the subject's right to existence in the face of the structurally determined indifference found in civil society. However, the right to existence is only satisfied at the political level ie. at the level of the state. The contradiction between the right to existence and the reproduction of the value-form is not therefore resolved by the activities of the state. On the contrary, all the state can do is institutionalise this contradiction by separating the elements involved. In doing this it enables the value-form processes of reproduction to continue largely unfettered:

*" The state stands above and outside the chaos of opposed particular interests to provide the context within which that unconsciously regulated competition can proceed." (15)*

This is why it is a bourgeois state, a state which appears over and above the abstract general interest which wills its existence. In this way it appears and acts as an external relation. As a result, collective demands for social emancipation through the state take on an alienated form, as *political* emancipation, in so far as they are largely divorced from civil society and the means of existence.

In this '*separation-in-unity*' (17) between civil society and the state, power can be seen to be 'privatised' in the former. This has important implications for bourgeois domination of the labour process (Wood 1981). The division between the political and the economic means that the 'privatisation' of political control within the economic sphere enables the integration of production and appropriation to an extent hitherto unknown. This integration, in turn, extends the control of capital over the lives of producers by subjecting them to *real* subsumption within the production process and indirect subsumption through the mechanisms of the market. In this way social class increasingly comes to permeate all aspects of social life within the CMP. Within the state, however, the alienated form of domination also poses a legitimation problem, in so far as the state needs to manifest itself as the will of the people. Such

alienation has therefore to be mediated by the political and bureaucratic institutions of the state. Overall, social form theory suggests the state:

*" ...is the form determined expression of the people's will, both reproducing the totality driven by the processes of valorisation, and leaving space in which critical forms of consciousness may develop, as individuals and groups seek to rectify the worst antinomies of their lives in civil society by political activity in and around the state." (18)*

Apart from the civil and state spheres of competition society, social form theory recognises the existence of a 'private' sphere. This is seen as the sphere of family and personal relations, in which people try to unify the three elements of their lives torn asunder by bourgeois social relations ie. their roles of competition subject, citizen and private person. The private sphere is seen as a residual realm in so far as it is constituted by the subjectivity 'left over' from the economic and state spheres. That is, it is mediated, ultimately, by the subject's activities in the economy and in relation to the state.

Social form theory therefore posits three forms of bourgeois domination - wage, state and civil - corresponding to the three spheres. Competition subjects are seen as partaking in competition society in such a way as their subjectivity is the product of the egoism and economic rationality pertaining to the deployment of their income source - measured in terms of value. Whilst each subject partakes of the 'free will' of the sphere, this is conditioned by the abstract universality of the cash-nexus. Thus, in the case of labour-power, we can identify the reproduction of bourgeois domination in terms of the '*wage-form*' of subjectivity. The wage form of domination found in the economic sphere has a tendency to 'de-politicise' class struggles, in so far as it defuses any attempt to contest existing social relations. That is, whilst it is the nature of the mode of exploitation - the appropriation of surplus labour - which remains the central dynamic around which conflicts are generated, these conflicts are often concerned with, and concentrated within, production itself ie. struggles over the terms and conditions of employment have a tendency to remain purely 'economic' conflicts. This is manifested in the concept of a 'class in itself' - a class reproduced within the logic of capitalist development, with interests which are integrated into the logic of that

selfsame development. This is the concept which has given rise to the problem of 'economism' within Marxist analysis (see *below*).

Within the state, citizenship qualifies the subject to partake in the political community (Barbalet 1988). Needs which are left unmet in the economy are satisfied in this sphere. However, this is an alienated form of emancipation. Communal interests, the general will of the people, are sanctioned by the state. This is the '*state-form*' of bourgeois domination. That is, in electoral democracies, the inequalities created in productive relations are transmuted into relations of formal equality within the political sphere. Thus, the collective nature of economic inequality is transformed into individualised political and juridical equality. Above all else, it is in the concept of 'citizenship' that this abstract separation of the economic and political spheres is realised. Indeed, the whole concept of citizenship is founded on the prior existence of inequalities in the economic sphere. As a result, '... class distinctions in civil society [become] merely social differences in private life, of no significance in political life. This accomplished the separation of political life and civil society '(Marx, quoted in Duncan and Goodwin 1988,p.40). The process of transmutation of class relations into relations of citizenship is therefore the '*state-form*' of the capital-labour relation.

Finally, within the private sphere, the subject is seen as striving for 'personal, interactive, cooperative, altruistic and multi-dimensional' relations. Such a reunification of the subject is however thought to be impossible in competition society. Thus bourgeois domination takes what will be termed here the '*civil form*' (19).

Social forms are subject to contestation and resistance due to the contradictions of everyday practices. Thus individual versus collective political mobilisation becomes a pivotal issue. It can be postulated that the degree of articulation of resistance between the spheres is crucially determined by the nature of political mobilisation which takes place. For example, the maintenance of the insulation between the social forms and their respective spheres would account for trade union 'economism' and political 'reformism'. As such, it is possible to identify distinct forms of political struggle which, in turn, have important consequences for both

class formation and class conflict. Social democracy for example can be seen as being a compromise position:

*" Social democracy is one compromise position in this conflict where organized labour has an institutional place qualifying both wage form and state form although, in Britain, this compromise is now under threat." (20)*

In this manner, the collective strategies of teachers for example, professionalism and trade unionism, can be interpreted in relation to the way in which they articulate social forms and reproduce class relations (see below).

### 3.v The Social Formation

The formation of classes within productive relations suggests a basic two class model of the social structure - appropriators and producers. This conception of polarised productive relations is however at odds with the complexity of the patterns of conflict found in the present social formation. This is why it has been argued by some critics that the basic Marxian notion of class, as defined in terms of the mode of exploitation, be either abandoned or redefined in the light of these debates. That is, Marx's basic conception is at variance with the current social formation, wherein a broad middle class is often identified. As a result, a three class model is now commonly postulated, and much recent theorising within Marxism has been concerned with the 'Boundary Question' or 'where to draw the lines'. Meiksins (1986), however, argues that these approaches to the analysis of class are unhelpful:

*" ...it may be that 'the boundary question', as it is posed in much of the Marxist literature, is not really the right one to be asking. Far too often, Marxists have adopted a static approach to class analysis, simply drawing lines through social formations and calling them class boundaries. This is inevitably an arbitrary procedure that begs the question of why classes and class conflict should develop..." (21)*

What is needed instead, Meiksins argues, is a dynamic conception of class. That is, a conception which entails taking into account the specific conditions and factors which affect the response of different types of

wage-labourers to the experience of their productive relations - especially the modes of their collective organisation. This position will be adopted and developed in this chapter.

As indicated above, according to Marx, the exploitative nature of capitalist social relations of production is based upon the appropriation of surplus labour from the direct producers. That is, capital, as value, is produced by labour, but is appropriated by the capitalist as surplus value. Therefore one's class position is determined by participation in the social relations of production. Although Marx recognised the existence of an 'intermediate' strata, the nature of capitalist development, and in particular the growing concentration of capital, meant there was a tendency towards the simplification or polarisation of the class structure. Capitalist development has however given rise to a plethora of clerical, administrative and scientific jobs which, as a proportion of the total workforce, has steadily increased this century. These occupations include the bureaucratized professions of state employment such as teaching. This 'new middle class' has been positioned between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat because it is argued that these occupations share characteristics which set them apart from the traditional classes of capital and labour. That is, they have a distinct class location. However, the precise nature of that location has been the subject of intense debate within Marxist class analysis. It is impossible to do full justice to this debate here, therefore only the general parameters will be discussed. In relation to this thesis, the essential point about this debate is that teachers are often taken to be part of the 'new' middle class.

In many theorisations, the basic distinction between the new middle class and the working class has been drawn in terms of the 'unproductive' labour of the former. Poulantzas (1975,1978), for example, identified three distinct forms of the *economic* relations of production:

- (a) *economic ownership* - the power to direct or control the means of production;
- (b) *economic possession* - the power to direct and design labour processes; and
- (c) *economic exploitation* - the power to expropriate surplus value from producers (22).

Critical to this differentiation of the economic relations of production is

the distinction which is inherent in the third form (economic exploitation) between *productive* and *unproductive* labour. Poulantzas is seen as having identified production with the material production of commodities and it is the expropriation of surplus value which is the critical criterion. As MacKenzie (1982) notes:

" ... by *productive labour* Poulantzas means labour that is *directly involved in the material process of the production of wealth, i.e. commodity production. Therefore the economic criterion of social class revolves around the simple and basic relation of exploitation within capitalist society: the production and expropriation of surplus value.*" (23)

Whilst this differentiation makes it relatively easy to identify the class location of both capital and labour, Poulantzas is forced to recognise that non-economic criteria may be more determinant in the location of the 'intermediate' strata, although economic possession is still considered influential. As a result of this conceptualisation, Poulantzas is able to identify three classes in advanced capitalist societies - the bourgeoisie, the proletariat and the 'petty bourgeoisie'. This of course has a significant bearing on the identification of the class location of teachers.

According to Poulantzas (1975), the 'new petty bourgeoisie (NPB)' could be distinguished from both the bourgeoisie and the proletariat but not from the 'traditional petty bourgeoisie' (TPB) in terms of its class location. Thus the NPB could be defined negatively in terms of its non-ownership of the means of production and its unproductive function in relation to the *direct* realisation of surplus value. Whilst it was clearly unlike the TPB in terms of its economic relations, Poulantzas held to the notion that the NPB shared the political and ideological class position of the TPB. As such, the NPB constituted the same class as the TPB, in so far as it shared the effects of their mutual exclusion from both the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Thus Poulantzas maintained that the NPB and the TPB lay outside the *fundamental* class struggle and as such could not have any long-term interests of their own.

Whilst Poulantzas allowed for both political and ideological factors in the determination of class locations, his later work is predominantly concerned with the economic i.e. the production process itself. The process of production was conceived of as a unity of the labour process, the

forces of production and the relations of production. It is within the relations of production that Poulantzas discerned three determining moments - the economic, political and ideological. Again it is with the economic moment that Poulantzas concentrates (which accounts for the accusations of 'economism' levelled at his conceptualisation). As outlined above, Poulantzas distinguishes between three aspects of this economic moment: ownership, possession and exploitation. Therefore an individual's class *place* can be seen to be determined by the (i) power or lack of power s/he has in terms of directing the means of production; (ii) the power or lack of power to direct or control the labour process; and (iii) the power or lack of power to appropriate surplus value from the direct producers. Each of these aspects can itself be seen to be determined by economic, political and ideological criteria. Thus, ownership by itself is an insufficient basis for the direction of the means of production eg. the 'market' and the profitability of a particular area of investment will also act as determining factors in economic ownership. Similarly, the direction of the labour process, as Braverman (1974) and others have shown, is both politically and ideologically constructed. That is, whilst technical relations play a major part in the actual form of the labour process, the concerns for profitability will sometimes be overdetermined by considerations of control and domination ie. the political. Finally, the mode and the rate of exploitation will be informed by both the labour process and the nature of the organised resistance on the part of workers. Overall, therefore, it is quite wrong to suggest that the structural determination of class places, within productive relations, are wholly economically determined. Both political and ideological criteria can be seen to enter into the economic moment of the relations of production.

As indicated above, using Poulantzas's criteria, and contrary to Marx's own thesis of polarisation, the working class becomes that increasingly small proportion of the population made up of only those directly involved in productive ( manual?) work. This definition thereby automatically excludes from the working class a whole host of white-collar and service workers, including teachers. As a result, Poulantzas's distinction between productive and unproductive labour, as the basis for the identification of class differences, has been strongly criticised. Indeed, the problematic nature of this distinction has led to a number of attempts to overcome the inconsistency between the polarisation thesis and the growth of

unproductive labour. In particular, the contribution of unproductive labour to the *realisation* of surplus value in the sphere of circulation and the sale of commodities has been theorised (Crompton 1976, Johnson 1977). There has also been an increasing use by Marxist theorists of the concept of the 'collective labourer' in discussions relating to the class location of the new middle class. Recognition of the fact that production processes increasingly require a diverse range of skills for their completion, has meant that the white-collar worker can be seen as just as integral to the overall production process as the direct producers. In this sense it has been argued that Marx's basic division between the exploiting class and the exploited remains a viable distinction. The new middle class are then assigned a place in the working class since they are also 'employees':

*" All sell their labour-power and participate in production, and all, even the most privileged, experience the conflicts inherent in capitalist relations of production - being treated as a cost, being exposed to de-skilling tendencies, unemployment and so on. Degrees of privilege and authority, while muting the experience of conflict, do not eliminate it." (24)*

The question of capitalist exploitation is however further obscured when it comes to employees of the state, a large number of whom are part of the new middle class. These 'unproductive' workers, including teachers and other semi-professionals, can be seen to perform surplus labour and are subject to a relation of employment which is not dissimilar to that of other exploited workers (Gough 1972). They contribute to the reproduction of variable capital. However, these economic approaches have not, as yet, provided a satisfactory resolution of the problem as they remain within the productive/unproductive framework:

*" Marx's account of class exploitation holds that the exploited class does not simply produce surplus value but that it suffers an appropriation of surplus value; it has the fruits of its full labour taken from it. The production of surplus value - that is, productive labour - can be performed by anyone who contributes to the labour process including, under certain circumstances, capitalists, as Marx acknowledged a number of times. While the major contribution to the production of surplus value will be from non-capitalists, from workers, the concept of 'productive labour' cannot itself distinguish between those who have surplus appropriated from them and those who do not... The Marxian distinction between productive and unproductive labour cannot lead to the identification of class differences." (25)*

An alternative way of distinguishing between the new middle class and the working class has been in terms of the 'functions' each performs for capital (Carchedi 1977, Wright 1978, Ehrenreich & Ehrenreich 1978). This argument is based on the growth of managerial and supervisory functions, and with it the new middle-class or, in the case of the Ehrenreich, the 'professional-managerial class' (PMC). Whilst having the role of controlling labour power within the workplace, the PMC is seen as remaining subject to control by capital: they are both exploiters and exploited, capitalist and working class. For this reason Wright refers to the new middle class as having a 'contradictory class location'. This type of 'functional' analysis has also met with considerable opposition. In particular, it is the individualised nature of the control function in Wright's analysis, both in terms of the particular context or capitalist enterprise and the exploitation of one individual by another, which has been objected to (Barbalet op cit, Meiksins 1986). That is, Wright has been accused of mistaking the control of labour function within the capitalist enterprise for a class relation analogous to the control of labour in general (Barbalet, op cit, p.560)

Whilst many of these conceptions of the class location of the new middle class maintain the basic Marxist proposition regarding the polarizing tendency of capitalist relations of production, they hardly correspond to the manifest lack of a common consciousness amongst the exploited class. Many groups within the 'collective labourer' class actively distance themselves from their common class position via status distinctions. Unlike Weberian conceptions of status based on prestige, these status distinctions must however be seen as the product of class inequalities:

*" If workers are concerned to protect and enhance their status, this is because exploitative production relations constantly threaten them with a loss of economic well-being and social respect. In struggling over status, specific groups of workers are not trying, ultimately, to take something away from those below them in a kind of zero-sum game. They are trying to get more from their employers. The fact that they sometimes enter into competition with other employees is a result of the way in which employers structure the conflict, not of any necessary conflict of interests among themselves. There is a real sense in which status consciousness is a reaction to the experience of class exploitation. " (26)*

In a similar vein, Barbalet (*op cit*) has argued that status differences arise out of the subordinate class' resistance to employers. This resistance produces normative expectations and aspirations which are manifested in the claim for *socially constructed rights* and entitlements. Thus norms 'arise in and are achieved through interested action' (p.567). Since different groups have different capacities in terms of the means available for their resistance, inequalities inevitably arise between those who achieve their rights and those who do not. Hence we find status differentials between groups within the same class. These differentials, in turn, account for the particularity of a group's political mobilisation;

*" members of any given class find themselves in quite different circumstances and able to take advantage of different types of opportunities at different times [therefore] ...the actual expression of the same class interest by different groups at the same time or by the same group at different times will necessarily yield a wide range of variation, including the possibility of contradictory expression." (27)*

This conception does nevertheless raise the issue of 'economism' in Marxist class analysis.

The question of 'economism' concerns the nature of the interests of the collectivities found in the relations of production i.e. are there 'real', material class interests? And, how might we identify such interests, and under what circumstances are they translated into class practices/political objectives? The argument put forward by critics of Marxism is that classes have no material interests outside of the discursive formation. Indeed, some go as far as to argue that there can be no such thing as material interests, only conceptions or ideas *about* such interests (Laclau & Mouffe 1985, Hindess 1987). As a result, there can be no direct or necessary translation of class interests into political objectives or action. These criticisms imply that it is impossible to identify class interests as either 'real' or 'objective'. It could be said that, to take such a position is to argue that there are basically no advantages or disadvantages which we can empirically identify with respect to capitalist social relations. Such a position is rejected in this thesis. The case can be made for the existence of 'real' class interests.

For example, Giddens has argued that we can speak meaningfully of 'objective' interests:

*" ...interests would only be 'subjective' (in a certain sense anyway) if interests were equated with wants. Interests presume wants, but the concept of interests concerns not wants as such, but the possible modes of their realisation in given sets of circumstances; and these can be determined as 'objectively' as anything else in social analysis." (28)*

Similarly, Saunders (1979) has argued that it is possible to identify objective class interests if one takes a 'realist' approach. That is, an approach which concerns itself with developing '...causal explanations of what we see through the generation of theories about underlying and unobservable structures and forces ' (p.35). According to Saunders, there are two basic propositions which any theory of objective interests has to confront. Firstly, it has to be able to explain political inaction as well as action with respect to objective interests. Secondly, that objective interests are essentially contestable i.e. based on moral and political values. However, Saunders recognises that we need to suspend the last proposition if we are to arrive at a definition of objective or real interests. Thus he argues:

*" ...any conception of objective interests is based ultimately on personal moral and political values. Any analysis of power and of political inaction will therefore be essentially contestable. But can we say more than this? The answer is we can, but only if we are prepared to accept a definition of interests which, while necessarily ultimately contestable, nevertheless rests on the assumption that real interests refer to the achievement of benefits and the avoidance of costs in any particular situation." (29)*

Saunders recognises the fact that any assessment of benefits and costs is itself influenced by the social context and is therefore necessarily evaluative. However, he counters this by arguing that benefits and costs, once contexted, can be utilised in assessing objective interests. According to Saunders, contexted evaluations must, by definition, be short-term assessments i.e. they require comparative empirical referents and as such this rules out identification of long-term interests. Saunders therefore argues that,

*" although objective interests cannot be said to exist independently of different conceptual frameworks, nevertheless costs and benefits do exist objectively and may be analysed empirically in any specified context of action. It follows that if the two are seen to be related through theory, then the former may be analysed in terms of the latter..." (30)*

Saunders' conception of objective interests is accepted here, with certain reservations. In particular, his failure to completely escape what Giddens has referred to as the 'dilemmas of utilitarian calculi' (p.189) is apparent in his notion of 'benefits and costs'. The retention of these terms is unnecessary. Instead, it is sufficient to assert that:

*"...actors have interests by virtue of their membership of particular groups, communities, classes, etc...A person shares certain interests in common with others, for example, by virtue of being a member of the working class; there are conflicts of interest between capitalists and workers which are integral to capitalist production."*  
(31)[original emphasis]

For Giddens therefore, 'objective' interests imply 'potential courses of action, in contingent and material circumstances' (*ibid*). That is, class interests need to be contexted in terms of the existing social relations within the CMP, as both Giddens and Saunders suggests, and as Social Form Theory requires. Thus class interests can be identified, even if they are as generalised as 'the avoidance of exploitation'. This is a position supported by Barbalet (1986) who argues that objective class interests are:

*"...the imperatives for a class which arise out of its relations with others in a class system. Thus it might be said that the class of employees has an interest in resisting the power of employers to determine the nature of the employment relation."* (32)

Although real or objective class interests can be identified, in terms of an analysis of the modes of exploitation, this does not mean that such interests will always be manifested in the political sphere. Political objectives are not automatically shaped by the conflicts involved in productive relations. However, this should not be taken to mean that the,

*"...absence of explicit class 'discourses' ...betoken the absence of class realities and their effects in shaping the life conditions and consciousness of the people who come within their 'field of force'. If these class situations and oppositions have not been directly mirrored in the political domain, it can hardly be concluded that people have no class interests or even that they have chosen not to express these interests politically."* (33)

Class interests have therefore to be seen as distinct from their representation in political objectives. The possibility always exists that class practices will not correspond to class interests, in so far as the limits of these practices will be subjectively (strategically) rather than

objectively defined. This corresponds with the notion of normatively defined status differentials giving rise to different capacities to respond to the employment relation. As such they will not be 'real' limits i.e. that which a class can objectively achieve within the constraints of a given situation or structure.

This is why Poulantzas (1973) referred to class interests as the 'horizon of class action'. However, the problem with this conception is that it is still predicated on an acceptance of a notion of long-term class interests i.e. the problem being one of establishing what the empirical referents of these long-term interests might be in any evaluation. Failure to resolve this question makes Poulantzas's argument unacceptable in its 'strong' form. However, a weaker notion of short-term objective interests - as defined by the 'horizon of class action', which is itself determined in class struggles - remains a useful conception in so far as it offers the possibility of seeing struggles as 'strategic' action, involving an element of choice on the part of conscious subjects. That is, there is no necessity to hypothesise beyond the present context of class relations to ascertain objective class interests; to extend Poulantzas' metaphor, to see over the horizon. Objective interests can in fact be seen to be derived out of class relations which, in turn, define the 'horizon of class action'. This does not mean that interests are normatively (subjectively) defined since both the 'horizon of class action' and the available modes of realising class interests, strategic action, can be objectively identified.

### 3.vi *Summary*

In this chapter it has been argued that class relations are derived from the mode of exploitation found in capitalist productive relations, with the value form providing the basis for the appropriation of surplus value from the direct producers. Thus, it is the nature of capitalist productive relations which constitutes the central organising principle of the social formation. It has also been argued that there is a directionality to capitalist development which is based upon the articulation of class relations and the forces of production. Class analysis is therefore essential to our understanding of social change

within capitalist society, including educational change. However, change is always the outcome of contestation and contradictions. In particular, the 'separation-in-unity' of the economic and political spheres, civil society and the state, gives rise to conflicts and struggles which delimit the reproduction of social relations. More specifically, the delineation of bourgeois domination into three separate social forms - wage, state and civil - corresponding to the three spheres of the economy, state and civil society, whilst enabling the reproduction of capitalist social relations, also contains contradictions which are the condition for contestation and resistance.

It is the relationship between the social forms of bourgeois domination which provides a key to understanding the level and nature of conflict and resistance. That is, the articulation of the contestation within and between the social forms delimits the nature of class conflict and struggle which, in turn, delimits capitalist development and social change. This articulation of conflict between the spheres is itself seen as predicated on the type of political mobilisation and organisation undertaken by the particular class or class fraction.

Within the current social formation, the class location of the 'new' middle class has been shown to be problematic. In terms of their economic role and function ie. whether they are 'productive' or 'unproductive' and/or perform the functions of capital or labour, their location appears ambiguous, even contradictory. However, such formulations move away from the value-form, the mode of exploitation, as the basis for class location. As such they are rejected in this account. Instead, an analysis based upon the value-form which places the new middle class within the exploited class, as employees, is accepted. The problem then becomes one of explaining the differences within this exploited class ie. differences between the traditional 'working class' and the 'new' middle class. In this account, these differences are explained in terms of *status* differentials which arise out of 'interested action'. That is, different sections of the exploited class have differential access to resources which are used in their resistance to employers. This provides for different normative expectations and aspirations which, in turn, constitute the basis for socially constructed rights and status. Not all rights are the product of conflict however. Rights can also be conferred if it is in the interests of

the dominant to do so. This in fact may be seen to be related to the nature of the state formation as a whole. These rights can be seen to be aspects of 'citizenship' - the state-form - which act back upon class inequalities. It is therefore postulated that the nature of the political mobilisation of the 'enfranchised' ie. those who have attained such rights, will reflect these status differentials.

Since the political class struggles within the education system and the reproduction process concern, centrally, the collective organisation of teachers, it is their class position and political mobilisation which provides the focus for the examination in the next Chapter. As in all such applications of class analysis, there is an inevitable 'slippage' between the theorisation and the particularity of the occupational group. This examination of the class location of teachers is no exception. However, a 'grounding' of the theory has been attempted wherever possible, especially in relation to the specificity of the work of FE teachers. As with class relations in general, it is necessary to review existing positions regarding the class location of teachers before attempting to develop the position outlined above.

### Notes and References - Chapter Three

1. Sharp (1988) p.190
2. Hall (1980) p.228
3. *ibid* p.229
4. Marx, Capital, 1,217,& cf.*ibid* 111,772,quoted in Cohen (1978),p.82
5. Meiksins (1986) p.189
6. Cohen & Howard (1979) p.80
7. Giddens' conception of class is based upon the institutional configuration of capitalism and in particular the separation of the economy and polity. This, in turn, is itself an expression of the 'deep-lying contradiction ...between private appropriation and socialised production'. As a result, classes are seen by Giddens to 'express' this 'institutional grounding' rather than being 'collectivities' as in some Marxist accounts (1979 p.114-5).
8. Giddens (1982) p.144
9. Wright (1983) p.24
10. *ibid* p.29
11. Sayer (1979) p.86
12. Wood (1981) p.76
13. *ibid* p.78
14. *ibid* p.79
15. Williams (1988) p.96
16. *ibid* p.104
17. 'Separation-in-unity' - this concept is used to denote the manner in which the the existence of the separation between the state and civil society is both necessary and at the same time contradictory. According to Williams, " ...the state and civil society exist necessarily in the contradictory form of separation-in-unity, since the former must inevitably intervene in the latter and since the legitimation of the state depends upon its being perceived as the emanation of the wills of bourgeois persons as citizens. The falling apart of particularity and universality at the most abstract level is here grounded in the concrete falling apart of civil society and the state." ( 1988, pp.12-13)
18. Williams *op cit* p.110

19. There is no designation in Social Form Theory of a 'form' for the private sphere. It is therefore proposed to use the term 'civil' form for the purposes of this thesis. This term is to be used since it encapsulates the non-state, non-wage element involved in its formation eg. gender and ethnicity.
20. Duncan & Goodwin (1988) p.41
21. Meiksins *op cit* p.108
22. According to Jessop (1985) ' Strictly speaking this is an aspect of economic ownership and Poulantzas himself tended to subsume it entirely under this rubric.' (p.161)
23. MacKenzie (1982) p.67
24. Meiksins *op cit* p.111
25. Barbalet (1986) p.559
26. Meiksins *op cit* p.114
27. Barbalet *op cit* p.571
28. Giddens (1979) p.189
29. Saunders (1979) p.45
30. *ibid* p.29
31. Giddens *op cit* p.189
32. Barbalet *op cit* p.570
33. Wood *op cit* p.97

## CHAPTER FOUR

### *The Class Location of Teachers*

#### 4.i *Harris*

Harris' (1982) conception of the class position of teachers is a useful starting point for this analysis since it draws upon many of the ideas contained in the various theorisations of the new middle class discussed in Chapter Three. As such, this examination of Harris's work will also highlight the limitations of these accounts, with a view to their transcendence by the position developed in the previous chapter.

Harris' theorisation is premised upon a model of the social formation which is constituted at three levels - the economic, political and ideological. This structuralist problematic is employed to locate the 'objective' class location of teachers by means of an identification of their interests at these three levels. Starting off with a deliberately 'mechanistic' formulation of social class, Harris privileges the relations of production as being determinant in the first instance. Thus, he begins his analysis of the class location of teachers by attempting to situate them first within the economic level.

The formulation of social class as determined by one's relationship to the means of production is predicated on the condition of ownership. On this basis, the location of teachers within the economic relations of production is quite simple - they are non-owners. According to Harris however, what matters is not the simple relation of ownership, or lack of it, but the nature of the *exchange* which takes place between non-owners and owners. Some workers exchange their labour directly with capital which makes them '*productive*', whilst others exchange their labour with revenue (by this it is meant that they are paid out of taxes) and are therefore '*unproductive*'. Furthermore, it is not the individual's own labour or activity which is deemed to be the determinant of the productive/unproductive distinction, it is the place of that activity within the overall production process. He therefore ascribes the term 'productive labour' to all '... who take part in the process of the production of surplus value, whether this be done manually or mentally, and whether the

labourer is engaged directly in the production of use-values or not' (p.57). This is the concept of the collective labourer. Thus, it is only the working class which can be considered productive, as they constitute what Harris, after Carchedi, calls '*collective productive labour*'. Since teachers are unproductive, in the sense that they exchange their labour for revenue, they cannot be considered as part of the working class.

As argued earlier, the productive/unproductive division, as used by Poulantzas and others, and including here Harris, does not in fact provide a basis for class location. The fact that Harris takes the notion of 'productive' to be a relation of exchange does not mitigate the fact that it moves away from the nature of that relation ie. the mode of exploitation, which is paramount in a Marxist theorisation. Therefore, the notion of teachers being 'unproductive' in this sense does not provide a ground for their exclusion from the working class and Harris' conception must be rejected. This objection notwithstanding, Harris's theorisation also incorporates a 'functional' basis to the teachers' class location which also needs to be examined.

Harris translates the basic economic functions of labour and capital into the actual labour process of teaching, with the result that the global function of capital is taken to be '*...that part of the teacher's labour which is directed towards socialisation through transmitting the hidden curriculum of schooling*' (p.63). Teachers are therefore seen to perform the '*global function of capital*' in so far as they '*...maintain the overall conditions of capitalist production*' through their '*surveillance and control*' activities within the schooling process. Harris also argues that the situation of the teachers is more complex still: he sees teachers performing *both* the functions of capital and the collective labourer. Thus, within the labour process of teaching the function of the collective labourer is '*...that part of the teacher's labour which is directed to transmitting the overt curriculum of schooling*' (ibid). As a result, Harris's theorisation means that teachers can, simultaneously, be excluded from the working class (because they are 'unproductive') and included as collective labourers because they,

" *...perform the function of the collective labourer (unproductively) through their part in instruction and coordination of the (future) work force...*" (1)

We are therefore left with an ambiguous, even contradictory, class location for teachers, the resolution of which comes in the form of their 'proletarianisation'.

The dynamic for the proletarianisation process in Harris' account is the persistent 'accumulation crisis' facing capital. That is to say, he sees the origins of the proletarianisation of teachers lying in the fact that the growth of unproductive labour is a drain on surplus value production. Since schooling is also directly related to the production of these unproductive workers [ note: this is not entirely the case in FE], there exists two options for capital: (i) it can increase the quality of the training it provides in schools and colleges so that the product - future workers - will not need subsequent, expensive re-training (which is itself a drain on surplus value). Alternatively, (ii) it can decrease the actual number of unproductive workers by redirecting training to more productive labour, and thereby increase surplus value production. Both (i) and (ii) assist the reduction of the numbers involved in unproductive labour and the global function of capital.

As well as reducing the numbers involved in the global function of capital, the process of proletarianisation is furthered by the devaluation of the labour of teachers by deskilling. This manifests itself, according to Harris, in the following ways:

- (a) - by the introduction of pre-packaged curricula;
- (b) - by the rationalisation of the relations of production within the teaching labour process. This is achieved by such means as payment by results and an increased emphasis on accountability, evaluation and assessment;
- (c) - by a reduction in the actual instruction relative to surveillance and control function which teachers undertake. Thus their 'secret knowledge' is reduced and not replaced, to the same extent, with the secret knowledge of the teaching process (pedagogic skills). In order to examine this argument more closely, it is necessary to understand the nature of the teachers' labour process in detail. This will involve a somewhat lengthy digression, but it is one which is unavoidable if the complexity of locating teachers in the social formation is to be comprehended.

#### 4.ii *The Labour Process of Teachers*

Before looking at the specific nature of the labour process of teaching, it is helpful to review the basic propositions of labour process theory in relation to *reproduction*.

According to Thompson (1983), Marx identified three main elements which can be found in all labour processes:

- " 1. *Purposeful activity of man (sic), directed to work.*
2. *The object on which the work is performed, in the form of natural instruments or raw materials.*
3. *The instruments of that work, most often tools or more complex technology."* (2)

These elements can be considered as the basic pre-requisites of any productive process. The first element refers to what Marx termed '*living labour*' i.e. labour which is expended in the act of transforming the second element, the '*objects of labour*'. Once this labour has been expended it becomes '*dead labour*'. However, Hales (1980) has suggested that there is a residual aspect of the transformation of living to dead labour, and that is the '*potential for further labour*' which stays with the labourer. This potential he terms '*learning*', which he considers to be a subjective form of dead labour. This will be shown to be a particularly useful conception with regard to the labour process of teaching.

In order to carry out the transformation of the objects of labour, instruments or tools, which are themselves dead labour, are employed. These instruments, the means of production, are not neutral in the sense of being unrelated to either the purpose to which they are used or the social relations which exist in production. Indeed, these instruments can be seen to be fashioned by, and therefore reflect, the social relations of production. Overall, therefore, a labour process represents a fusion of living labour - purposeful activity directed at the transformation of nature - and dead labour i.e. labour which has been expended in a relation between the objects of labour and the instruments of labour. Precisely how these elements are brought together is determined by the overall social relations of production existing within any social formation. In capitalism it is the production of commodities and the valorisation process which

determines the nature of labour processes. That is, within capitalism it is the function of capital to co-ordinate the elements of the labour process in such a way as to ensure that there is production of commodities with *use-values*. More than this however, as it is not enough simply to produce commodities with use-values equivalent to the cost of their production. This would bring no advantage to capital. Therefore, the goal of capital is to produce use-values which exceed the cost of their production i.e. produce *surplus-value*, which, whilst the product of labour, is not formally the property of labour. This is the valorisation process.

Initially, the valorisation process entailed capital employing labour on terms which were largely determined by labour itself. That is to say, capital had to take labour as it came, and employ it in a manner which left the technique of production largely in the heads and hands of labour. Thus, whilst formally being in the employ of capital, the labourer retained some control over the production process. This is what Marx referred to as the '*formal*' subordination of labour. As the necessity for capital to compete increases, the valorisation process impels capital to seek ways to reduce the costs of production. New ways of increasing the productivity of labour have therefore to be found. Under the formal subordination of labour the only means to achieve greater output is by lengthening the working day or paying the worker less. Both of these methods have their limits! Therefore, it is to the intensity of the labour process that capital turns in search of ways to increase the rate of surplus-value it can expropriate. By the development of new knowledge (science) and the application of technology, capital can reduce the costs of production and thereby bring about a more productive and profitable labour process.

If one takes the very general schemata of the labour process as outlined above, it can be represented as follows:

*objects of labour + living labour + instruments of labour → → products*

(Hales, 1980)

Before we can begin to relate this to the labour process of teaching, a number of the elements need to be reconsidered. Firstly, the teacher's labour process needs to be contexted within the sphere of '*reproduction*'.

There is little problem with the notion of living labour - this reproduction undoubtedly shares with production. More problematic is the concept 'objects of labour'. This would appear to set reproduction apart from production in so far as there appears to be no place for an *interactive* relation between the teacher's living labour and the objects of that labour. Indeed, this calls into question the whole notion of there being 'objects' of labour within reproduction processes. However, in so far as the transformation of the 'material' of reproduction - labour - is itself the objective of the teacher's labour process, it may be admissible in this sense to conceive of pupils/students as 'objects'. Nevertheless, confusion still exists in this formulation in that the use of the terms 'object' and 'objective' obviously denote quite different things. In order to alleviate this problem, I propose to see the 'purposeful activity' of teachers as being directed towards an 'objective' rather than at an object as such. This conceptualisation has the benefit of reinforcing the purposefulness of the activity and, more importantly, it allows for a certain amount of indeterminacy of outcome, which accords with the view that the 'material' of reproduction - labour - is not to be seen as passive. Reproduction must therefore be seen as an interactive process.

A further reconsideration needs to take place in terms of the 'instruments of labour'. In particular, these instruments have to be seen as more than simply dead-labour 'congealed' and brought to bear on living labour within the teaching process. In this respect Hales' conception of the 'forces of production' may be applicable to the labour process of teaching:

*" The forces of production comprise not just machines and tools, but the whole system of practices - objects, instruments, and labour-power together, in their material connectedness - which constitute a particular sector of social production." (3)[emphasis added]*

A distinction between the labour process of teaching and the labour processes to which it is directed also needs to be kept in mind at this point. The labour process of teaching has its own 'instruments' and 'practices' - forces of production in Hales' sense - which, whilst connected, very closely in the case of vocational education, to those of production, are nevertheless quite distinct. At the centre of what might be called the 'instruments of reproduction' in teaching is the curriculum. Indeed, the curriculum might be seen as embodying the labour process of

teaching, in so far as it is itself the vehicle which brings together dead and living labour in a 'material connectedness'. Like technology, this vehicle cannot be viewed as 'neutral' or unrelated to the relations of production ( or reproduction). In fact, the curriculum must be seen to materialise and condense those social relations of reproduction and, indeed, social relations in general:

*" Instruments of labour not only supply a standard of the degree to which human labour has obtained, but they also indicate the social relations in which men work." (4)*

Apart from the instruments of labour, the 'materiality' of the institutional framework within which reproduction takes place also needs to be taken into account. In the case of teaching, the fact that this activity takes place within large bureaucratic institutions, state institutions for the most part, must be considered as having a bearing on the teacher's labour process. Likewise, the spatial dimension to teacher's work - their isolation in the classroom for example - needs to be seen as having some determinancy on the nature of their labour process (Dreeben 1988). Finally, the 'product' of the reproduction process needs to be reconceptualised. In the case of production, the 'commodity' form is the basis of the theorisation of the product of the labour process. Is it possible, or even useful, to think of the product of reproduction, ie. labour power/capacity, in the same sense?

Reproduction does have a product. To suggest otherwise is perhaps to idealise the nature of teachers' work. Connell (1985), for example, argues that:

*" Teaching is a labour process without an object. At best, it has an object so intangible - the minds of kids, or the capacity to learn - that it cannot be specified in any but vague and metaphorical ways. A great deal of work is done in schools, day in and day out, but this work does not produce any things." (5)[emphasis added]*

Despite his reassurances that teachers do in fact *work*, Connell ignores the reality of the situation when he argues that teachers do not produce any 'things' - educational outcomes? There are definite outcomes - products - of the labour process of teaching and these are often discrete. They usually take the form of quantities of students 'processed' or qualified at particular levels or grades. Whilst each number or category represents a

person, each person in turn represents potential labour-power which, in the CMP, is a commodity. ( It is of course recognised here that the relationship between grades and labour capacities is very loose.) Despite protestations to the contrary, FE for example, is often said to be all about the '*numbers game*' as far as students are concerned (Tipton 1973). The entire organisation of the FE sector is predicated upon a system of 'levels' or 'grades' of work, wherein actual teaching practices are subordinate to the results - or exchange-values produced. That is, the quality of the process of teaching is immaterial to the exchange-value of educational outcomes. 'Higher' level work is assigned that label, not on the basis of the pedagogic inputs - teachers' 'skills' *qua* teacher, but on the basis of the credentials or students one produces.

Another important concept in this schema of the labour process is the '*knowledge*', which is used to co-ordinate and combine the elements of any labour process. This knowledge is concomitant with the real subordination of labour and is often condensed into instruments of reproduction which confront labour in much the same way as technology in production. We must also take into account the *forms* of the knowledge and how these relate to changes in the teachers' economic and political position (6). It is suggested here that it is in these forms of knowledge (and the nature of the curriculum ) that one finds the conditions for the teachers' class identification and formation, particularly in the distinction between 'academic' and 'vocational' knowledge. As a result,

*" 'knowledges' are not merely produced by one or other class but rather they provide the very conditions under which classes may exist and develop." (7)*

I would amend this view slightly to argue that forms of knowledge may only provide the conditions for the *reproduction* rather than production of classes. That is, the forms of knowledge only provide a basis for either reproducing or transforming an *existing* set of class relations. However, in the case of 'educated labour' one can agree with Abercrombie and Urry that the very existence of this stratum is only made possible by the 'fetishism of intellectual labour' (Sohn-Rethel 1978, pp 13-16) and the systematic manner in which knowledge has been appropriated from direct producers in the CMP. Therefore the existence of the 'intellectual labourer' is itself the product of the existing social relations between capital and labour.

The formulation of the labour process involved in reproduction can now be depicted as follows: -

*objectives + living + instruments of labour → → product(s)*  
*labour labour knowledge → → product(s)*

As with Hales' theorisation, the elements are plural as this allows for an indeterminate relation to exist between certain categories, as well allowing for the '...simultaneous working of concepts and physical things in a single labour process' (ibid).

In the labour process of teaching it is the teacher's living labour which is combined with the instruments of production, principally, but not exclusively, the curriculum, in order to reproduce labour capacities. Thus, in one sense at least, living labour - in what can be described as its 'objectified form' - contributes to the reproduction of labour-power. At the same time, this act of transformation also produces 'subjective' labour in the form of '*learning*'. This learning stays with the teacher despite being a form of dead labour. Reproduction can therefore be seen to refer to the production of two distinct forms of labour: the *objectified form*, which passes out with the completion or accomplishment of the objectives of labour - the product of reproduction; and the *subjective form* which remains with the teacher and is not immediately available as a product. In essence, it is this latter form of labour which can be thought of as the teacher's 'skill' (8). The living labour of the teacher can therefore be seen to have to undergo a process of transformation, a process of objectification, within the labour process of teaching before it can transform the objective of its labour, labour. That is, the teacher's skill has to be reproduced in a manner which contributes to the reproduction of labour capacities. It is this process of objectification of the teacher's skill which is increasingly being determined by what Hales, in the sphere of production, terms '*preconceptualisation*'.

Control of the labour process can only be attained by either: (1) the subsumption of living labour to dead labour, in the form of the instruments of production; or (2) the subsumption of subjective dead labour (learning) to objective dead labour. In terms of the reproduction process, these can be thought of as corresponding to the move from the formal to the real subordination of labour within production. If one were

to attempt to translate this into more concrete terms, it would mean that the introduction, for example, of new curricula may not necessarily 'deskill' or 'degrade' the teacher's existing skill but will, of necessity, still lead to the expropriation of the teacher's labour. This then is an example of the *formal* subordination of labour within the teaching labour process. Alternatively, any curricula which deskills the teacher and fragments the teaching labour process can be seen as the equivalent of a move towards the *real* subordination of labour. This is because it changes the basis of the objectification of teachers' labour in so far as it incorporates and devalues the teachers' subjective form of dead labour - learning - which is produced within the labour process.

Increasingly within FE, and teaching in general, knowledge is being brought into the teaching labour process from outside teaching itself (This is not entirely new. However, the scale of this external knowledge may now be unprecedented.). The development of curricula by external bodies such as the FEU and the MSC is certainly having an important effect on the way in which the management and coordination of the teaching labour process is being undertaken. Thus knowledge is more and more coming to confront the teacher in the labour process as an external relation. However, it is necessary to point out that teaching, like all work which involves conceptual production, complicates the exact relationship between the questions '*whose knowledge*' and '*what knowledge*':

*" The possible complexity of relations between knowledge internal and external to the labour process becomes much greater when we consider conceptual production, because here at least some of the objects of labour are carried by labourers." (9)*

When this relationship between internal and external knowledge is applied to the labour process of teaching, it may be seen that the knowledge with which teachers work is drawn from specialist knowledges. These too have a materiality and a subjectivity which has to be manipulated in relation to *the* knowledge i.e. that which is required to organise the labour process. Thus, they also constitute an 'objective of labour', in the sense which this term is defined above i.e. they too are part of the 'raw material' which has to be transformed within the labour process of teaching. 'Deskilling' therefore also comes to represent the process whereby the objectification of the specialist knowledges, the objectives of labour, reaches a point where they can be *socialised* into an apparatus or vehicle to be used in

reproduction eg. the curriculum, by being routinised or standardised into equivalents. Thus, the 'skill' of the teacher is being reduced to an 'average'. This whole process is necessary because the organisation of the knowledge of the labour process of teaching, as a whole, is increasingly predicated on the ability of some group other than subject-teachers developing the curriculum. Therefore:

*" What is crucial about deskilling is that knowledges are taken out of a given labour process and put into the possession of a materially distinct set of workers. Once that possession is material fact, knowledges may be transformed, and transferred knowledges may be embodied in new forms of labour process." (10)*

It is this transformation and incorporation of knowledges into new labour processes that is involved in what was earlier referred to as 'preconceptualisation'. This is a process of producing the knowledge of a labour process by subsuming the knowledge of existing labour:

*" Preconceptualisation is a relation of material connection between practices in which concepts are produced and objectified, and other practices in which the real objects corresponding to the concepts figure." (11)*

In many respects preconceptualisation describes what Braverman referred to as the 'separation of conception and execution', except that in this case it might be said that it refers to the separation of conception from certain conceptualisers ie. teachers. In itself, the notion of preconceptualisation would appear to involve, at least in its initial stages of the cycle, a move towards enhancing the knowledge required to mobilise the factors of (re)production - reskilling in fact. Thus, depending upon when and where one looks, deskilling may or may not be apparent. Obviously, this has important implications for our understanding of any particular labour process - especially in terms of recognising contestation and resistance.

Braverman's thesis was explicitly concerned with the 'objective' relations of the capitalist labour process and, as a result, this has been a major source of criticism. In Hales' formulation there is clearly a space for the more 'subjective' aspects of the labour process; the concept of 'learning' is important in this respect. Braverman's account of the labour process has also been criticised with respect to his 'idealisation' of the manual craft worker. In particular, the equation of 'skill' with control or power is thought to be overdrawn in Braverman's work. It has been

suggested that he failed to see that power is often obtained regardless of 'skill', especially in those situations where technological innovations have enabled unskilled or semi-skilled workers to 'capture' a degree of control through their collective organisation (Edwards 1979). Similarly, control may be maintained by groups of workers whilst the original 'skills' employed in the work are no longer required or even necessary. Similarly, it has been suggested that, in the case of teachers, their 'professionalism' and 'autonomy' has been overdrawn in many accounts (Ozga & Lawn 1981). That is, the whole question of teacher autonomy has come to hinge upon the notion that teachers are 'professionals' with certain skills. Yet, when examined more closely, this professionalism often turns out to be very fragile (Lawn 1985). Furthermore, teachers themselves are apt to stress their own professionalism in order to enhance their own self-importance and status, most obviously for the purposes of collective bargaining. Therefore we should be very wary of idealising the teacher in the same way as Braverman idealised the craft worker.

#### 4.iii *Teachers and Proletarianisation*

As stated earlier, within Harris' account the 'dynamic' for the proletarianisation of teachers is posited largely in terms of a global accumulation crisis. This, I feel, is mistaken; or at least it neglects the possibility of the proletarianisation of teachers being different from workers who are *directly* involved in the production of surplus value. That is, the teachers' relation with their employers may be different to that of other workers and, as such, their process of proletarianisation may be mediated by their political relations to a far greater extent. The impetus for their proletarianisation may not be directly related to an accumulation crisis and the maintenance of the mode of their exploitation, but more in terms of a change in power relations and the 'form' of their domination. Overall, Harris' account tends to privilege the economic as being determinate of the process of proletarianisation, to the exclusion of both political and ideological criteria. The notion that within this economic level the political moment could be determinant in the proletarianisation of teachers is not even considered. This is due, in particular, to the fact

that the 'socialisation of unproductive labour' is under-theorised within this account.

As discussed earlier, in relation to both Poulantzas and Harris, teachers can be seen to perform 'unproductive' labour. However, this does not exclude them from exploitation. As indicated above, there are good grounds for suggesting that the productive/unproductive divide is redundant as a means of class determination. Just like productive workers before them, unproductive labour is being socialised into the collective labourer. That is, unproductive labour is undergoing a process of *real* subsumption within capitalist relations of production. There are four basic reasons for this according to Abercrombie and Urry:

*" (a) growth in working-class real wages and resultant transformation in its 'historically and morally' determined needs; (b) the large growth in so-called service employment and the relative, and in some cases absolute, decline in manufacturing employment; (c) the vast expansion in the size and complexity of the planning function attendant upon technological and ownership changes; and (d) the development of working-class and other popular struggles which necessitate new forms of management and supervision, and of an enlarged and grossly more complex state." (12)*

If one looks closely at these reasons it is possible to see that this process of socialisation of unproductive labour is far from being simply the product of the logic of accumulation. Whilst economic determination is certainly present - in the form of imperatives in production and consumption, political factors are also prominent eg. particularly in point (d), which is especially relevant to this discussion of teachers. Hence it is possible that this socialisation process will not correspond directly with the 'needs' of capital. However, the socialisation of unproductive labour is a necessary condition for the proletarianisation of such labour. The nature of the production process will, in turn, be related to the form socialised unproductive labour takes:

" There are three main forms taken by such socialised unproductive labour: (1) the social relations involved in organising and managing the productive labour engaged in producing materially tangible commodities; (2) the social relations involved in organising, managing and producing predominantly intangible commodities which are directly exchanged with revenue; and (3) the social relations involved in organising, managing and producing intangible commodities which realise surplus-value for the owners of capital." (13)

Relating this three-fold classification to teachers one can see perhaps a contradictory location i.e. between (2) and (3). Teachers organise, manage and produce largely intangible commodities (their pedagogic skills, materials etc.) which they exchange for revenue. They also organise, manage and help produce a tangible commodity - labour-power - which realises surplus-value for owners of capital. These 'functions' can be seen as inter-dependent and, as such, need to be 'socialised' if reproduction is to take place.

#### 4.iv *The FE Teacher*

The distinction between the function of the collective labourer and that of global capital, and Harris' respective assignment of these to the 'instruction' and 'socialisation' roles of the teacher, raises some very important questions in relation to the work of FE teachers. The explicit transmission of skills - the FE equivalent of the 'overt' curriculum in schooling - has been seen as the most important aspect of the FE teacher's work. At least, this is the traditional perception of FE teaching. As a result, the 'surveillance and control' aspect of the FE teacher's role has tended to be seen as secondary. Thus FE has been seen to be largely concerned with transmission of vocational skills. However, in the few pieces of research which have looked at this question, and, more importantly, have attempted to theorise the role of the FE teacher, it has been found that surveillance and control, or at least, imparting the dominant *social* relations of production, often takes precedence over the transmission of the *technical* relations within the FE teaching process (Gleeson and Mardle 1980, Avis 1982). According to this research. it is the 'global function of capital' which is in fact the dominant aspect of the FE teacher's role.

Whilst it may be the case that FE teachers, like their school colleagues, are primarily engaged in the socialisation function, the manner in which this is carried out is quite distinct. In FE the cloak of the technical relations of production has been seen to be more firmly drawn over the transmission of the hidden curriculum (the social relations of production). Indeed, it may even be argued that the teachers themselves are sometimes unaware of their surveillance and control function. A notion of technological 'neutrality' permeates vocational teaching and this may account for the misrecognition of the ideological nature of the vocational teacher's task. For example, FE teachers, historically, have laid claim to their professionalism or the skilled nature of their role primarily in terms of their subject expertise rather than their pedagogic or educational skills (Horn & Horn 1983). Hence FE teachers were traditionally said to be 'teacher-professionals' rather than 'professional teachers'. This is also reflected in the rather different professional training and qualifications which apply to FE teaching compared to school teaching.

It is in fact the division between the production of use-values and exchange-values which can be seen to lie at the heart of the problem of 'socialising' the labour of FE teachers. Within FE this division manifests itself in the distinction between 'education' and 'training'. This is a distinction which, historically, has placed the FE teacher in an ambiguous position with respect to developments in the socialisation of labour in general (Horn & Horn 1983, Turner 1979). Studies such as those just cited indicate that the class position taken by FE teachers has been largely 'politically' and/or 'ideologically' inspired, as much as economically determined. That is, the organisation of FE teachers has been largely a response to questions of control and definition of their work. As a result, their major collective occupational strategies of 'professionalism' and 'trade unionism' have to be seen as a response to specific conjunctural factors and struggles rather than any underlying logic of social or economic development.

In the case of FE teachers, it is postulated here that the relationship between their educational and occupational ideologies is more pronounced than that of School-teachers due to the more vocationally-oriented nature of their teaching. That is, FE teachers are compelled more often by the nature of their work to make the distinction between being

either a 'professional teacher' or a 'teacher professional' (a 'professional' who teaches) and this has important ramifications for the articulation of their occupational and educational ideologies. Historically, it has been found that a division exists amongst the ranks of FE teachers between those who hold to an 'educationalist' ideology and those who profess a 'vocationalist' ideology. Broadly, one can characterise these ideologies in the following manner. Educationalists believe that the FE curriculum should not be dictated by the 'needs of industry' and, as a result, be solely or even primarily concerned with 'technical' or narrowly 'vocational' training. More positively, a belief in education 'for its own sake': a traditional liberal conception. Vocationalists, on the other hand, propound the view that FE is, and should be, concerned with the inculcation of 'skills' and 'technical' knowledge, which enables the student to obtain gainful employment and at the same time satisfies the need of the economy (employers) for skilled manpower. These can be seen as the 'principles' of the respective ideologies, for which there are corresponding pedagogic practices, teaching strategies. Together, these principles and strategies constitute the 'educational' ideologies of FE teachers.

Concurrent to the division between the educationalists and the vocationalists, there also exists the previously mentioned division between those FE teachers who hold to the ideology of professionalism and those who hold to the ideology of trade unionism. One of the primary concerns of this thesis will be to identify the various articulations of these ideologies within NATFHE (the FE teachers' trade union - see *Appendix 3*) and to assess the transformative effects of the new vocationalism. An expected articulation - based principally on the mental-manual division - would be as follows:

EDUCATIONALIST = PROFESSIONALISM

VOCATIONALIST = TRADE UNIONIST

However, from my own working knowledge and experience of FE teaching and NATFHE membership, this has not been the position. In fact, quite the reverse:

EDUCATIONALIST = TRADE UNIONIST

VOCATIONALIST = PROFESSIONALISM

has more often been the case. This is supported by Turner (1988) and can

be explained in terms of the age and educational profiles of the two groups eg. the younger, more 'radical' Educationalist and the 'liberalising' effect of a University education compared to the generally older, more 'conservative' technical teachers.

It is therefore postulated here that, in any conjuncture, there will be a dominant configuration of the FE teachers' educational and occupational ideologies which will be reflected in the policies and organisation of NATFHE as the teachers collective organisation. A transformation in this configuration brought about by the introduction of the new vocationalism will also therefore be reflected in the Association's policies.

#### *4.v The Political and Ideological Aspects of Teachers' Class Position*

Thus far it has been suggested that the economic determination of the teachers' class place is extremely problematic. Whilst recognising that class relations are essentially exploitative and condition the social formation, a purely economic determination has been rejected on the basis that the 'economic' itself has both political and juridical moments. In particular, it has been argued that changes in the labour process of teaching may be as much the product of distinct ideological and political determinants as any accumulation imperative. However the examination becomes even more complex when we begin to specify these political and ideological aspects of the teachers' class position.

The debate on the political and ideological determinants of the teachers' class position is extremely complex. The various positions in the debate can be seen to exhibit a common functionalist orientation. That is, it has been the ideological role or 'function' of teachers which has been the central concern. Within this delimitation of the issue, it has been the ideological importance of the divisions between the productive/unproductive nature of teachers' work, the public/private nature of their employment, and their role in the maintenance of mental/manual forms of knowledge, which have been focussed upon (following the work of Carchedi 1977, Poulantzas 1975, Ehrenreich & Ehrenreich 1979, Wright 1978 etc. on the new middle class). A high level of abstraction and the absence of notions

such as *resistance* and *struggle*, particularly political struggle, is noticeable in these accounts. Thus, with reference to these types of account Ozga and Lawn (1981) believe:

*'...it is [un]satisfactory to assume that, if education acts as a means of reproducing the labour force by inculcating both skills and attitudes necessary for the continuation of capitalism, then teachers are the witting or unwitting agents of an ideological state apparatus and, hence, oppressors of the working class. Such an argument seems to us tantamount to the suggestion that car assembly workers have an interest in maintaining monopoly capitalism because of their contribution to the profits of major multi-nationals.'* (14)

Instead, they suggest that any account of the political and ideological determination of teachers' class position must include an analysis of their changing role within the labour process, which includes an understanding of their proletarianisation, *plus* changes in their political and ideological practices - *'foremost among them being their increased trade union activity'* (p.61). Therefore they raise the issue of teachers' collective organisation. Lawn and Ozga also show that, historically, the literature on the collective organisation of teachers has been dominated by a rather *'sterile dichotomy'* between *'professionalism'* and *'trade unionism'*. Their own work has been an attempt to break with this tradition; as such it is the most productive contribution to the debate to date.

#### 4.vi *The Logic of Teachers' Collective Action*

Ozga and Lawn's (1981) central proposition is that the concept of *'professionalism'* has been used by different groups in different ways on different occasions. Therefore it has no *essential* meaning or evolutionary character. In relation to the collective organisation of teachers, they give a central role to the state in organising the education system in accordance with the needs and structure of capitalism. As a result, they see,

*" the most fruitful way of understanding the behaviour of organized teachers is in terms of employer-employee conflict, which leads to attempts by teachers to resist State interference."* (15)

It is the fact that teachers are *'workers'*, who are exploited in their

relations of production, which lies 'behind' the strategic use of 'professionalism' by both teachers and the state. According to Ozga and Lawn, in periods of economic crisis the restructuring of capitalism brings forth changes in labour processes, including that of the teachers, with a tendency towards proletarianisation. Consequently, the state's use of the strategy of professionalism is thought to decline in such periods and teachers more and more take on trade unionism as their dominant form of collective behaviour. Conflict between teachers and the state therefore becomes more visible and pronounced:

*" We feel that the process of proletarianization attacks the teachers idea of professionalism at its roots - the 'service' idea and the notion of autonomy. If these are destroyed, then the use of professionalism as a controlling ideology by the state is weakened, and the supposed conflict between professionalism and unionism is more clearly seen as the use of union strategies to defend the last traces of a 'craft' ideal." (16)*

Whilst Ozga and Lawn's thesis represents a considerable advance in our understanding of the collective organisation of teachers, it still undertheorises the political aspect of class determination. That is, the whole question of the nature or form of domination intrinsic to the concept of professionalism is largely taken for granted. That form is here being taken to be the 'state-form'. This is nowhere more apparent than in their conception of the relationship between the state and professionalism. In Ozga and Lawn's work, the state is still conceived in terms of an instrument which 'intervenes' in teachers' work and their labour process on behalf of capital. As a result, its bestowal of professionalism must be seen as transforming, on occasions, teachers into nothing more than state functionaries. Teachers are seen in fact to be co-opted, even incorporated, into the ideological state apparatus if and when the need arises. Inherent in this approach must lie an acceptance of the idea of an historic moment of non-intervention. Johnson (1982) argues that such conceptions are derived from an acceptance of the unique separation of the economic and the political in the CMP. As a result, there is little or no recognition in Ozga and Lawn's account of a more dialectical relationship between the state and professionalisation, such as that suggested in Johnson's own work. Such a dialectic would entail, in this case, seeing the teachers' professionalism as an emergent condition of the state formation, whilst at the same time the state formation, including the education system, would

need to be seen as conditioned by the teachers' professionalism. This conception recognises that classes, along with other entities within capitalism eg. the state, have causal powers which can generate empirical occurrences ( Abercrombie & Urry 1983, p.131). It is also in keeping with the emphasis which Ozga and Lawn themselves place on the relational nature of class ie. ' the extent to which classes are not 'things' but sets of social relations, characterized by the antagonistic nature of that relation...' (p.59). That is, whilst Ozga and Lawn recognise that 'professionalism' is a strategy employed by the state and teachers, it is changing *economic* circumstances which they see as 'behind' its adoption/abandonment ie. political determination is still being taken to be epiphenomenal. The separation of the economic from the political determination of teachers' class position is therefore maintained in Ozga and Lawn's account.

The existence of a dialectical relationship between state and professionalism does however accord with Ozga and Lawn's thesis in so far as the state, having granted the status of 'professional' to teachers, is then faced with the defence of this status by the teachers' invocation of the selfsame notion of 'professionalism'. That is, the monopolisation of the market for their services and control of the occupation in general become the strategic objectives of the teachers' collective organisation. Furthermore, the maintenance or, better still, expansion of state provision is central to these objectives. Overall, the successful employment by teachers of a strategy of professionalism may actually be seen to contribute to the restructuring of social inequalities by changing the distribution of educational opportunity and the basis of the legitimation of inequality to one of credentialling. This, of course, reinforces the teachers' *status* and control as professional educators. The question of the teachers' professionalism can therefore be seen to be intimately related to the scale and nature of state provision.

The relationship between state provision and social class inequalities has also been the focus of the recent debates concerning the concept of 'citizenship' (Turner 1986). In effect, the central question in these debates is whether the rights associated with citizenship, which ultimately have to be seen as politically determined, have contributed to the restructuring of social class inequalities (Marshall 1950). In many ways

these arguments parallel the above discussion of professionalism. It is not intended to enter this very complex debate here. Instead, I accept the position taken by Barbalet (1988) that:

*" Patterns of inequality or stratification may be modified by developments in citizenship rights, although it is necessary to recognize that other forces are also at work in this process. The class structure, however, cannot be changed by universal social rights, which treat only distributional arrangements and ignore the institutions of economic and social power which preserve class domination and exploitation. Rather than alter the class structure citizenship tends to legitimate it by contributing to a decline of class identity and resentment." (17)*

Barbalet's argument is based on the notion that modern citizenship, which entails civil, political and social rights, is fraught with internal tensions. For this reason, citizenship is capable of being used strategically by both the ruling class and popular movements. Thus, faced with pressures for change, the state, according to Barbalet, can decide its options regarding the granting of citizenship rights:

*" Such calculations will always be contingent... that no matter how intense the struggle for citizenship rights, it is the state which ultimately grants them, and it may chose to do so even in the absence of such a struggle. It has to be added that the denial of rights and not simply their extension may at certain times and in certain contexts, also enhance a state's rule." (18)*

There are obvious parallels here with Ozga and Lawn's conception of a contingent and strategic relationship between the state, teachers and professionalism. For this reason it may be possible to posit a general relationship between the expansion of 'social' citizenship and the professionalism of teachers. The expansion of social citizenship is thought to promote more equality of opportunity, including greater access to educational provision. One might take this to be a form of 'educational enfranchisement' in the case of groups who were previously excluded from such provision. However, in itself, greater equality of opportunity does not necessarily constitute a move towards greater equality of condition or outcome. It may in fact foster even greater inequality by providing more opportunities to be unequal. And the fact that the state is providing such opportunities serves only to legitimate such unequal outcomes as meritocratic. The acceptance of this legitimation will, in turn, promote social integration:

" By increasing the dependence of its recipients on the state and by making dissent and agitation less attractive, social welfare can be a means of preserving or safeguarding an existing political and economic order. Social legislation does bring changes and reforms, certainly; and ordinary people benefit from these. But such legislation can serve to preserve an existing pattern of power and privilege and may leave it essentially intact."  
(19)

One can see here that the pressure for such provision could come not only from the prime beneficiaries but also, quite independently, from other groups who may benefit eg. teachers as professionals. Thus the political relationship between the professional and the recipient of the provision is also preserved. The costs and benefits of such strategies for professionals have therefore to be seen as contingent and conjunctural.

The conception of teachers' organisation outlined above, suggests that 'professionalism' and 'trade unionism' are strategic forms of collective action. Offe (1985) has also identified two strategic forms or 'logics of collective action', the '*monological*' and the '*dialogical*'. These logics are seen by Offe as being determined by the social class location of the interest group concerned. Utilising the work of Offe, it will be argued in Part Two of the thesis that one of the principle effects of the 'rise' of the MSC and the new vocationalism on NATFHE, the collective organisation of FE teachers, was to shift the 'logic of its collective action' i.e. 'the associational practices whereby an interest group articulates, organises and conducts its *collective* conflict with other groups', to a strategy of 'opportunism', a strategy which involved elements of *both* professionalism and trade unionism. Offe's work will therefore provide a framework within which the strategic nature of these logics of collective action can be understood in terms of the class position of teachers. It is however necessary at this point to examine this framework in some detail.

The 'monological' pattern of collective action is seen by Offe as resulting from interests being uniform and seemingly 'fixed' or immutable. This gives rise to an organisational form based on the simple 'aggregation and specification' of these already-determined interests. Thus, the limited scope of capital's interests simplifies the organisational task of integrating its membership and the costs of continuing membership for the individual can be evaluated in terms of profit and loss, '*the measuring*

rod of money'. Therefore,

*" ...the problem of creating and maintaining the integration of members within the association can be described as being solvable in a one-dimensional and 'monological' way..." (20)*

By way of contrast, in the 'dialogical' pattern, labour organisations are seen by Offe as being required to do much more than simply aggregate the interests of their membership. The diversity of interests amongst the membership of trade unions is usually such that they defy a common denominator. This accords with the existence of status differentials *within* a class - a conception already posited in Chapter Three of this thesis. Thus the problem faced by unions is one of redefining the interests of their members in such a way as to constitute a '*collective identity*'. This redefinition of individual interests into a collective interest is seen by Offe as nearly always entailing interests becoming not only 'non-individual' but also 'non-utilitarian'. As such, the efficacy of the organisation is premised on the sacrifice or costs members are willing to undertake in the name of 'solidarity'. According to Offe, this means that organisations of labour are only able to represent their members in an effective manner if they can create a '*willingness to act*' amongst the rank and file:

*" ...a 'dialogical' process of definition of interest is required on the part of those who find themselves in an inferior power position and do, therefore, depend upon a common and collective concept of their interest."(21)*

This 'willingness to act' refers principally to the use of sanctions. Within trade unions the ultimate sanction is, of course, the withdrawal of labour, and a precondition for its use is that the membership are both coordinated and well-motivated.

It can be seen here that Offe's conception of class interests also corresponds to the one adopted in Chapter Three. That is, interests are seen as arising out of collective action and are taken to be the outcome of strategic choices made on the basis of class relations. Central therefore to the dilemma facing trade unions is the diversity of interests issue, the range of strategic choices available eg. the use of 'professionalism' or 'trade unionism'. The fact that members interests cannot be accommodated within an agreed formula of equivalences means

that strategies have to be evolved in an attempt to overcome the problem. One such strategy is for the union to 'delegate' interests to external bodies such as political parties. Alternatively, they may 'restrict the agenda' of permissible demands. As Offe remarks,

*" ... [the] union leadership is constantly caught between attempting to provide comprehensive representation for all the members interests of its working-class constituency and being limited in its ability to find a formula that reconciles these partly contradictory interests without endangering their internal acceptability and/or external negotiability." (22)*

Business associations are not thought to face such difficulties due to the relatively unproblematic nature of the interests they represent. The uniformity of the interests of capital is also thought to arise out of the fact that they are less susceptible to 'distortion' than those of labour. Their universality is such that they can be seen as 'externally guaranteed' by the very nature of capitalist society and, in particular, its institutional form. In fact, it might be said that there is a consensus as to the nature of capital's interests and this is what constitutes their *mono*-logicality. For labour, however, discovering their 'true' interests is much more problematic. The whole structure and effectivity of capitalist relations of production are thought to be such that a true appraisal of the interests of labour requires much more ideological and organisational work than that required by business associations. Furthermore, this work has to be class-specific if it is to challenge the hegemony of capital.

Related to this differential distortion of class interests, Offe suggests that conflict can take place on two levels: '...class conflict **within** political forms and class conflict **about** political forms ' (ibid, p.202). In what amounts to a differentiation between the economic and the political, the former is seen as a question of 'distributional' politics, whereas the latter concerns questions of identifying ones interests and ascertaining how these are best achieved. Offe sees the latter as 'conflict over political form '. This distinction between the levels of conflict has a direct bearing on the logics of collective action, in so far as within the first level - the economic - a purposive rationality is thought to come into play. This rationality sets limits on the conflict and is accepted by both sides. Conflict does not therefore spill-over into the second level. At

this second - political - level, however, no such rationality exists. The specification of both interests and their mode of articulation are at stake and, theoretically, no limits can be set to the conflict. Offe summarises the distinction in the following way:

*" What we have called before 'economic' class conflict differs from 'political' class conflict in two respects. One is the fairly obvious distinction that, on the former plane, the institutionalized modes of collective action are respected and taken for granted by both sides while, on the latter, these institutionalized forms themselves become the object of struggle. But there is also a second difference, which is deeper and more complicated. In economic class struggles, the working class as a whole or particular segments of it, as represented by unions and other working class associations, is confronted with smaller or larger segments of the bourgeoisie. In contrast, struggles over the political form involve both a confrontation between working class and bourgeoisie and political struggles within the working class." (23)*

The distinctiveness of 'political' struggle is therefore seen in the fact that it gives rise to both *internal* and an *external* struggles *within* labour organisations. This, in turn, is explained by Offe in terms of these organisations having not just a dialogical pattern of collective action but elements of a monological pattern as well:

*"... labour organisations are always a 'mixed case' that contains elements of both logics, a condition which leads to an on-going contradiction between bureaucracy and internal democracy, aggregation of individual interests and formation of a collective identity..."(24)*

It is important to note here the way in which Offe's conception of the 'economic' and the 'political' corresponds to the 'wage' and 'state-forms' being posited in this thesis. That is, conflicts over the wage-form take on a monologicality since they involve strategic action which expresses class interests arising out of employer-employee relations. Whilst conflicts over the state-form express status differentials and differences within the employee class itself. They have a dialogical nature and are the product of conflict within collective organisations of labour, as well as conflict between the occupational group and the state. Offe's work proceeds by suggesting a framework whereby such conflicts can be analysed.

Three possible organisational outcomes of such internal political struggle are postulated by Offe. Firstly, the organisation of labour could move towards a more dialogical pattern of collective action. This would require circumstances which were conducive to the articulation of working class interests i.e. the transition to socialism. Secondly, trade unions could be forced into a more monological pattern i.e. the *imposition* of this pattern of collective action on labour organisations through juridical processes or 'corporatist' practices. Thirdly, Offe suggests that labour organisations may move towards a more monological pattern as the result of an *internal* dynamic which arises out of the antagonisms which already exist within such organisations. This is seen by Offe as the adoption by labour organisations of a '*strategy of opportunism*'.

Offe is careful to point out that the term 'opportunism' is not being used in its pejorative sense within this context. He suggests that the term can be seen as having a concise 'analytical' meaning. Following Luxemburg (1974), Offe takes 'opportunism' to be a tendency towards the 'institutionalisation' of the labour movement. That is, an acceptance of capitalist institutional practices for the sake of achieving short-term objectives. Amongst other things, this includes the separation of political and economic struggles. Again, this is supportive of the notion that struggles over the wage and state-forms are necessarily insulated.

In terms of organisational practices, Offe identifies the following characteristics associated with opportunism operating in three dimensions:

- 1) in the '*substantive*' dimension, opportunism is characterised by an inversion of the means-end relationship with respect to organisational objectives;
- 2) in the '*temporal*' dimension, short-term gains come to be preferred over long-term benefits; and
- 3) in the '*social*' dimension, quantitative criterion are considered more important than qualitative in terms of recruitment and mobilisation of the membership. As a result, the 'collective identity' of the organisation is forsaken, along with any cognisance of those with whom the organisation is in conflict.

As this strategy is not seen as arising out of either imposition or corruption from within labour organisations, or the 'iron law of oligarchy', Offe suggests that opportunism is a rational strategy adopted by such

organisations. Furthermore, he goes on to outline a five-stage model of the processes involved in the adoption of this strategy by organisations of labour:

- Stage I* - The formation of a 'collective identity' and the 'willingness to act' amongst the membership. A 'dialogical' pattern of collective action prevails and there is a low level of bureaucracy within the organisation;
- Stage II* - The growth of the organisation is commensurate with its potential power. This potential has, however, to remain 'policed' if the organisation is to bargain effectively. Thus a 'willingness to act' must be generated amongst the membership but the exercise of its potential power has to be avoided if the maximum price for *not* using that potential is to be obtained. This creates a constant tension within the organisation which it seeks to resolve by moving towards a 'strategy of opportunism'.
- Stage III* - The organisation seeks to replace its power-base from one predicated on the membership's 'willingness to act' to one which is more institutionalised. In particular, it will seek state and legal recognition of its role. This move will also enable the organisation to bureaucratise and professionalise its practices.
- Stage IV* - As the result of a changing political climate, the 'external' support given to the organisation in Stage III may be withdrawn. Given the independence of the organisation from its membership, this de-institutionalisation is impossible to contest in any effective manner. Thus the organisation's very survival is called into question.
- Stage V* - In defence of the organisation, a new period of membership mobilisation and support is activated i.e. the cultivation of a new 'willingness to act' is attempted. However, historical precedents are cited and this renewed mobilisation is much more factionalised and 'political' i.e. the whole structure of the institutions within which previous 'recognition' was given is called into question.

This model suggests that the 'strategy of opportunism' is *both* rational and unstable. It is a short-term solution to the problem of reconciling the

contradictory nature of the two logics of collective action which are to be found in organisations of labour.

One problem with Offe's thesis is that it only deals with the categories of capital and labour ie. it does not account for the specificity of the logics of collective action of those 'intermediate' categories such as the 'petty bourgeoisie' and the 'new middle class'. Therefore one is left to surmise whether the dichotomous model of logics of collective action encompasses *all* classes, or whether a third pattern of collective action may be theorised. Since Offe does not propose a third pattern, it is only possible to assume that he sees the logics of collective action associated with the intermediate class are a variant of the two logics he does identify. This again accords with the class analysis supported in this thesis in so far as the new middle class are being seen as part of the proletariat. In which case, the following typology may be arrived at:

| Type of Organisation         | Capital     | Intermediate               | Labour                     |
|------------------------------|-------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Pattern of collective action | monological | monological/<br>dialogical | dialogical/<br>monological |

Why should organisations of the intermediate class have a primacy of the monological pattern of collective action? One reason is the fact that a seemingly 'fixed' shared interest often underlies their association. For instance, in the case of teachers, it might be argued that the common acceptance of the notion that 'education is a good thing' is taken as a given. As a result, there is a monological response to interest articulation. Furthermore, the institutionalisation of education reinforces the 'naturalness' of the teachers' interests and externally guarantees their validity. That is, their status, as professionals is underwritten by the state-form, the achievement of certain rights eg. to be consulted on educational reform etc. For this reason a public service ethic is often found amongst the professional associations of the middle class. In practice, however, a combination of both 'professionalism' and 'trade

unionism' is also common, which means that movement between the monological and dialogical patterns of collective action may be discerned within such associations. Where the emphasis falls in terms of organisational strategy will be determined by the organisational environment and the internal, political processes found in their association.

In the examination of the FE teachers's collective organisation, NATFHE, in Part Two of this thesis, the above typology will be employed along with Offe's five stage model of the processes involved in the resolution of the conflicting demands of the two logics of collective action. It will be argued that the adoption of a 'strategy of opportunism' is a response to the problem of reconciling the two logics of collective action. The effect of this move, in terms of the 'politicisation' of conflict such a strategy ultimately gives rise to, threatens the association's existence because it calls into question some of the fixed interests which are vital to the integration of the association's membership. In particular, the insulation of the economic and the political spheres is far more difficult to sustain, with the result that the association can no longer generate either a 'willingness to act' or a 'willingness to pay'. In effect, the outcome of using a strategy of opportunism may be to render the collective organisation of teachers ineffective.

#### 4.vii *Summary*

In the case of teachers, it has been argued that their nominal membership of the 'new' middle class places them in the exploited class. Their proletarianisation is taken here as evidence of this. That is, the manner in which their exploitation is increasingly arising out of their real subordination within their labour process, whilst not in itself changing their class location, can be taken as evidence of a change in their status. This involves the socialisation of their labour through the increasing preconceptualisation of their labour process. It is this process of socialising their labour which undermines their rights and ultimately their status. Again, this is thought to be reflected in their moves to

resist this process through the collective strategies of professionalism and trade unionism.

It is therefore postulated here that changes in the nature of the teachers' labour process and moves towards their proletarianisation are structurally linked to the the forms of bourgeois domination, in particular, the wage and state forms. As such, changes in the teachers' labour process arising from 'political' changes, including changes in the state formation and the state-form, act back upon their class location through the process of proletarianisation. These changes are also manifested in the logic of the teachers' collective action. Therefore, what is required is a model which can account for the relationships between social forms, teachers' collective strategies and state provision of education. This model should also provide the basis for comprehending specific instances of educational change. An attempt to develop such a model is undertaken in the next chapter.

Notes and References - Chapter Four

1. Harris (1982) p.63
2. Thompson (1983) p.34
3. Hales (1980) p.89
4. Marx, quoted in Thompson *op cit* p.39
5. Connell (1985) p.70
6. Forms of knowledge - the basic division in these forms is being taken to be between 'academic' knowledge and 'technical/practical' knowledge. This finds its clearest expression in the division between 'education ' and 'training' in the education system.
7. Abercrombie & Urry (1983) p.92
8. Teachers' 'skill' - it is recognised here that the concept of skill is a social construction, the product of social relations. No intrinsic quality is implied in this usage.
9. Hales *op cit* p.92
10. *ibid* p.95
11. *ibid*
12. Abercrombie & Urry *op cit* p.96
13. *ibid*
14. Ozga & Lawn (1981) p.62
15. *ibid* p.vii
16. *ibid* p.147
17. Barbalet (1988) p.58
18. *ibid* pp.110-11
19. *ibid* p.63
20. Offe (1985) p.191
21. *ibid* p.198
22. *ibid* p.188
23. *ibid* p.205
24. *ibid* p.205-6

## CHAPTER FIVE

### *A Content-Theoretical Model of Educational Change*

#### 5.i *Introduction*

As seen in the Pluralist models examined in Chapter Two, to speak of an 'education system' is to invoke the convention of seeing certain recurring relationships between institutions which have the provision of formal education as their principal objective. Whilst this convention is useful for the purposes of describing the boundaries of the particular institutional matrix, it tells us very little about the relationship between educational change and the wider social system. In fact, the institutional focus of this approach encourages the tendency to treat educational change as something entirely separate from wider social changes. Such conceptions have been shown to be inadequate, especially in their lack of specificity with regard to the *educational* aspect of change. Therefore what is needed is a quite different conception of 'education' and educational change, one which can specify a relationship between the social structure and the actual content of the ES. The 'content-theoretical' model developed below is an attempt to provide such an alternative.

#### 5.ii *A Content-Theoretical Model*

The content aspect of this 'content-theoretical' model refers to the specification of the 'educational' aspect of educational change. That is, educational change can only be delimited by defining what is meant by 'education' in a particular theorisation. This is necessary in order to avoid the adoption of a normative or ideological designation of one's theoretical object, one which would circumscribe inquiry by delimiting, for example, the level and type of analysis *a priori*. This was shown to be the case in the Pluralist models examined in Chapter Two. However, it is accepted here that educational change, in general, will be unobservable in its entirety. Therefore any conceptualisation will need to be grounded by reference to some specific social relations and processes. In Pluralist conceptions we have seen how this is achieved by reference to particular institutional matrices which, in turn, have been shown to be the product of the methodological individualism - both in terms of

individual bodies and institutions - used in these models. In many respects these models exclude concern for *social* relations and/or *social* structures. That is, individual actions are often aggregated, with the result that any understanding of change as having an underlying basis in the social structure is automatically precluded. Yet, it is quite clear that authors, such as Archer, recognise that social relations *condition* individual actions (*see Chapter Two*). Therefore these social relations should be as much the object of analysis as individuals. That is, the practices of agents must be seen as both conditioned by social relations *and* the outcome of human agency.

The theoretical aspect of the model involves recognition of a distinction between the transitive nature of the model itself and the intransitive object of the analysis ie. the real entity, its relations and effects - in this case, educational change. Thus, intransitivity refers here to the notion that '...things exist and act independent of our descriptions but we can only know them under particular descriptions ' (Bhaskar 1978,p.250). However, this epistemological principle needs to be reformulated in the case of social relations and structures. It is therefore recognised that our conceptions of the world are not independent of these social relations and structures. Indeed, our conceptions help constitute these. In this way, 'education' and educational change must be considered concept-dependent, theoretical phenomena, which nevertheless have '*real*' effects (Paulston 1976). Thus it is our theorisations which are transitive, whilst, in this case, the ES's role in the reproduction of social relations will be taken to be intransitive. Normative conceptions of education and educational change, such as those of the pluralists, fail to make this distinction. As a result, their explanatory potential is undermined in so far as they '... jump from model to conclusion, using the data collected or reported as confirmation or illustration. The model tends to become the reality instead of a source for hypotheses about it ' (Shipman 1984,p.208). The content-theoretical model of educational change which is developed below does not give rise to such 'jumps' since the relationship between the different levels of abstraction involved in theorising educational change is intrinsic to the model itself.

The basis for the conceptualisation to be employed here lies in Social Form Theory as outlined in Chapter Three. As a result, within this model, the

state is seen as providing for the 'general conditions' for capital accumulation, which includes the reproduction of labour capacities through educational provision. This accumulation process involves the reproduction of the value-form, a social relation specific to capitalist society. Therefore the accumulation process is itself a social relation, involving as it does relations of domination. In which case, the state, in maintaining and reproducing labour capacities, must, by definition, be involved in the reproduction of the relations of domination found in capitalism ie. the 'wage', 'state' and 'civil' forms identified in Chapter Three. The role of the ES must therefore be seen in the light of this relation to reproduction, rather than in terms of any direct or indirect links with the dominant class or classes. This relation between the ES and the process of reproduction can however to be specified at different levels of abstraction. Thus, at the highest level, the ES can be seen to contribute indirectly to the reproduction of labour-power by reproducing labour capacities. At an intermediate level, the specific form of that reproduction can be theorised in terms of various 'strategies of reproduction' (*see below*). The concept of 'strategy' will be shown to enable the identification of particular class interests in different conjunctures and, more importantly, to specify the nature of reproduction in different sectors of the ES. This thesis is concerned with reproduction carried out in the FE sector and no attempt is made to extrapolate from the model to other sectors. Finally, at the lowest level of abstraction, an analysis can be made of the relationship between the ES and reproduction which involves an examination of concrete political struggles.

There has been considerable debate within the Sociology of Education regarding the concept of 'relative autonomy' as applied to the relationship between the ES and the economy (Hargreaves 1982, Apple 1982, Reynolds 1984, Fritzel 1987). This has resulted in a dichotomy appearing in the literature. On the one hand, there are those who suggest a positive form of correspondence (eg. the early Bowles and Gintis) and, on the other, those who refute any such notion, indeed the very possibility, of correspondence (Moore 1988). The concept of relative autonomy was supposed to be the means to resolve such disputes. However, two questions need to be answered by those theorists who employ the concept. Firstly, what are the limits to the ES's autonomy? And secondly, what are the limits to the dominant class's reaction to changes in

the ES before it is 'brought it back into line'? However, in this model the question of relative autonomy is posed differently. Here the basis of the ES is being seen in terms of a division between the public and private spheres of reproduction, corresponding to the separation of civil society and the state - the economic and the political. The ES is being seen here as the most organised and public form of reproduction (Carnoy and Levin 1987). The relative autonomy of the ES should therefore be analysed in terms of its relation with this division ie. the contribution of the ES to the reproduction of this division. This formulation is thought to advance the notion of relative autonomy by operationalising it (Gulalp 1988). That is, it defines both the autonomy of the ES from specific class interests and the limits to that autonomy. At the intermediate level of abstraction, for example, we can link the reproduction process to particular class 'projects', the institutional materiality of the state and actual educational provision, through the concept 'strategy of reproduction'.

A strategy of reproduction entails the identification of the nature and scale of capital's labour-power requirements within a particular conjuncture, as well as developing the particular means for their realisation. Thus strategies of reproduction are always contingent and there may in fact be competing evaluations and projects. In particular, a strategy of reproduction entails a recognition on the part of the state of constraints such as the current modes of reproduction, their institutional materiality, demographic trends, resources available, new technology, changes in the labour process, and public demand etc. As a result, one can see how the possibility exists for different combinations of factors to be assigned different values and thereby contribute to the realisation of competing strategies. In this way, structural determination and class practices are brought together in this model through the use of this 'strategic concept'. Such concepts have the specific task of mediating '... between the abstract level of structural determination and the concrete modalities of the class struggle in specific conjunctures' (Jessop 1985, pp342-3). The use of the concept of strategy does however raise the issue of 'voluntarism'. That is, the problem of reconciling the 'purposive character of human conduct' with structural constraints (Giddens 1979,p.253. Crow 1989).

Jessop denies that the use of strategic concepts necessarily entails voluntarism. He does recognise however that consciousness is a necessary part of any explanation of social transformation. As such, he accepts that the use of strategic concepts involves 'calculating subjects' (p.358). Similarly, Saunders (1981) states:

*" In order to explain how class practices mediate structural contradictions, it seems necessary to understand how members of different classes come to interpret their objective situations." (1)*

Which means,

*" ...[introducing] the notions of actors engaging in purposeful strategies in response to their definitions of an ...objective situation." (2)[emphasis added]*

However, Jessop argues that there is no need for a conception of either a global calculating subject or a 'global strategy' in the use of strategic concepts. This is because we need not assume that all social relations can be subsumed in one all-encompassing strategy ie. it is not class reductionist. For example, the reproduction of gender and ethnic relations may involve entirely different strategies from those relating to class domination. Furthermore a strategy has to be seen as contingent. This is due to the fact that the boundaries of any social formation are conjunctural ie. cannot be delimited in any essentialised manner. Strategies can also be seen to be unsuccessful or mistaken in so far as they are not viable. Finally, Jessop argues that the existence of a 'global strategy' is also inconceivable because strategies are more than goals or ideas. Strategies have a materiality which can be located in terms of the specific forms of domination they reproduce. The concept 'strategy of reproduction' which is developed in this model, therefore accords with these general precepts identified by Jessop.

What then are the limits of the ES's autonomy? At the most abstract level, it is continuity in the reproduction of labour capacities. At the intermediate level, it is the reaction of the dominant class to the implementation of various strategies of reproduction. And at the lowest level of abstraction, it is the specificity of the political struggles which accompany the implementation of a strategy of reproduction. This formulation obviously involves the acceptance of certain relations of determination - from the

highest to the lowest level of abstraction. That is, a general requirement of the reproduction process within the CMP includes the necessity to reproduce the wage and state forms of domination. Thus, the specific form of reproduction in any conjuncture is to be seen as '*form-determined*'. A strategy of reproduction also needs to be compatible with the specific economic and political configuration in that conjuncture. Therefore the viability of a specific strategy can be seen as mediated by the outcome of political struggles. Educational change must also therefore be seen as mediated and immediately determined by these political struggles. Hence, the need for an intrinsic political analysis.

A central feature of this model is the relationship between the intermediate and concrete levels of abstraction - the site of political struggles. These struggles are seen as conditioned by class struggles. However, political struggles do not simply mirror class struggles. Factors such as the institutional context and political organisation and leadership mediate between class and political struggles. Economic reductionist models of the ES fail to grasp the complexity of this relationship by not allowing for the specificity of political practice. One can see this in the early correspondence theories of Althusser and Bowles and Gintis. On the other hand, those theorists who specify the political as an independent sphere, often do so at the expense of theorising the totality, the overall context (3). Those theorists who have attempted to avoid both economic and political reductionism - Bourdieu (and to a lesser extent Bernstein) - have only managed to conflate the economic and political levels. As a result of remaining at a high level of abstraction, they end up placing the bourgeoisie and the new middle class on the same level and neglect the specificity of political struggles.

In the model being proposed here, the '*form-determined*' basis of the reproduction process enables the class and state aspects to be seen on the same level. That is, the relative autonomy of the ES is rooted in the unique separation-in-unity of the economic and political spheres and their corresponding social forms within the CMP. The link being seen in terms of strategies of reproduction which reproduce this *separation-in-unity* of these social forms. The concept of strategy enables the specification of particular class interests and the relations which accompany certain logics of

reproduction. However, in order to analyse in what form those interests are served, what the modalities of performing the general function of reproduction are, and which institutions and individuals are involved, it is necessary to move to the most concrete level, where these questions are resolved in and through political struggle. This requires an intrinsic political analysis of educational change to be undertaken. To paraphrase Gulalp (1988), this framework therefore attempts to avoid reductionism but not determinism, 'for to avoid determinism would mean to reject the necessity of searching for the relations of determination', which should be the purpose of any inquiry into how education systems change.

### 5.iii *How is the ES delimited within this model?*

Whilst the above framework rejects the structuralist delimitation of separate political, ideological and economic instances, it does accept the utility of seeing the ES as constituted in three spheres. What follows is therefore an analytical differentiation of these spheres. Thus, the political sphere can be taken to encompass what is conventionally seen as the government and administrative aspects of the system. The main function of this sphere is to regulate and co-ordinate the other spheres. It will be a major consideration in any analysis of how educational systems change. The ideological sphere is concerned with the organisation of knowledge, the curriculum etc. - the 'symbolic content' of the ES. Finally, the economic sphere is being seen here as constituted by three *moments* - production, consumption and exchange (4). The *production* moment of the economic sphere of the ES will be delimited to the transmission of those specific 'technical' skills which contribute to capital accumulation. This process of transmission within the ES will be referred to as its *training* function. The *consumption* moment of the economic sphere will be delimited to the process of the differential integration of individuals into the culture and ideology of the dominant class. This process serves to legitimate the values of the dominant class as well as the modes of their transmission. This will be referred to as the ES's *education* function. The *exchange* moment of the economic sphere is concerned with the processes whereby individuals are certificated and distributed to positions in the division of labour. This moment is mediated by both the production and consumption

moments and is here being seen as the *selection* function of the ES. 'Education' in this theorisation is therefore the *combination* of these three moments ie. it involves training, socialisation and certification.

Having defined what is meant by 'education' in this analysis, it remains to be delimited in the context of the education *system*. This will be achieved by a process of elimination, based upon the identification of the three spheres which are being seen here to constitute the ES (note: methodology employed is that of Castells vis the 'Urban' see *Appendix 1*). The specificity of ES cannot be seen in its 'government' or administration. This is due to the fact that the type of government and administration found in the ES is found elsewhere in the social structure and is therefore not peculiar to this form of provision. As such the ES cannot be delimited in the political sphere. (This is why pluralist analyses which concentrate on the political level are unable to say what is specifically 'educational' about educational change.) Likewise, the specificity of the ES cannot lie within the ideological sphere. The ES does not constitute a specific cultural or ideological unit and the symbolic content of the ES, knowledge, has, for the most part, its origins elsewhere in the social structure. This can even be seen in theories *about* education and pedagogy which often have their antecedence outside the ES itself. Therefore, the specificity of the ES must lie in the economic sphere. Here, the three moments of the economic sphere can be seen to constitute the process whereby the reproduction of labour capacities is achieved. Thus the specificity of the ES can be seen to be its contribution to the process of reproducing labour power.

Within the economic sphere of the ES it is also possible to discern a 'moment in dominance'. This is due to the fact that both production and exchange (training and selection functions) are dependent, logically and temporally, on consumption (education). It is also true to say that neither training or 'selection are specific to the ES i.e. both are also found elsewhere eg. private training agencies and internal labour markets. Consumption is being seen here as the means by which the general conditions for the reproduction of labour capacities are renewed. In the case of educational provision, consumption takes place for the most part on a collective basis and includes, as a precondition for reproducing labour-power, an inculcation into the ruling ideology :

*" The reproduction of labour power thus reveals as its sine qua non not only the reproduction of its 'skills' but also the reproduction of its subjection to the ruling ideology or the 'practice' of that ideology, with the proviso that it is not enough to say 'not only but also', for it is clear that it is in the forms and under the forms of ideological subjection that provision is made for the reproduction of the skills of labour power." (5)[original emphasis]*

Therefore it is with consumption (education) that the specificity of the ES must lie. However, consumption alone cannot be taken as the specific object of theoretical analysis. Just as production and exchange cannot take place without consumption within the ES, there can be no consumption (education) without production (training) and exchange (selection). The reproduction of labour capacities requires all three moments of the economic sphere. Therefore, the specificity of the ES must lie in the nature of the relationship *between* consumption, production and exchange (the education, training and selection functions).

The nature of the relationship between education and training can be seen to be, within the CMP, one of contradiction i.e. '...the existence of two structural principles within a social system, whereby each depends upon the other but at the same time negates it ' (Giddens 1981 p.231). Thus, whilst capital requires suitably 'skilled' workers (training), it is unprofitable for individual capitals to invest in education. This is due to the intrinsic nature of the consumption moment i.e. the fact that education cannot be translated directly into 'solvent demand' because of its non-commodity form and the 'unproductive' nature of educational labour costs. This non-commodification of education must however be seen as contingent rather than generalised within the CMP. Thus there is always a *potential* contradiction between production and consumption moments or training and education. This potential contradiction constitutes a general case, due to the fact that training is concerned with exchange values, ultimately profitability, whilst education is concerned with use values, social necessity, as delimited by social relations within the CMP. Therefore the specificity of the ES as a theoretical object is being seen here to lie in the potential contradiction between the ES's training and education functions. (Selection may also have a contradictory articulation with

either/both training and education but it is seen here as secondary to the fundamental contradiction between training and education.)

5.iv *How can educational change be defined?*

In certain historical conjunctures, the contradiction between the training and education functions of the ES gives rise to what will be termed here a 'crisis of reproduction'. That is, capital is unable or unwilling to reproduce its own labour capacities because the consumption moment of reproduction is seen to jeopardise profitability ie. by state provision 'crowding out' production. In these circumstances capital, left to itself, cannot and/or will not produce either education or sufficient training. The reproduction of labour capacities has, in these circumstances, to be regulated and this takes place at the political level. The whole history of the government of the ES can therefore be seen as an attempt to resolve this system contradiction ie. capital's inability to reproduce one of the conditions of its own existence, labour-power, by the state intervening to provide the means for the reproduction of labour capacities in the form of *collective consumption* processes (*see below*). The form of these collective consumption processes can be seen to vary according to specific parts or sectors of the ES concerned.

Training involves a structuring of specific *elements* necessary for the reproduction of labour capacities. These can be designated the production, consumption and exchange elements of the training function of the ES. The production element of the process involves the valorisation of labour i.e. the 'adding-on' of skills. This production element is itself structured by the imperative within the CMP to either reduce the cost or increase the productivity of labour. Thus it may involve either deskilling or reskilling. The consumption element of training involves the real subsumption of labour within the labour process. This is brought about by ideological processes which individualise, neutralise and technicise skills acquisition. In this way the imposition of the wage-form reproduces the formally 'free' status of the wage-labourer as the *owner* of skills. Finally, the exchange element of training involves the validation and certification processes which 'commodify' skills and skills-ownership. This facilitates exchange within the labour market. Training unifies these elements into the production moment of the ES. Therefore within

the CMP, 'training' - the production moment of the ES - can be seen to represent the economic domination of capital in so far as it is the means whereby the wage-form is inculcated. However, the imposition of the wage-form within and by training is itself delimited by the law of value within the CMP in so far as the supply and demand for labour-power is related to changes in profitability, the market and investment policies. These provide the 'parameters' of the reproduction process and determine the nature of the ES's training function.

Within the consumption moment of the ES - the education function - political domination is achieved through the imposition of the state-form. Following Bourdieu, it can be argued that the 'constitutionalized' violence of the capitalist liberal-democratic state is paralleled in the ES by the use of 'symbolic violence'. Their effects are the same. Education can be seen to conceal the inequalities of the social structure by a process of 'misrecognition' in much the same way as the formal political and juridical 'rights' of citizenship conceal economic inequalities. Education individualises - what Poulantzas saw as the 'isolation effect' - and in doing so helps to disorganise collective (working-class) demands on the system. The ES also provides the legitimation of social inequalities by appearing to be meritocratic. In this respect there would appear to be no contradiction between the effects of the training and education functions of the ES ie. the state-form acts in the political sphere in much the same way as the wage-form in the economic sphere. That is, they both act to separate the economic from the political. It is this insulation, separation-in-unity, of these political forms which contributes to the reproduction of social relations within the CMP.

It may be argued that education has a far more 'critical' potential than training. However, this does not necessarily mean that they are inherently contradictory: it ignores for one thing the coercive aspect of education. Indeed, the common-ground between education and training may be under-stated in conceptions of the vocationalisation of education in recent years. They may in fact be seen as two facets of the same process. What those who argue for a distinction between training and education may therefore be emphasising is the potential transformative effect of education - its potentially emancipatory function. However, this may only really be apparent at the level of liberal

discourse ( cf. Gintis and Bowles). The debate here is very reminiscent of that concerning the limits of reformism. How far can citizenship rights, including the social right of education, undermine the inequalities which result from the class structure? (Turner 1986. Barbalet 1988).

Within the exchange moment of the ES, the domination of capital can be seen as imposed through the 'civil' form. That is, the processes of certification within the ES act to maintain the differentiation of labour in terms of the manual-non manual divide, gender and ethnic divisions. These divisions serve bourgeois domination by disorganising the labour force through the creation of hierarchies based largely on credentials and discriminatory practices. Yet credentials can be seen to be increasingly unrelated to actual abilities or skills required for specific positions in the labour market (Boudon 1974, Collins 1981).

*5.v How autonomous are educational processes vis-a-vis non-educational processes in shaping educational change ?*

Since educational change has been delimited here to change in the relationship between the training and education functions of the ES, it is conceivable that this may arise from developments internal to these functions, which may then affect the overall relationship (see for example the work of Moore in Chapter 6). For example, it is possible that changes in teaching methods, student composition and the curriculum will have repercussions on the ES's training function and changes in technologies and 'skills' may call forth changes in its education function. However, the extent to which the relationship between training and education can be redefined by these internal developments must be seen as delimited by the state, as reflected in the nature of its collective consumption provision. That is to say, internal change - changes in the processes of training and education - have a limited or relative autonomy in so far as their scope is constrained by the 'form-determined' nature of collective consumption processes. This can be seen in the notion of 'crises in reproduction' where imbalances in the relative functions of education or training generate either accumulation or legitimation crises which require state regulation. Any change in the education/training relation - the specificity of

the ES - has therefore to be sanctioned by a corresponding change in state regulation, as reflected in a particular strategy of reproduction. In Part Two of this thesis this will be shown to have occurred with the introduction of vocational preparation into FE (see *Chapter Six*). It is therefore postulated here that educational change can be gauged in terms of changes in the nature or form of a particular strategy of reproduction, concretised in the processes of collective consumption. As such, this model affords 'educational processes' only a limited autonomy in the determination of educational change.

5.vi *How autonomous are political processes vis-a-vis socio-economic processes in shaping educational change ?*

The development of this content-theoretical model started from some rather naive, common-sense assumptions regarding the nature of the 'politics' of education. However, these assumptions helped define some of the problems involved in conceptualising educational change. For example, one of the most evident casualties of recent developments has been the 'tripartism' of the government of education in England and Wales. This so-called 'consensual' approach to educational policy-making has given way to a more fundamental realignment of power relations between central and local government, in the process of which teachers appeared to have been marginalised. However, how exactly a realignment of the government of the education system related to educational change was not apparent. That is, it was not possible to discern whether this change in the government of education was a symptom or in fact the cause of 'educational' change. As a result, this type of development was taken only as *evidence* of educational change and most of the early research effort focused upon changes in central-local government relations. This led to an examination of the role of the state in general which, soon became a concern with the role of 'Local State' in particular. The concept of the 'Local State' had been developed in Urban Sociology, Political Sociology and Urban Politics and it was here, not unnaturally, that the theorisation of the 'political' appeared to be more advanced than in the Sociology of Education.

Dunleavy (1980) has defined the field of 'Urban Politics' as "*...the study of decision processes involved in areas of collective consumption.*" (p.2) The concept of collective consumption being central to the work of many neo-Marxist 'Urban' Sociologists, the foremost being Castells (1977,1978) who has theorised the 'urban' as the reproduction of labour-power brought about by state provision of collective consumption processes [see *Appendix 1 - for a brief history of Urban Sociology*]. As such, there appeared to be considerable advantages in utilising these theoretical and conceptual developments of Urban Sociology in the study of education and educational change. Up until now, Grace (1984) has been one of the few Sociologists of Education to recognise this.

Despite strong misgivings regarding the concept of collective consumption, some sociologists and political theorists, such as Saunders and Dunleavy, have found it useful in initiating insights into recent social and political developments:

*" The relevance of the concept is that it defines an area of analysis - state consumption provisions - that appear crucial to an understanding of processes within contemporary capitalism..." (6)*

In particular, Castells' theorisation of the 'urban' in terms of the reproduction of labour-power and his conception of state provision of the means of reproduction as collective consumption, has developed into a mature consideration of the 'Local state' and its 'relative autonomy'. These are also issues which any theorisation of the ES and educational change needs to address.

It was suggested above that, since it is the state which intervenes to regulate the contradiction between education and training in the form of collective consumption processes, it is in the political sphere that one can most clearly identify the process of educational change. Change will be reflected in the form of the state's intervention, its strategy of reproduction, which determines the the nature of both the institutional 'ensemble' of the state and collective consumption processes:

*" Focussing on the source and nature of control over education and schools entails focussing on the immediate provider of education, the State, and it is in the analysis of the State that we may begin to understand the assumptions, intentions and outcomes of various strategies of educational change." (7)*

Therefore one has to look to the nature of collective consumption processes if one is to explain educational change. Before doing this however, it is necessary to examine how the relationship between the central state and the Local state is to be theorised in this model. In particular, this involves an examination of the utility to this theorisation of educational change of what has become known in Urban Sociology as the ' Dual State Thesis'.

The principal formulation of the Dual State Thesis being used in this analysis is that of Cawson and Saunders (1983), with additional refinement by Dunleavy (1984). It must be stressed at the outset that the Dual State Thesis (hereafter DST) has been conceived as a tool of analysis and is not intended to be a depiction of *the* or even a reality:

*" ...our ideal-type is not an empirical statement and makes no claim to empirical validity... Like all ideal-types, it is a tool of analysis whose function is to simplify the complexity of the real world to facilitate our understanding of it." (8)*

The basic premise of the DST is that:

*" ...there is a systematic variation in how the State functions, its forms of intervention, and the pattern of interest representation, according to the level of the State under analysis." (9)*

In particular, it is argued that state expenditures can be conceptualised as serving three main functions - ' maintaining production, ensuring reproduction and ...maintaining social order'. Accordingly, state expenditures fall into three main types - expenditures relating to 'investment', 'social consumption' and 'social expenses' (O'Connor 1973). Within the DST, these expenditures are conceived as being distributed between different levels of the state such that investment and expenses are seen as largely located at the central or regional levels, and consumption is seen as being almost entirely the province of the local state.

Following on from this conceptualisation of state expenditures and their location, it is possible to identify, in ideal-typical terms, the 'mode' of the state's intervention at the various levels. Thus, three ideal-type '*modes of resource allocation*' have been identified: 'corporatist', 'bureaucratic' and the 'market' modes. These modes are thought to correspond to the functions of the state at the different levels. For the purposes of this exposition, this can be represented as follows:

| MODE         | FUNCTION                      | EXPENDITURE        | LEVEL                |
|--------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| corporatist  | production/<br>accumulation   | investment         | central/<br>regional |
| bureaucratic | reproduction                  | social consumption | local                |
| market       | legitimation/<br>social order | expenses           | central/<br>local    |

On the basis of this outline, it is argued that the form or nature of the political struggle which accompanies a particular mode of resource allocation will differ and, as such, one would expect different types of political struggles at central and local levels of the state. More specifically, struggles which take place in and around issues relating to production are thought to be mobilised on the basis of social class relations, and are mediated within the corporatist mode at the central state level. Struggles centring around issues of social consumption are conceptualised as having no necessary correspondence to class struggles, and are conceived of as being mobilised according to 'consumption sectors'. That is, '...sectoral cleavages in consumption processes...created by the existence of public and private (broadly speaking collective and individualised, and often also service and commodity) modes of consumption' (Dunleavy 1980,p.70). These consumption sectors are thought to be in competition with one another and, as such, conform to what

may be seen as a neo-Pluralist model of political struggle. Along with many other theorists, both Marxist and non-Marxist, the DST theorists see 'legitimation crises' arising from the idealised market mode having to give way to more problematic modes of state mediation which may be even more inadequate to the task. One can see here affinities between the work of the DST theorists and that of Habermas and Offe.

In the above formulation of the DST it is suggested that the concept of 'relative autonomy', in respect of the role of the state, can be 'rescued' in so far as autonomy is conceived of as existing *between* the central and local levels. A 'unitary' theory of the state is therefore abandoned. The basis of the relative autonomy can be seen to lie in the nature of the political mobilisation that certain state expenditures engender at different levels within the overall social formation. This can be summarised in terms of the spheres of 'production' and 'consumption' being delineated in relation to the respective forms of their political mobilisation. Thus it is possible to identify:

*" (a) a sphere of the politics of production...in which capital and labour are directly represented as classes...which negotiate with the State in a relatively exclusive corporate sector of the polity...which is located mainly at the central and regional government levels...and whose prevailing ideological principle is that of private property and the importance of maintaining private sector profitability..."*

And,

*"(b) a sphere of the politics of consumption ... in which a plurality of consumption sectors mobilise as non-class based interest groups...which battle with each other over specific issues in a competitive sector of the polity...which can be found at central and local (although not regional) levels of the government but most crucially at the relatively accessible local level...where the prevailing ideological principle is that of citizenship rights and the importance of alleviating social need." (11)*

Once again it is useful to note here the relationship between class and citizenship, and the wage and State-forms of domination which this thesis posits. Before going on to discuss the possible use of this analytical

framework for the project as a whole, it is worth looking at some of the major problems which this formulation has been said to give rise to.

Firstly, it has been suggested that the DST theorises the state in terms of its functions, as expressed in the denotation of the types of expenditures located at the various levels. This functionalist conception serves only to reify social relations and thus has a tendency to lapse into a form of economic determinism. This in turn, leads to political relations being 'read-off' from the functions which the particular level of the state performs: 'for a classificatory functionalist analysis at one and the same time results from, and perpetuates, a neglect for the social relations of the capitalist state' (Duncan and Goodwin 1982, p.85). A number of related issues are contained within this criticism of the DST. For one, it is difficult to deny that the delimitation of the function of the state by the nature of its expenditure presupposes that expenditure serves only one function. Whereas, for example, and very pertinent to this project, expenditure on education could conceivably fall into all three types - investment, expenses and social consumption. As such, education may be seen to be located at each and every level of the state. The fact that it is conceived of as primarily social consumption appears somewhat arbitrary, even ethnocentric. Thus, one might 'read-off' from this the fact that education is largely provided in and through (until recently) the local state in Britain, whereas in France it is much more centralised that education is more social consumption in Britain than it is in France. Such a conception is untenable. As a result, a reformulated DST, that of Dunleavy (1984) will be employed in this analysis ( *see below*).

In reply to the above criticism, it might well be argued that the DST schema of expenditure types should not, in any case, be interpreted in an either/or fashion. Investment expenditure may also have both a social consumption and a legitimation function and vice-versa. Thus, what this schema enables us to do is, broadly, to identify the political mobilisation - the political *effects* - commonly associated with the determination of a particular type of expenditure. That is to say, the expression of expenditure on education as 'investment' may be seen to give rise to certain political effects ( including a particular curricula form) which will be different to those associated with educational expenditure seen as social consumption. Thus, 'education as

investment' will place the emphasis of change on questions of increasing 'efficiency' and educational 'outcomes'- the training function of the ES; whereas the politics of educational change associated with 'education as social consumption' will be centred around issues and policies relating to 'equal opportunities' and the education function. Similarly, the politics associated with 'education as social expenses' may be concerned primarily with struggles over the content of the curriculum and social control in general. In each case it is the political effects, the reproduction of the social forms of domination, which are 'structured' by the nature of the expenditure and its administrative form. What we have in the DST therefore, is not the simple 'correspondence' of expenditure to different state levels, producing different forms of political mediation, but a means of conceptualising both the *content* and the *form* of state provision as manifested in its political effects ie. in terms of the reproduction of forms of bourgeois domination. In relation to the theorisation of educational change, this may be a considerable aid to our understanding. In particular, changes in the nature of central-local relations may be taken as indicative of a change in the modality or 'strategy' of reproduction. Similarly, the increasing centralisation of the education system may be evidence of the increasing emphasis being placed on the reproduction of the training moment at the expense of the education moment. In effect, the vocationalisation of the curriculum.

Crucially related to the above argument is a second criticism of the DST which centres on the notion of 'production' which it appears to entail. To be more exact, it is the differentiation of production from consumption, and their allocation to different levels of the state, which has been criticised:

*" ...there seems little historical argument for so rigid a separation between production and consumption. Much State activity, in central concerns law and social control for instance, are clearly concerned with both. Similarly housing policy, often the very stuff of 'urban politics' research, cannot just be designated as consumption. It is an important part of production itself...while housing provision deeply affects the cost of labour and of course political and social relations." (12)*

Education and training could also be said to be 'productive' in much the same way as Duncan and Goodwin see housing (cf. Apple) ie. part of the 'general conditions' for capital accumulation, the reproduction of the wage and state-

forms. However, in reply to this criticism, I feel it is a mistake to conceive a rigid division between production and consumption in the DST. On more than one occasion the DST theorists make the point that this is a conceptual division:

*" This is not a clear cut empirical distinction but a conceptual one, for we are aware that consumption and production processes entail and relate to each other, but we nevertheless argue that it is crucially important to distinguish those areas of state intervention which directly benefit capital by socialising or subsidising constant capital investment costs from those which directly benefit non-capitalist interests by providing resources such as housing, health care and education which the market might otherwise fail to provide or provide only at a prohibitive cost." (13)*

What this amounts to is the fact that the utility of the distinction between production and consumption to an analysis of the reproduction of social relations, has to be evaluated in terms of the insights it generates in its application to specific spheres of state intervention, including education and training. Whether or not it conforms with classical political-economy is, as Saunders believes, rather irrelevant.

There is one last aspect of the DST that needs to be mentioned and that is the reification of the state which is said to result from the concern shown for 'things' rather than for 'processes':

*" 'The state' is seen to do this or that, to carry out this or that function; it is implicitly viewed as an independent organism or the being of some 'hidden hand'. Clearly, this involves a certain fetishism of relations between people as relations between things." (14)*

Related to this is the problematic theorisation of the 'local State'. What exactly is the local state in the DST? It tends to be reified into an institutional conception which corresponds, to all intents and purposes, with the usual notion of 'local government'. The reason for this is thought to be directly related to the conception of the Local state as the main provider of the means of collective consumption. It also arises out of the failure to theorise the Local state as the embodiment of social relations, albeit at the local level. That is to say, the delimiting of the 'local' can only be theoretically valid if one can show that there is an area of state activity which is both specifically local *and* related to the activities of the state in general. I therefore accept the conception put forward by Duncan and Goodwin:

*" ...the 'local state' distinguishes a particular area of interest in the real world which can be subjected to political-economy ( especially Marxist) analysis. 'Local' refers to the importance of local variations in action and consciousness, 'state' to the links with national processes and also the style of analysis..."(15)*

Within this conception the specificity of the 'local' is counterposed to the wider socio-economic relations of the social formation. There is, in other words, cognisance of uneven development in the reproduction of the forms of domination (Duncan and Goodwin 1988). There is also nothing in this formulation which restricts the analysis to a particular set of institutions or the arbitrary administrative boundaries which are often used in studies of 'local government'. Thus,

*" Rather than provide a theoretical answer to empirical questions of what particular local state institutions do at various times, and how autonomous they are, theory should be able to relate these differences to those social relations producing central-local frameworks. In short, to answer how such differences occur.(16)*

This will be achieved in this content-theoretical model of educational change. The theorisation of the new vocationalism as a strategy of reproduction which has had as its objective the transformation of social and political relations, can only be validated as a useful theorisation if it also helps demarcate the relationship *between* the various levels of state intervention eg., the relationship between central and local state, and the political effects which resulted. In this sense 'relative autonomy' is seen here as an empirical question rather than a theoretical one, and is certainly a long way from the catch-all concept employed in other theories of reproduction. That is, the institutional materiality of the state has to be seen in terms of the social relations it reproduces. The contribution of central and Local States being seen as distinct. The DST still however needs to be refined.

To recap, within the DST, the state is seen as having to maintain a set of functional imperatives ie. *' to pursue contradictory accumulation and legitimation objectives, to undertake productive interventions without losing social control '* (Dunleavy 1984). As a result, the nature of the state's expenditures are seen to correspond to these different functions. This differentiation of expenditures results in a basic institutional dualism, between

the central and Local state, which, in turn, leads to a differentiation of forms of political mediation. However, according to Dunleavy,

*"...for this chain of influences to be established it is vital for the [DST] theory to demonstrate that it could conceivably be falsified, and in practice there are grounds for doubting this." (17)*

Dunleavy's argument rests on the fact that state expenditures cannot be seen as monofunctional. As mentioned above, expenditure on education could be seen as either social investment, expenses and/or consumption. That is, O'Connor's typology of state expenditures, on which the DST is based, is functionally indeterminate. Dunleavy has therefore suggested that,

*"State expenditures may assume different functional characteristics when they are administered by different kinds of agency, and when different kinds of political mobilisation occur around them. This undermines the causal sequence of the dual state model by suggesting that institutional allocations are logically and causally prior to the differentiation of state activities into social investment or consumption categories." (18)[emphasis added]*

For Dunleavy, it is the 'ideological' division between home and work which lies at the root of this institutional allocation. This, in turn, accounts for the variety of political mediations which 'progressively differentiat[es] state spending into distinct functional categories' (*ibid*). If we follow this chain of reasoning, a strategy of reproduction should also reflect this ideological division between home and work, leading to a particular institutional configuration of the state, which finds expression in a specific type of political mobilisation and a distinct form of state expenditure. Therefore it is with the institutional ensemble of the state and the political mobilisation this engenders, rather than the functional character of state expenditure, that one must start an analysis of a particular strategy of reproduction.

Dunleavy's revision of the DST does however itself need to be revised in terms of the content-theoretical model of educational change being employed here. What for Dunleavy is an 'ideological' division between home and work, can be seen in this model to be the product of the differentiation of the social forms of domination found within the CMP and, in particular, the wage and state-forms. In this respect, the institutional allocation of state expenditures can be interpreted as provision for the reproduction and maintenance of these

forms of domination. In this sense, there *is* a functional imperative for the state, which is the reproduction of these social forms. That is, strategies of reproduction will be 'form-determined'. Thus, historically and contingently, the local state can be seen as having been assigned primary responsibility for the state-form and the central state, in the period of advanced monopoly capitalism, the securing of the 'general conditions' for accumulation, which includes the imposition of the wage-form. This, in turn, may then account for the different forms of political mobilisation and struggle found in the two levels, including the seemingly 'schizophrenic' nature of teachers' political mobilisation and their veering between 'professionalism' and 'trade unionism' as strategies of collective representation.

To summarise, following Poulantzas, the state can be seen as both reflecting and regulating system contradictions. Therefore, as well as regulating the system - the government of the ES - one would expect to find the contradiction between education and training being reflected in the actual nature of collective consumption processes ( hence the need for a *content-theoretical* approach). The state can also be seen to be the 'condensation' of class struggles. That is, the state reflects class struggles which arise out of system contradictions and its interventions are shaped by the balance of forces within those same class struggles. Thus, state power has itself to be seen as the product of the political relations between classes as manifested in class practices. It follows from the above argument that political practices will mediate and immediately determine educational change, as delimited by the form of state intervention. According to Saunders,

*" Class struggle is in this sense the link in the causal chain between contradictions in the system and state intervention which attempts to resolve them. The greater the contradictions, the greater will be the intensity of the political struggle, and the more the state will intervene as a result." (19)*

However, the nature of political practices cannot simply be 'read-off' from system contradictions. This is due to the fact that political practices are relatively autonomous in terms of the level in which they are found ie. at the level of concrete political struggles. Political practices therefore do more than simply reflect system contradictions; they may articulate them, and in doing so produce change. State interventions, in the form of distinct strategies of

reproduction, can therefore be seen to be a response to system contradictions, as mediated by class practices. It is also postulated here that different strategies will have different political effects in terms of the formation of hegemonic projects.

#### 5.vii *Political Projects*

Domination should not be equated with hegemony (taken here to refer to the unification of a power bloc and the attainment of popular-national support). Specific forms of hegemony may be identified in the three spheres of political struggle within the ES. These forms of hegemony can be seen to correspond to the different forms of domination found in the three spheres. That is, political struggles are related to structural determinations (system contradictions) in so far as they are form-determined. Thus in the economic sphere (the reproduction of labour capacities) hegemony requires, as part of a strategy of reproduction, a project which unifies the different moments of the sphere - training, education and selection - under the leadership of a dominant fraction. This unification should also advance the interests of all the fractions, at the same time as ensuring the continued dominance of the dominant fraction - particularly in terms of its control over the allocation of resources. Therefore a viable strategy requires a hegemonic project within which the dominant fraction, who need not be the economically dominant, be cognisant of the 'determination in the last instance' of the needs of those who are economically dominant.

In the political sphere of the ES, the 'government' of the ES, hegemony is achieved through the formulation of a 'national-popular' political project. This project has to achieve two ends. Firstly, it must reproduce the institutional unity of the system. That is, it must preserve the various components of the system and secure the compliance of the individual sectors. This it achieves by such means as legislative fiat and diktat. In this way the cohesion of the parts is maintained. Secondly, this national-popular project

must bring about the unity of the dominant class. However, there are a number of possible obstacles to class unity arising out of institutional unity. For example, institutional 'form problematises function'. In the case of the state and its role in the ES, this involves the identification of its functions and how these are dispersed within the institutional matrix involved in the government of the system. Thus, there are three major functions of the state (i) economically, it has to provide for collective consumption processes in order to secure the general conditions for the reproduction of labour-power; (ii) ideologically, it has to provide the conditions for the reproduction of the division between for example mental and manual labour; and (iii) politically, it has to reproduce the institutional matrix which constitutes the ES. Responsibility for these functions is dispersed amongst the apparatuses of the state - particularly between the central and local state - and various 'private' institutions. Thus a particular institutional materiality of the state may jeopardise the necessary cohesion between its functions. However, the very same materiality and dispersion of responsibility is thought to be a necessary precondition for the State's overall function of maintaining the system as a whole. It is precisely this relative autonomy *within* the state, and in particular the role of the DES, which has been the focus of recent studies of educational change ( Salter & Tapper 1981, Fowler 1981, Ranson 1985). Finally, in the ideological sphere, hegemony can be taken to entail the formulation of a discourse on and in 'education' which encompasses a number of different perspectives. For ideological hegemony to be achieved within and about the ES, this discourse needs to unify these disparate views and at the same time maintain the manual/non-manual, gender and ethnic divisions which operate in the interests of the dominant.

Educational change must therefore be seen as the product of class practices. However, the nature of these class practices cannot be seen to be determined directly by the contradiction between education and training. This is because political struggles over the ES's education and training functions (within the economic sphere) are also relatively autonomous from struggles over government (the political sphere) and selection (the ideological sphere). Therefore it is being postulated here that it is only in the event of an articulation of practices/struggles in the different spheres of the ES that educational change results. Changes in the nature of collective consumption

processes are therefore also to be seen as a response to this articulation of political struggles in and between the ES' education and training functions, and its government and selection functions. This response takes the form of a new strategy of reproduction. It is also postulated here that the more apparent the contradiction between education and training becomes, the more likely this articulation of struggles within the ES becomes, the greater the state's intervention and more educational change will result. This in itself may generate further crises of reproduction and the politicisation of the ES. The degree to which contradictions are in fact articulated is here being seen to be critically dependent upon the nature and level of political organisation. Without this organisation, political practices and struggles in the economic (education and training), government and ideological spheres of the ES may remain fragmented and isolated and can be safely accommodated within an existing strategy of reproduction. A crisis of reproduction will be averted.

#### 5.viii *Summary*

In Chapter Two Salter and Tapper's notion of a 'translation effect' between different levels of analysis was accepted as a necessary component for any model of educational change. That is, it should be possible to trace the relationship between changes at the level of the education 'system' to changes in the nature of classroom practices. Salter and Tapper could not however provide for such an effect as their model was based upon an institutional analysis. Using the 'content-theoretical' model outlined above, such an effect can now be posited. Indeed, the range of the effect will be shown to be greater than that suggested by Salter and Tapper in so far as it will extend from the social formation as a whole to the 'politics of education', and down to the actual nature of educational provision, the 'content' of education. This is made possible by conceptualising educational change as 'form-determined'.

At the highest level of abstraction, the role of the ES has been taken to be the reproduction of capitalist social relations. These relations are the product of the unique separation-in-unity of the economic, political and private spheres within the CMP. This gives rise to specific forms of domination

- wage, state and civil - which need to be reproduced within the current social formation. The reproduction of these forms is not however unproblematic. They are contradictory relations and, as such, capital cannot provide for their successful reproduction. The state therefore intervenes. As a result, the most public reproduction of social relations takes place in and through state provided education.

The dominant function of the ES is seen in this model as the reproduction of labour capacities. As a result, the specificity of educational change, at the most concrete level of analysis, has been identified as any change in the relationship between its education and training functions, which are taken to be 'moments' in the reproduction process. The nature of the relationship between these moments is itself being seen as determined, at the intermediate level of abstraction, by the overall 'strategy of reproduction' employed by the state. This entails a particular 'institutional ensemble' of state institutions which provide 'collective consumption' processes appropriate to the specific strategy being pursued. Strategies are also form-determined. That is, the institutional ensemble and its collective consumption processes are determined by the requirement to reproduce the wage, state and civil forms of domination. However, this is made problematic by the contestation and resistance which arises out of the contradictory nature of these forms. Such contestation necessitates a strategy of reproduction be implemented with hegemonic projects corresponding to the separate spheres. Overall, the political struggles which ensue, following the implementation of such projects, act back upon the strategy and determine its viability. The degree of articulation between struggles in the different spheres is therefore seen as the crucial determinant of this viability. Such articulation is predicated upon the nature of the political mobilisation which the hegemonic projects engender ie. the extent to which the spheres are insulated. In relation to teachers' political mobilisation and organisation, this can be examined in terms of the logics of their collective action.

Directionality is incorporated into this model. That is, within the different levels of abstraction there are a range of positions or settings, from which the direction of change can be both theorised and identified in concrete terms. At the highest level of abstraction, there are the different forms and

their insulation. At the intermediate level, the level of the institutional ensemble, there is the centralised-decentralised nature of the government of the ES. And at the most concrete level there is the insulation of the 'education' and 'training' moments within the reproduction process. The initial settings of a strategy of reproduction can be identified at all three levels. Change can therefore be measured in terms of movements within and between the levels through the 'translation effect' - ie. the relationship between social forms at the three levels. Whilst the outcome of changes will remain uncertain, and the success or failure, in terms of its political acceptance, implementation and operation, of a particular strategy cannot be predicted, the general direction of change can however be gauged. For example, the model suggests that the 'success' of a strategy of reproduction which involves the dominance of the wage-form would require greater centralisation as well as policy and provision which emphasises vocationalism (the training moment). Whereas a strategy which entailed the dominance of the state-form, should be accompanied by decentralisation and an emphasis on the 'education' moment. A hybrid strategy, one which attempts to combine forms - lessen their insulation - would require new 'intermediate' tiers of government and policy and provision which did not differentiate between education and training. This model suggests that such a strategy would undermine the separation-in-unity of the social forms found in the CMP. As a result it will inevitably be unsuccessful given the present social formation.

As stated above, the 'content' aspect of the model involves the specification of the 'educational' aspect of educational change - the relationship between the education and training functions of the ES. In Part Two of the thesis this will be undertaken in terms of an examination of the actual provision which resulted from the political struggles which accompanied the introduction of what can now be seen as a new strategy of reproduction - the new vocationalism. Overall, therefore, it will be the relationship between the institutional ensemble of the state, the nature of the actual provision and the political mobilisation of FE teachers which will provide the focal points for the analysis of the 'new vocationalism' which follows.

## Notes and References - Chapter Five

1. Saunders (1981) p.202
2. *ibid* p.204
3. This charge of pluralism against the CCCS's *Unpopular Education* can be taken as evidence of this tendency to under-theorise the totality - see *Ch.1*
4. The 'economic' is a useful term in this respect since it encapsulates a conception of 'education' as production as well as consumption.
5. Althusser (1971) p.128
6. Saunders *op cit* p.215
7. Dale (1982) pp. 129-30
8. Cawson & Saunders (1983) p.14
9. *ibid* p.19
10. Cawson & Saunders *op cit* p.23
11. Duncan & Goodwin (1982) p.88
12. Cawson & Saunders *op cit* p.23
13. Duncan & Goodwin *op cit* p.86
14. *ibid* p.78
15. *ibid* p.90
16. Dunleavy (1984) p.71
17. *ibid* p.72
18. Saunders (1981a) p.192

PART TWO

## CHAPTER SIX

### *Vocationalism Old and New*

#### *6.i Introduction*

In Part Two of this thesis the 'content-theoretical' model developed in Chapter Five will be applied to a recent example of educational change, the introduction of the 'new vocationalism' into FE. The new vocationalism is being conceived here as a 'strategy of reproduction' designed to extend the 'educational franchise' ie. an extension of the reproductive role of the ES to those 16-19 year olds who were not already in full-time education or training. This strategy entailed a critical realignment of the relationship between 'education' and 'training' - which in this model is being taken to constitute the 'specificity of educational change'. As such, the content-theoretical model suggests that this extension be examined in terms of changes to (i) the institutional ensemble of the state, (ii) the nature of the state provision - seen in terms of collective consumption, social investment and/or social expenses - and (iii) the political projects and mobilisation engendered by the introduction of this provision. Thus, we have been presented, as sociologists, with the rather rare opportunity to examine a fundamental educational change. Before examining this claim, it is necessary to review recent developments in NAFE (Non-Advanced Further Education) provision in order to provide a context for the discussion that follows.

#### *6.ii Strategies, Phases and Discourses*

The history of provision in Britain of post-compulsory education and training ( hereafter NAFE) for the majority of school-leavers is nothing less than a catalogue of wilful neglect. At the beginning of the 1980s the UK had the lowest proportion of 16-19 year olds in full-time education and training of any advanced European country. The Manpower Services Commission (MSC) had itself noted that 'Britain has one of the least-trained workforces in the

industrial world...' (MSC, Youth Task Group Report, 1982, p.2).<sup>1</sup> For a brief history of the development of NAFE see Appendix 2.<sup>1</sup>

Recent NAFE provision and the advent of the new vocationalism can be periodised into three main phases: Phase I - the period of inception between 1973-78, seen here as the period of what will be termed *Binary FE* ; Phase II - the period of development between 1978-81, the period of *Vocational Preparation* ; and Phase III - the period of consolidation between 1981-84, the advent of the new vocationalism (1). Within these Phases distinct discourses relating to NAFE can be identified, each of which culminates with the publication of a significant text denoting a *change* of direction in terms of the development of NAFE policy and provision. These texts are the *Holland Report* (MSC 1977), the *New Training Initiative* ( DoE 1981) and *Training For Jobs* ( DoE 1984). These discourses can, in turn, be seen as part of three distinct 'strategies of reproduction' - Binary FE, Vocational Preparation and the New Vocationalism. This can be summarised as follows:

Phase I 1973-78 Binary NAFE - *The Holland Report* (1977)

Phase II 1978-81 Vocational Preparation - *New Training Initiative* (1981)

Phase III 1981-1984 New Vocationalism - *Training For Jobs* (1984)

Binary FE is outlined in Appendix 2. In the sections that follow, a summary of the discourse relating to Vocational Preparation will be provided before a more detailed examination of both Vocational Preparation and the New Vocationalism, as strategies of reproduction, is undertaken in the Chapters that follow.

### 6.iii Vocational Preparation

Vocational preparation was never simply a knee-jerk response to rising levels of youth unemployment - although this was to shape the nature of the provision. The origins of vocational preparation can be shown to lie in a genuine attempt - in the sense that it was not intended as a pretext for some other motive - to extend the educational franchise to all 16-19 year olds. This is perhaps why it managed to garner considerable support from within the

ES. Like many of the other major post-war educational reforms it was inspired by the twin social democratic objectives of 'economic efficiency' and 'equity'. It was therefore rooted in the the belief that '*education can make a difference*'. However, the genesis of this change in NAFE provision needs to be carefully charted if we are to understand its relevance to the introduction of the new vocationalism.

Vocational preparation was intended to be neither 'academic' nor traditional vocational/technical education provision. The main aim of vocational preparation was '...the development of the capacities required to make a success of adult and working life in general ' ( FEU 1981 b, p.9). The vagueness of this aim belies the very distinct division which permeated the provision rather than the discourse, namely the separation of 'adult' from 'working life' ( participation in the state and private spheres compared to the economic). Paradoxically, this distinction was to be maintained as a result of the sustained ideological effort to collapse the insulation between the spheres and their corresponding forms of domination. That is to say, the separation of work from other spheres of adult life - most notably politics - will be shown to have been achieved within vocational preparation as a result of the political and ideological processes which attempted to bring them together. As a result, a clear distinction between vocational preparation as a 'discourse', involving the integration of the wage and state forms, and the actual provision, which maintained the insulation of the forms, needs to be made. It is the former which will be examined here and the latter in the next chapter.

According to the FEU, the main aims of vocational preparation were:

- "a. to give young people basic skills, experience and knowledge
- b. to help them assess their potential, to think realistically about jobs and employment prospects and to optimize their employability
- c. to develop their understanding of the working and social environment, both nationally and locally, so that they may understand the variety of roles possible for them to play as an adult member of society
- d. to encourage them to become progressively responsible for their own personal development." (2)

What is most apparent here is the dual emphasis on the preparation of young people for both work and citizenship. In this sense vocational preparation was, from the very beginning, explicitly, to be a *combination* of training and education. Its target group were those who were '...not necessarily intending to proceed to further academic study, nor are they necessarily motivated to study academic subjects for their own sake. At the same time, their curricula cannot necessarily be derived from the demands of a particular job...'(ibid). In other words, vocational preparation was for all those who were not catered for by the existing Binary provision. What should be noted about this intended population is the fact that it was not confined to the young unemployed. Vocational preparation was to be for *all* school-leavers who did not take up the traditional academic and vocational educational routes ie. the hitherto neglected 50 per cent of 16-19 year olds. It can therefore most definitely be seen as part of an attempt to extend the educational franchise.

According to the FEU's *Vocational Preparation* (1981) there were four 'essential' components of the vocational preparation curriculum: (i) *Negotiation*, (ii) *Counselling, Guidance and Assessment*, (iii) *Acquisition of Basic Skills and Knowledge*, and (iv) *Relevance and Experience*. It is necessary here to examine these in detail because they reveal the underlying rationale of vocational preparation.

The essence of 'negotiation' in this context was taking responsibility for one's own action. Therefore the young person was seen as entering voluntarily into a contractual relation with the providing/sponsoring agency with respect to both the goals and means of his/her learning experience. The basic premise of this component of vocational preparation was that it motivated the young person by giving him/her responsibility. However, there are also a number of

unstated effects. For example, the whole notion of negotiation may be considered idealistic, even naive, in relationships where there are fundamental discrepancies in the distribution of power. Thus the appearance of 'equality' which this concept evokes is that of the juridically and politically equal 'citizen' - the state form. This individualised form conceals the real inequality which exists between the abilities of *groups* to secure their interests in the process of negotiation.

That part of the vocational preparation programme designated 'counselling, guidance and assessment' was concerned with the insertion of 'realism' into the young person's choices - especially in terms of employment. That is, the emphasis was on tailoring the capacities of the young person to the *real* opportunities available in the labour market. In this way their 'employability' was thought to be enhanced. However, this was coupled with the question of assessment. Since the range of learning experiences in vocational preparation was seen as '...a complex programme of personal maturation and vocational orientation, involving the mastery of basic skills, the development of values and the exposure to essential experiences...' these were only thought to be assessable in terms of a 'profile'. This individualised record of achievement formed the basis of the method of certification proposed for vocational preparation. Here the selection function of vocational preparation is apparent. That is, the differentiation of labour capacities was to be maintained via the use of these individualised records of achievement i.e. profiling.

Vocational preparation programmes were also premised on the notion of 'relevance'. In particular, experience was seen as intimately related to relevance, and this was then taken to be the basis of effective learning - a form of 'learning by doing' philosophy. In practice this was interpreted narrowly as experience of work eg.

*" A preferred vocational focus, even if ephemeral or vicarious, often produces the necessary motivation for further learning and provides the base for development." (3)[emphasis added]*

As a result, experiential learning was often counterposed to 'abstract' or academic learning, with the latter being deemed inappropriate to the needs of the young person in this particular target group. Experience and the discipline

of the workplace were therefore seen as essential to the process of preparing young people for work and this can be taken as part of the inculcation of the wage-form.

Finally, the acquisition of 'basic' skills within vocational preparation involved the learning of those '...essential areas of knowledge and skill which will increase a young person's chance of making a success of adult and working life' (*ibid*). Included here were 'Social and Life Skills'. In particular, the 'transferability' of skills was seen as a pre-requisite given the 'constantly changing nature of technological development'. This basic skills component of the vocational preparation programme developed into the notion of the Common Core. In many respects this is the central innovation attempted within vocational preparation. The concepts of transferable skills and the Common Core were innovative in so far as they can be seen as an attempt to bring together both 'technical' and 'social' skills. At least, that is the stated objective. When one looks at the political aspect of this objective, it could be interpreted as, in effect, an attempt to inculcate *both* the wage and state-forms of domination. In particular, it was this fusion of the forms of domination which was to be seen as especially important for those young persons who were not mature enough to accept the responsibility for their own plight i.e. were immune to the state-form, and those who were not being disciplined by the regime of the workplace and the wage-form i.e. the unemployed. Above all else it was this part of vocational preparation which was to become the central focus of curriculum development as the rate of youth unemployment soared in the mid 1970s.

The coming of vocational preparation appeared, in some accounts, as a progressive development within NAFE. It was even hailed as the beginning of the 'comprehensivisation' of FE (see *Chapter 7*). Juxtaposed to the ad hoc, rather patronising, measures being taken for those 'less able' within Binary NAFE, vocational preparation appeared to break with a general lack of concern for the less able school-leaver (including that found amongst many FE teachers). It also began to put a new types of course on the agenda. Despite the fact that in some areas the ad hocery of much Binary provision was already being overtaken by a more concerted effort to cater for the young unemployed eg. Appendix II within ILEA (Flower Report, 1981), vocational

preparation appeared to be a relatively dynamic strategy which was 'opening up' - extending the franchise - of NAFE. However, as will be shown below, vocational preparation eventually became rooted within the rhetoric of concern for the young unemployed, and it was the demise of the traditional craft student and the increasingly less than successful general education student within Binary NAFE, which appear to have been never far from the minds of those seeking to reform policy and provision at this time. That is, falling rolls and consequent threat to jobs within colleges acted, in some cases, as the most important incentive to embrace this new form of provision (Newell 1982). The fact that the interests of the vocational preparation student may not therefore have necessarily been the central concern of those seeking change, should alert us to the possibility that the motives or factors behind the change from Binary NAFE to vocational preparation may not be discerned simply from an analysis of the content of that change. For example, in most analyses of vocational preparation some very important factors are entirely ignored or appear peripheral to the move eg. the 'political will' to extend the educational franchise, changing central-local government relations, the financing of NAFE, the collective acceptance of change by FE teachers and the institutional problems associated with its implementation. Conversely, the central focus of most analyses i.e. youth unemployment, may have in fact been quite marginal to the original conception of vocational preparation.

In the following chapters it will be shown that the discourse on vocational preparation eventually came to be used to facilitate a movement away from differentiating between the causes and consequences of youth unemployment. That is, the whole question of lack of opportunity to secure employment was conflated with the question of 'employability'. The vicious circle of, lack of opportunity, leading to lack of experience, leading to lack of opportunity, was to be broken, in appearance at least, first by vocational preparation and later by the new-vocationalism. This enabled the emphasis to be placed on the individual's inadequacies rather than lack of opportunity. One of the objectives of the vocational preparation was therefore to stress the '*responsibilities of citizenship*' and adulthood. Hence the importance of the notions of maturity within FE. By inculcating a notion of autonomy and rights, the trainee is made responsible and, by inference, culpable for his/her own destiny vis-a-vis employment. The designation of 'trainee' or 'citizen in training'

served to underline the fact that these young people were neither workers or students and this in turn distanced vocational preparation and later the new-vocationalism from *both* training and education. However, it is suggested here that vocational preparation be seen as distinct from the new vocationalism, whilst at the same time recognising that they share this common heritage. This distinction between vocational preparation and the new vocationalism is not generally employed in the educational and sociological literature (*see below*). As a result, the term 'new vocationalism' is often used indiscriminately; a practice which renders invisible important political differences between what will now be shown to have been two quite distinct strategies of reproduction. This distinction becomes apparent as a result of utilising the content-theoretical model of educational change.

#### 6.iv *The MSC 1973-78*

One of the first tasks in the application of the content-theoretical model is to establish the relationship between the institutional ensemble of the state and the nature of the state expenditure associated with a particular type of educational provision. Vocational preparation, as an attempt to integrate the reproduction of the wage and state-forms, can be seen as an inherently unstable strategy of reproduction as it necessitated a unique institutional allocation *between* the central and Local state levels, as well as generating a novel form of political mobilisation. This unique institutional allocation was to be in the form of the Manpower Services Commission (MSC)(4). A brief history of this agency is necessary at this point.

Without question the central materialisation of change in the nature of the State ensemble associated with the emergence of first vocational preparation and later the new vocationalism, was the 'rise' of the MSC. The MSC was established by the Employment and Training Act 1973. Although this Act was introduced by a Conservative administration, it was Labour who had the responsibility of overseeing the MSC's inception in January 1974. This was rather appropriate since the concept of a national Manpower Board was, in many ways, the 'brainchild of the TUC' ( Gregory and Noble 1982, Jackson 1986).

The original configuration of the MSC was one of three corporate bodies: the Commission itself, the Employment Services Agency (ESA), and the Training Services Agency (TSA). These wings of the Commission were themselves considered semi-autonomous organisations; to the extent that they were thought of as statutory bodies in their own right. Thus the role of the Commission was conceived of as one concerned with overall manpower planning, and this is reflected in the fact that it started life with a very small staff of no more than 40 people and a budget of some £115m. The executive agencies on the other hand had staffs of 6,000 (TSA) and 13,000 (ESA) respectively. Some measure of the autonomy of the agencies can be gauged from the fact that they were found to be duplicating the administrative structures necessary to implement their independent measures such as the Job Creation Programme (JCP) set up in 1975, and the Work Experience Programme (WEP) set up in 1976. Therefore it might be said that the MSC was quite slow getting its corporate act together (Howell 1980).

Although it was a public authority established outside of Government, the MSC remained accountable, in theory, to the Secretary of State for Employment. According to its first Chairman:

*" The Commission is ...required to submit to the Secretary of State from time to time details of what it proposes to do in order to perform its functions. It has also to ensure that its activities are in accordance with general policies approved by the Secretary of State. Finally the Secretary of State has power to give a direction to the Commission: somewhat similar powers of direction apply to most public authorities, eg nationalised industries, but have seldom - if ever - been used." (5)*

Like all public bodies of this sort however, the accountability which is written into its constitution belies that which is thought to have existed in practice, especially at the local level (Fullick 1986).

In many respects the MSC was a typical Quango (quasi-autonomous non-governmental organisation). It was a public authority with responsibilities which were laid down in the 1973 Act as:

*"...making such arrangements as it considers appropriate for the purpose of assisting persons to select, train for, obtain and retain employment suitable for their ages and capacities and to obtain suitable employees."*

Thus the MSC inherited a number of the responsibilities which were previously those of the Department of Employment. Its remit appears to have been made deliberately vague and open-ended so as to enable it to do what many Quango's are set up to do i.e. to allow Government's to involve themselves in politically sensitive areas of social policy without being seen to be the author of specific interventions; to mobilise a quick response to a pressing political problem by by-passing the inertia of established Departments of State; and to enable government to 'incorporate' vested interests in policy-making and thus legitimate what may be unpopular measures (*Public Administration*, Winter, 1979).

In the case of the MSC, much store was placed on its tripartite constitution and its representativeness:

*"The "representative" membership of the Commission should thus ensure that it develops policies and provides services in the field of employment and training which will be generally accepted as reasonable and effective by the interests concerned, and that decisions of the Commission in allocating resources for these purposes will be generally supported and accepted by the various interests. (6)*

This of course is related to the origins of the MSC as a body. It has been suggested that the conception of the MSC as a 'corporatist' body was one which originated from within the TUC. According to Jackson (1986):

*" Its creation [the MSC] is seen by the TUC establishment as a great historical achievement to be preserved at virtually any cost. For the Commission embodies the aspirations of the movement's top bureaucracy to a formal share in the central structure of the state and recognition as part of the establishment of officialdom."(7)*

Whilst there is some truth in the idea that the TUC, over the years, showed a marked reluctance to withdraw its support for the MSC, it is perhaps too simplistic to argue that this was because of the vested interests (*aspirations?*) of TUC officials. The political make-up of the TUC leadership and the strategic considerations of individual unions are just as likely as explanations of the TUC's role in sustaining the legitimacy of the MSC and its programmes.

However, there is little doubt that the MSC made much of TUC endorsements, and this has been at the heart of most explanations given for the fragmented nature of the opposition to its role within the labour movement (Eversley 1986).

One of the most important features of the MSC was its distinctive *modus operandi*. Its interventions were nearly always carried out on an 'agency' basis. According to Brooksbank and Ackstine (1984):

*" In developing its policies the Commission has always operated at two levels - by means of ad hoc national groups representing the major interests (especially CBI/TUC ) and by local presence through a number of different types of board. It has always looked to new offices and new organisations to deliver new projects rather than rely on existing organisations. " (8)*

The importance of this is threefold. Firstly, it ensured the MSC's veneer of representativeness in all its operations, despite the fact that all its major offices were held by appointment and were ultimately at the discretion of the Secretary of State. Secondly, it ensured that the MSC had the necessary dynamic to introduce changes and that it was not encumbered by precedent or established channels. Thirdly, it effectively posed an alternative structure to those which already existed, such as Local Education Authorities, and in so doing was able to set the norm by which others were to be assessed, differences in their function and accountability notwithstanding.

When one looks at the operational level of the MSC's activities, one finds that at both the national and the local level its representativeness was keenly contested. On many of the *ad hoc* bodies set up to examine the feasibility of various programmes, significant interest groups were either totally without voice or inadequately represented. For example, on the MSC's first major Committee, the Holland Committee, there were no representatives of the Local Education Authorities. Similarly, the teachers' associations had no representation *as of right* on the local Area Manpower Boards, which replaced the discredited District Manpower Boards. The way in which the MSC initially structured its local organisation appears to have been based on a deliberate policy of *not* making their presence coterminous with local authority boundaries. This in itself created enormous problems for local representation, not to

mention efficiency of operation (Butters and Richardson 1983). Finally, the sheer bulk of the work which local Boards were supposed to oversee made it nigh on impossible for representatives to carry out their responsibilities. As a result, monitoring and approval of schemes was, in many cases, quite cursory. These and many more aspects of the MSC's operations undermine the claims to representativeness which were so prominent in MSC public relations.

There has also been a great deal of emphasis placed on the dynamic of the MSC, especially in the mid-1970s when this was used to criticise the DES's 'complacency'. The DES had been found wanting in separate investigations by the OECD (1975) and the House of Commons Public Expenditure Committee (HMSO 1976) in terms of its lack of responsiveness to changing demands in education policy-making. There is little doubt that it was the MSC's ability to be seen to reduce the time-lag between policy formation and implementation which won over many to its cause. Thus it was applauded by the Expenditure Committee for its '*initiative and enthusiasm*' (ibid,p. xxviii). In a situation of rapid growth in youth unemployment, politicians in particular, were apt to look for quick solutions. In this case, the MSC appeared to be the answer compared to what many may have seen as the 'lumbering dinosaur' of the DES. It is against this background that the policies and provision of the MSC relating to vocational preparation will be examined in Chapter Seven. Before that, it is necessary to review the existing sociological interpretations of the new vocationalism. This review will provide criteria for evaluating the efficacy of the content-theoretical model in relation to the analysis of the new vocationalism undertaken in this part of the thesis.

## 6.v *The Sociology of the New Vocationalism*

Since the early 1980s there has been a veritable explosion of analyses concerned with the 'new vocationalism' (variously defined). This body of work can now be seen to comprise a Sociology of the New Vocationalism (SNV)(Jordan 1986). Above all else, it has been the impact of mass youth unemployment which can be seen to lie behind the 'concern' that many Sociologists of Education have recently shown for NAFE. This is evidenced by the titles of some of the major texts eg. *Youth Unemployment and State Intervention, In Place of Work, Schooling For The Dole, Youth Unemployment and Schooling, Training Without Jobs*. The context of youth unemployment has also expressed itself in analyses which are, for the most part, critical of the various measures which have been introduced into the ES to deal with the problem. However, the term 'critical' is being used here in a theoretically underdeveloped sense i.e. it simply means, in effect, politically objectionable. Indeed, the polemical nature of much of the SNV is such that it must be seen as having made little or no contribution to any serious, 'progressive' educational project. One of the major reasons for this weakness within SNV accounts is that they have a tendency to be descriptive rather than analytical. It is precisely for this reason that this review of the literature concentrates on the exceptions to this rule. That is, only those accounts which proffer an *analysis* of the new vocationalism are examined. (These texts tend to be, in any case, both substantively and sociologically more interesting.)

Basically, analytical accounts within the SNV literature fall into three categories or types:

- (i) structural approaches - which tend to focus on the economic;
- (ii) culturalist approaches - which focus on the ideological; and
- (iii) a policy approach - which introduces a narrowly defined 'political' focus.

This typology is by no means exhaustive and, needless to say, there are exceptions. However, it does provide a framework for this review.

## 6.vi *Structural Approaches*

'Structural' in this context is being taken to mean accounts which attempt to locate the new vocationalism within a Reproduction problematic. Therefore, structural refers in this instance to certain underlying and recurring features of the relationship between the ES and the reproduction of labour capacities. Most of the early analyses of the new vocationalism fall into this category - eg. Dan Finn (1982) and Marilyn Moos (1983) - in so far as they sought to identify the functions of the new vocationalism, particularly in terms of its 'economic' role. Whilst it would be wrong to see these accounts as examples of the 'simple' correspondence thesis, the 'capital-logic' conceptions of the state which they employed was little more than a disguised economic reductionism (Jordan 1986). It is therefore not surprising that this highly polemical approach was rather short-lived and most authors (including Finn 1985) matured and moved on to a more complex reproduction problematic with a correspondingly more elaborate conception of the state and the relative autonomy of the ES. As a result, the focus on the ES's economic function has been either displaced or supplemented by a concern for its ideological role and, in particular, the 'social control' function of the new vocationalism. One of the leading exponents of this approach is Denis Gleeson (1980,1983,1985). Gleeson's work is notable in two major respects. Firstly, in terms of its comprehensiveness. Secondly, and perhaps more importantly, in terms of his understanding of the specificity of FE and the fact that its institutional, political and educational particularity must be taken into account in any serious analysis of the 'system'.

Gleeson utilises a conception of the relationship between FE and the economy, which he established with Mardle in *FE or Training? (1980)*, to locate the new vocationalism. Whilst this conception is within the Reproduction problematic, he firmly denies any simple 'correspondence' between the needs of capital and educational processes or outcomes. As a result, FE is seen as having a *degree* of relative autonomy in relation to 'production'. Gleeson also argues that the traditional conception of FE as solely concerned with the transmission of 'technical' or vocational skills is mistaken. A large part of traditional FE was concerned with the inculcation

of attitudes and dispositions which together constitute the 'social relations of production' eg. discipline, obedience, craft-consciousness etc.

FE's relative autonomy is seen by Gleeson as arising out of changes in the labour market. In particular, the demise of traditional craft apprenticeships has, according to Gleeson, led to the following developments:

- "1 FE has become progressively dissociated from direct contact with the workplace;*
- 2 the curricular arrangements of FE have become increasingly non-technical in orientation, i.e. the transmission of specific technical skills has declined in importance;*
- 3 FE courses tend to be primarily college based and pre-vocational in orientation, thereby anticipating students' likely place in the job market."*(9)

In the mid 1960s and early 1970s the distancing of FE from production meant that a more 'educational' logic entered into 'training' and this enabled an emphasis to be placed on 'generic' rather than job-specific transmissions. By being seen to 'do its own thing', FE thereby achieved an appearance of independence from production. This accords with the outline of developments in Binary NAFE provided in Appendix 2.

In relation to current developments, Gleeson, despite recent overtures to the 'ideological', stresses the importance of the 'economic' level in bringing about change. In particular, he argues that conjunctural factors such as mass youth unemployment and changes in labour processes have complicated the already complex relationship between FE and production. Therefore it is changes in the occupational structure and the demand for certain forms of labour power which can be seen to be especially important in his analysis of current developments. In particular, Gleeson argues that FE has had to take on a new, or at least more important, 'structural' role in recent times:

*" ...it is not simply a matter of whether FE manipulates young people's attitudes, or keeps them off the streets. Perhaps more important is the structural role FE now plays in regulating various openings and closures in the labour market and in separating off distinct categories of young workers in relation to their assumed job potential, age, gender, class and so forth...(10)*

The net effect of the 'new' FE has been the creation of a 'tripartite' system *within* FE itself. Gleeson identifies the three divisions in FE provision as follows:

- (a) the 'tertiary modern' stream - comprising of the 'new' vocationalism,
- (b) the 'traditional' craft stream - apprenticeships,
- (c) the 'academic - technical' stream - GCE, BTEC etc.

According to Gleeson, these divisions within FE help to structure the labour market for youth and as a result a dual labour market has arisen.

It is evident from this that Gleeson's analysis focuses upon the 'selection' moment of the ES. The differentiation of labour according to the needs of the labour market is seen as the principal function of the new vocationalism. It could be argued here that Gleeson is open to the charge of reductionism. However, he does recognise that the new vocationalism cannot be seen as FE simply engaged in the reproduction of capital's needs, especially with respect to the need for 'skilled workers'. As such, he also sees the new vocationalism as having an 'ideological' importance:

*"...the push towards training reform may have little to do with equipping labour with specific technical skills to make it more employable, but perhaps more to do with establishing 'substitute criteria' (vocational preparation, work experience, further education and so forth) for controlling the aspirations of disaffected young people."  
(11)*

As noted by Mungham (1983) this invocation of 'disaffected youth' as a reason 'behind' the introduction of the new vocationalism has little or no real basis in fact.

*" In historical terms the workless young have never been able to discharge the revolutionary load laid upon them, and there is nothing in the present circumstances to suggest that 'youth' is at last ready to indulge the hopes of political activists or the fears of those who, at a distance, imagine every kind of convulsion and youthful infamy." (12)*

It might be suggested therefore that one reason why Gleeson invoked this factor was in order to stave off criticisms of having an overly 'economic' analysis. However, in his defence, it is true to say that in his later work the ideological and the political aspects of the new vocationalism have become far more pronounced, if still somewhat secondary to the economic.

Gleeson has also become aware of the changes at the political level which have been associated with the introduction of the new vocationalism and in particular changes in the institutional ensemble of the state. The increasing centralisation of the forms of control and the rise of the MSC are recognised as key changes in the government of FE and training in recent years:

*" ...under the aegis of enlightened reform, following on from the Great Education Debate (1976-1979), the Conservative Government, via the MSC, has established direct control over non-advanced FE and training and achieved a tighter grip over both the transition and transmission points between school and work." (13)*

Gleeson's analysis can therefore be seen to incorporate an awareness of the different levels at which change in FE has come about i.e. at the political, ideological and economic levels. The problem with this account however is that the nature of the relationships both within and between the various levels are not explicated in accordance with the type of 'structural' analysis he employs. That is to say, he fails to show the mechanism(s) by which the relationship between the economic level - in Gleeson's case, principally the labour market - and the ES is mediated. Therefore, Gleeson has really only concerned himself with the framework of change, its basic structural features, and has not considered sufficiently both the processes and content of change. He has shown us *why* we have the new vocationalism and, to a lesser extent, *what* it is. He

has not however shown us *how* the new vocationalism has been 'achieved' and that this is due to his apolitical analysis.

It may be said therefore that what Gleeson's work lacks is an *intrinsic* political analysis of both the new vocationalism and educational change. In this respect his work is unexceptional, both within the SNV and the Sociology of Education in general. It is of course central to this thesis that such an analysis is necessary if we are to comprehend the nature of both the new vocationalism and recent educational change. In terms of the content-theoretical model outlined earlier, Gleeson's analysis can be interpreted as an analysis of the relationship between, at the economic level ( the moments of production, consumption and exchange ) and the ideological level. In particular, his emphasis has been with the exchange moment - the ES's selection function - and the ideological level, with some passing references to changes in the institutional ensemble of the state (the government of the ES). This emphasis has not however been complemented by a concern for the processes involved in their transformation. In particular, the hegemonic projects relating to each of these spheres. As such we are left with a rather static analysis, largely devoid of political actors and their intentions.

*Robert Moore*

If Gleeson's work attempts to tell us *why* the new vocationalism, Moore's work ( 1983,1984,1987,1988) can be seen as an attempt to answer the question *what* is the new vocationalism. In this sense they must be seen as complementary. In his later work Moore has explicitly set out to 'establish precisely what it is that is *new* in 'the new vocationalism' (1987,p.227). And in keeping with his earlier accounts Moore concentrates upon the changes in educational practices associated with the introduction of the new vocationalism, rather than the underlying contexts and causes of educational change such as youth unemployment and changes in labour processes. That is to say, his analysis is specifically 'educational' and concerns the content of educational change.

Moore's thesis on the new vocationalism can be summed up as follows:

*"...the new vocationalism' should be seen in the first place as an ideology of production regulating education rather than as an educational ideology serving the interests of production or the social control of unemployed youth." (14)*

Thus, any notion of 'correspondence' is firmly denied:

*"...there is no underlying continuity or causal link between education and production in the sense that educational practices develop skills or attitudes and values that are appropriate to corresponding sectors of the occupational structure. The supposed requirements of the occupational structure do not, therefore, explain developments in education carried out under the rhetoric of the 'world of work' or 'vocational preparation'." (15)*

From this radical conception of 'relative autonomy' between education and production, it might appear that Moore goes beyond many authors, such as Gleeson, by arguing that the new vocationalism is not even concerned with the development of the 'appropriate' attitudes or discipline in the young unemployed. Indeed, Moore in fact went further than others by arguing at one stage that the new vocationalism represented nothing more than a pragmatic response to control problems *within* educational institutions. However, he has since changed this conception. In his latest work he now sees the new vocationalism as '...an alternative conservative form of control over the educational system' (1987,p.241). Of course, a lot happened between 1983 and 1987 which may have led Moore to revise his conception of what the new vocationalism represents. However, if there is a basic flaw in Moore's account it is not that he has been proved wrong by the course of events ( no-one could blame him for that!) but that his conception has been devoid of any political dynamic. I will argue that the movement Moore's work has taken has its basis in a change in the objectives related to the new vocationalism. His apolitical analysis does not allow him to see this.

As stated above, Moore originally saw the new vocationalism as a *response* to control problems within the ES. These control problems were seen to arise from changes in the social composition of students within the system: which in the case of FE was partly attributable to Government measures relating to youth unemployment, such as YOP and more recently

YTS. At the lowest levels or 'branching points' (Boudon) of the ES a sudden influx of 'lower class' students precipitates a change in the social composition of the whole intake. Because these students bring with them different expectations, abilities and attitudes, this destabilises the system. As Moore sees it, ' the key issue is how the school(sic) responds to these transformations of its public ' (1984, p.70). The problem with this thesis is that Moore does not identify the stage at which this change in social composition brings forth a 'crisis' of social control within the ES. Moore appears to accept that schools have two limiting states: either they are in an 'organic' state or they are in a 'critical' state. By not being willing (or able?) to identify the precise moment of transition from one state to the other, this whole notion of change appears to be teleological. That is, Moore can only argue that a crisis ensues when schools reach a 'critical' state. In fact it could equally well be argued that they can only reach a 'critical' state if they are already in a crisis. Once again it is the lack of agency in the model and, in particular the absence of political struggle, which accounts for this inadequacy.

Changes in pedagogy are seen by Moore as arising out of the need to cope with this transition from 'organic' to 'critical' states. Thus this type of change is taken to be evidence of the ES's relative autonomy. Both the new vocationalism and the 'World of Work' introduced during the ROSLA period are used by Moore to illustrate this process of pedagogic change. Specifically, Moore sees the new vocationalism as representing a shift from the 'liberal-humanist' paradigm characterised by the 'social education' of the 'World of Work', to a new 'technicist training' paradigm encapsulated in Social and Life Skills (SLS) training. In Moore's latest work 'technicist training' has been reconceptualised as ' behavioural occupationalism':

*" The use of occupationalist objectives in constructing the curriculum entails a process of codification through which particular ideological representation of the 'needs of industry' is translated into a curriculum form and an associated teaching practice." (16)*

It is the 'hidden curriculum' of these representations and in particular the political message concerning the individual's role in society which Moore now sees as the 'new' in the new vocationalism. The message he sees is one of 'possessive individualism' (McPherson 1962). This is where I see Moore's

analysis complementing the one put forward in this thesis. That is to say, the new vocationalism is related to the introduction of a new form of 'citizenship'.

In many respects Moore's recent analysis of the new vocationalism represents a distinct move away from his earlier versions. The question of the political 'message' of the new vocationalism (albeit within the hidden curriculum) has come to the fore in his analysis whereas it was once the 'voice' which he concentrated upon:

*" It is not the substance of discourse and practice which counts, but its position within a complex of relationships."  
(17)[ emphasis added]*

In 1984 Moore was saying that we cannot 'read-off' the form of an educational practice (and educational change) from the 'needs' of production or the policies of the state. In fact it can be seen that this 'structural' reading of educational change, limited as it mostly was to the differentiation of pedagogies, led Moore to argue at that time (cf. his latest work) that there was very little that was 'new' about the new vocationalism:

*" In this manner vocational preparation is repeating in FE a process of adaptive transformations ( differentiation of pedagogies) which occurred in the schools some ten years ago in response to similar pressures and problems." (18)*

Of course, this conception takes absolutely no account of the complexity of the FE system - its history, institutional make-up and political system compared to that of the schools.

Specifically, Moore was arguing that this process of educational change, differentiation of pedagogies, was limited to a transformation of educational codes within a range of 'restricted - elaborated', with corresponding 'visible-invisible' modalities of control. As a result, the substantive distinction which Moore wishes to make between the 'World of Work' and the SLS of the new vocationalism becomes far too abstract. That is, Moore's argument that the social education of the 'World of Work' was firmly located within an 'educational paradigm' which fostered 'critical reflection' - 'an elaborate education code' - is simply juxtaposed to the far more restricting and restricted behavioural training objectives of SLS.

Social education was supposed to encourage pupils to '...relate their individual experiences to wider social conditions' (1983,p.17); whereas the SLS '*...has the same relation to life that painting by numbers has to art.*' (p20). However, seeing these aspects of the curriculum in isolation does not help us identify their political role.

It is precisely these contrasts, differences and oppositions which Moore was looking for in his early work that appear to have inhibited his analysis. Rather ironically, given his substantive examples, this stems from the lack of concern for the 'content' of pedagogic change and his emphasis on 'structure'. Concentrating on the opposition between social education and SLS meant that their similarities and common lineage which, if we are to grasp the political aspect of educational change, plays such an important part in their legitimation, remained hidden. For example, the 'learning by doing' philosophy which was at the heart of 'work experience' in social education in schools has not simply been abandoned in favour of training in work. The progressive elements of much that passed as social education have been incorporated within the training paradigm of the new vocationalism (Gleeson 1983, Cohen 1984) much to the chagrin of progressives. Moore's oppositional codes did not enable him to see this 'flirtation' with progressivism. As a result, it is easy to see why he was puzzled by the political quiescence of the proponents of the educational paradigm in the face of the new vocationalism:

*" One of the most remarkable features of the rise of the MSC and its training paradigm is the success of its invasion of educational spaces. The traditional educational paradigms seem to be capitulating almost without a fight."*  
(19)

The lack of political analysis involved in Moore's early work, a shortcoming he shares with most others within the SNV, is highlighted here. The 'invasion' he refers to in the quote above was, if anything, seen by some as a 'liberation' and at least in part, this accounts for the general quiescence. Moore has no means of actually showing this. This, despite the fact that his whole notion of the the dynamic of change as an active accomplishment, is based upon a conception of 'resistance' (1983,p.10). It is only in his recent work that he appears to recognise that, in practice, oppositional codes do not necessarily entail actual or outright

opposition:

*" There are numerous points at which 'the new vocationalism' resonates with established liberal, progressive and radical educational objectives. Alongside the occupationalist model is an educationalist one and in actual classrooms, colleges and YTS schemes the two in various ways and in differing degrees contest and delimit each other in the practice of teaching." (20)*

The contestation and delimitation that he refers to can also be taken as demarcation - the establishment of differences. Thus, whilst Moore is recognising here that a hegemonic struggle is taking place and that the outcome of this may appear indeterminate i.e. relatively autonomous, he fails to recognise the struggle itself can be seen as form-determined. In this respect his analysis is different from the content-theoretical model of educational change being developed in this thesis.

It is clear from the discussion above that there has been a considerable shift in Moore's conception of the new vocationalism. From a 'structural' perspective within which it was the 'principles' behind the actors which were considered all important, he has moved to something more like a content-theoretical analysis. Whereas his earlier work fails to locate both the impetus for change and the political struggles which accompany change, his recent work shows belated recognition of both these aspects. Indeed, Moore's whole notion of change has undergone revision. It is now far more comprehensive and includes changes in the '...discourse, practices, institutional arrangements and principles of power, control and legitimation' (1987,p.228). It also important to note here the lack of any reference to political organisation. Thus, whilst not overly concerned in his own work with either the 'institutional contexts' or the 'pragmatics of classroom practice', Moore recognises that these are important considerations in understanding change.

To conclude, Moore's recent work in many respects suggests an alternative correspondence thesis - a 'political' correspondence thesis. His conception of the hidden curriculum of the new vocationalism as entailing a concern for 'possessive individualism' corresponds to the rise of the New Right in the shape of Thatcherism. The restructuring of the ES

through the new vocationalism is therefore seen to 'parallel' the '...restructuring of political conservatism and the construction of the Thatcherite electoral constituency ' (p241). What the context and the principles of the new vocationalist ideology construct,

*" ... is not so much the model worker required by British industry, but the model citizen of Thatcherite Britain." (21)*

However, the problem with this particular correspondence thesis is that the conclusions bear little or no relation to the explanation offered. That is, the processes whereby this correspondence has come about are not analysed within Moore's account. This limitation of Moore's account should not however be seen to detract from its achievements. From an extremely narrow interpretation of educational change as a form of homeostasis, we are now provided with an analysis which enables us to see it as complex *system* of changes which occurs at various levels, each of which involves political contestation. Moore's own contribution has been to show the impossibility of confining one's analysis to a particular level - in his own case, the ideological.

#### 6.vii Culturalist Approaches

*Schooling For the Dole* (Bates et al, 1984) epitomises the 'cultural' approach to the new vocationalism and this is reflected in the authors' intentions:

*" ... we have tried to identify the material cultural experiences of the young themselves as a powerful element in the process of transition." (22)*

Unfortunately, within many of the actual contributions to the volume, the emphasis on the 'content and processes of schooling', within analyses of the state's responses to the crisis of youth unemployment, often collapse into description, which is then simply juxtaposed to the 'material cultural experiences' of youth. This has the effect, as will be shown below, of substituting one 'idealistic' solution for another. For example, the authors of the Introduction, Paul Willis and John Clarke, neglect to point out that

the dominant, 'official' conception of the situation facing young people today is not only something fashioned out of a particular 'ideology', but that it is also supported by a set of political and institutional relations, and that any 'critique' of the new vocationalism *must* entail an engagement with the nature of those relations. This is shown in their lack of discrimination between the schooling and schoolteachers and FE and FE lecturers.

Starting from what Willis and Clarke declare to be the 'most profound economic crisis experienced in Britain since the Second World War', it is argued that the state's response to the problem of youth unemployment has had two dominant themes. Firstly, that official explanations have 'blamed the victim' i.e. youth, for their own plight by stressing their lack of skill or motivation. Secondly, and very much related, the education system has been found wanting in terms of its [lack of] ability to produce suitably qualified and disciplined young labour. On top of these 'explanations' of the crisis, the state has justified its interventions, in the form of special measures such as YOP and YTS by stressing the demoralisation that accompanies youth unemployment and the potential threat to social order that this entails. Overall, therefore, the new vocationalism is seen by the authors as arising out two dominant perspectives i.e. the 'needs' of the economy and the 'needs' of the state. This can be seen as support for the notion that *both* the wage and state-forms of domination are integral to the reproduction of labour capacities within the new vocationalism.

It is interesting to note that Willis and Clarke argue that one of the reasons for this text was the need to articulate the one account of the crisis which is missing from the 'official' explanations i.e. that of youth. It is repeatedly stated that '...our approach is to try to see how the crisis is understood and **survived** by the young people involved ' (p.13)[original emphasis]. This leads Willis and Clarke to position teachers' accounts as being *either* synonymous with the 'official' account, or merely ciphers for marrying the official account with that of youth i.e. the '*real*' account. According to Willis and Clarke:

" This gap between the official and the real - and the problems of managing it - are, of course, the stuff of which the everyday life of teachers is constructed. The task of making these two versions of the world match, of managing the antagonisms between them, of controlling unfulfilled expectations, are those around which many of the problems of the classroom centre...These problems are contradictory ones: a commitment to either the official or unofficial versions of reality encounters the antagonism of its opposite. It is in this sense that one can speak of teachers 'negotiating' these pressures: of trying to hold these tensions and conflicting interests in some sort of balance within the classroom. " (23)

One is perhaps entitled to ask, whatever happened to the 'experiences, knowledges and cultures of the people involved', in this case, the teachers? What is put forward is a notion that on the one hand youth can partially 'penetrate' the situation because they have their 'material culture' with which to *resist*. Teachers, on the other hand, can only 'contain and handle' this situation because this is 'as much as they can do' (p.12).

To criticise this conception of the role of teachers is not to argue that teachers are more important or more autonomous than Willis and Clarke make out. It is to point out that seeing teachers as either simply 'responding' or, more actively, 'negotiating' their situation, is telling us nothing about the constraints or contexts within which they are operating. It also, unwittingly perhaps, gives the impression of *individual* teachers trying to cope with the problems, rather than teachers acting collectively. This conception only serves to reinforce the rather traditional, 'voluntaristic' view of teachers and their labour process as well as acting to de-politicise their role.

The whole Introduction to this volume misses, or avoids, the central *political* thrust of the debate on the new vocationalism. The 'needs' of industry and/or the 'needs' of the state are narrowly interpreted as being either 'economic' or 'ideological'. By concerning themselves with the 'lived experiences' or the 'material cultures' of youth, *and only youth*, the authors cannot begin to question the broader political aspects of the new vocationalism ( other than a *sui generis* conception of working-class 'resistance'). As a result, it is only the contributions of Moore (discussed

above) and Cohen which represent real attempts to provide an analytical dimension to the discussion of the new vocationalism within this volume. Therefore it is worthwhile examining the latter's analysis in some detail.

*Phil Cohen*

Cohen is in no doubt that one of the central objectives of the new vocationalism has been to develop and implement a new 'micro-technology' (cf. Foucault) of social discipline,

*" it represents an attempt to construct a more mobile form of self-discipline, adapted to changing technologies of production and consumption, and to link this to a modern version of self-improvement aimed at the reserve army of youth labour." (24)*

According to Cohen, the hegemony of the MSC has come about primarily as a result of the failure of the opposition (teachers and trade unionists) to contest the *ideological* aspects of the new vocationalism. Cohen argues that teachers and trade unionists have been fixated with both a 'voluntaristic' conception of education and a 'fatalistic' view of technology, and these have paralysed their ability to contest the MSC's project. That is to say, they have too long held the notions that education can '*make a difference*' to economic problems such as mass youth unemployment and that technological advance was immutable. By clinging to these views at a time of significant changes in the relationship between the state, education and the economy, the Right has been able to seize the initiative and put forward an agenda for educational reform. As if to add insult to injury, Cohen sees this agenda as incorporating new versions of some of the 'radical critiques' of education which were made in the 1960s.

Essentially, Cohen sees the new vocationalism as an ideological project designed to redefine and 'redeploy' the notion of 'skill'. This enterprise entails 'deskilling' and redefining practices to the extent that they become 'abstract universals', which Cohen sees as equivalent to 'transferable skills'. Corresponding to to this process, Cohen argues that the nature of 'discipline' is also undergoing a change, to the extent that is becoming

more 'subjectivised'. In particular it is the '*discipline of impression management*' which he sees as replacing the old class-patriarchal form of 'external controls and negative sanctions'. This new form of discipline is epitomised by 'Social and Life Skills' training:

*" Training in so called 'social and life skills' is essentially training in behavioural etiquettes which concretise in a subject form the general commodity form of abstract labour. And then this new discipline is made a special site of 'transferable skilling'.(25)*

Given the propensity of the service industries, for whom this form of training is seen as most apposite, to show an inverse relation between growth and labour intensity, Cohen argues that this reconstruction of skill/discipline is '...of little importance as an exercise in indicative planning'. For this reason he argues that the 'primary significance of the new vocationalism is ideological' (p.114). One of the problems with this conception is that the term 'discipline' is not fully explicated. It may be argued that one could quite easily substitute the term 'domination' for discipline without radically altering the substance of Cohen's analysis. In which case Cohen can be seen to be arguing that the new vocationalism represents a new form of domination corresponding to a combination of the wage and state forms. However, instead of 'forms' of domination Cohen explicates the redefinition of discipline/skill by utilising a theory of 'reproduction codes'.

According to Cohen, the dominant construct of 'skill' he sees as a product of a historic compromise between the reproduction codes of '*inheritance*' and '*career*'. These codes are associated with the aristocracy and bourgeoisie respectively. This dominant construct of 'skill' has a contradictory message in so far as it is seen as having '..both an inherent property and a socially-achieved practice, both the cause and effect of mastery' (p.117). Mediating this dominant construct of skill is the another construct generated from the '*vocation*' code, which is to be found amongst certain sections of the middle-class. Cohen sees this code as having a number of different articulations such as the 'feminine' and 'bohemian' variants which share a marginality to productive activity. Finally, the working-class construct of skill is seen as a product of a code

of 'apprenticeship' which is characterised by,

*"...the progressive mastery of techniques of dexterity associated with the performance of manual labour, both in the home and for wages." (26)*

The whole exercise of mapping-out these codes and their articulation leads Cohen to the conclusion that since the Second World War there has been a 'weakening and fragmentation' of the grids which these codes constitute. This, in turn, leads him to suggest that the new vocationalism represents an attempt by the state to establish the hegemony of vocation and career codes over working-class constructs of skill. Thus, the new vocationalism is seen as having the 'inner-directness' of the vocation code and the 'other-directedness' of the career code. This is exemplified within 'Social and Life Skills' training. Principally, this can be seen to promote the concept of 'mobile individualism' and involves instrumentalising the expressive.

Cohen's exposition is certainly challenging. He appears to explain what it is exactly the new vocationalism represents and involves. However, for all the references to '*hegemony*' and ideological work, his thesis lacks dynamic. The 'codes', despite their 'multiple articulations' and cross-fertilisation, appear too static and are often seen as being laid-on to whole categories of subjects. This is due to Cohen's apolitical conception of these 'codes' ie. they do not appear to involve any form of political relations. As a result his whole conception of the new vocationalism as an educational change is bereft of impetus other than in a rather hollow 'correspondence' with changes in the occupational structure or labour processes. For example,

*" What 'transferable skilling' corresponds to in reality is the process of deskilling set in motion by new information technologies..." (27)*

The cultural mediation, the role of reproduction codes, relating to this 'correspondence' can be seen as the detail of what might be involved but it does not explain how the new vocationalism has been achieved. Furthermore, Cohen himself rejects the thesis of correspondence. That is,

he sees the ideological project of the state [the MSC] as bearing little or no relation to the needs of production. Therefore he attempts to posit the ideological as an autonomous region or level. In which case we are left with either an internal ideological dynamic which explains both the cause and the effects of the new vocationalism. Or, we locate the agent of change as being a realignment of power within society i.e. a restructuring of political relations. Cohen denies that political relations have had such an effect (p.105).

We are thus left with the 'ideological' account of the new vocationalism. In Cohen's case, this amounts to an analytical account of the phenomenon ( the 'what' question) which, whilst going some way towards balancing the overly-deterministic accounts (the 'why' question) of the functionalists, both Left and Right, is still unhelpful when it comes to asking the central question, which is 'how' the new vocationalism? That is, we need to see the new vocationalism as a product of political struggle, the nature of which has to be understood if we are to comprehend its effects. This requires an intrinsic political analysis.

#### 6.viii *The Policy Studies Approach*

The work of David Raffé (1983, 1987) represents the 'policy' approach within the Sociology of the New Vocationalism. Unlike the descriptive nature of most policy research, Raffé's work is certainly more analytical. As a result, his recognition of the political nature of the new vocationalism is exceptional in terms of the SNV. It is therefore necessary to consider his work in some detail.

According to Raffé, there are two main assumptions underlying the state's policy for youth unemployment which can be identified : (i) the '...government cannot substantially reduce aggregate levels of unemployment, at least in the short term '. And, (ii) '...that young people should have prior claim on the consequently limited resources for dealing with unemployment ' (1983,p.11). As a result of these assumptions, policies on

youth unemployment have to be constructed around the constraint of attempting to focus any measures on youth whilst not attempting, or even appearing to, tackle the wider problem of unemployment. Raffae goes on to identify four '*strategies*' which are available:-

1. *The Non-selective Reduction in the Youth Labour Supply.* By this Raffae has in mind measures which fail to discriminate between unemployed and other youth. By withdrawing or withholding the supply of youth to the labour market, by such means as raising the school-leaving age, the competition for jobs amongst the young would be reduced. This strategy assumes that the youth and adult labour markets are segregated and that the resultant fall in supply of labour would benefit only those young people left in the market. Raffae argues that the evidence available does not support the assumption of segregated labour markets (p.13).

2. *Selective Reduction in Youth Labour Supply - or Re-defining Youth Unemployment.* This strategy is based on the assumption that youth and adult labour markets are *not* segregated. Principally, it involves the withdrawal of unemployed youth from the labour market by such means as 'special measures' and 'training' schemes. Since the young people on the schemes will not, effectively, have left the job market - they will be actively searching for work - they are still unemployed. Yet, they are not deemed as such. Thus, the schemes can be seen to 'redefine' youth unemployment. According to Raffae,

*" ...a scheme which is discontinuous with full-time education, which restricts recruitment to the unemployed and which risks losing its students at any time if they can find a job, is unlikely to be fully effective as an educational or training scheme." (28)*

Yet, it has to be 'sold' as either (or preferably both) 'education' or 'training' if it is to be accepted as a measure which is doing more than simply 'massaging' the youth unemployment figures. For this reason Strategy 3 has recently been invoked.

3. *Giving Young People a 'Competitive Edge'.* As with the previous strategy, this is premised on the assumption that the adult and youth

labour markets are not segregated. Thus, one way of improving the position of young workers in the labour market is to make them more 'competitive'. A means of increasing the 'competitiveness' of young workers is to improve their 'quality'. Improving the 'quality' of the young unemployed by means of 'education' or 'training' , and the inculcation of 'Social and Life Skills' does not however create jobs for young people. As such, this Strategy does not address the cause of youth unemployment. What it has done is redefine the concept of 'skills' and use 'training' as a panacea to the problem. This, in turn, has meant that there has had to be corresponding changes in the role of the education system which, once again is seen as shouldering the burden of an economic and political problem.

4. *Palliatives.* Raffe argues that the fourth Strategy open to government is to provide measures or schemes which are aimed at relieving the consequences but not the causes of youth unemployment. Amongst the most commonly cited consequences of youth unemployment are 'demoralisation, depression and social disorder'. Such schemes are therefore viewed as having a 'substitutional' effect on youth in so far as they stand instead of work and thereby prevent or limit the possibility of the negative consequences arising. Whilst the palliative effects of such schemes are recognised as being *bone fide* measures to help the young unemployed, the idea of 'training for unemployment' is often considered unacceptable. For this reason it is often the case that there is only an implicit acceptance of the need for teaching young people how to 'cope' with unemployment and this is evidenced by the structure of many schemes.

Raffe argues that it is the 'tactics' ( not the principles) relating to Strategy 3 which has dominated the public debate on policies for the young

unemployed. Giving young people the 'edge' over adult workers has been the main approach adopted. This has resulted in an 'incremental' system of policy adjustments which itself has led to confusion. What this amounts to is the possibility that the nature of the policies may have changed *without* any change in the public perception of their purpose(s). Thus whilst the detail and indeed the content of the policies may differ, they may share an underlying rationale. This then, is the reason that so much of the debate has been on 'supply side' arguments and policies.

Raffe suggests that the emphasis on 'training' as opposed to measures designed to reduce youth unemployment may be seen as something of an insurance policy for the government. If the schemes fail to reduce unemployment then they can be defined as not be directed towards this end. If, on the other hand, they do appear to help the problem then they can be seen as being the correct approach. The danger for the government, as Raffe sees it, is that such measures will 'continue to be regarded as a policy for youth unemployment'. The fact that it is unlikely to reduce the high levels of youth unemployment will mean that it will lose its credibility.

Raffe's analysis is compelling, in so far as it does give one the sense of the 'political' nature of the whole debate surrounding the new vocationalism, especially the notion of alternative 'strategies'. If there is a major criticism of Raffe's analysis it is that his conceptualisation of the policies relating to youth unemployment are viewed in isolation from other economic, social and political developments. That is, he has a very limited perspective on what a 'strategy' involves. For example, the sheer cost of strategy 3 has always been problematic and the fact that it has necessitated new means of implementation and administration has created its own dilemmas for the government i.e. its institutional form has problematised its function. This type of factor does not appear to enter Raffe's analysis. Similarly, contestation and resistance are not seen as part of the equation which governments have to consider i.e. the hegemonic work of the state. Raffe does not relate policy to social relations and the reason for this lies in Raffe's own Sociological inheritance.

Raffe has recognised the heritage of his approach and what this means in terms of his central focus:

*" Its perspective is drawn from one of the main traditions in the sociology of education, which emphasises the centrality of the selective function to the analysis of systems of education - and, by extension, of training." (29)*

The apolitical nature of this approach, the Political-Arithmetic tradition, has already been commented upon in Chapter One. Its shortcomings include, amongst other things, the taken-for-granted nature of policy objectives. Thus, evaluation is often undertaken in terms of their stated objectives and in terms of categories normatively defined. Raffe's analyses provides examples of both these limitations. In essence therefore, his choice of perspective radically inhibits a conceptualisation of the new vocationalism as educational change. For example, his insulation of educational content and processes from educational politics, results in a structural-functionalist conception of the ES. As a result, education and training are inevitably de-politicised within this modern 'Black-box' approach. Therefore Raffe's work, despite its overtly 'political' contextualisation of educational change, is not exceptional in this particular respect. However, as a statement of *one* of the functions of the ES - its selection function - his approach does provides useful empirical evidence. The relationship between 'strategy', educational provision and social relations in general remains to be explicated. Raffe's 'policy' analysis is incapable of achieving this.

#### *6.ix Summary of Sociology of the New Vocationalism*

The SNV accounts reviewed above share the following characteristics. Firstly, they can all be seen to have under-theorised the political aspects of the introduction of the new vocationalism. In none of the accounts does there appear to have been any real attempt to introduce an 'intrinsic' political analysis. As a result we are given economic, ideological and policy-study accounts which are largely bereft of political actors. Even the individual teachers/lecturers, let alone their collective organisation, are excluded from the analyses. Secondly, the institutional context of the new

vocationalism is left unaccounted for. That is, the means whereby educational change is brought about is unexplicated ( Raffe's work excepted). As a result we are only told what the change is and why it may have been necessary. The question of *how* it came to be is not answered. Thirdly, the relationship between the new vocationalism and wider political changes ( including other policies) is not considered. That is, the new vocationalism is not seen as an *example* of change, seen in terms of the institutional ensemble of the state, forms of collective consumption or political organisation in the current period.

These omissions stem from the failure to see the new vocationalism as an entirely new form of provision. What these accounts also reveal is that the interest shown by most of the authors in NAFE and educational change in general is tangential to the Sociology of Schools. Consequently, no real effort appears to have been made to comprehend the specificity of NAFE [Gleeson excepted] and/or the new vocationalism as an *example* of educational change. Thus we have witnessed in the SNV the importation of perspectives and methodologies developed outside the post-16 sector. This is characterised by the interchangeable use of the terms 'School' and 'schooling' in many, if not most, of these texts. Whilst schooling could quite appropriately be used to denote NAFE as formal education, in practice it has been used interchangeably with the term 'schools'. Therefore the question of whether it is an appropriate term in relation to the practices of the FE sector has simply been elided. Similarly, developments in NAFE have been seen by some authors as simply precursors to changes in Schools (Dale 1985, Green 1983) i.e. that NAFE is simply a staging-post on the road to the *really* important destination of compulsory education. In this sense, NAFE has no intrinsic importance as an area of study - it is still the Cinderella of the Sociology of Education. Within the content-theoretical model developed in this thesis, the specificity of both FE and the new vocationalism will be located in a manner which underlines the inadequacy of these SNV accounts. Without such specificity, the politics of educational change cannot be examined.

As mentioned above, within the copious amount of research into the new vocationalism now available there is an extraordinary absence: there

have been very few examinations of the impact of the new vocationalism on FE teachers. As Broomhead and Coles testify: 'In the revolution which has taken place within further education little is heard about the people who have to implement the changes' (1988,p.177). The exceptions eg. Moos (1979), Jordan (1986), Wilson (no date), including Broomhead and Coles (1988), serve only illustrate this more general rule. Yet even with these exceptions there has been no attempt to theorise the changes in the nature of the FE teachers' labour process or class position arising out of the implementation of the new vocationalism. Certainly there has been no analysis of the FE teachers' *collective* response and its role in this major educational change.

An analysis of 'the FE teachers' response' to the introduction of the new vocationalism is fraught with difficulties due to the extraordinary diversity of FE and FE teaching. It is also complicated by the different units of analysis ( the individual teacher, teachers of a particular subject, teachers in a particular college, Region, union Branch etc.) and the different measures ( pedagogic style, industrial relations, pay and conditions etc.) which may be used to gauge the changes which have been experienced. As a result, two 'general' units of analysis will be employed here: the individual teacher as a researched 'subject' and the FE teachers' collective organisation NATFHE. The advantage of taking the former is that it enables us to draw upon the quite extensive survey material now available which, whilst remaining difficult to regard as in any way representative, is nevertheless more generalisable than anything an individual researcher could hope to produce. The choice of NATFHE follows from the theorisation developed in Chapters Three and Four ie. that changes in the logic of collective action taken by NATFHE can be taken to be indicative of changes in the labour process and class position of FE teachers. Three basic measures will therefore be employed. Firstly, the extent to which the new vocationalism involved FE teachers in work which is different from that which they experienced before - the nature of the change. Secondly, the effect this has had on their labour process - the impact of the change. And thirdly, the nature of their (collective) resistance to the new vocationalism - the political mobilisation it engendered in their union NATFHE.

## 6.x *The New Vocationalism*

At the highest level of abstraction, the objective of the new vocationalism will be shown to have been an attempt to transform the mode of reproducing labour capacities. Within this process, the imposition of the wage, state and civil forms of domination is manifested in the 'training', 'education' and 'selection' functions of the ES. Herein lies the essential difficulty which faced the introduction of the new vocationalism. Being at the interface between education and work, the FE sector is beset with political pressures unlike those found elsewhere in the ES eg. the legitimation of its role as 'education' on the one hand, and meeting the needs of employers on the other. Historically these pressures have been resolved by a laissez-faire approach being taken to both policy and provision. FE in other words, despite being very much a part of the public sector ES, has operated in accordance with the demands of the 'market' for its services. This is enshrined in its self-publicised image of 'flexibility' and 'responsiveness' to local demands (Bristow 1976, Cantor and Roberts 1986). Indeed, the very fact that FE is part of the ES and concerned with the inculcation of the state-form, can be seen as legitimating its training function - the inculcation of the wage-form:

*"...the term FE...[is] a misnomer which acts to legitimate the 'training' process through which young workers are instructed in the cognitive and affectual skills deemed appropriate to their position within the industrial hierarchy" (30)*

Thus, the separation of training from education has been enshrined in the institutional division between FE and Schools, their educational ideologies, and politics and administration, if not always in actual provision.

Consequently, an extension of the *educational* franchise to a hitherto neglected section of the population, who were part of the 'natural' constituency for FE, will be shown to have to required the reconstitution of the entire institutional, political and ideological apparatus of this sector of the ES and not least the relationship between 'training' and 'education'. At the same time, it has to be borne in mind that the paramount concern was the reproduction of the labour capacities required

by the economy. Therefore a rather special set of determinants needed to coincide if this was to occur successfully, not least the creation of the appropriate curricula and political projects. It is therefore postulated here that it is more problematic for the state to extend the educational franchise to 16-19 year olds whilst holding on to the insulation - separation-in-unity - of the different forms of domination, than it is to introduce other major educational changes such as the ROSLA. Indeed, the very notion of extending the *educational* franchise to this group conflicted with the need to insulate the wage- and state-forms of domination. However, this is not a necessarily contradictory relationship. Compromise positions are possible, in the form of strategies of reproduction which can provide the appropriate political, institutional and curriculum frameworks. Two such strategies of reproduction, vocational preparation and the new vocationalism, will now be shown to be testimony to this thesis.

Notes and References - Chapter Six

1. This periodisation, with some amendments, is derived from that used by Brooksbank & Ackstine (1984) with regard to the development of the MSC.
2. FEU (1981 b) p.12
3. *ibid* p.13
4. The MSC has since become the Training Commission and more recently the Training Agency (1989). Thus returning it to its former status as an 'agency' of the Department of Employment.
5. Barnes (1974) p.2
6. *ibid* p.3
7. Jackson (1986) p.26
8. Brooksbank & Ackstine (1984) p.305
9. Gleeson (1983) p.42
10. *ibid*
11. *ibid* p.2
12. Rees & Atkinson (1982) p.39
13. Gleeson (1985) pp.60-1
14. Moore (1987) p.227
15. Moore (1983) p.14
16. Moore *op cit* p.230
17. Moore *op cit* p.100
18. *ibid* p.29
19. *ibid* p.30
20. Moore *op cit* p.240
21. *ibid* p.232
22. Bates *et al* (1984) p.2
23. *ibid* pp.11-2
24. Cohen (1984) p.105
25. *ibid* p.114
26. *ibid* p.118
27. *ibid* p.113
28. Raffe (1983) p.15
29. Raffe (1987) p.238
30. Gleeson & Mardle (1980) p.7

## CHAPTER SEVEN

### *Vocational Preparation as a Strategy of Reproduction*

#### 7.i *The MSC and Vocational Preparation*

In May 1975 the MSC published its first major contribution to the debate on education and training. The document, *Vocational Preparation for Young People* [hereafter *Vocational Preparation*], can be seen as a landmark in terms of both the rise of the MSC and the debate on what was eventually to become the new vocationalism.

*Vocational Preparation* provided a snapshot of training provision for young people in the early 1970s. It confirmed the neglect pointed out in Chapter Six and it was, in this respect, testament to the poverty of training provision in Britain. It also identified specific training needs and attempted to provide an explanation as to why these needs were not being met. Finally, it suggested certain measures which needed be taken to rectify the situation, the most important of which was the introduction of vocational preparation. In the analysis that follows it will be suggested that this call for vocational preparation be interpreted as an attempt to construct a new strategy of reproduction, one which entailed an extension of the educational franchise and a reformulation of the relationship between 'education' and 'training'. As such, it represented an attempt to introduce a fundamental change to the reproductive role of the ES. A critical examination of *Vocational Preparation* will therefore reveal the rationale which lay behind this attempt to construct a new strategy of reproduction.

*Vocational Preparation* was not simply an ad hoc intervention by the MSC arising out of the crisis of youth unemployment in the mid 1970s - a view common to some early critics of the MSC ( see *SNV literature in Chapter Six*). It was always intended to be a strategic intervention. There are a number of reasons for suggesting this. Firstly, one of the most significant features of *Vocational Preparation* was the fact that it identified as its specific target group, ' ... young people who enter employment between the ages of 16 and 18,

some of whom undertake training which extends beyond 18, as well as with those who do not remain in the jobs they first enter and those who experience unemployment ' (p.3). At this stage, the unemployed were not therefore being singled out as deserving special attention, although the MSC recognised they had special needs. The whole tenor of the document with regard to the young unemployed is very much one of optimism. ( This optimism can be seen to permeate nearly all the early MSC documents). In fact the stated grounds for concern with the target group were stereotypically those of the 'social democratic repertoire' i.e. a concern for efficiency and equity:

*" [that is, the] ...increasing need for skill and adaptability in employment; the inequity of opportunities being missed by young people because of where they live or the state of the economy when they start work; the importance of initial training and job experience in shaping attitudes to work; and the present imbalance between public funds devoted to young people entering work and those who continue in full-time education.(1)*

A second reason for suggesting that *Vocational Preparation* was an attempt to formulate a strategic intervention in youth training can be seen from the fact that the MSC surveyed all types of training provision. It was only by doing this that the level of the inadequacy of short-term provision, indeed its almost total absence, became evident. It is this distinction between the provision of long-term training (defined as training which continues for three to five years, including apprenticeships) and short-term training which is at the heart of this document. In terms of long-term training the document catalogued what was already well known at the time ie. that the laissez-faire nature of training policy and provision had been a complete failure. Despite improvements in the quality of long-term training brought about by the ITBs, the extent of their provision and the grant-levy mechanism of attributing costs was recognised in *Vocational Preparation* as inadequate [note: see *Appendix 2 for description of this mechanism*]. In particular, the system whereby small employers became exempt from the levy under the 1973 Employment and Training Act was singled out for criticism (p.19). Moreover, the MSC noted the fact that traditional apprenticeships were declining and being replaced by technician and operative type grades. The situation described here is clearly one of a 'crisis of reproduction'. In view of the severity of this crisis, the MSC's

recommendations for long-term training in *Vocational Preparation* appear surprisingly weak. It merely recommended that employers be subsidised for apprentice off-the-job training '*...at any rate in the first year*'. Why such a pallid response to what was visibly an enormous problem?

The answer lies in political compromise - the paralysis of corporatism. This is evident in the underlying rationale which, despite the overwhelming evidence showing its inadequacy, continued to inform the whole nature of the debate on training provision. That is, '*the general principle holds that the state pays for education and employers pay for training*' (p.22). Training was not to be provided directly through state expenditure. (Of course the state had always subsidised training through technical education provision). As long as training was distinct from education, responsibility for its provision was deemed to be that of the employers, despite the fact that they could not provide adequate long-term training due to the drain on profitability this entailed. This is evidence of the structural contradiction which exists in the reproduction of labour capacities ie. capital cannot provide for the reproduction of one of the conditions for its own existence, namely labour power. As a result, skills shortages and inadequately trained labour persist as structural features of the system. More important, given that this was true of long-term training, the MSC recognised that short-term training could never be provided on the necessary scale or in the necessary quality by employers, if this general principle of the division of responsibility for training and education was to be maintained. Therefore the maintenance of this principle effectively prevented any strategic resolution of the crisis of reproduction. To break this impasse a new initiative was required, one which satisfied all parties - employers, unions and educational interests. Thus, the MSC's objective in *Vocational Preparation*, as part of a new strategy of reproduction, appears to have been to present the case for providing short-term training, vocational preparation, through state expenditure. This however demanded that it be redefined as something other than training. Such an initiative could therefore only involve an extension the 'educational' franchise.

As stated above, the grounds for the MSC's intervention were based on the twin themes of efficiency and equity and, in particular, the imbalance between the provision for those who stay in education and those who leave at

the earliest opportunity eg. :

*" ... there is the argument from social justice. As the State devotes more money to educating the more gifted up to and beyond university degree level, the gap between provision for those who leave school at 16 to enter employment becomes wider." (2)*

Of course, the natural corollary of this is that responsibility for putting right this imbalance lies with the state, if it is deemed that the nature of provision is not 'training'. That is, provision could only be justified as a form of state expenditure, and the general principle of employers paying for training whilst the state pays for education maintained, if it could be shown to either be or include 'education'. The first task facing the MSC was therefore to define vocational preparation as something other than short-term training. This it did in the following manner:

*" For historical reasons a distinction has come to be accepted between training and further education which is reflected in the institutional arrangements. Vocationally-orientated learning is, however, essentially a single process, though for many purposes it is convenient to regard training as being more concerned with learning job skills -i.e. how to do things - while vocationally-orientated further education is more concerned with the general concepts involved -i.e. why things are done." (3)*

It then went on to argue that:

*" The origins of this division lie in history, but it is increasingly recognised that the distinction between training and vocational education is in many ways artificial, in the sense that both are directed to the broad objective of preparing people for work." (4)*

As a result of this conception (*reconception*), short-term training becomes vocational preparation, a term deliberately chosen to convey the fact that the provision includes both training *and* further education. Having defined the nature of vocational preparation as a combination of training and further education, it fell to the state to fund such provision. According to *Vocational Preparation* :

*" There is a good case for providing the resources on a collective basis so as to overcome the natural resistance of individual employers to incurring costs when there is no assurance that it will be they who directly enjoy the benefits." (5)*

In many respects this redefinition of short-term training as vocational preparation and, as a result, a candidate for state expenditure, was only the beginning. The MSC also recognised in *Vocational Preparation* that the very act of redefinition entailed a considerable amount of what is recognisably hegemonic work. In particular, two major obstacles or 'cardinal difficulties' were seen by the MSC to exist in the form of employers who saw no need for training and young people who were disinterested in more 'education'. This adds support the view that vocational preparation, as a strategy of reproduction, had its origins in a fraction of the new middle class - amongst the educational professionals (see section 7.iv) - and that both Capital (the employers) and Labour (the Trade Unions) needed to be 'won over' to the strategy. There was however also a third, lesser difficulty it appears, in the form of an absence of a curriculum for vocational preparation.

The ideological ground had not therefore been prepared. Not least, the nature of the relationship between any proposed curriculum and that already existing in the Schools was still considered a potential obstacle. This problem can be interpreted as the difficulty of reproducing the *separation-in-unity* of the different forms of domination - the state and wage-forms - in the curriculum. The 'progressivism' of the 1960s was seen by the MSC has having insulated the forms to the extent that:

*" In recent years the social environment in a number of schools, with more emphasis on personal development and less on formal instruction, has been diverging from that still encountered in most work situations, where the need to achieve results in conformity with defined standards and to do so within fixed time-limits calls for different patterns of behaviour. The contrast is more marked where changes in industrial processes have reduced the scope for individual reaction and initiative. The methods and disciplines of school and work are certainly different in a variety of ways, but they are not necessarily in conflict." (6)[emphasis added]*

The content-theoretical model suggests that the institutional allocation of provision precedes the designated function of state expenditures. In this case the institutional role of the MSC in the provision of vocational preparation does not appear to have been considered. This suggests that it was intended to graft vocational preparation on to existing institutional arrangements. That is, its intended designation as a form of collective

consumption can be confirmed by the fact that it was to be primarily the responsibility of the local authorities, in 'partnership' with central government (the MSC). As a result, the location of vocational preparation courses in FE and their acceptance by the staff of colleges was not considered problematic, despite the fact that it was recognised that such courses would entail 'greater demands' on staff. Again, this might be taken to indicate the fact that the MSC's conception of vocational preparation was largely that of the educational professionals. However, it remains the case that, the institutional and curricula problems associated with the implementation of vocational preparation - the overall political effect - appears, in *Vocational Preparation*, to have been entirely under-estimated. The model employed here suggests that until such issues were addressed, vocational preparation, as a viable strategy of reproduction, was to remain an inchoate attempt to institute a fundamental educational change. As it transpired, the economic and political context was in any case about change in a manner which fundamentally undermined the likelihood of vocational preparation ever being introduced in the form envisaged in *Vocational Preparation* ie. as a form of collective consumption. Principally, changes in the institutional ensemble of the state - central-local state relations - were to undermine vocational preparation being made the responsibility of the Local state (see below).

To summarise, it is suggested here that vocational preparation, as conceived by the MSC in *Vocational Preparation*, can be seen as an unintended product of political compromise. As a strategic intervention into 'training' it hardly began to touch the crisis of reproduction which was apparent in the early 1970s. In fact the corporatist framework within which it was conceived prevented this 'training' crisis being addressed, as the MSC's very existence depended on the principle that training remain the responsibility of employers and education that of the state. Therefore the only target group which the MSC could propose to restructure had to lie outside the traditional 'training' and 'education' constituencies, the neglected, unqualified and untrained school-leavers. Given the nature of this group, its 'low ability', and the type of work which was available to them, it was difficult, not to say impossible, for such an intervention to be based on extending their 'training'. The MSC therefore saw little choice but to call for an extension of the *educational* franchise. Such an extension inevitably entailed educational change, seen here as a change

in the relationship between the 'education' and 'training' functions of the ES. The inculcation of the state and wage-forms respectively.

It will now be shown that this call for change coincided with the needs of educational professionals as well as the government of the day, in so far as they could both be seen to be 'doing something' for this hitherto neglected section of the population. Vocational preparation therefore came along at an opportune moment. Contrary to the accepted view of the MSC leading the development of vocational preparation, in the sections that follow, it will be argued that many of the original proposals in *Vocational Preparation* were in fact discarded or redefined in accordance with the needs of the major interest groups involved in the implementation of vocational preparation, not least those of the FE teachers and their collective organisation NATFHE.

#### 7.ii *Central-Local Government Relations - the institutional ensemble*

Vocational preparation was conceived in a very distinct period in the history of central-local government relations. The changing pattern of such relations has been characterised as follows:

*" as a shift from bargaining through incorporation to direction in the 1980s." (7)[emphasis added]*

Rhodes periodises these changes as follows; the 'bargaining' period lasted from 1966 to 1973, 'incorporation' from 1974 to 1979 and 'direction' from 1980 to the present day. It is important to note that this periodisation corresponds to the restructuring of NAFE provision outlined in Chapter Six.

The rise of the MSC and the attempt to implement vocational preparation as a strategy of reproduction can therefore be seen as taking place during Rhodes' period of 'incorporation'. However, as stated above, very little thought appears to have been given to the nature of the institutional ensemble necessary for this new strategy of reproduction. In fact, the dominant thinking appears to have been confined to an attempt to establish 'partnerships'

between the central and Local state, which is more redolent of Rhodes' period of 'bargaining' between 1966 and 1973:

*" In these years the national associations of local authorities bargained with central government over the rate of growth in government grant and over the distribution of the total grant between the various types of local authority. Central government may have been the more powerful actor in these negotiations, being able to determine the timetable and set the broad parameters for discussion, but the Associations none the less achieved changes at the margin in both growth rate and the distribution." (8)*

It is therefore not insignificant that the MSC had itself been established at the end of this period. Thus, Brooksbank and Ackstine (1984) describe the nature of MSC-local authority relations in the mid 1970s as:

*" At this stage [ in the 'rise' of the MSC] there was talk of MSC encroachment on local duties and responsibilities but the overall impression was one of local partnership between LEAs and MSC.(9)[emphasis added]*

Within NAFE, the activities of the MSC were therefore crucial to the success of this 'partnership' objective. However, its initial attempt, in the form of a Training and Further Education Consultative Group (TFECG), to establish in 1976 a national forum for bodies concerned with NAFE and training, was not a success:

*"Members of the Group ...were not expected to ... commit the major representative organizations in the education service or industry to policies or views advocated by the Group. It has therefore inevitably become something of a 'talking shop', and, without executive or policy responsibilities, unable to exercise much influence or initiate much purposeful activity." (10)*

Nevertheless, by 1979, the MSC did manage to firmly establish itself in NAFE provision by developing the Youth Opportunities Programme (YOP). This accomplishment can be seen as the result of a successful move towards a strategy of 'incorporation' after 1976. What informed the adoption of this strategy ?

According to Rhodes, the period of 'incorporation' involved certain 'strategies', amongst which was the reduction of the range of interests within the local government system. This was accomplished through the strengthening of what he terms the 'national community of local government' i.e. '...the national organisations representing the multiple interests of local authorities in

their interactions with central institutions.' These included the Association of County Councils (ACC), the Association of District Councils (ADC) and the Association of Metropolitan Authorities (AMA). This national community was seen as an intermediate tier in central-local relations and acted to police local government expenditure, albeit through a certain amount of self-regulation - a form of 'responsible autonomy' (p.265).

It is important at this point to context this 'strategy of incorporation'. By 1976 the world oil crisis and galloping inflation meant that the Labour government were forced to go to the IMF for a loan. The conditions for that loan included a clear undertaking to reduce public expenditure which, up until that time had been growing. From 1973 local authority spending had been re-classified as part of the national public expenditure equation. It therefore came under the purview of the Treasury and was for the first time considered a legitimate tool for controlling total public spending. Among the mechanisms introduced after 1976 was the 'cash limit' system of central grants - fixed to an assumed rate of inflation rather than indexed - which restricted current spending by local authorities. By under-estimating the rate of inflation spending was invariably curtailed. As a result,

*" From its peak in 1975, local government spending started to decline as a percentage of GNP - from 17.17 percent in 1975 to 14.6 percent in 1979 - thus reversing the trend of the past 100 years and more." ( 11)*

The strategy of incorporation identified by Rhodes during the 1973-1979 period can therefore be seen to involve the central state gaining the co-operation of representatives of the Local state in the policing of public expenditure, particularly collective consumption expenditure. Amongst other things, this necessitated the breaking down of the distinction between specific interest groups - 'policy communities' - and more generalist interests (*cf. the relationship between education and training*) i.e. a deliberate attempt to wrest power from professional interest groups, including teachers. In relation to NAFE provision, it was the role of the MSC which was to parallel that of the 'national community of local government' organisations in acting as an intermediary between the central and Local states.

There are a number of factors which account for the ability of the MSC to 'incorporate' the local authorities during this period. Firstly, as indicated earlier, there can be little doubt that vocational education and training were in crisis, especially as a result of the demise of craft apprenticeship training. Some colleges were desperate for work which the LEAs could and/or would not provide. Secondly, the priority accorded this area by the DES was low. Therefore there was little new money coming into NAFE. This is reflected in the fact that vocational education and training were still attributed an ambiguous statutory status which, in itself, further contributed to the legitimisation of inaction on the part of both central and local government. Thirdly, the onset of mass youth unemployment after 1976 can be seen to have acted as a catalyst in relation to the demand that administrative responsibility for provision in this area be resolved. That is, general unemployment was accorded a 'national' problem status and, as a result, the local authorities had been slow to respond to youth unemployment. Therefore policy measures relating to youth unemployment, such as YOP, were deemed to fall outside their orbit. Fourthly, the nature of the MSC's constitution and, in particular its mono-functional nature, meant that it was seen as both able and willing to act quickly and unencumbered by the traditional constraints involved in central-local relations. As a result it came to be seen as an organisation which could 'get things done' (cf. *the DES*). According to Brooksbank and Ackstine (1984), the MSC's modus operandi had a profound affect on central-local relations:

*"The alien nature of MSC was emphasised from the start by its readiness to develop new local organisations and structures to deliver different programmes. Except in the earliest years MSC have employed local arrangements with boundaries coterminous with those of LEAs but they have avoided local organisations with one-to-one relationships with LEAs. Whatever the reason it has added to LEA uncertainty and emphasised an element of competitiveness."(12)*

Therefore it is not difficult to see why the MSC chose to operate in this manner. Above all else, this ensured its control over policy and provision. This became apparent with the MSC's first major intervention in NAFE, YOP.

YOP was visibly a product of the corporatist era - it bears all the hallmarks of political compromise and *statism*. That is, the institutional location of vocational preparation provision was to be with the MSC. This meant that centralised bargaining took little or no account of local needs or

accountability, with the result that agreements were often seen as being imposed by the state. This signalled the fact that the original concept of vocational preparation, as a form of collective consumption under the management of the local authorities, was compromised on the altar of political expediency. Not least the Government appears to have succumbed to pressure from the TUC to implement 'immediate action programmes', using 'earmarked' funds ie. expenditure which was prevented from coming under the aegis of the local authorities who, under the existing Rate Support Grant system, could determine its allocation. In other words, the TUC, including representatives of NATFHE, were in favour of preventing any additional state expenditure on vocational preparation becoming a form of collective consumption (*see below*).

In the mid-1970s, the role of the TUC in preparing the ground for the MSC's intervention into special measures for the young unemployed was crucial. Whilst not directly concerned with the actual content of the schemes or programmes, other than in ensuring that they did not trespass upon traditional craft training, the TUC was able to exert an influence upon the Labour government in respect of measures to help the young unemployed due to its 'special relationship' with the Administration (Gregory and Noble 1982). The result of this pressure was the establishment, in 1976, of the Holland Working Party. It was this Working Party which produced the MSC's first major initiative in the area of NAFE policy and provision, YOP. Apart from representing a crucial landmark in the development of the MSC, YOP is often seen as vocational preparation. This view is not supported by the evidence. If anything, YOP can be seen to depart considerably from the principles of vocational preparation, if not the rhetoric, to the extent of undermining it as a strategy of reproduction designed to extend the educational franchise.

### 7.iii *The Holland Report (1977)*

The full title of the Holland Report was '*Young People and Work: Report on the feasibility of a new programme of opportunities for unemployed young people*'. This clearly signifies the fact that this report was addressed specifically to the problem of youth unemployment. It is important to make this

point because it indicates the fact that, at this stage, the MSC had little or no choice but to deal with this immediate 'problem' group rather than the 16-19 age-group as a whole. In other words, the objectives of Holland appear to have been strictly limited and, as such, it represents a departure from the intentions of *Vocational Preparation*. Holland can in fact be shown to have been a very pragmatic response to a pressing *political* problem.

Holland was specifically concerned to improve the 'employability' of the young unemployed. This is evident in its adoption of a perspective on the problem of youth unemployment which, whilst recognising the causes as extraneous to the individual unemployed young person, nevertheless saw the solution in terms of the individual's qualities, character and attitudes. In terms of explaining the nature of youth unemployment, the report also adopted an uncommitted stance. That is, it neither rejected or accepted the idea that youth unemployment was 'structural':

*" We conclude that the problem of youth unemployment is serious and has been worsening; that it is difficult to say how far the problem is genuinely structural and whether it would disappear as a national, as opposed to a localised problem, if unemployment were generally to fall rapidly..." (13)*

There is little evidence in the report to justify this conclusion. Indeed, most, if not all, the evidence, suggested that mass youth unemployment was here to stay, at least for the foreseeable future. A Youthaid report published some two months after Holland is an illuminating contrast in terms of defining the type of youth unemployment at that time:

*" Youth unemployment is not merely a temporary cyclical phenomenon; its causes are more fundamental ...Youth unemployment is largely a structural problem - there is a long-term decline in demand for young workers." (14)*

A year earlier, NATFHE, in its Discussion Paper *'The Education, Training and Employment of the 16-19 Age-Group'*, had also stated categorically that there was a 'problem of structural unemployment among young people' (NATFHE, 1977). How then can the MSC's reluctance to recognise the structural nature of youth unemployment be explained?

If it was the case that the MSC was intent on building itself an empire, of establishing itself as a permanent feature in policy and provision for the

16-19 age-group, surely it would have staked its claim via finding for the structural nature of the problem of youth unemployment? If, as many critics have charged, the MSC was seeking to bring about a fundamental shift in the nature of the labour market, why did it seek to provide a short-term perspective to the problem of youth unemployment? One answer given by Raffaele (1984) is that the MSC took the view that an upturn in the economy as a whole would provide the longer-term answer to youth unemployment. However, in relation to this, it might also be surmised that it was *politically* inexpedient to admit to a long-term problem of youth unemployment because it might appear that the Government was not in command of the situation. Therefore the MSC's project at this stage appears to have been to redefine the problem of youth unemployment into one more amenable to interventionist policies. Thus one can concur with Finn (1984) that the MSC was charged with creating a 'politically useful mythology' with regard to the problem of youth unemployment by redefining it as a problem of 'employability' rather than 'lack of opportunity'. The MSC can therefore be seen as attempting to bring about a consensus on the problem of youth unemployment.

Rees and Atkinson (1982) also see the MSC as having to mobilise, at this stage, '*goodwill and co-operation*' in order to achieve its objective (pp.1-2). In this sense it would be correct to say that this was the MSC's hegemonic project. However, unlike Finn's conception, I do not see this as part of a conscious or coherent *strategy* (in the sense of a strategy of reproduction) being undertaken by the MSC. In fact, the strategic elements of the MSC's role can be seen as an *unintended result* of this short-term political project. That is, the very fact that the MSC was seen to be 'doing something' spurred the *normalisation* of some form of intervention as an answer not only to the problem of youth unemployment but also to the problem of the vocational preparation target population - the unqualified, untrained *and* unemployed school-leavers - as a whole. This normalisation was later to make it possible for the new vocationalism to become an acceptable form of intervention - a new strategy of reproduction. In particular, it was to legitimate interventions which were based on changing the nature of the young unemployed rather than their situation. The unintentional nature of this outcome accords with Rhodes' (1984) notion that the many of the measures taken in central-local government relations during this period had such effects. That the more comprehensive

objective came *after* the initial political involvement of the MSC can be seen in both the nature of the programme the MSC introduced - YOP - and its prioritisation of quantitative rather than qualitative objectives.

#### 7.iv NATFHE and Vocational Preparation - political mobilisation

By 1977, NATFHE's position on the type of educational provision required for the 16-19 year old age group can be described as falling squarely within the 'social democratic repertoire', with its twin themes of 'equity' and 'efficiency'. However, one can also detect an uneasy tension between these themes, especially in the Association's important Discussion Paper '*The Education, Training and Employment of the 16-19 Age Group*' (NATFHE 1977). This Paper laid out in concise terms the situation confronting young people in relation to education, training and employment. It also suggested some 'courses of action' which needed to be taken to help alleviate the problems facing young school-leavers, one of which was the introduction of vocational preparation. For this reason it is useful to compare this document with the MSC's Holland Report.

The title of the NATFHE Paper gives the impression of an all-encompassing view being taken of the problems facing the the 16-19 age-group as a whole. However, in keeping with the discourse on vocational preparation, the Paper is almost exclusively concerned with measures for the young unemployed. In this respect is unexceptional: many of the major NATFHE statements on vocational preparation lay claim to comprehensiveness but turn out to be particularistic i.e. concerned, in effect, only with the young unemployed. Presaging Holland, the Discussion Paper had called for a 'rationalisation' of the existing provisions for the young unemployed. In order to facilitate this, an immediate administrative solution was advanced:

*" The fragmentation of departmental responsibilities for training and education at government level has been a contributory cause [ of the 'meagre and piecemeal' responses to youth unemployment] and has prevented an effective and single-minded attack on the problem ...there is a clear need to find some means of much closer co-operation between education and training agencies. The Association has proposed the establishment of a Department of Education, Science and Training as a means of achieving this objective." (15)*

There is nothing new in this proposal. At NATFHE's 1976 annual Conference, the following resolution was passed *without discussion*:

*" Conference urges HM Government to eliminate the duplication of provision and control involved in the separate establishment of the TSA to create a Department of Education, Science and Training." (16)*

According to the author of the Paper, John Baillie (*see below*), it was the absence of a coherent, co-ordinated framework of provision which was partly responsible for the inequalities of post-school provision. It should be noted here that administrative rationalisation, no matter how justified, was very much the theme of the moment in many spheres of government eg. the introduction of 'corporate' management structures into the local government of education (Jennings 1979). Therefore NATFHE cannot be considered unusual in this respect. What is important to note however is that NATFHE, unlike the MSC in its *Vocational Preparation* in 1975, recognised the need to address the problem of the administration and control of any new provision.

In relation to educational inequality in general, the NATFHE document recognised that inequality stemmed not only from unequal access to educational provision but also from 'social, environmental and personal disadvantages, often associated with the family's economic, educational, linguistic or ethnic background'. However, the Paper offered no suggestions as to how these inequalities might be alleviated. This might be taken as evidence of the general belief that 'education can make a difference' ie. the notion that inequalities can be reduced by ensuring 'equality of opportunity' - extending the educational franchise. As such, the Paper went on to suggest some changes which might be introduced, most notably the introduction of vocational preparation. Before going on to discuss this, it is important that the rationale behind the proposals be examined because it is here we find the convergence with Holland. The following extract from the Paper summarises the 'philosophy' behind

NATFHE's recommendations:

*" ...for our common future the most vital aspect of the transition from childhood to adulthood is acquiring a vocational role. This is not to be equated simply with finding a job, important as that is at the appropriate time; it involves developing an understanding of the way in which the complex occupational structure of a modern economy can provide an acceptable and constructive environment for the individual worker, as well as a satisfactory and acceptable product or service for society...The most important gift society can give its young people as they acquire adult status is the sense of self-respect which stems from a consciousness that they have the capacity to cope with adult responsibilities. Beyond this, however, society has a duty both to itself and to its newly adult citizens to encourage them as participants in community life, local and national, to be aware of our collective responsibility for the physical, economic and cultural environment in which we live and work ..(17)*

Whilst the terminology of this Paper can be described as 'humanistic', its tendency to conflate the needs of the economy, the nation and employers with those of the individual is similar to that found in both the Holland Report and the FEU's *A Basis for Choice* (1979). It is the 'corporatist' language of the so-called 'Great Debate'. The sentiments of the NATFHE Paper parallel those of Callaghan's Ruskin Speech almost exactly:

*" The goals of our education, from nursery school through to adult education, are clear enough. They are to equip children to the best of their ability for a lively, constructive place in society and also to fit them to do a job of work. Not one or the other, but both..." (18)*

Therefore it is no surprise to find that NATFHE had greeted Callaghan's speech with the following matter-of-factness, ' As was to be expected, the Prime Minister in his speech on education at Ruskin said very little to which anyone could take exception..' ( N.J., No.8, Nov. 1976). This, in itself, indicates that NATFHE, far from adopting the discourse on vocational preparation as an imposition, was very much involved in its constitution.

NATFHE's leading role in the conception of vocational preparation is nowhere more evident than in what is definitely the most important statement contained in the whole Discussion Paper:

*" The important differences between training and education have been in scale and degree rather than in kind: longer-term vocational returns will usually be obtained from the more extensive experience provided by educational rather than training courses as currently understood." (19)*

This statement would appear to be innocuous, especially since it reaffirms the primacy of 'education' over training. By arguing that education and training are different only in 'scale and degree' amounts, however, to an argument that education is also about work and employment. Therefore what is important about this statement is the fact that it gave the 'green light' to the provision of courses which dispelled or broke the distinction that they were *either* education or training. In other words, an altogether new type of provision was deemed appropriate.

The author of the NATFHE Discussion Paper recalled that he was well aware of the importance for NATFHE, as union, of that particular statement:

*"..though it was an odd little sentence, not apparently meaning very much, it was actually a hinge in the evolution of thought within NATFHE." (20)*

The consequences were also apparent:

*"...we have systematically questioned that particular distinction [between education and training] and we have been willing to accept that we are in the business of training. Now, if you go into the business of training then, quite clearly, you are in an area which you cannot define as a monopoly provision of yours. And one of the advantages, from the point of view of a profession - in the narrow sense something which wants to hold things rigidly to itself - is that the old definition of education would allow you to do that." (21)*

This supports the view that, in arriving at a new type of provision, NATFHE was willing to concede its claims to a 'professional' monopoly over 'education' in an effort to compete in the marketplace - the *'business of training'*. If this was the case, then the discourse on vocational preparation can be seen as having had a profound influence on both the union's activities and philosophy.

Although the above comment seems to support the notion that the occupational strategy of 'professionalism', laying claim to a particular expertise or monopoly of skill, was forsaken by NATFHE in the mid 1970s, this does not mean to say, however, that the *'professionality'* of FE teachers was forsaken

(Hoyle 1980). That is, the occupational strategy may have been abandoned but the principles of professionalism remained intact. Whilst there were undoubtedly many underlying motives for the abandonment of this occupational strategy, the 'rise' of the MSC can be seen as having acted as a catalyst. This is made clear by the NATFHE leadership's recognition of the fact that it was now faced with operating within a 'competitive' environment:

*" ...though the creation of the MSC and its related Employment and Training Services Agencies has meant new opportunities for co-ordinating training and manpower planning, it has introduced a substantial competitive element as far as educational services are concerned." (22)*

The question which therefore arises is, did the NATFHE leadership choose this particular moment to conflate the notions of education and training, change its 'educational' ideology, knowing full well the implications for its claims to 'professionalism' ie. its occupational strategy? Or did the advent of vocational preparation and the 'rise' of the MSC impel its decision? The evidence suggests that the NATFHE leadership was proactive in the construction of its new logic of collective action and that this accounts for the eventual transformation of the dominant educational ideology of the Association away from an 'educationalist' ideology towards one of 'vocationalism'.

Historically, technical teachers have always been held in low esteem within the 'world of education' because of their ambiguous status:

*' Technical teachers always had a very difficult role to play in the educational world; being suspected on the one hand by organised workers' associations as being merely the instruments " for training better profit-earning machines" and on the other hand furtively ( and sometimes openly) sneered at by the " highbrow " academician as "the purveyor of soiled goods ". (23)*

According to Turner (1979,1988) two distinct occupational strategies have been open to technical teachers. Either, they seek to enhance their status by adopting a strategy of 'professionalism' and thereby attempt to emulate the standing of their schoolteaching colleagues - an essential aspect of this strategy was the maintenance of the distinction between 'education' and 'training'. Or, do they seek to improve their position by collective bargaining and trade union organisation. Turner's history of the collective organisation of technical teachers throughout this century, is one in which the 'trade unionist'

occupational strategy has come to dominate, but not completely supersede, the 'professional association' strategy as a means of achieving collective goals. Turner found that this process had reached a mature stage within the ATTI (NATFHE's predecessor) and she describes the union as having become a 'professional trade union' by 1976 (*the year is of course significant, in the light of Baillie's comment, since it is the year NATFHE came into being and the advent of vocational preparation*). Some measure of this movement may be gauged from the fact that the ATTI was the first teachers' organisation to affiliate to the TUC (1967) and that NATFHE, at its first annual Conference in 1976, unanimously passed a resolution seeking affiliation. The growth of this trade union consciousness coincided with the growth of general education in FE and an 'educationalist' ideology dominating NATFHE's policies. Thus, equality of opportunity and an emphasis on access to FE, its 'comprehensivisation', were being called for in this period.

The decline in demand for the traditional craft student had been compensated for, to some extent, by this influx of the more 'academic' student (usually following 'O' and 'A' Level courses)[ see *Binary FE, Appendix 2*]. NATFHE's membership reflected this move and, as such, more than ever could be said to have straddled the 'great divide' between technical and academic subjects. However, after 1975 neither the academic or the technical subject areas were growing as fast as the measures being taken to help the young unemployed. The nature of these courses, and in particular their new pedagogies, were considered by both management and teachers alike as unsuited to the skills of the traditional FE teacher (Flower Report 1981, FEU 1981). In fact, given the system of relating Lecturers' pay and conditions to the grading of courses, there was a natural disinclination by FE teachers to get involved in the 'low-level' work of vocational preparation. On the other hand, the fact that this was a fast growing area of provision, with new posts (members), meant that, collectively, in the shape of NATFHE, FE teachers could not simply 'put their head in the sand'. As such there are contradictory forces at work on FE teachers. On an individual, 'professional' level, the new FE was largely something to avoid, whilst on a collective, trade union basis, it represented a growth area.

The conflation of education and training in the mid 1970s has therefore to be taken to signal more than than a philosophical or educational turn in the evolution of the collective organisation of FE teachers. It can be interpreted as part of a more general move to adopt an effective occupational strategy, in so far as it was preparing the ground for NATFHE's attempt to monopolise the growing post-school public sector as an area of recruitment. This must therefore be seen as the culmination of a very long process of forging a 'collective trade union' identity for FE teachers: one which can be seen to correspond to the Stage I in Offe's (1985) process of adopting a 'strategy of opportunism' (see *Chapter Four*).

The growth potential of vocational preparation meant that NATFHE, if it was to continue to attract membership and assert itself as a 'partner' in policy-making, had to be seen to be the representative of all interests within the post-school sector. However, by adopting a narrowly educationalist ideology it would have left itself open to a charge of elitism. The imperatives of the trade unionist strategy were such that growth and a 'voice' were considered synonymous. In Offe's terms, NATFHE can be seen as in the process of cultivating a '*willingness to act*' as a trade union : Stage II of the process of developing the strategy of opportunism. This entailed not only embracing the vocational preparation discourse but actually being seen to develop it, which meant that the distinction between education and training became both no longer tenable or even desirable.

Whilst there is obviously a definite relation between the moves towards the conflation of education and training and NATFHE's abandonment of 'professional' claims to the field of vocational education, it is not being suggested here that this is a causal relationship. As Turner's history of the ATTI shows, the transition from a dominant occupational strategy of professionalism to one of trade unionism had been in train long before this reconceptualisation of the relationship between education and training. What we see however with the introduction of vocational preparation is an attempt within the leadership of NATFHE to articulate 'trade unionism' with this new vocationalist ideology (see *section 7.v*).

How did this conflation of education and training reflect itself in NATFHE's proposals for the 16s-19s? As already indicated, whilst the 1977 Discussion Paper purported to deal with the age-group as a whole, its recommendations were confined mainly to the needs of the young unemployed. In this respect NATFHE was following the TUC's invocation to 'do something'. More than this, NATFHE advocated a new type of provision for this group:

*" The Association believes that colleges, in co-operation with local authorities, community organisations, and employers, should consciously establish courses which are not of the conventional or academic pattern but are acceptable and appropriate to young people, who, for whatever reason, are of limited previous attainment. " (24)*

In effect, this represents the beginning of MSC's version of vocational preparation being 'talked' within NATFHE. Despite the call for equality of opportunity within the very same document, this marks a decisive move away from previous policies aimed at equalising access to FE. In its own terms, it is a move towards a policy of positive discrimination i.e. it explicitly called for '*compensatory education*': ' Among its many other functions, a comprehensive further education service must assume a compensatory role ' (ibid). The fact that the FE Service was not then, and perhaps could never be, a comprehensive service, given that its organisation is predicated largely on the vagaries of the labour market, this call for compensatory education could only act to reinforce the tendency to *individualise* the problems faced by the young unemployed. This is due to the fact that the whole notion of 'compensation' is one which forestalls any examination of the causes of youth unemployment other than those which relate to the individual.

Here then we have the clearest example of the convergence within the discourse on vocational preparation between the Holland Report (1977) and NATFHE. The dominant conception of youth unemployment as shown in Holland and in the NATFHE Discussion Paper, was one which defined the young unemployed as being responsible for their own situation and, as a result, in need of *compensatory* education and training. Essentially, this view served to *individualise* and *normalise* the problem of youth unemployment as one amenable to specific interventions. This example of the perception of youth unemployment within vocational preparation discourse also serves to illustrate how ' the parts of a structure of cognitions evoke, reinforce, and transform into each

other ' (Edelman 1977). To paraphrase Edelman's own example of the perception of poverty as a social problem, the definition of the young unemployed as responsible for their own condition acts to displace any relationship being established between the nature of the structures of society i.e. economic and political institutions, and the problem of youth unemployment. More importantly, it legitimises the 'special measures' which are deemed necessary to deal with the capacities and attitudes of the young unemployed. In this way, three separate but related elements are brought together: (1) the inadequacy of the young unemployed person in terms of capacities and attitudes,(2) the efficacy of state intervention, and (3) the belief that the basic structures of the economy and polity are sound and are not responsible for the problem of youth unemployment. In vocational preparation discourse what ones sees is that these three parts of the 'structure of cognition' of youth unemployment are mutually reinforcing, to the extent that a reference to one element invokes the structure as a whole. For this reason the TUC's and NATFHE's invocation to 'do something' about youth unemployment, taken as it was *within* this discourse, almost inevitably acted to individualise and normalise the problem.

This particular cognitive structure can also be seen to act in much the same way as Edelman's own example of structure of cognition in relation to poverty i.e. it,

*"...justifies the status, power, and roles of the middle class, public officials, and helping professionals, and provides an acceptable reason to maintain inequalities, though it does so ambivalently." (25)*

This ambivalence comes through most obviously in the notion of '*helping*' the young unemployed, which has been so prominent within vocational preparation. This is closely tied to the compensatory nature of the programmes offered and, in particular, the 'diagnostic' and counselling roles which are so central to their project. Furthermore, a 'technicisation' of the terminology of training helped fuel a renewed process of 'professionalisation' (this has an important bearing on Stage III in the process of adopting the strategy of opportunism). As a result, the '*helping*' professions, including teachers, can be seen as seeking to extend their authority by defining more and more people as falling within their orbit. This is later evidenced by the extension of vocational preparation in the form of YOP, relating primarily to the young unemployed, to

the new vocationalism and its concern with 'the whole age group'. However, this extension of the 'population' often means, in practice, an extension to *all* the working class or, as in the case of the new vocationalism, all working class adolescents. As Edelman cogently remarks, ' the ambiguity of "helping" is apparent when we examine the contrasting ways in which society "helps" elites and non-elites ' (ibid,p.73).

NATFHE's Discussion Paper placed considerable emphasis upon the personal needs of the young. However, it did so in such a way as to map out a particular role for 'adults' (i.e. teachers):

*" Many other aspects of adult life command the attention of young people in their later teens. Enjoying leisure time is nearly as important for most, and although peer group influence outweighs that of the adult community in this field, there is evidence that many young people (especially boys) hope for adult help in using their spare time...Relationships with the opposite sex, preparation for marriage and new roles in family life, present and future, together constitute a major concern for young people of both sexes, and the development of a more open as well as a more frank society has tended to narrow the 'generation gap' to the extent that adult help can be more willingly sought and accepted." (26)[emphasis added]*

Apart from the apocryphal tone of this passage, there is quaintness about it which I am sure many young people would find quite embarrassing, not to mention their teachers. What the Paper appears to be seeking in this respect is a place for what has since become known as 'Social and Life Skills' (SLS). However, this Paper went beyond simply reciting the basic framework necessary for future vocational preparation courses. It also called specifically for a new type of provision which encompassed what has come to be a hallmark of the new FE, the concept of 'transferable skills':

*" Vocational preparation should tend towards the general rather than the specific, both to allow for the approximate nature of manpower planning, and to provide for the likelihood of changes of occupation in later life." (27)*

Given the centrality of the concept of 'transferable skills' to vocational preparation discourse, the fact that NATFHE was ahead of Holland in this recommendation is an important indication that the union's role was not peripheral to the constitution of the discourse as a whole. As shown, NATFHE

can be seen to lead the field in many aspects of the thinking around the 'new FE'. The author of the Discussion Paper, when interviewed, had no doubt about this:

*"NATFHE made the running. People have picked the ball up and gone in directions which NATFHE would not have wished, but the ball is the ball that NATFHE identified." (28)*

One could argue from this examination of the 1977 Discussion Paper that NATFHE's call for compensatory programmes was only to be expected given that it was in their own interests to explain youth unemployment as a problem of 'employability'. In short, it provided NATFHE members with jobs. Similarly, the urge to 'do something' can be seen to override any considerations of the comprehensiveness of the proposed provision (or rather, the *lack* of it) and the increased centralisation which 'immediate action programmes' involved. In effect this call acted to sustain inequalities already existing within the education and training system as a whole, albeit 'ambivalently'. Conversely, an 'opposition' within NATFHE also came into existence i.e. a view which suggested that the young unemployed were products of the 'system'. This view, paradoxically, also served to justify existing inequalities in so far as it called for a defence of the status quo (*see below*). Thus, both the opposition's view and the 'official' response within NATFHE can be taken as examples of what Edelman calls 'stock' explanations. This is because they perform a very specific function in political debate in so far as they make '...possible a wide spectrum of ambivalent postures for each individual and a similarly large set of contradictions in political rhetoric' (1977,p.7). As a result, according to Edelman, opposing positions act as boundary-markers within which a whole range of possibilities are made available.

Overall, the debate on vocational preparation within NATFHE will be shown to have resulted in a convergence in the effects of the 'structure of cognition' relating to youth unemployment i.e. the maintenance of existing inequalities through either 'special measures' or defending the status quo and, as a result, the negation of any effective opposition. That is, NATFHE was entering upon a course of reasoning which inevitably led to situating the problem of youth unemployment within the young people themselves and, by inference, the failure of their previous educational experience to prepare them

to compete in the job market. It also helped create a space for the normalisation of the problem of youth unemployment as one amenable to special measures such as YOP. Furthermore, and perhaps more important for the union leadership, this space opened up a future role - an opportunity - for the 'professionals'. This can be illustrated by looking at the 'political' responses within the union to the rise of the MSC, vocational preparation and YOP.

#### 7.v *The Debate Within NATFHE*

It is important at this point to keep in mind the overall political context within which NATFHE's response to the growing problem of youth unemployment was taking place. In particular, the whole manner of the 'delivery' of the Government measures, and especially the question of funding, can be seen as impinging upon the established relationship between central and local government. NATFHE was not ignorant of the importance of this and its centrality to the debate within the union can be gauged from the fact that the editorial in the very first NATFHE Journal ( No.1 Feb.1976) was entitled '*The Rate Support Grant, Public Expenditure ...and You*'.

By 1976, the creation of the MSC and the activities of the TSA were already causing anxiety in some quarters in terms of their disturbance of the relationship between central and local government. In particular, the Training Opportunities Scheme (TOPS) was held responsible for the corruption of existing funding arrangements between the DES and the Local Education Authorities (LEAs) and the LEAs and the Colleges. With TOPS the LEAs negotiated through their Association for fees which were to be paid *directly* by the MSC to colleges for 'agency' work. It is interesting to note here how the importance of the Associations of the local authorities in this corresponds to Rhodes' (1984) view of their increasing importance during the era of 'incorporation' (see *section 7ii above*). As suggested earlier, the relationship between the growth of the TSA-sponsored work within colleges and youth unemployment measures meant that the LEAs could afford to sit back and leave provision to central government (the MSC). That is, youth unemployment was deemed a *national*

problem and provision was considered outside the remit and statutory responsibilities of the LEAs. Added to which, the LEAs' ability to actively intervene in this type of provision was felt to be strictly curtailed by the administration of the Rate Support Grant (RSG). NATFHE was not slow in recognising the predicament facing many, if not all, LEAs.

Realising that the LEAs found it extremely difficult to respond to the severity of the problem of youth unemployment, and, more important perhaps, seeing an opportunity to harness new funds to FE provision at a time when other sources were constrained or shrinking, NATFHE called for amendments in the RSG arrangements:

*" The Association believes that provided wider consultation or negotiations take place in the determination of the RSG, some arrangements by means of 'earmarked' grants for particular areas of local authority expenditure would be desirable." (29)*

There is no question here of considering the issues of local accountability or the quality of the intended provision. The emphasis is almost entirely on securing sufficient funds to compensate for the shortfall occasioned by the 'cuts'. Such calls were very much the parlance of the era. For example, the General Secretary of the TUC, as late as 1979, was reported as saying:

*" The Rate Support Grant - so vigorously defended in the name of local freedom - is, in practice, often the best weapon available to those who want to minimise educational provision and delay educational advance...As for the financing of the new programmes, it is the TUC's general approach that the Government should make more extensive use of specific grants, through the Manpower Services Commission, Industry Training Boards, and directly to Local Education Authorities and local providers." (30)*

There can be little doubt that it was the inactivity of local authorities, coupled with NATFHE's desire to have a 'seat at the table', which provided the impetus for these calls for greater centralisation of policy and provision. That NATFHE, amongst others, was prepared to forsake local accountability for this 'voice' may be seen as testament to its newly found 'maturity' as an organisation with a collective, trade union identity. Eventually however, by moving away from 'local' representation to a more national profile, NATFHE can be seen as preparing the ground for a move towards Stage III in the

process of adopting a '*strategy of opportunism*'. That is, a move away from a dialogical pattern of collective action - essentially a trade union strategy - to a monological pattern and a return to an occupational strategy of 'professionalism'. Thus the calls for greater central control of NAFE policy and provision signal both the zenith of NATFHE's trade union strategy and the beginning of a renewed 'professionalism' which, in turn, is reflected in the move away from the original conception of vocational preparation as a form of collective consumption to an acceptance of YOP as a form of social 'expenses'.

One can gauge the reception within NATFHE of the important Discussion Paper on 16-19s by looking at the union's 1977 Annual Conference resolution relating to youth unemployment measures. Although this resolution was passed before the Paper had been discussed at National Council (due to take place in July of that year), it had been circulated to Branches and one can see an accord between the Paper's intent and that of the Conference resolution. Given the fact that the resolution was put by the National Executive Committee (NEC), this is hardly surprising. Part of the resolution read as follows:

*'Conference calls upon the Government to develop, as a matter of urgency, a large-scale suitably funded, co-ordinated and integrated programme of education, training, work experience and job creation projects compatible with the individual, social and economic needs of the young unemployed, aimed at involving the vast majority of all unemployed youth.*

*Conference therefore welcomes the approach of the Holland Report as a basis for such a programme and instructs the National Executive Committee to initiate urgent discussions with the Government and local authorities, and to continue discussions with the TUC.*

*Conference further reiterates its resolution No 5 of 1976 for a unified Department of Education, Science and Training and considers that the immediate action programme should be the responsibility of the DES, thus preventing the threat of erosion of conditions of service of teachers in Further Education and the unnecessary establishment of centres outside DES control. Conference in addition calls upon the Government to make available through the DES sufficient public funds to allow for the proper expansion in the FE sector for the provision of such courses.'*

There are a number of important factors to note with regard to this

resolution. Firstly, it only concerns the young unemployed. Secondly, it endorses the 'Holland approach', albeit with the proviso that any programme arising from that Report should be 'suitably funded'. Thirdly, it reiterates the administrative solution to the problem of provision and policy by advocating the combined Department of Education, Science and Training. It also states that '... the immediate action programme should be the responsibility of the DES.' What is particularly noteworthy about this is that it goes totally against the sentiments expressed only a year earlier in NATFHE's submission to the House of Commons Expenditure Committee: 'To sum up, the Association is not in favour of greater central control by the DES' (N.J. No.2, March 1976, p.31) [emphasis added]. (This is itself evidence of the change to the strategy of opportunism). No mention is made in this resolution of the problem of 'centralisation' such control would entail. Fourthly, and closely related to the previous point, the resolution explicitly recognised that the MSC was becoming an 'alternative centre of control' and that this posed a threat to existing conditions of service. Finally, the resolution re-emphasised NATFHE's desire to have a 'seat at the table' when it came to decision-making, and its advocacy of 'tripartitism' and the efficacy of state intervention.

All the above points correspond to the dimensions Offe (1985) associates with the adoption of a strategy of opportunism. Substantively, there is an inversion of the means-end relationship with respect to the organisation's objectives. Part of NATFHE's constitution states that it is one of the Association's aims to:

*"...advance further and higher education generally and professional and vocational training in particular and to promote research into educational development..."(NATFHE Constitution)*

Yet, the 1977 resolution on youth unemployment forsakes any concern with the actual content of the measures being proposed and focusses entirely on the means. Not only has the orientation to the 'client' disappeared but the welfare of its own members is seen as paramount. In the temporal dimension, it is not concerned or aware of the long-term effects of embracing the types of provision being proposed within the Holland Report. It is only concerned with the immediate, short-term benefits. Finally, in the 'social' dimension, the quest for representation - a 'seat at the table' - overrides any 'cognisance of those

with whom the organisation is in conflict'. Overall, this resolution contains elements of both 'trade unionism' and professionalism' which are inherently contradictory. No more so than the negation of an oppositional stance towards the employers, yet a concern for the conditions of the members.

This 1977 Conference resolution can also be seen as laying the ground rules for the debate on vocational preparation within NATFHE. In this instance, the Left opposition (to the leadership) attacked the resolution for being too favourable to the underlying philosophy of the MSC's proposals i.e. 'subservience to the narrow needs of the employer and disregard for educational standards or actual content of training'. A trade union stance, with an 'educationalist' voice. According to the NATFHE Journal, in the debate on the resolution, a spokesperson for the opposition, Fawzi Ibrahim 'thought work experience schemes offered employers a six-month chance to sort out possible employees - something even the slavery system had not afforded' (p.5). As indicated above, the irony of this form of opposition was that it required a defence of the status quo. Thus Ibrahim is reported as saying,

*" We have a responsibility not to allow the system to be undermined or dismantled by the concept of the Manpower Services Commission." (31)*

Ibrahim went on to argue that the Holland proposals, indeed, the MSC as a whole, represented a distinct and real threat to the 'high standards of education in skills within the FE/HE sector'. He was therefore forced to defend the system and in particular the 'skills' which it imparted. The inequalities which this system helped reproduce are not therefore contested in what is tantamount an appeal to the membership's professional-educationalist ideology. The opposition's amendment to the resolution was defeated.

In answer to the opposition, the Executive called for 'realism' and 'getting on with it'. The amendment to the resolution was considered 'unconstructive'. Jack Mansell, a leading figure in the union and later Chief Officer of the Further Education Unit (FEU), replied for the Executive:

*'...saying that the amendment removed anything positive from the motion and failed to recognise that the TSA and Holland proposals would pump resources for education and training - however primitive - into that sector of young people who have so far been neglected by the somewhat elitist schemes of the industrial training boards - schemes which the mover and seconder so staunchly defended. " The amendment seeks to reduce the motion to a destructive resolution and asks the FE and HE Service to stand on one side wringing its hands, waiting for the revolution" he concluded.'* (32)

This type of response, berating those who opposed the MSC's intervention for having no 'alternative', and arguing that the Holland approach was a move towards the comprehensivisation of FE, was to be a common feature of all future debates.

As stated earlier, the 1977 Conference debate laid the ground rules for future debates within NATFHE on the whole area of the 'new FE'. It did this in a number of respects. Firstly, the argument that 'something had to be done' was accepted. In particular, the notion that the young unemployed were disadvantaged and in need of special help was established. This is signalled by the welcome given to the Holland Report. Thus the question of more radical and comprehensive reform - the original conception of vocational preparation - was, in effect if not in rhetoric, put aside in favour of 'immediate action programmes'. Again, this only served to normalise and individualise the problem of youth unemployment. Secondly, there was no real attempt to debate the causes and consequences of youth unemployment, especially the role of employers and their failure to train young people. Thirdly, the belief in the efficacy of state intervention was underlined and, as a result, administrative solutions were propounded. Coupled with this was a constant call for an active NATFHE involvement or representation on these bureaucratic bodies. Fourthly, accusations of 'negativism' and 'elitism' were aimed at those who opposed the MSC's role and interventions. The MSC was seen as 'doing something' - no matter how *primitive* - which was more than others were doing. Opponents of the MSC's work were therefore easily branded as 'misguided' or 'political'. Fifth, there was little or no real thought given to the question of what it was these young people were to be trained for. An implicit assumption was that the future was going to be more 'technological' and that, correspondingly, these young people needed to have more 'skills', albeit of a 'generic' character. Very little serious debate was to be centred around this issue within NATFHE. Sixth,

the implications for the actual labour process of teaching of these programmes was seldom, if ever, debated.

What one can see therefore is that the 'rise' of the MSC had an immediate and divisive effect in terms of the political response to vocational preparation. In general, it found favour with the Right within NATFHE and served to underline their dominance within the union. Hence their embrace of YOP (*see below*). As for the opposition, it served only to emphasize their lack of an 'alternative' which, in turn, found them defending the status quo. In effect, the once trade-union/educationalists had become the professional/educationalists, in opposition to the once professional/vocationalist leadership who were now the trade-union/vocationalists. A somewhat uncomfortable transformation in the relationship between occupational and educational ideologies had occurred.

## Notes and References - Chapter Seven

1. MSC (1975) p.1
2. *ibid* p.19
3. *ibid* p.12
4. *ibid*
5. *ibid* p.20
6. *ibid* p.15
7. Rhodes (1984) p.262
8. *ibid*
9. Brooksbank & Ackstine (1984) pp.307-8
10. Farley (1985) p.77
11. Newton & Karran (1985) pp.115-6
12. Brooksbank & Ackstine *op cit* p.319
13. MSC (Holland) (1977) p.8
14. Youthaid (1977) p.40
15. NATFHE (1977) pp.9-10
16. NJ. June/July 1976 No.5
17. Natfhe *op cit*
18. James Callaghan, from Times Educational Supplement, 22.10.1976
19. Natfhe *op cit* p.9
20. John Baillie, a leading NATFHE officer, NEC member and NATFHE representative to FEU. Interviewed 1986 - the 'sole author' of the NATFHE Discussion paper.
21. *ibid*
22. NATFHE evidence to the House of Commons Expenditure Cmtte Feb.1976
23. Presidential Address by Prof.Knox of the School of Mines, at the 1921 annual conference of the ATTI, as quoted in Horn & Horn (1983) p.8
24. Natfhe *op cit* p.10
25. Edelman (1977) p.8
26. Natfhe *op cit* p.9
27. *ibid*
28. Baillie *op cit*
29. NJ. March 1976 No.2
30. Len Murray, May 1979
31. NJ *op cit*
32. *ibid*

## CHAPTER EIGHT

### *The Youth Opportunities Programme*

#### *8.i The Provision*

It was the Holland Report (MSC 1977) which laid down the design for the YOP, which was eventually launched in April 1978. Apart from the need to be seen to 'doing something' about youth unemployment, Holland argued that there was a clear need to rationalise the variety of *ad hoc* measures which had sprung up in response to the growth of youth unemployment. This is somewhat ironic in the sense that Holland was itself an *immediate* response to the problem, and the solution it came up with, YOP, was seen as 'a temporary solution for a temporary problem'. That YOP was itself part of a rationalisation process points to the fact that Holland did not set out to invent a new type of provision, certainly not the intended integration of education and training - the wage and state forms - of the original conception of vocational preparation. Further evidence of the lack of originality of YOP comes in the following statement in the report '...the problem is too urgent for there to be time to experiment with entirely novel concepts and approaches' (p.33). This also indicates that YOP was based on ideas which were borrowed from existing practice and in no sense can it be seen as entirely the work of the MSC. Before exploring the importance of this, it is necessary to outline what YOP actually entailed.

YOP provided two basic kinds of 'opportunity' for the young unemployed. They were to be offered either courses to prepare them for work, or 'work experience'. The work preparation courses came in three varieties:

- a) *assessment or employment induction courses* - which were intended to improve the 'employability' of the young person. These short courses, some as little as two weeks, were felt to be best provided in an 'industrial environment'.

b) *short industrial courses* - which were described as courses designed to:

*" ...introduce young people to, and develop skills needed for, a fairly specific (though broad) occupational area as a basis for employment at operator or semi-skilled level, and also to motivate young people to work and to help them with skills to deal with the demands of adult working life."*(1)

In many ways, this one sentence completely encapsulates the thinking behind YOP. In particular, the conflation of the concept of 'skill' with low-level work and the question of motivation and life outside work. Nowhere is there an attempt to punctuate the notion of 'skill' according to context. This is a theme which runs all the way through the MSC's thinking.

An important aspect of these courses was that Holland insisted they should be provided in accordance with the 'actual or potential employment opportunities in the locality'. In other words, the provision was to be market-led. They were also to be courses which increasingly catered for young people of 'lower ability' and, as a result, needed to be 'designed with this in mind'.

c) *remedial or preparatory courses* - these courses were considered suitable for those with special needs. The MSC clearly felt that they had no remit, at this stage, for many of these young people and were quite content to pass them over to the local authorities (demonstrating their lack of usefulness for work perhaps?)

In terms of the 'Work Experience' parts of the programme, there were to be four types made available:

1. *Work experience on employer's premises (WEEP) - designed to give 'first hand experience of different kinds of work'.*
2. *Project-based work experience - ' to give first hand experience of different kinds of work through the medium of projects'.*
3. *Training workshops - ' to give first hand experience of different kinds of work in a group producing goods or services'.*
4. *Community service - ' to give first hand experience of different kinds of work through the medium of local community activities'.*

Each of these different types of work experience was to contain four core elements - induction, planned work experience, an opportunity for training or further education and counselling.

The whole manner of the MSC's operation during the period immediately before and after Holland is one which is predicated on a concern above all else for quantitative measures of success. This supports the suggestion that the MSC was not overly concerned with the ideological moment or content of the programmes it was engaged in. What we see therefore is a readiness on the part of the MSC to compromise its concerns with the actual nature of the programmes in order to establish the 'structures of their *delivery*', the bureaucracy of provision (Butters and Richardson 1982). In this way the field was, to some extent, left open for those who wished to influence the curricula within certain programmes; provided that is they fitted into the institutional and structural constraints being laid down by the MSC. Given the gestation period of most curricula developments, the likelihood of established bodies being able to come up with completely new courses seemed remote. When they did, we find that their 'product' attempts to reproduce the integration of the wage and state-forms, but significantly reverses the emphasis towards the latter form. This reflects the 'educationalist' origins of the proposals. For example, the work of the Further Education Unit and in particular its seminal document on vocational preparation *A Basis for Choice* (FEU 1979,1982).

#### 8.ii *A Basis For Choice*

Both before and after the introduction of YOP there had been a considerable amount of curriculum development work undertaken relating to vocational preparation, most notably by the Further Education Unit (FEU). The FEU was established in 1977 as a separate department within the DES, from whom it received an annual grant ( since 1983 it has had an independent status as a company limited by guarantee). The fact that the FEU took the lead in developing vocational preparation is not surprising given the fact that, ' ..its key strategic interest is in the question of the linkage between training and education ' (Edwards 1984,p.61). It is interesting to note here the similarity between the legitimating role played by the FEU in relation to vocational preparation and that of the ILEA's Curriculum Development Project, established in 1973, with regard to Appendix II courses. In fact the ILEA

Project can be seen as a role model for the FEU with respect to many aspects of legitimating the vocationalising of the curriculum.

As stated above, the MSC's preoccupation with the modes of delivery, as exemplified by the Holland Report, left the content of the vocational preparation curriculum open for colonisation. The FEU was not slow to recognise this and in the period leading up to and including the development of the YOP it came to assert a significant influence (Seale 1984). Whilst not completely at one with the MSC in terms of its overall emphasis, there is growing congruence between the work of the two organisations in this area, at least in this early period. Again, this can be taken as evidence of the MSC's successful incorporation of professional interests into the discourse of vocational preparation. An example of this can be seen in the FEU's 'A Basis For Choice' (1979,1982) [ hereafter *ABC* - all references from 2nd Ed.].

According to Avis (1983), *ABC* can be taken as an exemplar of a consensus on pre-employment and vocational courses within FE during this period. Like the Holland Report, *ABC* called for a rationalisation of the provision of the pre-vocational courses which had proliferated in response to the growth in youth unemployment in the late 1970s. However, *ABC*, despite its 'liberal and humanist' rhetoric, is seen by Avis as a document which attempted to meet both the employers' criticisms of young workers ( and by implication the education system) and the needs of the young themselves. Thus it was firmly within the traditional social democratic repertoire. Given this location, its twin emphasis on the 'needs' of employers' and the individual needs of young people are seen by Avis as 'contradictory'. However, he fails to demonstrate why this is so. Instead, he simply assumes that there are fundamental conflicts of interest between students and employers, and that the presumption within *ABC* that employer ' needs are the assumed needs of capital and student needs are those which create suitable labour for capital', is unfounded. Even more important, Avis sees the social democratic ideology behind *ABC* as containing a more fundamental contradiction: ' ...the assumption that educational interventions can overcome the employment problems of youth '(p 29). This argument, in the terms of this thesis, can be equated with the notion of extending the *educational* franchise. For a more illuminating analysis ie. one which shows *how ABC* was contradictory, this document will be

examined in terms of what it implied for both the reproduction of the wage and state forms of domination and the labour process of FE teachers.

It is the concept of the Common Core which dominated the curriculum framework proposed in *ABC*. The Common Core was designed to take up at least 50-60% of total course time; the rest being made up of what were termed 'vocational studies' (20%) and 'job-specific studies' (20%). Whilst *ABC* paid lip-service to the integrated nature of the three parts of the curriculum, the emphasis was almost entirely on the Common Core. As such, it is necessary to look at this in some detail.

The Common Core was to be that part of the curriculum of vocational preparation which sought to combine:

*" (a) those experiences from which we think students should have had the opportunity to learn..."*

with,

*" (b) the nature and level of performance we think students should be expected to achieve." (2)*

The most interesting aspect of the examples of 'experience' and 'performance' which *ABC* provides in its 'checklist' of Aims of the Common Core is that they consist almost exclusively of work-related activities. For Aim 1, for example, students should:

*"Visit a place of work, relevant to their interests and describe:*

- (a) the working conditions and tasks of new entrants;*
- (b) the range of decisions which can be legitimately made by the young workers;*
- (c) to whom they are responsible;*
- (d) with whom have they regular working relationships;*
- (e) training and career prospects: entry requirements.*

*(3)*

What can be seen in the above example is a structuring of both experience and performance which, for the student, entailed a notion of status and role which was determined by work and the wage-form. By implication, being *workless* was a derogation of status. Arguably, an educational, as opposed to a vocational structuring of the same learning situation would have, ideally, allowed for a

wider range of experiences and performances than that presented in ABC. This then raises the question, as to what the Common Core was really concerned with?

There can be little doubt that the aims of the Common Core presumed a deficit model of the vocational preparation student ie. the lack of certain qualities, abilities and predispositions was being seen as responsible for the young person's failure to find suitable employment. The ABC course was therefore designed to compensate the learner. This was not the original intention behind 'vocational preparation' as conceived by the MSC in *Vocational Preparation*. Thus ABC, like YOP, was not in fact a comprehensive curriculum designed for all school-leavers outside the traditional academic route. As such it departs considerably from the intentions behind vocational preparation as a strategy of reproduction.

The question of 'relevance' was also placed well to the fore within the type of education and training being offered within the ABC course. This drew upon the trainees' perception that the existing education system had somehow failed them. As a result they were perceived as being more willing to accept that they were deficient in some respect and that they could themselves put the situation right by undertaking more 'training'. According to Avis, profiling reinforces this perspective and amounted, in some instances, to little more than a 'degradation ceremony which posits student inadequacy'. What makes profiling a *new* mechanism of social selection and control within education is that it 'attacks the centre of student resistance by working on students' consciousness, by changing their ways of thought through negotiation' (p.28). The 'negotiation' between teacher and student was seen as taking place between equals, whereas, in fact, teachers maintained their power over the student. Thus there was only an appearance of equality but this was enough to ensure compliance on the part of the student, who 'freely' entered into the negotiation. This clearly supports the view that negotiation involved the imposition of a notion of formal equality - the state-form of domination. This conception of 'equality' can therefore be seen to contradict the 'deficit' model of the vocational preparation student contained in the Common Core.

Clearly there was a problem of reconciling the reproduction of the wage and state-forms within this curriculum framework, and herein lies the contradictory nature of *ABC*. That is to say, *ABC* called for the reproduction of the forms of domination in terms of the integration of training and education. Yet, in the actual curriculum framework proposed, the wage-form would have been inculcated via the the state-form. This can be seen as supportative of the notion of the trainee as a 'citizen-in-training' (4). Vocational preparation, short-term training, could only be legitimated if it included some form of education. However, the more 'education' the trainee received, the more the 'training' objective was liable to be undermined. That is, the dispositions, attitudes etc. sought in trainees - the wage-form - were to be inculcated utilising the dispositions and attitudes of the state-form eg. the concept of 'negotiation'. The 'maturity' required in the latter can therefore be seen to undermine the 'deficit' notion of trainees contained in the former. As conceived in *ABC*, 'education' and training', far from being integrated, have a contradictory relation. Like YOP, there was *separation* but not *unity* between the wage and state-forms within this proposed curriculum.

In his analysis of *ABC*, Avis fails to point out that it was principally an 'educationalist' response to the Holland Report and an attempt to 'liberalise' the Holland recommendations. This explains, to some extent at least, the nature of it humanist rhetoric and the emphasis on 'negotiation' (the state-form). The fact that its underlying tenets were those of the 'social democratic repertoire' should not therefore come as a surprise. It may even be thought of as a last-ditch attempt to salvage the original conception of vocational preparation as a strategy of reproduction. A second criticism of Avis might be that he, like many others within the Sociology of the New Vocationalism (SNV), underplays the potentially 'progressive' elements of *ABC*, which derive from the emancipatory potential of the state-form, education. For example, he argues that ' *ABC* therefore works within the assumption of the closure of the academic route [ to social mobility] ' (p 26). As Mansell (1983) has pointed out, such a route may never have existed for the majority in the first instance. Therefore it was both 'realistic' and 'progressive' to attempt to provide another avenue for mobility ie. to extend the educational franchise. Whether *ABC* actually fitted the bill in this respect is another matter, since the FEU's conception of vocational preparation can be seen to have entailed a

contradictory relationship between the reproduction of the state and wage forms. This contradiction is nowhere more apparent than in the effects an ABC -type curriculum would have had on the FE teachers' labour process.

As indicated earlier, the impetus for vocational preparation did not stem from the problem of mass youth unemployment. However, by the second half of the 1970s NAFE was beginning to experience a rapid change in its clientele, which can be considered as a change in the raw material of the teachers' labour process. By all accounts, the nature of this change was principally in the ability and attainment of the students which were beginning to enter FE in large numbers. There can be little doubt that these 'lower ability' and, by implication, less motivated students were perceived by administrators and teachers alike as a potential problem, especially when seen in contrast to the idealised craft apprentice and the 'academic' students of the Binary period (Wilson, no date). It is a measure of the success of the MSC in transforming attitudes within FE, by incorporating professional interests, that its message in the Holland Report, 'The time has now come to turn a major problem and cost into an opportunity and a benefit' (MSC 1977,p.7), was now being accepted in many quarters. For example, far from bemoaning this influx of less than well-disposed students into FE, teachers were told, not only by the MSC but also by certain sections of their own professional association, to consider the change as part of the much-vaunted '*comprehensivisation*' of FE (*see below*). This was to be a particularly powerful argument used against all those who tried to contest the role of the MSC within FE. Vocational preparation, as conceived by both the MSC and the FEU came therefore to be seen as ideally suited for '...those young people who are not thought to be equipped to follow one-year 'O' courses successfully (whether because of lack of motivation, ability, or because of the level of their previous attainment' (FEU 1982, p.12). FE's new 'clientele'.

By adopting a labour process approach to ABC, what immediately strikes the reader is the absence of references to teachers and teachers' work. There were barely half dozen short paragraphs, in a report which runs to some 60 pages including Appendices, which dealt directly with the implications for teachers of the curriculum framework developed in the document. The report was therefore almost exclusively concerned with the organisation of the FE

teachers' labour process without reference to the teachers' '*learning*' (5). This in itself suggests that the focus of concern was not entirely pedagogical, if by that one means some form of interactive process of learning involving teachers *and* taught.

In effect, the 'objectives of labour' involved in the FE teacher's labour process, were being transformed by the changes in the nature of the raw materials - the students - who were, by and large, increasingly the products of mass youth unemployment. FE teachers, whether they liked it or not, were being confronted by the requirement to reconsider the nature of their work. Of course, the context is one in which there was mounting concern with the fall in the number of traditional craft apprentices and vociferous criticism of the quality of students on general academic courses in the FE system. FE was being accused of 'inefficiency' in terms of both the quality and the quantity of its product. Therefore a new 'product', in the form of vocational preparation, was welcomed, albeit cautiously. The question soon became how this new product was to be produced? It appears that, in asking this question, the role of the existing FE teacher and his/her practice was considered only to the extent that it was seen to act as some form of impediment to the wider objective. Hence the necessity for 'preconceptualisation' within this whole area of provision and the need for a body such as the FEU.

It is therefore possible to interpret the Common Core of *ABC* as a vehicle for bringing together the factors of reproduction - the objectives of labour, living labour and dead labour - in order to transform the FE teachers' labour process in accordance with the demands of the 'new FE'. According to the FEU, it had three functions:

- [To] " (a) allow a full range of types of learning to be described...*
- (b) provide sufficient guidance to allow for co-ordination and validation of courses...*
- (c) leave colleges sufficient flexibility and room for manoeuvre..." (6)*

In labour process terms, these might be seen as:

- (i) the objectification of 'learning';
- (ii) the management and control of the FE teachers' labour process;
- (iii) setting technical limits to teacher autonomy.

Thus, the Common Core presented in *ABC* whilst appearing to offer opportunity, autonomy and flexibility in the teaching situation, in fact involved the exact opposite. This is because its starting point was the 'world of work'. The wrapping up of a vocational focus within what, to all intents and purposes, was an old Liberal Studies syllabus (7) did not hide the fact that 'work' and all that surrounds it, was both the 'common' and the 'core' of this report. What was new about *ABC* was the explicit nature of the references to the integration of vocational and social skills. What was before the largely 'hidden' curriculum of vocational studies, the transmission of the social relations of production - the wage-form - was, in vocational preparation, to be the overt curriculum. Meanwhile the technical relations of production were subsumed within the curriculum as equivalents i.e. transferable skills. For the FE teacher, the Common Core represented that part of the vocational preparation curriculum which brought about the simultaneous objectification of the technical and social relations of production. In doing this, the teacher's 'learning' - the 'subjective exercise of purpose' (Holly 1975) - was to be devalued in so far as objectified labour, dead labour, would increasingly come to confront teachers in the form of limits to what was to be taught and how it was to be taught. In short, the curriculum was to be defined elsewhere by others i.e. preconceptualised.

Therefore, in general terms, it is possible to interpret the difference between *ABC* and the Holland as one between two schools of thought regarding the most effective way to transform FE and the FE teachers' labour process to meet the demands of the new FE. Firstly, there was the 'pure' preconceptualisation argument put forward by the FEU in *ABC* which entailed transforming the *actual* labour process of the FE teacher. This can be considered the 'educational' response to the problem of bringing about change since it involved enhancing the socialisation function of the teacher - the inculcation of the state-form - relative to the instruction function (the imposition of the wage form). Such a move could be seen as both 'reskilling' some FE teachers, especially the vocationalists, and 'deskilling' others,

educationalists. Such a curriculum was therefore undoubtedly divisive in terms of the existing educational ideologies of FE teachers and such divisions could only enhance the power of management. Alternatively, there was the Holland approach, which was far less subtle, and implied a change in the 'market' for FE teaching. This was to be achieved principally by introducing an element of competition in the form of both private training agencies and YOP 'supervisors'. One can think of this as primarily a 'training' response. However, these schools of thought coalesce in terms of the discourse on vocational preparation ie. the agreement that the 'product' of vocational preparation should be *different* from that previously found in FE.

Seale (1984) has suggested that this agreement or partnership between the FEU and the MSC on vocational preparation was something of an unwitting courtship, doomed to come to nought given their very different conceptions. This view, whilst true of what was later to become the new vocationalism, overlooks the common ground which these two organisations shared in relation to 'doing something' about the pressing political problem of youth unemployment. In the short term it was the MSC's recommendations which were to prove more viable, politically. As a result, YOP was implemented with the full support of the FEU, despite its evident shortcomings regarding the integration of education and training. Yet YOP was bound to fail, as a strategy of reproduction, as it did not encompass an extension of the educational franchise. There was 'separation' but no 'unity' in the reproduction of the wage and state-forms in YOP.

### 8.iii *The NATFHE Leadership*

As shown above, NATFHE had 'welcomed' the Holland proposals at its 1977 Annual Conference. However, a year later criticisms of YOP began to emerge in the union. Talk of MSC 'infiltration' and an 'alternative education

structure' being created was heard, and not just from the Left opposition. It is interesting to note the theme of the criticism at this point. It is still almost entirely institutional and relates to NATFHE's representation. This is reflected in the actual motion which was addressed and passed. Part of this motion included:

*" Conference views with alarm the creation by the Government through the Manpower Services Commission of an alternative education structure for 16-19 year olds outside the recognised FHE sector which is leading to the dilution of training in labour skills, the possible redundancy of lecturers in colleges at present providing sound, educationally-based courses in the same areas and the unnecessary duplication of expensive equipment, staffing and other allied resources. " (8)*

The debate on YOP within NATFHE rapidly became more intense and, following a questionnaire sent to Branches of the Association in 1978 relating to YOP provision, the Assistant Secretary (FE) Mick Farley felt it necessary to provide a 'factual account' of YOP to dispel a 'lack of understanding' within the union. Yet, by this time approximately half of the colleges which responded to the survey were engaged in YOP or youth unemployment related work. This was to be the first of many such attempts by Farley to 'put the members right' about YOP. Farley's efforts can be interpreted as evidence of a growing chasm between the leadership and the rank and file on the question of vocational preparation. As such they warrant further examination.

The union leadership's position on YOP in 1978 can be summed up as follows:

*" ...whatever criticism can, justifiably, be directed against the various measures being taken by the Special Programmes Division of the MSC, the programmes do provide the possibility of stepping, however circuitously, towards the development of an overall strategy to meet the education, training and employment needs of the age-group." (9) [emphasis added]*

It is more than apparent from this that NATFHE still sought to implement vocational preparation as an 'overall strategy' and saw YOP as an immediate step towards this objective. The only critical note one can detect in the leadership's response to YOP was the lack of adequate representation it afforded the union, otherwise it warranted support. However, in October 1979 another Farley article appeared in the union's Journal under the Kitchener-esque banner headline ' YOP NEEDS YOU, TOO! '. This article is far more

forthright in its condemnation of the opposition to YOP within the union. Given the vitriolic nature of Farley's attack on the 'opposition', this article is indicative of what was a perceptible growth in hostility towards the leadership's position. Some flavour of the article can be gleaned from its opening sentences:

*" Whatever criticisms there may be of the Youth Opportunities Programme (YOP) run by the Manpower Services Commission (MSC) - and some are more fashionable than they are valid - it is doubtful that the Further Education service could itself have achieved such action and progress over the country as a whole, in such a short time-scale. The dynamic activities of the MSC in the development of programmes for young people have pushed the service into re-defining objectives and thinking in new concepts - some would add, not before time."*  
(10)

The 'challenge' thrown down by the MSC to FE called for a 'totally positive response' according to Farley. As for the 'opposition', their arguments '...do not stand up in serious debate'. (It is interesting to note here that the list of the opponents 'fears' relating to YOP which Farley uses in his article was taken from the Rev. Canon Dr George Tolley who was a prominent member of NATFHE and, like Farley, later worked for the MSC as head of its 'Quality' Branch). This type of statement must be taken as evidence of the leadership's embrace of a strategy of opportunism, in so far as it is an example of the replacement of their power-base '... from one predicated on the membership's willingness to act to one which is more institutionalised' ie. Farley was now speaking from his 'seat at the table'. The rest of this article rehearses the 'strategic' arguments for extending YOP and contains an explicit threat to the membership:

*"If the service does not respond positively to the needs of these young people then - to an even greater extent than at present - a response will be made elsewhere, by other agencies."* (11)

A curious fact about this argument, quite apart from Farley's direct use of phrases and arguments found in MSC documents, is that he ignored the growing evidence regarding the actual working of YOP and, in particular, FE's involvement. For example, he simply footnoted the following without comment:

*' A survey of 5000 young people on YOP schemes in Spring 1979 indicated 23% receiving some 'off-the-job' education or training, 64% of which were in FE. But, only 12% of young people on WEEP receive some form of 'off-the-job' education or training. See for example, 'Review of the first year of Special Programmes', SPD of MSC, July 1979' (12)*

The actual operation of YOP needs to be examined at this point.

#### 8.iv *YOP in Practice*

It is now generally recognised that YOP was a failure, both in its own terms as 'temporary solution to the temporary problem' of mass youth unemployment and in terms of it being part of a new strategy of reproduction ie. vocational preparation.

Overall it was WEEP which became the main type of provision offered within YOP. In 1978-9 the work experience schemes provided 64 per cent of placements on YOP and grew to some 84 per cent by 1980-1, and most of these were WEEP (Atkinson and Rees, 1982). According to Raffe (1983) it was the selection function of YOP, above all else which accounts for its importance as a youth unemployment measure . YOP was, according to Raffe, singularly successful in changing both the manner and the means of occupational selection (p.303). It was precisely this exploitation of YOP by employers which eventually brought about calls for change and the introduction of the Youth Training Scheme (YTS).

Overall, 63 per cent of YOP places were provided by private employers, compared to 36 per cent by local authorities, public bodies and voluntary organisations. In particular, the nature of the employers who 'used' the programme was highly criticised. Unsurprisingly, a large percentage of these placements were in non-unionised companies. In a report commissioned by the MSC, the Institute of Manpower Studies (IMS) found that:

*" The majority of young people in YOP spend their time with an employer. Until recently the overwhelming majority of employers have been small, often with little tradition of training. Because the young people are untrained and training is minimal, the work they can be given demands few occupational skills and at the end of the period such young people emerge with little to show except some important world of work skills. Moreover, many young people are not given experience in more than one type of work, particularly in places where the YOP trainee is being substituted for a properly employed person. Hence the widespread reaction by young people that YOP offers not training of lasting value and that without a job at the end it is a 'con'. (13)*

In fact the placement of YOP 'graduates' into either a full-time job or FE or training was inversely related to the growth of the programme. The aim of YOP was to provide a 'throughput' of 230,000 young people in its first year. In fact it dealt with 162,000 entrants, which represented approximately one in eight of all school leavers. By 1982-3 however, it was providing for 630,000 entrants, or one out of every two school leavers.

#### YOP PLACES

|             |         |
|-------------|---------|
| 1978 - 1979 | 162,000 |
| 1979 - 1980 | 216,000 |
| 1980 - 1981 | 360,000 |
| 1981 - 1982 | 550,000 |
| 1982 - 1983 | 630,000 |

( Source: Youth Development Unit, April 1982)

The growth in YOP numbers was reflected in the size of its budget. In its first year of operation it was estimated to have cost in the region of £150m; by 1982-83 this had risen to £730m. However, the actual cost to the Exchequer was much lower than this due to the contribution of the EEC's Social Fund and the savings on benefits and allowances. It was felt by many that this growth in the programme was achieved at the expense of any consideration of quality objectives. The job placement rate for example fell from an all-time high of 75 per cent in 1978 to 44 per cent in 1981. Thus, YOP made little or no

real impact as a measure designed to reduce the overall levels of youth unemployment.

Another major criticism of YOP was its 'substitution' effect. That is, the employers' substitution of YOP trainees for permanent employees. It is difficult to gauge the extent of this practice but it is generally thought to have been evident in *at least 29 per cent* of all YOP placements ( MSC, 1981 *A Review of Second Year Special Programmes*). The charge that YOP was 'cheap labour' was not without foundation. The fact that the training allowance of £23 depreciated in value, coupled with the decreasing likelihood of full-time employment after a YOP placement, meant that any incentive to take part in the scheme lessened as the programme developed. YOP in practice also revealed widespread discrimination with respect to both gender and ethnicity. By the end of the programme, a whole catalogue of objections could quite easily be produced [See Finn (1987, pp 131-159) for more detailed criticisms of YOP ]

What can be seen is a process whereby the growth of the programme corresponded with the intensification of discontent, eventually resulting in demands for changes and the setting up of a Task Group which was to result in the introduction of the Youth Training Scheme (YTS). Within YTS there was an immediate re-prioritisation of objectives along the lines of a move from an emphasis on 'quantity' to one of 'quality'. One might characterise this as a move from 'doing *something*' to one of 'doing *something in particular*'. Alternatively, one can interpret this as a call for a more comprehensive and effective strategy of reproduction rather than reform of an existing one.

As a result, by 1981, it was no longer possible for the leadership of the Association to ignore the growing dissatisfaction with YOP within the rank and file. In yet another article, entitled '*Quality in YOP*', Farley recognised the criticisms, albeit ambivalently:

*" ...it is widely acknowledged that the very rapid build-up of the Programme has, perhaps inevitably, resulted in a concentration on quantity rather than quality. This is not to say that the Manpower Services Commission's Special Programmes Division has not done a remarkable job ..."* (14)

It is this shift in emphasis to one of 'quality' which already signals the end of

vocational preparation in the form of YOP and marks the beginning of the new vocationalism in the form of YTS. In this 1981 article Farley begins to rehearse the development of YOP into a new Programme which is now recognisably a blue-print for YTS. There are no more acrimonious 'jibes' at those members who still opposed YOP. Stage IV in the process of adopting a strategy of opportunism had begun and the change in the political climate, following the 1979 election, was beginning to make itself felt within NATFHE. That is, the de-institutionalisation of NATFHE's representation within the MSC left it no choice but to attempt to resurrect the members' 'willingness to act'. The battle for hearts and minds was re-commenced and this was reflected in changed register of the union's leadership, away from a discourse on professionalism to, once again, one of trade unionism.

At the union's 1981 annual conference a motion, supported by the NEC, was passed which included the following:

*" Conference is concerned at some effects of the operation of WEEP, including the exploitation of young persons and job substitution."(15)*

By November of the same year, Farley went as far as to say ' YOP is currently being subjected to a rising barrage of criticism - much of it totally justified' ( NJ,Nov, 1981 p.25) This represents a revolution in terms of the tone of the leadership towards the activities of the MSC. It came at precisely the same moment that NATFHE was being marginalised from the policy-making process. This is reflected in the conference motion (above) which pointedly calls for action through the TUC, not the MSC or the institutions of government. This is evidence of the return to a more dialogical logic of collective action - a trade union strategy - within NATFHE at the end of 1981.

#### *8.v Conclusions on Vocational Preparation as a Strategy of Reproduction.*

Vocational preparation, as originally conceived, was meant to provide for those 16-19 year olds who were following neither the conventional academic or craft routes. There had been a long history of neglect of this section of the

population. In the early 1970s a combination of factors - economic, ideological and most important, political - came together to promote an extension of the educational franchise to this group which, given their age, were a natural constituency for FE. A national-popular project relating to this section of the age group was therefore developed in this period along with a distinct discourse. Educationalists, politicians and, to a lesser extent, employers shared a 'structure of cognition' which supported the notion that 'something should be done'. Of course, the spectre of youth unemployment fuelled this sentiment. However, the nature of the proposed provision had to be different from that already existing i.e. it had to be *both* education and training in order for it to qualify as a form of state expenditure. One of the major objectives of vocational preparation was therefore to develop a form of provision which brought together education and training, initially seen as a form of collective consumption, whilst maintaining the principle that education was the responsibility of the state and training that of employers. This can be seen to be upheld as part of the necessary separation of the political and the economic spheres and the inculcation of the wage and state-forms of domination.

A development which should have facilitated this new form of provision was the increasing importance in the mid 1970s of the intermediate tier of government - the 'national community of local government'. This in many ways served to break down narrow institutional and professional interests and enabled a more strategic perspective to be taken on the relationship between the central and Local state. In terms of the institutional arrangements necessary for bringing about vocational preparation, the existence of the MSC was crucial. The MSC had the potential to unify the disparate institutional interests - initially in the form of partnerships - and oversee the strategic nature of the change. As a corporate body the MSC also provided a political forum for the various interest groups involved. In particular, the strategic needs of the FE teachers' organisation NATFHE during this period can be seen to have corresponded with the development of a corporate body such as the MSC. This is evidenced in the transformation of NATFHE's 'logic of collective action' to a 'strategy of opportunism'. This later enabled the MSC to incorporate the interests of the NATFHE leadership and thereby further legitimate the nature of the national-popular project relating vocational

preparation. All the portents of a major educational change were therefore apparent in the mid 1970s.

However, changes in central-local government relations and mass youth unemployment, both arising out of economic recession, prevented the introduction of vocational preparation as part of an overall strategy of reproduction. Instead, 'temporary measures', most noticeably YOP, came into existence which, whilst paying lip-service to the discourse of vocational-preparation, were nevertheless significantly different. In particular, YOP undermined the inculcation of the state-form of political domination, which was reflected in the marginal role played by the local state in this provision (including the almost completely marginal role of FE). Yet, YOP was still hailed as 'potentially' a platform for the more comprehensive objective of introducing vocational preparation. This acclamation can be seen to have been the product of organisational self-interest on the part of all those concerned, especially the employers, the MSC and NATFHE.

Not only did YOP displace original conception of a strategic change, its operation also occasioned the near-collapse of the national-popular project, the political ramifications of which can be gauged by growing criticisms of both the MSC and YOP in terms of the lack of accountability, employer exploitation and its increasing divisiveness amongst FE teachers. YOP gave vocational preparation a bad name. Its reputation also created numerous problems for the leadership of NATFHE which had 'opportunistically' embraced the programme. Despite this, or even because of this, the goal of vocational preparation became even more sought after by organisations such as NATFHE and the FEU, who had become increasingly dependent upon the activities of the MSC. There was a determination to get vocational preparation right. As a result, development of the curriculum proceeded eg. *ABC*, despite growing and widespread opposition to vocationalism from educationalists.

In the meantime, the political climate changed dramatically with the election of a radical Conservative government in 1979. This signalled the end of 'corporatist' policy-making and the 'social democratic repertoire'. As a result, forms of provision based upon extending the *educational* franchise, which involved, if only rhetorically, the integration of education and training

became politically untenable. Changes in the relationship between central and local government, the marginalisation of 'professional' interests, including those of FE teachers, and the break-up of corporate representation were soon to follow. Along with these went all hope of introducing vocational preparation as a strategy of reproduction. The logic of NATFHE's collective action also changed in response to these developments. A move towards a trade union strategy - a dialogical logic of collective action - was renewed. Whereas NATFHE had been proactive with regard to vocational preparation, it was to take on an increasingly reactive role in the future. Trade unionism, as a strategy, was also to take on a rather different complexion in the Thatcher era than it did in the era of corporatism.

The strategic potential of vocational preparation was not lost on the new Conservative administration. The impetus for bringing about a fundamental change relating to the 16-19 age group had been established and it was now a question of finding an alternative to vocational preparation. The answer was to be the new vocationalism, in the shape of the Youth Training Scheme. This strategy of reproduction was to be different in so far as the *separation-in-unity* of the wage and state forms was to be achieved by radically reformulating the state-form, bringing it 'into line' with the wage-form - a '*training-in-citizenship*' as opposed to the '*citizen-in training*' ideal of vocational preparation. This is what was to be 'new' about the new vocationalism.

## Notes and References - Chapter Eight

1. MSC (1977) p.35
2. FEU (1982) p.16
3. *ibid* p.30
4. The term 'citizen-in-training' first appeared in the Final Report of the Departmental Committee on Juvenile Education after the War, Vol.1,Cmmnd.8512,1917, pp.3-5, which preceded the Fisher Act of 1917.  
*" Can the age of adolescence be brought out of the purview of economic exploration and into that of the social conscience? Can the conception of the juvenile as primarily a little wage-earner be replaced by the conception of the juvenile as primarily the workman and the citizen-in-training? Can it be established that the educational purpose is to be the dominating one, without as well as within the school doors,during the formative years between twelve and eighteen? It not, clearly no remedies at all are possible in the absence of the will by which alone they could be rendered effective ..."*
5. *see Chapter Four*
6. FEU *op cit* p.29
7. The old Liberal Studies syllabus was characterised by its 'humanistic' emphasis. Its non-vocational nature and the emphasis on the 'citizen' as worker, rather than the 'worker' as citizen, put it at odds with the day-release ethic. See Gleeson & Mardle (1980).
8. NJ. July 1978
9. Farley, NJ. Dec. 1978 p.10
10. Farley, NJ Oct.1979 p.16
11. *ibid*
12. *ibid* footnote 9
13. IMS (1982) para.2.2.25
14. Farley, NJ May 1981, p.20
15. NJ, June 1981, p.29

## CHAPTER NINE

### *The New Vocationalism as a Strategy of Reproduction*

#### 9.i *Introduction*

Since the late 1970s there have been literally hundreds of reports, studies and critiques made of the new vocationalism; of which at least 270 have been devoted to the Youth Training Scheme alone ( National Labour Movement Enquiry 1986). Whilst some of these accounts are analytical, most are in the mould of 'abstracted empiricism' (Mills 1959). In the following chapters an attempt will be made to bring together some of the key findings of these studies in order to provide some coherence to our understanding of the new vocationalism. As in the case of vocational preparation, this coherence will be achieved by utilising the content-theoretical model of educational change.

The content-theoretical model suggests that the new vocationalism, in the shape of the Youth Training Scheme, if it was to succeed as a strategy of reproduction, required the development of:

- (i) an appropriate institutional ensemble of the state;
- (ii) policy and provision which reproduced the 'separation-in-unity' of the wage and state-forms
- (iii) an appropriate hegemonic project.

The implementation of the Youth Training Scheme will therefore be examined in terms of its:

- (a) aims, organisation and administrative structure,
- (b) the actual nature of the policy and provision, and
- (c) the political mobilisation of teachers it engendered.

9.ii *The Youth Training Scheme: its aims, organisation and structure*

The Youth Training Scheme (YTS) was announced by the government in a White Paper entitled 'A New Training Initiative: A Programme for Action' (DoE 1981) which was published in December 1981. This White Paper was itself a response to the publication in May of that year of the MSC's consultative paper 'A New Training Initiative' (NTI) which had put forward the case for a strategic restructuring of training provision as a result of changes in the labour market. The document outlined three strands of a comprehensive 'strategy' to overhaul Britain's 'training crisis':

- " i. we must develop skill training including apprenticeship in such a way as to enable young people entering at different ages and with different educational attainments to acquire agreed standards of skill appropriate to the jobs available and to provide them with a basis for progression through further learning;*
- ii. we must move towards a position where all young people under the age of 18 have the opportunity either of continuing in full-time education or of entering a period of planned work experience combined with work related training and education;*
- iii. we must open up widespread opportunities for adults, whether employed, unemployed or returning to work, to acquire, increase or update their skills and knowledge during the course of their working lives."<sup>(1)</sup>*

The NTI consultative document also made it very clear that the principle of employers being 'primarily responsible' for their training needs was to be maintained. Yet, it went on to argue that all the beneficiaries of training should share the costs i.e. the employers, the trainees and the government (representing 'the national interest'). The MSC also argued that it (the MSC) should take a major role in planning and developing the progress towards the three objectives. It is this last point which is significantly different from the proposals made for YOP. That is, the institutional allocation of the provision appears to have been carefully considered and there was to be little or no possibility that the local authorities would be made responsible for its implementation.

The success of the MSC's hegemonic project can be gauged from the fact that nearly one thousand responses to this consultation paper were received, the vast majority of which endorsed its objectives. Such was the broad span of agreement as to the merit ( or generality?) of these proposals, amongst employers, trade unions, educationalists and training specialists, the MSC was able to publish the response to its consultative paper in December 1981. It was on the same day that this document was published - '*A New Training Initiative. An Agenda for Action*' (MSC 1981 - hereafter MSC:AA) - that the government published its own similarly titled White Paper '*A Programme for Action*' (DoE 1981 - hereafter Govt.:APA). The timing could not have been coincidental.

In MSC:AA the MSC had reiterated its concern that a strategic approach be adopted towards training and, most significantly, suggested '*a new mechanism of public funding*' be developed to achieve the NTI objectives. MSC:AA also proposed to set up a 'high level task group' which was to examine the implication of the NTI objectives for youth training. This was to be the Youth Task Group (YTG). Both the original NTI and MSC:AA documents are therefore relatively open-ended and, as such, appear to have revived what appears to have been a consensual, corporatist approach towards restructuring training. This consensual approach is thought to have typified the preferred stance of the MSC's then Chairperson, Sir Richard O'Brien. At this stage, therefore, the thinking of the MSC appears to have reverted, after the experience of YOP, to a commitment to introduce a new strategy of reproduction. However, the government's White Paper (Govt:APA) proposals were at variance with those of the MSC in several respects. It is important to note that it was only the second strand of the NTI, concerning youth unemployment and training, which was taken up with any conviction ( as measured in terms of funding and debate), and in particular the proposal for '*a new £1 billion a year Youth Training Scheme*'. The government's APA explicitly states that the "*... young unemployed will remain a priority group in terms of new training arrangements.*" ( Govt:APA,p.6). Point (i) of a 10-point programme for action therefore proposed that:

*" a new £1 billion a year Youth Training Scheme, guaranteeing from September 1983 a full year's foundation training for all those leaving school at the minimum age without jobs..." (2)*

The restriction of the scheme to the unemployed was a major departure from the MSC:AA. It appeared to undermine the 'strategic' nature of the YTS in much the same manner as YOP had undermined vocational preparation. Therefore the question is, why did the government choose to concentrate its efforts on the young unemployed? Once again it is political pressures which appear to have been most significant.

According to the government, YTS was part of a strategic answer to the long-standing problem of making Britain more competitive. At the same time, a less than long-term 'strategic' explanation of the need for YTS is apparent:

*" Meanwhile, we must continue to plan on the basis that over the next few years many young people may have difficulty in finding jobs on leaving school. So special provision will continue to be needed for them in order to achieve our major aim of reaching the position where all young people, on leaving school, either move on to further education, find a job or are given the chance of training or community service."*  
(3)[emphasis added]

This can only be interpreted as an explicit recognition that reducing youth unemployment remained the political priority behind YTS. Further evidence suggesting that a YTS type scheme was being thought about in terms of a measure designed to counteract the growing political and social threat arising out mass youth unemployment, can also be seen in the 1981 Think Tank report which was 'leaked' and became public in May 1983. This report is purported to have said:

*" From the point of view of law and order, the fact that unemployment leaves some potentially troublesome youngsters with nothing to do is a justifiable cause for anxiety."* (4)

Youth unemployment had indeed grown by 500 per cent between 1975 and 1982 and all the indicators suggested that it was set to continue to rise. The MSC had estimated that approximately 50 per cent of all school-leavers in 1983/4 would fail to find employment and that by September 1984, 57 per cent of 16 year olds and 48 per cent of 17 year olds on the labour market would be unemployed if there were no policy interventions.(MSC Youth Task Group Report, 1982,p.8). Yet, despite the concern shown for youth unemployment, especially after the riots in some inner city areas in Britain in the summer of

1981, it is too simplistic to see the government's response, in the shape of YTS, as entirely mediated by this particular issue. Undoubtedly the political pressure to be seen to be 'doing something' about youth unemployment was uppermost: especially in a period which was a run-up to a general election. However, the actual form and structure of the response has to be viewed in the context of a much wider range of policies the government was then pursuing. In particular, a determined attempt was being made to find a solution to the 'training crisis' with policies which incorporated wherever possible a return to the 'free market'. In Govt:APA the government had insisted that YTS was to be 'first and last a training scheme' (Para 34, p.9). The nature of the proposed training measure, YTS, was therefore to reflect the political outlook of the government of the day, not just on youth unemployment but the reproduction of labour capacities as a whole.

Quite apart from restricting the constituency of YTS, Govt:APA also departed from the MSC's proposals, in so far as it proposed that the allowance paid to trainees be £15 per week. That is, as their contribution to the scheme, YTS trainees were to forego £10 per week of the allowance which was then being paid to YOP trainees (£25). In addition, supplementary benefit entitlement was to be withdrawn from any young person who unreasonably refused a YTS place. However, this was seen by the government as being counter-balanced by the continued payment of child-benefit to parents of trainees. Overall, these proposals were seen by most observers as introducing an element of compulsion into the YTS. Even the Confederation of British Industry (CBI) was not enamoured by these terms:

*"...it was readily apparent to the more influential members of the CBI's main policy committee..that the imposition of a £15 allowance and compulsory participation was simply unrealistic in political terms ...it was left therefore with little alternative but to go along with the other groups over these issues." (5)*

It was perhaps the CBI's realisation that 'forced labour' undermines the operation of 'free market' principles, rather than their concern for the plight of the young worker, which informed their opposition to compulsion in YTS. That is, the inculcation of the wage-form - the whole notion of 'free labour' - would have been undermined by compulsion. Compulsory 'training' would however have made visible the contradiction between the inculcation of the wage and

state-forms of domination by making the wage-form open to political contestation. The insulation of the economic from the political would therefore have been jeopardised by this proposal. The 'form-determined' nature of a strategy of reproduction suggests that this was not, from the outset, a viable proposition.

Was the proposed low allowance and the introduction of compulsion into YTS a political blunder on the part of Norman Tebbit, the newly installed Minister of Employment? Mrs Thatcher's 'most effortlessly provocative minister' (The Guardian) was not renowned for such crass under-estimation of public approbation. Therefore it has been suggested that this was in fact a deliberate 'tactic' by Tebbit to introduce such harsh terms for YTS:

*" Tebbit's initial proposals (including the £15 allowance and de facto youth conscription) were so outrageous that opponents could unite with relief behind the apparently liberal MSC alternative and savour a rather hollow victory over the Employment Minister when his proposals were shelved." (6)*

The conspiracy theory being propounded here fails to appreciate the very real gulf which existed between the government and the MSC concerning training strategy. It is difficult to see the government's proposals regarding the trainee allowance and the supplementary benefits as a tactic in what would have been an unacceptably high-risk strategy. As to the effect of the debate and Tebbit's eventual 'climb-down', it is nevertheless true to say that it did distract attention, albeit unintentionally, perhaps, from the issues of content and 'quality' in YTS.

In order to understand Govt:APA, and the government's strategy in general, we need to locate the proposals for YTS within the broader framework of training reform which the government had embarked upon. Basically, the guiding philosophy of the government's proposals on training, of which YTS was most certainly a central part, was to *appear* to divest the state of any statutory responsibility. That is, training was to be returned to the 'free market' and was to be made, once more, the responsibility of individual employers. However, the government was well aware that the employers had no interest in taking up such a responsibility, and indeed were fundamentally unable and ill-prepared to undertake such a role, especially at the sub-craft, vocational preparation level. Furthermore, there was still the pressing political

problem with mass youth unemployment. Therefore, it was the *principles* of the free market which were to be introduced into what, to all intents and purposes, would be state provision of training. That is, the design and administration of YTS was to conform to the dictates of the free-market philosophy, without the imperfections of such a philosophy - the inevitable drain on profitability. This would also obviate the need to make this provision a form of collective consumption under the control of the Local state and its professionals. From the government's point of view, YTS was to be a form of 'social investment' or, at worse, a form of 'social expenses' expenditure. In this light, the government's proposals are far from as contradictory as they might have first appeared. In particular, the principle of employers being 'responsible' for their training needs was not infringed by the state ensuring that this was in fact achieved. However, the determination of the type of expenditure desired by the government was dependent on the nature of the institutional ensemble and political mobilisation which YTS engendered. Central to the government's strategy of placing training back on a 'voluntary' basis was the abolition of the Industrial Training Boards (ITBs). Therefore one has to agree with Keep (1986) that the abolition of the ITBs constituted the 'most immediately important factor' in the inception of YTS. That is, the question of institutional location of this new state expenditure needed to be resolved to begin with.

The abolition of the ITBs was first muted during the Heath administration, following the Bolton inquiry (1971) into small firms. Due to a lack of support for this proposal, a compromise was reached under the 1973 Employment and Training Act whereby the power of the ITBs was restricted in terms of the amount of levy they could impose (see *history of NAFE, Appendix 2*). In July 1980 the MSC published the results of the Review of the 1973 Employment and Training Act (RETA) '*Outlook on Training*' (MSC 1980). This set in motion a period of consultation regarding the future role and function of the ITBs. In October 1980, a sector by sector review of training provision was announced. As a result,

*"the Review Body ... took the view that the existing statutory framework, within which the MSC can work in collaboration with industry training bodies, could be satisfactorily developed and adapted to meet changing needs."*(7)

However, in November 1980, the government, quite unilaterally, announced that it wished the Review to consider the return of the ITBs to a non-statutory basis wherever possible. In the following months the discussions regarding the ITBs continued and by December it had been decided that seven sectors would retain ITBs. Moves towards disbanding the remaining ITBs were also set in motion at this time. The importance of these moves lies in the fact that,

*"...by dismantling a large number of the ITBs, the Government was removing, wittingly or unwittingly, most of the major delivery mechanisms and centres of expertise in the provision and monitoring of youth training, just at a time when they would be most needed."*(8)

Why then were the ITBs discarded at this crucial time?

As indicated earlier, it has been the employers' unwillingness to finance training which has, historically, led to training crises - crises of reproduction. The abolition of the ITBs was presented therefore as a measure designed to free the employers from the burden of unnecessary costs associated with bureaucracy (Govt:APA, p.14). The savings arising from their abolition, were, in principle, to be made available for increasing the amount of training undertaken by the employers themselves. Looking back over the course of this century, and even into the last, there is not a shred of evidence to suggest that this would in fact occur. Everything pointed to just the reverse, especially with regard to the target population for the new vocationalism.

After the passing of 1981 Employment and Training Act, 17 of the statutory ITBs were dissolved and 100 employer-led 'non-statutory training organisations' (NSTOs) were to be put in their place. It was the government's hope that these voluntary bodies would provide an alternative 'employer-led' mechanism for the implementation of any new training initiative such as YTS. However, according to Keep (1986), the employers did not see it in the same light. They 'simply regarded the establishment of an NSTO with minimal functions as the price required from them for the removal of the financial burden of their industry's ITB' (Keep 1986, p.12). Furthermore, the nature of these new organisations, in some cases, was such that they were regarded at the time as 'little more than shells' whose effectiveness led some CBI staff to be 'privately alarmed' (ibid). This explains why the CBI chose to divert and

oppose any attempt to use these organisations as one of the delivery mechanisms for YTS. Characteristically, the position of most CBI members appears to have been one which sought to minimise their involvement, at any level, in training. Keep's account, from inside the CBI, makes it clear however that this position was largely untenable given the political allegiance of that body. It had to appear to support the government.

According to the Govt:APA,

*"The cost of training is basically a matter for the individual employer." ...*

*"In the longer term the responsibility for training must lie mainly with employers as it does in most other major industrial countries." (9)*

However, the government's position in relation to the funding of the YTS had to be that training was an *investment* for the nation's future. It was therefore deemed necessary for the state to intervene during the recession because employers had cut-back on training and it was the responsibility of the government to fill the gap, to the tune of £1 billion:

*" For the immediate future the Government sees an increase of public expenditure on this scale as the only way of plugging the gap in the training provision required if we are to be ready to meet the skill needs of the economy as trading conditions improve and to offer adequate opportunities to the current generation of young people." (10)*

As a result, the government's justification for funding YTS was in terms of social 'investment' rather than as a form of collective consumption. At the same time, the government recognised the structural difficulties facing many employers:

*"...the individual firm has absolutely no guarantee of a return on this investment [in training] since the trainee is under no legal obligation to stay once his training is complete." (11)*

Attempts to overcome this disincentive to train were seen as resulting in a 'somewhat haphazard and often illogical apportioning of costs between the public and private sectors, and between individual undertakings'. This echoes the argument made by the the MSC in its 1975 document *Vocational Preparation* (see Chapter Seven). Meanwhile, the current system was being dismantled and

replaced by a short-time expedient i.e. the government paying the bulk of the costs of YTS. Yet, in the longer-term, the government had as its main objective the return of 'responsibility' for training to the employers. In order to get their co-operation on YTS, the government resorted to a 'carrot and stick' approach.

The 'carrot' included direct incentives which were placed before employers. The Government was keen to point out in Govt:APA that it was itself to shoulder the burden of the costs of the proposed YTS and employers were admonished of any blame for the inadequacy of the present training arrangements. This reinforced the view that employers could be trusted, 'the best way of providing ...training is through arrangements made by employers for their own employees ' (p.6). Despite the fact that in the very next line it emphasises the fact that 'in 1979 40 per cent of the 700,000 school-leavers who found jobs received no training at all. About another 20 per cent were receiving training for only eight weeks or less ...'(ibid). This contradiction is nowhere explained in the document. One of the longer-term direct benefits for the employers was clearly spelled out :

*"It [ the Government] is applying these extra resource to help secure longer-term reforms in the quality of training and bring about a change in the attitudes of young people to the value of training and acceptance of relatively lower wages for trainees.(12)*

It is not just the lower wages argument which is important here, it is also the dominance of the wage *form* in general. Linked to this was the promise of removing 'obstacles to the full and efficient use of...skills acquired'. This is nothing less than a promise to challenge the right of the trade unions on their 'restrictive practices'.

On the 'stick' side of the equation, the Govt:APA pointed out that a remissible tax ' along the lines of the French system has been suggested as one possibility for influencing positively employer's calculations about the relative costs and returns of investing in training ' (p.14). This was a threat to the employers which, as it turned out, appears to have been effective. The fear of the CBI was indeed that,

*"...if employers were not seen to co-operate sufficiently with Government plans, they might be faced with a humiliating re-imposition of the ITBs, or by the introduction of some form of remissible training tax administered by the MSC." (13)*

There are a number of points which arise from this examination of the proposals behind the funding of YTS. Firstly, it is the Government which appears to have been willing to sacrifice its long-term non-interventionist line in an attempt to ward off short-term political embarrassment over youth unemployment. The CBI can be seen as either disinterested in change or reluctant to embark on the short-term 'remedial' action favoured by the Government. It therefore needed to be induced into supporting YTS. Failure on the part of the CBI to support the Government would have jeopardised the entire strategy. This can be seen as the incorporation of the CBI into the government's hegemonic project relating to the introduction of the new vocationalism as a new strategy of reproduction. The incorporation of 'professional' interests, most notably the leadership of NATFHE, came as a result of the Youth Task Group Report on YTS.

### 9.iii *NATFHE and the New Training Initiative*

As shown in Chapter Eight, NATFHE's leadership faced a considerable problem of legitimation vis-a-vis the introduction of vocational preparation into FE. The 'strategy of opportunism' which it had embarked upon with the introduction of YOP resulted in the isolation of the leadership from both its own membership and the centres of power - a 'place at the table'. It therefore had had to revert to forging a renewed collective trade union identity in the face of the threat to conditions of service posed by YOP. However, there is evidence to suggest that the debate within the union had been divisive to the point of preventing such a collective identity coming to fruition. Furthermore, the internal divisions created by YOP were to be reinforced, even exacerbated, with the introduction of YTS.

NATFHE's leadership welcomed the MSC's NTI: *Agenda for Action* (MSC:AA) and roundly condemned aspects of the Government's White Paper 'A New Training Initiative: A Programme for Action' (Govt.:APA) which they believed 'jeopardised and undermined' the MSC's 'imaginative' proposals. At its National Council meeting in February 1982, 11 motions relating to the NTI were passed, the majority of which concerned the allowances and compulsory aspects of Tebbit's proposals for the YTS. In particular, equal opportunities were not seen by the NATFHE leadership as forthcoming within the Government's proposals for YTS. NATFHE's NEC was also, not unnaturally, concerned with the salaries and conditions of service issues which arose from the White Paper. However, it was confident that existing arrangements in relation to salaries etc. could accommodate the proposals if they were properly funded.

The overall tenor of the NATFHE's arguments against the NTI (now seen solely in terms of the Government's White Paper) also supports the view that it had entered upon a trade union strategy with regard to MSC/training related matters. The NEC's criticisms are noticeably devoid of what might be termed 'educational' content or 'professional' issues. In particular, the Association's leadership appears to have been beguiled by the prospect of an 'extra' 80,000 full-time equivalent places, and by implication more jobs for NATFHE members, proposed in the Government's White Paper. The fact that such a change in the scale and nature of the FE service would bring with it changes in the curriculum and pedagogy, can be seen to have come almost as an afterthought to the leadership:

*" The Agenda will demand not only a massive injection of resources into the FE Service, it will require an historical re-orientation of the service itself demanding substantial changes in pedagogy and curriculum." (14)*

This belated recognition of 'educational issues' came at the end of a very long article outlining (para-phrasing) the White Paper proposals. The fact that the author, Farley, did not begin to address the issues relating to the educational content of the proposals is indicative of the Association's increasingly trade-union approach to MSC matters. Precisely what the Association meant by the much vaunted high 'quality' YTS was nowhere spelled out. Maintaining the conditions of service of the membership was however seen as the means to ensure such 'quality'. It is also interesting to note that at the very same

February National Council an NEC report on the recruitment of YOP supervisors was endorsed. This report also clearly illustrates the relationship between the concepts of professionalism and trade unionism as seen by NATFHE's leadership at this time:

*" It is consistent with the Association's attitude to vocational preparation in all its modes that YOP Supervisors should be accepted into the membership. It will enable the Association's professional expertise to be available to increasing numbers of young people; it will strengthen the Association's ability to safeguard established salary levels and conditions of service; and it will provide the supervisors themselves with a wide range of union services."*(15)

Following the publication of the Youth Task Group Report in April 1982, a change of strategy already began to appear in terms of the NATFHE leadership's stance towards the MSC. As in the case of YOP, the leadership appears to have been 'incorporated' once again as a result of participating on a MSC Working Party. The YTG Report assuaged their fears, and those of the TUC, on the question of allowances and compulsion contained in the White Paper proposals for YTS. The so-called Tebbit 'climbdown' was seen as a considerable achievement: a rare victory for social democratic consensus over the Conservative's creeping unilateralism. This, plus the fact that the content of YTS was never seen as an issue, appears to have once more opened the way for the more 'professional' approach to negotiation over the YTS. In fact, the YTG proposals were hailed as holding ' the potential of a major advance, an important step on the road towards comprehensive provision of training and educational opportunities for all young people between the ages of 16 and 18...' ( NJ, 6.82.p.15). 'Vocational preparation', which by now had become a synonym for 'consensus', was once more on the agenda.

#### *9.iv The Youth Task Group Report*

The YTG reported in April 1982. Its general objectives were accepted by all parties to the report. Working within the Government's budgetary constraint of £1 billion (which was not all Treasury monies. Some was from the EEC Social Fund and some represented savings on benefits.) the YTG came up with proposals which not only expanded the scheme from 300,000 to 460,000

trainees, it also increased allowances to £25. In this and other significant respects the YTG Report is at variance with the Govt:APA White Paper. For example, the Report was notably unequivocal as to its support for participation being on voluntary basis:

*" Our report is about greatly increasing opportunities, widening options and realising the potential of our young people. It is not about eliminating choice or introducing compulsion." (16)*

Despite the differences between the Government's and MSC's proposals regarding YTS, the overall emphasis of both bodies coalesced in the central objective of producing above all else a 'training' scheme. Thus, for the YTG, 'our aim is to provide for what the economy needs, and what employers want - a better equipped, better qualified, better educated and better motivated workforce " (para. 1.3 p.7).

It would appear from the above that the MSC's intent on introducing a strategic change, in the form of vocational preparation had been accepted by the YTG. The Scheme they arrived at is far broader in scope and contains elements which go beyond the narrow and immediate objectives of the Government's White Paper proposals. However, the YTG's proposals were encased in an institutional ensemble and administrative design which actually militated against their realisation as a strategy for introducing vocational preparation. That is, the government's objective of producing an altogether different form of provision was ensured by the nature of the institutional framework chosen to implement the YTS. There was therefore no possibility of YTS integrating training and education, as in vocational preparation, because this would almost inevitably have meant it would have become a form of collective consumption.

The single most important administrative element introduced into YTS was the part to be played by '*managing agents*' (MAs). These were to provide the trainee with a complete programme of integrated training and work experience. More specifically, the MA was to :

*Design the Programme and make the necessary arrangements for it to take place;*

*Manage the Programme and be accountable for it;*

*Select young people for the Programme and supervise them during their stay;*

*Provide the young people at the end of the Programme with a certificate to show what they have achieved;*

*Maintain the quality and standards of the Programme.*

(17)

It is thought that the MSC initially had in mind, for the most part, local employers acting as MAs. These employers would be themselves sponsoring some trainees and providing places. Where there was a shortage of such MAs, particularly in areas of industrial recession, the MSC was to act as the MA. For this reason YTS was to be 'delivered' in two basic Modes - A and B.

The 'financial miracle' (Raffe 1984) performed by the YTG, in not only increasing the scope of the scheme but also the trainee allowance, was achieved through the division of the Scheme into these different modes. Mode A was to be employer-based with 9 months sponsored work experience (the old WEEP format) and a minimum of three months off-the-job training and education. 300,000 Mode A places were planned for in the first year of YTS. Mode B schemes, intended mainly for the unemployed and the 'unemployable', were where the MSC acted as the managing agent. These schemes were further sub-divided into B1 and B2 types. In B1 the 'provider' was either a local authority or voluntary organisation which took on the role of arranging the complete programme of training. Mode B2 consisted of places managed by the MSC, 'through a network of 'linked schemes' comprising training courses (largely in Colleges of Further Education) linked to periods of work experience on employer's premises'. Together, Modes B1 and B2 were planned to provide 160,000 places on YTS.

The division between Modes A and B represented more than an administrative division. It also signified the fact that two distinct forms of state expenditure - social 'investment' ( Mode A) and a form of 'social expenses' (mode B) - were being combined within a single strategy of

reproduction. This accounts for the unique character of YTS. As a result, the majority of providers of Mode A were to be in the private sector and the majority of Mode B providers in the public sector:

*"...private sector and private training agencies were providing almost three quarters of the Mode A places and ... the public sector and voluntary organisations were providing more than 80 per cent of places on the Mode B schemes." (18)*

This unique character of YTS was reflected in the role of the Local state and the government of the education system.

#### 9.v YTS and the Institutional Ensemble of the State

The introduction of YTS took place against a background of profound changes in the nature of the relationship between the central and Local state. These changes can be seen as part of a continuing reorganisation of the institutional ensemble of the state, including the 'rise' of the MSC in relation to the government of the ES. Furthermore, the nature of these changes in the institutional ensemble can be shown to have been reflected in the organisation and administration of YTS. It is therefore necessary to outline the basic features of the wider changes that were taking place in central-local relations at this point.

According to Rhodes (1984), central-local government relations in the period after 1979 can be characterised as '*an era of direction*'. In particular,

*"If one single theme permeates recent developments, it is the search by central government for more effective instruments of control (not influence) over the expenditure of local government." (19)*

The Conservative government's approach to central-local relations was premised on the belief that local government expenditure, as a significant proportion of total public expenditure, was a strategic site for controlling the national economy. Therefore reduced public spending and the return to more efficient market mechanisms were seen as both desirable and necessary. Control, plus 'privatisation', therefore came to represent the dominant principles

informing the Conservative's policy towards local government in this period. The fact that these principles pulled the government in opposite directions - towards centralisation and decentralisation - resulted in a series of 'unintended consequences' according to Rhodes. For example, greater centralisation of control did not produce the desired overall reduction in public expenditure. Whereas between 1975/6 and 1978/9 local authority expenditure fell as a percentage of GDP, from 15.5% to 12.8% and, as a percentage of total public expenditure, from 31% to 28%, between 1979/80 and 1982/83 total public expenditure rose as a proportion of GDP and central government's proportion increased (Rhodes,p.277). A similar inverse pattern of expenditure can be seen in the simultaneous reduction in spending on 'education' (fell by 8% between 1979 and 1983) and the corresponding dramatic increase in expenditure on 'training' in the form of YOP and YTS. Rhodes characterises the situation thus, '...for the 1979-83 Conservative Government, there is a divergence between the rhetoric and the reality of its policy on public expenditure...'(p.278).

In its attempts to control local government spending the Conservative government introduced in rapid succession a variety of means, most notably the Block Grant system contained in the 1980 Local Government Planning and Land Act and subsequently amended by the Local Government Finance Act (1982). In fact there were no less than seven major revisions of the grant system between 1979 and 1983. Without entering into the details of these 'compendious' and complex pieces of legislation, the net effect on local authorities was to introduce 'considerable uncertainty'. In response to which Rhodes argues the local authorities became either more 'litigious', 'recalcitrant' and/or expert in strategies of 'risk-avoidance'. It is the last tactic which can be seen to have been employed by some local authorities in relation to the introduction of YTS (see *below*). The dominant characteristic of central-local relations over the past decade has therefore been one of 'confusion and ambiguity', according to Rhodes.

This confusion and ambiguity was most apparent in the introduction of YTS. That is, YTS can be seen to have been carefully structured in such a way as to be both politically expedient, yet strategic. This is due to the fact that:

*"The youth training scheme owes its origins to two fundamental needs: a long-standing need to improve industrial training; and a more immediate need to deal with high and rising youth unemployment." (20)*

The very ambiguity of the YTS policy objectives enabled subtle but important changes to be introduced when and where necessary. In particular, the emphasis of the policy could be changed in accordance with local and national circumstances ie. it took account of uneven economic and political development. However, this same ambiguity can also be seen as preventing a more straightforward strategic intervention by central government. Therefore it could have, in the longer term, jeopardised the Scheme's credibility. It was certainly a high-risk strategy.

One of the more ironic products of this policy ambiguity was the way in which some Labour-controlled authorities became more determined than some Tory authorities to implement 'quality' schemes. This helped to legitimate the Scheme. This is due to the relative autonomy of the Local state and its ability to 'interpret' the scheme. Thus, the Further Education Staff College's (FESC) report *YTS and the Local Authority* (1986) highlights the fact that the 'political' nature of YTS was often subsumed by the negotiations over its technical and administrative features:

*" Only in one case was there an explicit difference of opinion about the function and role of YTS, and, in general, the concern to implement the scheme took priority over discussions about its purpose. There was sufficient mutual dependence to guarantee local delivery. Any conflicts appeared to centre on technical, professional and administrative issues and inconveniences." (21)*

The FESC Report also shows how some local authorities deferred their investment in YTS as a result of their reluctance to commit themselves to new rate-borne expenditure emanating from a central government initiative. Thus '...economic circumstances, rather than [YTS] Scheme objectives, were often the dominant factor in decisions ' (p.i) by the local authorities in relation to YTS. In particular, the location of YTS within the overall organisation of a local authority was found to depend on the particular interpretation placed on YTS as a policy. As a result, most authorities initially incorporated YTS within their existing structures and procedures, despite the fact that it was

seen as something entirely new (p.iv). That is, none of the authorities studied by the FESC made significant changes to their internal organisational structures in order to plan and implement YTS. YTS also acted as a catalyst - even a Trojan Horse. That is, to paraphrase the report, 'YTS occasioned changes in the local authority policy or organisation that officers or members had already decided they wished to make eg. the more explicit formulation of a policy for 14-19 provision and the consequent changes in relationships between departments and institutions.'(FESC, 1986). This is a very important finding. It suggests that YTS was the *means* by which some local authorities introduced educational change. In particular, with the advent of the Technical and Vocational Educational Initiative (TVEI), YTS cleared an administrative and political path in some authorities for the vocationalising the curriculum in Schools (Dale 1985). Overall, however, the FESC Report found that many local authorities could and did not commit themselves to YTS.

From the above it might appear that the chances of 'strategic' change resulting from YTS were undermined by the local authorities understandably cautious reception. However, looked at more closely, it could equally well be argued that this was in fact part of the government's long-term strategy to minimise local authority involvement in YTS. Not least because this involvement, due to the proposed administrative framework of YTS and in particular its division into two Modes, increased total public expenditure and imparted some degree of control over training to the local authorities. This violated, in the short-term at least, both the underlying objectives of achieving greater central control and privatisation. However, the immediate political priority of youth unemployment meant that some form of local authority involvement was unavoidable. In this sense the local authorities found themselves with a certain amount of bargaining power, which some recognised and used to establish their particular 'interpretation' of YTS. This was the case especially in those areas with high levels of youth unemployment, where the local authority was the only body capable of providing the necessary Scheme places.

Compared with YOP, it was open for local authorities to contribute to YTS in one or more of the following ways:



*An emphasis on the aspirations of pupils in their last year at school supports an interpretation of YTS as an educational policy, in which the aim is to develop the young people according to their interests and aptitudes.*

*An emphasis on future labour market demands strengthens an interpretation of YTS as an economic development policy, whose major purpose is to create a more productive workforce in the future.*

*An emphasis on the simple availability of places supports an interpretation of YTS as a general training policy, according to which young people should acquire general work-related skills and attitudes. ( It also supports an interpretation of YTS as a containment policy: but that was not an interpretation which helped explain agents' decisions in planning and implementing YTS.) (22)*

What the FESC notably fails to indicate is what determined the choice of the data source. It is suggested here that the politics involved in this choice were paramount and that the 'representational' role of the Local state (Duncan and Goodwin 1987) is evident in this process. That is to say, the choice of data was dependent upon local political struggles which reflect, in turn, the wider economic and political process of development in the locality. What is perhaps more pertinent is the fact that education and, to a far lesser extent, training, fell within the established orbit of some local authority provision, whereas this was not always the case with employment and economic issues. Thus the division really breaks down to the spheres of influence ie. the extent of local authority intervention in local 'economic' and employment planning, and the effect this has on training and education. This, as has been shown elsewhere, is very much the outcome of local political struggles and conflicts, which, whilst related to economic development in general, cannot be seen as 'determined' by these more global influences ( Boddy and Fudge 1984, Dunleavy 1980, Duncan and Goodwin, 1988).

The ambiguity of local involvement in YTS can therefore be seen to have resulted from the ambiguous nature of YTS itself. This allowed for local interpretations, made in accordance with uneven economic and political development. Ultimately of course, it was the government's preferred policy to remove any role in training from the local authority - especially in the form of Mode B. Mode A involvement was acceptable in the short-term provided it

operated in accordance with market principles. This meant that Mode B was always seen by the MSC as 'residual'. Since many of the BI schemes were re-scheduled YOP schemes, which catered mainly for the low-achiever, a differentiation in terms of client groups soon appeared under YTS. Mode B became, in the eyes of providers and potential trainees, the poor cousin of Mode A, *irrespective of the quality of the schemes*. It is also interesting to note the reasons given for the MSC's preference of Mode A :

*" The emphasis on Mode A was argued on the grounds that trainees should experience real industrial workplaces. In addition, although Ministers stated that YTS should not be judged by the success of trainees in finding work, employer-based Mode A places were believed by many to offer the best chances of finding employment. Certainly such placements were attractive to young people and their parents. An added attraction for MSC, of course, was that Mode A places cost MSC less." (23)*

As a result,

*" A survey carried out by the MSC in October 1983 showed that local authorities and local education authorities provided 17% of Mode A places, more than 50% of Mode B1 places and more than 70% of Mode B2 places." (24)*

In the MSC's planning for YTS in 1984/5, Mode B was in fact reduced by 27% ( the national policy for 1983/4 had been approximately that 65% were to be Mode A and 35% under Mode B nationally - locally there were significant variations). This again created considerable uncertainty in the local authorities regarding the extent and nature of their future commitment to YTS.

The provision of off-the-job education and training (OTJ) - mostly in FE - also baulked large in the estimation of the local authorities involvement in YTS. The actual rates for provision were negotiated nationally between the CBI and the Local Authorities Associations. The outcome of this negotiation affected the amount of money devoted to off-the-job training which came out of the trainee block grant. Thus, the more expensive the OTJ provision, the more managing agents were liable to either reduce their consumption of local authority provision or contract out their OTJ to private agencies. This could be seen as a step towards the 'back door privatisation' of training. The Authorities were caught in a vice in two ways. Firstly, if they were themselves Mode A managing agents, it meant that in some cases they were both

attempting to have cheaper rates for OTJ and trying to secure as much OTJ for their colleges as possible at viable rates. They were trying to both avoid charging themselves and at the same time needing to charge themselves more! Secondly, if they incurred a deficit they were liable to rate-capping. A situation described by the Society of Education Officers as a 'bizarre state of affairs' (Brooksbank & Ackstine, p.315)

Another aspect of the change in the institutional relations with regard to YTS and the local authorities was the latter's increasing control over colleges. Ironically, at a time when the local authorities were themselves losing control to central government, in the form of the MSC, YTS gave them more control over individual colleges ( FESC, p.28). The interesting thing about this is the fact that it mirrors the nature of the relationship between the MSC and the local authorities. It also paved the way for the greater control of the FE teachers' labour process through monitoring mechanisms such as the Further Education Management Information System (FEMIS) and educational audits (see *Chapter Ten*).

Overall, it can be seen that the original framework, the institutional ensemble, which accompanied YTS was complex and transitional. The objective was to retain control whilst making provision for uneven local development, especially in relation to the local level of youth unemployment. This variation in response was however constrained by the nature of the funding mechanisms and the interventions of the MSC in relation to YTS. Thus, local authorities had relative autonomy in the sense that they were free to involve themselves in YTS in a number of guises, yet their particular 'interpretation' was bounded by the overall financial and administrative measures which, quite separate from the immediate threat posed by the MSC, had been put into operation in this period eg. rate-capping. As a result, whilst the representational role of the local authority was being severely curtailed, its interpretative role was being emphasised. Thus the institutional basis of YTS perfectly reflects the intended diminution of the state-form relative to the wage-form which was to be the defining feature of the new vocationalism as a strategy of reproduction. This undermining of local representation and accountability was nowhere more apparent than in the operation of the Area Manpower Boards.

9.vi *Political Representation and the Institutional Ensemble*

In order to implement YOP and other special programmes the MSC had worked through 28 Special Programmes Area Boards. These were thought to provide a very important link with developments in local labour markets and with their corporatist composition - employers, trade unionists, local government, voluntary organisations and educational representatives - they helped legitimate the activities of the MSC. Significantly, this form of organisational 'bridge' between the MSC and the locality was restructured with the introduction of YTS. The Youth Task Group Report had recommended that:

*" ...Local Boards should be established to supersede Special Programmes Area Boards ...[whose function] would be to assess the quality and nature of opportunities required in their areas; to establish, support and supervise a network of managing agencies in their areas and through them to ensure that individual schemes meet criteria decided nationally; to mobilise local support, to monitor and evaluate the progress of schemes on the ground..." (25)*

Fifty-four Area Manpower Boards were created, initially with responsibility for planning and supervising the local provision of YTS Schemes.

The original geographical and economic rationale for the distribution of the AMBs is difficult to discern, apart from their compatibility with the MSC's own regional administrative structure. Also, with the introduction of YTS came the creation of a new MSC Training Division through the amalgamation of the previous Training Services and Special Programmes Divisions. In particular, the fact that the AMBs were not always coterminous with local authority boundaries made their liaison and planning functions difficult, not to mention the problem of their accountability (Butters & Richardson 1983). For example, in London four AMBs were created which seemed to correspond only to the division of the capital into arbitrary quadrants. As for their membership, the regional offices of the CBI and the TUC *nominated* representatives and in some cases the representatives of local authority and educational interests were often placed in the invidious position of sitting on Boards which encroached upon geographical, administrative and political areas of which they were not representative at all! At the same time certain interest groups were only

marginally represented and in some cases excluded altogether from participation on the Boards. According to the Youthisaid study:

*" The total voting membership of the 55 AMBs in May 1984 was 859 according to the MSC head office. In the same period, there was only one voting ethnic minority representative on an AMB and only seventy women including co-optees. The number of young people on AMBs was not known by the MSC." (26)*

Quite apart from the unrepresentative and limited advisory capacity of the AMBs, their actual procedures are also thought to have undermined their intended role ie. the role envisaged by the Youth Task Group Report. Lack of suitable information, agenda-setting and proper inspection of schemes have all been known to have hindered those representatives who have attempted to monitor YTS in their locality (Youthisaid 1983). As a result, the planning and supervision of training needs by the AMBs is thought to have been, at best, cursory. Critics of the MSC therefore point to the real, 'political' function of the Boards - the centralisation of power and control.

#### 9.vii Summary

As shown above, YTS was designed in such a way as to meet two policy objectives: overcoming the crisis in training and the problem of youth unemployment. In this respect it was a 'natural' candidate for determination by the two guiding principles behind the Conservative government's policies relating to central-local state relations, namely privatisation and greater central control. The institutional and administrative form of YTS and, in particular, the role of Managing Agents and the division between Modes A and B, can be seen to mirror exactly the duality of the Conservative's approach. On the one hand Mode A, being 'employer-led', was to spearhead the opening up of training to market forces and privatisation. This should be interpreted as a deliberate attempt to make the wage-form dominant within Mode A Schemes ie. the discipline of the workplace and the rigours of work itself were to be the major devices for reproducing the appropriate capacities and attitudes in the

young worker. It also entailed 'decollectivising' the consumption of NAFE. On the other hand, Mode B was to act as a residual form of reproduction, vocational preparation in fact, for those who, for whatever reason, but most noticeably youth unemployment associated with uneven economic development, could not be found places on Mode A. Within Mode B the dominance of the state-form was unavoidable, albeit always open to modification by changing the citizenship rights of the young people in question. Therefore the two YTS Modes can be seen as complementary components of a single strategy of reproduction.

The fact that Mode A was directly related to employment, or the possibility of future employment, meant that it soon came to be seen by trainees as superior to Mode B, regardless of the quality of the Schemes. Inevitably this meant that the justification for, and indeed 'marketing' of, Mode B provision was made more difficult by the 'success' of Mode A. From its inception therefore, the organisation of YTS was deliberately geared towards the eventual elimination of Mode B ie. the elimination of vocational preparation as a residual form of state expenditure. This is due to the fact that vocational preparation, by necessity, prioritised the inculcation of the state-form as a means of combining education with training. This inevitably left it open to political determination as a form of collective consumption. YTS, on the other hand, was to be '*first and last a training scheme*'. If it was to extend the educational franchise, it could only do so by redefining the 'education' moment. This entailed a redefinition of the state-form, the rights of citizenship, of the target population. The institutional ensemble of the state outlined above provided the basis for this strategy. It is therefore necessary to look at how YTS was implemented in order to evaluate this thesis.

Notes and References - Chapter Nine

1. MSC:AA (MSC 1981) para 23
2. Govt:APA (DoE 1981) para 3 p.3
3. *ibid* p.6
4. Youthaid (1984) p.4
5. Keep (1986) p.17
6. Green (1983) p.60 *see also* Coventry Workshop (1983) in *Keep op cit*
7. Farley (1985) p.
8. *Keep op cit* p.5
9. Govt:APA (DoE 1981) pp.5 & 14
10. *ibid* p.13
11. *ibid* p.14
12. *ibid* p.13
13. *ibid* p.9
14. Farley, NJ, Feb. 1982, p.13
15. NJ, March 1982 p.7
16. MSC/YTG Report para 1.2 p.7
17. MSC (1983) Guide to Managing Agents
18. Chapman & Tooze (1987) p.53
19. Rhodes (1984) p.268
20. Bevan & Varlaam (1988) p.93
21. FESC (1986) p.13
22. *ibid* p.7
23. *ibid* p.8
24. *ibid* p.14
25. MSC/YTG para 5.11
26. Youthaid (1983) p.208

## CHAPTER TEN

### *The Youth Training Scheme*

#### 10.i *Introduction*

As indicated in the previous chapter, the introduction of YTS helped transform the relationship between both the employers and FE and the local authority and the individual college. It therefore represented a 'major shift in the control of vocational education and training' (Stoney 1987 - hereafter NFER). As well as cementing the provision of new types of course, the 'new FE' also brought with it a considerable impetus for curriculum and organisational change. Of course, FE had, by the time of the introduction of YTS, already adjusted to a form of vocational preparation, YOP, and the new clientele this brought to the colleges.

FE had also had time to reflect and reorganise following the decline in the numbers of traditional apprentices. Many 'traditional' vocational lecturers had been redeployed to the 'new FE', albeit unwillingly in many cases since the grading system of FE courses continued to work against the new FE being seen as anything other than second-class, both professionally and remuneratively. These factors and others, such as the new funding arrangements associated with MSC 'purchasing' courses, are important in so far as they were to be reflected in the variability of the teachers' response to the introduction of the new vocationalism. In general, the introduction of the new vocationalism did not come as a shock to the system since the decade leading up to it had already been one of 'turbulence and change'. Nevertheless, the FE teachers' renowned adaptability was to be tested to the full with the introduction of YTS.

#### 10.ii *YTS in Practice*

Following the success of the tripartite Youth Task Group in revising the government's attempt to move directly to a compulsory 'training' scheme, YTS

was deemed to be a one-year scheme of '...vocational preparation ..for young people of all abilities designed to provide an integrated programme of training, work experience and further education' (MSC 1984,p.3). There was no doubt therefore as to where the emphasis of the scheme was eventually to lie - it was to be 'work-based and focussed on practical competence'. That is, it was to be '*first and last a training scheme*'. Hence the significance attached to Mode A.

Overall, YTS was to consist of 'learning opportunities' in six broad areas :

- i) basic skills
- ii) world of work
- iii) world outside employment
- iv) job specific and broadly-related skills
- v) personal effectiveness
- vi) skill transfer

which were to be provided within the following 'design elements';

- i) induction
- ii) occupationally-based training
- iii) off-the-job training
- iv) planned work experience
- v) core areas
- vi) guidance and support
- vii) assessment
- viii) reviewing and recording progress achievement and certification.

From the nature of these proposed learning opportunities, it can be seen that, in theory at least, the division between 'work' and 'adult' life was still intended to be bridged within the YTS curriculum. However, the means by which this bridge or integration was to be achieved was tenuous to say the least. It was to be found only in the design elements of 'induction' and the 'core areas'. The other design elements can be seen to fall squarely within the well-established realms of either 'work/training' (ii and iv), 'social/education' (vi,vii and viii) or 'assessment/selection' (iii and vi) ie. which, in terms of the content-theoretical model being employed here, correspond to the three 'moments' of the process of reproducing labour capacities - training, education and selection.

In 1981 the MSC had commissioned the Institute of Manpower Studies (IMS) to identify a programme of learning objectives - the framework for a YTS curriculum - which could be specified as the basis for its New Training Initiative. The IMS reported in *Training For Skill Ownership* (1983) which identified the learning objectives and the methods of assessment to be employed in YTS. A feature of these objectives is their high level of generality. The central content of YTS was to be the Core Skills programme - 103 generic and transferable 'skills'. That is, skills which could be related to a broad range of occupations. These were not the traditional vocational 'skills' but competences - dispositions, attitudes etc. - designed specifically to develop the trainee cognitively, socially and personally.

The competences identified by the IMS were initially divided broadly between those required in employment and those required in 'the world outside employment', with a built-in assumption that the former were more important. The problem with this division was that, since the competences for employment were to be generic and transferable, they could not be specified. As such, it was only the dispositions of the trainee which could provide the basis for assessment. The generic character of the employment-related competences also meant that some form of classification of common skills within a range of occupations was called for. This was eventually to take the form of the IMS's concept of Occupational Training Families (OTFs), each of which had its own 'Key Purpose'. Employment-related competences were deemed to either reflect the key purpose of the OTF or be common to all OTFs. For example, 25 occupations were named in OTF 1 (Transport Services Occupations) including air traffic control assistant, milkman, refuse collector, lift attendant and ship's agent. Not surprisingly, the basis for this aggregation of what appear to be disparate occupations has been widely criticised. For example, Jonathan (1987):

*" If criteria relate primarily to the notional 'key purpose' of a general field of employment activity, irrespective of the competence differences of both level and type which obtain within that field, then there is clearly no basis for common competence and consequent skill transfer between occupations within the family which would adequately prepare for any, let alone all, of the named occupations. OTFs established on this basis would defeat the purpose for which they were set up."*

(1)

Alternatively, it had to be the fact that a competence was common to all the

named occupations which defined membership of a particular OTF. In which case, the generality of this common possession must be of such a low order as to make the notion of 'skill' transfer almost meaningless.

In the 'world outside employment' six key roles were identified; Contributing to the Community, Self-employment, Continuing Education, Pursuit of Leisure Activities, Personal Survival and Exercising Citizenship. The last two of which were considered 'essential' roles. In practice, the 'world outside of employment' can be seen to have consisted largely of the world of unemployment. That is, the trainee's status and role were to be measured in terms of work or the absence of work. Therefore the wage-form was to be the central reference point for both the learning objectives for employment and the world outside of employment. Thus the wage-form can be seen to define the nature of the state-form - the citizenship rights of the trainee. This is most evident in the role for the YTS trainee 'outside the world of employment' identified as 'Exercising Citizenship'.

The central objective of Exercising Citizenship, an area of personal development, was for the YTS trainee 'to obtain rights and fulfil responsibilities as a citizen'. Citizenship can here be seen as being taken literally as a given. For example, the nature of the rights relevant to trainees are defined into two areas: their right to 'contribute to society' and their right 'obtain social, financial and legal benefits to which entitled as a citizen'. The nature of the competences associated with these duties and benefits clearly indicates that a passive role was envisaged for the trainee. Thus, the trainee should 'apply to the right body/person at the correct time' and 'Apply by means seen appropriate by body/person'. This is a conception of citizenship which is modelled on the wage-form, a training-in-citizenship, as opposed to the citizen-in-training of vocational preparation. It is a conception which is based on what is expected, duties, rather than responsibilities and rights.

In the light of the above, and the analysis of the institutional form of YTS in Chapter Nine, the content-theoretical model suggests that, in practice, there should be a clear relationship between the different Modes and the degree of insulation/integration of the design elements found in YTS. That is, Mode A should have exhibited the least integration and Mode B the most. This

conforms with the general hypothesis that the dominance of the wage-form was to replace that of the state-form in YTS as it moved from being a form of social expenses/collective consumption (Modes B1 and B2) to a form of social investment (Mode A). This hypothesis is based on the view that the insulation, separation-in-unity, of the forms of domination was made more problematic as a result of both the relative autonomy of the Local state and its capacity to deem expenditure to be a form of collective consumption (Mode B) and the employers inability to integrate training and education (Mode A). Evidence from a number of studies of the actual implementation and practice of YTS support this hypothesis and thereby confirm the efficacy of the model.

The integration of 'working' and 'adult life' was to be manifested within YTS in the distinction which was made between 'planned worked experience'[WE] and 'off-the-job' training and further education [OTJ]. The ideal of integrating these components was referred to as 'alternance' [note] a central concept in vocational preparation. Most, if not all of the independent research suggests that alternance has not been achieved within YTS ( FEU 1985, IDS 1983, DES 1984). Furthermore this failure has been attributed, in the main, to institutional basis of YTS. That is, the institutional form of YTS has been shown to have compromised its functions. In particular, responsibility for alternance was placed in the hands of MAs. As a result it has been found that:

*" Colleges have not been able to introduce curricular aims as stated in MSC guidelines and have often found it necessary , particularly in Mode A schemes merely to respond to customer demand...the possibilities of integration have been greatly reduced in YTS." (2)*

However, the FEU also found that the ' ...situation has been very different on Mode B2 schemes where an FE college has been able to plan the entire programme '(p.12). Here they found a 'high degree' of integration. This suggests that propensity to integrate WE and OTJ was directly related to Scheme Mode which, in turn, denotes a relationship to the type of state expenditure (collective consumption, social expenses or investment). Overall, the FEU summarised the situation as follows:

*" The chief deficiency in the design of the curriculum has been the lack of integration (alternance) between the off-the-job education and training and the work experience/on-the-job training. Alternance is exhibited in most B2 schemes but only in a few others. The constraints to an integrated design include the independent development of the off-the-job programme; shortage of financial resources to allow curriculum development and design working groups to be set up between the college and the employers (MAs); and the prescription of MAs for a traditional course. When the college had control of a scheme it was able to innovate and pursue ideas that had been suggested by the MSC, FEU and others."*  
(3)

The lack of alternance within YTS can be gauged most clearly in those design elements which were to act specifically as the bridge between WE and OTJ - induction and Core Skills. Induction is an important content area of the YTS curriculum in so far as it helps illustrate the gap between the ideals of vocational preparation, with its overall orientation to the state-form, and the dominance of the wage-form in the new vocationalism. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the different interpretations of induction offered by the MSC [note: in the guise of their curriculum advisors on YTS, the IMSJ and the FEU. According to the MSC's Scheme Guide, induction was to consist of the following:

*" The induction programme should cover what the trainees need to know on entry to the scheme, and each time the trainee moves to a new area of work within the scheme. Items which should be included are: the purpose of YTS; details of work experience; an explanation of the skills that the trainee will be given the opportunity to acquire; an explanation of the off-the-job training; the relevant health and safety rules; scheme administration such as allowances; attendance, discipline; etc."* (4)

According to Seale (1984), whereas the MSC required little of trainees but to 'listen and remember' the rules and regulations relating to YTS, the FEU, '...regard[ed] induction as an exercise with far broader implications than simply settling trainees down to appropriate roles and telling them where to hang their coats ' (p.345). The FEU's stated view was that the basis of induction should be a 're-orientation' of the trainees away from the traditional staff-learner relationship within which they see themselves as pupils. The emphasis therefore was to be placed on their maturity and ability to 'negotiate' their curriculum. Trainees were to be persuaded/taught that '...what they get out of YTS

should be as much their responsibility as their Sponsors' (p.8). The MSC's view, on the other hand, contains no such 're-orientation' or 'adjustment' of the trainee's outlook, and can be seen as little more than initial introduction to what is expected of the trainee on YTS i.e. there was little or no mention of 'negotiation' in the MSC's conception.

In practice very little 'negotiation' of the curriculum has been found in the studies of YTS. The FEU, for example, found little evidence of negotiation either between MA and college or trainee and tutor. Overall, there is also little evidence to suggest that the FEU's view of induction has prevailed in YTS. Where induction was carried out by MAs it was found that they failed to relate the different aspects of the Scheme design and in some cases totally misled or misinformed trainees as to the nature of the OTJ training. ( FEU, para 5.1.2). Where the induction was carried out in colleges it was found to be unrelated to the trainees work placements. Moreover, it was not well received by trainees. This was the experience of those trainees in one local authority scheme observed by this author. At the induction 'feedback' meeting, there was a general feeling of being 'bombarded' with information, rules, etc. which could not be digested. This appears to have been quite a common experience (FEU, para 5.1.6).

A similar situation has been found in relation to the lack of integration of Core Skills:

*" the survey has revealed that the core skills have created the greatest problems and exhibit a wider variety of approaches than any other aspect of YTS." (5)*

An HMI report came to similar conclusions:

*" There is little evidence of integration or coordination of core skills, vocational studies and work experience across various parts of schemes." (6)*

This would appear to vindicate the view that the the whole concept of vocational preparation, the integration of forms, was being actively resisted by some trainees and staff in FE. Indeed, something of an accord between staff and students can be seen in the fact that it was only the vocational subjects (often job-specific) teaching which many teachers and trainees found acceptable:

*" ...most trainees were happiest with the vocationally linked elements of the off-the-job training. Attempts to provide a broadly-based introduction to a family of jobs were not readily acceptable. (7)*

Paradoxically, it appears to have been the case that, within YTS, it was those schemes which departed most from the philosophy of vocational preparation, such as the Construction Industry Training Board (CITB) schemes, and those that most conformed, B2 schemes, that trainees were found to be 'highly motivated and well satisfied' (FEU p.69, DES p.9). Once again, this can be explained in terms of the degree of insulation of the wage and state forms found in these schemes and how this determined the perceptions of YTS held by trainees (Rickman *et al* 1986).

The low level of allowance has also been shown in some studies to have been a particular disincentive to YTS 'enlistment.' This, coupled with the sheer banality of the tasks some trainees have been told to perform - both in work placement and in OTJ - has surfaced as a major indictment of YTS by trainees on low skill schemes. Discipline problems have also resulted and this has placed many employers and some traditional FE lecturers in an altogether new domain as far as their employer-employee, student-teacher relations are concerned. This, coupled with the growth of the tendencies towards compulsion, most noticeably recent changes to the benefits system, has also tarnished the portrayal of YTS as a serious training scheme. This attack on the social citizenship of the young unemployed was reinforced by Mrs Thatcher's declarations relating to withdrawal of their 'right' to choose to be idle' (see *below*). This denial of citizenship rights - a transformation of the state-form - also supports the notion that YTS has produced a new 'social condition' in the young unemployed school-leaver (Finn 1987, Willis 1986, Jordan 1986).

Willis (1986), for example, has suggested that the young unemployed have begun to experience such a new social condition. This he describes as a condition of 'suspended animation' between school and work. Willis attributes this state of consciousness to the absence of the *wage* (p.157).

*" ...the wage is still the golden key ( mortgage, rent, bills) to a personal household separate from parents and separate from work, from Production. The home is the main living embodiment of the (especially male) labourer's 'freedom and independence' from Capital - apart from wage labour, of course, which is the price for the independence of the separate home. But this price really does purchase something. The household is an area of privacy, security and protection from the aggression and exploitation of work, from the patriarchal dependencies at least of the parental home, from the vicissitudes of the market place. The separate home is still a universal working class objective and the promise, at least, of its warmth and safety more than offsets the risk and coldness of work. Waged work is still the key to its opposite. No wage is no keys in the future." (8)*

Willis' general point about the power of what in this thesis is being seen as the wage-form is most important. The promise of the wage and the experience of the wage relation can indeed be seen as a form of 'enfranchisement' (p.158) so long as it is recognised that it is also, in reality, a form of *unfreedom* (Wood 1986). In Willis' terms, it is the price of the private sphere. What appears to be missing in this recognition of the different spheres and their relation, is the state. A conception of citizenship, the state-form, apart from a single reference to the state's increasingly coercive character, is absent in Willis' account. Yet, it is precisely the transformation of this form which can be seen to account for the 'new condition' of the young unemployed. Whilst Willis fails to recognise this, it is however implicit in his policy recommendations:

*" In general the impulses of those reforms which come from what I called the 'profane' functions of education for working class and oppressed groups could be placed simply under the heading of a vigorous equal opportunities policy." (9)*

In other words, the restoration of the rights of social citizenship, the state-form, including the right to education, is called for.

Willis' work also points towards another phenomenon associated with the transformation of the state-form in the new vocationalism, the fact that Black youth (10) are turning in large numbers to Further Education and the traditional academic 'second chance' to improve their employment prospects (p.165). In which case, it becomes possible to develop an explanation of the racism which has been found in YTS.

Research on Black youth has shown that they have been marginalised within YTS to Mode B schemes. The Commission for Racial Equality (1984), for example, found clear evidence of discrimination amongst fifteen major employers. This can be seen as an example of an institutional framework, in this case YTS, working through values which reinforce stereotypes. A view supported by Means *et al* (1985): ' ..the values about race were aligned to efficiency values in implementation in such a way as to undermine the social goals of the policy ' (p.71). This is the case despite the MSC's commitment to an Equal Opportunities policy in the Scheme - in January 1983 the MSC released a press statement which stated that the scheme would be ' open to all young people within the range of eligibility, regardless of race, religion, sex and disability.' The MSC also commissioned Means *et al* to conduct a six month survey of ethnic minority provision because,

*" From an early stage, the MSC became concerned that young black people would be recruited disproportionately into Mode B schemes and that this Mode would come to be seen as an inferior form of YTS provision. Research into YOP had shown that young black people were far more likely than their white counterparts to be allocated a place on the then 'Training Workshops' or 'Community Service Schemes' than ' Work Experience in Employers Premises' (11)*

Means' research showed that this indeed was happening in YTS. Not only were Black youth being placed disproportionately on Mode B, they were also concentrated on a relatively small number of such schemes. Typical of the comments reported in the study is that of a Managing Agent, ' Mode B provision is needed for those with special needs...the emotionally disturbed and ethnic minorities.' Contrary to the actual situation, ie. of Black youth staying at school and in FE longer than their white counterparts, it was often found that Black young people were *perceived* as lacking commitment to obtaining qualifications. Consequently they were considered unsuited to Mode A schemes. This research demonstrates in a most vivid way the extent of the institutionalised racism in the YTS, made possible by the division between the Modes and the role given to Managing Agents.

Young white women have faced a similar fate to Black youth in general within the institutional framework of YTS (Wickham 1985, Cockburn 1987, Skeggs 1988, Seymour 1988). Despite the pronouncements of 'breaking the mould' of sex stereotyping within YTS, familiar gender divisions in the labour

market have been shown to have been reproduced. Young women have been found to be concentrated in community and health, sales and personal services and the clerical occupational sectors. Young men are to be found in engineering and manufacturing (Fawcett Society 1985). In relation to this thesis, one of the most interesting aspects of the research regarding the impact on young women of youth unemployment and YTS has been the finding that there has been renewed emphasis on what is seen here as the 'civil-form' of domination. That is, some young working-class women have sought autonomy and self-esteem through motherhood and 'caring' in response to the blocked opportunities on offer through training (Campbell 1984, Skeggs 1988). Thus, as a result of their exclusion from the wage-form and the state's attempt to redefine the state-form, this might be interpreted as an attempt to appropriate the 'private' sphere and the civil-form as their own. However, such an appropriation appears to reproduce their own subordination and, as Skeggs (*op cit*) in particular, demonstrates, this resonates with current policies and welfare cut-backs ie. can be related to changes in the nature of collective consumption processes in general (p.146).

The relationship between the transformation of the state-form and citizenship rights in YTS and these findings relating to gender and race, accords with the widely recognised disparities between the nature of citizenship rights between men and women and between the 'indigenous' (white) population and ethnic minorities (Hall et al 1978, MacKinnon, 1982). Thus, the transformation in YTS of the state-form, citizenship, on the basis of the wage-form, can be seen as a way of introducing the principles of the labour market into social rights: the 'privatisation' of rights. Therefore,

*"...the category of YTS trainee does not have the same legal status as a 'worker' or 'student'. They have, along with increasing numbers of the unemployed, a quasi-citizenship status imposed upon them by the state - the 1981 Nationality Act exemplifying this in relation to blacks. Thus, skill and its 'ownership' are given by the state (MSC) as a means of enfranchisement into socio-legal rights on YTS schemes" (12)*

This inevitably meant that those who already had second-class rights, as 'second-class' citizens eg. the young, women and Black people, would become even more vulnerable to the discriminatory practices of the labour market, since what little protection they had would be redefined and diminished.

Therefore a scheme such as YTS, based as it was on the wage-form, inevitably reproduced, even exacerbated, these inequalities.

The introduction of YTS can also be seen to have signalled a change in the citizenship rights of teachers. That is, the transformation of their labour process brought about by YTS can be shown to have undermined their status as 'professionals'. As a result, it must be seen as contributing to their proletarianisation.

### 10.iii *YTS and the FE Teachers' Labour Process*

In what is perhaps the most comprehensive study yet made of the 'impact' of YTS on FE, Stoney (1987) [INFER Report] appears to seriously understate the situation regarding the introduction of YTS when she suggests that 'the nine months prior to the launch of YTS in September 1983 was characterized as a period of considerable uncertainty' (p.123). By way of comparison, the then President of NATFHE described the same period as resembling the 'Mad Hatter's Tea Party' (Minta 1983). Colleges had run pilot NTI (YTS) courses in the previous twelve months according to criteria which were believed to have been the blue print for the actual YTS. The financial, administrative, staffing, curricula and accommodation plans for the first intake of YTS were already well advanced when the MSC 'moved the goal-posts', including most crucially the amount of OTJ work which was to be provided in FE (13 weeks was to be the norm rather than the envisaged 26). Therefore, last minute reorganisation had to take place creating the 'considerable uncertainty' mentioned above. Both the NFER Report on YTS and the FEU's (1985) evaluation of the role of FE, found that the management of the introduction of YTS had created considerable hostility amongst FE staff towards the scheme and the MSC.

As in the case of the local authorities (Chapter 9), the climate of uncertainty surrounding the introduction of YTS meant that a 'wait and see' position was initially adopted by FE management and staff. As a result, YTS was often 'bolted-on' to existing organisation and provision. This meant

however that the colleges had to be prepared for changes in 'the market' for their services and that traditional course planning and staffing arrangements had to be changed. This was manifested in for example the Extended College Year (ECY) being adopted in direct response to the competition of private training agencies who could recruit and run all year round. By 1985, eighty per cent of Principals reported that their college had begun to operate some form of ECY (NFER, p.22). Similarly, in the appointment of staff. YTS, like YOP, encouraged the practice of appointment on the basis of temporary and part-time contracts. The vagaries of the 'market' for trainees and the last minute nature of the assessing the viability (profitability) of running a college scheme, meant that decisions on staffing also had to be made at the last moment. This led to YTS being staffed mostly by 'junior' ( what used to be the L1 grade) and part-time teachers. The insecurity and the lesser conditions of service associated with this type of appointment strengthened what was an already growing divide within the ranks of the FE teachers between can be seen as a 'core' of full-time, secure and higher status positions and a 'periphery' made up of temporary, part-time and lower status positions, occupied in many cases by women teachers. This might also be taken as evidence of the relationship between the feminisation and deskilling of teaching which has been noted elsewhere (Apple 1986).

Overall, YTS tutors have been found to fall into three distinct categories:

*" i) Tutors who have been redeployed on to the schemes from traditional FE courses, who tended to see YTS in terms of vocational outcomes and who needed help in implementing student-centred teaching and assessment methods, learning how to work flexibly with colleagues from different disciplines and how to relate to young people of varied abilities, attitudes and needs.*

*ii) Experienced FE practitioners who have been drawn towards vocational preparation work in recent years and have been responsible for leading the YTS innovations in their colleges. They have been concerned to extend their existing skills and to further their career development process.*

*iii) Lecturers new to FE from industry, youth work or initial teacher training who have been attracted to YTS work, are skilled in coping with young people but need help in fulfilling their new lecturing roles and learning about the FE system."*  
(13)

In many respects, it is possible to see in this categorisation a built-in

gradation of the levels of acceptance of YTS, running from low to high ( i to iii). Also, an important point to note here is the fact that many of the appointments in category (iii) were found to have been made on a completely novel basis for FE. That is, they were found to have been appointed *not* on the traditional basis of either their academic or teaching qualifications or proven experience in a skilled occupation, but on the basis their '*flexibility and willingness to work in new ways*'.(NFER, p.48) Empathy and experience of working with unmotivated, immature youngsters were considered more important as criteria of appointment than previous educational, commercial or industrial experience. As a result, these 'generalists' (NFER) can be distinguished from both 'vocationists' and 'educationalists' - a new type of teacher for the 'new FE'. The basis of these new appointments also strongly suggests that teaching and vocational 'skills' were not the qualities required of the new teachers, indeed they might even be considered to be obstacles to the implementation of the new type of courses. For example, in 1984 an HMI report *Education for Employees* found that some lecturers, particularly 'vocationists' (using the above categorisation) had become '*out of touch*' with the demands of the new FE.

In order to help overcome resistance to change amongst FE teachers, *course teams* were set up to develop and implement the type of curriculum called for by YTS (14). These teams were led by 'course co-ordinators' whose responsibility it was to lead the initiative. As a result, one of the major innovations in curriculum development brought about by the advent of YTS has been the greater involvement of junior members of staff. In the NFER study forty per cent of tutors felt that they were more involved in curriculum development work as a result of YTS. From this it might appear that YTS also heralded the 'reskilling' of many FE teachers, a form of responsible autonomy which parallels that of the local authorities *vis* the 'interpretation' of YTS. However, looked at more closely, these findings reveal that 'many' YTS lecturers felt themselves to be 'merely the implementers' of other people's designs (p.67). In fact, many felt uninformed as to their contribution to the courses as a whole and ill-equipped to undertake the sort of development work which they were now being asked to carry out, often at short notice and with little or no guidance. One would therefore have to conclude from this that, whilst some reskilling was undoubtedly taking place, especially in the case of

course co-ordinators, it was minimal and short-term. This is also evidenced by the funding arrangements for Staff Development - the so-called Robertson Shilling - which was temporary and concerned with initial training rather than INSET. Nevertheless, sixty per cent of of YTS tutors felt that they had already adopted new teaching methods by the Spring of 1984 (NFER, p.70). A fundamental transformation of the labour process of the FE teacher had therefore begun to take place as a result of the introduction of YTS.

In Chapter Seven the labour process of the FE teacher was discussed. One of the main conclusions of that discussion was the possibility that the introduction of vocational preparation, in the shape of YOP, could be related directly to the deskilling of some FE teachers. This deskilling was seen primarily in terms of a reduction in the transmission of the technical relations of production, the 'instruction' function of the teacher and a concomitant increase in their socialisation function, seen however as increasingly the product of preconceptualisation. Thus, it might now be posited that, as a result of the introduction of the new vocationalism, the labour process of the FE teacher saw the removal of the cloak which previously covered the transmission of an ideology which supported the social relations found *in* production. That is, the emphasis which FE teachers traditionally placed upon the transmission of the technical relations of production is no longer required by the new FE. As a result, 'transferable skills' and the integration of 'education' and 'training' did not allow for this neutrality which masked the underlying social relations in production. As a result, FE teachers have begun to experience the same sort of conception of their role as that held by many school teachers. That is, they are beginning to see their role primarily in terms of surveillance and control, albeit without some of the safeguards that school teachers have eg. the compulsory nature of schooling. This change in the nature of the FE teachers' labour process has been borne out by the research into YTS.

An important indication of the increasing surveillance and control function associated with the introduction of YTS has been found to be the greater involvement of lecturers in the guidance, review and profiling aspects of the YTS curriculum - its selection function. As a result, of those surveyed by the NFER, many considered the administrative functions associated with YTS

had taken up most of their commitment. However, the extent to which profiling was considered an important aspect of the YTS curriculum varied enormously ( p.75) There was certainly a lack of consistency and purpose found in the way in which profiles were being used (Jordan 1986).

Both the FEU and the NFER reports found that one of the major difficulties experienced by YTS tutors had been with the change in the clientele within FE - the raw material of the FE teachers labour process. This change had brought with it behavioural and motivational problems which for some FE teachers were beyond their previous experience (NFER, p.68). As a result:

*" Many tutors previously experienced in teaching pre-selected youngsters of above average ability, reported that they found it very difficult to cope with the range of needs presented in some of the early classes. As the 1983/84 session progressed this led not only to disillusioned trainees, but also to many disaffected and frustrated staff, who felt themselves to be working in a highly unrewarding teaching situation for which most had not received any training." (15)*

This disaffection amongst teachers can also be directly related to the institutional framework of YTS. In particular, the way in which Managing Agents could direct FE to take trainees on to courses for which they were unsuited. Thus, the professional advice of the FE teacher was being ignored in many cases and their ownership and control of the learning process undermined by the nature of the institutionalised control incorporated in the design of the YTS ( FEU,1985). As a result of these difficulties some FE teachers were found to have reduced the academic content of their courses and the pace of the programmes (NFER, p.70). Additionally, many teachers turned to pre-packaged course materials:

*" The heavy workload of YTS tutors, the changing composition of some trainee groups and the time needed to design projects, prepare materials and to assess the work appeared to constrain the amount of homemade materials which could be developed. As a result, tutors depended heavily in the first year of YTS, on existing or published materials." (16)*

All of this suggests that the labour process of some FE teachers has undergone a process of deskilling.

The reduction of the FE teacher's skills to an 'average' is also evidenced in the introduction of the educational audit. This form of control has entered

FE along with the MSC's funds. According to Broomhead and Coles, educational audits involve the following characteristics:

*" It is assumed ...that education ...can be evaluated according to 'cost-benefit equations'. Inputs are thus measured in units - staff hours, equipment, classroom or workshop plant all measured in pounds. Outputs are measured through ' qualifications attained' and 'students placed in employment'. Implementation is 'efficient' and 'effective' use of staff time, measured by 'staff-student ratios', 'course-unit costing' and 'student retention rates'. the quality of teaching thus becomes reduced to the efficient and cost-effective investment of time and money spent teaching ( or preparing to do so), as measured against an 'outcome': placing the results of one's teaching in the labour market." (17)*

What we see here is an attempt to introduce a form of 'scientific management' in FE. Indeed, with the introduction of the Further Education Management Information Systems (FEMIS) (18) already well advanced in many local authorities, the *real* subsumption of the labour of the FE teacher had clearly become a major objective of management.

The 'objective' evidence supports the claim that the introduction of the new vocationalism, in the shape of YTS, has contributed to the deskilling of FE teachers. The nature of the political mobilisation this engendered will now be examined. As one would expect, given the ambiguous nature of YTS itself, the overall pattern of political mobilisation was one of increasing divisiveness amongst the ranks of FE teachers.

#### 10. iv *The Divisions within NATFHE over YTS*

From internal and published accounts of the debate within NATFHE over the introduction of YTS, it is possible to identify three loosely defined 'factions' within the membership. Firstly there was the 'opposition' to YTS, mainly from the Left, who were pessimistic about the possibility of reforming the Government's intentions regarding YTS and saw the scheme as a departure from the ideals of vocational preparation. In other words, they identified YTS as a completely new form of provision designed to undermine both the trainees' and teachers' resistance to vocationalism. A second faction, the 'optimists', can be identified as those who embraced the concept of the new vocationalism and believed that YTS was the foundation for vocational preparation in FE. Finally, there were the 'pragmatists' who recognised the very real faults in the new vocationalism, as proposed by the Government in the shape of YTS, but nevertheless were intent on 'making the most of a bad job for the sake of the trainees' (one might add that their own career interests were also served by 'getting on with it'.) This last fraction held onto the hope of YTS being 'turned' into vocational preparation. By making reference to illustrative materials, the various positions can now be identified in more detail.

The views of the opposition within the ranks of NATFHE are expressed for example by Marilyn Moos in the *NATFHE Journal* (NJ, May, 1982). Implacably opposed to the MSC and all it stood for, Moos argued that the YTS was nothing less than an attempt to 'restructure youth and decrease the power of the trade unions' (p.26). She argued that the 'muted' opposition to the MSC and YTS within the ranks of NATFHE was due to the Tebbit 'trick' of dropping the elements of compulsion within the White Paper proposals. This had seduced the leadership of the Association and at the same time induced a sense of relief that the milder proposals of the YTG had been accepted. Moos' article contains a number of insights which exemplify the opposition views regarding YTS and the new vocationalism:

- i) YTS was seen as representing a widening of the net of the new vocationalism to all young people, not just the unemployed. In this sense, the opposition saw the scheme as reinforcing inequalities through social selection.
  - ii) The notion of 'transferable skills' contained in the content of YTS was equated with an attack on apprenticeships and the trade unions' control of skills.
  - iii) An employer-led scheme was seen as leading inevitably to the privatisation of training.
  - iv) According to Moos, 'education' was being redefined as 'training' and this represented a move away from the social-democratic consensus and the notion of individual mobility through education.
  - v) YTS would bring with it changes in the teachers' labour process. In particular, there would be an increase in the teachers' policing/supervisory role through profiling, as well as a loss of control over the curriculum.
  - vii) Finally, there was a real threat to the FE teachers' conditions of service.
- What is most noticeable about this list is the way in which it combines 'professional' and 'trade union' issues. Indeed, the comprehensiveness of the opposition's arguments and, in particular, their recognition of the 'political' nature of YTS, may account for the difficulties they experienced in winning over sections of the membership during this period. That is, bringing the issues together in this way goes against the traditional separation, if only in rhetoric, of their being 'professional' and 'trade union' issues. The opposition's argument be seen as an attempt to collapse this distinction. As a result they were often accused of attempting to bring about the 'politicisation' of teacher trade unionism.

The arguments of those in favour of YTS - the 'optimists' - are typified by Roy Boffy and Paul Cave (*NJ*. Dec. 1982.). They also attempted to conflate professional and trade union issues - although they are seen and talked about 'as if' they are separate and sequential. That is, it is only by being professional that one eventually achieves better conditions of service. This is typical of what Elliot terms 'occupational-professionalism' (1973). Boffy and Cave argued that by doing 'their best' in terms of making YTS work, NATFHE members would be helping themselves. Furthermore, YTS was seen to offer an opportunity to provide a 'fully comprehensive' system of FE by breaking down those forces of reaction - the academic and trade elites - which in the past

made it a preserve of a few. Most importantly, this is seen by Boffy and Cave as requiring a redefinition of the relationship between education and training, although in a manner which is contrary to that envisaged by the opposition. Thus Boffy and Cave suggested the proposals for YTS implied the following : ' In this context, training equals education and education equals learning.' (p.25). It is difficult to know whether the 'education equals learning' is meant to be suggestive of 'education equals training' in this usage. These authors also emphasised the trainee-centred nature of the YTS curriculum. The 'negotiated curriculum' would, in their view, place the trainee in a situation of greater control and responsibility over their individualised learning programme. This, they argued, would prevent the prejudices of the tutor being imposed on the learner,

*" There is far less chance of a tutor's own personal prejudices interfering with the process of learning than in the traditional examination-based system.' Furthermore, the professionalism of the tutor is thereby enhanced in this situation." (19)*

However, the contradictory nature of this argument was obviously not apparent to Boffy and Cave. By most accounts, teacher professionalism usually is taken to mean some form of control over the professional-client relationship. Therefore the authors' proposed partnership of tutor and learner and the reduction of the tutor's role to 'facilitator', which requires no particular expertise, simply an 'empathetic adult' , appears to militate against an enhanced professionalism .

What is most noticeable about these pro-YTS arguments is the emphasis on professional responsibility and their subsequent wish to be apolitical. Therefore it is the elimination of any references to the 'political' aspects of YTS which dictates their preferred occupational strategy. Furthermore, it is this insulation of professional and 'political' issues which reinforced their concern with content eg. the negotiated curriculum, rather than the conditions of service issues. This is typical of those who can be described as having professional-vocationalist articulation of teachers' occupational and educational ideologies.

From what might be termed the 'pragmatist's' position on YTS, Tony Warren - an NEC member- outlines this perspective in 'The Youth Training

*Scheme - hopes and fears'*. (NJ.May 83.) Warren began this article by pointing out the variety of interpretations members of NATFHE could, and indeed had, put on the YTS:

*" The YTS presents a range of possible outcomes from becoming the first truly comprehensive system of vocational preparation for all school-leavers to being merely another method of massaging unemployment statistics." (20)*

In this respect Warren confirmed the existence of the optimists (Farley, Boffy and Cave) and pessimists (Moos) outlined above. Flattering the membership's sense of importance, and perhaps his own, he went on to suggest:

*" As both teachers and trade unionists we are probably left with most of the responsibility for ensuring one of the more favourable outcomes, but if we are to succeed, we must form a realistic assessment of its strengths and weaknesses and determine a strategy for dealing with it." (21)*

Warren, in this one paragraph, encapsulated the whole debate over YTS as it was then being carried on within the ranks of NATFHE in the early part of 1983. What is most noticeable is the use of the 'teachers and trade unionists', the assessment that YTS can be seen as many things and the need for a 'strategy'. Reminiscent of the leadership's calls with regard to YOP, Warren went on to make the case for 'something to be done' in relation to YTS. However, he recognised that institutional and budgetary constraints meant that, as with YOP, quantity rather than quality objectives would be the order of the day. As a result, he saw the NATFHE members' role as one of watching out for possible 'abuses' within YTS, a sort of scheme police. This article goes on to specify the areas of 'abuse' which the YTS may give rise to ie. the abuses NATFHE members were to expected to police.

Warren's position, and that of the leadership of NATFHE in general, can be described as a pragmatic, since it sought to steer a course between acceptance and rejection of YTS:

*" Ultimately our involvement in YTS depends on our ability to ensure the quality of our input.It may be that the reputation of YTS will begin to go the same way as that of YOP. If we are to defend ourselves from the threat of alternative providers it is important that the schemes that we are involved in are seen to be high-quality schemes." (22)*

It was this 'pragmatic' argument which, in concert with those of both the

optimists and the opposition, was to dominate NATFHE's policy towards YTS at the 1983 Annual Conference.

#### 10.v NATFHE Policy on YTS

The centrality of the debate on YTS to NATFHE became most evident in 1983. According to the NATFHE *Journal*, at the Association's 1983 Annual Conference :

*" Of the many specific issues discussed ...the Youth Training Scheme undoubtedly produced the most lively debate and the concern of teachers was clear for all to see." (23)*

However, what is missing from this editorial Comment is the fact that the policies arising from the Conference debates on YTS were at best ambiguous, at worse contradictory. Indeed, they perfectly reflect both the duality of the objectives behind YTS itself ie. to tackle youth unemployment and training, as well as the divisions within the membership outlined above.

The 1983 Conference debated two motions on YTS which resulted in (i) the Association rejecting any campaign against the Scheme whilst (ii) supporting the notion that piecemeal reform of its objectionable aspects would be inadequate. Part of the first motion on YTS read as follows -

*Conference believes YTS Schemes to be part of Government policy to depress real wages, to disguise unemployment by providing short-term answers and by substituting for real jobs, and to reduce rather than extend educational opportunities.*

*Because of the existence of mass youth unemployment and the underlying philosophy of YTS, the Scheme cannot be improved by piecemeal modification to become the comprehensive system of vocational preparation which the Association advocates.*

The original motion had called for NATFHE to campaign ' against the present YTS'. However, this was deleted on a vote of 216 to 172. In the debate, Tony Warren, a 'pragmatist', supported this NEC amendment to delete. Clearly the final motion represented a compromise position between the pragmatists and the opposition. As indeed was the second motion, part of which read as follows:

*Conference believes that the effect of the YTS is to conceal unemployment, to substitute for real jobs and to reduce educational opportunities. However, YTS could offer a basis for a permanent scheme of education and training for 16-18 if quality can be ensured. Therefore, Conference supports the TUC demand for the creation of real jobs and elimination of cheap labour schemes, and for TU monitoring of YTS.*

Again, the position of NATFHE's leadership can be gleaned from the fact that the second and third sentences of this motion were an amendment introduced by the FE Standing Committee. They were however only carried by 152 votes to 143.

There was also an NEC motion on representation (rather the lack of it):

*Conference believes that it is essential for the Association to be represented in all decision-making processes concerned with the provision of education and training and in particular urges the MSC and the LEAs to involve the post-school teaching profession in planning YTS....*

Representation was considered essential to the process of reforming YTS. In his address the out-going President, Chris Minta, reflecting the mood of the leadership, believed the introduction of YTS would be 'a total and utter shambles'. Yet, Minta still considered that YTS could be made operable by NATFHE members 'working harder than ever before to rescue the scheme'!

At the end of 1983 the Association gave evidence to the House of Commons Education, Science and Arts Committee on the YTS. In the introduction to the document NATFHE did little more than a paraphrase MSC's YTG by referring to YTS as:

*"...a major step forward in principle, in that it gives a new status to the young people within its ambit, it offers a permanent bridge between school and work, and it aims at high quality in the education and training it provides." (24)*

What is significant about this 'optimistic' view is that it corresponds with one of the sentences inserted by the FE Standing Committee in the otherwise critical motion on YTS at the 1983 Annual Conference which read: "... YTS could offer a basis for a permanent scheme of education and training for 16-18 if quality can be ensured. 'Quality' was certainly the key word at this time. It appears no less than seven times on one page in the NATFHE submission to the Commons Committee! Yet, nowhere within that document, or indeed elsewhere

in NATFHE publications or statements, does there appear a definition or set of indices relating to its measure. Similarly, the term 'relevant' is used liberally in the text without any reference to what it may mean. The use of both these terms can be taken as evidence of the NATFHE leadership's increasing incorporation into the discourse of the new vocationalism - what was sometimes referred to as *MSC-speak*.

The fact that YTS was underfunded, the Core considered to be 'an abstraction' and progression/certification were perceived as being at best 'a problem'; that there were no guarantees of equality of opportunity within the YTS and there was the possibility of a form stratification arising; that there was little or no staff development funding and no AMB representation as of right; all these criticisms of YTS appeared in the Association's evidence. However, the Conference resolution which stated that YTS could not be reformed 'by piecemeal modification' was *not* presented to the House of Commons Committee. Indeed, and unusually for a public statement, the document rounds on the opposition to YTS within NATFHE (no doubt a reference to critics such as Moos) and declared that:

*" Some highly vocal critics of YTS have argued that few jobs will be available for young people at the end of the YTS year. The Association, although deeply concerned about the problem of youth unemployment, believes that such criticisms of YTS are misguided: further education has never been in a position to guarantee the future of its students, but it can seek to ensure that its students are as well equipped as possible to take up those educational or employment opportunities which do exist." (25)*

This is all very reminiscent of the type of criticisms made of the opponents of YOP within NATFHE. It also bears a striking similarity to the work of the 'optimists' Boffy and Cave who had earlier written:

*" As teachers, we cannot guarantee the futures of our students: we can, however, take what is offered and use it to their advantage through the quality of our teaching and of our care." (26)*

Again, what is important about these remarks is that they flatly contradict the spirit, if not the letter, of the 1983 Conference policy on YTS. Both the major Conference resolutions on YTS had stated that one of the objectives of the scheme was to 'disguise' and 'conceal' unemployment. More significant still,

the leadership went on to endorse explicitly the permanence of YTS by calling for an expansion of the scheme. This came to pass with the two-year YTS being announced in 1985.

The leadership of the Association can be seen here to have used the ambiguity of the NATFHE policy for their own ends. As one critic said at the time, the leadership of "NATFHE has stood as though between the MSC and the membership with its back to the MSC, explaining it to the membership" (Lash, p.27). The leadership certainly appear to have decided to pursue the optimists position and ignore the opposition's perspective as enshrined in the two motions to the 1983 Conference. Above all else it was the question of 'professional' representation which can be seen again to dominate the leadership's approach to YTS. For example, in relation to the AMBs:

*"The Association believes that the Area Manpower Boards (AMBs) will play a key role in the success of the YTS. It is a matter of considerable concern that teachers' organisations, representing the professionals most directly concerned with the quality of YTS, are not directly represented on the AMBs. However, the Association will work within this deeply unsatisfactory situation at local level to ensure the success of the YTS."* (27)

The whole issue of local accountability, in the form of the local authorities, is nowhere mentioned. AMBs were, in practical terms, part of an effective alternative to local authority control of FE; therefore the Association's call for representation on such a body was, in one sense, recognition of this fact. Undoubtedly NATFHE's leadership faced a real dilemma in this respect:

*"The problem facing the Association is whether we want AMBs to have real muscle to discipline cowboy training schemes and, if so, can we accept the corollary of powerful rivals to education committees in the training area?"* (28)

The variability of NATFHE's support for local accountability and control through the local authorities was recognised by the same author:

*"...our enthusiasm for supporting local control of further education through elected councillors has ebbed and flowed depending on the actions and/or the political complexion of the national and local government at the time."* (29)

This observation encapsulates an important aspect of this thesis, namely the notion that the strategy and type of political mobilisation within NATFHE can be seen as 'determined' by the nature of central-local government relations.

NATFHE's ambivalence with regard to the MSC and YTS can therefore be seen to arise as a result of the historical ambivalence of the Association with respect to the government of the education system. The lack of a consistent and principled position is nowhere more evident. This encouraged the development of the strategy of 'opportunism' as the normal recourse of the leadership of the Association. This strategem almost inevitably led to ineffectiveness, as in the case of YTS. The publication in January 1984 of the Government White Paper 'Training For Jobs' can be seen as marking a watershed in the history of the new vocationalism. For NATFHE it also signalled the failure of the leadership's strategy of opportunism.

#### 10. vi *Training For Jobs*

The White Paper *Training For Jobs* [TFJ] was published on 31 January 1984. In keeping with the era of 'direction' in central-local government relations (Rhodes 1984), it proposed the transfer of 25 per cent of funding of work-related NAFE (WRNAFE) from local authority Rate Support to the MSC - thought to be worth approximately £200m in 1986/87. This was to enable the MSC to 'purchase' provision from FE 'or elsewhere'. The basis of the transfer was an admitted ministerial 'impression' that FE could be made more 'responsive' to the needs of employers. This impression was also backed up by the publication of the NEDC/MSF publication of *Competence and Competition* (1984) which purportedly showed that international economic competitiveness was linked to training and education.

The lack of consultation and the general secrecy which surrounded the TFJ proposals met with universal condemnation from the teachers trade unions, principals in colleges, the local authorities and their associations. According to the NATFHE Journal:

*" Publication of the 'Training for Jobs' White Paper in January 1984 opened up one of the most prolonged, intense and bitter controversies seen in the world of education since 1944." (30)*

The then President of NATFHE is reported as saying that 'Training For Jobs' represented ' the most serious threat to face further education in the last 40 years'. Even the MSC refused to implement the proposals until instructed to do

so by Secretary of State for Employment, Tom King, in September of 1984. This was the first time such a directive, although not admitted, had been issued to the Commission.

Within NATFHE the reception given to *Training For Jobs* was predictably hostile from all factions within the union. In particular the opposition felt that they had been proven right about the intentions of the MSC and the Government. The leadership's 'strategy' of 'fraternisation' was roundly condemned and ridiculed:

*"The MSC issues will not be resolved by a letter from Peter Dawson [the General Secretary] to Sir Keith Joseph." (31)*

*" NATFHE Officers have interviewed the MSC: the point is to challenge it." (Conference delegate, 1984)*

*" The leadership of the TUC and NATFHE see themselves not as representatives of union members and students against a hostile government but as part of the state ...The leadership of both organisations look at the membership from the same perspective as the Government." (32)*

Despite this crescendo of criticism of the leadership, the pragmatists and, to a lesser extent the optimists, continued to win the argument at Conference.

Specifically on *Training For Jobs*, the following is part of a motion which can be taken as an indication of the membership's strength of feeling:

*" Conference condemns the proposals contained in the White Paper 'Training For Jobs' and rejects its allegations concerning the FE service. Conference considers that the proposals will*

*- jeopardise the future of further education*

*- reduce local democratic control*

*-further centralise educational decision-making to a larger non-accountable body...*

*Conference deplores the deleterious effects of many MSC schemes on negotiated terms and conditions of employment in further education. Conference believes that the MSC exercises power without effective accountability through its fluctuating financial arrangements, which the White Paper can only exacerbate...'*

Moving the motion for the NEC, Tony Warren, a leading pragmatist, lamented the lack of consultation and NATFHE representation on MSC matters and *Training For Jobs* in particular. He maintained that the Association must

continue to work through the TUC. The leadership's strategy of reform therefore remained intact at this Conference, evidenced by an amendment calling for a campaign for the withdrawal of all trade union support for the MSC being 'substantially defeated'. This was to be but a respite for the NATFHE leadership however.

In December 1984 Mrs Thatcher had begun an offensive on youth unemployment when she said in a television interview that young people under eighteen should not be allowed to choose unemployment, ' Young people ought not to be idle. It is very bad for them. It starts them off wrong '. She left the impression that the Government was preparing to extend YTS to a two year scheme. This was quickly followed by Lord Young's remarks to the Society of Education Officers in January 1985: ' What I have in mind is a scheme building on the existing Youth training Scheme, possibly lengthening the period of training which the scheme offers and setting objectives for trainees to work towards '. The tone of this speech, and Mrs Thatcher's, was one which appeared to threaten the rights of the young unemployed. In particular, by changing the rules relating supplementary benefits. Lord Young later told the House of Lords that there was no intention of removing benefit from 16 and 17 year olds. However, he did foresee circumstances in which benefit would only be paid in cases of need. That is, he could not rule out some reduction in benefit for those not in full-time education or further training.

In March 1985 the Chancellor of the Exchequer announced that the Youth Training Scheme was to be extended to a two-year Scheme as from April 1986. The MSC stressed that the new scheme would not be more of the same. In particular, it emphasised:

- " a) new outcomes: in particular, the opportunity for all trainees to obtain a vocational qualification or a recognised credit towards such a qualification;*
- b) new forms of delivery: in particular, the introduction of the concept of approval for training organisations before they are admitted to the scheme;*
- c) a new status for young people taking part in the scheme, to be achieved through the medium of a "training agreement";*
- d) a new guarantee to school leavers;*
- e) a new and far-reaching development in design and content of the scheme;*
- f) significant new developments in quality control;*
- g) a new funding regime."*

The major change associated with the two-year scheme was the single mode of organisation and administration. Mode B was to disappear and be replaced with new Premium places. That is, an additional payment was to be made to Managing Agents to meet specified training needs: ' The purpose of this grant is to ensure that special training needs are met and that there are sufficient places for all eligible young people, including the most disadvantaged, in all localities '. Payment of the Premium would be approved on the advice of the Area Manpower Boards. The MSC estimated that around 51,000 places (approximately 15 per cent of all provision) would be premium places, as opposed to the 30 per cent already on Mode B. In effect this moved the scheme quite considerably towards the 'employer-led' scheme which the government had always desired as its ultimate objective. The new scheme was therefore budgeted to cost little more than the original £1 billion of the one-year YTS.

By the time of NATFHE's 1985 Conference the antipathy towards the proposals for the two-year YTS was too much for the Association's leadership to quell. The following motion was passed:

*" Conference expresses its grave concern at the erosion of standards and modes of provision for YTS, in particular the denial of Supplementary benefit to those not on the scheme. The support of NATFHE serves to give credibility to a system which is being transformed from one directed to the needs of young people to conscription in the interests of employers and private agencies.*

*Conference therefore resolves to oppose YTS and to demand education and training provision for all 16-19 year olds, with adequate financial support for all young people that does not distinguish between full-time education and training schemes."*[emphasis added]

The NEC of course opposed the motion. An amendment to take-out the term "oppose" was lost. For many within the Association, particularly those in the opposition, this was a the culmination of many years work. At last the Association had taken a principled position on the new vocationalism. The tide had finally turned, or so it seemed. However, nobody, it appears, bothered to spell out what exactly 'opposition' to YTS actually entailed. As a result, a

year later, we find the 1986 Conference berating the NEC and the General Secretary for failing to carry out the resolution to oppose YTS.

#### 10.vi *Summary*

It has been suggested in this chapter that the separation-in-unity of the wage and state-forms was achieved in YTS as a result of a reformulation of the state-form. This is what has made the new vocationalism a 'successful' ie. permanent and today largely uncontested, form of provision for the 16-19 age group. This reformulation of the state-form was shown to be most apparent in the conception of 'citizenship' promoted within the YTS Core Skills programme. As a result, it could also be shown that the element of the new vocationalism which has been most emphasised is that which concerns the attitudes, dispositions etc. of the trainee. In YTS these have been modelled on the system of social relations *in* production - the wage-form. The overall dominance of the wage-form in YTS is therefore confirmation of the fact that the scheme was designed to be '*first and last a training scheme*'. Thus, it has been widely recognised in the SNV that the flexibility and transferability of 'skills' which YTS was designed to encourage actually involves the promotion of a brand of 'mobile individualism'( Cohen 1984) and/or 'possessive individualism' (Moore 1988) suited to political ideals of a Thatcherite Britain, rather than the imperatives of production per se. However, the manner in which this conclusion has been arrived at in this thesis is different to that found in these SNV accounts.

Whilst many accounts within the SNV have seen YTS as a political response to mass youth unemployment, the analysis in this chapter has shown that the 'restructuring' of youth has, if anything, been complicated by this problem. This suggests that the new vocationalism was not a short-term panacea but a long-term strategic response to the problem of 'training', one which has had *unintended* consequences for 'education' eg. the manner in which TVEI was supposedly conceived over a dinner at No.10, lends credence to this suggestion ( Dale 1985). Overall, therefore, it is suggested here that the reformulation of the state-form in YTS has provided a template for the

vocationalisation of the School curriculum. It has provided a new model of how to achieve the separation-in-unity of the wage and state-forms *within* a single curriculum. Hence, the Youth Task Group's statement that YTS was '*about providing a permanent bridge between school and work. It is not about youth unemployment*' (p.7). This should be taken as an accurate assessment of the new vocationalism as a strategy of reproduction, rather than treated with the cynicism shown by some SNV authors (Ainley 1988).

The content-theoretical model employed in this analysis has also helped to explain why the separation-in-unity of the wage and state-forms has only been effectively implemented on Mode A schemes within YTS. Here the insulation of the forms was shown to have been ensured by the control exercised over the scheme by private sector Managing Agents. That is, the institutional framework of YTS effectively prevented it becoming accountable to the Local state. Thus it diminished the representational role of the local authority. Conversely, in Mode B schemes the insulation of forms has been shown to be more problematic. In particular, the interpretative role of the Local state was shown to have complicated the separation of the forms. Developments in the institutional ensemble of the state, especially central-Local state relations, have therefore been shown to be an important aspect of politics of educational change. Much of the SNV literature is devoid of this type of analysis.

One result of the lack of the separation-in-unity of the wage and state-forms in YTS, especially on Mode B schemes, has been the creation of a 'new' social condition amongst unemployed youth. This has been identified by other SNV authors. Willis (1986), for example, describes this condition as one of 'suspended animation'. Whilst Willis sees this condition arising as the result of the absence of the wage ie. youth unemployment, the analysis undertaken in this thesis suggests that it has in fact been the transformation of the state-form which renders the condition more explicable. That is, in Mode B schemes such a transformation of forms, the remodelling of the state-form on the social relations in production, has had to take place outside of employment and the workplace. It has therefore had little purchase on the consciousness of both trainees or FE teachers. Hence the 'resistance' of both teachers and taught. In particular, one response by some young working class women to this

situation has been to replace the emphasis on the wage and state-forms by gender relations, the civil-form. Such a strategy has however been shown to reproduce their subordination, as women, rather than workers or 'citizens' (Skeggs 1988). This attempt to re-articulate the forms of domination becomes more explicable when seen in the context of changes in central-local state relations and the resulting changes in the processes of collective consumption. The content-theoretical model employed in this thesis provides a coherence to these relationships which is largely absent in the SNV literature. A further advance in our understanding of the new vocationalism has been made possible in this thesis by examining the role of FE teachers in the implementation of YTS.

The introduction of YTS has been shown in this analysis to have heralded a 'new' type of FE teacher - the generalist. Their recruitment and practice is suggestive of 'deskilling' taking place in the FE teachers' labour process ie. the 'empathetic adult' replacing the technical and academic teacher. This is evidenced in the increasing 'socialisation' function of the teacher and the increasing preconceptualisation of the curriculum. Whilst some 'reskilling' has undoubtedly taken place, especially amongst course co-ordinators, it is their administrative skills which appear to have largely been enhanced. As with the introduction of BTEC (Gleeson and Mardle 1980), the response of FE teachers to pre-packaged materials associated with YTS has been variable. Some have been shown to have welcomed the packages as a means of maintaining control in what has been for many, especially vocationalists, an entirely new teaching situation. Others, such as traditional Liberal Studies teachers, have rejected the imposition of such packages and seen them as inherently restrictive (YTS Workers' Bulletin)(33). The variable nature of these responses to the introduction of YTS was reflected in the FE teachers' political mobilisation within NATFHE.

Despite the fact that YTS was intended to be an altogether different form of provision from YOP, the legacy and experience of the latter dominated the debates on the new vocationalism within NATFHE. Following YOP, there was a general hostility to the encroachments of the MSC into the government of FE and this served to distance the leadership of NATFHE, who had 'opportunistically' embraced YOP, from the rank and file. The critical nature of

many of the Conference motions regarding the MSC can be seen as a measure of this. The leadership was therefore faced with a dilemma with regard to YTS. Opposition, in the form of a boycott, was never considered a viable option since this would have marginalised NATFHE within the ranks of the TUC, which had already 'critically accepted' YTS. On the other hand, the very nature of YTS precluded NATFHE's wholehearted involvement in what was widely recognised as a scheme which had little or no 'educational' legitimacy - it was to be 'first and last a training scheme'.

As shown in this chapter, the leadership of NATFHE resorted to a form of pragmatism, which meant that they neither accepted or rejected YTS. This position was made tenable by the split between those who opposed and those who accepted YTS. The union was, in effect, paralysed by the scheme. As shown, this resulted in NATFHE's policies on YTS being contradictory. This 'ambiguity' did however provide a space for the leadership to interpret developments in YTS in accordance with their own strategy of opportunism. Given the institutional and political context of YTS, such a strategy was inevitably ineffectual, resulting as it did in *Training For Jobs* and the transfer of 25% of WRNAFE to the MSC. Whilst NATFHE cannot be held responsible for this happening, its lack of an effective voice in opposition was entirely the responsibility of the union. Thus, the widely commented upon, yet 'inexplicable', quiescence of NATFHE within the SNV literature (Eversley 1986, Finn 1987) has been explicated in this thesis by examining of the politics of the new vocationalism within the union.

Whether or not NATFHE's opposition could have prevented the imposition of YTS has not been the issue (neither is the fact that the union's eventual policy of opposition has been largely gestural and has made little or no difference to the operation of YTS). This 'opposition' has, in any case, largely taken place post factum ie. after YTS had become established. What is at issue is that, at the time of its implementation, effective opposition by NATFHE, in alliance with the local authorities and trade unions, may have helped reform YTS. However, the lack of a clear understanding as to the overall political importance of YTS as a strategy of reproduction appears to have precluded this possibility. The union's historical ambivalence towards the Local state has been the major factor in this respect. Thus the strategic

importance of the representational role of the local authorities and the exercise of citizenship - state-form - appears to have been consistently under-estimated by the union's leadership. That is, there appears to have been little or no understanding of the nature of the relationship between the institutional ensemble of the state, educational policy and provision and the logic of their collective action. Recourse to a 'strategy of opportunism', a form of pragmatism, has therefore substituted for this understanding. The result of this has been shown, in respect of both vocational preparation and the new vocationalism, to have rendered the union ineffective in its opposition to such changes ie. politically determined changes which undermine *both* professionalism and trade unionism as occupational strategies. This has been revealed as a result of the intrinsic political analysis of educational change undertaken here.

Sociologists of Education, particularly those involved in the SNV, as much as the leadership of NATFHE, could also be said to have been partly responsible for the overall lack of understanding of the new vocationalism. This is due to the fact that their analyses have lacked an *intrinsic* political evaluation of 'education' and educational change. For example, not once, to my knowledge, during the whole debate on YTS within NATFHE was any reference made to a theorisation of the new vocationalism by a Sociologist of Education. Both the abstracted empiricism of the SNV and the extrinsic nature of much of its political theorisation appears to have had little or nothing to offer activists. Undoubtedly an opportunity to influence the course of events has been missed. This has also provided ammunition to those critics of the Sociology of Education who we perhaps most need to convince as to the 'relevance' of our studies, the educational practitioners. Hopefully, the content-theoretical model developed in this thesis and the analysis of the new vocationalism which has resulted will help redress this situation. It may therefore also assist in the development of an alternative, progressive educational project.

Notes and References - Chapter Ten

1. Jonathan (1987) p.104
2. FEU (1985) pp.11-12
3. *ibid* pp.68-9
4. MSC (1984a) p.4
5. FEU *op cit* p.54
6. DES (1984) p.25
7. *ibid* p.6
8. Willis (1986) p.157
9. *ibid* p.169
10. Black youth is being taken to refer to both male and females - see Cole (1988) p.39
11. Means *et al* (1985) p.73
12. Jordan (1986) p.23
13. NFER (1987) p.127
14. Note the similarity between this and work-teams in manufacturing, Littler & Salaman (1984)
15. NFER *op cit* p.69
16. *ibid* p.71
17. Broomhead & Coles (1988) p.176
18. FEMIS - Further Education Management Information Systems - an off-line database which FE colleges can be connected to. It provides up-to-date information for FE management.
19. Boffy & Cave, NJ Dec.1982
20. Warren, NJ May 1983
21. *ibid* p.18
22. *ibid* p.21
23. Comment, NJ June 1983 p.3
24. NATFHE (1984) Evidence to the House of Commons Education and Science & Arts Committee on YTS.
25. *ibid*
26. Boffy & Cave *op cit*
27. NATFHE (1984) *op cit*
28. Hall, NJ Dec. 1983 p.13
29. *ibid* p.12

30. NJ Oct. 1985 p.24
31. Grassby, NJ Dec. 1984
32. Barr & Aspinwall, NJ Oct. 1984
33. YTS Workers' Bulletin - a radical anti-YTS publication. Edited by Colin Waugh, a General Studies Lecturer/activist.

## CONCLUSIONS

The central objective of this thesis has been to theorise educational change. This has involved the identification of a distinct theoretical object, a definition of educational change, the delimitation of fundamental units of analysis and the conceptualisation of a dynamic of educational change. Together, these have provided the basis for the development of a content-theoretical model of educational change. Such a project was deemed necessary as it was felt that the theorisation of change had recently become neglected within the Sociology of Education. The reasons for this neglect were discussed in Chapter One.

In Chapter One three major approaches within the Sociology of Education - the Political-Arithmetic tradition, the New Sociology of Education and the Reproduction problematic - were examined with regard to their theorisation of educational change. It was shown that the absence of an intrinsic political analysis, a politics *of* education, within each approach, had inhibited the theorisation of change. The reason for this absence was located in the dual effects of their preferred methodologies and the political commitment of the theorists. In each case a specific combination of these factors was shown to have prevented the theorisation of educational change. More specifically, an inadequate conceptualisation of the social structure and, in particular, the social relations of production, was identified as contributing to this failure. For example, in the Political-Arithmetic tradition, the nature of the relationship between class and status was shown to have been consistently ill-conceived. In the NSE, the relationship between knowledge and the social structure remained unresolved and in the case of the Reproduction theorists, it has been their failure to differentiate between the social relations *of* production and the system of social relations *in* production which has led to problematic conceptions of 'correspondence'. Thus, by failing to theorise the nature of social relations, especially political relations, within the CMP, the theoretical basis for comprehending educational change has been neglected.

As a result of this failure, power and domination within the education system have come to be conceptualised as either a simple reflection of

relations outside the system, or as part of an autonomous domain with its 'own principles and possibilities'. An internal/external dichotomy with regard to locating a dynamic for educational change has been established. This dichotomy has manifested itself in several guises within the Sociology of Education, not least, in the divergence between macro and micro theorists. The macro theorists, by and large, have taken the nature of social relations external to the education system as the central dynamic of change, with the result that the actual content of *educational* relations has been marginalised or neglected in their analyses. The micro theorists have preferred the internal relations as their principal source of change and have, as a result, failed to adequately theorise the social structure. The identification of a mediating site between the social structure and the education system - 'the political' sphere - has therefore eluded most theorists. One result of this has been the development of a 'paradigmatic mentality' (Hammersley 1984). Another, more important result, in terms of this thesis, has been the failure to theorise educational change:

*"...macro and micro approaches are mutually blind...The one can explain everything in general, but nothing in particular, the other can explain everything in particular, but nothing in general. Just as importantly, their explanations are neither complementary nor overlapping. There are areas of problems to which neither speaks effectively. Among these areas is one of the most important tasks for the sociology of education, that of understanding the source and nature of educational stability and change." (1)*

It is not of course being suggested here that the three approaches discussed in Chapter One have failed to contribute to our understanding of how education systems actually operate. Rather that, in order to transcend their limitations regarding the theorisation of change, a major reformulation of their conceptions of social relations was required and in particular the identification of the role of 'political' relations in educational change. Where such explicitly 'political' models of change have been developed, they have come from theorists working outside the Sociology of Education, or from those such as Archer who have adapted political/systems theories to the study of education.

In Chapter Two the work of Archer and Salter and Tapper was examined. Their liberal, institutionalist conceptions of the 'political' were shown to exclude the theorisation of an *educational* aspect of educational change. As

such, they did not even begin to fulfil a basic requirement for the theorising change, namely the identification of a specific theoretical object. That is, within these models, educational change was shown to have been conceptualised as anything and everything which was different from that which existed before. Such open-ended conceptions were shown to be unhelpful since they have no recognisable units of analysis and therefore no real theoretical object. These institutional models of change were also shown to be largely devoid of social relations and political actors.

As an alternative political model of educational change, a non-Pluralist approach, the recent work of Gintis and Bowles was also reviewed in Chapter Two. Whilst concerning themselves with the 'political' - the point of mediation between the external and internal pressures for educational change - Gintis and Bowles can be seen as part of the 'new orthodoxy' within the Sociology of Education (Sharp 1988). That is, in their desire to escape the legacy of their own pessimism in *Schooling in Capitalist America*, they appear to have 'discovered' the heterogeneity and irreducibility of forms and sites of domination within Capitalism. This has then led them and others, such as Carnoy and Levin, and to a lesser extent Michael Apple, to either abandon the conceptual unity of Marxism altogether, or revert to varieties of historicism and humanism in Marxist theorising. The fact that this new orthodoxy has found favour amongst American theorists, although by no means a monopoly of theirs, is no doubt related to the singular nature of American Marxism eg. the very strong emphasis on the concept of 'equality'.

Thus the 'politicisation' of Gintis and Bowles' most recent work was shown to have only been made possible by their rejection of the 'cardinal principle' of Marxism, the determination in the last instance by the mode of production - the economic. That is, whilst retaining a conception of the relative autonomy of the education system, the limits to and structural constraints on educational change remained implicit in Gintis and Bowles' latest theorisation. Rather than seeking the 'specificity of the political' within a Marxist problematic, which would have made possible an intrinsic political analysis of educational change, Gintis and Bowles were shown to have regressed to a liberal-Pluralist conception ie. a conception which neglects to theorise the origins of power and domination and concerns itself with institutional forms.

As such, their latest account was seen to converge in certain respects, especially its methodological individualism, with existing political models, including those of Archer and Salter and Tapper. This also precluded Gintis and Bowles realising in their work a 'translation effect' between different levels of analysis ie. it should be possible to trace the relationship between changes at the level of the education 'system' to changes in the nature of classroom practices, since they only operate at one level, the institutional level. Gintis and Bowles' abandonment of Marxism is seen in this thesis as premature. Therefore an attempt to develop such an intrinsic political analysis of educational change *within* a Marxist problematic was undertaken.

In Chapter Three it was argued that, in order to develop such a Marxist account, it was necessary to 'recover' Bowles and Gintis and avoid the liberal deviation of Gintis and Bowles. In this respect, four 'critical themes' of the early Bowles and Gintis were taken to be the foundation for such an approach. Firstly, the issue of causal primacy. That is, the nature of the social relations of production within the CMP were to be taken as the basis for understanding educational change. The reproduction of these relations within the education system was therefore taken as *the* central domain assumption of this approach. Secondly, there was to be a notion of directionality to educational change which could be related to the periodisation of the restructuring of social, economic and political relations within capitalism. For this reason class struggles, as opposed to struggles relating to gender or race, were considered to be the dynamic for change. Thirdly, reproduction was not to be taken as a linear process. Contradictions, inertia and indeterminacy were to be taken into account. Finally, it was necessary to identify a specific mechanism of change which acted to unify educational and economic change by mediating class struggles. However, in order to develop an intrinsic *political* analysis, the objective was to shift the emphasis from simple correspondence to one of contradiction and contestation, without negating the reproduction problematic and invoking an institutional-Pluralist conception of the political. Thus, it was suggested that a Marxist approach should be based upon a particular conception of historical development and class struggle. It should have both a structural and dynamic character and the education system was also to be seen as a historical product related to a specific social formation and, in particular, its social relations of production.

Utilising developments in 'Political Marxism' and Social Form Theory, it was argued in Chapter Three that class relations are derived from the mode of exploitation found in capitalist productive relations, with the value form providing the basis for the appropriation of surplus value from the direct producers. Thus, the nature of capitalist productive relations were taken to constitute the central organising principle of the social formation. It was also argued that there is a directionality to capitalist development which is based upon the articulation of class relations and the forces of production. (In the same way educational change was to be theorised as having a directionality which is related to the form-determined nature of the reproduction process.) Class analysis was therefore considered essential to our understanding of social change within capitalist society, including educational change. However, it was also recognised that change is always the outcome of contestation and contradictions. In particular, the 'separation-in-unity' of the economic and political spheres, civil society and the state, was seen as giving rise to conflicts and struggles which delimited the reproduction of social relations. More specifically, the delineation of bourgeois domination into distinct social forms - wage, state and civil - corresponding to the spheres of the economy, state and civil society - whilst enabling the reproduction of capitalist social relations, involves contradictions which are themselves conditions for contestation and resistance. As a result, it was the relationship *between* the social forms of bourgeois domination which was seen to provide the key to understanding the level and nature of conflict and resistance. That is, the articulation of the contestation within and between the social forms was taken to structure the nature of class conflict and struggle which, in turn, delimited capitalist development. Change was therefore seen as 'form-determined'. However, the articulation of conflict between the spheres had also to be seen as overdetermined by the political mobilisation and struggles undertaken by classes and class fractions. Change was therefore seen as *both* structural and dynamic.

This reformulation of the base/superstructure couplet, arrived at through Political Marxism and Social Form Theory, and the re-conception of class relations which has resulted, met the criteria of the four critical themes outlined in the early work of Bowles and Gintis. As a result, the education system was conceived as critically involved in the reproduction of the relations

of production, in so far as its principal function was taken to be the reproduction of labour capacities. Since reproduction is undertaken in the interests of a particular class, this process could be seen to produce conflict and the potential for class struggle. Therefore it was in the nature and outcome of these struggles that educational change was to be explained. This approach entailed recognition of the fact that reproduction is a *social* phenomenon: it is contested and has a political aspect. The object of analysis was therefore to reveal this political aspect by delineating the relationship between the economic and political, in order to show how 'the political' made possible the reproductive role of the education system. This involved tracing the continuities between the economic and political aspects of reproduction; continuities which lie in the fact that they are both constituted by social relations - social forms. In this way, a base/superstructure conception has not simply been replaced by one of superstructure/base, but by an organic conception, one which suggests that political 'forms' are attributes of the reproduction process itself. That is, political contestation and organisation were to be taken as constitutive and not simply epiphenomenal features of the reproduction process. Therefore, in order to understand educational change, an intrinsic political analysis is required. However, such an analysis is predicated on being able to conceptualise the 'specificity of the political'.

The 'specificity of the political' was also examined in Chapter Three. Thus, whilst it was argued that the political does indeed have its own specificity, this needs to be seen as articulated with the economic. That is, political class struggles mediate the economic relations of production through a set of irreducible concepts, forms and processes. The economic 'need' for reproduction, could therefore be taken to provide the 'raw material' and the 'outer limits' of the political class struggle, which in turn could react back upon the mode of production in terms of having pertinent effects on the forces and relations of production. This was exemplified throughout this thesis in terms of the relationship between the wage- and state-forms, class and citizenship. It was also recognised however that the political forms and relations within the reproduction process were constituted in and by the wider class relations of the capitalist mode of production. Political analysis therefore required a theory of the class formation. Since teachers were to be the focus of the class struggles within the education system, it was their

class location which provided the focus for this discussion. They have recently been located as part of the 'new' middle class.

Within the current social formation, the location of the 'new' middle class was shown to be problematic. In terms of their economic role and function ie. whether they are 'productive' or 'unproductive' and/or perform the functions of capital or labour, their location often appears ambiguous, even contradictory. However, such formulations were considered in Chapter Four to move away from the value-form, the mode of exploitation, as the basis for class location. As such they were to be rejected within this account. Instead, an analysis based upon the value-form, one which placed the new middle class within the exploited class, as employees, was utilised. The problem then became one of explaining differences within this exploited class ie. differences between the traditional 'working class' and the 'new' middle class. In this account, these differences were to be explained in terms of *status* differentials which arose out of 'interested action'. Such action was seen as the 'horizon of class action' in a specific conjuncture. That is, different sections of the exploited class were seen to have differential access to resources which they used in their resistance to employers. This provided for different normative expectations and aspirations which, in turn, constituted the basis for socially constructed rights and status. Status differentials could therefore be seen as related to the nature of the state formation as a whole eg. the relationship between the state ensemble and professionalism. That is, rights were seen to be aspects of 'citizenship' - the state-form - which could act back upon class inequalities - the wage-form. It was therefore postulated that the political mobilisation of the 'enfranchised' ie. those who have attained such rights, would be both constituted by and reflected in these status differentials.

In the case of teachers, it was argued in Chapter Four that their nominal membership of the 'new' middle class placed them in the exploited class. Their proclivity to proletarianisation was taken to be evidence of this. That is, the manner in which their exploitation is increasingly arising out of their *real* subordination within their labour process, whilst not in itself changing their class location, was taken as evidence of a change in their status. This was seen to involve, principally, the socialisation of their labour and the increasingly preconceptualised nature of their labour process. These processes

were seen to undermine their rights and ultimately their status. Again, this was thought to be reflected in their moves to resist this process through their collective occupational strategies of professionalism and trade unionism. It was therefore postulated that changes in the nature of the teachers' labour process and moves towards their proletarianisation were structurally linked to the reproduction of the forms of bourgeois domination, in particular, the wage and state forms. As such, changes in the teachers' labour process arising out of political change, including changes in the institutional ensemble of the state and the state-form affected their class location. These changes were then made manifest in the logic of the teachers' collective action. Therefore, a model which could account for the relationship between social forms, teachers' collective strategies and state provision of education was required: a model which could provide a basis for comprehending specific instances of educational change.

In Chapter Five a 'content-theoretical' model of educational change was developed. At the highest level of abstraction, the role of the education system was taken to be the reproduction of capitalist social relations. These relations were seen as the product of the unique separation-in-unity of the economic, political and private spheres within the CMP. This was conceived as giving rise to specific forms of domination - the wage, state and civil forms - which needed to be reproduced within the current social formation. The reproduction of these forms was not however unproblematic. They were shown to be contradictory relations and, as such, it was argued that capital could not provide for their successful reproduction. The state therefore needed to intervene. As a result, the most public reproduction of social relations was seen as taking place in and through state provided education.

As stated above, the dominant function of the education system in this model was taken to be the reproduction of labour capacities. As a result, the specificity of educational change, at the most concrete level of analysis, was identified as change in the relationship between its education and training functions, seen as 'moments' in the reproduction process. These moments were seen as articulated in so far as they reproduced distinct forms of political domination. Training was taken to involve the inculcation of 'skills' and the reproduction of the 'wage-form'. Education was seen as socialisation into the

dominant ideology and the reproduction of the 'state-form'. Selection was seen as involving the processes of differentiation and certification which contributed to the reproduction of the 'civil-form'. Thus the differentiation of the forms could be seen as 'structured' in accordance with the social relations of production.

The nature of the relationship between the training, education and selection moments of the reproduction process was also seen as determined, at the intermediate level of abstraction, by the overall 'strategy of reproduction' employed by the state. This, in turn, entailed a particular 'institutional ensemble' with 'collective consumption' processes appropriate to the specific strategy. Strategies were therefore seen as form-determined. That is, the institutional ensemble and its collective consumption processes were constrained by the requirement to reproduce the wage, state and civil forms of domination. However, as mentioned above, this is problematic in so far as contestation and resistance arise out of the contradictory nature of these forms. As a result of this contestation, the implementation of a strategy of reproduction also involves hegemonic projects corresponding to the separate spheres of the education system. Overall, the political struggles which accompany such projects affect the viability of a strategy. That is, the degree of articulation between struggles in the different spheres was seen as the crucial determinant of a strategy's viability. Such articulation was seen however as predicated upon the nature of the political mobilisation and the hegemonic projects it engendered ie. the extent to which the spheres are insulated.

The 'content' aspect of the model involved the specification of an 'educational' aspect of educational change - seen in terms of the relationship between the education, training and selection functions of the education system. In Part Two of the thesis this was undertaken in the form of an examination of the actual provision which resulted from the political struggles which accompanied the introduction of the new vocationalism as a strategy of reproduction. Overall, therefore, using the content-theoretical model, it was the institutional ensemble of the state, the nature of the actual provision and the political mobilisation of FE teachers that were to be taken as the fundamental units of analysis in the examination of the new vocationalism in Part Two of the thesis.

Model-making requires the specification of some fundamental units of analysis in advance of any explanation of the object of inquiry. Hence the identification of such units in Part One of the thesis. This process is necessarily 'theoretical' in so far as the choice of these units will be made from a perspective or theory, in this case Marxism. Models are therefore theory-laden. The adequacy of a particular model should therefore be assessed in terms of its internal, logical consistency. However, logical consistency cannot be in itself a sufficient criterion of a model's utility. The application of the model and, in particular, the empirical research which it generates will ultimately be the test of its value. The 'content-theoretical' model developed in this thesis is no exception in this respect.

The choice of the terms 'content' and 'theoretical' was therefore deliberate in that they were to convey the importance of both theory and evidence, as well as indicating a concern to relate the theorisation of social relations (seen in terms of social *forms*) to actual educational provision (content). The terms were therefore considered doubly pertinent. According to Hargreaves (1985),

*" Empirical work of high quality consists of a continuing dialogue between theory and evidence where each is continually interrogated against the other as well as being tested for its internal consistency and coherence. It is only through such a dialogue that understandings of the social world can ever come to approximate to valid knowledge."(2)*

This is consistent with the Marxist methodological procedure of 'reproduction':

*" Marx's historical categories, the one's in which he grasps 'real historical stages of production', are generated neither from 'simple abstraction' in general nor from transhistorical categories in particular. They are emphatically a posteriori constructs, arrived at precisely by abstraction from the 'real and concrete'. Marx has no mysteriously privileged starting-point. Like the rest of man-kind(sic), he starts from phenomenal forms of our 'what is given'. What differs, perhaps, is what he does with these forms." (3)*

According to Sayer (1979), what Marx in fact did with these forms is subject them to critique. Furthermore, social forms were taken by Marx to be the sole and proper subject of political-economy (Sayer, Ch.5). This has been the methodological basis adopted in this thesis. Thus, the starting point for the

analysis was my own 'real and concrete' experience and knowledge, as a lecturer in FE, of recent changes. From this, my initial inquiries into the government of the education system led to the theorisation of the Local state and the processes of collective consumption. Developments in Urban Sociology and Urban Politics therefore provided a framework for conceptualising the role of the state with regard to the preconditions for the reproduction of labour capacities within the education system. This understanding was developed further by incorporating theoretical advances made by Political Marxism and Social Form Theory. Thus the identification of social forms and their relationship to the reproduction process within the education system was achieved via a process of abstraction from the phenomenal. As a result, the dominant and taken-for-granted categories of 'education' and 'training' became available for interrogation and reformulation within the content-theoretical model. This could then be used in Part Two of the thesis to re-examine the phenomenal aspects of educational change. Such an examination would, in turn contribute to the refinement and development of the theorisation of educational change in general ie. a return to theory (*see below*).

## *Part Two*

In Chapter Six it was shown that vocational preparation was meant to provide for those 16-19 year olds who were following neither the conventional academic or craft routes. Whilst there had long been concern for this group, there was also a long history of neglect. In the early 1970s a combination of factors - economic, ideological and most important, political - came together to promote the development of this new strategy of reproduction which entailed an extension of the educational franchise. That is, an extension of the 'education' function of the ES, the inculcation of state-form, to a largely un-receptive population.

One development which should have facilitated the viability of introducing vocational preparation as a new strategy of reproduction was the increasing importance in the mid 1970s of the intermediate tier of government - the

'national community of local government'. This in many ways served to break down narrow institutional and professional interests and enabled a more strategic perspective to be taken on the relationship between the central and Local state. In particular, the role of the MSC was to unify disparate interest groups - which it attempted to do initially in the form of partnerships - and thereby ensure the strategic nature of change. As a corporatist body, the MSC provided a political forum for the various interest groups involved.

In Chapter Seven it was shown that vocational preparation, as a corporatist strategy of reproduction, contained contradictory objectives. It was an attempt to develop a form of provision which, whilst bringing together education and training, maintained the principle that education was to be the responsibility of the state and training that of employers. This principle can be seen to have been upheld as part of the separation-in-unity of the political and the economic spheres and the insulation of the wage and state forms of domination ie. an example of the form-determination of a strategy of reproduction. In relation to vocational preparation however, the early 'partnership' approach of the MSC proved to be inadequate. That is, whilst the notion of a partnership between 'education' (the LEAs) and 'training' (the MSC) provided for the unity of forms, it could not ensure their separation within a single strategy. This was due to the relative autonomy of the Local state ie. its potential to determine vocational preparation to be a form of collective consumption - 'education' - as well as the absence of an appropriate curriculum. Therefore the intended separation-in-unity of education and training within vocational preparation would undoubtedly have been inhibited by the role of the Local state, in so far as it would have, as a result of its traditional insulation from 'training' provision, attempted the integration of forms. Therefore some form of institutional reorganisation, one which curtailed the autonomy of the Local state by locating responsibility for provision at an intermediate level ie. between the central and Local states, was required in order for the separation-in-unity of the forms within vocational preparation to take place. Such an attempt at reorganisation was shown in Chapter Seven to have required a hegemonic project which incorporated the active support of 'educationalists', especially in the development and legitimation of an appropriate curriculum.

The importance to our understanding of educational change of the overall economic and political context, including policy areas not specifically relating to 'education', was highlighted in Chapter Eight. Here it was shown how economic recession and mass youth unemployment occasioned changes in central-Local state relations, especially in terms of the constraints which were placed upon the processes of collective consumption. This effectively prevented the introduction of vocational preparation as a strategy of reproduction, albeit one which was already flawed in terms of its institutional basis and the absence of a curriculum. Instead, 'temporary measures', in the shape of the Youth Opportunities Programme (YOP), came into existence which, whilst paying lip-service to the discourse of vocational-preparation, were shown to be significantly different. In particular, YOP completely undermined the inculcation of the state-form by marginalising the role played by the Local state in its provision. Despite this, YOP continued to garner support as a form of vocational preparation.

An intrinsic political analysis revealed in Chapter Eight how this support was the product of the organisational self-interest of all the parties concerned, not least the leadership of FE teachers' union NATFHE. That is, during this period, the strategic needs of NATFHE, corresponded with the development of a corporate body such as the MSC. This is important in so far as it is evidence of the existence of a dialectical relation between 'professionalism' and the state formation. This was also evidenced by the transformation of NATFHE's 'logic of collective action' to one of a 'strategy of opportunism'. It was the adoption of such a strategy which enabled the MSC to 'incorporate' the interests of the NATFHE leadership and thereby further legitimate its hegemonic project relating to vocational preparation. This project also gave rise to a structure of cognition, a discourse, central to which was the notion that 'something should be done' about youth unemployment. The result of this was YOP.

YOP displaced the original conception of vocational preparation as a strategy of reproduction ie. as a strategic change which involved an extension of the educational franchise. In doing this it also brought about the near-collapse of the hegemonic project relating to vocational preparation. Inside NATFHE the political effects of this failure to extend the educational

franchise, as well as the deskilling it brought to the labour process of some FE teachers, found expression in the formation of an 'opposition' to both YOP and the MSC more generally. YOP therefore left the leadership of NATFHE with severe problems. The 'strategy of opportunism' which it had adopted meant that, at a time when the union leadership found itself increasingly dependent upon the activities of the MSC, it had to vigorously defend what rapidly became indefensible. This divisiveness of YOP was clearly reflected within the membership of NATFHE.

With the election of the Conservative government in 1979, the corporatist framework which had encouraged the initial attempt to extend the *educational* franchise, in the form of vocational preparation, came to an abrupt end. With this also came changes in the relationship between central and Local state, the marginalisation of 'professional' interests and the withdrawal of their rights eg. of consultation etc., including those of the FE teachers. The logic of NATFHE's collective action was also seen to change in response to these developments. A move towards a trade union strategy - a dialogical logic of collective action - was renewed. Whereas NATFHE had been 'professionally' proactive with regard to vocational preparation, it was shown to have taken a more traditional reactive, trade union role in relation to the new vocationalism. An important finding with regard to the speed of this transformation is that it only becomes fully explicable when conceived in relation to the concept 'strategy of opportunism'. That is, the transition between professionalism and trade unionism as teachers' occupational strategies has up until now largely been conceived of as a slow, even evolutionary process. This thesis has demonstrated that this is not necessarily the case. The rapidity of the transformation between these strategies is therefore a major finding of this thesis.

Offe's (1985) concept of a 'strategy of opportunism' has therefore been shown in this thesis to accurately reflect the location of teachers as part of the new middle class, in so far as it highlights the discontinuities which exist between their objective, real class interests and their subjective 'horizon of class action'. That is, it encompasses their objective interests as employees in its trade union aspect, at the same time as recognising their attempts to retain their status differences through 'professionalism'. It includes *both*

dialogical and monological moments. It is therefore a concept which helps overcome the 'sterile dichotomy' between trade unionism and professionalism which permeates much of the literature on teachers' ideologies and collective organisation.

The strategic potential of vocational preparation was also shown not to have been lost on the new Conservative administration. The impetus for bringing about a fundamental change relating to the 16-19 age group had been established and an alternative to vocational preparation was sought. This was to be in the form of the new vocationalism. As a strategy of reproduction, the new vocationalism was shown to be different in so far as the *separation-in-unity* of the wage and state forms was to be achieved by radically reformulating the state-form, bringing it 'into line' with the wage-form. This is what made the new vocationalism 'new'. This differentiation between the new vocationalism and vocational preparation, encapsulated in the respective terms 'training in citizenship', indicating that the wage-form was ascendent, and 'citizens in training', in which the state-form is dominant, resulted from the nature of the intrinsic political analysis developed in this thesis.

Whilst many accounts within the SNV have seen YTS as a political response to youth unemployment, the analysis in Chapter Ten suggested that the 'restructuring' of youth was in fact complicated by mass youth unemployment. For this reason, it was argued that the new vocationalism should be seen as a long-term strategic response, rather than a short-term panacea, to the problem of 'training'. It is also one which has had consequences for 'education'. Furthermore, it was suggested that these were largely unintended consequences. Thus, the reformulation of the state-form in YTS can be seen as an unintended model for a strategy of reproduction designed to vocationalise the School curriculum. The new vocationalism has therefore provided the means, the reformulation of the state-form, to reproduce the separation-in-unity of the wage and state-forms *within* a unitary curricula framework.

It was therefore shown in Chapter Ten that the separation-in-unity of the wage and state-forms was achieved in the new vocationalism (YTS) as a result of a radical reformulation of the state-form. This has enabled the new

vocationalism to become a 'successful' ie. permanent, form of provision for the 16-19 age group. The reformulation of the state-form was evidenced by the conception of 'citizenship' employed in the YTS Core Skills programme. It was also shown to be the case that the element of training which has been most emphasised in YTS has been that which concerns the attitudes, dispositions etc. of the trainee. These were seen as modelled on the system of social relations *in* production, the wage-form. Thus, the flexibility and transferability of 'skills' in YTS has actually involved the promotion of a new form of citizenship, suited to political ideals of a Thatcherite Britain, rather than the imperatives of production per se. This is also why an attempt has been made to extend this strategy to the Schools sector eg. in the form of the TVEI.

Contrary therefore to Stuart Hall's view that,

*"Thatcherism deliberately - and from its viewpoint, correctly - eschews all reference to the concept of citizenship..." (4)*

it has been argued in this thesis that 'citizenship', more recently 'active citizenship', has come to the top of the Thatcherite agenda. A re-modelling of the concept appears however to have been the general objective. Part of this re-modelling, including that which has been shown to have taken place as a result of YTS, involves a denial of status and rights to certain groups eg. 'professionals' in fields as diverse as education, medicine and the law, as well as the already disenfranchised YTS trainee and the unemployed. A wholesale remodelling of citizenship appears therefore to have been undertaken, rather than its eschewal. This lends support to the claim that Thatcherism represents a type of 'authoritarian statism' (Jessop *et al* 1988).

Within YTS, this separation-in-unity of the wage and state-forms was shown to have been effected only in Mode A schemes. Here the insulation of the forms was ensured by the control of private sector Managing Agents. That is, the institutional framework of YTS, its division into distinct Modes, effectively prevented provision being made accountable, in the long-term, to the Local state ie. made a form of collective consumption (Mode B was always intended to be 'residual' and short-lived). The representational role of the Local state was therefore undermined by this framework. Thus, in accordance with the revised Dual State Thesis employed in this thesis, institutional allocation and political mobilisation were shown to determine the nature of the

state's expenditure. This suggests that attempts to vocationalise the School curriculum would also necessitate a similar mechanism, one which ensured the 'privatisation' of control and accountability. Recent Conservative policies, including schools opting-out of local authority control and the setting up of City Technology Colleges, would appear to support this. That is, based upon the experience of introducing the new vocationalism into FE, they can be seen as part of a deliberate strategy to de-collectivise the consumption of 'education'.

Conversely, the relative autonomy of the Local state and in particular its interpretative role, made the insulation of the social forms far more problematic in Mode B schemes in YTS. This was shown to be related to a 'new' social condition which has been identified amongst unemployed youth. In Chapter Ten it was argued that whilst Willis (1986), for example, sees this condition resulting from the absence of the wage, an intrinsic political analysis suggests that it has been the transformation of the state-form, a denial of citizenship rights, which provides a more plausible explanation. Thus, on Mode B schemes this transformation of the state-form had to take place outside of employment and the workplace. As a result, it had little purchase on the consciousness of some trainees and teachers. There has therefore been 'resistance' to YTS. For example, one significant response to this new social condition has been a renewed emphasis being placed on the civil form, gender relations, by young working class women. Whilst such a strategy has been shown to reproduce their subordination, as women, rather than workers or 'citizens', this move becomes even more explicable if seen in terms of both their exclusion from the wage-form *and* their secondary status vis-a-vis the state-form. This observation needs to be confirmed by further research within the framework of this model.

It was also shown in Chapter Ten that the introduction of YTS has heralded a 'new' type of FE teacher - the generalist. Whilst there have been 'generalists' in FE teaching for many years eg. the Liberal Studies teacher, the 'new' generalist is notable for being *neither* a vocationalist or an educationalist. As a result, it was suggested that their recruitment and practice was indicative of a process of 'deskilling' of FE teachers. This was seen in terms of the increasing 'socialisation' function of the teacher and preconceptualisation of the curriculum. It was recognised however that this

situation was complicated by the fact that some 'reskilling' could also be seen to be taking place, especially amongst course co-ordinators. The variable nature of these processes were shown to have been reflected in NATFHE. Despite the fact that YTS was an altogether different form of provision from YOP, the legacy and experience of the latter dominated the debates on the new vocationalism within NATFHE. The leadership of NATFHE was therefore faced with a dilemma with regard to YTS. On the one hand, opposition to YTS in the form a boycott was never considered a viable option since this would have marginalised NATFHE within the ranks of the TUC. On the other hand, the very nature of YTS precluded NATFHE's wholehearted involvement in what was widely recognised as a scheme which had little or no 'educational' legitimacy. Furthermore, a general hostility towards the MSC served to distance even further the leadership of NATFHE from the rank and file. As a result, the leadership resorted to a pragmatic response, one which meant that they neither accepted or rejected YTS. This position was made tenable by the divisions which existed within the union. As a result, the union's opposition to the imposition of the new vocationalism was to be rendered ineffective.

As shown in Chapter Ten, these divisions within NATFHE resulted in policies on YTS which were contradictory. This, in turn, provided space for the union's leadership to place their own interpretation upon developments in YTS and re-adopt a strategy of opportunism. Given the institutional and political context of YTS, such a strategy proved to be increasingly ineffectual eg. the transfer of 25% of WRNAFE to the MSC. Thus the internal politics of the union and, in particular, the adoption of a strategy of opportunism, were shown to have been responsible for the muted opposition of NATFHE to the new vocationalism. This ineffectual response was also seen to have contributed to the proletarianisation of FE teachers. Thus, each time a strategy of opportunism was adopted, its inevitable failure appears to have enhanced a commitment to trade unionism as the preferred occupational strategy of FE teachers. This in itself may be indicative of the seemingly ineluctable proletarianisation the adoption of such a strategy produces. Given the rapidity of strategic change in the period examined, the pace of this process of proletarianisation appears to have speeded up quite dramatically.

Overall, from this account it might be argued that recognition by the leadership of NATFHE of the *political* aspects of YTS would have helped it constitute a more effective opposition to the new vocationalism, in alliance of course with the local authorities and trade unions. This may have resulted in the reform of YTS. Whilst it is impossible to prove a negative hypothesis, it does nevertheless appear that the lack of a political understanding of YTS and in particular the importance of the representational and interpretative roles of the Local state, undermined NATFHE's ability to take an effective stance on the new vocationalism. As a result, the union's leadership was shown to have been complicit in its own ineffectiveness.

The account of the introduction of the new vocationalism into FE given in Part Two of this thesis, differs from those made in the SNV in a number of respects. Firstly, it has theorised the political aspects of the introduction of the new vocationalism, whereas in the existing SNV accounts there appears to have been no attempt to introduce such an 'intrinsic' political analysis. As a result we have had economic, ideological and policy-study accounts which are largely bereft of political actors. By comparison the role of the FE teachers and their organisation NATFHE has been shown in this thesis to have been an important aspect of the political process of introducing the new vocationalism into FE, especially their role in the development and legitimation of vocational preparation as a strategy of reproduction.

The question of *how* the new vocationalism came to pass has also been largely ignored within the SNV. Again, in this account, it has been shown that an examination of the overall institutional and organisational context of the new vocationalism is vitally important to an understanding of the actual provision. For this reason, a historical perspective to the new vocationalism has been adopted. Without such a perspective, important political distinctions relating to the effects of the provision would have remained unseen eg. the distinction between vocational preparation as 'citizens in training' and the new vocationalism as 'training in citizenship'. The former could be said to have been an attempt to extend the rights of young people, whilst the latter has redefined and restricted their rights.

Educational change has also been delimited in this account. That is, the new vocationalism has been examined in terms of three fundamental units of analysis - the institutional ensemble of the state, policy and provision and the political organisation it engendered. Thus, the institutional context of the new vocationalism has been examined, especially changes in central-Local state relations. In this way, the institutional ensemble of the state was shown to be an important variable in the dynamic of educational change rather than simply a by-product of such changes.

The unintended nature of some outcomes associated with the introduction of the new vocationalism eg. its extension into Schools in the form of TVEI, is consonant with the views of Smith (1989) with regard to recent educational changes. According to Smith:

*"...the assumptions by many researchers that increased government control [over education] was the consequence of a cumulative process generated by actions intended to achieve this outcome seem to be misconceived. The occasions of greater control should be seen more as 'drifts towards centralisation' that were both transformative and the outcome of developments in which unintended consequences played a significant part." (5)*

It is interesting to note that Smith arrived at this view through the development of what he terms a 'structuring model' of educational transformations. This model has been designed to provide a framework for the analysis of change which includes:

*'relationships between state agencies, relationships between educational policy-making and what goes on in schools, with both sets of relationships being viewed as part of a dynamic historical process. In particular, it is proposed that these relationships can best be understood through the prior development of an over-arching theory of the State and its relationships both with constituent, internal, parts and with the wider society' (6).*

The generality of Smith's programme is such that it coincides with the attempt to develop a content-theoretical model in this thesis. However, Smith's model shares with Archer and Salter and Tapper, an institutional bias which prevents the realisation of a translation effect between the levels of analysis which he identifies. His central concern is therefore with identifying 'control' of the education system through decisional-analysis. The content-theoretical model

developed in this thesis also belies Smith's central contention (and the *raison d'être* of his own model) that 'structuralist' accounts of educational change:

*"...no matter how elegant their formulation .... do not seem to be suitable for analysing current changes in educational control. They cannot account for two of the main features of these changes, namely their transformative nature and the way in which this transformation seems to have come about as much through the intended as the unintended consequences of action." (7)*

The 'structuralist' element of the content-theoretical model - the conception of educational change as form-determined - has not in fact negated the importance of unintended consequences, eg. in the account of the new vocationalism given in this thesis. Smith's general objection to 'structuralist' accounts is therefore rejected here.

It is obviously the case that the very notion of a 'model' suggests that any explanation of the object of analysis, in this case educational change, will necessarily be a simplification. Shipman (1984) has warned us:

*" There is a need for caution in the use of models to generate interpretations of the working of a complicated service such as education. In practice as distinct from theory, chaos rather than conspiracy, muddle rather than reason, maybe common. Using a model always leads to a reasonable explanation. That explicable, rational shift in the balance of influence, or this move to support the economy through curriculum change, may actually be inexplicable. Not everything can be satisfactorily explained. But a model provides explanations. It is a source for understanding. Specific cases may not fit. Models rationalize, simplify, tidy up the often messy reality." (8)*

It is accepted that the model of educational change presented here is not immune from this charge. It does simplify a complex reality, but it does so in order to provide some coherence to what has otherwise remained, for the most part, largely incoherent. Indeed, this simplification has been deliberately sought, in so far as it is has been an attempt to reverse the recent tendency of theorists working within the Reproduction problematic to become more elaborate and complex in their explanations ( Moore 1988). Of course, in this context, 'simplification' is not to be confused with 'simplistic'. The former is used here to denote clarity and intelligibility.

The major claim of this content-theoretical model is that it has made possible an intrinsic political analysis of educational change. An analysis of this type is the key to understanding educational change since it is in the nature of the relationship between the forms of power and domination which permeate the social structure that a dynamic for change can be located. Social forms are the product of social relations of production within the CMP and the education system is the most public and formal site of their reproduction. Since these social forms are to be found throughout the social structure, including the education system, a 'translation effect' between different levels of analysis can be identified. That is, the form-determined nature of the reproduction process enables changes to be linked at different levels of abstraction. Thus changes in social relations can be related to actual provision, as mediated by political struggles. Relative autonomy in this context lies in the relationship between form-determination and the actual nature of educational provision. It therefore becomes an empirical question. In this respect, it may also be suggested here that some progress towards a resolution of the macro-micro problem within the Sociology of Education is afforded by this approach. Thus, in keeping with the retroductive method, a number of theoretical issues can be addressed as a result of the analysis which has been undertaken in this thesis.

For example, West (1984) has suggested that some rapprochement between neo-Marxism and Symbolic Interactionism may be possible on the basis of the concept of social 'form'. It is therefore interesting to note that Social Form Theory was arrived at in this thesis via Urban Sociology: the connection between the two, historically, lies in the Chicago School and the work of Simmel. Simmel's Social Form Theory, whilst distinct from that of Marx in many respects, comes from the same critique of Hegel and German Idealism. However, Simmel's theorisation of Social Forms underwent a process of sanitisation in the hands of the Chicago School theorists, in so far as it was purged of all references to conflict (Coser 1965). As a result, the Chicago School's Urban Studies were informed more by American pragmatism and liberalism than Simmel's 'structural' critique of the 'urban'. As West notes, the basis for a rapprochement between neo-Marxism and Symbolic Interactionism may therefore lie in the recovery of the conflict in Simmel's conception of forms, brought together with the writings of the 'early' ie. political, Marx:

*" I submit that neo-Marxist and interactionist formulations of conceptual analysis have much in common. There is the same search for history, will, and political action to provide the real sufficient conditions. There is the same relative disinterest in particular contents, the same search for underlying structure. Furthermore, both neo-Marxism and Interactionism rely upon a claimed isomorphism of subjects' categories ( or ideology) and social behaviour and social form. In a very real sense, the 'micro-macro' split is dissolved." (9)*

Whilst West's claims may be somewhat premature, his general point regarding a more rigorous Marxist ethnography, may be supported by the advances which the content-theoretical model developed in this thesis appear to offer. For example, the concept of 'resistance' which has been so prominent in neo-Marxist ethnography (Willis 1977, McRobbie 1978) can be accommodated within the model in so far as it is the contradictory relations between social forms which can be seen to account for the spaces for contestation. This was shown in Part Two to be particularly apparent in the relationship between the wage and state-forms, where the rights of citizenship were seen to act back upon class inequalities eg. the relationship between the class location of teachers and their status as professionals. Similarly, this could be seen in trainee resistance to the imposition of the new form of citizenship implicit in the new vocationalism. However, one aspect of this relationship which has been left unexamined within this thesis is the effects of these developments on the civil-form. This was due to the pragmatics of the research process which necessarily entailed some cut-off points. In this instance, the central concern with teachers' collective organisation, central-Local state relations, the nature of the provision etc. has precluded an examination of the civil-form. It was however noted that one response, by young working class women, to exclusion from both the wage and state-forms has been an increased emphasis on the civil-form. This is just one area the model opens up for future exploration and development.

Another area which the content-theoretical model opens up for further investigation includes the ideologies of teachers. For example, Kean (1989) has recently suggested that the different conception of citizenship (the state-form) experienced by women in the early part of this century accounts for the distinct nature of feminist teachers' political mobilisation. Here gender

relations, the civil-form, intersects both the wage and state-forms. This finding lends support to the notion posited in this thesis of a dialectical relationship existing between professionalism (the state-form) and the state formation. I believe the content-theoretical model would be a considerable aid to further historical research in this area in so far as it offers a theoretical framework within which comparative studies of teachers' ideologies could be undertaken. Similarly, the relationship between central and Local states has also featured large in this thesis. Here, the possibilities for inter-disciplinary research, especially between the areas of the Sociology of Education and Urban and Political Sociology, could be undertaken within the framework provided by this model. Finally, the relationship between the FE curriculum and the social relations of production has been examined in this account. There is no reason why, with certain refinements, this content-theoretical model should not also be used in relation to other sectors of the education system. Therefore a major strength of the model presented here is I believe its capacity to generate a variety of inter-related areas/hypotheses to be researched at a number of levels using a variety of methods, whilst retaining a 'structural' ie. form-determined, framework. Such a model has made it possible to theorise educational change.

In conclusion, the following have been generated by this analysis:

- (i) The conceptualisation of a 'translation effect' between different levels of analysis of educational change has been made possible by utilising Social Form Theory. This goes some way towards bridging the macro-micro divide which permeates the Sociology of Education.
- (ii) An intrinsic political analysis of educational change has been undertaken as a result of developing a content-theoretical model of the education system ( at level of the FE sector). Educational change has been conceived as resulting from changes in the 'strategy of reproduction' employed by the state.
- (iii) An application of Offe's concept 'strategy of opportunism' in relation to the logic of the FE teachers' collective action has advanced our understanding of teacher trade unionism, in so

far as it revealed and helped explain the rapidity of the transitions between 'professionalism' and 'trade unionism' associated with recent educational change.

- (iv) An important 'political' differentiation has been revealed between vocational preparation - '~~citizens-in-training~~' - and the new vocationalism - '~~training-in-citizenship~~'. These have been shown to be two distinct strategies of reproduction employed by the state. This is a differentiation which has not been made within the Sociology of the New Vocationalism. In fact it has only been possible to make this differentiation by carrying out an intrinsic political analysis. This, in turn, was made possible by the content-theoretical model developed in this thesis.

## Notes and References - Conclusions

1. Dale (1982) p.129
2. Hargreaves (1985) p28
3. Sayer (1979) p.102
4. Hall (1985) p.123
5. Smith (1989) p.175
6. *ibid*
7. *ibid* p.177
8. Shipman (1984) p.208
9. West (1984) pp.273-4

## APPENDIX 1

### *From Urban Studies to the 'New' Urban Sociology*

Urban Sociology as a distinct field of study is first and foremost associated with the Chicago School of the 1920s and 1930s. Pioneers such as Park and Burgess can be said to have carved out a particular niche for 'Urban Studies' within their wider ecological formulations. However, the specificity of the 'urban' within the work of the Chicago School is largely elided. In other words, there is a certain taken-for-grantedness about what exactly constituted the theoretical object - the urban - and one can only infer that it was constituted by reference to the density and heterogeneity of the population, a spatial dimension ( the metropolis) and a concomitant '*urban way of life*'. In effect, it was seen as almost anything which was related to 'city-life' and this, in turn, was simply juxtaposed to 'rural-life'. Therefore one is really none the wiser as to what exactly the 'urban' is. This failure to delimit a theoretical object, other than normatively, was of course also a characteristic of the early Sociology of Education.

With hindsight one can see what city-life came to convey to urban sociologists was primarily the rise of social pathologies such as crime and delinquency, suicide, family break-ups and overcrowding. As a result, it was with these types of social problem that much of the early *Urban Studies* was concerned. In this sense it can be seen as a continuation of the social conditions investigations of people such as Booth and Rowntree, inspired by Durkheimian notions such as anomie. In this and other respects, it can therefore be seen to have much in common with the political-arithmetic tradition found later in the Sociology of Education. That the 'problems' approach of the Chicago School failed to even consider that the urban, as they conceived it, was the product of a particular mode of production, should not really surprise us. Their whole perspective depended upon a biologically determined view of social behaviour within which 'survival' was the keyword. Therefore the socio-political context was viewed as given, an arena, rather than itself being seen as a contributing factor in this struggle for survival. As such it was immune from any critical consideration. Again, the parallel with the

political-arithmetic tradition's treatment of the State within the Sociology of Education is revealing.

By the 1960s the 'urban' problematic had begun to be reformulated in the wake of various urban crises, especially in the United States. The consensual model of the Chicago School was overtaken by the actual course of events, particularly the advent of the Equal Rights and Black Consciousness movements. The substitution of the consensus paradigm by one which recognised the normality of urban conflict was a considerable advance over the Urban Studies perspective. The question of the allocation of resources within urban political systems then became the focus of much of the research in the 1960s. These '*community power studies*' also sought to identify significant participants in the processes of urban politics and, in particular, decision-makers and -takers (eg. Dahl, 1961). As a result, a more pluralistic account of urban sociology developed wherein the focus moved away from the disadvantaged towards an understanding of the whole 'socio-spatial' system. In Britain this shift in perspective is exemplified in the work of Pahl (1975) and Rex (1973). Both of these located their work within what can broadly be called a neo-Weberian framework. Pahl's work on 'urban managers' (1977a) is typical of this approach. Whilst recognising the conflicts of interest between the occupants of the urban 'system', writers such as Pahl were quite firm in their conviction that conflicts were delimited and presented no real threat to the stability of the political system as a whole. Accommodation and reform were seen as the usual outcome of urban conflicts which tended, on the whole, to revolve around questions of the distribution of resources and services rather than their production. As such, struggles in the urban arena were seen as quite distinct from class struggles, and there was no necessary correspondence between the two. For this reason quite a few of the studies using this perspective were particularly concerned with the plight of the 'underclass' or 'really disadvantaged'.

What is interesting to note about this perspective is the unquestioning way in which the problematic concept of the 'urban' was approached. The notion of a 'socio-spatial system' (Pahl, 1979) posited a relationship between local political systems and urban locales (the spatial boundaries of those systems). Central to this conception of the urban is the notion of 'concentration' - of both population and problems relating to the distribution of

goods and services. Mediating these two aspects of concentration are the urban 'managers' located primarily within the local administration. This raises two key questions: what is the limit of their professional autonomy; and secondly, how are questions of distribution divorced from production? Both questions which, within the Sociology of Education of the 1970s, find their expression in the New Sociology of Education's concerns with teachers' autonomy, knowledge and control. Neither of these questions are satisfactorily addressed within the Urban 'Managerialist' perspective ( as Pahl concedes - see notes, Pahl, 1978). It is also worth noting how this approach has much in common - especially its methodological individualism - with the Pluralist analyses of educational change ( Archer 1980, Salter and Tapper 1982), especially its methodological individualism. As in the Sociology of Education, the case-study and ethnographic approaches were commonly being employed by Urban Sociologists as the dominant methods of inquiry.

The 'Structuralist' or Marxist perspective which has developed since the early 1970s, as a direct critique of both the Chicago School's functionalism and the neo-Weberian 'managerialism', locates the concept of the 'urban' in the capitalist mode of production. That is, the wider economic and political structures of capitalist society are assigned a determining influence on the subject area designated the 'urban'. A political-economy of the urban has been generated by writers within this perspective and this transcends the notion of urban 'conflict' by the introduction of urban 'contradictions'. What was taken for 'Urban Sociology' prior to this reformulation has been deemed by the major theorist within this new problematic, Castells, as nothing less than 'ideological' (Castells, 1977). Following Althusser's (1971) distinction between 'real' and 'theoretical' objects, Castells argued that both the Chicago and neo-Weberian conceptions of the urban had invalid 'theoretical objects', as well as invalid 'real objects' of study. Thus, the failure of the Chicago School to delimit that which is specific to the urban meant that the dominant popular conception - a common-sense conception - was used uncritically as the basis of their understanding. This popular conception was a culturally specific conception involving a notion of an 'urban way of life'. This turns out on inspection to be indistinguishable from the 'industrial way of life' ( which in effect meant the capitalist way of life). For example, when we look closely at the urban/rural divide posited by writers such as Wirth (1938) and Gans (1973) we find that

the 'urban' is similarly quite indistinguishable from the 'industrial'. The urban/rural divide can in fact be subsumed within the wider industrialised/non-industrialised division, in which case it becomes largely meaningless. In Castells' view, there is no 'real object' designated by the term the 'urban' within this perspective (cf. Archer and 'education'- Chapter Two).

Castells has also dismissed the notion of the urban as a socio-spatial system on the grounds that this too is not a 'real object'. The relationship between the local socio-political system and the spatial boundary of that system is considered to be quite arbitrary. The administrative boundaries are not delimited by the spatial and, as a result, the 'urban' becomes an arbitrary object. Similarly, the close attention which is given to certain individuals within the socio-spatial system by the managerialist perspective tends to undermine the possibility of an analysis which takes the location of those individuals as in any way structured. That is, the voluntaristic emphasis of the managerialist perspective fails to take into account the wider structural constraints within which those individual 'urban managers' operate. Once again, this criticism parallels that levelled at the New Sociology of Education's 'possibilitarianism'.

Accepting as he does a trinity of levels - the economic, political and the ideological - Castells, by a process of elimination, locates the 'urban' within the economic. As already seen, Castells dismisses the possibility that the specificity of the urban lies in either the ideological ( it can be culturally defined) or the political (the nature of institutional control). Therefore it must be in the economic level. However, it cannot, according to Castells, be in *production*, as this is not spatially delimited and can be regionally, nationally or ( as is increasingly the case) internationally organised. Similarly, and for the same reasons, it cannot be in *exchange*. It can only therefore be delimited to the process of *consumption*. According to Saunders,

" ...the principal function of consumption is that it is the means whereby the human-labour power expended in production of commodities comes to be replaced. In other words, it is only by consuming socially necessary use-values ( housing, food, leisure facilities etc.) that the workforce is able to reproduce the capacity for labour which it sells afresh each day." (1)

Thus, for Castells, the 'real urban object' is the reproduction of labour-power as it takes place through consumption.

What Castells believes he has achieved with this formulation is precisely that which has eluded all previous 'urban' sociologists: he has discerned what for him constitutes a specifically urban 'real object' of study - the reproduction of labour-power as it relates to a spatial unit. This is what makes this perspective 'new' in terms of it being a 'New Urban Sociology'. The spatial aspect of the equation lies in the fact that Castells sees the concentration of capital necessitating the concentration of labour within the capitalist mode of production. This, in turn, requires the structuration of spatial units within which the reproduction of that labour-power can take place. It is beyond the capacity of any individual capitalist to provide for this structuration of space and, as a result, it falls to the State to intervene on capital's collective behalf. State intervention inevitably entails the 'socialisation' of the consumption process and, more importantly, its 'politicisation'. According to Castells, there is a contradiction inherent in the State's intervention in the provision of the means of collective consumption. That contradiction is between consumption and production. For while it is the case that capital requires the continued reproduction of labour-power, individual capitalists find it increasingly unprofitable to invest in the commodities which secure that reproduction. For this reason the State's intervention must increase and, as a result, the 'politicisation' of the process can only grow. Thus the advent of 'social movements' in the sphere of consumption which come to challenge the scale and distribution of collective consumption. These social movements in turn may form alliances with the broader labour movement in production and, together, may mount a challenge to the entire system.

There can be no denying the fact that the epistemological break which Castells has brought to Urban Sociology has transformed the field. It has not however been achieved without considerable opposition and criticism. In particular, Castells' rather mechanical and dogmatic reading of the Althusserian project has been widely objected to (Pickvance 1976). That Castells imported virtually all the problems associated with the Althusserian methodology has however been duly recognised by the author (2). It is not intended here to take

up all the epistemological issues which Castells' work raises. What is important however, is that the central concept, collective consumption, be explored and 'not thrown out with the bath water'. Saunders, for one, has recognised this:

*" The relevance of the concept is that it defines an area of analysis - state consumption provisions - that appear crucial to an understanding of processes within contemporary capitalism...[And Castells'] concept of collective consumption may be retained as an initial basis for an ideal-type conceptualisation of 'urban' problems (the implication of this being that it should be assessed according to its heuristic value ...although it needs to be modified and qualified." (3)*

Castells' concept of collective consumption, as with his theory in general, has not been immune to criticism. In particular, his conceptualisation of the relationship between collective consumption and the reproduction of labour power has been keenly contested by critics of the 'structuralist' reading of the 'urban' such as Pahl (1978). It is worth listing in full Pahl's main criticisms as they provide a framework for examining Castells' formulation of the concept:

*" (a) Can collective consumption be defined solely in terms of the nature of the facility?*

*(b) Can collective consumption be defined solely in terms of the ownership, control or rights of access to a facility?*

*(c) Can collective consumption be defined by the way a particular facility is used?*

*(d) Is collective consumption simply a way of describing a process at a given stage of development of a specific mode of production?*

*(4)*

Each of these questions needs to be addressed. However, it should also be borne in mind that the concept of collective consumption, as formulated by Castells, needs to be seen in the context of the particular research project for which it is being used. The nature of the questions above suggest that this is not recognised by Pahl. Therefore an abstracted defence will, in many respects, inevitably be inadequate.

Firstly, there is no doubt that Castells, in his earliest formulations, attempted to conceptualise collective consumption in terms of some inherent quality ie. the nature or scale of the process itself. He stated, for example,

that collective consumption arose from " *those processes whose organisation and management cannot be other than collective given the nature and size of the problems.*" (Castells 1969). In this respect Castells has much in common with Lojkin (1976) who, working from within a similar Marxist perspective, argued that:

*"...the mode of consumption is collective and is thus by its nature opposed to individual, private appropriation. Parks or lessons cannot be consumed individually - at least not in their currently increasingly socialised form."* (5)

It would appear from this that Pahl had every right to be sceptical about the concept. For the fact remains that some of the seemingly most obvious forms of collective consumption, such as roads, transport, housing and even education can be *both* collectively and individually appropriated and consumed. There would appear to be nothing intrinsic to these commodities or services which makes them 'collective' consumption. Castells recognised this and in a later formulation stated that:

*" ... collective consumption is, therefore, consumption of commodities whose production is not assured by capital, not because of some intrinsic quality, but because of the specific and general interests of capital: thus the same product (housing, for example) will be treated both by the market and by the state, and will therefore be alternately a product of individual or collective consumption, according to criteria, which will change according to the historical situation."* (6) [emphasis added]

Within this formulation there is affirmation of the fact that Castells now sees the defining characteristic of collective consumption as state provision:

*" This is the distinction between individual consumption and collective consumption, the second being consumption whose economic and social treatment, while remaining capitalist, takes place not through the market but through the state apparatus."* (7)

Pahl, had also recognised Castells' delimitation of collective consumption as state provision:

*" It seems to me that in much of Castells' writing it is possible to substitute the phrase 'state provision' for 'collective consumption' without materially altering the sense."  
(8)*

However, Pahl misses what is perhaps the most important difference between collective consumption, defined as state provision, and Castells' earlier conceptualisation. That difference lies in the *political effects* of state provision. As a result,

*"... It is entirely consistent, therefore, for Castells to argue that collective consumption, defined as facilities provided by the state on account of their unprofitability, has qualitatively different political effects from individual consumption via the market. There is no reason therefore to abandon the concept..." (9) [emphasis added]*

This response by Saunders also goes some way towards rebutting Pahl's third criticism - that relating to the defining characteristic of collective consumption as the way in which it is used.

Pahl's final objection is that the Marxist concept of collective consumption has been rather arbitrarily assigned a significance only in the capitalist mode of production and, as a result, collective consumption in 'socialist' societies has largely been ignored. Pahl insists that if the purpose of collective consumption is to ensure the reproduction of labour-power, this must take place in all modes of production. As such, collective consumption cannot be seen as a specifically capitalist phenomenon. Critics, both to the Left and Right of Castells, have taken up this point. By appearing to restrict the notion of reproduction, and thereby collective consumption, to the economic level, Castells does invite the criticism that his thesis is tautological. That is, by positing the idea that collective consumption *only* acts to reproduce labour-power suited to capital's interests, all concessions or reforms wrung from capital in the form of state provision must, in the long-term at least, be supportative of capital. Where does this leave the concept in non-capitalist modes of production, presumably having no usefulness? I do not believe this is so. Recognition of the ideological and especially the political aspects of the reproduction process would not discount the usefulness of the concept of collective consumption in analyses of non-capitalist modes of production.

Whilst coming from a perspective which is very sympathetic to that of Castells, Harloe (1977) has also argued that Castells' demarcation of collective consumption from production is also unacceptable. According to Harloe, the function of collective consumption is not simply to reproduce labour-power, it also has a *productive* function (cf. Apple on education):

*"...the separation of consumption from production in Castells' analysis...and the focus on collective consumption for the study of the role of state urban policies seems far too narrow a perspective and is misleading. 'Urban' processes and forms cannot be understood without reference to the production of capital and the reproduction of the labour force." (10)*

In his defence Castells would deny an over-concentration on consumption, at least to the extent that he fails to recognise the productive aspects of urban processes. He simply contends that it is in the sphere of consumption that the *specificity* of the urban can be located. He certainly does not hold the view attributed to him by some of his critics that collective consumption is the *only* significant process which takes place within the urban:

*"...a concrete city ( or an urban area, or a given spatial unit) is not only a unit of consumption. It is, of course, made up of a very great diversity of practices and functions. It expresses, in fact, society as a whole, though through the specific historical forms that it represents. Therefore, whoever wishes to study a city (or series of cities) must also study capital, production, distribution, politics, ideology etc. Furthermore, one cannot understand the process of consumption without linking it to the accumulation of capital and to the political relations between classes." (11)*

Here Castells is arguing for a relational perspective. That is, a perspective which, whilst prioritising certain aspects of an analysis eg. consumption processes, does not lose sight of the fact that such prioritisation is entirely analytical and in no way constitutes the reality of the phenomenon under study. It is only by linking ones *theoretical* object to other processes that a more comprehensive understanding may ultimately be achieved ( cf. as with the earlier theorisation of 'education' as consumption needing to be seen in relation to training and selection).

Notes and References - Appendix 1

1. Saunders (1981) p.185
2. Castells has re-assessed his early formulations and, according to some, has now come to a more Weberian conception of the 'urban question' which recovers the 'subject' as 'agency'. See Walther (1982)
3. Saunders *op cit* pp.215 & 218
4. Pahl (1978) p.167
5. Lojkine (1976) p.122
6. Castells (1977) p.460
7. *ibid*
8. Pahl *op cit* p.
9. Saunders (1980) p.123
10. Harloe (1977) p.22
11. Castells *op cit* p.440

## APPENDIX 2

### *A History of Non-Advanced Further Education*

*"The English people do not believe in the value of technical education." J.S.Russell, 1869*

Since 1870 the state's involvement in 'education' can be described as being an abiding pre-occupation with the production of academic elitism. Moreover, technical and (even) further education have never really been seen to be the responsibility of the state. This is not to say that the State or indeed the conscience of the general public has been unconcerned with further education. On the contrary, at regular intervals in the history of Britain's industrial decline the absence of sufficient/suitably trained workers, compared with our competitors, has been commented upon ( *see for example, Le Guillou, 1981, for a discussion of the period 1851-1914*). Indeed, this use of the international comparison has become almost *de rigeur* in debates on training. In 1884 for example, the *Samuelson Report* highlighted the gulf that existed between Britain and its European competitors and called for the establishment of local authority controlled technical colleges. Exactly a hundred years later the NEDC/MSA published *Competence and Competition (1984)*, a similar comparative exercise, which came to precisely the same conclusion. If nothing else, this perhaps highlights the structural and contradictory nature of the relationship between the provision of 'education' and 'training'. There have been various attempts this century to resolve this contradiction and these warrant some examination.

Following the *Lewis Report (1917)* which recommended compulsory day continuation classes for all 14-18 year olds, the *Fisher Education Act (1918)* was the first real attempt by the State to intervene in post-compulsory education for the majority of school-leavers. However, the Act failed to specify when day release should become compulsory and left it to the discretion of the local authorities. As a result nothing, save in certain instance eg., the founding of the London Day Continuing School, came of its recommendations. The next mention of technical education came in the *Spens*

*Report (1930)* where the creation of technical schools was called for. This was eventually incorporated into the *1944 Education Act*, albeit in characteristically ambiguous fashion.

In sections 43 to 46 of the 1944 Act, the responsibilities and duties of the local authorities with respect to further education were specified. The Secretary of State was empowered through an Order in Council to allow local authorities to establish and maintain 'county colleges'. These colleges were to provide for young persons '...who are not in full-time attendance at any school or other educational institution such further education including physical, practical, and vocational training as will enable them to develop their various aptitudes and capabilities and will prepare them for the responsibilities of citizenship...'. [the concept of citizenship is an important and recurring theme in vocational preparation and the new vocationalism in general]. The Act incorporated the Fisher recommendation of compulsory day release and went as far as to suggest fines for non-compliance. In practice, the provisions in the Act were largely ignored and their ambiguity was to bedevil FE's legal status thereafter ( a review by the DES in 1981 *The Legal Basis of Further Education* noted these ambiguities but failed to deal with them in any meaningful way). In particular the Act sanctioned the provision by LEAs of post-compulsory education in *both* Schools and FE. Not only this, the LEAs interpreted the Act in a way which meant that they were not obliged to meet all demands for post-compulsory education. They were merely required to '...secure provision for their area of adequate facilities for further education...'. This in effect ensured the localised nature of FE provision with all that this meant in terms of the difficulties of implementing strategic i.e. national, manpower planning. It also reaffirmed the notion of FE as responsive to local political and economic demands ( Lewis,1980, Jackson,1979, Dean,1979 all quoted in Dunne JFHE(2) Summer 1983).

The practical effects of the 1944 Act in terms of securing post-compulsory provision for the majority of school-leavers, was disappointing to say the least. No government in the post-war period laid the Orders in Council and few county colleges were ever established. An absence at the central state level of the necessary political will to implement the Act's provisions is generally thought to lie behind the inadequate response to the needs of school-

leavers. In other words, there were other political priorities eg. the Schools and Universities.

After the war, the abolition of the controls on labour meant that employers were once more left to prioritise NAFE requirements. The government saw its role only in terms of providing further education '*where necessary*'. This division of responsibility became enshrined in the 'voluntarist' tradition of post-school provision and the 'ethos' of FE as 'demand-led' was not to be easily displaced. Indeed, some would say that it is still a cornerstone in the FE 'tradition' and one which has been built upon in the current period of 'privatisation' of FE and training. It is therefore an important contextual factor in understanding the development of FE and training provision in the post-war period.

Following the *Carr Report (1956)* a White Paper entitled *Technical Education* was published which concerned itself almost entirely with what is now thought of as Advanced Further Education (AFE). According to Ziderman (1978), the Carr Committee:

*" ...did not see the need for any radical form of government intervention, and urged strongly that responsibility for training remain firmly within industry." (p.40)*

As a result, an examination of the needs of the under or unqualified school-leaver was delegated to a Central Advisory Council committee headed by Sir Geoffrey Crowther. In the *Crowther Report (1959)* full-time education to the age of 16 and part-time education to 18 were recommended. Once more compulsory day release was placed on the agenda and Crowther, echoing J.S.Russell quoted at the start of this Appendix, stated that '*it is the widespread lack of belief in this intention which in our view has almost stopped the growth of all part-time release other than that clearly essential for technical reasons.*' Crowther's call for the ROSLA was finally implemented in 1972. As for day release, this once again was side-stepped by the government of the day. In *Better Opportunities in Technical Education (1961)* the reason for this was made clear, '*...the right to day release could not be granted without holding back the prospects for other urgent educational developments.*' Once again, NAFE was not considered politically important.

The whole question of day release was again reviewed three years later in the Henniker-Heaton Report *Day Release (1964)*. This report called for the 'doubling' of provision of day release; although its recommendations were applicable only to those already part-qualified and in employment. Furthermore, the 'voluntarist' flavour of the report meant that once again responsibility for provision was left almost entirely in the hands of employers. Thus it recommended that '...day release should be ...subject to the courses being appropriate to all individuals and employers.' This was a green light for the employers' traditional complacency. In fact, in the period following the report, day release provision actually *fell*. However, a sea-change in the 'voluntarist' philosophy on training was about to take place. Following a White Paper *Industrial Training (1962)*, statutory intervention was incorporated into the 1964 *Industrial Training Act*. The setting up of Industrial Training Boards (ITBs) with responsibility for training in individual industries or sectors of industry was therefore recognition of the failure of the employers to provide not only adequate training but *any* training in many instances. It was estimated that less than 20 per cent of male school leavers and as few as 3 per cent of female school leavers received skilled training at this time. There was therefore a crisis of reproduction with skills shortages being blamed for Britain's relative backwardness in a period of rapid modernisation i.e. the 'white-heat of the technological revolution'.

The ITBs were charged with improving both the amount and the quality of training. Since they were to be the responsibility of the individual industries, it was thought that they would be more responsive to actual skill demands, especially counter-cyclical i.e. in terms of the trade cycle. They were to cover all those over the statutory leaving age and in conjunction with FE they mounted full-time integrated - further education and initial apprenticeship training - courses of usually one year duration. The costs of such training was dispersed by a system of levies and grants. That is, employers were liable to a levy - on average approximately 1% of its payroll - if they did not train, and eligible for a grant if they did. Throughout the 1960s the ITBs laboured to establish themselves in constant opposition to those employers who saw them as 'State interference' and the levy system as a 'training tax'. However, despite their limited success in establishing better quality training, the ITBs failed to touch the vast majority of young people. In fact, in terms of

actual numbers, day release reached a plateau and eventually fell during the 1960s. Apprenticeships also began to decline. The Conservative government, responding to the anti-ITB lobby, especially amongst small businessmen who had traditionally 'poached' their skilled labour, published a green paper in 1971 *Training for the Future* which proposed to *weaken* the power of the ITBs. Under the *Employment and Training Act (1973)* this in fact occurred with the establishment of the Manpower Services Commission (MSC).

### *Binary NAFE*

Binary NAFE involved an admixture of general with technical/vocational education. That is, whilst the overwhelming ethos, and indeed structure, of the FE sector was always one of providing technical or vocational education, by the mid-1970's the College of Further Education or the 'tertiary' college had largely superseded the 'Tech'. This was reflected in an increasingly diverse student intake in the 1970s :

Table.

*Numbers of non-advanced further education students in England and Wales, by mode of attendance, 1970-1980 ('000s)*

#### Mode of Attendance

|             | 1970 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 | 1977 | 1978 | 1979 | 1980 |
|-------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| FT/sandwich | 198  | 230  | 271  | 287  | 293  | 305  | 304  | 314  |
| PT          | 680  | 647  | 658  | 600  | 610  | 652  | 637  | 612  |
| Eve         | 696  | 749  | 731  | 748  | 647  | 680  | 602  | 590  |
| Total       | 1563 | 1623 | 1660 | 1635 | 1550 | 1637 | 1574 | 1226 |

(FEU, Dec. 1982,p.20)

The growth in full-time 'general' education courses compensated for the decline in the numbers of part-time day release (except in the case of women). That is, the number of full-time equivalent students increased overall by 22.3 per cent, while the proportion of full-time students increased from 43.8 per cent in 1970-71 to 60 per cent in 1980-81, with a corresponding decline in the number of part-time students. This decline in the number of 'traditional' FE students reflected, amongst other things, the decline in employment in the manufacturing sector of the economy during this period, especially in engineering apprenticeships.

Whilst the changing clientele within NAFE in the 1970s brought about a far more pronounced 'academic' and 'social' education emphasis to FE policy and provision, it would be wrong to see this as a transformation in what was actually being taught within the sector. Apart from the well known Liberal Studies tradition within FE, it has to be recognised that a lot of what had previously passed as 'vocational' or 'technical' education was in fact an education into the 'social relations of production' i.e. socialisation into work relations, and this often involved little or no training in technical skills (Gleeson and Mardle 1980).

One of the most important ingredients of the Binary NAFE discourse was the notion that FE colleges were increasingly providing an alternative avenue for educational achievement through the provision of a '*second chance*' (Bristow, 1976). Of course there was nothing particularly new about this. Since the days of the Mechanics Institutes the ambition of 'bettering oneself' i.e. being socially mobile, through education had motivated many working class aspirants. However, the ideological nature of this claim is revealed in the fact that, during the 1970s, the majority of full-time students in FE Colleges are thought to have come from the middle or 'upper' working class. That is, the majority of working class young people, especially girls, once out of the compulsory system, still ended their formal education at 16. One study revealed that as few as 30 per cent of FE students came from working class backgrounds (Dean et al 1979). Therefore the decline in the numbers of day-release and evening students and the corresponding rise in full-time students during the 1970s, would have disproportionately affected the working class because they formed the majority of the traditional part-time category of

student. This was further reinforced by the absence of mandatory student grants in this sector. Therefore FE, in the early 1970s, was increasingly becoming, literally, a 'second-chance' for many middle-class school leavers intent on the academic route i.e. GCE 'A' levels etc. The insulation of the forms of domination can therefore be seen to have been maintained in the very different provision for working and middle class students ie. the traditional laissez-faire policy for 'training' and the wage form and general 'education' for the state-form. Such insulation was further reinforced by the Departmental 'ethos' of many colleges and the 'ideological' division between 'technical teachers' and 'educationalists' amongst the staff (Gleeson and Mardle, 1980).

This increasing 'educational' emphasis within NAFE was also being reflected in the convergence between schools and FE (FEU 1982). An important aspect to note here is the fact that the regime of the FE College has always been considered, by both staff and students alike, as quite different to that of Schools. Indeed, it has often been suggested that this is one of the major attractions of FE for students. In particular, it involves the notion of students being treated '*more like adults*'. The correlate of this is that the majority of FE teachers have also been attracted to the sector because they wanted to teach 'older' or more 'mature' students (Bradley and Silverleaf 1979). It will be argued later that this emphasis on 'maturity', especially in association with 'citizenship' was an important ingredient in fostering certain aspects of vocational preparation.

Other major changes within vocational education and training were also taking place in the early 1970s. Following the *Haslegrave Report (1969)* on the rationalisation of technician education, the Technician Education Council (TEC) and the Business Education Council (BEC) were established, albeit after considerable delay, in 1973 and 1974 respectively. (They have since merged, in 1983, to form BTEC) As a result, a 'revolution' in curriculum design is said to have taken place. In particular, there was a reaffirmation of the 'course', as opposed to the 'subject', as the focus of curriculum design. According to Parkes (1982) this is the '*...great distinction between FE and other educational sectors*' and one which leads to an organisational complexity which is '*...otherwise unknown in the Western world* (p.87). Therefore it is with some justification that FE curricular provision has been described as a 'jungle' and

that at least one attempt to map of 16-19 provision has been abandoned as 'not feasible' (Locke and Bloomfield 1982). The integrationist philosophy of BTEC, with its 'aims' and 'objectives' format of curricula design and assessment, quite apart from its very necessary rationalisation function, was intended above all else to introduce 'relevance' and 'flexibility' into technician education in the 1970s. This modernisation of the curriculum may also be seen to have contributed to the blurring of the distinction between FE and schools. More important in terms of this project is the fact that the influence of BTEC did not stop at technician education. Many of the principles incorporated in their curriculum design, for example experiential learning, found their way into lower level programmes.

By the mid 1970s there were areas of provision within Binary NAFE which were being deliberately aimed at the young unqualified school-leaver and, in particular, those of 'low ability' eg, the Appendix Two category within ILEA. In some respects this singled them out as deserving of special attention ie. acted as a form of positive discrimination. However, one has to bear in mind that, far from seeing this as a process of isolating the young unemployed, the 'special measures' being developed in the mid 1970s were actually thought of as steps to bring this historically neglected group into the FE fold. Indeed, this attempted integration of the young unemployed into the general scheme of things can be seen as the first step towards gaining acceptance of what was to become known as 'vocational preparation'.

Overall, it is possible to cite a number of explanations for the neglect of NAFE for the majority of school-leavers up until the 1970s. Firstly, NAFE was not considered necessary. That is, the nature of the employment which many school-leavers went into was thought to require little or no further education or training. The little that was required was picked up on the job by the '*sitting with Nellie*' type of training (Kaufman 1986). This can be thought of as a 'technical' explanation. Secondly, and closely related to the above point, employers did not see it as being in their interests to train young people in the 'transferable skills' which are required in many of the jobs entered into by school leavers. Therefore employers did not feel that it was their duty or responsibility to incur the costs of day-release for 'general' education: this they believed was the responsibility of the State. These are the economic

arguments. Thirdly, the state was not particularly keen to involve itself in matters of manpower planning. This laissez-faire approach meant that employers were seen as responsible for their own labour needs. As a result, the so-called 'voluntarist' principle became embedded in NAFE. Furthermore, political priorities in the shape of compulsory schooling and Higher Education had to be taken into consideration. NAFE was not politically (electorally) attractive. This is the political explanation. Finally, and by no means least, NAFE was not popular amongst Further Education lecturers or school leavers. Due to the Burnham grading system of FE work and vocational orientation of FE teaching, it was seen as professionally unsound to develop low level courses. Many school leavers had had an unrewarding experience of formal education in the compulsory sector and therefore had no wish to repeat the process. Education was therefore equated with dependency, whilst the transition to work represented independence ( Willis 1977). Once out of the ES, these young persons had no inclination to return. This can be thought of as the 'cultural' explanation. Together, these explanations presented a powerful obstacle to NAFE provision.

Within Binary FE the insulation between training and education can be seen to have been maintained by a combination of the employers' intransigence on the question of extending training to its young employees who were not in craft apprenticeships; the lack of political will on the part of governments to legislate for day-release provision instead of the more electorally popular demands relating to secondary and higher education ; the ambiguous nature of the statutory duties of local authorities vis the target group; and the presumed hostile attitudes and expectations of the target group themselves towards an extension of their education. This combination of anti-forces gradually weakened during the 1970s in the wake of overwhelming evidence that training was in a critical condition ie. there was a 'crisis of reproduction'. This compelled some new thinking on the possibility of extending the educational franchise. Initially this took the form of *vocational preparation*.

### APPENDIX 3

#### *The National Association of Teachers in Further and Higher Education (NATFHE)*

NATFHE was formed in 1976 through an amalgamation of the Association of Teachers in Colleges and Departments of Education (ATCDE) and the larger Association of Teachers in Technical Institutions (ATTI). In recent years NATFHE has also merged with two small unions - the Association for Adult and Continuing Education and the Association of Teachers in Penal Establishments - to the extent that it can now claim a 'density' of approximately 85% of teachers who come under the Further Education Regulations of 1975. In total, NATFHE now has a membership in excess of 75,000 members. As well as acting as a negotiating body, NATFHE represents its members on a panoply of educational, examination, Government and Local government Committees and bodies. It also provides all the professional and trade union services one would expect of a modern teachers' organisation eg. legal, advisory, financial, benevolent, publications etc.

NATFHE is affiliated to the TUC. This affiliation was unanimously agreed at its inaugural Conference ( its predecessor, the ATTI, was in fact the first teachers' organisation to affiliate to the TUC in 1967). Overall NATFHE's affiliation to the TUC can be seen as primarily 'instrumental', in so far as it is a means whereby the union can seek to influence Government opinion through TUC representation. Throughout the 1980s, and especially in relation to MSC matters, the union has placed great store on being 'in line' with TUC policy on education and training issues. Therefore affiliation to the TUC is an important factor in understanding NATFHE's policies. Although NATFHE has recently voted for a Political Fund, it is not affiliated to any political party.

There has been one major secession from the ranks of NATFHE. In the late 1970s the now Association of Polytechnic Teachers (APT) broke away from NATFHE on the pretext that their interests were not being furthered within the union. As their number was quite small, the 'crisis' which this caused within the union was largely symbolic in character and has not been particularly

harmful. Recent changes in the funding arrangements for the Polytechnics may change this.

In recent years, one of the most important developments in NATFHE's policy on membership has been the attempts to recruit from outside the public sector. Although NATFHE has, in the past, recruited from the private sector - mostly tutors/teachers in the larger language schools situated in and around London and the South East - these recent moves has been more determined and systematic. They have not however been entirely successful. The policy of placing increased emphasis on recruiting from outside the public sector can also be seen as a direct result of the MSC's interventions into NAFE. Thus the focus of the recruitment has been Supervisors/Tutors on MSC sponsored schemes such as YOP and YTS. As such, this is one of the more tangible effects of the MSC's influence on NATFHE's policy making. It is also one which exemplifies the ambiguous and increasingly contradictory position NATFHE finds itself in *vis* the MSC and initiatives such as YTS. It should also be pointed out that NATFHE's increased emphasis on recruitment in the private sector has not come about as a result of any significant membership decline. Unlike many other unions during the recession of the 1970s and early 1980s, NATFHE has enjoyed a relatively stable and sustained growth. It is therefore the rate of growth, rather than growth *per se*, which it is now finding difficult to maintain.

The diversity of the membership of NATFHE belies a common ground which, with the exception of some Adult Education teachers, lies in the fact that virtually all the members are involved in some form of vocational education. Whilst this is a matter of definition, it is nevertheless true to say that it has been the nature and orientation of vocational education, rather than its desirability, which has been at issue in most debates within the union. One of the interesting factors which emerges from the heterogeneous nature of the membership and the fact that they are nearly all involved in vocational education, is the close fit which exists between the range of subject teachers and the occupational structure of the economy as a whole. Unlike other teachers's organisations, NATFHE draws its membership from all occupational groupings and, to this extent, could be said to mirror the occupational

structure. Thus even its members involved in teacher education can be seen to represent that section of the occupational structure.

Since NATFHE recruits across the whole spectrum of teachers in the post-School sector, it may be argued that it approaches the 'industrial union', rather than 'craft' or 'general' union, ideal-type. The distinctive nature of this sector of the education system reinforces this proposition. FE has quite different Regulations than Schools and professional training, salaries and conditions of service. The overall *modus operandi* of FE is therefore unique. The fact that FE is largely 'voluntary' and 'demand-led' also contributes to its distinct character. The ambiguous statutory position of FE reinforces this.

The diversity of the union's membership is also reflected in the organisational structure and, in particular, the Committee structure within which all major policy decisions are initially discussed. This Committee structure can be represented as follows:-

#### NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

*sub-committees* EDUCATION POLICY    SALARIES    FINANCE & GENERAL

*standing*    HIGHER    FURTHER    TEACHER    ART    ADULT & CONTINUING

*panels*            Women's Rights    Race and anti-racism    International relations

Part-time staff    Penal Education    Polytechnics    Adult & Continuing

In theory, the NEC is answerable to a National Council which is, in turn, answerable to the Annual Conference. There is a regional tier of representation, arranged on a geographical basis, which mirrors this national committee structure. The regional tier extends downwards via Liason Committees which cover an individual Local Authority area, and Co-ordinating Committees which relate to the individual workplace Branches within an institution. Thus, there are the following tiers of government within NATFHE:

*National*

CONFERENCE

NATIONAL COUNCIL

NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

*Regional*

REGIONAL COUNCIL

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

LIASON COMMITTEE

*Local*

CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEE

BRANCH

Thus the heterogeneity of the membership has a bearing on the organisation of the union and its Committee structure. This means, in practice, individual topics/issues are simultaneously dealt with by various Committees and that policy-making is of an incremental rather than rationalist nature. That is to say, policies are arrived at by the intersection of various views emanating from different parts of the system. An analysis of actual policy-making within the union is thereby precluded due to this. One saving grace is that the distinctiveness of the special interests usually means that dominance in policy-making is often self-evident ie. FE matters are dealt with and decided by those in FE, Adult Education by those in Adult Education and Polytechnic matters by Polytechnic teachers etc. It is only where an issue or problem transcends the interest group boundaries, as in the case of salaries and conditions, that inter-group rivalries and conflicts arise. Therefore, for the most part, there is a surprising amount of harmony within the membership. Interestingly, this also means that where internecine struggles develop, these are often 'straightforward' political conflicts between the 'Left' and 'Right' or between the 'Rank and File' and the 'Leadership'.

In terms of the internal politics of the union, the fact that NATFHE can be seen to approach the 'industrial' union model is therefore significant. It may be expected, for example, that the heterogeneity of the interest groups found within NATFHE would produce a higher level of democracy than that found in other teachers's organisations. Similarly, the fact that NATFHE members may have, on the whole, more industrial experience than other teachers and more non-teaching union experience, means that the organisation and the level of internal debate could be said to be more 'developed' ( in terms of trade unionism) than in other teachers' organisations.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

*(This includes selected reading)*

*(BJSE - British Journal of the Sociology of Education*

*JFHE - Journal of Further and Higher Education)*

- Abercrombie, N & Urry, J (1983) *Capital, Labour & the Middle Classes* Allen & Unwin London
- Ahier, J & Flude, M (1983) *Contemporary Education Policy* Croom Helm London
- Ainley, P (1988) *From School to YTS* Open Univ. Press Milton Keynes
- Althusser, L (1969) *For Marx* Allen & Unwin London
- Althusser, L (1971) *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays* New Left Books London
- Anderson, M & Fairley, J (1986) *The Politics of Industrial Training in the U.K.* J. of Public Policy Vol.3 No.2
- Apple, M (ed) (1982) *Cultural & Economic Reproduction in Education* Routledge London
- Apple, M (1985) *Education and Power* Ark London
- Apple, M (1986) *Teachers and Texts* Routledge & Kegan Paul London
- Archer, M (1981) *Educational Politics: a model for their analysis* in Broadfoot et al
- Annot, M & Whitty, G (1982) *From reproduction to transformation* BJSE (3)
- Atkinson, P (1985) *Language, Structure and Reproduction* Methuen London
- Aumeeruddy, A et al (1978) *Labour Power and the State* Capital & Class Aut. 6

- Avis, J (1981) *Social & Technical Relations: the case of FE*  
BJSE Vol.2 No.2 pp  
145-161
- Avis, J (1983) *ABC & the New Vocational Consensus*  
JFHE Vol 7 No. 1 Spring
- Bachrach, P &  
Baratz, M (1971) *Two Faces of Power* in Castles, F *et al*  
pp.376-388
- Banks, O (1982) *The sociology of education 1952 - 1982*  
British Journal of  
Educational Studies 30  
(1) pp18-31
- Barbalet, J (1986) *Limitations of Class Theory and the Disappearance of  
Status* Sociology Vol.20 No.4  
pp. 557-575
- Barbalet, J (1988) *Citizenship* Open Univ. Press Milton  
Keynes
- Barnes, Sir D (1974) in Coombe Lodge Report
- Barr, G &  
Aspinall, P (1984) *FE & the YTS: Time to Pull Out*  
Natfhe Journal Oct.
- Barton, L &  
Walker, S (eds)(1986) *Youth, Unemployment and Schooling*  
Open Univ. Press Milton  
Keynes
- Barton, L  
*et al* (eds) (1980) *Schooling, Ideology & the Curriculum*  
Falmer Press Lewes
- Barton, L &  
Walker, S (eds) (1984) *Social Crisis & Educational Research*  
Croom Helm London
- Barton, L &  
Walker, S (eds) (1985) *Education and Social Change* Croom Helm London
- Bates, I  
*et al* (eds) (1985) *Schooling For The Dole: the new vocationalism*  
Macmillan London

- Benn, C & Fairley, J (eds) (1986) *Challenging the MSC on Jobs, Education & Training* Pluto Press London
- Bernstein, B (1977) *Class, Codes and Control Vol.3 2nd Ed.* Routledge, London
- Bernstein, B (1982) *Codes, Modalities & the Process of Cultural Reproduction* in Apple, M (ed)
- Bevan, S & (1988) *Political Pressures and Strategic Aspirations in the*  
Varlaam, C *Youth Training Scheme* Audit IMS
- Bhaskar, R (1978) *A Realist Theory of Science* Harvester Brighton
- Bloomer, K (1980) *The teacher as professional and trade unionist*  
in Hoyle & Megarry (eds)  
pp 361-373
- Bloomfield, J (1977) *Class, Hegemony and Party* Lawrence and Wishart  
London
- Blunkett, D (1982) *Has the Education Service Left it Too Late?*  
Natlhe Journal Nov
- Bocock, R *An Introduction to Sociology* Fontana in association  
*et al* (1980) Open Univ. London
- Boddy, M (1983) *Central-local government relations*  
Pol.Geog. Qtrly Vol.2  
No.2 pp 119-138
- Boddy, M & Fudge, C (eds)(1984) *Local Socialism* Macmillan London
- Boffy, R (1984) *FE & Work Based Learning* Natfhe Journal April
- Boffy, R (1984) *FE & The YTS: Some thoughts on year one*  
Natfhe Journal Oct
- Boffy, R & Cave, P (1982) *The YTS A Cynical Betrayal* Natfhe Journal Dec
- Boudon, R (1974) *Education, Opportunity and Social Inequality*  
John Wiley New York

- Bourdieu, P (1976) *The school as a conservative force*  
in Dale, R *et al*
- Bourdieu, P & Passeron, J-C (1977) *Reproduction: in Education, Society and Culture*  
Sage London
- Bourdieu, P (1980) *A diagram of social position and life-style*  
Media, Culture & Society  
2.pp 255-59
- Bowles, S & Gintis, H (1976) *Schooling in Capitalist America*  
Routledge London
- Boyle, C (1984) *Time To Pull out - And What Then?*  
Natlhe Journal Dec
- Bradley, J & Silverleaf, J (1979) *Making the Grade: careers in FE teaching*  
NFER Windsor
- Bradley, J & Silverleaf, J (1979) *Women Teachers in FE*  
Educ'l Research Vol.22  
No.1
- Braverman, H (1974) *Labor and Monopoly Capital*  
Monthly Review Press  
New York
- Bristow, A (1976) *Inside the College of Further Education*  
HMSO London
- Broadfoot, P *et al* (eds.)(1981) *Politics & Educational Change*  
Croom Helm London
- Brooksbank, K & Ackstine, A (1984) *MSC: education & training*  
in Society of Education  
Officers Educational  
Administration Year Book
- Broomhead, S & Coles, B (1988) *Youth Unemployment and the Growth of 'New Further Education'*  
in Coles, B (ed) pp 164-180
- Brown, P (1987) *Schooling Ordinary Kids*  
Tavistock London
- Browne, K (1981) *Schooling, Capitalism & the mental/manual division of labour*  
Soc'l Review 29 No.3 pp  
445-473

- Burgess, R (1985) *Issues in Educational Research*  
Falmer Lewes
- Burke, V (1971) *Teachers in Turmoil* Penguin Harmondsworth
- Butters, S  
et al (1984) *Capping Opportunity: Education & the Rates Bill*  
Local Govt. Campaign  
Unit
- Butters, S &  
Richardson, P (1983) *YOP in Inner London* unpublished University  
of London
- Campbell, B (1984) *Wigan Pier Revisited: poverty and politics in the 80s*  
Virago London
- Cantor, L &  
Roberts, I (1986) *Further Education Today: a critical review 3rd Ed.*  
Routledge & Kegan Paul  
London
- Carchedi, G (1977) *On the Economic Identification of Social Classes*  
Routledge & Kegan Paul  
London
- Carnoy, M (1982) *Education, economy and the State*  
in Apple, M (ed) pp 79-  
126
- Carnoy, M &  
Levin, H (1985) *Schooling and Work in the Democratic State*  
Stanford Univ.Press  
Stanford
- Carter, B (1985) *Capitalism, Class Conflict & the Middle Class*  
Routledge & Kegan Paul  
London
- Castells, M (1977) *The Urban Question* Edward Arnold London
- Castells, M (1978) *City, Class and Power* Macmillan London
- Castles, F  
et al (1971) *Decisions, Organizations and Society*  
Penguin - Open Univ.  
Harmondsworth
- Cawson, A &  
Saunders, P (1983) *Corporatism, Competitive Politics & Class Struggle*  
in King, R (ed), pp 8-27

- CCCS (Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies)(1978) *On Ideology* Hutchinson London
- CCCS (1978) *Social Democracy, Education & the Crisis in CCCS On Ideology*
- CCCS (1981) *Unpopular Education* Hutchinson London
- CCCS Women's Studies Group (1978) *Women take Issue* Hutchinson London
- Challis, B & Mason, C (1984) *YTS and the Local Authority* FE Staff College, Bristol
- Chapman, P & Tooze, M (1987) *The Youth Training Scheme in the United Kingdom* Avebury Aldershot
- Cherkaoui, M (1977) *Bernstein & Durkheim* Harvard Educ. Review Vol 47 No.4
- Child, J et al (1973) *Towards an Organisational Study of Trade Unions* Sociology Vol.7 No.1 pp.71-91
- Coates, R (1972) *Teachers' Unions and Interest Group Politics* Cambridge Univ. Press Cambridge
- Cockburn, C (1977) *The Local State* Pluto Press London
- Cockburn, C (1987) *Two-Track Training: sex inequalities & the YTS* Macmillan London
- Cohen, G (1978) *Karl Marx's Theory of History : a Defence* Oxford Univ. Press Oxford
- Cohen, J & Howard, D (1979) *Why Class ?* in Walker, P. (ed)
- Cohen, P (1984) *Against the New Vocationalism* in Bates et al
- Cole, M (ed)(1988) *Bowles and Gintis Revisited* Falmer Press Lewes

- Coles, B (ed)(1988) *Young Careers* Open.Univ. Milton Keynes
- Collins, R (1981) *The Credential Society* Academic Press New York
- Commission for Racial Equality(1984) *Racial Equality and the YTS* CRE London
- Connell, R (1985) *Teachers' Work* Allen & Unwin London
- Coser, L (1965) *Georg Simmel* Prentice-Hall New Jersey
- Crompton, R (1976) *Approaches to the study of white collar unionism* Sociology Vol.10
- Crouch, C (1982) *Trade Unions: the logic of collective action* Fontana London
- Crow, G (1989) *The Use of the Concept Strategy in Recent Sociological Literature* Sociology Vol 23.Vol.1 pp.1-24
- CSE State Group (1979) *Struggle over the State* CSE London
- Dale, R. et al (1976) *Schooling and Capitalism* Open University, Milton Keynes
- Dale, R (1982) *Education & the Capitalist State; contributions and contradictions* in Apple, M (ed) pp 127-161
- Dale, R (1983) *The Political Sociology of Education* BJSE Vol.4 No.2
- Dale, R.(ed) (1985) *Education, Training & Employment: towards a new vocationalism* Pergamon Press Oxford
- Dawson, P (1983) *General Secretary's Speech: 1983 Conference* Natfhe Journal June pp 37-39
- Dean,J et al (1979) *The Sixth Form and Its Alternatives* NFER Windsor

- Deem, R (1976) *Professionalism, Unity and Militant Action*  
Soc'l Review Vol 24 No1  
Feb.
- DES (1982) *The YTS: Implications for the the Education Service*  
Circular 6/82
- DES (1984) *The YTS in FE 1983-84: an HMI Survey*  
HMSO London
- Dept. of Employment (1981) *A New Training Initiative : a Programme for Action*  
Cmnd. 8455, Dec.
- Dept. of Employment (1984) *Training For Jobs*  
Cmnd 9135 Jan.
- Dewey, J (1966) *Democracy and Education*  
Free Press New York
- Dreeben, R (1988) *The school as a workplace*  
in Ozga, J (ed)
- Duncan, S & Goodwin, M (1982) *The Local State*  
Pol. Geog. Qtrly Vol. 1  
No.1 pp 77-96
- Duncan, S & Goodwin, M (1985) *The Local State & Local Economic Policy*  
Policy & Politics Vol.13  
No.3
- Duncan, S & Goodwin, M (1988) *The Local State & Uneven Development*  
Polity Press Cambridge
- Dunleavy, P (1980) *Urban Political Analysis*  
Macmillan London
- Dunleavy, P (1980) *Social & Political Theory & the Issues in Central-Local  
Governement Relations*  
in Jones, G (ed) pp.116-  
133
- Dunleavy, P (1984) *The Limits to Local Government*  
in Boddy & Fudge (eds)
- Dunne, J (1983) *Description or Analysis? A critical review of accounts*  
JFHE Vol.7 No.2
- Edelman, M (1977) *Political Language*  
Academic Press New  
York

- Edwards, R (1979) *Contested Terrain* Heinemann London
- Edwards, T (1984) *The YTS : A New Curriculum? Episode One*  
Falmer Press London
- Ehrenreich, B & Ehrenreich, J (1979) *The professional - managerial class*  
in Walker, P (ed)
- Eversley, J (1986) *Trade Union Responses to the MSC*  
in Benn & Fairley  
pp.201-226
- Farley, M (1979) *YOP Needs You Too!* Natfhe Journal Oct
- Farley, M (1982) *YTS: An update on content & standards*  
Natfhe Journal Dec.
- Farley, M (1983) *Trends & Structural Change in English Vocational Education*  
in Watson, K (ed)
- Fawcett Soc. (1985) *The Class of '84 : a study of girls on 1st year YTS*  
Nat. Joint Commte  
London
- FEU (1979)(1982) *A Basis for Choice* FEU London
- FEU (1981a) *Curriculum Change: An evaluation of TEC Programme Development*  
FEU London
- FEU (1981b) *Vocational Preparation* FEU London
- FEU (1982) *The Changing face of FE* FEU London
- FEU (1985) *Evaluation of the FE Role in YTS*  
FEU London
- Fiddy, R (ed)(1983) *In Place of Work* Falmer Press London
- Finn, D (1985) *Youth Unemployment & the State's response*  
Post-16 Educ. Centre  
Working Paper 1, Univ.  
of London

- Finn, D (1984) *A New Deal for British Youth? The New vocationalism & the YTS* Soc.Sc. Teacher Vol.13 No.2 pp 42-45
- Finn, D (1987) *Training Without Jobs: new deals and broken promises* Macmillan London
- Flower, F (1981) *Transition and Access: a review of low-level FE courses in the ILEA* FEU London
- Flude, M & Ahier, J (1974) *Educability, Schools & Ideology* Croom Helm, London
- Forrest, R et al (1982) *Urban Political Economy & Social Theory* Gower London
- Fowler, G (1981) *The Changing Nature of Educational Politics in the 1970s* in Broadfoot et al
- Fritzell, C (1987) *On the Concept of Relative Autonomy in Educational Theory* BJSE Vol 8 No.1
- Fullick, L (1986) *The MSC and the Local Community* in Benn & Fairley (eds), pp.227-249
- Gans, H (1968) *The Urban Villagers* Free Press New York
- Giddens, A (1979) *Central Problems in Social Theory* Macmillan London
- Giddens, A (1981) *A Contemporary critique of Historical Materialism* Macmillan London
- Giddens, A (1982) *Profiles and Critiques in Social Theory* Macmillan London
- Giddens, A & Held, D (eds) (1982) *Classes, Power and Conflict* Macmillan London
- Giddens, A & MacKenzie, G (1982) *Social Class and the Division of Labour* Cambridge Univ. Press Cambridge

- Ginsburg, M.  
et al (1980) *Teachers' Conceptions of Professionalism and Trade Unionism* in Woods, P (ed) pp178-212
- Gintis, H &  
Bowles, S (1980) *Contradiction and Reproduction in Educational Theory* Barton et al (eds)(1980)
- Gintis, H &  
Bowles, S (1988) *Contradiction and Reproduction in Educational Theory* in Cole, M (ed) pp. 16-32
- Gleeson, D &  
Mardle, G (1980) *FE or Training ?* Routledge & Kegan Paul London
- Gleeson, D (1981) *Communality and Conservatism in Technical Education* BJSE Vol.2, No.3
- Gleeson,D(ed)(1983) *Youth Training and the Search for Work* Routledge & Kegan Paul London
- Gleeson, D (1984) *Someone Else's Children* in Barton & Walker (eds)
- Gleeson, D (1984) *On the Politics of Youth Training* Educ'l Review Vol.36 No. 2 pp 157-63
- Gleeson, D (1985) *Privatization of Industry and the Nationalisation of Youth* in Dale, R (ed) pp 57-71
- Greater London  
Training Board (1983) *The YTS in London* GLC London
- Gosden, P (1972) *The Evolution of a Profession* Basil Blackwell Oxford
- Gough, I (1972) *Productive and Unproductive Labour in Marx* New Left Review 76
- Grace, G (1978) *Teachers, Ideology and Control* Routledge & Kegan Paul London
- Grace, G (ed) (1984) *Education and the City* Routledge & Kegan Paul London

- Grant, L (1985) *The Changing Pattern of Vocational Education for 16-18 year olds* JFHE, Vol 9 No.1
- Grassby, J (1983) *Responding to Radical Change* Natfhe Journal Dec
- Grassby, J (1984) *Time for Grass Roots Action* Natfhe Journal Dec
- Green, A (1983) *Education & Training Under New Masters*  
in Wolpe & Donald (eds)
- Gregory, D & Noble, C (1982) *Trade Unions and Special Measures for the Young Unemployed*  
in Rees & Atkinson (eds)
- Gulalp, H (1988) *Capital Accumulation and the State*  
in Williams, M (ed)
- Gyford, J (1983) *The New Urban Left* New Society 21/4 pp91-3
- Gyford, J (1985) *The Politics of Local Socialism* Allen & Unwin, London
- Hales, M (1980) *Living Thinkwork* CSE Books London
- Hall, E (1985) *One FE Division's Response to the Challenge of MSC*  
JFHE, Vol.9 No.1
- Hall, S *et al* (1978) *Policing the Crisis: Mugging, the State and Law and Order* Macmillan London
- Hall, S (1980) *The 'political' and the 'economic' in Marx's theory of classes*  
in Boccock *et al* pp. 197-237
- Hall, S (1985) *Authoritarian Populism* New Left Review 151  
pp.115-124
- Halsey, A *et al* (1961) *Education, Economy and Society* Free Press New York
- Halsey, A & Karabel, J (eds) (1977) *Power and Ideology in Education* Oxford Univ. Press New York
- Hammersley, M (1984) *The Paradigmatic Mentality : A Diagnosis*  
in Barton & Walker

- Hargreaves, A & Hammersley, M (1982) *CCCS Gas!* Oxford Review of Education, Vol.8 No.2
- Hargreaves, A (1982) *Resistance and Relative Autonomy Theories* BJSE Vol. 13 No.2 pp 107 - 126
- Hargreaves, A (1985) *The Micro-Macro Problem in the Sociology of Education* in Burgess, R (ed)
- Harloe, M (1978) *The New Urban Sociology* New Society 5/10 pp 12-13
- Harloe, M (ed)(1981) *New Perspectives in Urban Change and Conflict* Heinemann London
- Harloe, M & Lebas, E (eds) (1981) *City, Class & Capital* Edward Arnold London
- Harloe, M & Paris, E (1984) *The decollectivisation of consumption* in Szelenyi, I (ed) pp.70-98
- Harris, K (1982) *Teachers and Classes: a Marxist analysis* Routledge & Kegan Paul London
- Harrison, J & Dungeate, M (1984) *The Training Investment* CRAC Cambridge
- Harvey, A (1985) *Forget the Trendy Image - is this the real MSC ?* Natfhe Journal April
- Hickox, M (1982) *The Marxist Sociology of Education* B.J.Soc. Vol.33 No.4 pp 563-578
- Hindess, B (1977) *The Concept of Class in Marxist Theory and Marxist Politics* in Bloomfield, J (ed)
- Hindess, B (1987) *Politics & Class Analysis* Basil Blackwell Oxford
- Hirst, P.Q (1976) *Althusser and the Theory of Ideology* Economy & Society Vol.5 (4)

- HMSO (1976) *Policy Making in the DES: Tenth Report from the Expenditure Committee, House of Commons Session 1975-76* HMSO London
- Holt, M (ed) (1987) *Skills and Vocationalism* Open University Press, Milton Keynes
- Holloway, D (1985) *Accountability in Further Education : Teachers' perceptions* JFHE, Vol.9 (2)
- Holly, D (1977) *Education and the Social Relations of a Capitalist Society* in Young & Whitty (eds)
- Hooper, A (1982) *Neo-Weberian Political Sociology* Pol Geog Quartly Vol.1 No.1 pp 97-107
- Horn, C & Horn, P (1983) *The ATTI and its Policies: 1904-1914* JFHE Vol.7 No.1
- Hoyle, E & Megarry, J (eds) (1980) *World Yearbook of Education 1980* Kogan Page London
- Hoyle, E (1980) *Professionalization and de-professionalization in Education* in Hoyle & Megarry
- Hunter, C (1983) *Education and Local Government in the Light of Central Government Policy* in Ahier & Flude pp 81-107
- IDS (1983) *Youth Training Scheme* Income Data Services Ltd study 293
- IMS (1982) *Training for Skills Ownership* IMS
- Jackson, J (ed)(1970) *Professions and Professionalisation* Cambridge Univ Press Cambridge
- Jackson, M (1986) *A Seat at the table?* in Benn & Fairley (eds) pp. 26-39
- Jennings, R (1977) *Education and Politics* Batsford London

- Jessop, B (1985) *Nicos Poulantzas : Marxist Theory and Political Strategy*  
Macmillan London
- Jessop, B.  
*et al* (1988) *Thatcherism* Polity Press Cambridge
- Johnson, T (1972) *Professions and Power* Macmillan London
- Johnson, T (1982) *The State and the Professions*  
in Giddens & Mackenzie  
(eds) pp. 186-208
- Jonathan, R (1987) *The Youth Training Scheme and core skills*  
in Holt, M. (ed) pp.68-  
119
- Jones, G (ed)(1980) *New Approaches to the Study of Central-Local  
Government* Gower London
- Jones, K (1983) *Teachers and their Organisations*  
in Wolpe & Donald (eds)  
pp 137-144
- Jordan, S (1986) *Profiling and pedagogy in YTS*  
Post 16 Working Paper 5  
University of London
- Kaufman, M (1986) *The MSC and the New Training System*  
in Benn & Fairley (eds)  
pp. 135-152
- Kean, H (1989) *Teachers and the State 1900-30*  
BJSE Vol.10 No.2 pp.  
141-153
- Keep, E (1986) *Designing the Stable Door: a study of how the Youth  
Training Scheme was planned*  
Warwick Papers in  
Ind.Relations No.8  
Univ.of Karwick
- Keohane,N  
*et al* (eds)(1982) *Feminist Theory: a critique of ideology*  
Harvester Brighton

- King, R.(ed) (1983)      *Capital and Politics*      Routledge & Kegan Paul  
London
- Kogan, M (1983)      *The case of Education*      in Young, K (ed) pp 58-  
75
- Labour      *Inquiry into Youth Unemployment*  
Movement Inquiry (1986)      TURC Birmingham
- Labour Party, (1982)      *16-19 : Learning For Life*      Labour Party London
- Laclau, E &      *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy : towards a radical*  
Mouffe, C (1985)      *democratic politics*      Verso London
- Lash, S (1983)      *YTS: some fundamental flaws*      Natfhe Journal Oct
- Lawn, M (ed) (1985)      *The Politics of Teacher Unionism*  
Croom Helm London
- Lawn, M &      *The Educational Worker? A reassessment of teachers*  
Ozga, J (1988)      in Ozga, J (ed) pp 81-98
- Le Guillou, M (1981)      *Technical Education 1850-1914*  
in Roderick & Stephens
- Lee, D (1983)      *Social Policy and Institutional Autonomy in FE*  
in Gleeson, D (ed) pp  
234-253
- Leech, M &      *The Curriculum*      in FEU pp.31-37  
Hollyhock, B (1982)
- Leggatt, T (1970)      *Teaching as a Profession*      in Johnson, J (ed) pp  
153-178
- Levine, A      *Marxism and Methodological Individualism*  
*et al* (1987)      New Left Review 162 pp  
67-84
- Littler, C      *Class at Work*      Batsford London  
Salaman, G (1984)
- Locke, M &      *Mapping and reviewing the Pattern of 16-19 Education*  
Bloomfield, J (1982)      Schools Council Pamphlet  
No.20



- Means et al (1985) *Implementation of Social Goals in Labour Market Policy: the case of Black Youth, Equal Opportunities & the YTS* Policy & Politics Vol 13 No.1
- Meiksins, P (1986) *Beyond the Boundary Question* New Left Review 157 pp 101-120
- Mills,(1959) *The Sociological Imagination* Oxford Univ. Press  
C,Wright Oxford
- Minta, C (1983) *Presidential Address, Natfhe Conference 1983* Natfhe Journal July
- Moore, R (1983) *Further education, pedagogy and production* in Gleeson (ed) pp.14-31
- Moore, R (1984) *Schooling and the world of work* in Bates et al
- Moore, R (1984) Ph.D Univ of London
- Moore, R (1987) *Education and the ideology of production* BJSE No.8 Vol.2.
- Moore, R (1988) *The Correspondence Principle and the Marxist Sociology of Education* in Cole, M (ed)
- Moos, M (1979) *Government Youth Training Policy and its impact on FE* CCCS Stencilled Paper, Univ of Birmingham
- Moos, M (1982) *MSC - A Wolf in Sheep's Clothing* Natfhe Journal Oct
- Moos, M (1983) *The Training Myth* in Gleeson, D (ed)
- MSC (1975) *Vocational Preparation For Young People* MSC Sheffield
- MSC (1977) *(The Holland Report) - Young People and Work: Report on the Feasibility of a New Programme of Opportunities for Unemployed Young People* MSC Sheffield

- MSC (1980) *Outlook on Training* MSC Sheffield
- MSC (1981) *A New Training Initiative : An Agenda For Action*  
MSC Sheffield
- MSC (1982) *Report of Youth Task Group* MSC Sheffield
- MSC (1983) *YTS : A Guide to Managing Agents*  
MSC Sheffield
- MSC (1984) *YTS Review 1984* MSC Sheffield
- MSC (1984) *YTS : A Guide to Scheme and Content*  
MSC Sheffield
- Mungham, J (1982) *Youth unemployment and Moral panics?*  
in Rees & Atkinson (eds)
- NATFHE (1977) *The 16-19s - their education, training & employment*  
Natfhe Journal May
- Newell, R (1982) *The Rise of the MSC* Natfhe Journal Nov
- Newton, K &  
Karran, T (1985) *The Politics of Local Expenditure*  
Macmillan London
- NFER (1981) *TEC Programmes: some initial findings*  
NFER Windsor
- Nicholls, A (1983) *Managing Educational Innovations*  
Allen & Unwin London
- O'Connor, J (1973) *The Fiscal Crisis of the State*  
St.Martin's Press New  
York
- OECD (1975) *Educational development Strategy in England and Wales*  
OECD Paris
- Offe, C (1984) *Contradictions of the Welfare State*  
Hutchinson London
- Offe, C (1985) *Disorganized Capitalism* Polity Press Cambridge

- Ozga, J & Lawn, M (1981) *Teachers, Professionalism and Class* Falmer Press London
- Ozga, J (ed) (1988) *Schoolwork: approaches to the labour process of teaching* Open Univ Press Milton Keynes
- Ozga, J & Lawn, M (1988) *Schoolwork : interpreting the labour process of teaching* BJSE Vol.9 No.3
- Pahl, R (1977) *Collective Consumption and the State* in Scase, R (ed)
- Pahl, R (1978) *Castells and Collective Consumption* Sociology Vol.12 pp 309-315
- Parkes, D (1982) *The Changing Face of FE* FEU London
- Parkes, D (1985) *Competition...and Competence ?* in McNay & Ozgra (eds) pp 159-172
- Parkin, F (1982) *Max Weber* Tavistock London
- Parry, N & Parry, J (1974) *The Teachers and Professionalism* in Flude and Ahier, pp160-185
- Paulston, R (1976) *Conflicting Theories of Social and Educational Change* Univ of Pittsburgh Pittsburgh
- Pickvance, C (ed) (1976) *Urban Sociology* Tavistock London
- Poole, M (1981) *Theories of Trade Unionism* Routledge & Kegan Paul London
- Post-16 Educ Centre (1985) *The New Vocationalism : the Pros & Cons* PSEC Working Paper No.1
- Poulantzas, N (1973) *Political Power and Social Classes* New Left Books London

- Poulantzas, N (1975) *Classes in Contemporary Capitalism*  
New Left Books London
- Poulantzas, N (1978) *State, Power, Socialism* New Left Books London
- Poulantzas, N (1982) *On Social Classes* in Giddens & Held (eds)
- Preteceille, E (1981) *Collective Consumption and the State*  
in Harloe & Lebas (eds)
- Raffe, D (1981) *Education, Employment & YOP: some sociological perspectives*  
Oxford Review of Education, Vol.7
- Raffe, D (1983) *Education and Unemployment: Does YOP make a difference*  
in Gleeson, D (ed)
- Raffe, D (1983) *Can there be an effective youth unemployment policy?*  
in Fiddy, R (ed)
- Raffe, D (1986) *The Context of the YTS*  
BSA Youth Study Conference London
- Ranson, S (1985) *Changing Relations between Centre and Locality in Education*  
in McNay & Ozga pp 103-123
- Rees, G & Rees, T (1982) *Juvenile Unemployment and the State between the wars*  
in Rees and Atkinson
- Rees, T & Atkinson, P (eds)(1982) *Youth Unemployment and State Intervention*  
Routledge & Kegan Paul London
- Reuten, G (1988) *Value as Social Form* in Williams, M (ed)
- Reynolds, D (1984) *Relative Autonomy Reconstructed*  
in Barton & Walker (eds)
- Rhodes, R (1984) *Continuity and Change in British Central-Local Relations*  
B. Journal of Political Science Vol 14 pp261-283

- Rickman, P  
et al (1986) *Training For What: a case study of YTS* BSA Youth Study Conference London
- Roderick, G &  
Stephens, M (eds) (1981) *Where Did We Go Wrong? Industrial Performance Education and the Economy in Victorian Britain* Falmer Press Lewes
- Roy, W (1968) *Teaching Under Attack* Croom Helm London
- Salter, B  
Tapper, T (1981) *Education, Politics & the State* Grant McIntyre London
- Sammons, P (1983) *Patterns of participation in vocational FE* in Gleeson, D (ed)
- Sarup, M (1978) *Marxism and Education* Routledge & Kegan Paul London
- Sarup, M (1982) *Education, State and Crisis* Routledge & Kegan Paul London
- Saunders, P (1980) *Local Government and the State* New Society 13/3 pp550-51
- Saunders, P (1981a) *Social Theory and the Urban Question* Hutchinson London
- Saunders, P (1981b) *Community Power, Managerialism and the Local State* in Harloe, M (ed) pp 27-49
- Saunders, P (1983) *Urban Politics* Hutchinson London
- Sayer, A (1984) *Method in Social Science* Hutchinson London
- Sayer, D (1979) *Marx's Method : Ideology, Science, and Critique in Capital* Harvester London
- Scase, R (ed) (1977) *Industrial Society: Class Cleavage and Control* Allen & Unwin London

- Seale, C (1984) *Some Trends in YTS Curriculum Theory*  
Coombe Lodge Report,  
Vol 17 No. 6
- Seale, C (1987) *Policy makers and the Youth Training Scheme*  
in Holt (ed) pp.120-138
- Seymour, J (1988) *YTS : An attitude survey of trainees at two Colleges of F.E*  
Univ of Manchester  
Working Paper 14
- Sharp, R &  
Green, A (1975) *Education and Social Control* Routledge & Kegan Paul  
London
- Sharp, R (1980) *Knowledge, Ideology and the Politics of Schooling*  
Routledge London
- Sharp, R (1988) *Old and New Orthodoxies: The Seductions of Liberalism*  
in Cole, M (ed) pp 189-  
208
- Shipman, M (1984) *Education As A Public Service* Harper London
- Skeggs, B (1988) *Gender reproduction and Further Education*  
BJSE Vol. 9 No.2
- Smith, D (1989) *Unintended Transformations of Control over Education: a process of structuring*  
BJSE Vol.10 No.2  
pp.175-193
- Socialist  
Society (1983) *The Youth Training Scheme* Spider Web London
- Society of  
Educ. Officers (1984) *Educational Administration* Councils and Education  
Press London
- Sohn-Rethel, A (1978) *Intellectual and Manual Labour*  
Macmillan London
- Stoney, S &  
Lines, A (1987) *YTS: the Impact on FE* NFER-Nelson Windsor
- Swartz,D (1977) *Pierre Bourdieu: the cultural transmission of inequality*  
Harvard Educ Review  
Vol.47 No.4

- Szelenyi, I (ed) (1984) *Cities in Recession* Sage London
- Thompson, P (1984) *The New Vocationalism* Social Science Teacher  
Vol. 13 No.2
- Thompson, P (1983) *The Nature of Work* Macmillan London
- Tipton, B (1973) *Conflict and Change in a Technical College*  
Hutchinson London
- Tomlinson, J (1984) *Issues for an LEA in the new vocationalism*  
Social Science Teacher  
Vol.13 No.2
- TUC (1983) *TUC Handbook on the MSC's Youth Training Scheme*  
TUC London
- Turner, B (1986) *Citizenship and Capitalism : The Debate Over Reformism*  
Allen & Unwin London
- Turner, S (1979) *The Association of Teachers in Technical Institutions*  
Bristol Univ Ph.D.
- Turner, S (1988) *Social Class, Status and Teacher Trade Unionism*  
Croom Helm London
- Urry, J (1981) *The Anatomy of Capitalist Societies : The Economy,  
Civil Society and the State*  
Macmillan London
- Venables, E (1967) *The Young Worker at College*  
Faber London
- Walker, P (ed) (1979) *Between Labour and Capital*  
Monthly Review Press  
New York
- Walther, U-J (1982) *The Making of the New Urban Sociology*  
in Forrest *et al*
- Warren, T (1983) *The YTS: hopes and fears* Natfhe Journal May
- Warren, T (1985) *The MSC - what goes up...can come down*  
Natfhe Journal April

- Warwick, D (1976) *Professional Properties : The Case of the College Teachers* Dept of Sociology Univ of Leeds Paper No. 3
- Watson, K (ed) (1983) *Youth, Education and Employment* Croom Helm London
- West, G (1984) *Phenomenon and Form in Interactionist and Neo-Marxist Qualitative Educational Research* in Barton & Walker (eds)
- Whiteside, T (1978) *The Sociology of Educational Innovation* Methuen London
- Whitty, G (1977) *Sociology and the problem of radical educational change* in Young & Whitty (eds)
- Williams, M (ed)(1988) *Value, Social Form and the State* Macmillan Basingstoke
- Williamson, B (1983) *The Peripheralisation of Youth* in Ahier & Flude (eds) pp. 139-163
- Willis, P (1977) *Learning to Labour* Saxon House London
- Willis, P (1986) *Unemployment: the final inequality* BJSE Vol.7 No.2 pp 155-170
- Wilson, D (no date) *The Impact of the MSC on an FE College* Youth & Policy
- Wirth, L (1938) *Urbanism as Way of Life* Am.J.of Soc.Vol.33
- Wolpe, A.& Donald, J (1983) *Is There Anyone Here From Education ?* Pluto Press London
- Wood,E Meiksins(1981) *The Separation of the Economic & Political in Capitalism* New Left Review 127
- Wood,E Meiksins(1986) *The Retreat from Class* Verso London
- Wright, E.Olin (1978) *Class, Crisis and the State* New Left Books London

- Wright, E.Olin (1983) *Giddens's Critique of Marxism* New Left Review 138
- Young, M (ed), (1971) *Knowledge and Control* Collier-Macmillan London
- Young, M.& Whitty, G (eds) (1977) *Society, State and Schooling* Falmer Press Lewes
- Youthaid/GLTB (1983) *The YTS in London* GLC London
- Youthaid (1984) *Briefing Paper : The Youth Training Scheme* Youthaid London
- Ziderman, A (1978) *Manpower Training : Theory and Policy* Macmillan, London

